Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The assembled palace of Samosata: object vibrancy in 1st C. BCE Commagene

Kruijer, L.W.

Citation
Kruijer, L. W. (2022, May 24). *The assembled palace of Samosata: object vibrancy in 1st C. BCE Commagene*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3304326

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3304326

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chapter 7. Transforming *Objectscapes* of Samosata (4th c. BCE - 1st c. CE).

7.1. Introduction: four vibrant objectscapes of Samosata

In this chapter, I distinguish and analyse the sequencing of four objectscapes in Samosata that together span a period between ca. the 4th c. BCE and the 1st c. CE. These consists of:

- *Objectscape 1*, consisting of the 4th -2nd c. BCE, pre-palatial material (section 7.2);
- *Objectscape 2*, consisting of the early 1st c. BCE, early palatial material (section 7.3);
- *Objectscape 3*, consisting of the mid-late 1st c. BCE, later palatial material (section 7.4); and
- *Objectscape 4*, consisting of the 1st c. CE, post-palatial material (section 7.5).

In the first place, then, this chapter provides a fairly conventional synthesizing overview of the archaeological evidence for this broad, circa four centuries spanning, period in Samosata, and it suggests a chronological development for the available material that itself contextualizes the palace in this development. However, this chapter also attempts to apply the theoretical and methodological notions that were presented in chapter 3 to the archaeological evidence of Hellenistic and early Roman Samosata, attempting to develop a new perspective on the impact of the witnessed material transformations. By reconceptualising the palace as a relational assemblage consisting of 'vibrant' elements, it is hoped to provide a forward-reading, 'morphogenic' understanding of cultural transformation in Samosata (see chapter 3). This chapter, then, understands the four successive 'objectscapes' not merely as archaeological phases but rather as synchronous assemblages whose relational capacities caused different types of vibrancy. Instead of understanding the object changes from one objectscape to another as merely representative of abstract socio-historical or (ethno)cultural-historical concepts such as 'imperialism', 'urbanization', or 'Hellenization', this approach emphasizes the impact of the observed object-change itself. In chapter 3, I have proposed four different 'objectscape-proxies', with which we can investigate the relational capacities and thus the vibrancy of each successive objectscape. These proxies are: 1) temporal and geographical genealogies (investigating the vibrancy of glocal relations); 2) materials and colours (investigating the vibrancy of materials and their relational capacities); 3) sensorial capacities (investigating the vibrancy of matter through the multi-sensorial capacities of objects and their place in 'sensorial regimes'; and 4) radical alterity and representation (investigating the vibrancy of 'ontologically unsettling' objects). By analysing, for each objectscape, the changes of these four proxies in relation to their preceding objectscape, it is attempted to investigate the impact and vibrancy of material transformations through time.

Crucial to the argument of this chapter is the suggested separation of objectscape 2 and 3: an 'early palatial objectscape' dating approximately to the early 1st c. BCE (section 7.3) and a 'later palatial objectscape' dating to approximately the mid-late 1st c. BCE (section 7.4). This separation is based on the recurring evidence for at least two phases in the archaeological material of the palatial complex, witnessed in the evidence for the architectural lay-out (see paragraph 4.3.5), the architectural decoration (chapter 5) as well as the painted wall decoration (see paragraph 7.3.4). It should be emphasized again that the character and quality of the available legacy data does not allow for high-definition archaeology[726], and the broad periodic sequencing of the four proposed objectscapes in many ways already stretches the analytical possibilities of the material to its maximum.[727]

7.2. Objectscape 1 (4th-2nd c. BCE; pre-palatial)

In this section, I will discuss the archaeological evidence for the pre-palatial objectscape' of Samosata, comprising of layers that broadly date to the 4th -2nd c. BCE.[728] Four sectors on top of the *höyük* yielded evidence for this pre-palatial period: the so-called 'torus-base structure' in sector d-g/15-17, on the southwest of the *höyük* (7.2.1); the so-called 'altar structure' in sector f-g/17, directly east from the torus-base structure (7.2.2); the 'curved step' structure in sector k/16, below the palace (7.2.3); and pottery finds in sector u/9-10, on the north-east side of the *höyük* (7.2.4). I will discuss the material evidence for these four contexts separately, after which I provide an analysis of this objectscape according to the objectscape-proxies introduced in chapter 3 and in the introduction of this chapter (7.1).

[726] Raja and Sindbaek 2018.
[727] Paradoxically perhaps, I believe that the objectscape methodology has a particular value for patchy and low-definition legacy data such as those under discussion. Its theoretical, middle-range character and its zoomed-out investigation of *moyenne durée* change ideally functions as an analytical compensation for the dearth of high-definition evidence of the legacy data for Samosata.
[728] Part of the evidence and arguments presented in this paragraph were already published in Kruijer and Riedel 2021. Özgüç published some of these findings in Özgüç 1996, 216; Özgüç 2009, 46-48.

7.2.1 The 'torus-base structure' in sector d-g/15-17, layer VI

Fig. 7.1. Map of the 'torus-base structure' in sector d-g/15-17, layer V, with indication of rooms, courtyard and entrances (red arrows). Source: Özgüç 2009 140, plan 13 (adapted by the author).



Fig. 7.2 Section A (see fig. 7.1) of the 'torus-base structure' in sector d-g/15-17, layer V. Source: Özgüç 2009, 141 plan 14.

The so-called 'torus-base structure' is located on the southwest edge of the *höyük* and assigned to periodic layer VI in the excavations of Özgüç (figs. 7.1-4).[729] Its remains were placed directly on top of a level containing a mixed debris of Neo-Babylonian, Neo-Assyrian and Late Hittite material.[730] The structure consist of a courtyard with at least three adjoining rooms in the north, east and west that were only partially preserved (see fig. 7.1). The central room I (ca. 14,0 x 4,5 m.) has a NW-SE orientation and opened to the courtyard in the SW with two simple torus-bases *in antis* set on plinths, at ca. 4,0 m. distance (fig. 7.4). South-east of this room a second large L-shaped space, 'room II' (ca. 10,0 x 9,0 m.) was located. It is possible that this area in fact consisted of multiple rooms or a corridor with rooms; the documentation and preservation does not allow for a definitive plan. Although not assigned as such by the excavators, it seems likely that west of the courtyard a third, space, 'room III' (size unclear) was partially excavated. By means of the ample space between the torus-bases *in antis*, room I was easily accessible and visible from the courtyard. In the east of room I, an entrance towards room II was located (see fig. 7.1, entrances indicated with red arrows). Further towards the south, room II could also be reached from the courtyard. A third entrance led from room II towards the NE; it remains unclear whether the structure continued in that area.

a. b.

Fig. 7.3a-b. The 'torus-base structure' in sector d-g/15-17, layer V. Towards the NNW. Source: a: Özgüç 2009, pl. 119, 259 (originally published in negative); b: Özgüç 2009, pl. 120, 260a (originally published in negative).

[729] Mellink 1984, 449; Özgüç 1996, 214; Özgüç 2009, 46–48. plans 13–14. pls. 119–120. 258–260b; Canepa 2011,219-220; Canepa 2018, 109-110; Canepa 2021, 84. Note that the pictures of the structure provided in Özgüç 2009, pls. 119-120 were published in negative, creating a confusing image that did not correspond with the maps.
[730] Özgüç 2009, 46.

Fig. 7.4. One of two torus-bases belonging to the 'torus-base structure' in sector d-g/15-17, layer V. Source: Özgüç 2009, pl. 120, 260b.

Throughout the structure, the walls are constructed with mudbrick combined with many medium-sized limestone fragments and pebbles. On the exteriors, the walls are covered with facings of smoothened limestone orthostats with an average size of 1,0 x 0.5 x 0.25 m., aligned and starting at a height of ca. 0,40 m. above the surface (fig. 7.3a-b).[731] The entrance in the NE furthermore contained reused limestone blocks which, according to Özgüç, *'partly bore late-Hittite hieroglyphic signs'*[732], with which she probably meant Luwian inscriptions (indicated on the section of fig. 2 with '*kapı eşiği'*). All in all, these remains seem to have made up the southwest part of a larger structure with a NE-SW orientation that faced the lower town in the west. Several authors have suggested that the structure was related to the 'altar structure' immediately to the east in f-g/17, something which indeed seems likely (see below).[733]

[731] Özgüç 1996, 213.
[732] *Idem*, 213–215; Özgüç 2009, 46.
[733] Özgüç 1996, 216; Canepa 2021, 84.



a b

Fig. 7.5 a-b. Ceramics from sector e-f/15-16, layer V. Source: by the author.

Fig. 7.6 Storage jar with circular decoration in red paint. Source: Özgüç 2009, pl. 122, fig. 263.

The pottery connected to the 'torus-base structure' (mainly from sector e-f /15-16, layer V, found, according to the excavators, in and on the floor of the structure[734]) contains a group of mostly body sherds that are characterized by thick walls, rather coarse fabrics made of a yellowish buff clay, and decorations of different types in red paint (fig. 7.5a).[735] The decoration contains geometric motifs, floral designs and figurative elements that often consist of either human or gazelle depictions. Similar red-painted ceramics were attested in several sites in Cappadocia and Pontus, where they are dated to the very broad mid-late Iron Age period (ca. 6th-3rd c. BCE) often continuing into the early and mid-Hellenistic period.[736] In nearby Tille Höyük, the red painted buff

[734] Özgüç 2009, 47.
[735] A thorough analysis of the Iron Age and Hellenistic-period pottery of Samosata is still desirable; here I selected a non-random sample of sherds for a very general overview.
[736] Such red painted mid-late Iron Age wares with geometric motifs are for instance known from the Amasya Region, at Oluz Höyük (Dönmez and Naza-Dönmez 2009, fig. 37), where it continues into the Hellenistic-period with the so-called Galatian wares, cf. Özsait and Özsait 2003, 338, pl. 1.6. It is also attested in the late

fabrics are for instance widely attested for the Iron Age layers as well, and continuing into the 3rd and 2nd c. BCE.[737] They are assumed to be locally produced. Another important group consists of the typical shallow 'Hellenistic bowls' with incurved rims covered with red and brownish paint, covering the inside and outside rims and shoulders (fig. 7.5b). These shapes are attested also in the wider Syrian region but are likely to have been locally produced.[738] Not belonging to either of these groups is a storage jar in pinkish clay with fine sand inclusions has a bulging body, ring base and short cylinder-shaped neck and circular decoration in red paint (h. 25,0 cm.; diam. 21.2 cm; rim diam. 11.4 cm.), which was found in sector d/15, layer VI, in the floor level of SW corner of the torus-base structure (see fig. 7.6).[739] A secure dating of the assemblage is problematic as there is an absence of non-local finds that can serve as clear chronological markers, however the examples from Cappadocia, Pontus and Tille suggest a general 4th-3rd c. BCE date. The very general, unspecified contextual character of the periodic layer as well as the appearance of especially the first ceramic group in the earlier layers VI and VII blurs the picture considerably.

Fig. 7.7. Stamped Rhodian amphora handle found, from sector e/17, layer IV. Source: Wagner Archive.

Iron Age layers of Gövezli Tepesi (Ergürer 2018, fig. 3); Dédik (Genouillac 1926, pl. 7: 10061, pl. 8: 10054); Büyükkale in Boğazköy/Hattuša (Genz 2000, 37-39, figs. 7,5, 9-10, 13; Genouillac 1926, pl. 9:10091), Kara Höyük (Genouillac 1926, pl. 1: 9807 and 9812, pl. 17: 9816) and Çadır Höyük (Genz 2001, 160-161, with fig. 4).

[737] Blaylock 2016, 5; French et al. 1982, 173.

[738] E.g. in *Antioch*: Christensen and Johansen 1971, 2;*Tarsus:* Christensen and Johansen 1971, 2; *Aşvan Kale:* French 1973; *Hama:* Christensen and Johansen 1971, 1 and 6 nos. 2-3 figs. 1-2; *Tell Mardikh/Ebla*: Mazzoni 1991, 92 fig. 7.8-13; Mazzoni 1995.

[739] Özgüç 1996, pl. 37,6; Özgüç 2009, 47, st.83-360, pl. 122 fig. 263.

A stamped Rhodian amphora handle (l. 9,7; w. 7,7) found in sector e/17 - but in layer IV, so covering the 'torus-base structure' - might provide a further clue in terms of the dating of the 'torus-base structure' (see fig. 7.7).[740] It contains the eponym Αριστόδαμος, who officiated in ca. 166/164 BCE.[741] As such, it is possible that the 'torus-base structure' was abandoned and destroyed in the course of the early-mid 2nd c. BCE. This stamp also provides an insight in the genealogies of objectscape 1 as the same Rhodian stamp is also attested in, for instance, Cosa in Italy[742], Alexandria[743] Gözlü Kule (Tarsus) in Cilicia[744], Tel Jezreel in northern Judea.[745] More in general, Rhodian amphorae recur in Commagene, for instance in Arsameia on the Nymphaios, where two fragments of stamped handles from Rhodian amphorae date to the 2nd half of the 2nd c. BCE up to the early 1st c. BCE.[746]

The 'torus-base structure' has been interpreted as the remainder of a satrapal palace from the Achaemenid period[747] or as a palace belonging to the reign of the Orontids of Sophene in the first half of the 3rd c. BCE.[748] The latter interpretation has been favoured specifically by Matthew Canepa, who argues that the early Orontids in Greater Armenia abandoned old satrapal sites – such as Tille Höyük[749] - and instead favoured sites with a long occupation history but without an Achaemenid satrapal phase.[750] In this scenario, Canepa suggests that the torus bases would have evoked a concept of Persian architecture and kingship, something which is attested for the Orontids of Sophene in other instances as well.[751] Although Canepa's interpretation indeed conveniently fits the overall picture of 3rd c. BCE Orontid dynastic policy, the archaeological

[740] Published in Zoroğlu 2000, 83, fig. 119, with n. 294.
[741] Finkielsztejn 2001, 192.
[742] Will and Slane 2019, 144, cat. no. B5
[743] Şenol and Şenol 2000, 404, no. 17.
[744] Grace 1934, 219, fig. 2; Grace 1950, 141, no. 28.
[745] Ariel 2014, 136,138. Other Rhodian amphorae found in Commagene derive from Arsameia on the Nymphaios and Doliche. See Dörner and Goell 1963, 244 and Wagner, 21-24.
[746] Dörner and Goell 1963, 244–245.
[747] Mellinck 1984, 448; Messerschmidt 2014, 330. See also the earlier excavation reports of Özgüç 1985, 221-228 and Özgüç 1986, 297-304; only later, the excavators, opted for an Early-Hellenistic dating.
[748] Özgüç 1996, 213-216 (assigning the structure specifically to Samos I); Özgüç 2009, 41–48; Canepa 2018, 102-103, 109–110 and Canepa 2021, 84. Note that Facella 2006, 173 first assigns the structure to the Late-Persian period but later discusses '*un grande edificio*' that was found '*nella parte sud-occidentale*' which she dates to '*prima età ellenistica'.*
[749] Blaylock 2009, 157. 171–212; Canepa 2018, 25–28.
[750] Canepa 2011, 219-220. See also Canepa 2021, 75: '*Samosata evinces an analogous pattern of development compared to Arsamosata in Sophene. Founded in the mid- to late-3rd c. BCE by Arsames, son of Samos I, it too had a similar gap between the Urartian and Hellenistic occupations. Still more, its use of 'sub Achaemenid' Persian architectural forms is conceptually continuous with Orontid structures in Greater Armenia, as is its location at a site of ancient significance without satrapal connotations*.' Another argument in favour of this interpretation is another torus-base found at Arsameia on the Nymphaios, dating to the 1st half of the 3rd c. BCE (cf. Oenbrink 2017, 37–38; contra Messerschmidt 2014, 330 n. 37, who dates the base to the Achaemenid period). The torus bases from Samosata and Arsameia on the Nymphaios do however differ in terms of their height and their proportion vis-à-vis the plinth, making a chronological comparison between the two problematic.
[751] Canepa 2011, 219-220; Canepa 2018, 109–112; Canepa 2021, 84.

evidence remains thin and interpretative caution must be warranted. Based on the very general Hellenistic-period dating of part of the associated ceramic material, it is possible that the structure was constructed already in the late Iron Age (ca. 4th c. BCE) and remained in use until the early 2nd c. BCE.

7.2.2 The 'altar structure' in sector f-g/17, layer VI

Figs. 7.8. The so-called 'altar-structure' in sector f-g/17 of the höyük*. Towards the NNW. Source: Özgüç Archive.*

There is only limited archaeological evidence for the so-called 'altar-structure' in sector f-g/17, layer VI; it was not well preserved and the excavators did not document it apart from a handful of pictures and short descriptions (figs. 7.8-11).[752] Like the torus-base structure, the altar structure was built directly on top of a layer with a mixed debris of Neo-Babylonian, Neo-Assyrian and Late Hittite material.[753] The structure consists of three walls that together create a space of ca. 9,0 x 4,0 m. with a NE-SW orientation; no wall was found in the NE which would close this possible room. Just like the nearby torus-base structure in sector d-g/15-17, the walls of the 'altar structure' appear to be constructed in mudbrick and limestone pebbles and also contain smoothened limestone orthostat facings. Only in the north-western wall, a couple of limestone orthostats were

[752] Özgüç 1996, 213; Özgüç 2009, 41–46. See also Canepa 2018, 102–103; Canepa 2021, 84-86; Kruijer and Riedel 2021.No maps or drawings were made. The orientation of the structure can nonetheless be deduced from figure 8, which shows the east-west running border of the trench (the north of sector f-g/17).
[753] Özgüç 2009, 46.

discovered *in situ*; in the south-western wall, all the orthostats fell backwards on top of the remainder of the mudbrick wall (fig. 7.8).

Figs. 7.9. The so-called 'altar-structure' in sector f-g/17 of the höyük*. Towards the SW. Source: Özgüç Archive.*

Figs. 7.10. The so-called 'altar-structure' in sector f-g/17 of the höyük*. Towards the SE. Source: Özgüç Archive.*

Fig. 7.11 The so-called 'altar-structure' in sector f-g/17 of the höyük. Towards the NW. Source: Özgüç Archive.

In the north-eastern extension of the north-western wall, an installation was unearthed that granted the structure its name (figs. 7.9 and 7.10). Instead of an altar, the elevated part, consisting of mudbrick and three large limestone orthostats, should however most likely be understood as the best preserved part and north-eastern (perhaps widening) end of the north-western wall. Further towards the north-east, a surface consisting of neatly fitting limestone slabs is most likely a threshold belonging to the north-eastern entrance to the structure.



a *b*

c d

Fig. 7.12a-d. Ceramics from sector g/17, layer VI. Source: by the author.

The ceramics found in relation to the 'altar structure', specifically in sector g/17, layer VI, can predominantly be assigned to the first group discussed in relation to the 'torus-base structure'; these are characterized by thick-walled, rather coarse fabrics made of a yellowish buff clay with decorations of different types in red paint (see fig. 7.12a-d). Most fragments are body sherds of large closed vessels; some vertical handles indicate the presence of amphora-type shapes (see fig. 7.12a and d). Also here, the decoration contains geometric motifs, floral designs and figurative elements with either human or gazelle subjects.

a b c

Fig. 7.13a-c. a: Neck of a crater with painted hunting scene found in the northern part of the 'altar structure'. b-c: front and side of jug with vertical handles and gazelle iconography. Source a: Wagner Archive b+c: pictures by the author.

From this group, we can single out two craters with remarkable and well preserved painted decoration (see figs.7.13a-c). One is a neck fragment of a crater containing painted decoration depicting a hunting scene, in so-called silhouette style (see fig. 7.13a).[754] The elongated neck (h.

[754] Özgüç 1996, st.89-107, pl. 38. 1-3; Özgüç 2009, 47, pl. 123 fig. 266.

38,0 cm.; diam. 34,0 cm.) with protruding rim and long vertical handles shows a hunter on a galloping horse directing his spear towards what is probably a gazelle, while a dog chases another gazelle at the bottom. The other crater (fig. 7.13b-c) was almost completely preserved, with a shorter neck and bulging body, with two vertical handles that start at the rim and end at the belly.[755] The crater has a slightly protruding rim and a flat base. This crater also contains abundant gazelle iconography in red paint onto the yellowish buff surface, albeit not in the form of a hunting scene. The central scene rather depicts a continuous frieze of what appear to be date trees that are each adjoined by two gazelles facing in the same direction. This silhouette or animal style ceramics is widely attested for the mid-late Iron Age in Cappadocia and the Pontic region but, like the red-painted buff wares, might have still been produced in the early-mid Hellenistic period as well.[756]

Fig.7. 14. Anthropomorphic ivory comb found in the 'altar structure'. Source: Özgüç 2009, pl. 125, fig. 268.

Like for the torus-base structure, the excavators mention the presence of reused late-Hittite stone reliefs with (Luwian) inscriptions; it is not clear which fragments they refer to.[757] Özgüç also mentions a large amount of white and green glazed bricks or tiles which were found in association with the 'altar structure'.[758] It is not clear whether these indeed were originally integrated in the 'altar structure' or merely findings belonging to the layer onto which the structure was placed.

[755] Özgüç 2009, 47, pl. 124 fig. 267a-c.
[756] Early examples are attested in Büyükkale II in Boğazköy/Hattuša (cf. Opificius 1965; Genz 2000, 53, figs. 14-15) and Gordion (Sams 1994). In general, see Özkaya 1995.
[757] Özgüç 2009, 46-47.
[758] *Ibidem*. For pictures of these glazed bricks/tiles, see Özgüç 2009, pls. 125-126, figs. 269-270.

The 'altar structure' also yielded an anthropomorphic ivory comb (see fig. 7.14).[759] The comb (l. 8,5 cm.; w. 3,1 cm.) has twenty narrow teeth, of which three were missing. Both sides of the handle have the same carved imagery of a human subject with an angular head, a schematic indication of hair, two circular eyes and the suggestion of shoulders, arms and hands placed along the body and perhaps the suggestion of a skirt with horizontally carved lines.

Taken together, the evidence for the 'altar structure', and especially its high quality limestone orthostats and slabs, suggests that it was part of a representative structure. The ceramic assemblage is very similar to that of the nearby 'torus-base structure' (ca. 10 m. to the west), although, compared to the latter context, the absence of 'Hellenistic fish plates' in the former context is remarkable. The similar wall technique and decoration as well as the identical NE-SW/NW-SE orientation make it probable that the 'altar structure' belonged to the same large representative structure on the south-west part of the *höyük* as did the 'torus-base structure' (see above). None of the ceramic and small finds from the 'altar structure' can be dated with any certainty, but following the very similar ceramic finds from Cappadocia and Tille Höyük (see paragraph 7.2.1), and assuming the structure indeed belonged to the 'torus-base structure', it is likely that it was in use approximately during the 4th-3rd c. BCE.

[759] Özgüç 2009, 48, st. 89-110, pl. 125, fig. 268.

7.2.3 'Curved step structure' in sector k /16, layer VI



Fig. 7.15. Pre-palatial structure indicated in light grey in sector k/16, underneath the palatial structure, indicated in dark grey. Map by the author (based on Özgüç 2009, 139 plan 12).

The third context with structural remains belonging to the objectscape 1 is the so-called 'curved step structure' located in sector k/16, in layer VI, underneath the tessellated mosaic of room XIV of the Late-Hellenistic palatial structure of layer V (see fig. 7.15).[760] These remains consist of slightly curving stairs (W56, see appendix A) made of several small stones and adjoining walls (W53/54/55/62/101) with a different alignment (NEE-SWW) than the later palatial complex. The limited preservation and documentation of this structure do not allow for any far-reaching conclusions concerning its dating, overall size and character. The masonry, however, seems to differ from the 'torus-base structure' and the 'altar-structure' (for both, see above) as there is no evidence for the use of smoothened limestone orthostats nor mudbrick walls. It is therefore likely that this structure does not belong to the building phase of the large representative building on the southwest sector of the *höyük*.

[760] Although visible in the plans of the palatial complex, this small structure remains unmentioned throughout the publications on Samosata by Özgüç 2009, Zoroğlu 2000/2012 and Bingöl 2013. See also Kruijer and Riedel 2021.



a. *b.*

Fig. 7.16a-b. Ceramics from sector k/16, layer VI. Source: by the author.

The ceramic evidence connected to the 'curved step structure' in sector k/16, layer VI, indicates a similar picture as it is more varied than the assemblages connected to the 'torus-base structure' and the 'altar-structure' (see fig. 7.16a-b). Only a handful of fragments belong to the group of thick-walled, rather coarse fabrics made of a yellowish buff clay with decorations of different types in red paint, which was found in large numbers in the previous two sectors (7.2.1 and 7.2.2). Here, the decorations are less elaborate compared to the previous two contexts. Again, however, these fragments seem to belong to large vessels, and the presence of vertical painted handles indicates the occurrence of amphora-like forms. Some rim fragments and body sherds belonging to the typical shallow 'Hellenistic bowls' with incurved rims were equally attested. Far more numerous however are less shallow bowls made of a similar buff clay with few inclusions, with simple protruding rims and a mat light red painted surface. As in the other two pre-palatial contexts (7.2.1 and 7.2.2), the ceramic material lacks non-local finds that can serve as clear chronological markers, but the overall picture again allows for a broad 5th-2nd c. BCE date. The lack of any ceramics firmly dated to the late 2nd - early 1st c. BCE – for instance ESA - has important implications for the dating of the superimposed palace, as it allows for an early 1st c. BCE dating (as also argued for in paragraph 4.3.7)

7.2.4 Pottery finds in sector u/9-10, layer VII

In sector u/9–10, Hellenistic-period ceramic material was found in Özgüç's layer VII (see fig. 7.18a-d), which, in other sectors, could be dated to the Iron Age but here looks very similar to the

previously discussed layers V and VI. As such, it is likely that this layer belongs to objectscape 1 as well. The sector is located at the north-east slope of the *höyük* and hence its potential structural remains were probably all eroded. The ceramic material however shows an interesting combination of pottery types also attested in the other three previously discussed pre-palatial contexts, while also yielding some evidence for non-local finds that might serve as chronological markers.



a. b.

Fig. 7.17a-b. Pottery from sector u/9-10, layer VII. Source: by the author.



a. b.

Fig. 7.18a-b Attic black-glazed pottery from sector u/9-10, layer VII. Source: by the author.

The ceramic material contains a considerable amount of the thick-walled, rather coarse fabrics made of a yellowish buff clay with decorations of different types in red paint (see fig 7.17b), which were found in large numbers in the previous three sectors. Next to this are some rim fragments belonging to the well attested Hellenistic fish plates, covered with red paint. Less shallow bowls attested in k/16, layer V, in connection to the 'curved step structure' were equally attested (fig.

7.17a). Two fragments of Attic black-glazed pottery were furthermore found and allow for a more precise dating (fig. 7.18a-b). These two fragments might derive from the same kylix, bowl or plate and contain an interior design of stamped palmettes placed within rouletting. Close parallels derive from the Athenian agora and can be dated to the last quarter of the 4th and beginning 3rd c. BCE.[761] The mixed and probably rather contaminated character of layer VII in sector u/9-10 however makes it difficult to draw any further conclusions concerning the dating of the other ceramics and structures. Nonetheless, the sporadic fragments do indicate some sort of material link and supra-regional genealogies to the Mediterranean in the Early-Hellenistic period. This is also attested in other Commagenean sites such as Tille Höyük and Arsameia on the Nymphaios, where, however, the numbers of imports are equally low.[762]

7.2.5 Analysis

Although the evidence is rather sketchy and haphazard, it is possible to analyse objectscape 1 in terms of the four proxies introduced and defined in chapter 3 and in the introduction to this chapter (7.1), looking at 1) temporal and geographical genealogies (investigating the vibrancy of glocal relations); 2) materials and colours (investigating the vibrancy of materials and their relational capacities); 3) sensorial capacities (investigating the vibrancy of matter through the multi-sensorial capacities of objects and their place in 'sensorial regimes'; and 4) radical alterity and representation (investigating the vibrancy of 'ontologically unsettling' objects).

Temporal and geographical genealogies. In terms of architectural features, the use of torus-bases and smoothened limestone orthostats in the large structure on the SW edge of the *höyük* (comprising of the 'torus base structure' and the 'altar structure') are most notable. If the suggested 3rd c. BCE dating is approximately correct, the use of these features should be considered the appropriation and activation of forms that were developed already centuries before. The limestone orthostat wall facings likely had the capacity to evoke a building tradition

[761] Rotroff 1997, 309–310 nos. 635–653. 330–331 nos. 874. 877. For a detailed study of the ceramics from the '*Atelier des pétit estampilles'* see still Morel 1969.

[762] For Tille Höyük, see French et al. 1982, 173. A few black glazed sherds dating to the Early-Hellenistic period including one probable piece of Athenian West Slope are mentioned. French 1984, 247 merely mentions the occurrence of black-glazed pottery. French 1985, 213 mentions many such sherds found at the site but it is well possible that these were locally or regionally produced, as he does not mention a place of origin. This idea seems to be confirmed by Blaylock et al. 1990, 117 where the pottery of Tille Höyük is connected to the findings at Antioch on the Orontes, adding local wares '*from the Tille material*'. Cf. also Blaylock 2016, 66 who, on the basis of the pottery, suggests only a gradual turn towards the Mediterranean from the later 4th c. BCE onwards. It is however possible that this turn started already earlier, as a handful of black-gloss fragments are considered Mediterranean imports or imitations of 'western models' and are dated to the late 5th c. BCE (cf. Blaylock 2009, 63). This however still concerns only a very limited amount; Blaylock 2016, 201–203 lists only 26 pieces for the whole Iron Age period with a '*late emphasis'* (Blaylock 2016, 62). For three black-glazed sherds from Arsameia on the Nymphaios, see Dörner and Goell 1963, 236 nos. 1–2 and Hoepfner 1983, 6. 92 no. 6.

that developed already during the Middle Bronze age in Northern Syria and became particularly ubiquitous in the Early Iron Age of Upper Mesopotamia.[763] Its initial function, protecting the otherwise vulnerable mudbrick walls from weathering, through time, had likely become entangled with concepts of monumentality, ceremonial space and royalty, especially through its later use in the courtyards and interior spaces of Late-Assyrian palaces.[764]

A similar drawing on earlier building traditions is witnessed in the adoption of the torus-base, which was developed in northern Syrian (late) Hittite architecture of the early Iron Age and is found in north Syrian sites such as Karkamiš, Zincirli, Tell Taynat and Zamaghara.[765] The torus bases would later become strongly entangled with a concept of Persian royal culture, as it was enthusiastically adopted in the palaces of Pasargadae in Palace S and in the Darius Gate in Susa.[766] It is not unlikely that the use of torus-bases in Samosata was an active attempt by the Orontids of Sophene at evoking a concept of Persian royal culture in the 3rd c. BCE, a cultural scenario of 'Persianism' also well attested in other places for this dynasty.[767] It should however be noted that other Hellenistic-period contexts throughout Eurasia often involved the adoption of torus bases as well (e.g. the Oxus temple at Taht-i Sangin[768], the central complex of Ai Khanoum[769], the rock-cut tombs of Paphlagonia[770] and Ağıcıkişi near Taşköprü/ Pompeiopolis[771], and, perhaps, the residence at Meydancıkkale in Cilicia[772]) thus perhaps again watering down the Persian connotation. The widely attested integration of the torus-bases as elements that are placed *in antis,* providing entrance between a central courtyard and an elongated room that runs along the length of the court, is neatly adhered to in the torus-base structure in Samosata. It might be suggested that that, *if* the glazed bricks found in association with the 'altar structure' indeed adorned the walls of the large representative edifice that stood on the SW edge of Samosata's *höyük*, these provide us with another architectural element that tied in with an older building tradition stood on the SW edge of Samosata's *höyük*, these provide us with yet another architectural element that tied in with an older building tradition that was deeply entangled with a concept of Persian royal culture. With these considerations in mind, we might furthermore hypothesize that, besides fulfilling their basic functional role as architectural *spolia*, the re-used

[763] Semper 2004.
[764] Harmanşah 2013, 157-162, with many examples.
[765] Naumann 1955, 130–132; Wesenberg 1971, 87–116.
[766] Stronach 1978, 56–106, pls. 54–56, 73-75; Ladiray 2010, 181 -195, figs. 169, 188; Boucharlat 2010, 420-443; Wesenberg 1971, 104 - 111.
[767] As already suggested in Canepa 2011, 219-220; Canepa 2018, 109–112; Canepa 2021, 84. For 'Persianism', see Strootman and Versluys 2017.
[768] Litvinskij and Pičikjan 2002, 75–83, pls. 7–9, 15, 16.
[769] Hoo 2018 with further literature.
[770] Von Gall 1966, 113–116, fig. 29; Summerer and Von Kienlin 2010, 195–221.
[771] Von Kienlin 2011, 215–216, pl. 1,1, 2.
[772] Held and Kaplan 2015, 184, which the excavators date to the Persian period arguing unconvincingly that the Early-Hellenistic Ptolemaic rule of Meydancıkkale excludes the possibility of a Hellenistic dating.

limestone blocks with Late-Hittite Luwian inscriptions found in the 'torus-base structure' in a similar way activated a more general sense of a deep past (rather than necessarily evoking Persian kingship). Their specific, seemingly targeted integration in the NE entrance of that structure might indeed suggest some degree of awareness of the deep historical, local entanglements of these blocks.[773]

As such, the limestone orthostats, the torus bases and perhaps also the glazed bricks and reused Late-Hittite blocks imbued objectscape 1 with deep genealogical links to building traditions that, in fact, almost all had been originally developed in northern Syria itself. Hence, these architectural elements together in principle provided objectscape 1 with a strongly local and regional signature. Many of these elements, however, seem to have come down to 4th -2nd c. BCE Samosata in an evolved, further developed manner: it is likely that these architectural elements had acquired conceptual connections to concepts of non-local and non-regional royal culture through their Late-Assyrian or their Persian palatial genealogical phases. The 3rd c. BCE access to and application of such forms therefore demonstrates some degree of supra-regional connectivity for objectscape 1.

The pottery associated with objectscape 1 demands a more detailed study for its full potential to be appreciated but some broader characteristics can be formulated here already. In general, the pottery assemblage predominantly seems to follow local and regional developments. This is most evident for the group of ceramics with thick walls, rather coarse fabrics made of a yellowish buff clay, and decorations of different types in red paint, which was most likely locally produced but in terms of shape and decoration was attested also in Cilicia and Pontus. It was found in large amounts in all the four discussed contexts, but seems to be specifically associated with the large representative structure on the SW edge of the *höyük* that comprises of the 'torus-base structure'

[773] This would fit with contemporary, 3rd-2nd c. BCE Near Eastern examples of intentional integrations of antique building materials and the integration of these materials in a meaningful way. In the Seleucid theatre of Babylon, bricks were re-used that carried stamps with Nebuchadnezzar's name and derived from the long gone Esagila temple (Ristvet 2014a, 259-260). In the 2nd c. BCE palace of Adad-nadin-ahhe, at Têlloh, ancient Lagash, the foundations and statues of a 3rd millennium BCE structure were reused and consciously reconstructed and imitated (Bahrani 2014,217-224); temples in Uruk too adopted older lay-outs, consciously suggesting a sense of continuity and connection to the deep past (Kose 1998). In Samosata, the appropriateness for the liminal location of these spolia perhaps lay in these blocks' potential at transforming spatial movement into temporal movement, entering from a mundane present into an 'extra-temporal' or 'infinite' space, cf. Bahrani 2014, esp. 99-100. Bahrani contemplates how tell sites of the Near East inevitably caused encounters with traces of the past each time a building was reconstructed. Such encounters with objects from the deep past potentially opened up '*the dizzying* mise en abyme *of deep time (…) They re-emerge as liminal objects or apparitions from a space that is not part of the world of the living, but not the funerary realm of the netherworld (…) It is not the space of death; it is the obverse or opposite of the space of life, of the realm of the living, and it is somehow known to continue for all time*'. Although such meanings and functions remain unproved, we may at least understand their integration in objectscape 1 as indicative of another active engagement with the materials, styles and visual concepts of the early Iron Age.

and the 'altar structure'. As mentioned before, this type of pottery featured in the 4th – 2nd c. BCE layers V and VI (or VII in u/9-10), but also occurred in large quantities in the older, Iron Age layers. As such, its strong presence in the 4th–2nd c. BCE layers indicates a 'performed continuity' of Iron Age local ceramic production.[774] The specifically high quality of the sherds belonging to this pottery type in the large SW structure, where the painted decoration is most elaborate, perhaps suggests that this pottery type participated in a similar mechanism of performing much older, Iron Age traditions, in a similar vein as discussed for the architectural features above. The other large group of ceramics comprises of the so-called 'Hellenistic bowls' with inverted rim, which are most likely locally produced but in its formal adoption indicates a supra-regional connection. The only evidence for imported ceramics in objectscape 1 derives from sector u/9-10 and comprises of two (perhaps related) fragments of Attic black-glazed pottery with an interior design of stamped palmettes and rouletting, probably dating to the late 4th and early 3rd c. BCE, as well as the stamped Rhodian amphora in sector e/17, layer IV, dating to the 2nd c. BCE. All in all, the ceramic evidence of objectscape 1 shows a complex combination of seemingly continued local ceramic styles with the local production of supra-regional forms and some, but probably very limited, integration in supra-regional (Mediterranean) trade networks.

Materials and colours. The objectscape contains a large amount of white limestone, visible in the well-executed torus bases, the orthostats and the slabs that adorn the northern entrance of the 'altar-structure'. Although some caution should be exercised, the lack of traces of paint on these limestone surfaces seems to suggest that their whiteness was indeed a principle characteristic of the objectscape, something for instance also recurring in the ivory anthropomorphic comb (see fig. 7.15). The pottery shows a more bi-chromic 'colourscape' consisting of yellowish buff and red tones, witnessed in the figurative depictions as well as the partially colour-coated 'Hellenistic bowls'.

Sensorial capacities. The tactile capacities of the objects making up objectscape 1 furthermore might be deduced from the finely cut and smoothened limestone elements, which show no evidence for deep reliefs, appliques or other types of irregular surfaces. Even the ivory comb contains only a very limited and shallow degree of relief, with an overall emphasis on relatively large flat fields. The ceramic evidence too is characterized by flat surfaces, and only the stamped palmettes and rouletting of the Attic black gloss fragments (fig. 7.18c-d) contain a shallow relief.

[774] I use the phrase 'performed continuity' here because it is well established that terms like 'continuity' or 'tradition' often obfuscate and simplify complex social processes that lie behind the adoption of older forms or forms that are perceived as such now or in antiquity. See Giddens 2000. Ristvet 2014a, 155-158 rightly warns for Orientalist views of an unchanging 'traditional' Near East, for which see still Said 1978. Connerton summarizes the issue of the emergence of 'tradition' and 'continuity' well when he says that the *'very act of restituting a presence to what was past produces something new*.' (Connerton 2011, 122).

The only evidence for the surface of floors derives from the threshold of neatly cut limestone slabs (figs. 7.9-10). Otherwise there is no evidence for the material, visual and tactile qualities of the floors in this objectscape; it is however likely that these consisted of packed earth surfaces that were covered with textile carpets.[775] Earthen floors are high-maintenance; to keep them dry, even, dry, salubrious and debris-free demanded an ongoing routine of upkeep and care, entangling humans individuals to the floors in a profoundly mutually dependent relation.[776]

Radical alterity and representation. When considering the role and character of representation in objectscape 1, the available imagery, mostly deriving from the painted ceramics, appears to rely primarily on schematized and two-dimensional figuration. The elaborate painted depictions on the yellowish buff ceramics portray animals, plants and humans in a flat and largely undetailed manner; there is no suggestion of depth as all figuration is set in the same two-dimensional field (fig. 7.13a-c). This emphasis on schematized and two-dimensional figuration is also witnessed in the flat anthropomorphic ivory comb (fig. 7.15), that only provides the most and essential of figurative elements (eyes, rounded shoulders, dentil-shaped hairs) for it to become anthropomorphic. In all these representations, furthermore, we can observe the blurred boundaries between the ontological status of objects, plants, animals and humans. Take for instance the same ivory comb, an object made of an animal-derived material which has taken on human form and functions as a human-object entity.[777] On the ceramics, we see how the use of one and the same colour of paint for human, animal, vegetal and geometric subjects creates a flat ontology in which all figurative subjects are made out of the same substance and together form alternative ontological entities (fig. 7.13a-c). Especially the hunter, his horse and his spear together are rendered in one uninterrupted painted form and thus seem to become one singular entity, just like the dog and his gazelle prey below it. On the other gazelle scene, we furthermore observe how the date trees curve in a parallel fashion to the necks of the gazelles, and how the overall composition makes us focus not on separate gazelles and separate date trees but rather on an entity consisting of one date tree adjoined by two gazelles, infinitely and rhythmically repeating in the circular frieze.[778]

[775] See paragraph 9.3.3.2 of this dissertation for a discussion of evidence for packed earth surfaces and the use of textiles in comparable palatial contexts of the region.
[776] For similar notions of maintenance and care, see Hodder 2011. Hodder 2014, 20 summarizes the basic idea well when he states: '*Because humans rely on things that have to be maintained so that they can be relied on, humans are caught in the lives and temporalities of things, their uncertain vicissitudes and their insatiable needs*'.
[777] For the 'living presence' of anthropomorphic objects, see Gell 1998; Van Eck 2010, 642–59. See also Alberti 2018.
[778] For a discussion of 'circular repetition' in the visual culture of the Near East, see Bahrani 2014, 115-144. She discusses the visual effects of repeating figurative motifs, for instance on vessels (Bahrani 2014, 130-132) but also on cylinder seals (Bahrani 2014, 128-130). She suggests there are powerful ontological implications to 'circular repetition', especially in terms of its implicit infinity of representation or the infinite

Conclusion. In conclusion, objectscape 1, as far as we can reconstruct, is characterized by a wide variety of actual or performed manifestations of a deep local past, be it through the re-use of Late-Hittite limestone blocks with Luwian inscriptions, the use of limestone orthostats or the continued local production of red-painted figurative wares. The objectscape has an overall strong emphasis on local and regional connections, with architectural elements that connect to a deep regional tradition as well as an almost absence of ceramic imports. The objectscape does however provide some indications for supra-regional connections through Attic black glaze imports, the widely attested 'Hellenistic bowls', and the local particularization of the universalized torus base. The objectscape has a general recurrence of limestone, a bi-chrome and probably white colour palette, and a preference for smooth, flat surfaces. Lastly, the objectscape comprises of a type of representation that emphasizes schematized and two-dimensional figuration, in which the ontological boundaries between objects, animals, plants and humans are often blurred.

7.3 Objectscape 2 (early 1st c. BCE; early palatial)

In this section, I will synthesize and analyse the archaeological evidence for the early 1st c. BCE objectscape 2, largely comprising of the first construction phase of the Late-Hellenistic palatial complex. In the previous chapters, I have already described and discussed in detail the palace's architecture (chapter 4), its mosaic decoration (chapter 4), its painted wall decoration (chapter 4), its architectural decoration (chapter 5), and its sculptural evidence (chapter 6). This section therefore is less descriptive than the previous section as it will mostly provide an 'objectscape synthesis' of the already presented evidence according to material groups. This means I will consider and discuss the main characteristics of the architecture (7.3.1), the mosaics (7.3.2), the architectural decoration (7.3.3), the wall painting (7.3.4), and the ceramics (7.3.5). After this, I will analyse objectscape 2 in terms of the proxies introduced in the introduction (7.3.6) and compare these to the analysis of objectscape 1 (7.2.5).

7.3.1 Architecture

Here, I will briefly synthesize the evidence for the architectural features of the large palatial complex, located in layer V of sector i–m/14–20, at the south-eastern part of the *höyük* (see the map in appendix D1). The NNE-SSW oriented structure was at least 1700 m^2 in size and erected

in representation: *'It has a peculiar power. In being a fragment of an extending continuity, it compels our knowledge of a potential infinite*.' (Bahrani 2014, 129).

on multiple newly constructed terraces that progressively decreased in height towards the NE. The different 'height zones' created through this micro-terracing largely correspond to wings of interconnected rooms and/or corridors within the structure (*zone 1*: rooms I-V; *zone 2*: rooms VI-IX; *zone 3*: rooms X-XIII, XIX and corr. A4-5; *zone 4*: rooms XIV-XV and corr. A3; *zone 5*: corr. A1-2; *zone 6*: corridor B1-4. See the map in appendix D9). The walls of objectscape 2 are wide (ca. 1,50 m.) and almost all constructed with limestone fieldstones. Throughout the structure, these walls are covered by a layer of painted plaster (see 7.3.4), although this is more abundantly attested in zones 1, 2, 4 and 5 and (almost) not in zones 3 and 6.

The architectural lay-out is characterized by a long narrow corridor (B1-4) that runs along the entire western periphery of the structure and holds an open water drainage that descends towards the NE. This peripheral corridor was probably unroofed and largely inaccessible from the rest of the spaces within the palace. A series of five small rectangular roofed rooms in zone 1 (rooms I-V) creates a symmetrical suite with internal access but only limited entrances leading out of the suite (probably in rooms II, III and V). The large space east of this symmetrical suite was a large roofed space (room XIV). This combination indicates that the lay-out of the structure was characterized by at least a double layer of rooms (the symmetrical suite of rooms I-V plus room XIV) around a potential open court further east of room XIV. This double layer consisting of a larger space with a suite of smaller rooms behind it is repeated almost in identical manner towards the south with the larger roofed room XV and roofed rooms VI-IX, perhaps also forming a symmetrical suite, behind it. In the north (zone 3) the situation is less clear but seems to consist of small rooms and several corridors, creating a double or even triple layer of rooms as well. Based on the lacking evidence for features such as staircases, it is assumed that the structure did not contain a second floor.

7.3.2 Mosaics

Many of the floors of the palace contained tessellated or pebble mosaics that were placed on layers of mortar. The retrieved examples of tessellated mosaics all derive from zones 1, 2, 4 and 5, while the pebble mosaics derive from the unroofed corridor B (F9 in zone 6). Some of the tessellated mosaics are executed in bi-chrome dark-grey/white geometric patterns such as the chequerboard motif (F2 in room II, F5 and F6 in corr. A3, and F7 in corr. A2, see descriptions in chapter 4 and the map in appendix D1). These bi-chrome geometric patterns are all located in corridor(-like) contexts. The use of black-and-white chequerboard-mosaics is widely attested in pebble mosaics of the open courtyards and passages of the northern Syrian palaces of Arslan Tash[779] and Tell

[779] Thureau-Dangin et al. 1931, 43–44.

Ahmar[780], at Tille Höyük[781] and Karkemish on the Euphrates[782], and at Ziyaret Tepe[783] and Assur on the Tigris River[784].[785] The execution of this very local/regional and ancient decorative motif in the entirely novel tessellated technique should be regarded a remarkable innovation in Samosata that is otherwise unattested in the wider north-Syrian region.

The other retrieved tessellated mosaics are executed in the so-called 'concentric border style' and contained figurative *emblemata* in their centre (F1 in room 1, F3 in room VIII, F4 in room XIV, with a destroyed *emblema* that contained glass tesserae; F8 in room XV; and F18 in sector s/11 of the *höyük,* see descriptions in chapter 4 and the map in appendix D1). The concentric border mosaics contain bands with geometric patterns consisting of the meander motif (in F1, in perspective with red tesserae; F3; and F4), the stepped pyramid motif (in F1; F3; F4; and F8), the wave-crest motif (in F1; F3; F4; F8; and F18), the saw-tooth motif (in F3; F4; F8; and F18), the crenellation motif (in F3; F8; and F18) and illusionistic cubes (in F8; and F18).

Concentric border mosaics containing such geometric motifs are widely attested in 2nd and early 1st c. BCE Eastern Mediterranean contexts such as Pergamon and Delos, where they consisted of exceptionally large amount of concentric bands.[786] In Commagene, the mosaics from the so-called 'Mosaic Rooms' in the *hierothesion* of Arsameia on the Nymphaios show very close parallels, while mosaic fragments from Güzelcay indicate the existence of another Commagenean dynastic context with similar concentric mosaics.[787] In the wider region around Commagene, the concentric border mosaics are not attested; tessellated mosaics in general are rare in eastern Anatolia, Syria and the wider Near East.[788] The geometric motifs witnessed in Samosata all belong to a set of geometric motifs that had become widely standardized and glocal by the 2nd c. BCE, and often used in concentric border mosaics, although the specific combination of geometric motifs and their sequencing is never exactly the same. For some motifs we see specific standardized norms however[789], which are adhered to in the mosaics of Samosata; illusionistic cubes always demand a wider band than the other motifs[790] and the crenellation motif is almost always found in the outer border of the concentric scheme (see chapter 10 for a more in-depth analysis of the integration and impact of the crenellation motif in Samosata). Although a formal dating of the

[780] Thureau-Dangin and Dunand 1936, 24, plan B, pl. 42.1.
[781] Blaylock 2009, 134–38.
[782] Marchetti 2016, 37a, fig. 13.
[783] Matney et al. 2002, 69–70, fig. 25–27.
[784] Miglus 1996, 96–97.
[785] For pebble mosaics in the Neo-Assyrian period in general, see Bunnens 2016.
[786] Dunbabin 1999, 32.
[787] For Arsameia on the Nymphaios, see Lavin 1963. The mosaic fragments from the private collection at Güzelçay have not yet been published in detail but for this collection, see *infra*, n.165.
[788] Haug 2021, 542.
[789] Scheibelreiter 2005, 762–763; Zapheiropoulou 2006, 115–116.
[790] For these illusionistic cubes or lozenges in perspective, see Moormann and Swinkels 1983, 239-262.

concentric scheme and its motifs is difficult because of its widespread occurrence during a long period of time (from approximately the late classical to the Roman period), it can be cautiously suggested that the high quantity of concentric borders attested in Samosata fits more to a 2nd c. BCE-early 1st c. BCE eastern Mediterranean tradition than the more modest framing methods that generally develop in the mid-1st c. BCE.[791] The visual impact of such elaborate borders – functioning as a captivating maze or a visual trap that potentially slowed down the eye and the mind[792]– increased with the amount of borders and was thus fanatically exploited in Samosata.

Fig. 7.19a-c. Details of the frieze with a fish mosaic. Source: the Wagner Archive.

The only preserved mosaic *emblemata*, containing figurative depictions in *opus tessellatum* (sometimes using relatively small tesserae), were found in F1 in room I and F8 in room XV. The *emblema* of F1 is framed in a frieze with contrasting fish of different size and types as well as fine foliage, all against a white background (fig. 7.19a-c).[793] The fish are likely edible luxury fish.[794] The *emblema* itself contains two dolphins with sharp teeth symmetrically flanking an orange-red Rhodian amphora in the centre, executed in a wide palette of coloured tesserae and placed against a dark background (fig. 7.20a-b). The rendering of especially the fish and the dolphins is very realistic in style and full of coloured detail; the fish are executed in a palette of brown, yellow, black, green-brown, dark brown and pink. The tondo of F8 contains a depiction of an orange-red satyr-like comic mask of an old bearded man wearing a laurel wreath, also placed against a dark background.[795] A wide colour palette and the use of relatively small tesserae (no *vermiculatum*) is used to indicate details such as wrinkles, shadows and strains of hair in the beard. The tondo itself has a border with a stylized Ionian cymation and lies at the centre of a square panel with naturalistic vegetal decoration set in an elaborate square concentric scheme.

These figurative *emblemata* fit to a contemporary phenomenon of the 2nd c. BCE and early 1st c. BCE in which tessellated and figurative polychrome mosaics start appearing in large amounts

[791] Westgate 1999.
[792] Following the ideas about the visual techniques of geometric decoration of Gell 1998, esp. 73-95. For a more in-depth application of these ideas see the case-studies of chapters 8 and 9.
[793] See chapter 4 of this dissertation for a more detailed description.
[794] Especially the larger fish depicted on the longer side of the mosaic can most likely be identified as a type of bass, which occurs in the form of freshwater types in the Euphrates. See Çiçek et al. 2015.
[795] See chapter 4 of this dissertation for a detailed description and chapter 10 for a case-study.

throughout the Mediterranean.[796] In the eastern Mediterranean, this type of mosaics first and mainly occur in high-status Hellenistic residences such as the palatial complexes of Pergamon, Alexandria and Ptolemais, whereas in the western Mediterranean, they occur specifically in elite domestic contexts of the Italian peninsula.[797] The figurative mosaics of Samosata should be considered local adoptions of contemporary globalized techniques, forms of presentation, image themes and visual formula/image schemes that were used in a contextually specific manner but fitted to a supra-regional consumption pattern witnessed in similarly elite and palatial contexts. In terms of technique, the use of *opus tessellatum* with varying sizes of tesserae, sometimes relatively small, fits to the overall image of figurative polychrome mosaics in the eastern Mediterranean, where a broader spectrum of techniques was in use than the *opus vermiculatum* witnessed in the western Mediterranean.[798]



Fig. 7.20a-b. Details of the emblema *with dolphin and Rhodian amphora, F1 in room I. Source: Wagner Archive.*

Let us first briefly consider the genealogies, meanings and local applications of the iconographic elements of F1. Fish mosaics are widely attested on the Italian peninsula, but can be regarded a more supra-regional phenomenon as well, with examples throughout the wider Mediterranean.[799] Dolphin iconography is also widely attested in a wide variety of contexts in the Mediterranean with a strong point of gravity on Delos, with floors dating to the late 2nd c. - early 1st c. BCE (e.g. the House of the Masks, the House of the Dolphins).[800] When combined with amphorae, as in the

[796] Zapheiropoulou 2006; Haug 2021, esp. 543 and annex I, an addendum to the overview provided in Zapheiropoulou 2006.
[797] Zapheiropoulou 2006; Haug 2021, 543. It should be noted that the high amount of specimens in domestic contexts from the Gulf of Naples to some extent may be the result of a methodological bias.
[798] Haug 2021, 558.
[799] For fish mosaic on the Italian peninsula, see Gullini 1956, 20–32; De Puma 1969; Meyboom 1977. For a more gobal perspective, see Haug 2021. This important study gives ample attention to the mosaics with fish and dolphin-like creatures from Samosata and Arsameia on the Nymphaios. In her overall analysis, Haug excludes Nilotic mosaics, still lives with dead fish, and mythological scenes including fish.
[800] *House of the Masks* (end of 2nd/beginning 1st c. BCE): Bruneau 1972, no. 215, figs. 184–195. *House of the Dolphins* (around 150 BCE (Haug); 130–88 BCE (Dunbabin)): Bruneau 1972, no. 210, fig. 168, pl. B,1–2; Dunbabin 1999, figs. 34–35. See also Haug 2021, 555-557.

case of Samosata, they generally are considered to refer to trade.[801] The motif recurs in an almost identical manner in the 'Mosaic Rooms' of the *hierothesion* of Arsameia on the Nymphaios.[802]

Placing the fish mosaics in an elaborate concentric border scheme is more typical for the eastern Mediterranean (e.g. the fish mosaic in 'palace IV' in Pergamon).[803] On the one hand, the concentric bands with geometric patterns might have created a visual competition with the marine setting of the *emblema* as the carpet-like quality of the concentric bands suggested a more indoor environment.[804] On the other hand, however, the use of two wave-crest bands around the fish-and-dolphin *emblema* perhaps in some way blurred the conceptual boundaries of indoors and outdoors.[805] Haug has argued convincingly that the mosaic of room I in Samosata implies the remarkable combination of two image concepts – dolphins and swimming fish – that in other Eurasian contexts, without exception, are kept separate.[806] Whereas the dolphins, in combination with the dark background and the amphora evoke the idea of a maritime world as well as maritime trade (and the wealth and general connectivity associated with this), the frieze of swimming fish, against a white background, and framed by the carpet-like concentric borders, are typical for representations of indoor luxury dining.[807]

The iconographic element of F8, the satyr-like comedy mask of an old bearded man wearing a laurel wreath, is less easily understood as an expression of a distinctly local concept or practice, as there are for instance no signs for the existence of theatre practice or Dionysiac cults in Commagene.[808] Like the iconographic elements of F1, however, the mask should be considered a particularization of a glocal iconographic motif (satyr-like comedy masks), glocal techniques (an *opus tessellatum* with relatively small tesserae), and glocal visual formula/image schemes (the concentric border scheme and the tondo), that all widely occurred in elite contexts on a supra-regional scale throughout the Mediterranean around the 2nd c.-early 1st c. BCE. Like the remarkable thematic combination of F1 (see above), the variations on the globalized mask theme in F8 are rather spectacular as well: it uniquely combines an isolated satyr-like mask with a circular tondo and an elaborate concentric border scheme. Furthermore, the strict frontality of the mask is unusual when compared to most of the known mask mosaics, and, together with the concentric

[801] Haug 2021, 558.
[802] Lavin 1963, pl. 44A; Bingöl 1997, fig. 71; Brijder 2014, fig. 179a. See paragraph 10.5.1 of this dissertation for more about the 'Mosaic Rooms' of Arsameia on the Nymphaios.
[803] Andreae 2003, 140; Kopsacheili 2012, 160–166.
[804] As argued for eastern Mediterranean fish mosaics in concentric border schemata in Haug 2021, 554
[805] Following the argumentation about the semantic and formal impact of geometric borders in concentric border designs in Bahmer 2015.
[806] Haug 2021, 555-557. She demonstrates how dolphins occur often on fish mosaics of the east, but here are mostly set against a white background and not in relation to luxury food. Rather they function as visual signs that refer to the marine world.
[807] *Idem*, 557: '*The combination of two different image concepts – dolphins and swimming fish – is spectacular.*'
[808] See chapter 9 for an in-depth analysis of the mask mosaic, its iconographic genealogy and its integration and impact in Samosata. Here I offer only a summary of the arguments and conclusions developed there.

scheme, this potentially triggered a whole set of visual effects that were novel to the glocal iconographic theme. Thus, mosaic F8 also shows, on the one hand, the adoption of contemporary glocal visual themes, available on a supra-regional scale, but, on the other hand, also a very specific local variation and combination of these elements.

7.3.3 Architectural decoration

The architectural decoration of objectscape 2 comprises of the Commagenean Corinthian Capital Order I and the decorated limestone doorframes ('*Türlaibungen*') containing the vegetal motif of bound tre-foil garlands of olive (or laurel) leaves. Both architectural elements are already discussed in detail in chapter 5 so I will here only shortly synthesize this evidence with specific attention for the objectscape proxies mentioned in the introduction of this chapter.

Nine capital fragments are assigned to Oenbrink's Corinthian Order I (ID292, ID513, ID518, ID522, ID526, ID527, ID528, ID529, ID679, see chapter 5) and generally dated to the late 2nd or early-1st c. BCE by Oenbrink.[809] In terms of form and syntax, these Corinthian capitals largely follow a globalized repertoire and closely stick to contemporary developments of Corinthian capital production in Asia Minor. This adherence to a supra-regional forms and structural composition is for instance witnessed in its use of two circulating folia, the rendering of the acanthus leaves (with droplet-like eyelets, the use of individual leaflets and four to five lobes per leaflet), the rendering of the caulis-knot (the simple form of the roundel) and the parallel fluting of the caulis-stem. An important parallel derives from the re-used capitals of the column monument of Sextus Appuleius in Klaros (west Anatolia).[810] According to Oenbrink, the workshop responsible for the Corinthian Order I largely follows a universal repertoire of forms and does not show any inclination towards the integration of alternative regional or local variations into this glocal formal composition.[811]

The architectural decoration of objectscape 2 is furthermore characterized by the decorated limestone doorframes ('*Türlaibungen*') containing the vegetal motif of bound tre-foil garlands of olive (or laurel) leaves. Four fragments (ID517/588/613/614, see chapter 5) were described and discussed in chapter 5, where I have suggested that they potentially adorned the wide entrance from corridor A2 leading into room XV. The only other example of this decorative motif placed on door lintels derives from the *hierothesion* of Arsameia on the Nymphaios and also occur in the private collection of Neşet Akel, probably belonging to a Commagenean dynastic sepulchral

[809] Oenbrink 2021, 169-172. See chapter 5 for more detailed descriptions and analyses.
[810] Hoepfner 1983, 73; Oenbrink 2017, 51, referring to *i.a.* Rumscheid 1994, 19 f. 32, 93, 152).
[811] Oenbrink 2021, 170.

context near Güzelçay Köyü.[812] Beyond these parallels, the decorative motif of tre-foil garlands of olive or laurel leaves is attested on a variety of materials and media but never on doorframes.[813] Especially from the late 3rd c. BCE onwards, the bound version of the motif starts appears in great quantity, often in relation to Seleucid dynastic visual culture, most notably on coins, but also on architectural ornaments of Seleucid monuments.[814] By the 2nd c. BCE, the motif might therefore have acquired the capacity to signal concepts related to the Seleucids, as for instance witnessed on a sculptural frieze in Pergamon.[815] In the early 2nd-1st c. BCE, the motif also starts appearing further east, for instance on bowls and rhytons belonging to the Parthian silverware treasures I and II.[816] After Seleucid power declined in the region, the motif continued to be used on architectural decoration, for instance on a frieze of the Khazne Firaun in Petra (last quarter 1st c. BCE).[817] These parallels suggest that, by the 1st c. BCE, the vegetal motif of bound tre-foil garlands of olive (or laurel) leaves had acquired a strongly supra-regional, glocal signature, and potentially had developed a relation to a concept of Seleucid royal power. Its occurrence on a doorframe is a Commagenean innovation, that was applied in at least two other dynastic contexts in Commagene besides the palace of Samosata.[818]

[812] For the possible *hierothesion* at Güzelçay, see *infra*, n.165. For Arsameia on the Nymphaios, see: Oenbrink 2017, 99 no. A195. pl. 29,2.

[813] The earliest examples occur on red-figured ceramics from ca. 400 BCE where its appears in a non-bound version, cf. Pfrommer 1993, n. 367. In the 3rd c. BCE, the same motif appears throughout the Mediterranean, on a Ptolemaic gilded glass cup (Brussels, Musées Royaux E8034. Adriani 1967, 122. pl. 7A.), a faience skyphos (Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum JE 10479. Breccia 1912, 80–81 no. 233. pls. 45. 65.) and a bronze *cista* from Palestrina (Italy) (cf. Copenhagen, National Museum 778. See the 1968 Museum catalogue, page 93). Pfrommer 1993, 37–39 deals extensively with the development of the motif on a variety of materials in his study of the Parthian silverware treasures and this paragraph strongly draws on his findings. Pfrommer proposed a different chronology of the motif 's biography than Callaghan 1980, 33–47.

[814] *Coins:* Pfrommer 1993, n. 382 for instance mentions Houghton 1983, 27 no. 404. pl. 22. *Seleucid architectural ornamentation*: e.g. a red-clay *sima* from Seleucia on the Tigris from the 3rd c. BCE (Hopkins 1972, 132–133 figs. 44–46.). For approximately the same period, see also the grave reliefs from Tyre (Seyrig 1940, 120–122) and a stele from Sidon (Callaghan 1980, 45 fig. 2,3).

[815] The motif appears on a shield ornament depicted on a weapon frieze of the Athena precinct in Pergamon, (2nd c. BCE.), which represented weapons captured by the Attalids, possibly after the battle of Magnesia against the Seleucids in 190 BCE. See Pfrommer 1993, 38.

[816] Pfrommer 1993, treasure I: nos. 1, 2, 17, 74; treasure II: nos. 69, 70, stag rhyton 74.

[817] Schmidt-Colinet 1980, 217 fig. 32. For the dating, see Kropp 2013, 199–205.

[818] The only other example of the motif on a doorframe was found on a block reused in a wall foundation in the sanctuary of Bel in Palmyra (late 1st c. BCE or early 1st c. CE), dating later than the doorframe fragments from Samosata. See Seyrig 1940, 285–289, multiple fragments: fig. 5. pl. 29,2. 30 (left). For the dating see Seyrig 1940,
279–282. See also Gawlikowski 2015. Note that Pfrommer 1993 also refers to the adyton-fronton of the temple of Bacchus in Baalbek, which, however, is a 2nd c. CE structure and thus beyond our chronological scope.

7.3.4 Wall painting

Objectscape 2 contained painted plaster decoration with imitations of ashlar masonry, luxurious panelling in coloured stone veneers and decorative elements of stone walls.[819] In chapter 4, I have presented in detail the evidence for *in situ* wall painting in the palace, with descriptions that link to the figures of these wall paintings in appendix A. Here, I will synthesize this evidence, and supplement it with a couple of *ex situ* fragments of wall painting as well.[820] In chapter 4, I have already tentatively proposed the existence of two different wall decoration phases, which I maintain here as a division between objectscapes 2 and 3. This differentiation is primarily based on the existence of two different wall types – rubble masonry with medium-sized limestones and a fine mudbrick - of which the latter is used in several instances to close off entrances (see chapter 4). The lack of any evidence for re-plastering should of course make us cautious, although I believe that the apparent correlation of the later mudbrick walls with the use of an otherwise unattested iconographic motif, the diamond-shaped lozenge, makes the proposed differentiation significant and worthwhile (see 7.4.2).[821]

Evidence for wall painting belonging to objectscape 2 derives from room I (W9), room II (W2), room III, (W11), room XV (*i.a.* W28), room XVIII (W37) and corridor A2 (W20 and W21). The paintings on these walls are organized in a design that has a tripartite structure, consisting of 1) a socle with a continuous plinth or with isodomes, 2) a central band with alternating wide and narrow orthostats, with a frieze on top and 3) an upper band, containing a layer of isodomes, a frieze, or panels with stone imitations. Of these, only the socle and central bands have been preserved *in situ*. The wall decoration consists of plaster painted in a wide palette of colours (mostly red, yellow, and white but also burgundy, blue, light blue and green) and does not contain any convincing indications of plaster modelled in relief, nor any use of the diamond-shaped lozenge motif or natural stone imitations.[822] The *ex situ* fragments of painted plaster assigned to

[819] In scholarship, a wide array of terms is used often interchangeably to indicate the decoration of walls by means of plaster that has been moulded and/or painted (e.g. 'wall painting', 'painted (or coloured) stucco', 'painted (or coloured) plaster', 'plaster decoration', 'moulded plaster', 'stucco', 'fresco'). Although labels like 'wall plaster' and 'stucco' are synonymous, others in fact indicate important differences, such as the difference between plaster that has been moulded in relief versus flat painted walls that render the illusion of three-dimensional relief in two dimensions. See also Kidd 2018, 5.

[820] The *ex situ* fragments cannot be assigned with certainty to a specific palatial objectscape but, for matters of convenience, are discussed under objectscape 2. See paragraph 7.2.3.

[821] Note that Bingöl also distinguished between two types of wall painting in the palace of Samosata (Types A and B), for which the presence of the diamond-shaped lozenge (as well as triangular and trapezoid socle decoration) was the defining characteristic of type B. Bingöl 1997, 111-113. Bingöl did not consider these two types as different chronological phases however.

[822] As I will suggest in 7.2.3, it is possible that the latter two elements were only introduced in objectscape 3. The occurrence of two small *ex situ* fragments of stamped stucco with cymation moulding (chapter 5, ID523 and ID524) should make us cautious but the evidence is too meagre to argue for the existence of elaborate plaster modelled in relief.

the palace furthermore indicate that two layers of plaster were used: 1) a coarse layer (width ca. 2,0 cm.) with many inclusions of small stones and reed impressions on the reverse, and 2) a very fine layer (width ca. 0,4 cm.) without visible inclusions.

In room I, W9 contains a central band with alternating wide and narrow orthostats in alternating red and yellow, and contrasting frames in red and yellow (appendix A, fig. LXXXVIII). In room II, W2 contains a socle with isodomes alternating in red and yellow with contrasting frames in red and yellow. Above it, begin the central zone with alternating wide and narrow orthostats in alternating red and yellow, and contrasting frames in red and yellow (appendix A, fig. IV). In room III, W11 contains a continuous socle in yellow with a central band with alternating wide and narrow orthostats on top. The wide orthostats alternate in red (with light blue framing) and yellow (with red framing), while the narrow orthostats are in burgundy. The yellow orthostats contain depictions of red pomegranates with green foliage (appendix A, figs. LXXXVI/ LXXXIX/ XC).[823] In room XV, W28 and other walls contain a socle with yellow isodomes with red framing, followed by an uninterrupted light blue band, with a central band on top, that consists of orthostats alternating in red and yellow with contrasting framing in red and yellow (appendix A, figs. XCIV/ CXXVI/ XCII/ XCIII/ XCV). In room XVIII, W37 seems to have contained an orthostat with yellow and red, but the painting is poorly preserved (appendix A, figs. XLIV/ LXX). In corridor A2, W20 and W21 contain a socle with red isodomes with yellow framing and a central band with alternating wide and narrow orthostats in red (with blue framing) and yellow (with red framing). The narrow orthostats are rendered in blue, with yellow framing (appendix A, fig. V).



Fig. 7.21a-b. Painted plaster frieze with light yellow acanthus leaves against a light blue background, with cymation moulding. Source: the Wagner Archive.

Let us now turn to the *ex situ* evidence for wall painting that can be connected to the palace. It is difficult to assign these fragments to either objectscape 2 or 3, but these fragments do provide us

[823] Bingöl 1997, 112, fig. 77; Bingöl 2013, 34 figs. 34–35.

with elements of the decorative scheme that have otherwise not been preserved, especially of the higher zones of the tripartite structure. In figure 7.21a-b, two *ex situ* fragments of painted plaster that most likely belonged to the main band of the frieze zone above the orthostats are shown. They contain a continuous palmette frieze in fine yellow, red and white lines with subtle suggestions of shadow and relief, placed against a light blue background.[824] The frieze is framed by an Ionic cymation moulding below it.

Fig. 7.22. Painted plaster fragment with yellow isodome and red framing. Source: the Wagner Archive.

A very similar Ionic cymation moulding of the fragment in fig. 7.22 suggests that this fragment was located right below a frieze similar to that of fig. 7.21a-b and thus also part of the frieze zone above the orthostats.[825] Below the cymation moulding runs a smaller band with a string-course of narrow bevelled-edge blocks in yellow with red framing, which is the colour scheme that recurs most in the painting of objectscape 2. The bevelled-edge is indicated with very fine white and black lines that create the illusionistic effect of a relief that is illuminated from the right top and casts a shadow at the left bottom. Below this band runs yet another band (width. ca. 14 cm) with vine leaves rendered very realistically in light green against a dark background.

[824] Bingöl 1997, 116 fig. 83; Bingöl 2013, 52–53 figs. 72. 74.
[825] Bingöl 1997, 114 fig. 80; Bingöl 2013, 108 fig.168.

a.  b.  c. 

Fig. 7.23a-c. Painted plaster with a band of vine leaf decoration. Source: the Wagner Archive.

Such bands with continuous strips with ivy leaf decoration rendered in light green against a dark background are attested on three other *ex situ* fragments as well, where they are of equal size (fig. 7.23a-c). The detail of the ivy leaves is remarkable, with the stems, veins, lobes and fingers of the leaves clearly and realistically rendered. In some fragments, the grapes, rendered in yellow, are also indicated (fig. 7.22a).[826] The fragments of fig. 7.21-23 together suggest that the total frieze zone consisted of a frieze and at least two extra bands. The fragment of fig. 7.23c shows how the band with vine leaves also occurred in a different frieze scheme, as there it is framed with two red borders and a larger band with luxury stone imitation, rendered in white with blue, red and yellow inclusions on top. It is likely that the latter field was an alternative to the string-course of narrow bevelled-edge blocks in yellow witnessed in fig. 7.22.

Fig. 7.24. Painted plaster with fields of stone imitation. Source: the Wagner Archive.

Such luxury stone imitation is also witnessed in other *ex situ* fragments, such as in figure 7.24, which contains isodomes with alabaster-like imitation with long waving veins in white, orange-red, yellow, dark grey and light blue.[827] Like the *in situ* paintings of objectscape 1, the field is

[826] Bingöl 2013, 47–48 figs. 63–64.
[827] Bingöl 1997, 115 fig. 81. Note that Bingöl describes the fragments as '*Marmorierten Quader*' (115).

framed with plain red and yellow borders. This fragment might have belonged to one of the bands in the frieze zone above the orthostats or to the upper zone of the decorative scheme.

These fragments of *in situ* painted wall decoration from objectscape 1 can be assigned to the so-called 'Masonry Style', which is widely attested on walls and ceilings across the Mediterranean, and is characterized by painted decorations depicting *trompe-l'oeil* imitations of monumental ashlar masonry, luxurious panelling in coloured stone veneers and decorative elements of stone walls, often in three- to five- partite schemes.[828] In the late 4th c. BCE, early examples of the Masonry Style appear in the houses of Olynthos in Greece, the Hieron of Samothrace in the Aegean, and in tombs of Macedonia.[829] In these early instances, we already encounter stone imitations in very structured decorative schemata, sometimes with hints towards illusionism by means of the use of stucco relief and painted suggestion of shadows and three-dimensionality.[830] From the 3rd c. BCE onwards, the Masonry Style becomes more widespread, now appearing in Alexandria[831], South Russia (Kerch)[832] and the Greek mainland and its islands, specifically Delos.[833] Important comparanda in Asia Minor are found in Ephesus[834], Kolophon[835], Halikarnassos[836], Priene[837],

[828] A useful brief introduction to the Masonry Style is provided in Westgate 2000, 397-400. A thorough and up-to-date analysis of the Masonry Style across western Afro-Eurasia so far is unfortunately lacking however. See also Bruno 1969, 305-317; Laidlaw 1985.

[829] *Olynthos*: Robinson and Graham 1938, 297–299. *Hieron of Samothrace* (ca. 325 BCE): Lehmann 1964a, 267–286. *Macedonia*: Gossel 1980; Brecoulaki 2006 (Tomb of Lefkadia). I will not deal here in detail with the debate concerning the supposed 'origin' of the Masonry Style, which has been assigned to *i.a.* Athens, Delos and Alexandria, cf. Bulard 1988, 91ff; Pagenstecher 1917, 20ff; Bruno 1969, 305-317. This scholarly debate developed from a quest for the 'origin' of the first Pompeian/Campanian style, but, like I argue here for the paintings of Samosata and in general in this dissertation, this quest for 'origins' seems to be missing the point as, by the 2nd c. BCE, we seem to be dealing with local adoptions and adaptations of a glocal phenomenon. Fragaki 2003, 257–258 explains this development very well in her assessment of the origins of the first Pompeian/Campanian style, stating: '*On a distingué dans la peinture et l'architecture de cette période, aussi bien en Orient qu'en Italie, des tendences communes qui se retrouvent plus tard sur les murs pompéiens. Au seins de cette koine hellenistique, on a repéré différents systèmes décoratifs à zones qui évoquent, malgré leurs particularités et leurs divergences, le Premier Style pompéien. En ce sens, ce style aurait des précurseurs et des variantes aussi bien en Afrique du Nord, en Syrie, en Asia Mineure, en Grèce, en Macédoine, en Thrace et en Russie du Sud qu'en Italie*.' *Contra* Laidlaw 1993, 227–233, who holds that the Masonry Style was inherently different from the First Pompeian/Campanian style. See also Strocka 1996; 2007; Bragantini 2014; Moormann 2018.

[830] Note, however, that for instance most of the houses of Olynthos contain only very flat and monochrome wall decorations, with painted or incised incisions and only very sporadic relief decoration. Only one house yielded a decorated frieze. See Westgate 2000, 400.

[831] Venit 2002. For the tombs of Anfushy, see Adriani 1952, 55–97; Adriani 1966, 191–197; Venit 2002, 73–90; Helmbold-Doyé 2009, 5–56; Fragaki 2021.

[832] Rostovtzeff 2004.

[833] *Delos*: Chamonard 1922-1924, vol. 8, fig. 83, 98-169 (The House of the Masks); Bezerra de Meneses 1970, 151-193 (The House of the Comedians).

[834] Strocka 1977; Zimmermann 2005.

[835] Holland 1944, 137ff.

[836] Hinks 1933, 8 fig. 4-5.

[837] Wiegand and Schrader 1904, 308ff; Raeder 1983, 21 pl. 1.

Assos[838], Pergamon[839], Magnesia on the Maeander[840], Miletus[841], Erythrai[842] and Knidos[843].[844] In Syria, the Levant and Judea, the Masonry Style is furthermore attested in the 'Painted House' of Beidha[845], the late-Hellenistic Stuccoed Building of Tel Anafa[846], the Western Quarter at Gamla[847] the 'Petit Serail' in Beirut[848], the 'House of the Painted Frieze' in the insula of Jebel Khalid[849], as well as in Iraq el-Amir[850], Akko[851], Mareshah[852], in the Hasmonaean palace-complex at Jericho[853], and in the closely related 'Mosaic Rooms' of the *hierothesion* of Arsameia on the Nymphaios.[854] Clearly, by the early 1st c. BCE, the Masonry Style was widespread across the Mediterranean and Levant and had become a glocal, supra-regional phenomenon. Ruth Westgate emphasizes that, by the 2nd c. BCE, the range of decorative possibilities within this Masonry Style had basically exploded: '*By the second century, the flat decoration which was usual at Olynthos was found only in rooms of secondary importance; there had clearly been a process of inflation at work, which had the effect of widening the range of available possibilities, and hence the range of distinctions that could be expressed in the decoration*.'[855]

Most of the Mediterranean examples of masonry style wall painting referred to above, however, belong to what Bingöl has termed the 'First Eastern Style', a sub-style of the Masonry Style which is characterized by the elaborate use and combination of painted decoration with plaster modelled in relief, the use of incisions, and a four- or five-partite scheme.[856] In contrast, Bingöl has suggested that the wall decoration of Samosata rather belonged to the less widely attested 'Second Eastern Style', which deviates from the 'First Eastern Style' by its strictly tri-partite scheme and its exclusion of stucco relief and incisions.[857] Besides the painted plaster walls of Samosata, Bingöl

[838] Clarke et al. 1902, 113.
[839] Kawerau and Wiegand 1930, 47, 52, pl. 4, 7.
[840] Humann 1904, 138, figs. 149-150.
[841] Weber 1985, 36 fig. 4, pl. 11-12 and 48.
[842] Bingöl 1988, fig. 4; Bingöl 1997, 89, 90 fig. 60, pl. 16.
[843] Bingöl 1997, 89-96, pl. 17-21
[844] For the wall painting of Asia Minor in general, see Bingöl 1997, 89-98 and 111-118
[845] Bikai et al. 2008, 465–507; Twaissi et al. 2010, 31–42.
[846] Weinberg 1970, 135-138, pl. D; Kidd 2018.
[847] Farhi and Sharabi 2020.
[848] Aubert and Eristov 1998, pl. 39.
[849] Area 19 in the House of the Painted Frieze: Jackson 2009, 231–253.
[850] Groot 1983, figs. 33ff; Will and Larché 1991.
[851] Hartal 1993, 22-24.
[852] Kloner 2003.
[853] Netzer 2001, 11ff, figs. 12-13.
[854] Hoepfner 1983, pl 17 D.
[855] Westgate 2000, 400.
[856] Bingöl 1997, 89-98. Note that Rozenberg 2009 makes a similar differentiation in Judaea between the paintings dating to the Hasmonaean period and the later paintings belonging to the Herodian palaces. For more about the Herodian paintings, see paragraph 7.2.3.
[857] Bingöl 1997, 111: *'Sockel, Orthostaten und Deckschicht sind an und für sich nichts anderes als die gleichen Hauptglieder des ersten Stils, die jedoch jetzt nach den Prinzipien des zweiten Stils kein plastisches Profil aufweisen, sondern nur Malerei sind. Durch Farbe, Licht und Schatten und durch die Verwendung der Perspektive wird jetzt das ersetzt, was früher aus Stuck geformt war.'*

also assigns the wall paintings in private houses of Amphipolis[858] and in several 2nd c. BCE contexts in Pergamon to this 'Second Eastern Style'.[859] The complete absence of relief and incision devices is also reminiscent of the Herodian palaces of ca. the second half of the 1st c. BCE.[860] Bingöl argues that the lack of relief and incision in the 'Second Eastern Style' was compensated for by an emphasized suggestion of perspective and three-dimensionality, but, especially when compared to the examples from Pergamon and Delos, this cannot in fact be attested for the orthostats and isodomes in Samosata.[861]

Bingöl's differentiation between a First and Second Eastern Style clearly was not meant as a strict chronological or geographical separation, and rather indicates the '*widening range of available possibilities'*[862] as well as the flexible character of the glocal Masonry Style. There was ample room to vary and combine in terms of colour, framing, moulding, the amount of frieze bands, their decorative motifs, and specifically also the use of plaster modelling in relief and the use of incisions. These variations strongly determined the degree to which the Masonry Style's capacity to evoke perspective and three-dimensionality was activated. When we compare the isodomes and orthostats of the socle and lower zones in objectscape 2 to the many examples of Masonry Style wall painting attested throughout the Mediterranean and the Near East, it seems that in Samosata we are dealing with a relatively flat corpus. Its rejection of incisions as well as plaster modelling in relief was not at all compensated for, as the largely plain and mostly bi-chrome orthostats and isodomes in red and yellow show. Even their contrasting frames, usually the feature that suggests a shadow or a relief, here seems to function more almost as a flat geometric patterns than as a form of *trompe l'oeil,* mind-boggling illusionism.[863]

---

[858] Ginouvès et al. 1994, 103–104, figs. 92–93.

[859] Bingöl 1997, 142. He refers to the decoration of a northern wall in the west wing of the Lower Agora (cf. Conze 1912, 152, fig. 4), as well as the northern wall of House II in the Lower Agora, cf. Bingöl 2013, 100 fig. 155a-b. Note that the Masonry Style in the 'Mosaic Rooms' belonging to the *hierothesion* of Arsameia on the Nymphaios belongs to the 'First Eastern Style' as it contains incised decoration.

[860] Rozenberg 2009, 254-255 for instance remarks that '*The choice of white or black framing lines as a means for indicating the direction of the light is not as consistent in the Herodian examples as in those from Italy, and was probably copied as a decorative motif without illusionistic significance*'.

[861] In this regard, it should be noted that the Masonry Style paintings attested in the so-called Mosaic Rooms of the *hierothesion* at Arsameia on the Nymphaios do in fact appear to contain incisions, and therefore perhaps adhered more to the more widespread 'First Eastern Style' where three-dimensionality was more directly achieved. See Hoepfner 1983, pl. 17, D.

[862] Westgate 2000, 400.

[863] One might argue that the 'modest' orthostats and isodomes of Samosata merely belonged to 'the cheaper segment' of what workshops trained in the Masonry Style had on offer. Ruth Westgate for example argues the following concerning variations in its appearance in different contexts: '*In its most basic form, this scheme is marked out on a flat, white plaster surface by incised or painted lines, occasionally with the frieze picked out in red paint. However, it could be elaborated in several ways to express distinctions between rooms and areas of the house. These distinctions seem to depend on a combination of four factors: the extent of relief moulding; the number of frieze bands; the colours and motifs used; and the addition of monumental architectural forms in stucco relief. No doubt, as in the case of mosaics, the distinction was ultimately one of cost.*' (Westgate 2000, 397). In line with the theoretical framework of this dissertation, however, I would

The elaborate frieze above the orthostats however strongly contrasts the visual modesty of the orthostats and isodomes, as it consists of at least three borders, and contains a cymation moulding, realistic vine leaf decoration in green, a string-course of narrow bevelled-edge blocks or luxurious stone imitation, as well as a polychrome continuous frieze with acanthus leafs with indications of shadow. The contrast between, on the one hand, a relatively flat, almost geometric zone of plain isodome socles and orthostats, and, on the other hand, a relatively elaborate frieze, creates an effect of visual extremes. This strong emphasis on the compositional concentration of detail, realism and illusionism is in fact very similar to the visual strategies witnessed in the concentric border style mosaics (see above), where the flat geometric motifs activate a different type of visuality than the highly figurative and naturalistic *emblemata*, which framed and separated in the centre of the composition.

7.3.5 Ceramics

Here I will provide a brief overview of the ceramic evidence for objectscape 2, focusing on red-gloss wares and largely based on the work of Levent Zoroğlu, whose main conclusions I follow here.[864] In 1986, Zoroğlu published a study of the Late-Hellenistic-Early Roman red-gloss table wares or 'Eastern Sigillata A' ceramics from the *höyük* and the Lower Town. He distinguished between two types of red-gloss table ware: 1) with a pale and light red clay with or without mica and with small limestone inclusions, and with a light red and reddish brown glaze with dark patches; 2) with a yellowish or reddish cream clay with limestone inclusions but without mica, and with a brown mat glaze.[865] For the forms, which are not necessarily restricted to one clay/gloss type, he based his investigations on the classifications that Kathleen Kenyon had

warn for an overtly simple economic reduction of this Masonry Style variation; merely stating that the choice for this flatter, more geometric Masonry Style in Samosata was simply the result of a limited budget risks ignoring the contextual implications of the *outcome* of this choice. On a different but related note, it is important to consider that a seemingly simple 'flat' design could for instance be executed in very expensive pigments, something which was probably recognized by the viewers as well (Westgate 2000, 399 n.10, referring to remarks of Vitruvius (Vitr. *De arch.* vii. 7-14) and Pliny (Plin. *HN* xxxv. 12-31)). Research into the chemical composition of the pigments used in Samosata would therefore be highly desirable.

[864] Zoroğlu 1986. 'Terra Sigillata' is a 19th century term that is less adequate than the more recently used 'Late-Hellenistic/Early Roman red-gloss table wares'. The former suggests that it concerns 'stamped' pottery per definition, while not all the red-slip ware contains stamped figures and/or floral ornaments and other decorative techniques (barbotine, appliqué, roulette and incising) are also attested. For 'Eastern Sigillata A' in general, see Berlin 2006, 13-14; Hayes 1985; Hayes 2008, 13-30; Lund 2005, 234-235; Kavvadias 2012; Kramer 2012, 13-16; Kramer 2013; Slane and Berlin 1997; Willet 2012, 211-250; Lund 2015, 264-265. The typology suggested by John W. Hayes and refined by Kathleen W. Slane have by now become the standard classification, cf. Hayes 1985; Slane and Berlin 1997. An in-depth re-appraisal of the ceramic material of Hellenistic and Roman Samosata did not lie within the scope of this dissertation, but is much desired, albeit with the caveat of good stratigraphic documentation of this material.

[865] Zoroğlu 1986, 72 table 2.

established on the basis of material from Samaria in 1957.[866] On the basis of this formal typology, Zoroğlu identified 17 different forms in Samosata (1, 3, 8, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 - 26, 27). Most of this material was found in layers III and IV of sector g-l/14-16 - i.e. in the layers covering the palatial complex - and layers IV-VI in sector e-f/14-16 as well as during cleaning activities near the Urfa Gate in the Lower Town. As mentioned in chapter 1, the lack of good stratigraphic evidence makes it almost impossible to use this ceramic material to date the structures or to build a relative chronology of the ceramic material itself. However, on the basis of Zoroğlu's analysis, who compared the red-gloss wares from Samosata with more securely dated fragments in the wider region, we can cautiously make a rough distinction between forms that are likely already produced in the early 1st c. BCE (1, 16, 19, 21)[867], forms that were likely produced in the late 1st c. BCE (3/18/27) and forms that are dated to the 1st c. CE (14, 20, 22, 23, 24). As such, I will briefly discuss the fragments belonging to the first group here as potentially already part of objectscape 2, those of the second group as part of the late 1st c. BCE objectscape 3 (see paragraph 7.4.6) and those of the third group as belonging to the 1st c. CE objectscape 3 (see paragraph 7.5.5).



Fig. 7.25. Drawings of fragments pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 1'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 75 fig. 1.

[866] Cf. Crowfoot et al. 1957.
[867] Zoroğlu 1986, 96: '*This pottery was first produced nearly at the beginning of the first c. B.C.*'

Fourteen fragments were assigned to 'Form 1', which consists of shallow plates with a ring-base and an inverted edge (fig. 7.25). Fragments of this form were found both in sectors e-f/15-16 (fr. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11) G-K/15-16 (fr. 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 14) on the *höyük* as well as during the Urfa Gate cleanings (fr. 12, 13). Zoroğlu suggested that fragments 1, 2, 12 and 13 belonged to the earliest fragments of this form, as these have a wider wall (except for 12) and are less shallow and thus have more affinities with earlier, Hellenistic shapes.[868] Fragment 14 is a ring base fragment of a plate with roulette decoration and a so-called 'Isis Crown' stamp, which is exclusive to plates of Hayes form 4 and bowls of form 5A in 'Eastern Sigillata A'. The stamp has parallels in the late 2nd c. BCE and early 1st c. BCE[869], while plates of Hayes form 4 belongs to the so-called 'second generation' of Eastern Sigillata A forms, which start to be produced approximately in the last quarter of the 2nd c. BCE, but remain in use during the 1st c. BCE.[870]



Fig. 7.26. Drawings of fragments pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 16'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 82 fig. 6.

[868] Zoroğlu 1986, 74: '*Elimizdeki parçalardan 1, 2 ve 13 nolu kenar profilleri bir cok bakımlardan Hellenistik dönemin aynı formdaki çanak ve tabaklarını hatırlatmaktadır. Yalnız sigillataların genel olarak diğer Hellenistik karakterli örneklere göre sığ olması dikkat çekicidir. Bu ilk üç örnek bize göre derin sayılabilecek kaplar olmak itibariyle hôlô Hellenistik formların etkisini taşımaktadır. Ayrıca cidar arının kalınlığı da, bize bunların erken olmasını düşündürmektedir*'. Fragment 1: clay/gloss type 1, h. 2,8; from sector j-k/15-16, layer IV. Fragment 2: clay/gloss type 1, h. 2,4; from sector j-k/15-16, layer IV. Fragment 12: clay/gloss type 1, h. 2,2, from Urfa Gate cleaning. Fragment 13: clay/gloss type 1, h. 3,5, from Urfa Gate cleaning.

[869] Hayes 2008, 17, n. 25; Lund 2016, 834-837. Several examples derive from stratum Hell 2B/C, Hell 2C and 2C+ at Tel Anafa in Israel, which is suggestive of a date between 128 and 80 BCE, cf. Slane and Berlin 1997, 258-261, 340 nos. FW 368-369, FW 373 pl. 46, no. FW 374 pl. 27, 48, no. FW 380 pl. 48. Two examples were furthermore found at Jebel Khalid in Syria, with an estimated date in the first third of the 1st century BCE, cf. Jackson and Tidmarsh 2011, 334 nos. FW 267-268, fig. 117, pl. 25.

[870] Lund 2005, 345, n.18: '*The evidence from Tel Anafa suggests that the earliest version of this form began to be made before 128/125 BC'.*

Six fragments were assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 16', which consists of straight walled, hemispherical bowls with a ring base and a flat rim (fig. 7.26). These fragments derive from sectors E-F/15–16 (fr.3), K-L/14 (fr. 2 and 5), J-K/15-16 (fr.6) and the Urfa Gate cleanings (fr. 1 and 4). This form is a continuation of earlier black-slipped bowls and belongs to the earliest forms of red-gloss wares, starting at the end of the 2nd c. BCE. Based on parallels from Samaria, Hama and Ephesus, Zoroğlu assigned especially fragment 3 to this early phase.[871]



Fig. 7.27. Drawing of fragment pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 19'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 86 fig. 8.

One fragment was assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 19', which consists of thick-walled bowl with a hemispherical body, a flat base and relief decoration on the exterior (fig. 7.27). The fragment was found during the cleaning works at the Urfa Gate.[872] According to Zoroğlu, this shape also derives from earlier black-slipped forms with grooved decoration, which leads him to date the fragment to the late 2nd and early 1st c. BCE.[873] Important parallels derive from Samaria[874], Hama[875], and Tarsus.[876]

[871] Zoroğlu 1986, 83: '*Biz Samsat'da EF/15-16 V. tabakada bulunan bir parçayı (no: 3) bu formun en erken örneği olarak kabul etmek istiyoruz'. Samaria*: Crowfoot et al. 1957, 332, fig. 80; *Hama*: Johansen 1971, 113, fig. 45; Sehäfer 1962, fig. 2/20; Mitsoupoulou-Leon 1972/1975, fig. 2/2; *Ephesus*: Mitsoupoulou-Leon 1972/1975, fig. 3/9. Fragment 3: clay characteristics of type 1, gloss characteristics of type 2, h. 2,2, from E-F/15-16, layer V.
[872] Fragment 1: clay characteristics of type 2, gloss characteristics of type 1, h. 3,9; w. 11, 1.
[873] Zoroğlu 1986, 85: '*Aslında Form 19'da 1 ve 16 formlar gibi, Hellenistik dönemden gelen ve Doğu Sigillataları içinde de sevilen bir kaptipidir. Bu bakımdan onun ortaya çıkışını DS'ların ilk ortayaçıkış tarihine götürmek fazla abartma olmaz.'* For black-glazed versions, see Jones 1950, fig. 124, No. 104.
[874] Crowfoot et al. 1957, 342.
[875] Johansen 1971, 120, figs. 46-47.
[876] Jones 1950, fig. 137, No. 293.

Fig. 7.28. Drawing of a fragment pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 21'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 87 fig. 9.

One fragment was assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 21', which consists of a deep bowl with a profile, a slightly out-curving rim (fig. 7.28). The fragment was found in layer V of sector E-F/15-16. Zoroğlu claims that this is a rare form in 'Eastern Sigillata A'.[877] Parallels from Samaria[878], Hama[879], and the Heraion on Samos[880] suggest a dating in the early 1st c. BCE.[881]

In general, the production of red-slip wares starts in the 2nd c. BCE, when it is already attested in the Levant, Judea, Cyprus, Egypt, the Aegean, western Anatolia, and, in smaller quantities, in the inner lands of present-day Turkey and Syria.[882] During the 1st c. BCE, this distribution remains similar but increases in number, with a peak production period between 50 and 1 BCE[883], continuing but strongly decreasing in number from the 1st c. CE until deep into the 3rd c. CE.[884] The production centres of 'Eastern Sigillata A' have not yet been identified but chemical analyses of the clays suggests that kilns producing it where located in North-western Syria or eastern Cilicia, where indeed also by far the highest quantities of 'eastern Sigillata A' were found.[885] The type of pottery is characterized by a high degree of fabric and shape standardization, the latter which might be explained by the use of moulds.[886] At Arsameia on the Nymphaios, 'Eastern Sigillata A' is also found from the end of the 2nd c. BCE onwards[887], where it is closely related to the

[877] Zoroğlu 1986, 87: '*Samsat'da E-F/15 - 16 plankaresinde V. tabaka"da bulunan çanak parçası DS'lar içinde nadir bir formu temsil etmektedir.*'
[878] Crowfoot et al. 1957, 336, fig. 81.
[879] Johansen 1971, 159, fig. 64.
[880] Technau 1929, 48.
[881] Suggested also in Lapp 1961, 213.
[882] For a geographical distribution map of ESA in the period 150-100 BCE, see Lund 2005, 241 fig. 10.4.
[883] For the geographical distribution of ESA in the 1st c. BCE, see Lund 2005, 242 fig. 10.5.
[884] Hayes 1985, 13; Lund 2005, 239 with fig. 10.3 showing the occurrence of ESA in absolute numbers; Reynolds 2014.
[885] Schneider 1995, 416; Hayes 1997, 54; Slane and Berlin 1997, 335; Fischer-Genz et al. 2014. For the still debated connection to the *'vasa rhosica'*, mentioned by Cicero, see Poblome *et al*. 2001, 144 with Lund 2005, 237-238.
[886] Sartre 2001, 228; Hayes 1997, 19–21 fig. 6; Meyza 2000, 237–9 fig. 1.
[887] Cf. Dörner and Goell 1963, 235–241 nos. 9–32.

construction period of the *hierothesion*.[888] At Tille Höyük, too, large quantities of red-gloss pottery have been attested.[889]

7.3.6 Analysis

I will now analyse the material pertaining to objectscape 2 in terms of the four objectscape-proxies as defined in sections 3.3 and 3.4: 1) temporal and geographical genealogies (investigating the vibrancy of glocal relations); 2) materials and colours (investigating the vibrancy of materials and their relational capacities); 3) sensorial capacities (investigating the vibrancy of matter through the multi-sensorial capacities of objects and their place in 'sensorial regimes'; and 4) radical alterity and representation (investigating the vibrancy of 'ontologically unsettling' objects). Where possible, I will address significant differences with objectscape 1 of paragraph 7.2.1.

Temporal and geographical genealogies. Many of the objects, styles and concepts of objectscape 2 appear to be completely new when compared with the pre-existing objectscapes of both Samosata and Commagene, and in some cases even to that of the wider northern Syrian region. Until its appearance in Samosata in the early 1st c. BCE, the use of tessellated mosaics is, for instance, unattested in northern Syria, as well as the concentric border scheme, the figurative, polychrome *emblemata* and specific iconographic motifs such as the crenellations, the illusionistic cubes, fish depictions, dolphin and amphora iconography and mask iconography; also in other media, these are not attested. The joint appearance of so many novel elements in objectscape 2 potentially initially triggered a '*shock of the new*'.[890] What many of these non-local mosaic elements seem to share is their genealogical development in the 4th or 3rd c. BCE, mostly in the eastern Mediterranean, and their subsequent explosive increase in terms of quantity and geographical scope during the 2nd c. BCE, becoming truly glocal phenomena with a supra-regional reach. In a similar way, the arrival of Masonry Style wall painting in Samosata in the early 1st c. BCE appears to be a novum for the whole of Commagene, although, on a wider geographical scale, it seems to be much less rare in (northern) Syria than the tessellated mosaics are.[891] The Masonry Style too seems to have developed in the 4th/3rd c. BCE Eastern Mediterranean, and reached a supra-regional character by the 2nd c. BCE. For the architectural decoration, the Corinthian capitals and the door frames with bound tre-foil motifs, there are also no precursors in Commagene before the early 1st c. BCE. The former however sticks close to late 2nd c.- early 1st c. BCE developments in

[888] Hoepfner 1983, 51.
[889] Although the final publication of the Hellenistic period at Tille Höyük is still eagerly awaited, the preliminary reports at least mention '*many pieces of fine, red pottery, especially of the mould made relief ware common in the late Hellenistic period*' (French 1982, 417) indicating a very similar situation, whereas the composition of the evidence seems to be rather complicated in the Hellenistic period (cf. French 1984, 247; Blaylock et al. 1990, 117) like in other places of Commagene.
[890] Hughes 1991, who used it mainly as a description of change relating to the modernist movement.
[891] Masonry Style wall painting is witnessed, for instance, in Jebel Khalid on the Euphrates, cf. Jackson 2009.

Asia Minor, while the latter adopts a motif that is ubiquitous in the wider Syrian region during the 2nd c. BCE. On a wide regional scale, we might therefore suggest that these elements of the objectscape were not particularly rare.

The manifest and recurring tendency of engaging with objects and concepts from a deep local past, as observed in objectscape 1 (see 7.2), is less present in objectscape 2 but not absent. An important example is provided by the multiple chequerboard mosaics in *opus tessellatum* (F2, F5, F6 and F7) which adapt a decorative motif from the deep local past in a novel, non-local technique. In the architectural lay-out (small rooms and narrow corridors; a 'double layer' of rooms around a courtyard; the peripheral corridor mudbrick architecture), we perhaps also witness a certain type of anchoring of the manifold novel, non-local elements (e.g. mosaics, architectural decoration, wall paintings) into an architectural setting that, through its adherence to pre-existing architectural forms and techniques (e.g. the mudbrick architecture of the 'torus-base structure' and the Iron Age architecture of nearby Tille Höyük[892]), was capable of evoking a deep local past.[893] It is also worth considering the Rhodian amphora depicted in the iconography of mosaic floor F1: they suggest a continued presence of at least the *concept* of such amphorae, as these were attested already in objectscape 1 (see 7.2.1). Overall, however, there appears to be a shift from objectscape 1 with a strong inclination to performed manifestations of a deep local past and very limited supra-regional elements to objectscape 2 that mainly consists of novel, non-local elements with a supra-regional character that had only become widespread and glocal by the 2nd c. BCE.

A significant change can also be observed in the mechanisms behind the appropriation of these non-local objects: whereas, in objectscape 1, the attested non-local elements seem to be either imports (e.g. black glazed pottery, Rhodian amphorae) or adoptions that adhere neatly to the pre-existing, glocal norms (e.g. the torus-bases *in antis*), objectscape 2 is characterized more by local adaptions, variations and unique combinations of non-local elements. It uniquely combines, among other things, an unusually large amount of very flat, bi-chrome concentric borders with polychrome figurative *emblemata* in very fine *opus tessellatum*; a border with a fish mosaic with an *emblema* with dolphins; satyr-like mask iconography with an elaborate border scheme and a tondo frame; an ornamental limestone doorframe with the vegetal motif of bound tre-foil garlands of olive (or laurel) leaves; and, lastly, relatively flat and exclusively painted Masonry Style orthostats and isodomes with an elaborate and illusionistic frieze zone. An important exception to this phenomenon is the adoption of the Corinthian Capital Order I, which largely seems to follow the wider regional repertoire and its decorative norms without a clear indication of local variations and unique combinations.

892 Blaylock 2009, 157. 171–212; Canepa 2018, 25–28.
893 For the concept of anchoring, see Sluiter 2017.

Materials and colours. In terms of materials and colours, objectscape 2 is characterized by much novelty and a widening of the repertoire too. The mosaic stone floors introduced a wide variety of new, coloured stone types, as well as glass (in the destroyed *emblema* of mosaic F4 in room XIV). The walls of the palace implied the introduction of plaster of two different types, and pigments made of a variety of different materials, potentially deriving from far, and difficult and expensive to acquire.[894] Some materials, at the same time, must have been deeply familiar: the pebbles, probably from the nearby river bed of the Euphrates, used in the pebble floors and filling of the walls; the fine vegetal reeds used for the attachment of the plaster; the local limestone, most probably from quarries nearby the city. It is striking however how many of these more local materials seem to be made invisible in the palatial complex as they are covered or disguised by novel materials; the pebbles and the reeds, and even the ashlar masonry wall, covered by the painted plaster, and the pebble floors placed exclusively in the remarkably inaccessible and invisible peripheral corridor.

The largely bi-chrome use of colour in objectscape 1 was enriched by a much wider palette of colours in objectscape 2, although the use of bi-chromatic contrasts was still visible in the black and white the concentric borders as well as the yellow and red painted orthostats and isodomes. The figurative *emblemata* of the tessellated mosaics introduced red, brown, yellow, green, orange, blue, pink and, by means of the glass tesserae, even translucent and shimmering tones. Besides the yellow, red and sometimes blue and burgundy painted orthostats and isodomes, especially the friezes and possible upper zones contained a wide variety of colours (light blue, orange-red, brown, greens, and white). This overall rich palette, with red and yellow as the dominant colours, seems to have played an instrumental and active role in the modes of visuality of the palatial complex. By contrasting the bi-chrome black-and-white concentric border scheme with a polychrome figurative *emblema*, the gaze was steered towards the latter.[895] Orange-red reoccurs as the central and prime colour of both *emblemata* (the amphora and the mask). It is likely that colour to some extent had the capacity to indicate the hierarchies between spaces; the relatively increased colour palette of the orthostats in room III for instance suggests an elevated position of this space, especially when considered in relation to its unique use of figurative elements (the pomegranates) and its size and central position of the room in the symmetrical suite.[896] The role of colour in the architectural decoration of objectscape 2 remains unclear; no traces of paint were attested on any of the fragments but their current shiny white appearance might have been coloured originally as well.

[894] See Rozenberg 2009 for the chemical analysis of the pigments used in the only slightly later dating palace of Masada in Judea.
[895] Haug 2021, 547.
[896] For the use of colours for the (hierarchic) organization of space in Hellenistic palaces, see Rozenberg 2004.

Sensorial capacities. Objectscape 2 also introduces a wide variety of new sensorial, experiential object capacities, preserving however one important sensorial aspect: the use of flat wall surfaces. This is all the more surprising considering the ample possibilities offered by the Masonry Style to make use of moulded plaster in relief as well as incisions. The exclusion of such relief meant the persistence of a tactile experience of smooth flat surfaces. In objectscape 2, however, this flatness becomes more complex in a multi-sensorial sense, as the illusionistic friezes, with their painted suggestion of relief, invited viewers to touch the surfaces, potentially triggering an immediate 'dissonant experience' between the visual and the tactile. This sensorial dissonance was perhaps enforced by the co-existence of these wall paintings with elements of architectural decoration where, in contrast to the wall paintings, the perceived relief was in fact tangible; the visual suggestion of three-dimensionality in the Corinthian capitals as well as the door lintels with bound tre-foil garlands in relief could actually be confirmed in a tactile sense as well. Importantly, the wall painting covered completely all the walls of the rooms, 'enveloping' the spectator in a total environment, meaning that entering these rooms implied being completely surrounded by a painted world.[897]

The tessellated mosaic floors probably introduced a radically new set of multi-sensorial experiences, especially when compared to the proposed stamped earth and tapestry covered floors of objectscape 1. The specific types of maintenance and ensuing human-thing entanglement discussed for the stamped earthen floors of objectscape 1 had shifted to a less high-maintenance flooring, which was flat by itself, and easily cleaned and dried, in turn introducing a new olfactory regime.[898] If we consider the tactile experience of treading on mosaics with bare feet, we should consider how the fragmented but flat surface was harder and colder than floor surfaces had probably been before.[899] The tessellated floors furthermore brought along new and different acoustic qualities, especially when walked on with sandals.[900] In combination with these sensorial qualities, the concentric border decoration potentially triggered a visual and cognitive response that slowed down the gaze of the eye, functioning as a mind-trap.[901] The illusionistic elements of

[897] For 'enveloping' aspects of Minoan wall painting, see Morgan 2005, 24-26.
[898] Hamilakis 2013, 117.
[899] Ingold 2011, 16 emphasizes the importance of the tactile qualities of floors when treaded on with bare feet: 'O*ur understanding of that most fundamental surface of all, the ground, is moulded by the experience of walking in boots or shoes over paved surfaces. Barefoot walking reveals the ground to be composite and heterogeneous, not so much an isotropic platform for life as a coarse cloth or patchwork woven from the comings and goings of its manifold inhabitants. And it reveals, too, the extent to which our primary tactile contact with the environment is through the feet rather than the hands.'*
[900] The acoustic qualities of mosaics have not yet been investigated in separate studies, but archaeological investigation into auditive experience of ancient architectural space can be found in Devereux and Jahn 1996; Watson and Keating 1999; and Watson 2001.
[901] Gell 1998.

the tessellated mosaics (the meander in perspective and the illusionistic cubes) potentially triggered a multi-sensorial dissonance similar to that of the illusionistic wall painting described above, with the *visual* perception of an uneven surface and the simultaneous *tactile* perception of a flat surface. The geometric maze of the concentric borders furthermore steered the eye toward its central *emblema*, where the figurative realism contrasted in terms of its visual modality. As argued before, a similar contrast of visual modes was achieved by the use of very flat orthostats and isodomes combined with relatively elaborate and illusionistic frieze bands. Hamilakis makes us aware that the elaboration of such wall and floor decorations and were indeed not simply attempts to impress through conspicuous consumption, but rather *'they were attempts to regulate sensory modalities, to manage attention, through the regulated movement and conduct of the body, and the controlled sensory interactions that this entailed – to produce, in other words, a con-sensus*.'[902] Hamilakis sees a correlation between increased accumulations of power, drawing more people to a court, and the necessity to regulate and fix meanings and memories.[903] It is not unlikely that a similar social process lay at the basis of objectscape 2 as well.

The architectural lay-out of objectscape 2 actively steered and restricted the corporeal movement of people (and for instance also of animals) inside its walls. The small rooms and long, narrow and winding corridors potentially triggered a sense of confinement and perhaps even claustrophobia, as the organic, labyrinth-like lay-out could easily cause a loss of orientation, something perhaps enforced by the subtle, almost unnoticeable height differences caused by the micro-terracing underlying the architecture.[904] In contrast to the single layer of spaces around a courtyard in objectscape 1, the multiple layers of spaces in objectscape 2 would have added to a sense of seclusion, while also limiting the possibility of daylight entering these spaces. The narrow corridors and mostly small rooms furthermore made it hard to avoid contact with other people moving through the palace, with the risk of touching other bodies, or being gazed upon always present. All these considerations apply also to the suites of small rooms (I-V and, probably VI-IX), in which movement was restricted even more. Both the inaccessibility of the structure – for instance suggested by the peripheral corridor – as well as its maze-like internal lay-out actively allowed for the evocation of concepts of power and hierarchy between those who visited and those who ruled, affecting the visitor '*in an unconscious, habitual, corporeal way*'.[905] Such architectural elements together partook in a 'sensorial regime' (see paragraph 3.3.2) that had the

[902] Hamilakis 2013, 179. Note that Hamilakis also acknowledges that this was not necessarily the outcome of such attempts: '*Yet, these sensory experiences would not have necessarily had the intended outcomes and effects, and their unpredictability, the dis-sensual processes generated, are perhaps hinted in the deliberate, successive, and often-selective destructions*'
[903] *Ibidem*.
[904] Something for instance also suggested by Lauren Ristvet for the palace of Tell Beydar, cf. Ristvet 2014a, 60. See also Dovey 2008, 10.
[905] Hastorf 2009, 53. See also Ristvet 2014a, 44.

capacity to impose an overall sense of powerlessness onto the visitor, and could evoke the authority of the royal power that monitored these spaces. It is furthermore possible that the capacity to cause 'sensorial dissonance' by the wall paintings and mosaics as well as the 'mind trap' capacity of the concentric borders with geometric patterns all participated and enforced this multi-sensorial regime, in which the individual senses were simultaneously restricted, steered, confused and slowed down. As underlined in paragraph 3.3.2, however, the 'power to' of such bio-politics need not necessarily have been successful or have gone unchallenged.

Radical alterity and representation. In terms of representation, objectscape 2 introduces depictions that are characterized by more detailed, more naturalistic, and sometimes illusionistic ways of rendering. The carefully rendered and deeply notched leaf-fingers of the acanthus in the corinthian capitals (cf, ID522), as well as the tre-foil garland on the door lintels (cf. ID588) introduce a degree of finely detailed figurative articulation that cannot be attested for the objectscape 1. This fine detail recurs throughout the objectscape, from the small tesserae in the beard of the mask mosaic (F8), allowing to distinguish separate strains of hair, to the extremely fine white and black lines in the painted bevelled-edge yellow block (fig. 22). This is strongly connected to the types of figuration used in objectscape 2. Whereas objectscape 1 seemed restricted to schematized and two-dimensional figuration (7.2.5), in objectscape 2 this type of figuration is supplemented with more naturalistic and illusionistic figuration. The schematized, two-dimensional figuration can still be observed in the mosaic concentric border decoration (cf. F1, F3, F4 and F8), the Rhodian amphora (F1), and the painted isodomes and orthostats (e.g. W2). Naturalism and illusionism are specifically observed in the rendering of the mosaic fish (F1), the mosaic dolphins (F1), the painted vine leaf band (fig. 23), the painted bevelled-edge block (fig. x), the painted alabaster imitation (fig. 24), the sculpted tre-foil garland (cf. ID588)), and the acanthus leaves of the corinthian capitals (cf. ID522).

This mixed use of schematic as well as naturalistic modes of figuration has implications for the ontological status of the things that are depicted. Whereas, in objectscape 1, we witnessed blurred boundaries between the ontological status of objects by means of material, composition and figurative rendering (creating 'gazelle-date-tree' and 'hunter-horse-spear' entities as well as a 'human-comb' entity, see paragraph 7.2.1), in objectscape 2, the depictions of humans, animals and things are mostly separated by figurative or compositional boundaries. The dolphins, fish and amphora of F1 are depicted as self-contained entities, as well as the mask (F8), and the painted vine leaves (fig. 24). In compositional terms, both the concentric border scheme and the Masonry style scheme also actively create ontological boundaries by means of the frames that divide the decorative elements within them. The use of illusionist painting, however, does create more ontologically complex categories, especially in the painted frieze bands and stone imitations,

where the ontological status of actual stone masonry is redefined by the illusionist suggestion of such masonry in plaster. The mask mosaic (F8) is ontologically complex too, as it conflates an object (the mask) with a demanding, human-like vivacity (especially by means of the staring eyes), and an animal-like wildness (the satyr).[906]

Conclusion. In conclusion, objectscape 2 is characterized by the introduction of many elements that are new on a local and regional scale, but that had already become ubiquitous and glocal on a supra-regional scale. Many of these elements introduced new colours, materials, sensorial qualities, modes of representation as well as ontological concepts. The integration of these non-local objects in objectscape 2 often occurred by combining these elements in a unique manner. In the case of the architectural technique and lay-out as well as the chequerboard mosaics, it can be argued that forms with a deeper local past were reworked into the new configuration as well, perhaps functioning as anchoring devices that allowed an embedding of the many innovating objects. Simultaneously, these elements added to and enforced the palace's sensorial regime that restricted, steered, confused and slowed down. All these remarkable appropriations and combinations together meant the creation of a unique assemblage at the intersection of the local, regional and global scales, with a strong emphasis on the latter. Compared to objectscape 1, this meant a radical shift in orientation and scale of its relational capacities.

7.4 Objectscape 3 (mid-late 1st c. BCE; later-palatial)

In this section, I will synthesize and analyse the archaeological evidence for objectscape 3. Like the previous section, I will mostly provide an 'objectscape synthesis' of the already presented evidence in the previous chapters, albeit with some additions of material types that were not yet analysed in detail in the previous chapters (i.e. wall painting and ceramics). As some elements of objectscape 2 were still part of objectscape 3, I will also very briefly repeat some of the conclusions offered there already. This means I will consider and discuss the main characteristics of the architecture (paragraph 7.4.1), the mosaics (paragraph 7.4.2), the architectural decoration (paragraph 7.4.3), the painted wall decoration (paragraph 7.4.4), the sculpture (paragraph 7.4.5), and the ceramics (paragraph 7.4.6). After this, I will analyse objectscape 3 in terms of the proxies that were introduced in chapter 3 and the introduction of this chapter (7.1), and compare these with the analysis of the previous objectscape 2 (discussed in 7.3.6).

[906] See chapter 8 for a case study that investigates the relational capacities of the mask mosaic of room XV.

7.4.1 Architecture



Fig. 7.29. Map of the palatial complex with indicated in brown the walls pertaining to objectscape 3. Source: by the author.

In large part, the architectural techniques and lay-out of objectscape 3 are the same as those of objectscape 2 (for which, see 7.3). However, as discussed in chapter 4, there is evidence for the later replacement or addition of walls that were constructed in a different technique than the walls pertaining to the objectscape 2 (fig. 7.29). Instead of very wide walls with many small and middle-sized stone inclusions, these later walls are characterized by a decreased width and a fine type of mudbrick. These walls are W5 in room IV, W6 in room VI, W7 in rooms VI and VII, W49 in room VIII, W14 in rooms I and XIV, W17 in room XIV, W18 in room XIV, W19 in corridor A3, W25 in corridor A3, W28 in corridor A3 and room XIV and W30 in room XIV. In some cases, the construction of these walls appears to have closed off entrances, thus altering the accessibility of the structure. This had most repercussions for room V, where an entrance from room IV was closed off by W5, as well as an entrance from room XIV by W18, making this room exceptionally secluded in terms of accessibility and adding to the already inaccessible character of the symmetrical suite of room I-V. It is not unlikely that these changes went hand in hand with the construction of an altar and a socle with a statue group in room V (see below). The other important closed off entrance is W30, between room XIV and corridor A4, through which the accessibility between the northern zone and the central, western and southern zones of the palace was likely drastically restricted. The claustrophobic and labyrinthine character of the architectural lay-out thus seems to increase in objectscape 3 when compared to objectscape 2.

7.4.2 Mosaics

There is no evidence for later additions or alterations to the floors that pre-existed from objectscape 2. This means that the same geographical and temporal genealogies, materials and colours, sensorial qualities and modes of representation and ontologies discussed in paragraph 7.3.2 should be assumed to persist in objectscape 3.

7.4.3 Architectural decoration

As discussed in chapter 5, there is evidence for a later phase of architectural decoration in the form of the Corinthian Capital Order II, as defined by Werner Oenbrink (see chapter 5). Two capital fragments (ID287, ID294) could be assigned to this order and should be considered part of objectscape 3 as they likely date to the late 1st half to mid-1st c. BCE. Compared to the fragments of Corinthian Capital Order I from objectscape 2, we can observe several changes in terms of the composition and the formal characteristics of the foliage decoration, as, for instance, this order has a lower kalathos and a much more compact but ample rendering of the foliage decoration, with tri-partite acanthus leaves, rounded stems, wide leaf-fingers, and heart-shaped eyelets. Whereas the Corinthian capital fragments of objectscape 2 largely followed the standard canon of Corinthian capitals in Asia Minor (see 7.3.3), these later Corinthian capital fragments contain multiple uncanonical characteristics that should be considered unique local reworkings of universalized and standardized forms.[907] The unusual appropriation of the duplicated caulis-motif is especially noteworthy, as this is a short-lived phenomenon that has parallels primarily in late-Republican Rome and Campania (the early-1st c. BCE circular temple B in Largo Argentina and a grave monument of the mid-1st c. BCE in Pompeii).[908] In terms of architectural decoration, objectscape 3 thus suggests a change of orientation of the network from the wider region (Asia Minor) to the western Mediterranean.

One of the fragments pertaining to the later Corinthian Capital Order II contained clear traces of gilding (ID287). It concerns a small pilaster capital that likely pertained to a half-pilaster aligning the walls of an interior space. Gilding as a decorative technique on architectural decoration is unattested in Samosata and Commagene in the previous objectscapes. This decorative feature probably developed somewhere in the 4th c. BCE (with examples in tombs of Macedonia[909] and South-western Turkey[910]) and probably became widespread and glocal by the 2nd and 1st c. BCE.

[907] Oenbrink 2021, 174. See also Oenbrink 2017, 61.
[908] Oenbrink 2017, 61-64; Oenbrink 2021, 174-175 with further literature.
[909] Kakoulli 2009, 60.
[910] *Mylasa:* Kidd 2015, n. 17.

By then, it is attested on Delos in the House of the Comedians[911] and in northern Syria at the 'Governor's Palatial complex' of Jebel Khalid,[912] while on the Italian peninsula the concept of gilded architectural forms (capitals, pilasters and columns) starts featuring on the painted plaster decoration of the Campanian houses.[913] In Judea and Nabatea, gilded plaster in relief as well as gilded architectural decoration (among which corinthian capitals) occurs in multiple contexts, for instance in the so-called late Hellenistic Stuccoed Building of Tel Anafa (Upper Galilee, ca. 125–90 BCE)[914], the 1st c. BCE Great Temple Complex of Petra[915] and in the debris of exedra 7 of the 'Nabatean Mansion' or villa at Az-Zantur IV.[916] The earliest actual attestation of gilded architecture on the Italian peninsula is in the Augustan temple of Apollo on the Palatine (dedicated in 28 BCE).[917] The adoption of gilded architectural decoration in Samosata thus corresponded well to the developments in the building projects of other monarchs, since the 2nd c. BCE. Its accompanying visual, shimmering effects as well as its specific illusionistic materiality (suggesting a solid gold capital) were all novel aspects in objectscape 3.

7.4.4 Wall painting

Like objectscape 2, objectscape 3 also contained painted plaster decoration that contained imitations of ashlar masonry, luxurious panelling in coloured stone veneers and decorative elements of stone walls. Some evidence for wall painting can however be cautiously assigned to objectscape 3. Here, I will synthesize this evidence (that I already described in detail in chapter 4) and analyse its genealogies and overall character.[918] As discussed in 7.3.2 and chapter 4, the proposed chronological division between objectscapes 2 and 3 is primarily based on the existence of two different wall types – a rubble masonry with medium-sized limestones and a fine mudbrick - of which the latter is used in several instances to close off entrances and thus is presented here as belonging to objectscape 3. Because most of the paintings of objectscape 2 were likely still visible in objectscape 3, I refer principally to the synthesis and analysis of these offered in 7.3.2.

Evidence for objectscape 3 was located in rooms IV (W5), room VIII (W49), and room XIV (W14, W18, W28, and W30). The paintings on these walls are organized in a design that has a tripartite structure, consisting of 1) a socle with a continuous plinth or with isodomes, 2) a central band

[911] Westgate 2000, 408.
[912] Clarke 2002, 42–43.
[913] E.g. *Villa of Oplontis (Torre Annunziata)*: De Franciscis 1975, 9-38, pls. 8, 16, 17, 23.
[914] Kidd 2015, 83–84.
[915] Kropp 2013, 161.
[916] Kolb and Keller 2001, 319.
[917] Zink and Piening 2009
[918] The *ex situ* fragments cannot be assigned with certainty to a specific palatial objectscape but, for matters of convenience, are discussed under the 'later palatial objectscape'. See paragraph 7.2.3.

with alternating wide and narrow orthostats, with a frieze on top and 3) an upper band, containing a layer of isodomes, a frieze, or panels with stone imitations. On W14, W18, W28 and W30, however, the socle is absent, creating a bi-partite scheme. In W49, a fragment of the frieze zone has been preserved. The wall decoration consists of plaster painted in a wide palette of colours (with red, yellow, white, dark blue, burgundy, pink, purple, green, light blue and black) and, like in objectscape 2, does not contain any evidence for plaster modelled in relief.

In room IV, W5 contains a socle with a narrow continuous green band and isodomes that consist of a large trapezoid field in green and smaller triangular field in red (left top) and yellow (right bottom). It has a narrow continuous frame in blue below the isodome and a frame in yellow on top of it. The central band consists of alternating wide and narrow orthostats. The wide orthostats alternate in yellow with a red frame and pink with a blue frame, while the narrow orthostats are rendered in purple with a yellow frame. The wide orthostats contain lozenges, alternating in yellow with pink and blue frames (in the pink orthostat) and red with blue and red frames (in the yellow orthostat) (cf. appendix A, figs. LXXXIV/XCVI/XCVII/XCVIII). In room VIII, W49 contains a continuous red socle and a frieze with a row of rosettes in red, yellow, light blue and white, separated by stylized miniature Doric columns in red with shadows indicated in burgundy, and capitals and bases rendered in light blue. Below and on top of the frieze run uninterrupted yellow, red and blue continuous lines as well as a cymation moulding (appendix A, (figs. LXXXV/ XCI/ C/ CXXX).[919] In room XIV, W14, W18, W28 and W30 do not appear to contain a socle but instead immediately start with a zone with alternating wide and narrow orthostats, with the narrow orthostats in burgundy with yellow framing and the wide orthostats alternating in yellow (with red framing) and red (with white framing). The wide orthostats contain lozenges, alternating in red with white and red framing (in the yellow orthostat) and yellow with red and white framing (in the red orthostat) (appendix A, figs. VI/XXIV/ LXXXVII/XXIV).

In general, we can say that, compared to the wall paintings of objectscape 2, the composition of these later wall paintings shows more complexity and experimentation, especially when we consider the character of its socle zone (by leaving it out altogether on W14, W18, W28 and W30 or its unique trapezoid-shaped colouring on W5), as well as the inclusion of framed and multi-coloured lozenges inside the orthostats (W5, W14, W18, W28 and W30). Another difference is witnessed in the cymation moulding of W49 in room VIII, which has less elongated ovoli than the cymation in the fragments presented in figs. 21a-b and 7.22, which were assigned to objectscape 2.

[919] Bingöl 2013, 55–56 figs. 79–80.

The rosette frieze of W49 imitates the use of carved rosettes on architectural Doric friezes, which has an early appearance on the 4th c. BCE tholos of Epidauros.[920] In the 3rd c. BCE, the Ptolemaeum and Arseneion at Samothrace contain friezes with carved rosettes and bucrania.[921] The Ptolemaic link of these structures suggests that the motif occurred in Alexandria as well during this period, but the lack of Alexandrian evidence makes it difficult to establish this connection.[922] For the 2nd and 1st c. BCE, there are ample parallels for this decoration on the Italian peninsula, both in tombs[923] and public buildings and temples.[924] In the Campanian domestic contexts, we also find what seems to be one of the earliest examples of Doric friezes with rosettes in painted form, in the bichrome architectural imitation in the villa of Boscoreale (c. 50-40 BCE).[925] Probably semi-contemporary to its adoption in objectscape 3 in Samosata, the motif appears in the architectural decoration of Herodian Judea (ca. 37-4 BCE).[926] Peleg-Barkat has emphasized how the motif is entirely new to Judea and considers it as part of one of many Herodian adoptions from a distinctly Roman repertoire.[927] It cannot be said with certainty whether the rosette frieze in Samosata post- or ante-dates its parallels in Judea, but it seems to combine a polychrome, painted rendering with a decorative concept that derived from architectural decoration that had strongly developed in Roman (Italian) contexts but apparently had become attractive also for other late 1st c. Near Eastern monarchs.

The earliest known examples of diamond-shaped lozenges in interior painted stucco decoration derive from 2nd c. BCE plastered vault decoration of tombs in Alexandria, where the complex borders suggest the motif imitated three-dimensional ceiling coffers.[928] Not much later, the use of the motif is attested in the Masonry Style wall decorations in 2nd c. BCE Delos (e.g. the 'Quartier du

[920] Roux 1961, 131, pl. 43.
[921] Lawrence 1996, 141, 155, fig. 244.
[922] As also noted by Peleg-Barkat 2014, 147.
[923] Foerster 1998, 304. The sarcophagus of Lucius Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, dated to the first half of the 3rd c. BCE is an early example, cf. (Saladino 1970, pls. 4-5).
[924] E.g. the podium of the apsidal hall in Palestrina (c. 80 BCE), cf. Krauss 1976, 456–58, figs. 1–2.
[925] Simon 1986, pl. 24f; Bingöl 1997, 115 n.132.
[926] For the adoption of Doric friezes with rosette decoration in Judaea and the Decapolis, see Peleg-Barkat 2011, 430-432. See also Mathea-Förtsch 1996, 151. Important examples derive from the palaestra in the large bathhouse at Masada (Foerster 1995, figs. 225–30; Peleg-Barkat 2014, 146 fig. 5.) and from the possible burial complex of Herod at the Lower Herodium (Netzer 1999, fig. 152; Peleg-Barkat 2014, fig. 5), while carved rosettes also occur on sarcophagi and tomb facades from Jersualem (Peleg-Barkat 2014, 147). For Herodian art and architecture in general, see Peleg-Barkat 2021, with additional literature.
[927] Peleg-Barkat 2014, 146-147: '*Doric friezes with rosettes in the metopes, as well as Ionic friezes decorated with acanthus scrolls, both appear for the first time in Judaea under Herod, constituting a turning point in local architectural décor* (…) *It seems reasonable to believe that the shift from plain metopes to metopes carved with rosettes that occurred under Herod was due to Roman influence*'
[928] Adriani 1940, 55–97. The decorative motif itself is obviously older, occurring for instance in the brick decoration of the Apadana from the palatial complex of Dareios I in Susa, cf. Perrot 2013. It is in fact likely that, in Classical Greece, the motif was initially associated with the Achaemenids, as the motif occurs in representations of Persians on red-figured ceramics, for instance adorning the leggings of Persians and Amazons, cf. Morgan 2016, 120–122.

Stade'[929] and The House of Dionysos[930]), Amphipolis (2nd c. BCE)[931], as well as the Late Hellenistic Stucco Building of Tel Anafa (125-80 BCE)[932], where the lozenges are placed in orthostats and rendered in relief and incision. In the 1st c. BCE, the motif is widely attested in flat versions on the Italian peninsula, with examples like Room II in the House of the Griffins on the Palatine in Rome (80-60 BCE), the Villa dei Misteri (70-60 BCE), and the Villa Imperiale in Pompeii(20 BCE).[933] The motif also occurs further west, in the 'Maison de Sulla'(32 BCE)[934], the 'Maison aux deux alcoves' (XVIII) (40-30 BCE) and the 'portique Dorique' (XXXII) (40-35 BCE) at Glanum, in southern France.[935] In the Herodian palaces of the last three decades of the 1st c. BCE, we see the lozenge used with and without the incision and relief styles. At the entrance room in the Mountain Palace Fortress at Herodium (early 20s BCE) the lozenges appear solely in relief and incision.[936] In the north palace of Masada (30-20 BCE) the lozenges appear in both guises[937], while in the Third Herodian palace of Jericho, the lozenge patterns exist only in small decorative designs and in socle ornamentations without incision and relief.[938] Netzer understand this as a typical Roman influence: '*The relief and incision Styles do not appear in the Herodian fragments from Jericho, where the principle influences seem to be from the Roman western examples and not from the Hellenistic world*.'[939] In Judea, the use of the lozenge is however not restricted to Herodian contexts, as it is also attested in Khirbet al Murak[940]and the western quarter at Gamla (1st c. CE)[941], where, however, the motif is again rendered in relief and with incisions. The use of the lozenge in Samosata is very similar to the flat versions of the northern palace of Masada and the northern palace of Jericho, but, as with the rosette frieze, it remains unclear whether the lozenges of Samosata date somewhat earlier (for instance during the reign of Antiochos I) or somewhat later (for instance during the reigns of Mithridates II or Mithridates III) than the Herodian examples. It seems safe to say that the adoption of the flat orthostat also meant the appropriation of a glocal decorative element that, however, had undergone a profound Roman (Italian) phase of particularizations in the 1st c. BCE, which perhaps did create the attractiveness of this motif to Near Eastern Roman client kings in the last decades of the 1st c. BCE.

[929] Alabé 1994, 160.
[930] Chamonard 1922-1924, no. 45, 536.
[931] Lazaridis 1982, 48; 1983, 35-7; Ginouves et al. 1994, 103, figs. 92,93.
[932] Weinberg 1971, 98; Kidd 2015, 85–89
[933] Beyen 1956, 54ff; Ehrhardt 1987, pls. 18:73, 22:91, 23:95; Pappalardo and Grimaldi 2018.
[934] Rolland 1946, 118ff., fig. 93.
[935] Barbet 1987, 16-17, 37.
[936] Corbo 1967, 111–112, fig. 21; Rozenberg 2008, 360.
[937] Foerster 1995, 13-36; Fittschen 1996, 139-162; Rozenberg 2006, 355-356.
[938] Rozenberg 2008, 439–440, figs. 531, 532 and no. 90; Rozenberg 2009, fig. 12 (room B90).
[939] Netzer 2004.
[940] Also known as 'the Palace of Hilkiya'. See Damati 1972, 173; Damati 1982, 117-120 (Hebrew); Netzer 2008, 232-234.
[941] Farhi and Sharabi 2020, 89, No. 22; Fig. 2.

7.4.5 Sculpture

Here, I will synthesize and analyse some of the sculptural evidence that likely pertained to objectscape 3. In chapter 5, I already presented, described and discussed the sculptural evidence for the Hellenistic and Roman periods in Samosata. The problematic archaeological contexts of many of these finds precludes their designation to a particular objectscape, which means I will only focus on some of the fragments from chapter 5, namely ID215/216/520/688/689/690/691.

The alterations to room V are most important in this regard. In chapter 4, I have argued that the instalment of a statue group on a square statue base (I8) with an altar (I9) in front of it, in the southern corner of this room, necessitated the closing off of two entrances in W5 and W18, which was done with new mudbrick walls that were covered with the wall painting (discussed in this section, see above). This allowed for the erection of a statue of Antiochos I (ID216) and a Zeus-like bearded male (ID215), which probably formed part of an ancestral gallery which included statues of one or more gods (see 6.2). As discussed in chapter 5, this meant the introduction in Samosata of a concept of ancestral galleries that was widely attested already in the Attalid, Antigonid, Mauretanian and Arsacid (Parthian) dynasties, as well as at the Ptolemaic court, where a similar inclusion of deities in such an ancestral gallery was probably available in the *Thalamegos*, the Nile-boat of Ptolemy IV. As observed in paragraph 6.2, the proposed ancestral gallery of objectscape 3 adheres more to this globalized ancestral gallery practice than the gallery witnessed on Nemrut Dağı, as it consists of statues and busts instead of the more unusual basalt reliefs.

Both the Zeus-like bearded male (ID215) and the statue of Antiochos I (ID216) introduce a rather classicizing but still very naturalistic form of semi-life-size, three-dimensional sculptural portraiture of rulers and deities that cannot be attested with certainty in the previous objectscapes. ID216's adoption of an Octavian-type hairstyle in combination with a bronze radiant crown placed in the diadem, shows an innovative combination of concepts of self-representation that had been developing during the last two centuries BCE, on the one hand, in Near Eastern royal contexts, and, on the other hand, in the Italic peninsula, perhaps suggestive of the introduction of a type of 'Romanism' in objectscape 3. The other portrait of Antiochos I (ID520) fitted more to the known representations of Antiochos I in other *hierothesia*, such as the ancestral gallery of Arsameia on the Nymphaios and the basalt relief ancestral gallery of Nemrut Dağı. The adoption of the Armenian tiara with a diadem containing a row of eagles in relief implies the adoption of an Armenian royal concept and its Commagenean reworking into a type of 'Persianism' by its simultaneous use in the depictions of the diadem with eagles in, for instance, Darius on the ancestral stele on the North socle (I-1) of the Eastern Terrace on Nemrut Dağı.[942] The introduction

[942] For 'Persianism', see Strootman and Versluys 2017.

of inscription stelai (ID688 and ID689) and *dexiosis* stelai (ID690 and ID691) pertaining to the ruler cult of Antiochos I, placed near or in the city, in the lower town or on top of the *höyük*, introduced a range of non-local religious and iconographic concepts, materials, styles and objects to objectscape 3 that were not witnessed there in the preceding period.[943]

7.4.6 Ceramics

Here, I will provide a brief overview of forms of red-gloss table wares pertaining to the mid-late 1st c. BCE. I refer to 7.2.2 for an introduction to 'Eastern Sigillata A' and the specific find conditions of this material in Samosata. The forms discussed here (3/18/27) were also found in layers III and IV of sector G-L/14-16 - i.e. in the layers covering the palatial complex - and layers IV-VI in sector E-F/14-16 as well as during cleaning activities near the Urfa Gate in the Lower Town.



Fig. 7.30. Drawings of fragments pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 3'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 76 fig. 2.

Three fragments were assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 3', which consists of plates with rims extending outwards (fig. 7.30). The fragments derive from sectors J-K (fr. 1 and 2) and L-O (fr. 3). Zoroğlu suggests that the form emerged from a typical form of Hellenistic black-slipped plates, which is also evidenced by the black-slipped fragment 2.[944] Zoroğlu follows a dating by Lapp to the period 75-30 BCE.[945]

[943] The innovative character of these Antiochan appropriations of globalized elements and their local reworking have been discussed in depth and at long length elsewhere, and will not be further commented upon here. See, most importantly, Versluys 2017a.
[944] Cf. a black-slipped plate from Hama: Johansen 1971, fig. 33. Zoroğlu 1986, 76: '*Hellenistik dönemin siyah gılazurlu tabakları içinde tipik bir form olarak ortaya çıkan bu türün kırmızı astarlı örnekleri de siyah astarlıların bir devamı olarak görülmektedir.*'
[945] Lapp 1961, 35.



Fig. 7.31. Drawings of fragments pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 18'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 84 fig. 7.

Eight fragments were assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 18', which consists of deep bowls with a profiled interior and plain rims (fig. 7.31). Zoroğlu refers to earlier black-slipped as well as metal and glass versions of this form.[946] The fragments derive from sectors E-F/15/16 (fr.1 and 2), O-R/14/15 (fr. 3), and K/15 on the *höyük*, and at The Urfa Gate (fr. 5 and 6). Fragments from Hama[947], Samaria[948] and Antiochia[949] suggest a date in the last decades of the 1st c. BCE.



Fig. 7.32. Drawing of fragment pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 27'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 94 fig. 13.

[946] Zoroğlu 1986, 83 with n. 53. For a black-slipped bowl of this form from Dura Europos, see Cox 1949, 5, No. 25.
[947] Johansen 1971, 117, fig. 46.
[948] Crowfoot et al.1957, 335, fig. 80.
[949] Waagé 1948, 15, pl. II, No. 54.

One fragment was assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 27' which consists of craters with widened mouths, profiled rims, and a relatively short neck (fig. 7.32). The fragment was found in sector E/16-17, in layer IV. Zoroğlu mentions that the shape already pre-existed in the earlier Hellenistic form repertoire but has a much shorter neck than these predecessors.[950] A parallel from Hama shows that these types of craters have relatively very high ring-bases.[951] A parallel from Samaria was dated to 30-25 BCE[952], and also the parallel from Hama dates to the last centuries of the 1st c. BCE[953], which makes a similar dating for the fragment from Samosata possible as well. Zoroğlu mentions that one aspect of the fragment is remarkable: the ornamentation with a laurel wreath and a Doric frieze is sliced into the clay but lacks a second slip to finish the crater. This unfinished state, according to Zoroğlu, might indicate the existence of a potter's workshop at Samosata.[954]

7.4.7 Analysis

On the basis of the above presentation and discussion of the material pertaining to objectscape 3, I will now analyse this objectscape in terms of the four objectscape-proxies developed in chapter 3: 1) temporal and geographical genealogies (investigating the vibrancy of glocal relations); 2) materials and colours (investigating the vibrancy of materials and their relational capacities); 3) sensorial capacities (investigating the vibrancy of matter through the multi-sensorial capacities of objects and their place in 'sensorial regimes'; and 4) radical alterity and representation (investigating the vibrancy of 'ontologically unsettling' objects. Where possible, I will address significant differences with objectscape 2 (7.3).

---

[950] Zoroğlu 1986, 95.
[951] Christensen and Johansen. 1971, 188, fig. 72.
[952] Crowfoot et al. 1957, 340, fig. 82.
[953] *Ibidem*.
[954] Zoroğlu 1986, 95: '*Kraterlerin en önemli özelliği karın başlangıcında ve karın üzerinde yer alan kazıma ile yapılmış süslerdir. Form 19'da olduğu gibi, Hellenistik devirden intikal eden bu tür süslemelere Samsat'da bulunan yarım bir parça üzerinde de rastlamaktayız. Burada boyun bitiminde bir defne çelengini hatırlatan süsleme yanında karın üzerinde dikine üçlü guruplar halinde dilimler bulunmaktadır. Samsat parçasının en önemli özelliği krem-sarı renkteki hamurun üzerinde çok hafif olarak - özellikle oyulmuş kısımları daha koyu bırakan - bir astarla kaplanmış olduğudur. Öyle sanıyoruz ki, bu parça ikinci daldırma yapılmadan bırakılmıştır. Samaria ve Hama'da bulunan kraterlerin A tipi sigillatalara özgu bir astarla kaplı olmasına karşın, Samsat kraterinin bu astarsız veya yarı astarlı olarak bırakılmış yüzeyi, belki de burada bir çömlekçi atölyesinin varlığmın işareti sayılabilir. Bu konuda henüz yeterli araştırmalar yapılmadığı için bir şey söylemek istemiyoruz. Ancak, Samsat gibi önemli bir merkezde çömlekçi atölyesinin bulunmasının da şaşırtıcı bir durum olmayacağını vurgulamak isteriz.'* Note that this was already suggested also by Dörner and Goell 1963, 234 with note 2.

Temporal and geographical genealogies. The temporal and geographical genealogies discussed for the fixed features pertaining to objectscape 2 – the architecture, mosaics, architectural decoration and the wall paintings; see 7.3– in large parts persisted into objectscape 3, albeit with some additions and adaptions. In terms of temporal genealogies, it is possible that, by the late 1st c. BCE, the elaborate concentric border schemes of the tessellated mosaics had become somewhat outdated reminders of an elite culture that was popular a century earlier in centres like Delos and Pergamon; their potential to trigger a 'shock of the new' was now severely watered down. For the architectural decoration, it is likely that the appearance of the Corinthian Capital Order II should be understood as an addition rather than a replacement of Order I, which would mean that in this case too older forms persisted. The continued use of red-gloss table wares furthermore shows no remarkable break with objectscape 2 either. Like the red-gloss wares from objectscape 2, the new forms (3, 18, 27) in objectscape 3 were re-workings of forms that pre-existed in the earlier Hellenistic repertoire, especially with black-slipped wares. Although objectscape 3 consisted of many objects that were already around since approximately the early 1st c., some of its elements can also be regarded as completely novel; these new elements include the gilded architectural decoration, the painted diamond-shaped lozenge, the painted rosette frieze, the naturalistic, three-dimensional portraits, the concept of an ancestral gallery, the iconography of *dexiosis* stelai and the Armenian tiara.

In terms of geographical genealogies, a striking aspect of objectscape 3 is the increased adoption of objects that, by the 1st c. BCE, had been repeatedly re-articulated in the Italian peninsula. These include the duplicated caulis-stem in the Corinthian Capital Order II, the use of gilded architectural decoration, the rosette frieze in the painted wall decoration of W49, the diamond-shaped lozenges, and the Octavian-type hairstyle in the limestone portrait of ID216. None of these elements were originally Roman nor exclusively available on the Italian peninsula, yet their popularity in the Late-Republican Roman world will likely have altered or added to the (virtual) capacities of these objects on a global scale as well. The fanatic adoption of some of these elements at the Herodian court in Judea (lozenges, rosette frieze, gilding) attests of the capacity of these elements to evoke 'Rome', as they occurred in royal contexts where a 'Roman cultural scenario' was explicitly intended.[955] The 'Roman connection' need not necessarily have been activated in Samosata as well though, as many of the objects and concepts witnessed objectscape 3 corresponded also to developments happening beyond Rome and closer to home, with gilded architectural decoration occurring on Delos, in Jebel Khalid and in Nabatean contexts; rosette

[955] With which I do not intend to imply that these elements signalled a political submission to Roman power and functioned in a programmatic manner. Rather, through the Roman/Italic phases of their genealogies, these elements had acquired a capacity to be associated with the riches and luxuries that were connected to an idea of Roman/Italic culture, which Herod adopted to signal his position as a strong Hellenistic sovereign. See Lichtenberger 2009.

friezes in Ptolemaic contexts in the Aegean at Samothrace; ancestral galleries in a wide variety of Hellenistic courts[956]; red-gloss wares of the 'Eastern Sigillata A' type occurring throughout the eastern Mediterranean[957]; and Octavian-like hairstyles in the portrait sculpture of other Hellenistic client-kings such as Iuba II of Mauretania.[958] With such a wide-ranging set of geographical genealogies, we should thus be cautious in describing this objectscape as 'Romanized'. Especially the adoption of elements that very explicitly evoke a concept of other cultures, such as the occurrence of the 'Armenian Tiara' (ID690) and the 'Persianized' diadem with eagles in relief (ID520), suggest that 'Rome' as a connection and cultural concept did not necessarily seems to have had the primacy.

Instead, what seems more important in this regard are the many innovative local adaptions and unique combinations of many of these non-local elements. The Corinthian Capital Order II deviates much more from the canonical standards of Corinthian capitals in Asia Minor than Order I, especially through the adoption of the duplicated caulis. Other local experimentation with glocal elements is the appearance of Masonry Style wall painting that excludes a socle zone or contains socles with polychrome trapezoid and triangular fields. In the sculpture too, we observe the integration of different traditions, with its combination of an Octavian-type hairstyle and a Hellenistic, eastern Mediterranean diadem with bronze radiant crown. A final example of local adoption and adaption of non-local forms might be witnessed in the possibility of a local production of 'eastern Sigillata A' red gloss table wares, as suggested by Zoroğlu.[959]

Materials and colours. Objectscape 3 largely consisted of the same materials and colours as objectscape 2 (7.3), safe for some additions. The wall paintings show a similar emphasis on red, yellow and white in its orthostat zone, but the palette now is extended with burgundy. The integration of the diamond-shaped lozenges furthermore caused a more complex colour setting with multiple contrasting frames in different colours within one orthostat. The socle zone also occurs in many more colours than in the previous objectscape, with multiple colour fields within one isodome and green as the dominant colour. In the architectural decoration, an important new addition is the gilding on the small Corinthian column or pilaster capital (ID287).

Sensorial capacities. The sensorial capacities of objectscape 2 (7.3.6) in large part persisted in objectscape 3. The additions and alterations in the palatial complex however did also have implications on an experiential level. The closing off of several entrances inside the palatial complex (W5, W18 and W30) would have added to the pre-existing labyrinthine lay-out, which

[956] Versluys 2014, 130-135.
[957] Lund 2005.
[958] Fleischer 2008, 321-324, 327 and 329.
[959] Zoroğlu 1986, 61-100.

increased its control and regulation of human action and movement. The widened colour palette of burgundy and gilding and the increased complexity of the wall paintings with polychrome socle zones and diamond-shaped lozenges inside the orthostats, further regulated the sensory modalities of the visitors, potentially allowing for an increased managing of their attention.[960]

If we consider the sensorial qualities brought along with the figurative three-dimensional sculpture, it is important to especially consider ID215 and ID216 in their assumed spatial context in room V. It is possible that the closing off of room V and the installation of a pedestal for a statue group, with an altar placed in front of it, set the very theatrical stage for a radically new multi-sensorial assemblage. The zigzag route through the narrow corridors and small rooms from room II or III to room V led past concentric border mosaics and illusionistic wall painting, which lured the visitor into a maze of which the only way out was by turning back. At the very end of this, one would have been confronted with the limestone life-size sculpture, probably depicting the king, his ancestors as well as deities in an ancestral gallery, hovering above the spectator, standing on a pedestal. The shallow altar in front of the statues, smelling of offered foods and liquids, necessitated the visitor to kneel in order to reach it and to offer to the royal family, causing a deep curtsy, a forced corporeal submission of subject to king. The light coming in from high up in the NW wall (W13), would fall right on the bronze radiant crown of the statue of king Antiochos I, creating a strong contrast between the enlightened sovereign and the spectator below in the shadows, possibly blinded by this sight. The 'naturalistic' rendering of the limestone portraits drew visitors into a shared ontological realm (see below) but it also provided the statues with a heightened capacity for the appropriation of natural bodily response.[961] All these theatrical and multi-sensorial devices regulating the sensorial modalities and social relations likely were adoptions of more common elements of Hellenistic court culture but the specific assemblage of features in the palatial context of Samosata created a unique multi-sensorial regime.[962]

Representation and ontologies. In terms of the mosaics, the wall paintings and the architectural decoration, the analysis of the role of representation and ontologies in objectscape 2 (7.3.6) largely stays the same in objectscape 3. An important addition however is provided by the figurative, three-dimensional sculpture in limestone (specifically ID215, ID216, ID520). Its life-size character and largely 'naturalistic' rendering (in a classicizing style) seem to introduce a radically new way of representation, of which I already briefly discussed its sensorial capacities

[960] Causing the production of what Hamilakis calls a '*con-sensus', cf.* Hamilakis 2013, 179. For more on the sensorial qualities of the wall paintings, see 7.2.2.
[961] After Jeremy Tanner's understanding of the specific affective qualities of naturalism in classical sculpture, cf. Tanner 2001, 257. For 'naturalism' and its capacities, see also Tanner 2006 and Neer 2010.
[962] A thorough investigation of the theatricality and multi-sensoriality of Hellenistic-period palaces is still desired but important first steps have been made by Strootman 2014 (on theatricality and Hellenistic court culture) and Ristvet 2014a and 2014b (on performance in Seleucid Babylonia).

above. The lifelike, mimetic aspect of such sculpture has a direct impact on ontological taxonomies, as it actively drew people and objects into the same ontological realm, making the king, the god and potential other ancestors as present and real as their participating spectators.[963] The fact that both the Zeus-like bearded deity (ID215) and Antiochos I (ID216) were executed in the same limestone material is of significance as it is an aspect that is explicitly mentioned in the Great Cult Inscription on Nemrut Dağı: '*and from one and the same quarry, throned likewise among the deities who hear our prayers, I have consecrated the features of my own form.*'[964] Through a stress on the identical materiality of the statues, the king attempted to substantiate a shared ontological status of the king and the gods. A similar claim was likely desirable in room V too, as the incorporation of a deity into an ancestral gallery makes a similar ontological claim by means of the shared socio-spatial context.[965]

Conclusion. Although objectscape 3 in many ways perpetuated the general characteristics of objectscape 2, some important alterations and additions were noticed while analysing the objectscape-proxies. Many of the elements of objectscape 2 likely were retained in objectscape 3: The fact that many elements of objectscape 2 were retained (i.e. the architecture, wall painting, mosaics, architectural decoration, and red-gloss table wares) paradoxically would have introduced a different temporality of the new objectscape, in which the 'shock of the new' was likely greatly diminished. Similarly, the geographical genealogy of these objects had changed, adding a local phase to elements that previously could have been categorized as 'non-local'; in objectscape 3, these persisting elements now perhaps in some way even served as local anchors into which actually novel objects (such as the Corinthian order II and the painted lozenges) could be embedded. In terms of geographical genealogies, I have also cautiously suggested an increase of objects with a strong Roman/Italic genealogical phase, but, instead of suggesting a 'romanized phase', I have put emphasis on the wider geographical scope of the objectscape and specifically the myriad of local reworkings and unique local combinations of such non-local forms. The slight increase of colours and materials, but especially the changes in the architectural lay-out and the appearance of naturalistic life-size sculpture not only enforced pre-existing sensorial modalities inherent to objectscape 2, but also created specific sensorial assemblages (specifically in room V). The naturalistic style and limestone materiality of the sculpture furthermore introduced a different representational modality and ontological taxonomy that likely played an active role in the performance of royal power and social relations.

[963] Or, as Tonio Hölscher would call it, one shared '*Lebenswelt*', cf. Hölscher 2014, 21.
[964] N 54-63. Translation from Sanders 1996, 206-217.
[965] The divine connotations of the bronze radiant crown furthermore added to this ontological equation of king and god.

7.5 Objectscape 4 (1st c. CE; post-palatial)

In this section, I will synthesize and analyse the archaeological evidence for the post-palatial, 1st c. CE objectscape 4 of Samosata. I will discuss the relevant evidence for four different contexts that are likely assigned to this objectscape: the structure in *opus reticulatum* in sector m-r/14-15 (paragraph 7.5.1); the citadel wall in *opus reticulatum* in sector f-h/2-3 (paragraph 7.5.2); The city walls and Urfa Gate in *opus reticulatum* in the Lower Town (paragraph 7.5.3); and the structure in *opus reticulatum* in the Lower Town (paragraph 7.5.4). In a separate paragraph, I will discuss the ceramic material that likely pertained to this objectscape as well (paragraph 7.5.5). After this, I will analyse objectscape 4 in terms of the proxies that were introduced in chapter 3 and in the introduction of this chapter (7.1), and compare this with the analysis of objectscape 3 (7.4.7).

7.5.1 The structure in opus reticulatum *in sector m-r/14-15.*

Fig. 7.33. Map of the structure in opus reticulatum *in sector m-r/14-15. Source: by the author (based on Özgüç 2009, 129 pl. 12).*

In sector m-r/14-15, the excavations yielded parts of a rectangular, longitudinal structure that was at least 22,0 x 15,0 m. in size and has a NWW-SEE orientation (see fig. 7.33 and appendix A, figs. XV / XVI / XVIII / XXV / XXVI / XXIX / XXXI / XXXII / XXXV / XXXVI / XXXIX / XLII / XLVII / XLVIII / XLIX / L / LIII / LXV / LXXI / LXXXII / CXXVII / CXXVIII / CXXXI). The walls, constructed in *opus caementicium* consist of three parallel running walls in a NWW orientation (W41, W67 and W88) and three parallel running walls with a NNE orientation (W64, W86+W87 and W89), all of which continued into the northern trench profile. In the outer aisle at the SW side of the building, two fragments of floors were retrieved: F17 in the centre of the aisle and F10 in the NW of the

aisle, both consisting of small, square and plain white limestone slabs in an orthogonal design. W41 and W64 contain a facing in *opus reticulatum* combined with a band of bricks on both sides, suggesting that it was visible both on the exterior and interior of the building. Özgüç and Tırpan claim that the technique used of the *opus reticulatum* in this structure is the same as in the city walls in the Lower Town.[966] The excavators mention bricks and roof tiles containing a stamp with '*BACIΛIKH'*.[967] In fact, the lay-out of the structure is reminiscent of Roman basilicas, with a central nave flanked by, in this case, two longitudinal aisles on both sides. The presence of multiple floors, often occurring in the central nave of basilicas, could not be established. F10 and W41 partially cover walls pertaining to the palatial complex, which suggests that it post-dates the abandonment and destruction of the palatial complex.[968] The excavators suggest that the structure underwent repairs into the Byzantine period, suggesting a life-span of several centuries.[969] Inside the structure the excavators unearthed four sculptural fragments that were possibly erected inside the structure: a male torso in marble that likely formed part of a statue group (ID89), a fragment of a left leg in marble that potentially belonged to this (ID327), a limestone fragment of a hand that originally held a metal objects, perhaps a sceptre (ID328) and a limestone relief depicting a Zeus-like, bearded male deity (ID298). It proved impossible to assign to this structure specific fragments of architectural decoration or wall painting.[970] The limited contextual evidence for this basilica-shaped structure makes it hard to assign any concrete function to it, apart from the general notion that it concerns a large representative structure on a significant location, on top of the *höyük* and partially covering the old royal palace. As I will discuss at the end of this chapter, the use of *opus caemticium* and *opus reticulatum* is rare outside of the Italian peninsula, but, as we will see below, not at all rare within Samosata itself.

[966] Özgüç 2009, 33; Tırpan 1989, 519-526.
[967] Özgüç 2009, pl. 89 fig. 200, and 33: '*Höyüğün IV.katının en önemli yapısının, enkazından ve çevresinden derlediğimiz 'BACIΛIKH' yazıtlı kiremit ve tuğlalardan bir bazilika olduğunu öğrendiğimiz dört köşeli uzun mekandır.'*
[968] *Idem*, 33: '*Bir kısmı Kommagene sarayının kuzey kanadındaki 14-15 nolu odaların temelleri üstüne oturmuştur.'*
[969] *Ibidem*: '*Bizans devri onarımları sırasında değiştirilmemiş olan iki uzun duvarının iç ve dış yüzeyleri retikulatlarla kaplıdır'.*
[970] One fragment of wall painting, depicting a female portrait, was found in layers III or IV in sector k-l/16-17, covering the palatial structure, cf. Özgüç 2009, 33, pl. 89 fig. 199. Stylistically, this fragment however likely dates to the mid- or late-Imperial period.

7.5.2 The citadel wall in opus reticulatum *in sector g-h/2-3*

a. b.

Fig. 7.34a-b. Map (a) and section (b) of the citadel wall in opus reticulatum in sector g-h/2-3. Source: Özgüç Archive.



a. b. c. d.

Fig. 7.35a-d. Pictures of the citadel wall in opus reticulatum *in sector g-h/2-3. Source: Özgüç Archive.*

More architectural features that likely pertain to objectscape 4 were located at the north-west edge of the *höyük* in sector g-h/2-3.[971] Here, a fragment of a fortification wall with protruding bastions was encountered (see fig. 7.34 and 7.35a-d). The walls were constructed in *opus caementicium* and contained a facing in *opus reticulatum*, with limestone, diamond-shaped *cubilia* of approximately 10,0 x 10,0 cm. The wall was built on top of older citadel walls dating to the early Iron Age and was itself used as the foundation for later Medieval period walls.[972] Although badly preserved in other places because of erosion processes on the edge of the *höyük* and later demolishment, it is likely that the citadel wall encircled large parts or even the entire citadel.

[971] Özgüç 2009, 34.
[972] *Ibidem*.

7.5.3 The city walls and Urfa Gate in opus reticulatum *in the Lower Town*

a. b.

Fig. 7.36a-b. Pictures of the wall in opus caementicium *with a facing in* opus reticulatum*, in the south-eastern side of the Lower Town, near the Urfa Gate. Source: Wagner Archive.*

In multiple locations along the ancient city's 5,5 km. long border, fragments of a fortification wall were still standing up by the time that the team of professor Tırpan studied them in the 1980s (fig. 7.36a-b and appendix B, map B1, with the mapped course of the wall).[973] The lowest regions of these walls were constructed in *opus caementicium,* filled with gravel and coarse river stones, and had a facing in *opus reticulatum.* The limestone *cubilia* were approximately 8,3 - 8,9 cm. At regular intervals of 7,20 m., the wall contained rectangular enforcements in brick masonry (1.30 x 0.36 m.), that were placed against the exterior of the wall, covering part of the wall facing in *opus reticulatum*. It is possible that these date much later (perhaps Byzantine period) than the original construction of the wall.[974]

[973] Tırpan 1987; 1989. See also Goell 1974, fig. 2; Spanu 1996, 926-930; and Özgüç 2009, 34-35, figs. 209-213.
[974] Özgüç 2009, 34, with figs. 210-211.



Fig. 7.37. The so-called Urfa Gate with the smaller, well-preserved tower in the south and the larger tower in the north. Top is towards the north. Source: Özgüç 2009, 138, pl. 10.

a.
b.

c.
d.

Fig. 7.38a-d. The so-called Urfa Gate (a-c) with the well-reserved smaller southern tower (c) and the interior of the larger northern tower (d). Source: Wagner Archive.

South of the *höyük*, one of the main gates of the city was located, the so-called Urfa Gate, which was located in a corner of the wall and faced towards the East (figs. 7.37 and 7.38a-d). It was most probably intended to control the incoming traffic that had crossed the Euphrates. Tırpan made a section underneath the gate, in which he distinguished, from bottom to top, 1) a thick layer of fluvial deposit, 2) a layer (h. 25 cm) described as a fill (character unclear), and 3) a foundation layer (h. 85 cm.) consisting of mortar filled with large and small pebbles.[975] In the vicinity of the plain, rectangular gate, two rectangular towers with rooms were located that opened up to the interior of the wall (fig. 7.37 and fig. 7.38 c-d). The smaller, southern tower was preserved up to a height of ca. 6,65 m. when investigated by Tırpan in the 1980s. The larger tower (7,50 x 7,30 m.), placed towards the north of the gate was cleaned and contained a facing of *opus reticulatum* on the outside, but a facing of hexagonal shaped limestone *cubilia* in the interior (fig. 7.38d).[976] Many fragment of red-gloss ware were found inside these rooms and in the further surroundings of the Urfa Gate (see also 7.5.5), but a systematic and contextual documentation of these finds is unfortunately lacking.

7.5.4 The structure in opus reticulatum *in the Lower Town*

a. b. c.

Fig. 7.39a-c. The structure in opus reticulatum *in the Lower Town. Source: Wagner Archive.*

A last context that likely belonged to objectscape 4 was encountered in the Lower Town, where a structure with walls in *opus reticulatum* combined with brick masonry was encountered. Unfortunately, the context remains completely undocumented safe for three pictures that were encountered in the Wagner Archive (fig. 7.39a-c). The exact location of the structure is not clear, but the few houses pertaining to the old town of Samsat (fig. 7.39a) suggests that we have to situate the trench somewhere in the south of the ancient city. On the basis of the pictures, the excavators seem to have unearthed one wall with a facing in *opus reticulatum*, which makes a turn into the profile of the trench. Three other walls executed in a more regular drystone masonry form a rectangular structure that is placed against the wall in *opus reticulatum* and is thus probably

[975] Tırpan 1989, 519-526.
[976] Özgüç 2009, 34, pl. 95, fig. 212.

later. Although the evidence is very minimal, the context at least attests of the use of *opus reticulatum* in the Lower Town as well.

As mentioned before, the use of *opus caementicium* masonry with a facing *in opus reticulatum* is very rare outside of the Italian peninsula, and even there it seems to be largely constricted to Latium and Campania, where it is usually dated to the early 1st c. BCE until the Augustan period (27 BCE – 14 CE).[977] Here, the use of *opus reticulatum* in city walls is rare but not unattested.[978] In the Near East, there are a handful of examples of its use, but, apart from Samosata, he technique is never attested in fortification walls. The earliest examples in the east are likely witnessed in several contexts pertaining to the building program of king Herod in Judea, who seems to adopt the technique after 20 BCE.[979] It is now generally accepted however, that in these Judean instances, the *opus reticulatum* was not visible as the walls were coated and plastered afterwards.[980] In later 1st c. CE contexts in the Near East, the *opus reticulatum* was however visible, for instance in several 1st and 2nd c. CE contexts at Antioch[981] and the monumental royal tomb of Sampsigeramus in Emesa, dating to ca. 70 CE.[982]

The many examples in Samosata discussed above are not easy to date, but the suggestion to assign the walls to the reign of Antiochos I[983] is generally unconvincing, especially since the structure in *opus reticulatum* on top of the *höyük* must post-date the palatial complex, which is likely to have been in place until the early 1st c. CE (see chapter 4). The absence of *opus reticulatum* in the *hierothesia* of Antiochos I further weakens this suggestion. Most scholars have suggested a date after the Roman provincialization of Commagene in 72 CE.[984] A context in Ancoz (Eskitaş) very nearby Samosata, might however suggest an earlier dating.[985] Here the evidence suggests a major sanctuary that was in use from the 8th c. BCE until at least the 1st c. CE, with a temple podium ca. (20,0 x 8,0 m.) in *opus caementicium*, and walls of a narrow corridor executed in *opus reticulatum.* Blömer and Winter suggest that '*(t)he occurrence of this building technique in Samosata is usually explained by the deployment of a Roman legion after the annexation of Commagene in 72 CE.*

[977] Dodge 1990; Spanu 1996, 923-939; Torelli 1980. Tırpan 1986; 1989, 519-536; Lichtenberger 2009, 50-52; Kropp 2013147-148.
[978] E.g. the Augustan fortification walls of Saepinum in Molise, cf. Pinder 2016.
[979] Netzer 1975, 93 n.18. Contexts with *opus caementicium* and *opus reticulatum* in Judea comprise of 1) Jericho, Herod's Third Palace; 2) Jerusalem, the potential tomb of Herod; 3) Panias, Herod's potential Augusteum; Post-Herodian contexts in Judea can also include the wall technique: 1) Caesarea, a secondary wall at the south of the Hippodrome (Burrell 2009, 220).
[980] Netzer 1975, I, 238; Lichtenberger 2009, 51; Kropp 2013, 148.
[981] In the aqueduct from Daphne (mid-1st c. CE), cf. Wilber 1938, 55; in a monumental tomb (probably 2nd c. CE), cf. Lassus 1972, 85-87; and in a 2nd c. CE villa: Stillwell 1941, 25.
[982] Watzinger 1923; Oenbrink 2009; Kropp 2013, 208-212.
[983] Wagner 2003/2004, 135–136; Hoepfner 2012, 117.
[984] Tırpan 1987, 101-112; 1989, 522-523; Sinclair 1990, 147-148; Özgüç 2009; Zoroğlu 2000, 76; Zoroğlu 2012, 137; Facella 2005, 239.
[985] As suggested by Blömer and Winter 2011, 117-120. See also Krüger and Blömer 2011.

However, many pieces of architectural decoration from the temple of Eskitaş would be in accordance with an earlier date as well.'[986] This context then might be cautiously used to suggest a general dating for *opus reticulatum* in Commagene in the reign of Antiochos IV (38-72 CE). Although such an adoption of *opus reticulatum* by Roman 'client-kings' like Herod, Antiochos IV and Sampsigeramus seems to be easily interpreted as a signalling of allegiance to Roman power[987], the extent to which the Roman capacity in Samosata itself was activated remains doubtful.[988] The remarkably high amount of examples of *opus caementicium* and *opus reticulatum* in Samosata, in a variety of different contexts (city walls, citadel walls, representative buildings on top of the citadel and perhaps less representative buildings in the Lower Town), suggests that these techniques profoundly altered the objectscape of Samosata. The *reticulatum*-like facing witnessed in the interior of the large tower near the Urfa Gate suggests a local variation of a non-local technique.

7.5.5 Ceramics

Here, I will provide a brief overview of forms of red-gloss table wares pertaining to the early-mid 1st c. BCE. I refer to 7.3.5 for an introduction to red-gloss 'Eastern Sigillata A' wares and the specific find conditions of this material in Samosata. The forms discussed here (14/20/22/23/24) were also found in layers III and IV of sector G-L/14-16 - i.e. in the layers covering the palatial complex - and layers IV-VI in sector E-F/14-16 as well as during cleaning activities near the Urfa Gate in the Lower Town.

[986] Blömer and Winter 2011, 120.
[987] As suggested by Blömer and Winter 2011, 120-121.
[988] See Lichtenberger 2009, 51-52 for a similar discussion of the programmatic value of *opus reticulatum* and *opus caementicium* in Herodian Judea. He stresses that, although it is possible that the construction methods were openly visible to the public and thus part of the programmatic-propagandistic character of Herod's building program, it is likely that it was not so much the 'Roman' character of these techniques rather than their expensiveness and altogether foreignness that was activated. See also Kropp 2013, 148 with a similar argument.



Fig. 7.40. Drawings of fragments pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 14'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 76 fig. 2.

Twelve fragments were assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 14', which consist of shallow plates with vertical rims and wide but low ring bases (fig. 7.40). Most fragments derive from the cleaning activities near the Urfa Gate (fr. 1-11) and one fragment derived from sector J-K/15-16 on the *höyük*. The form is widely available and occurs in red gloss wares in the eastern Mediterranean, the western Mediterranean and along the northern limes.[989] An early parallel, from the mid-1st c. BCE derives from Samaria[990] but the shape is attested until deep into the 1st c. CE, for instance in Pompeii.[991] Fragments 9 and 12 have roulette decoration on the rim or on the body. Fragments 10 and 12 have stamp decoration on the interior. The stamp of fragment 12 ('KAICY', read as 'καὶ σύ') is a well attested stamp belonging to the category of 'redende Stempel' and mostly seen in contexts dating to the 1st c. CE and later, for instance in Tarsus.[992] The roulette ornamentation is considered an invention from western Mediterranean potters, which was subsequently adopted

[989] E.g. in Haltern (Germany): Loeschke 1909, 143, fig. 2 Type 2.
[990] Crowfoot et al. 1957, 332.
[991] Pucci 1977, pl. V, 127.
[992] One in Walters, 1908, 18 and two more examples from Tarsus in Iliffe 1936, 37. For '*redende Stempel*', see Oxé 1934.

in the eastern Mediterranean, for instance in examples from Antiochia[993] and Hama[994], which are dated to the first half of the 1st c. CE.



Fig. 7.41. Drawings of fragments pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 20'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 86 fig. 8.

Seven fragments were assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 20', which consists of hemispherical, embossed bowls, mostly with a simple ring-base (fig. 7.41). Most finds derive from sector J-K/15/16 on top of the *höyük* (fr.1,2,4,5,6,7), and one derived from sector Q-R/14-15. Zoroğlu states that these red-gloss bowls are slightly smaller and more thin-walled re-workings of a pre-existent Hellenistic form known commonly as the 'Megarian bowl'.[995] The body is divided by a protruding profile in the middle and below it, some of the fragments carried decoration in relief (fr. 4-7), which comprises of vegetal motifs, palmettes, shell motifs and architectural elements (fr. 5). The form is in use between the middle of the 1st c. BCE to the 2ndc. CE, with important parallels

[993] Waagé 1948, pl. IV, no. 412.
[994] Johansen 1971, fig. 40, no. 40.
[995] For which, see Courby 1922; Rotroff 2006.

in Hama[996], Samaria[997], Antiochia[998] and Tarsus.[999] Zoroğlu dates these fragments to the early 1st c. CE.[1000]



Fig. 7.42. Drawing of a fragment pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 22'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 87 fig. 9.

One fragment was assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 22', which consists of deep bowls with a simple straight rim and a profile in the middle of the body (fig. 7.42). It derived from sector L/14, layer IV. Based on parallels from Hama[1001], Tarsus[1002] and Antioch[1003], Zoroğlu arrived at a dating to the first half of the 1st century CE.

[996] Johansen 1971, 124.
[997] Crowfoot et al. 1957, 272.
[998] Waagé 1948, 30.
[999] Jones 1950, 177.
[1000] Zoroğlu 1986, 87: '*Samsat parçaları da, özellikle Merkez açmasında bulunan örneklerin yardımıyla M.S. erken 1. yüzyıla tarihlenebilir düşüncesindeyiz.*'
[1001] Johansen 1971, 163, 166, fig. 64
[1002] Jones 1950, 243, fig. 144, no. 411.
[1003] Waagé 1948, pl. V, 450 f, k and p.



Fig. 7.43. Drawings of fragments pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 23'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 76 figs. 10 and 11.



a. b.

Fig. 7.44a-b. Fragments 1 (a) and 3 (b) pertaining to 'Form 23'. Source: by the author.

Nine fragments were assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 23', which consist of angular profiled cups with a relatively low ring base, also known as 'Kalathos cups' (figs. 7.43 and 7.44a-b). The fragments derive from sector K-L/14-15 (fr.6-9) on top of the *höyük* and from the cleaning activities near the Urfa Gate in the Lower Town (fr.1-5). Several fragments contain rouletting ornamentation on the exterior of the profiled rim (fr. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) and two fragments contain a stamp in the tondo (fr. 2: palmette, fr. 3: '*Χαρις*'). The general form is well-attested, both in eastern and western red-gloss wares, and is generally dated to the first half of the 1st c. CE.[1004] Important parallels derive

[1004] Hayes 1986, 34. Zoroğlu 1986, 91: '*Urfa Kapısı'nda bulunanlar dışında, diğerleri Merkez açmadaki Mozaikli yapı seviyesinde, yani iV. tabakada ele geçmişlerdir ki, daha önce burada ele geçen parçalarda olduğu gibi, bu fincanlar da M. S. 1. yüzyılın ilk yarısına tarihlenebllecek buluntulardır*.'

from Hama[1005], Samaria[1006], Tarsus[1007], Dura Europos[1008], Tel Anafa[1009], Nessana[1010], Corinth[1011], Perge[1012] and Antiochia.[1013]



Fig. 7.45. Drawings of fragments pertaining to Zoroğlu's 'Form 24'. Source: Zoroğlu 1986, 92 fig. 12.

Nine fragments were assigned by Zoroğlu to 'Form 24', which consists of deep bowls with vertical, often profiled rims, an angular body and a high, narrow and profiled ring-base (fig. 7.45). Fragments were found primarily at the Urfa Gate in the Lower Town (fr. 1-7 and 9), while one fragment was found on top of the *höyük* (fr. 8). This form has several parallels with western red-gloss forms.[1014] In some cases, the rim has vertical roulette decoration on the exterior. Fragment 9 contains a stamp ('*Χαρις*') in the tondo. Form 24 is generally dated to the 1st century CE in other

[1005] Christensen and Johansen 1971, 166-168, fig. 64.
[1006] Crowfoot et al. 1957, fig. 68, 81.
[1007] Jones 1950, 182, 244.
[1008] Cox 1949, 12, pl. 3, no. 69.
[1009] Slane and Berlin 1997, 324-325.
[1010] Baly 1962, 283, pl. 44j.
[1011] Hayes 1973, 451, pl. 85, no. 119.
[1012] Atik 1995, 68, fig. 27 no. 96.
[1013] Waagé 1948, forms 453, 455, 457, 460.
[1014] E.g. Loeschke 1909, 152, 153, pl. XI, 12 (in Haltern).

contexts such as Samaria[1015] and Hama[1016], with the plain and un-profiled walls perhaps slightly later. Zoroğlu dates these fragments from Samosata to the Augustan-1st c. CE period.[1017]

7.5.6 Analysis

On the basis of the above presentation and discussion of the material pertaining to objectscape 4, I will now again analyse this objectscape in terms of the four different objectscape-proxies: 1) temporal and geographical genealogies (investigating the vibrancy of glocal relations); 2) materials and colours (investigating the vibrancy of materials and their relational capacities); 3) sensorial capacities (investigating the vibrancy of matter through the multi-sensorial capacities of objects and their place in 'sensorial regimes'; and 4) radical alterity and representation (investigating the vibrancy of 'ontologically unsettling' objects). If appropriate and possible, I will address significant differences with the analysis of objectscape 3 (paragraph 7.4.7).

Temporal and geographical genealogies. For some elements of objectscape 4, there were precursors in objectscape 3. The red-gloss wares remained the principle fine ware ceramics in the assemblage; and the Zeus-like iconography witnessed in the sculptural evidence (ID298) was already attested for the previous objectscape as well (ID215). Except from the new citadel wall, which followed the course of the older Iron Age Wall, no temporal relations with a deep, local history can be witnessed in this objectscape however. In fact, most other objects making up objectscape 4 were most likely entirely novel on this local scale. The most important of these are the wall techniques of *opus caementicium* and *opus reticulatum*, which occurred in such great quantity and were so unlike pre-existing wall constructions (mudbrick with fieldstones and ashlar masonry) and wall facing techniques (limestone slabs or plaster coating) that it likely brought about another 'shock of the new'.[1018] Other new elements in objectscape 4 comprise of the symmetrical basilica lay-out; the limestone floor made with square, plain white slabs (F10 and F17); the new forms of red-gloss wares (forms 14, 20, 22, 23 and 24); the use of 'redende Stempel' (fig. 40, fragment 12); and the construction of city walls in the Lower City.

In terms of geographical genealogies, it seems that the shift attested for objectscape 3 to forms that were widely attested on the Italian peninsula and the western Mediterranean in general (see 7.2.3), is amplified in objectscape 4. At the same time, many of such forms were also witnessed in a more incidental way in other Near Eastern kingdoms and localities, especially in Herodian Judea.

[1015] Crowfoot et al. 1957, 338, fig. 81.
[1016] Christensen and Johansen 1971, 172, fig. 69.
[1017] Zoroğlu 1986, 93: '*Ancak diğer parçaları Augustus döneminden itibaren M.S. 1. yüzyıla tarihlemek istiyoruz.'*
[1018] See n. 886.

The *opus reticulatum* and *opus caementicium* were developed and ubiquitous especially in Latium and Campania, but it was also attested in several contexts in Herodian Judea, in Emesa and in Antioch. The basilica lay-out was likely developed in Rome already by the 3rd c. BCE but started to appear in the eastern Mediterranean from the late 1st c. BCE onwards, with examples in Samaria-Sebaste, Ashkelon and Aphrodisias.[1019] Several of the newly introduced forms of 'Eastern Sigillata A' red-gloss wares, which were widely attested in Asia Minor, Syria, and the Levant, now also had parallels in western Mediterranean red-gloss wares (especially forms 14, 23, 24).

Some of the local appropriations of these non-local objects might be termed rearticulations or local adaptions of the glocal norm. Especially the construction of a wall facing in hexagonal *cubilia*, in the large tower near the Urfa Gate, seems to be a local variation on *opus reticulatum.* The use of *opus reticulatum* in a city fortification is not attested outside of the Italian peninsula and even there it appears to be a marginal phenomenon. Its simultaneous application in a city wall, a citadel wall, and in representative buildings like a basilica, fundamentally determining the fabric of the city, is a unique phenomenon for Samosata.

Materials and colours. Objectscape 4 is characterized by the introduction of several new materials. The sculptural evidence suggests that marble has become part of the objectscape (ID89/327) alongside the continued use of limestone (ID298/328). The use of walls in *opus caementicium*, filled with gravel and pebbles, allowed for novel architectural lay-outs (for instance a multi-storeyed basilica with a wide nave and wide aisles) compared to the mud-brick architecture of the previous objectscapes, where small rooms and narrow corridors were the norm.[1020] White was likely one of the dominant colours, witnessed in the many walls in *opus reticulatum*, the limestone floors (F10 and F17) and, if we allow for (partially) unpainted sculpture, the marble torso and leg (ID89/327). Through the continued preference for red-gloss ware, red retained a strong presence in the 'colourscape' too.

Sensorial capacities. The new objects of objectscape 4 brought along new sensorial qualities as well. The combination of the city fortification and the citadel walls meant a new degree of controlled constrain of movement and passage; people were channelled through checkpoints and gates (like the Urfa Gate) and the access to especially the citadel was limited, thus emphasizing the authority in charge of these constraints.[1021] The similarities between the city wall and the citadel wall suggest a holistic sensorial regime that limited movement in the city, perhaps caused

[1019] For basilicas and their early manifestations in Rome, see Balty 1991, 396; Welch 2003. For the adoption of basilicas in the east, see Ohr 1975; Nünnerich-Asmus 1994. *Samaria-Sebaste* (probably a Herodian earliest phase): Watzinger 1935; Boehm et al. 2016, 292); *Aphrodisias* (1st c. CE): Stinson 2008; and *Ashkelon* (1st c. CE earliest phase): Boehm et al. 2016.
[1020] For the impact of *opus caementicium* on architecture and society at large in the Roman world, see Flohr 2016, 16-17.
[1021] Ristvet 2014a, 54-56.

by the increase of visitors, which in turn was likely related to increased movement across the Euphrates. In contrast to all this, the basilica lay-out of the structure in *opus reticulatum* suggests a shift from a labyrinthine architecture of the palatial complex to more extended, open and symmetrical spaces, where control of movement and a sense of disorientation and powerlessness were likely less prominent. The presence of the plain, white square decorative elements on floors (F10 and F17) and walls in *opus reticulatum* meant a shift from the palace's complex polychrome wall and floor decoration and its inherent tendency to regulate the sensory modalities of the visitors to a less imposing sensorial regime with neutral colours and shapes. We might conclude that, in objectscape 4, the management of movement and attention was less present inside its representative buildings on top of the *höyük*, while at the same time, the control of movement became a more prominent feature of the city as a whole.

Radical alterity and Representation. The use of figurative three-dimensional and more-or-less life-size sculpture in a naturalistic fashion was already discussed for objectscape 3 and is also attested for objectscape 4. The use of sculpture groups, suggesting inter-relations between the represented figures, can again also be presumed on the basis of ID89. As mentioned above, the overall inclination towards plain white surfaces suggests a move away from representations at least in some domains, when compared to the previous objectscape. The appearance of 'redende Stempel' on red-gloss ware - 'καὶ σύ' on form 14, fr. 12 (fig. 7.40); but perhaps also 'χάρις', taken either as a greeting or as 'favour'[1022] on form 23, fr. 3 (fig. 7.43) and on form 24, fr. 9 (fig. 7.45) - introduces an innovative object to the objectscape of Samosata, with certain ceramics acquiring the capacity to become a type of 'conversational partners', engaging and encouraging the human participants to the banquet.[1023]

Conclusion: Objectscape 4 is characterized by an amplification of the pre-existent tendency towards contemporary western Mediterranean genealogies, especially connections on the Italian peninsula. The local appropriation of non-local forms does not simply follow the norm in terms of the integration of these forms, something especially witnessed in the all-encompassing use of *opus caementicium* and *opus reticulatum* and the local hexagonal variations of the latter. The move towards less regulating architectural lay-outs and decorative features in representative buildings is contrasted with the increased emphasis on the control of movement through the building of two fortification walls and well-guarded city gates.

[1022] Hayes 1985, 11 51.
[1023] For similar considerations on the speaking stamps of 'Rhenish' ware, see Van Oyen 2016, 108.

7.6 From objectscapes to glocal genealogies

In chapter 3, I argued that an Assemblage Theory approach to Hellenistic palaces provides us with analytical room to analyse the constituent elements of such palaces in a 'more-than-representational' manner. Such an analytical shift, I explained, entails moving from interpretations that reduce such elements to *merely* expressing cultural concepts and ideological messages (participating in 'visual games of power') to an approach that asks questions about the vibrancy of such elements, their capacities (their 'power to'), and the way these emerged from their relations. In order to grasp some of the capacities of the palace's elements, this present chapter zoomed out from the palace and looked how its elements played an active role in Samosata's transforming objectscapes during the 4th c. BCE and the 1st c. CE. Instead of understanding changes in the archaeological repertoire in this period as representative of cultural concepts or socio-political developments, the focus was now on 'thinking along with these objects', in a 'morphogenic' manner, analysing how a new objectscape implied the introduction of new types of relational object capacities, assembling and emerging as vibrant objectscapes. To some extent, however, this objectscape-approach necessarily focuses more on the broader assemblages and their overall change than on the elements they comprise of. As such, it does not completely do justice yet to the potential of these individual elements, the multiplicity of their relational capacities. What is needed therefore, is a finer, more specific level of analysis that zooms in on the relational capacities of singular objects, an approach that really considers these individual elements as assemblages in their own right. This type of analysis is offered in the case studies of chapters 8, 9 and 10.

These three case studies investigate the relational capacities of different elements assembled in the palace, namely a figurative decoration (the 'mask mosaic', chapter 8), a geometric decorative motif (the 'crenellation motif', chapter 9), and an architectural lay-out (the 'symmetrical suite', chapter 10). The very different character of these three elements follows logically from an understanding of the palatial assemblage as heterogeneous and non-hierarchical: the different elements that make up the palace, be they an entire architectural lay-out or a seemingly unremarkable geometric motif, are not *a priori* separated or valued differently, but instead analysed and approached according to the same method and terms.

In each of these case studies, the first part of the analysis provides and analyses the *glocal genealogy* of the object under discussion. In the theoretical chapter of this dissertation, I have explained how a genealogical approach to objects can help us to understand better the emergence and relationality of these objects (paragraph 3.3.4). To briefly recapitulate, these genealogical relations of objects form a crucial aspect of their vibrancy because they illuminate an important type of continuous processes that these objects were caught up in. With these continuous

processes I mean the dynamic relation that exists between an object and a group of objects of the same type. Building on the work of Alfred Gell and Chris Gosden, and strongly following the recent New Materialist approaches to object types by Chris Fowler, in chapter 3 I suggested to see these object genealogies and their continuous relational processes as assemblages themselves: emergent groups of related objects that are not static and monolithic like a conventional archaeological typology, but rather vibrant, and transforming through the relations of their own elements. I argued that such a model of object types and objects being co-emergent, constituting each other, fits very well to the notion of glocality, in which objects are always caught up in simultaneous processes of universalization and particularization. The notion of universalization indicates the way that, in a context of increased connectivity, objects become de-territorialized or disembedded from their previous cultural environments, and thus become available to be particularized (i.e. 're-embedded' or 'recontextualized') in a new context, acquiring new relations and thus new forms of object capacities. To emphasize the importance of this vibrant aspect of object genealogies, these case studies are all considered 'glocal genealogies'. In each case study, I thus trace the glocal genealogy of these object-types, resulting in a diachronic narrative of universalization and particularization of the object under scrutiny. For each particularization of these object types, I investigate how it adhered to or deviated from the universalizing object type, and, consequently, how it modified the glocal genealogy itself. Bringing into focus the emergent processes that individual object in the palace were caught up in and interpreting their role in Samosata is the scope of the first part of these case studies.

In the second part of these case studies, we move from interpretation to 'analytical exploration', turning to the question what these genealogical relations actually implied. On the basis of their glocal genealogies, I formulate different potential object type capacities and test these in the context of Samosata. This approach relies on the assumption that object-types allowed for enduring object capacities. Taking the emphasis on heterogeneity and 'flat ontologies' in New Materialism seriously, these enduring object capacities should allow for the inclusion of conceptual relations. Thus, 'meaning' re-enters through the backdoor in the analysis, however now only in a relational sense – thus opposing interpretative models in which objects 'have' meaning or are mere empty carriers of meaning (e.g. cultural reductionism, see chapter 2 and 3). Exploring an object's capacity to evoke certain conceptual relations instead foregrounds how a genealogy allows for multiple (yet not an infinite amount of) possible meanings, which can be subsequently 'tested' for the specific context within which the object type is particularized. As an explorative analysis, therefore, I attempt to arrive at object meaning not by prioritizing the local context of the *actual* relations and assemblages these objects were caught up in, but rather by starting out from their genealogical and *virtual* relations and capacities. What kinds of conceptual

capacities had object types acquired through time? To what extent did these endure? And how might they have been transformative and vibrant in the context of the palace of Samosata?

In the conclusion of this dissertation, I will provide a comparison of the different case studies that not only discusses the different types of glocal genealogies and types of object impact presented, but also considers how their relational capacities potentially resonated and formed an assemblage in the palace itself. Furthermore, I will reflect on the methodological gains and disadvantages of this genealogical approach, considering the possibility of its application also in other, contemporary contexts in Afro-Eurasia.