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Abstract

A corridor pavement of the House of Mosaics in Iasos shows the theme of running animals, which is known in central Italy in the I-II century in the black-and-white version, and which is very common in Western Asia Minor, particularly in Caria (Halikarnassos, Iasos, Orthosia), for a wide period since the second century AD. The aim of this paper is to discuss different problems related to this kind of mosaics: the artistic point of view, the possible identification of workshops, the meaning of such a theme, above all in relation to the Iasian mosaic. In this respect, it is important that the Iasian pavement has been unearthed very recently and that the study of its archaeological context is in progress. To define the chronological range of the Iasian mosaic, the stylistic and iconographic study will be combined with the analysis of the pottery found in the layers underneath the floor and in the layers above it.
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The mosaics

The House of Mosaics, which has been only partially uncovered, is a beautiful Roman domus of imperial age, situated on the South end of the rocky peninsula on which Iasos stands and facing the Gulf of Mandalay (Fig. 1). The entrance of the house is shifted toward west, where a long corridor leads to the heart of the dwelling (room 10). Very likely this part of the building – entrance and corridor – was added in a later period, as the bigger size of the tesserae of the pavements suggests¹. Here, on a white background, a bear, a donkey (or rather an onager) and a leopard are running after one another. The bear is squat, black, drawn as a silhouette, with a short tail, a gibbous neck, open jaws, and hexagonal white eyes with a black pupil (Fig. 2). The front legs are rampant while the hind ones stand on the frame of the mosaic panel. The colours of the onager are black and grey-blue: black are the head, the ears, the top of the back, the tail and the legs in the background, the hoof of the foreground front leg and the hock of the
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foreground hind leg (Fig. 3). The animal is running without touching land. The tail is upright and the ears are straight. The eyes have the same hexagonal shape as the ones of the bear. The leopard has been only partly brought to light, because of a critical state of preservation: just the light burgundy tail and legs with claws are visible (Fig. 4). A row of white tesserae follows the animals’ outline, with a different layout in comparison with that of the rest of the mosaic. There are no shadows, nor ground lines, nor elements of a landscape. Very likely the original composition consisted of a series of predacious animals in pursuit of their prey: the bear after the onager, the leopard after an animal we do not yet know (Fig. 5).

This pavement is the only one with a figured subject in the House of Mosaics; all the others have geometric patterns, with a few exceptions. In the pastas, dolphins surround the central carpet (Fig. 6); all the four rooms opening on the pastas have geometric mosaic with a small figural decoration: a dolphin and a pelta stress the doorway respectively of room 3 and 4, while craters and oinochoai, vases for keeping wine, suggest that room 2 and 5 were triclinia or reception rooms.

In the House of the Propylaeum too, near to the House of Mosaics and only partially excavated by Doro Levi in the seventies, the rooms, which seemingly are the core of the building, are emphasized by means of a figural design: in room κ, a central panel with black and white chessboard (Décor I 120 g) is framed by a panel with a sea horse and one with a dolphin and another sea monster. North of κ, and separated from this by a long step, is room σ, through which it was possible to go from κ to the other rooms of the building, on either side, at the back and upstairs. The mosaic is white with a large panel in the middle, where a dog is chasing a gazelle (Fig. 7). There is no shadow or ground line, only a bare tree suggests a setting in a wild nature. Tree and animals are executed in grey-blue and black tesserae. As for the animals in the corridor of the House of Mosaics, black are the back and the neck, the front legs in the background, the hoof of the foreground front leg of the gazelle (the hind legs of the gazelle and the other legs of the dog are missing), the tails. The bodies of the animals have a black outline,
the foreground ears are grey, the others are black, the foreground horn of the gazelle is black, the other is grey. Both animals have eyes of hexagonal shape as the ones of the bear in the House of Mosaics. The dog and the gazelle keep their mouth open, the dog has white teeth and a red tongue. He bears a high black and white collar. All these mosaics were possibly created in the same workshop, and it is likely that the panels with sea animals were to ascribe to the same craftsmen too (Berti 1983: 239).

All the pavements which have been brought to light at Iasos, about thirty, have geometric patterns, with the exception of the three pavements we are talking about and of an emblema; two out of four are decorated with a hunt scene and this is not by chance, I think. Hunt was a favourite subject, which Alexander the Great had already loaded with heroic values (Frumusa 2009), and it held its importance up to the Roman age, at least till the tetrarchic period (Cf. the
mosaic of Santa Bibiana: Salvetti 2004), even if some change in iconography and meanings occurred. In the first century A.D. mosaics (Cf. Pompei I 7. 1, Casa di Paquius Procullus or di Cuspius Pansa, tablinum 6: Pompei 1990: 483-552 fig. 42, Augustan Age) and paintings (Sant’Antonio Abate, loc. Casa Salese, Castellammare di Stabia, room 8: Guzzo – Tagliamonte 2013: 966, 968) with hunt scenes are known in the Vesuvian area, at Pompeii and Herculaneum, then they spread throughout Italy³, and, most of all after the 2nd century, throughout the Empire⁴.

Hunt scenes have ancient oriental and aristocratic origins, as hunting occurred in the royal Assyrian and Babylonian gardens. Later on, in the Persian Empire, they became a popular subject for funerary and honorary monuments because they glorified the deceased by showing his status and his valour (Şare 2013); in Athens chase became a favourite activity of Athenian aristocracy (Barringer 2001: 10-69). Therefore, this iconography spread all over Asia Minor and Greece since the 6th century B.C. up to the Hellenistic period. The mosaics at Pella (Petsas 1965) and the painting on the so called “Philip’s Tomb” at Vergina (Andronicos 1984: 106-119) show the popularity of hunt scenes by Macedonian monarchy (Aymard 1951: especially 43-57). The historical and political events of the 2nd century B.C. brought to Rome Greek artists and intellectuals, Greek culture, ideas and patterns, and brought the senatorial rank into contact with the great chases of Alexander and his successors (Aymard 1951: 54-57). In the meantime, hunt and hunt scenes lost their symbolic aristocratic connotations and began to signify Roman values: the symbolic date of this semantic change is 186 B.C., when Fulvius Nobilior arranged luxurious games, with athletic contests and a *venatio* with lions and panthers, in order to celebrate his victory over the Etolians (Liv. XXXIX 22, 2). Even if other historians refer to older performances of exotic animals (Plaut. Persa, 198-199; Plaut. Poen., 1011-1012; Plin.nat. VIII 16.), Fulvius Nobilior gave the first significant example of the important role which *venationes* will play in Rome since now on.

They became an essential moment of the amphitheater contests, so that their meaning was completed by that of the other spectacles, capital punishments and gladiatorial combats. *Venationes*, the first game to be staged in the morning, represented the victory of the culture over the nature, of rationality over irrationality, of the organized society over the primitive society. The following spectacles were complementary to each other: by means of capital punishments, Rome openly got rid of those people who were unable to integrate in the Roman society, and so became really enemies of it. With gladiatorial combats Rome acknowledged the virtue of gladiators, who, although they were mostly war prisoners, convicted criminals, or rebel slaves, practiced the typical Roman values: severe discipline, obedience, bravery even if they should lose their life; so that they were admired by senatorial aristocracy and considered like a model by Stoic philosophers⁵. The Roman state, by staging this kind of spectacle and fight, displayed its own skill to integrate and reform even the most dangerous

³ Sant’Angelo in Vado, 1st century A.D. (De Marinis – Quiri 2006: Fig. 8); Saltara, 2nd century (Blake 1936: 155 f., pl. 35, 4); Castel Porziano, 2nd century (Pagliardi 2012); Ostia: Becatti 1961: nos.18, 28, 62, 109, 268, 408, 2nd century; nos. 76, 359, first half of the 3rd century.

⁴ Orbe (von Gonzenbach 1961: no. 95 Orbe V, 184-194, pls. 60, 64-65, A.D. 220-230), Merida (Alvarez Martinez 1994: Fig. 1, second half of the 2nd – beginning of the 3rd century; Blanco Freijeiro 1978: 52, no. 65, pl. 107, 4th century); Conimbriga, Casa dos Repuxos (Oliveira 2005: 21, last quarter of the 2nd – first quarter of the 3rd century).

⁵ Let us remember the admiring words about gladiators and their courage written by Cic. Tusc. 2, 41 and Sen. epist. 30, 8; const. 16, 2; about symbolic values of gladiatorial games in Rome see Clavel-Lévêque 1984: 63-77.
people, and highlighted that the greatness of the empire was based on culture, value and discipline (Cf. Flaig 2007). This idea was even more stressed by the performance of mythological pantomimes and by the way the capital punishments were executed, performed as if they were mythological pantomimes, like Orpheus charming the animals or the death of Prometheus, as we read in the verses of the poet Martial (Martial. **de spect.** 7: Prometheus, 21: Orpheus). We find the same message, more or less expressly, on many monuments of Greece and Asia Minor. For instance, in the mosaics of Orpheus and of the judgement of Paris at Cos (De Mattei 2004: 33-53 no. 1 pls. II-XIII B 201-202 A.D.; 145-147 no. 70 pls. LXXXV2-LXXXVI), the importance of _paideia_ is stressed, in the former, by matching Orpheus charming the animals by the music of a lyre with _munera gladiatoria_, in the latter, by representing Apollo and the Muses, poets and philosophers, and _munera gladiatoria_ and _venationes_ (De Mattei 2004: 49). On a mosaic at Orthosia some mythological subjects, among which Herakles struggling against the Stynphalid birds, are framed by running animals and gladiatorial combats (Debord – Varınlıoğlu 2010: 241-245).

Mainly between the second half of the 2nd and the 3rd century A.D., we find a widespread public favour for hunt scenes in Asia Minor and Eastern Mediterranean Greece: they are a favourite subject for mosaics in private houses and a recurring theme in the architectural sculpture of public buildings at least until the 6th-7th century, even in a cryptic way (Cf. Ritti – Yılmaz 1998: 491-494, no. 11; 506-511, no. 16). Beside figurative evidences, many literary and epigraphic monuments testify for the popularity of _munera_ and _venationes_ in Eastern Greece, at least since Augustan age: imperial cult priests offered _munera_; _venationes_ and _munera gladiatoria_ were scheduled in the traditional Greek games, for instance at Ilion and Magnesia on Meander (Ville 1981: 214f). The great number of hunt scenes in Asia Minor and specially in Caria and nearby very likely can be connected with the ancient local tradition of the royal hunting in the Assyrian and Babylonian gardens.

In public buildings we can easily recognize the strong will of political authorities to assert the Roman ideal of _civis_; an ideal which associates culture with courage, strength, discipline. In private houses it is the _dominus_ who, by choosing the decorative programme of the _domus_, purposes to show his own belonging to the culture of the ruling class, either by right of birth, as a Roman or Italic, or by his own choice. In Rome Q. Ortensius staged a performance of Orpheus charming the animals with the music of his lyre (Varro rust. III, 13), while the _dominus_ of the House of Dionysos at Paphos and that of the House of Mosaics at Iasos expressed their choice of their own way of life by means of mosaics. At Iasos this message is made clear not only by the subject of the mosaic decoration of rooms

---

6 She recognizes five standing male figures with lance and whip as _venatores_, even if she does not exclude the possibility of a depiction of a _pompa gladiatoria_.

7 Occurrences are at Cos (De Mattei 2004: nos. 1, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 49, 51, 61, 72, 82), Halkí (Scheibelreiter 2011: no. 49 and Poulsen 2008: 101-110, tomb b. 13 in the necropolis outside the Myndos Gate), Didyma (Scheibelreiter 2011: no. 16), Mileto (Scheibelreiter 2011: nos. 91-92), Efeuso (Scheibelreiter 2011: nos. 24, 30), Orthosia (Scheibelreiter 2011: no. 100), Pergamö (Scheibelreiter 2011: no. 103), Sardis (Scheibelreiter 2011: no. 129). And then, still in the Eastern Mediterranean, a pavement in Crete (Markoulaki 1994: Fig. 4) and two at Paphos (House of Dionysos: Kondoleon 1995: Especially 271 – 314; House of the Four Seasons: Michaelides 1999: 85-87, pls. XIX-XX). On the values which animal combats underscore see also Parrish 1987.

8 See the 5th century mosaic of the Late Roman Villa in Halkí (Scheibelreiter 2011: no. 49) and the 6th-7th century Birds Mosaic of Cesarea Marítima (Porath – Gorin-Rosen – Neguer 2005/2006).

9 In Mylasa, in the Augustan Age, the priest C. Julius Hybreas is honoured by eighteen _bestiarii_ who possibly took part in _venationes_ he had offered to the town (Ville 1981: 207). On the East Greece evidence, see Robert 1940, Ville 1981: especially 200-215.
situated in a spot of great visibility (the access passage in the House of Mosaics, the central room in the House of the Propylaecum), but also by the artistic language used here and in every pavement of the *domus*. The distinctive feature of these pavements is a strong resemblance to Italic mosaics (Angiolillo 2013: 129f), exactly as K. Dunbabin and V. Scheibelreiter noticed in the other mosaics of western Asia Minor (Dunbabin 1999: 224f, Scheibelreiter 2005); noteworthy is the fondness for black-and-white mosaics and for a layout with one or more panels in the middle of a white mosaic surrounded with a black frame and a wide white margin, and the custom of marking different parts of pavements with either slanting or perpendicular rows of tesserae. As far as *venationes* are concerned, meaningful is the way they are represented, in a concise, basic manner without anatomic and landscape details – save for a stylized tree in the House of the Propylaecum –; a manner very near to that of the mosaic of the atrium of the House of Cuspius Pansa at Pompeii and, on the contrary, far from that of the other mosaics of the Greek-Asiatic area, in spite of consonances which concern iconography rather than style. From this point of view, on the contrary, we can possibly see some analogies with mosaics of Orthosia (Scheibelreiter 2011: figs. 443, 455-457) – in the way figures are drawn, and in the lack of concern for whatever setting – and Miletos – where the eyes of sea animals are very similar to those of the bear, the dog and the gazelle of Iasos (Scheibelreiter 2011: no. 87 fig. 395; no. 92 fig. 418) –, but even with the late Mosaïque du Cerf in Apameia (Balty 1997: 103 fig. 24).

A sign of the popularity which *venationes* enjoyed, in my opinion, is the circulation of their iconographies throughout the Empire and their persistency during many centuries. Severely, the author of the dog pursuing a gazelle in the House of the Propylaecum followed the same pattern as that of a black-and-white mosaic in the museum of Ancona (Blake 1936: 155f. pl. 35.4), which M.E. Blake dated to the 2nd century A. D., while a 6th-7th century bear chasing a horse in a house of Cesarea Maritima (Porath – Gorin Rosen – Neguer 2005/2006: 180 fig. 8a) looks like the one of the House of Mosaics, in spite of the obvious difference due to the chronological gap. And this is one more evidence of comings and goings around the Mediterranean sea of copy books used by mosaic workers, just as sculptors made use of moulds (Angiolillo 2011: 584-588).

The mosaics of Orthosia and Miletos have been dated to the period between the end of 2nd and the middle of 3rd century (Cf. Scheibelreiter 2011: 327-330, no. 100, Orthosia; 308-311, nos. 87, and 318-320, no. 92, Miletos); for that of the House of Mosaics at Iasos most likely we have a *terminus post quem* to the middle of 3rd century A.D.
The Archaeological Excavation in Room 10 and the Evidence of Materials

The room 10 decorated with the hunt scene mosaic has been discovered and partially excavated in 1970 by the Italian Archaeological School of Athens under the direction of Doro Levi (Levi 1972: 522-525). Afterwards, in 2003, the area was investigated by the University of Cagliari to define the connection between the entrance of the building and the rooms located immediately northern and to clarify the function of these spaces (Angiolillo et al. 2004: 13-15). The research unearthed almost wholly the pavement and the borders of the room which appeared to have been an entrance corridor leading from the threshold of the house to the rooms located on the west side of the main court.

In 2003 a stratigraphic investigation was conducted in the NE corner of the corridor, in a small portion of the floor intentionally not covered by the mosaic, in order to explore the layers underneath the mosaic level. The first stratum that was excavated (SU 114) was the fill of a small pit (Tab. 1). In addition to a few sherds – mostly black gloss, eastern sigillata, amphoras and common ware –, it has yielded a pretty well-preserved lamp (Fig. 8). The mold made unglazed lamp round in shape, with short rounded nozzle, double-grooved pierced handle and plain shoulder decorated with a little transverse band on each side (the broken disc should be plain) belongs to the Corinthian type (Dressel 25, Loeschcke VIII, Bronner XXVIII) produced in Corinth from the end of the 1st century to the 3rd century A.D. and widely exported in the Mediterranean area where the shape was also locally imitated (Loeschcke 1919: 49-53 tav. 1; Bruneau 1971; Bruneau 1977). The Iasian exemplar dates to the first half of the 3rd century A.D. (Floris 2008: 53 fig. 3. Cfr. e.g. Perlzweig 1961: 95 n. 284, early 3rd century A.D.).

An amphora pointed handle from the same context could be referred to an Aegean production of the imperial period. The fragmentary state makes it difficult to distinguish the type, but the handle shape is characteristic of transport containers produced in eastern Mediterranean area between the 1st and the 3rd century A.D. (Cfr. Bertoldi 2012: 130, Cretoise 4; 131, Knossos 19; 133, Camulodunum 184).

The investigation in the NE corner of the corridor reached a thick deposit of stone slags and fragmentary materials which was part of the filling of the terrace platform to support the Southern part of the house (SU 115 and 116). Even if it was possible to dig only the portion in correspondence of the pit in the corner, the deposit was also under the pavement with the hunt mosaic, so the data from these layers give an important contribution to define the chronology of this wing of the house.

Apart from a copious number of fragments of a terracotta roof of Corinthian type (pan tiles with raised edge and pitched cover tiles) (Cfr. Hasaki 1999), the material assemblage consists of a great amount of pottery fragments, most of all amphora sherds (Tab. 2).

The largest number of amphora fragments belongs to Hellenistic Cos amphoras (2nd–1st century B.C.) and possibly to sub-Cos amphoras (1st century B.C. – 2nd century A.D.), a typology of transport containers for wine originally

---

10 The field research was conducted by Marco Giuman, Maria Adele Ilba and Alfonso Stiglitz under the direction of Simonetta Angiolillo. Maria Adele Ilba was in charge of the finds lab, making an important contribution to the study of the material found in the House of Mosaics.

11 Hellenistic or early Roman.
produced in Cos (Papuci Wladyka 1997) and largely exported and imitated all over the Mediterranean area. This amphora type is very common in Iasos and many fragments were found also in other parts of the House of Mosaics (Stiglitz 2004). From room 10 come many small rolled rims (Fig. 9) and angular bifid handles (Fig. 10), characteristic features of the Cos amphora type. Unfortunately they are all in fragmentary state and no complete profile has been reconstructed, so at the moment it is impossible to suggest a more specific typological and chronological definition for the exemplars found in this part of the house. The typical impasto is orange-red with a small quantity of mica and other additives.

A considerable number of common ware has been found in the filling of the terrace under the mosaic, but most of them are not diagnostic. The most characteristic shapes of cooking ware are the chytra (Fig. 11), a double handle jar with outturned rim, and the ‘Ionian’ lopas, a shallow cooking vessel with carinated body, offset rim and loop handle (Fig. 12). These vessels are common in late Hellenistic period. The Ionian lopades appear also in the quarter to the south of the theatre in Iasos, in contexts dating to the begin of the 2nd century B.C. (Gasperetti 2003: p.152 pl. XCV nn. 49-50).

Despite the fragmentary state, the fine tableware provides important elements to define the chronological range of the context. With the exception of few residual
Sherds, the most of the fine ware vessels seems to refer to a chronological range between the late Hellenistic period and the Augustan age. Two sherds belong to white ground lagynoi of the Hadra type decorated with red-brown bands dating to 2nd – 1st century B.C. (Dereboylu 2001: 22-25). Among the fragments of Eastern Sigillata A, two exemplars are recognizable as Hayes form 4 plates with incurved rim attested from the late 2nd century B.C. to the early Augustan period (Hayes 1985: 15-16 pl. I 10-12) (Fig. 13) and one as a Hayes form 13 plate found in archeological contexts between the second half of 1st century B.C. and early 1st century A.D. (Hayes 1985: 20 pl. II 11) (Fig. 14). A rim of a Hayes form 46 cup (Hayes 1985: 34 pl. VI 14) (Fig. 15a) and another rim of a Hayes form 33 dish (Hayes 1985: 29 pl. V 3-4) (Fig. 15b) could date to the first half of the 1st century A.D. The “gray ware”, the late production of black gloss pottery characterized by gray impasto and gray gloss usually bad in quality, date at 50 B.C. – A.D. 50, even if the poor preservation makes difficult to reconstruct the original shape of the vessels.

Six very small fragments of lamps could be referred to the Ephesian type produced in different sites in Asia Minor from early in the second century to the middle of the first century B.C. (Bronner 1930: 66-70; Howland 1958: 166-169). Comparanda come also from the votive deposits found in the agora of Iasos (Michelucci 2013: 86). A fragmentary crescent-shaped nozzle in grey ware has been recognized as part of a Knidian lamp. The shape is typical in late Hellenistic – early Imperial time (Howland 1958: 126-127 no. 521-522 pl. 9-12; Bailey 1988: 329-327; Kögl 2005: 56 fig. 7 no. 39).

Well-attested are the Hellenistic relief bowls, the so called “Megarian”, and the colour coated pottery, usually known as “Knidian”. The “Megarian” bowls (Fig. 16), characterized by an hemispherical body and relief moldmade decoration, appear in Athens in late 3rd century B.C. and are widespread all over the Mediterranean area until the begin of the 1st century B.C. Except for one sherd possibly to be referred to the Attic type with overlapped rim, the exemplars from the filling of the terrace in room 10 belong to the so called Delian type with vertical rim, which production has been located along the South-West coast of Asia Minor (Rotroff 1982. For relief bowls in Iasos: Pierobon 1985; Pierobon Benoit 1997). The fragments from the room 10 are decorated with floral patterns and covered with a black-grey to dark red slip.

The most common shape of colour coated pottery is the carineted cup with π-shape handles (Fig. 17). The fragments from room 10 present on the interior surface a beige to grey impasto and grey to brown slip; the external surface is partially covered by slip in the upper part of the body. Produced in Knidian workshops from the middle of 2nd century B.C., the form has been imported and locally imitated in the Eastern Mediterranean region until the end of 1st century B.C. – first quarter of 1st century A.D. (Meriç 2002: 22-27; Kassab Tezgör 2003: 38. For comparanda from Iasos: Gasperetti 2003: 147 pl. XCI n. 22-23; Michelucci 2013: 88 fig. 8).

The stratigraphic sequence over the pavement level has been almost completely lost during the previous researchers, except for a narrow strip of ground – the so called “Testimone Levi” – that was dug by the team of the University of Cagliari. In the “Testimone Levi” the superficial layers seemed to be connected with the investigations in 1970, but the lower ones were related to the abandonment and post-abandonment of the building. Few not diagnostic finds without complete profile has been preserved: some wheel ridged wall fragments in common ware are typical of Imperial time or later productions.
In conclusion, the Corinthian lamp found in the upper layer (SU 114) of the NE corner offers a terminus post quem to the middle of 3rd century A.D. for the mosaic in room 10, confirming the chronology based on stylistic and iconographic analysis. We have to specify that the stratigraphic relation between the floor and the fill was partially compromise by the previous investigations and it is not possible to exclude the possibility that the layer has been altered by the abandonment spolium of some structures originally located in that corner. Nevertheless, considering the depth of the SU 114 and the morphology of the area excavated, it is likely that the mosaic with the hunt scene covered the SU 114.

With the exception of few residual fragments, the most of the materials found in the filling of the terrace (SU 115 and 116) is datable between the late Hellenistic period and the begin of the Imperial era. The same situation has been revealed in the places of the House of Mosaics where was possible to investigate the deeper layers under the frequentation levels, i.e., rooms 5, 6 and 11 in the western wing of the building. The dating of the pottery sets the building of the terrace later the end of 1st century B.C., likely in the first half of 1st century A.D. It is not possible at the moment to date the complete abandonment of the house.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>PRODUCTION</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>CHRONOLOGY</th>
<th>FIG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamps</td>
<td>Attic (?)</td>
<td>lamp</td>
<td>Corinthian Loeschcke VIII, Bronner XXVIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200-250 A.D.</td>
<td>fig. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphoras</td>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>amphora</td>
<td>not id.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st – 3rd cent. A.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**MATERIALS FROM UNDER FLOOR CAVITY (SU 115, 116)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS (PRODUCTION)</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>CHRONOLOGY</th>
<th>FIG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attic black gloss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black gloss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black gloss “grey ware”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern sigillata A</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>Hayes form 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late 2nd cent. B.C. – Augustan period</td>
<td>fig. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern sigillata A</td>
<td>plate</td>
<td>Hayes form 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50 B.C. – early 1st cent. A.D.</td>
<td>fig. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern sigillata A</td>
<td>cup</td>
<td>Hayes form 33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-30/50 B.C.</td>
<td>fig. 15a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadra vases</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Attic type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200-50 B.C.</td>
<td>fig. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Megarian” ware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>Delian type</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200-50 B.C.</td>
<td>fig. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour coated ware</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>so called Knidian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>late 2nd cent. B.C. – early 1st cent. A.D.</td>
<td>fig. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamps</td>
<td>lamp</td>
<td>Ephesos type</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200-50 B.C.</td>
<td>fig. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphoras</td>
<td>amphora</td>
<td>Cos type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd cent.B.C. – 1st cent. A.D.</td>
<td>fig. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (?) Aegean</td>
<td>amphora</td>
<td>‘Mushroom rim’ type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4th cent. B.C.</td>
<td>fig. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphoras</td>
<td>amphora</td>
<td>Cherediknov</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4th cent. B.C.</td>
<td>fig. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Ware</td>
<td>local (?)</td>
<td>lopas ‘Ionian’ type</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>late Hellenistic</td>
<td>fig. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass (blown)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>post 50 B.C.</td>
<td>fig. 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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