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Abstract

This thesis examines the archaeological evidence for the formation of identity within new colonial foundations in Seleucid Syria from the early third century to the first century B.C. Although this topic has been addressed relating to other Hellenistic Kingdoms, within the Seleucid Kingdom the dearth of undisturbed occupational levels has limited the scope of discussion. Owing to its remarkable levels of preservation and subsequent publication, this thesis uses the site of Jebel Khalid, located on the Euphrates River in modern Syria, as a case study to address this gap. Where available, I draw on other settlements to establish a broader perspective of how cultural preferences manifested themselves throughout the breadth of the Seleucid Kingdom.

To examine how the Greco-Macedonian settlers constructed their identities in Jebel Khalid, I examine the available architectural and material evidence from the site. During the initial phase of occupation (Phase A, early third century B.C. to 150 B.C.) the settlement’s nature as a Seleucid foundation heavily influenced the architectural choices in both the public and domestic spheres. Simultaneously, the presence of a new fortified town in the area made a declarative statement of Seleucid strength to the local people. In the second phase (Phase B, 150 B.C.- ca. 70/60 B.C.) local Syrian and Eastern trade networks gained prominence as invading Parthians drew Seleucid interest towards borders and away from sites such as Jebel Khalid. Local production of international pottery forms, based on Greco-Macedonian predecessors, demonstrate another way in which market demand was being met at Jebel Khalid. A hyper-local presence is seen in the cook wares and the appearance of Semitic names in local production. Finally, I examine the temple; this is the edifice that the excavators of Jebel Khalid believe shows the most evidence of cultural hybridization; a building employing elements from the
architecture of both ethnic groups but united in a new expression, one that would be both familiar and foreign to all.

The presence of different cultural elements within this Seleucid outpost combined to create an identity that was predominantly Greco-Macedonian; this same identity, seen through the architecture and ceramics of Jebel Khalid also demonstrates the gradual process of incorporating local people into the cultural and economic fabric of a Seleucid foundation.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Although the political turmoil in the wake of the death of Alexander the Great is well attested in ancient literary sources, many aspects of daily life in the following period, known as the Hellenistic period, c. 323-31 B.C., remain elusive.¹ Leading generals carved up Alexander’s empire into new successor kingdoms.² Seleucos Nikator, one of these generals, assumed control over the eastern portions of the empire, what would be known as the Seleucid Kingdom. At its greatest extent, his kingdom stretched from the southern shores of the Aegean to the northwest corner of modern India. In order to solidify control over this vast and diverse territory, Seleucos Nikator erected a chain of colonial foundations.³ These foundations were strategically placed along trade routes and river crossings. They were evenly spaced throughout the kingdom to create a string of cities connected to the royal court.⁴ Furthermore, pre-existing towns were often refounded and given a new name, a name reminiscent of the royal family, a Macedonian town, or simply a Hellenized form of the local toponym. The most obvious effort to secure new territory was the establishment of military garrison sites. Literary sources (Strabo 14.2.25) use the term *katoikia* to denote a garrison site of this type, although Seleucid royal documents do not use the term.⁵ Surrounding these settlements were parcels of land, *kleroi*, given out to the soldiers.⁶ Land allotment was one way in which Seleucid kings thanked their retired soldiers for their service. *Kleroi* were hereditary land holdings, but later Hellenistic and Roman documents imply that they

¹ For an overview of the Hellenistic Period as well as an extensive bibliography, see Shipley 2000; Green 1990.
² These discussions, known as the Partition of Babylon, are documented by Diod. Sic. 18.2-3 and Curt. 10.10.
³ Grainger 2014.
⁴ A majority of Seleucid settlements were spaced 65-100 km from their nearest neighbor, see Grainger 1990, p. 67.
⁵ For a discussion on *katoikiai* and *kleroi* see, Kosmin 2014, pp. 195-196 and Cohen 1978, pp. 4-5.
⁶ This term appears in a second century B.C. document from Dura-Europos (*P. Dura 15*).
were not allotted with inherent military obligation. Even without continuous military service, the retired soldiers would have established loyalty to the Seleucid rulers through their service. Both the old and new settlements formed a hierarchical set of administrative centers that served as regional reminders and enforcers of Seleucid rule.

Seleucid presence and culture was not the only factor influencing the expression of identity in these new foundations. While Hellenistic Syria was sparsely populated, nomadic tribes roamed the interior, showing resistance to Alexander the Great’s army and later to the Seleucid successors. These local groups seem to have adjusted to the new system of rule by the late fourth century B.C. While these tribes no longer posed the offensive threat, which had been one of the causes for Seleucos Nikator’s foundations, their presence can be identified in the material culture of these sites. Other external forces were also a concern to the early Seleucid Kingdom. The Seleucids were involved in a series of wars with Ptolemaic Egypt, beginning in the early third century B.C. and ending after the Roman involvement on the “Day of Eleusis” in 168 B.C. (Polyb. 29.27). The longstanding tensions between these two successor states had political and economic implications resulting in little direct trade between these two kingdoms. As the Syrian and Ptolemaic threats diminished, the Seleucids had to contend with the expansion of the Parthian Empire into their territory. Mithridates I of Parthia extended his territory, conquering major portions of Bactria (Strabo 11.11.2) in 148 or 147 B.C. and Seleucia-on-the-Tigris in 141 B.C. The invasion of the Parthians meant that established trade routes and administrative systems were disrupted and new ones were formed during the second half of the second century B.C.

---

7 See *P. Dura* 12 for evidence of a female inheriting *kleros* and *P. Dura* 15 for the ability to mortgage a *kleros*, both indicators that military service was not included in ownership. Cohen (1978) suggests that the landowners formed informal clubs or bands that provided additional military support when needed, p. 76.

While the changing political, economic, and cultural situations have been analyzed for some of the Hellenistic Kingdoms, there is more to be understood concerning how identity is expressed through material culture in Seleucid Syria. Few Hellenistic period sites in the Seleucid Kingdom have been fully excavated; one site with an abundance of excavated data is Jebel Khalid (Fig. 1). Using the material from this site as a case study, I will offer a nuanced approach that accounts for the changing political boundaries and the development of local identities within the Seleucid Kingdom. Jebel Khalid was only occupied from the early 3rd century B.C. until circa 70 B.C. and, thus, provides us with a unique glimpse into how political and cultural negotiations within the Seleucid kingdom are expressed in the archeological record. Taking into account the material culture of a broad spectrum of the inhabitants, I will offer a more holistic view of how the changing world in the time after Alexander affected the formation and expression of various identities at one site in Seleucid Syria.

Identity in a Seleucid Settlement

Traditionally, the study of the Seleucid Kingdom has attracted top-down approaches that focus on political administration, the formation of a Seleucid ideology, and show little interest in the expression of cultural identity in the archaeological record. Getzel Cohen and John Grainger compiled the evidence on Seleucid Syria, with an emphasis on the written sources, and have connected the various settlements with literary and epigraphic texts to make inferences about the function of the administration. Within the past decade, there has been a resurgence of interest in the Hellenistic successor kingdoms. Scholarship related to Ptolemaic Egypt, in particular, has

---

9 Moyer (2011) looks at identity in Ptolemaic Egypt from a historic perspective; Franks (2012) studies Macedonian self-expression through various artistic media; the edited volume Archibald et. al. (2011) includes both archaeological and historic approaches to the economic practices of many of the successor kingdoms.
10 Cohen 2006; Grainger 1990.
stressed the flexible formation of identities under Macedonian rule.\textsuperscript{11} Meanwhile, new scholarship regarding the Seleucid Kingdom has addressed the question of how these kingdoms eventually collapsed.\textsuperscript{12} Another topic of interest has been the historical establishment of imperial unity and the ways Seleucid rulers brought together their vast and disparate territory through colonial policies.\textsuperscript{13} Textual data, often from documents written significantly after the events they chronicle, is the basis of these top down approaches. Using these overarching discussions of the Seleucid Kingdom, I will emphasize how archaeological evidence from Jebel Khalid can be used to add another dimension to discussions of identity in Seleucid Syria.

The traditional model, which is based on ancient sources and is espoused by many of the above scholars, emphasizes the establishment of a pan-Seleucid identity. Some sources present us with the extreme view that the king imposed unity on his people by commanding them to abandon their own customs (Macc. 1.41-42.) Although this passage is hyperbolic, it does signify the importance of bridging cultural gaps between the new settlers and indigenous populations to establish a stable kingdom. Throughout its history, the Seleucid Kingdom was an ethnically diverse territory.\textsuperscript{14} Alexander’s troops, a combination of Macedonians, Greeks, and national regiments from recently acquired territories came to populate this area through the establishment of military garrisons.\textsuperscript{15} Civilians were also resettled into the newly acquired territory, first by Alexander, and later by the Seleucid kings. By 306 B.C., when Seleucos Nikator crowned himself king, tensions between the inheritors of Alexander’s empire were so high that the Seleucids could no longer draw on the Macedonian homeland for new settlers. Instead, settlers

\textsuperscript{11} Thompson 2012; Moyer 2011; Vandorpe 2008; La’da 2003.  
\textsuperscript{12} Erikson and Ramsey 2011.  
\textsuperscript{13} Kosmin 2014.  
\textsuperscript{14} For \textit{ethne} present in Syria see, Capechet 2007, pp. 87-133.  
\textsuperscript{15} Bar-Kochva 1976, pp. 20-53. The site of Arados is one of the best candidates for one of these Alexandrian garrisons, see Rey-Coquais 1974, pp. 151-153.
were drawn from existing cities—places like Antioch, with its mix of Macedonian, Athenian, and local inhabitants (Strabo 16.2.4), or Seleucia-on-Tigris, with its Macedonian, Greek, and Syrian population (Jos. AJ 18.372). It is against this background that I wish to utilize the archaeological evidence from Jebel Khalid to address the how identity is manifested through material culture in Seleucid Syria and a military colony in particular.

Questions of identity have become prominent in discussions of antiquity within the past twenty to thirty years. There are multiple types of identity: ethnic, cultural, linguistic, gendered, social, and religious to name a few. To further complicate the matter, individuals often have multiple identities. These identities can be fluid depending on the situation and context: for example a Seleucid soldier could have been religiously Jewish, ethnically Syrian, and use aspects of Greco-Macedonian culture. Certain types of identity remain more static than others; ethnic identity is associated with origins and the group one is born into, while cultural identity can vary based on external influences. To study these variable forms of identity, archaeologists and anthropologists assess identities through multiple sources of data, such as: language, artistic style, social practice, and kinship. In this thesis I will be using some of these sources of evidence to look at cultural identity. Notions of belonging to a particular group and self-perception are central to the concept of cultural identity. For the ancient world, this type of perception is often analyzed through the constructions and projections in the material record formulated from external influences (material, cultural, linguistic interactions, etc.). When dealing with a group or subset of the population about whom there is little written record, as is

---

16 Hall 2002; Woolf 1998; Shennan 1989.
18 This notion of “disparate identity” is discussed by Mattingly, see in particular Mattingly 2004.
19 Many of these aspects of identity fall under similar categories as described in footnote 17.
20 Mairs 2013, p. 91.
the case of Jebel Khalid, archaeological evidence is the only means of discussing cultural identity.\textsuperscript{21} I will be using the excavation data from Jebel Khalid to examine how the settlers chose to express their identity in the various excavated sections of the town and during the different phases of occupation.

Colonies, like those established in the Seleucid Kingdom during the late fourth century B.C., are particularly appealing contexts for examining identity. This is because of the coexistence of two or more distinct ethnic and cultural groups in the same site. The balance of socio-economic power creates a dynamic of inequality between these groups.\textsuperscript{22} Traditional narratives emphasize the gradual, top-down, imposition of the cultural identity of the colonizer onto the colonized and assume the desire of the indigenous group to imitate the colonizer. The Seleucid use of Greek and Macedonian architecture, symbols, bureaucracy, and institutions have all been used as examples of colonizers asserting their identity over new territory.\textsuperscript{23}

Seleucid Syria was not occupied by a cohesive group united by common language, religion, or ancestry. This kingdom arose in the aftermath of Alexander the Great’s empire and its royal court maintained and spread many of the material cultural practices seen in the Greek and Macedonian homeland. I will be using the term Greco-Macedonian to refer to that region and to people and influences originating from it. The term Greco-Macedonian has been used to describe settlers in the Seleucid kingdom since the first-half of the 19th century.\textsuperscript{24} Originally the term referred to an ethnic group, but more recent scholars have used this term to address the material culture of settlers within the Seleucid kingdom.\textsuperscript{25} People employing markers of Greco-

\textsuperscript{21} Antonaccio 2005, especially pp. 100-106.
\textsuperscript{22} For a discussion on the origins and use of post-colonial theory in archaeology see van Dommelen 2012; Mattingly 2011; van Dommelen 1998.
\textsuperscript{23} For a detailed examination of these practices see Capdetrey 2007, pp. 333-438.
\textsuperscript{24} i.e. Rostovtzeff 1936, p. 234.
\textsuperscript{25} See especially Strootman (2007) for how this term encapsulates the emergent heterogeneous culture of the Hellenistic kingdoms; also Beckman 2013; and Watkins (1964) for an early usage.
Macedonian material culture did not need to originate from the Aegean exclusively. I will be using this term in reference to cultural expression, not as a geographic reference.

In addition to the identity of the colonizer, I will also cover the identity of the colonized, the local Syrian peoples. Archaeological evidence from Syria indicates the formation of a Syrian cultural identity as far back as Early Iron Age and its persistence despite numerous waves of invaders. Formation of identity in the Seleucid East was also impacted by external groups, namely the Parthians, a growing power who adopted elements of Greco-Macedonian material culture into their own methods of representation. In accordance with recent scholarship, which has challenged concept of cultural dominance of colonizers over the colonized, I will be using the terms hybridity and hybridization to discuss how colonial experiences affected the creation of new identities. Hybridization, a term borrowed from biology, denotes a merging of elements to create a new product that borrows distinctive features from both sources. Domestic architecture, consumption, language, and religious practices have all been used as evidence for how Greco-Macedonian culture and local habits were adapted, rejected, or merged to express new identities. Traditional artistic and archaeological approaches, tallying the presence of Greco-Macedonian or non-Greek elements, a task 21st century scholars can easily undertake, may not adequately represent the experience of ancient population groups. A more nuanced approach, taking into account the interactions of these various cultural groups, as expressed through material culture, can bring us closer to an actual understanding of how cultural identity was manifested in Seleucid Jebel Khalid.

---

26 Much like Greco-Macedonian the term Syrian can be used to describe the ethnic groups of Assyrian or Aramean descent, see Andrade 2013, p.7. While the groups I am referring to are likely to be of “Syrian” descent, without firm evidence I am simply using the term as it applies to location.
28 Stockhammer 2012.
29 This is a simplistic definition of a term that is highly debated, for the use of this term in archaeology see Deagan 2009; Silliman 2009. For an overview of the critiques see Hodos 2006, p. 17.
The Site and its History

Jebel Khalid, the modern name for the site, which has no known ancient name, is located in modern Syria, some 200 km east from the Mediterranean coast on a high bluff (a jebel) overlooking the Euphrates River. As a part of the broader Seleucid system, this settlement was connected to Carchemish by river, located 60 km north, and to Hierapolis-Bambike by overland routes, 30 km to the southeast. The nearest major Seleucid center was Zeugma, located on the major east-west access route. Located on the banks of the Euphrates, Jebel Khalid was on a secondary route through the empire. Further downstream the river widened, making the area around Jebel Khalid one of the last easy river crossings. Perched above the surrounding territory, the Seleucid settlement occupied 30 ha, or 60% of the bluff.

This location in inland Syria was a difficult area to inhabit, but the benefit of the Euphrates River made it a desirable location. Jebel Khalid is located within the Syrian Desert. This portion of Syria is a semi-arid landscape, receiving between 150-500 mm of annual rainfall. Environmental studies have shown that the soil in this region of Syria has changed very little in the past 3,000 years. Irrigation was used in the low lands surrounding the bluff to grow crops such as grain, olives, grapes, and legumes. Along the Euphrates, many sites took advantage of the agricultural and trade benefits the river offered.

No evidence of earlier occupation on the jebel has been found, but several smaller settlements were located in the immediate vicinity (Fig. 2). From the end of the fourth century

---

30 Extent of occupation was determined by survey work done in 1984 and 1985, see Jebel Khalid I, p. viii.
31 Rapp 1976, p. 121.
33 Discussions on crops, particularly grains, will use the data published in Fairbairn’s two reports, included in Clarke et al. 2003, pp.182-183; Clarke et. al. 2005, pp. 158-160.
34 van der Spek 2006, pp. 414-416.
B.C. through to the beginning of Roman occupation, there is no evidence of a large town within the immediate vicinity of Jebel Khalid. Nearby Khamis (Hamis) only shows signs of sporadic and marginal occupation.\footnote{Séiquer 1999, pp. 208-216. The site of Tell Khamis was excavated from 1992 to 1997 by a team from the University de Murcia. The Middle Bronze Age seems to be the most prosperous period for this site, with a large temple and several other structured uncovered. Two tannurs, the associated grain silos, and a handful of loom weights were found within the Hellenistic layers.} Barsip (Ahmar), situated 20 km upriver, has evidence of a few structures dating to the Hellenistic period.\footnote{This site was first excavated by a French expedition under the direction of F. Thureau-Dangin from 1928 to 1931, which published two excavation volumes Til Barsib I-II. More recently, from 1988-1997 the University of Melbourne has been excavating the site. Til Barsip was at its largest and most affluent during the Assyrian period (eight century B.C.).} This site is positioned along a narrow portion of the river, making it a viable candidate for having a ferry crossing.\footnote{Although no archaeological evidence indicates this, this area was used as a ferry crossing up until the 20th century, Bell 1910, p. 513. To both the north and south the river widens and the next best crossing downstream would be Jebel Khalid.} Shiyouk Tahtani, the furthest Hellenistic settlement within this micro region, located 27 km upriver from Jebel Khalid, shows the most evidence for permanent Hellenistic occupation.\footnote{This site was excavated by the University of Palermo from 1993-1998 with additional field seasons, focusing on the Bronze Age levels, from 2006 to 2010. See Falsone and Sconzo 2012.} The few trenches opened in the lower town have revealed Hellenistic structures. The amount of infrastructure and industry at Jebel Khalid makes it clear that this was the major settlement in the immediate vicinity.

Archaeological work at Jebel Khalid began in the 1980s under the joint leadership of Peter Connor and Grahame Clarke, and continued until 2011 despite Connor’s passing in 1996. Between 1984 and 2011, the University of Sydney’s team alternated between excavation seasons and study seasons. They have published three volumes on the excavations, as well as numerous field reports. Major works include: a report on the excavations from 1986-1996 (Jebel Khalid I), a report on the terracotta figurines (Jebel Khalid II), and a report on the ceramics (Jebel Khalid III).\footnote{Throughout the thesis I will refer to these works by their abbreviated titles shown in parenthesis. Jebel Khalid I; Jebel Khalid II; Jebel Khalid III.} Heather Jackson has published and is still in the processes of publishing materials from the
one excavated domestic area of Jebel Khalid, the Housing Insula.\textsuperscript{40} Two forthcoming volumes will cover the Housing Insula (\textit{Jebel Khalid IV}) and excavations from 1996-2011 (\textit{Jebel Khalid V}).\textsuperscript{41} Increasing political instability in the area has prevented the excavation team from returning to the field after their final season in 2011.

Over the course of twenty-seven years on site, the team was able to excavate approximately 15\% of the settlement.\textsuperscript{42} Several distinct areas within Jebel Khalid were explored: the Northwest tower, the Main Gate, the Acropolis structure, a portion of the necropolis, a temple sanctuary, an insula of the domestic quarter, the palaestra, and a stoa complex (Fig. 3). The fortification system, including the Northwest tower and the Main Gate, encircle the site on three sides.\textsuperscript{43} Within the city, the acropolis structure served as the administrative center and likely housed the local governing body, including an appointed governor. The remains of what is called the Governor’s Palace have been excavated atop the acropolis.\textsuperscript{44} If there ever were military barracks at Jebel Khalid, they would have been located on the acropolis as well.\textsuperscript{45} To the north are areas referred to as the palaestra (Area C) and the stoa complex (Area S).\textsuperscript{46} These two areas were common in Hellenized settlements and served as recreational, community, and commercial spaces. Nearby, nestled in the ravine draining down to the Euphrates, lies the one identified temple of Jebel Khalid.\textsuperscript{47} Another illustrative area, the Domestic Quarter, is a cluster of homes located far from the administrative center, on the opposite slope of the town. Other, unexcavated insulae occupy the slope as well.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Jebel Khalid IV}. Jackson 2011; 2009; Clarke and Jackson 2002; Jackson also authored sections on the Housing Insula in Clarke \textit{et. al.} 2011; 2008; 2005.
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Jebel Khalid IV}; \textit{Jebel Khalid V}.
\textsuperscript{42} Not all areas of the site have been excavated to bedrock, potentially obscuring signs of earliest occupation.
\textsuperscript{43} Clarke \textit{et. al.} 2000; \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, pp. 15.
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, pp. 25-28.
\textsuperscript{45} Clarke may have uncovered a portion of the barracks in their final field season, see Clarke \textit{et. al.} 2011, pp. 170-174
\textsuperscript{47} For the temple see, Wright 2011; Clarke \textit{et. al.} 2009/10, pp. 207-211.
Based on numismatic and ceramic dating, excavators believe that Jebel Khalid was founded shortly after 300 B.C. The earliest coins found at the site are two posthumous issues of Alexander the Great and two others of Seleucus Nikator, supporting a terminus post quem circa 300 B.C.\(^\text{48}\) The earliest pottery dates to the first half of the third century B.C.\(^\text{49}\) Together this evidence seems to indicate an early third century B.C. foundation date. In the aftermath of Seleucid victory at Ipsos in 301 B.C., Seleucus Nikator founded over 60 colonies (App. Syr. 57). Despite the lack of an ancient toponym, all evidence suggests that Jebel Khalid was part of this massive Seleucid foundation movement.\(^\text{50}\) Prior to the Seleucid period there is no evidence of habitation at the site.\(^\text{51}\) The traditional narrative suggests that the virgin site would have been populated by Greek or Macedonian colonists, built on a Hellenistic model of urban planning, and heavily dependent on trade with the Seleucid homeland.\(^\text{52}\)

The settlement seems to have remained relatively stable for the first one hundred and fifty years of habitation (Phase A).\(^\text{53}\) During Phase A, the Seleucids were engaged in a series of wars with the Ptolemies that were not resolved until 168 B.C., thus limiting trade between these two successor kingdoms. After the year 150 B.C., major changes to the lifestyle and structures occurred. For the next fifty years (Phase B) there is increased activity at the site, visible in both construction and production. This period of occupation is considered to be a time of prosperity for the settlement. The partitioning of larger spaces within the Domestic Quarter, occurring in the

\(^{48}\) *Jebel Khalid I*, p. 293.
\(^{49}\) The earliest datable pottery was associated with the construction of the Main Gates of Jebel Khalid, see *Jebel Khalid I*, p. 22.
\(^{50}\) As with many Seleucid settlements, it is likely that the ancient name derived from the name of a preexisting Greek or Macedonian city (Thapsacus for example) or related to the Seleucid dynasty (all the Seleucias for example), Kosmin 2014, pp. 106-107.
\(^{51}\) *Jebel Khalid I*, pp. 71-2.
\(^{52}\) Billows 1995, pp. 169-172.
\(^{53}\) The sequence of Phase A, B, and B+ is only used for the Housing Insula. Other portions of the site are discussed using different terminology (such as Phase 1, 2, ect.). These different reference systems roughly line up. I will be using Phase A, B, and B+ when discussing well stratified portions of the site (such as the temple and gateway) and make note of any terminology that appears in the publications.
final occupational period before abandonment (Phase B+), indicates changes in the character and density of habitation. Clarke suggests that prior to this period there was a slow population decrease, leading to a brief period when the site was not fully occupied. Renewed activity at the site may represent a new wave of colonists sent by the Seleucid center. The material culture of the site after 150 B.C. shows a shift away from Antiochene pottery towards local production of vessels using local clay. Stamped amphora handles produced at Jebel Khalid indicate surplus production and export. Agriculture and production at Jebel Khalid seems to have allowed the settlers a new level of economic independence. Around this time, there is an increase in the quantity of Parthian imports, and Parthian surface finishes of ceramic vessels become more popular. Some seals and gems also feature Parthian forms of decoration. Politically, the Parthian presence was also increasing during Phase B. Mithridates I expanded his territory, conquering major portions of Bactria (Strabo 11.11.2) in 148 or 147 B.C. and Seleucia-on-the-Tigris in 141 B.C. Thus, based on the material record, the middle of the second century B.C. was a time of dynamic economic change for the colony at Jebel Khalid and saw reorientation of trade networks.

This growth was short lived– Jebel Khalid was abandoned only seventy years later. The latest coin on site was minted in 76 B.C., providing, in conjunction with the lack of later ceramics, an abandonment date of sometime before 70 or 60 B.C. There is no trace of an obvious impetus for abandonment, no signs of hostility or strife. Perhaps this was a planned

54 Clarke et. al. 2008.
55 Clarke forthcoming.
57 Especially green-glaze ware, see Jebel Khalid III, pp. 431-495.
59 This date is suggested by Nixon in Jebel Khalid I, p. 278.
evacuation as Seleucid power waned in the face of the emerging Parthian Empire,\(^{60}\) or perhaps it is explained by a forced repopulation of the citizens by Tigranes the Great in 69 B.C.\(^{61}\) It is clear that the abandonment was systematic and planned: settlers had the time to gather their portable possessions, and even the roof tiles were stripped from the site.\(^{62}\) The city did have a brief afterlife; scant evidence of a temporary Roman outpost is present, as well as a handful of Late Antique coins, but Jebel Khalid was not substantially resettled in later periods. Without a traumatic impetus for abandonment, it can be inferred that Jebel Khalid lost its strategic purpose. This abandonment has left us with an unobscured glimpse into the material culture of a Hellenistic, Seleucid town, making Jebel Khalid a prefect case study for my work.

In my thesis, I discuss the ways in which material culture forms the expression of identities at Jebel Khalid. I place emphasis on how identities were formed and transformed by cultural interactions, especially by changes in trade networks and political boundaries. The body of this thesis is divided into four chapters, each of which examines a particular aspect of Jebel Khalid’s material record. Chapter Two studies the fortifications of Jebel Khalid and the administrative buildings that are closely associated with them. This chapter will be focusing on the types of cultural expressions seen in public architecture with connections back to the Seleucid court. Chapter Three looks at the houses, moving this study from the public to private domain, examining their forms and decorations to discover what they reveal about the cultural and social identities of those who made and lived in them. Chapter Four turns to the ceramics from Jebel Khalid, considering how sources for both the physical vessels and their forms serve as expressions of identity. A comparison between the tablewares and cooking wares will be

\(^{60}\) Olbrycht 2014, pp. 133-134.

\(^{61}\) Wright 2011, p. 129. Nixon suggests that abandonment coincided with Pompey’s conquest of the Levant in 64 B.C., see Jebel Khalid I, pp. 296-297.

\(^{62}\) Combined with the lack of significant finds from immediately before abandonment suggests that the inhabitants took most of their possessions with them, Jebel Khalid III, pp. 146-147.
undertaken in order to see if different tasks associated with these vessels and their uses contribute to a variant identities at the site. Amphorae and the stamps on them will also be used to see what changing economic role Jebel Khalid played in the Seleucid Kingdom and to discuss the identities of the individuals who were responsible for large-scale production at the site.

Chapter Five considers the temple at Jebel Khalid, paying particular attention to the hybrid architectural forms that influenced this architecture and the reception of these different cultural traits by the residents of Jebel Khalid and the surrounding areas. Throughout this thesis comparisons to other settlements, particularly from the Seleucid East, are made to better contextualize the way in which identities were shaped in the broader Seleucid Kingdom. A final chapter provides a brief synthesis of how these different identities reflect the changing political and economic environment of Seleucid Syria.

My analysis demonstrates that the origins of Jebel Khalid, as a Seleucid foundation, had a strong impact on the ways in which people chose to represent themselves, but did not preclude the expression of local identities and the creation of hybrid identities. While this process does not directly map onto all Seleucid settlements, it provides one suggestion of how these interactions may have occurred at garrison sites. Although Greco-Macedonian cultural expressions predominate, this study demonstrates the gradual process of a manifestation of local identities and their incorporation into the cultural and economic fabric of this Seleucid foundation.
Chapter 2: The Fortification System

The first major choice that has to be made when establishing a new settlement is the location, and this choice depends upon the nature of the settlement. When asserting their new power, the Seleucid kings would repeatedly face these decisions in order to secure their kingdom. The earliest buildings at Jebel Khalid, the fortifications, demonstrate the importance of a defensible, permanent settlement at the site to the Seleucid center. The preferences indicated by the material culture during this initial phase of occupation are most likely to directly reflect the cultural identity of Jebel Khalid’s original settlers. In this chapter, I will present the fortifications, indicating the amount of investment that went into them, in order to show that Seleucid authorities had a great deal of involvement in constructing this aspect of the town. The scale of investment and the uniformity of building defenses in Seleucid Syria will help determine if Jebel Khalid was established as a part of the Seleucid policy of colonial foundations. Large constructions, such as the fortification walls and acropolis structures, are more likely to not undergo significant change and to consistently reflect the preferences of the group that first built them. Jebel Khalid was not just a minor waypoint, but served as a reminder of Seleucid presence to the surrounding territory.

The Curtain Wall

Defense was a crucial feature in the establishment of Seleucid sites founded in the turbulent, first fifty years of Seleucid rule. This is especially true for a potential garrison site. There was a vested interest by the Seleucid administration to protect the imperial outpost and the
colonists that accompanied them to this site by building a sturdy curtain wall around Jebel Khalid. This wall runs for 2.7 km around three quarters of the promontory, only leaving the western side, along the Euphrates River exposed (Fig. 4). No walls were needed along the river as the precipitous cliffs served as a deterrent to invading armies, a strategy that is repeatedly seen in this region. The three inland sides of the defenses feature thick walls with bases 2.8 m in width. Within this larger circuit, a secondary set of walls, only measuring 0.7 km in length, encircled the acropolis. A majority of this circuit was built with an inner and outer face of cut limestone blocks and was filled with limestone chips or other types of quarrying rubble; this construction is also known as a “compartmented” wall. At regular intervals the walls would include header blocks, solid blocks that penetrate further into the interior of the walls, in order to further strengthen the circuit wall against attack. More commonly a system called headers and stretchers was employed, meaning that worked stone filled the spaces in between the irregularly spaced headers. Throughout Jebel Khalid there is standard length of header and stretcher spacing, achieved through uniform 1.10m blocks. A majority of the walls were built using header and stretcher construction. Along the wall, at points of defensive importance, there are stretches that use the “solid built” technique, meaning that uniformly cut blocks make up the entirety of the wall width. In a solid built technique there is no rubble between the wall faces. The advanced techniques of this circuit wall suggest the presence of a centrally appointed architect to

63 One example being at the Roman fortress of Cireesium (Procop. Aed. 2 6).
67 For this construction technique see p. 135, McNicoll 1997, pp. 222-223; Lawrence 1979, p. 214; Winter 1971,
69 This is seen particularly around the North West tower, Connor and Clarke 1996, pp.169-170, Jebel Khalid I, pp.
4-6.
oversee construction. Interestingly, the walls of Jebel Khalid appear to have never been damaged by an attack.\textsuperscript{70} Topography was the key decider of the circuit wall’s course around the bluff.

Where the circuit wall changes course, towers were strategically placed in order to serve as lookout posts and as defensible platforms.\textsuperscript{71} Thirty towers were constructed in the same manner as the walls, primarily limestone blocks with rubble filling, but since they were of greater tactical importance, solid built construction was employed more often. Not all the towers were intended to fulfill the same function. Some towers are reverse towers, meaning they project inside the wall (towers 1-4, 6, 7, 9, and 21), while the other towers project outward (towers 8 and 10-20).\textsuperscript{72} Projecting towers were designed for defense; they provide more angles from which to repel assailants. The reverse towers were most likely for observation, as their small size does not make them suitable as fighting platforms. Most of the reverse towers were located along the northern line of circuit walls, where the elevation of the bluff is higher and the slope much steeper.\textsuperscript{73} This sheer cliff would have also made it difficult to construct the more common projecting towers. Without an easy approach, there was less need to build an attack platform, rather these towers were constructed to increase sightlines over land and river routes.

The North-West Tower (Fig. 5) distinguishes itself in both its form and location. This tower is the only curvilinear tower at Jebel Khalid. It is the third largest tower (only the towers by the city gate surpass it), and has commanding views over any approach to the city.\textsuperscript{74} Semi-circular towers, such as this, appeared on the Greek mainland around the middle of the fourth century B.C., while the earliest half-round tower in Asia Minor, at Colophon, appeared at the end

\begin{flushright}
\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{71} See McNicoll 1997, pp. 8-11 for the rationale behind tower placement.
\textsuperscript{72} Connor and Clarke 1996, pp. 156-166.
\textsuperscript{73} Connor and Clarke 1996, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, p. 1.
\end{small}
\end{flushright}
of the fourth century B.C.\textsuperscript{75} Although semi-circular towers were common, it is much more rare to see just one used in a fortification system. Most of the North-West Tower is the same width as the walls, but the eastern face is thicker, measuring 3.49 m. Reinforced headers lay behind the more common header and stretcher pattern, further strengthening this portion of the wall.\textsuperscript{76} The interior of the North-West Tower is a single chamber, measuring 14.5 m by 18 m, with no evidence for a second story or roofing. Perched above the plateau, the tower would be out of missile range, and therefore did not require a roof for added defense.\textsuperscript{77} Alternatively, it has been suggested that open-air towers, such as this one, could have held large stone throwers and been used offensively.\textsuperscript{78} Like the other fortification towers of Jebel Khalid, the North-West Tower was specifically designed to best suit the topography.

The final portion of the curtain wall, the main gateway into the town, served to defend the town at its weakest point, the entry, while also conveying the importance of Jebel Khalid to those entering and exiting the town. The main gate into the town is comprised of two towers flanking the actual gateway (Fig. 6). These towers are monumental in size, measuring 16.5 m by 16.2 m and 16.2 m by 16.35 m, built entirely out of solid built masonry, and show signs of revetment on the exterior walls.\textsuperscript{79} This attention to aesthetics is perhaps a reflection of the Aristotelian preference for fortification walls that add to the beauty of a city (\textit{Pol.} 7.1331a). In addition to appearing imposing, the gateway had to function as a defensive control point. Many things about the gateway formation are unclear: the height of towers, number of stories, access within the towers, shutters, and windows to name a few. Based on the roofing tiles found, they would have

\textsuperscript{75} See Ober 1987 for the defenses of mainland Greece; see McNicoll 1997 for the dating of Colophon’s defense system.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, pp. 4-11.
\textsuperscript{77} For upper stories and roofing see Winter 1971, pp. 164-173.
\textsuperscript{78} These were typically 30-mina stone throwers, Marsden 1969, p.145.
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, pp. 17-19.
been covered. A ledge inside the towers, where wooden floor boards once rested, indicate the presence of at least a story, but no traces of higher construction are attested.\textsuperscript{80} Although the martial component of the entryway was important, we should not forget that in peace, when tradesmen and locals were entering and exiting the city, this gate held a key role in projecting Seleucid control.

Our best evidence for dating the entire fortification system of Jebel Khalid, the imported pottery found at the foundation levels of the gateway, suggests a date of the late fourth century or early third century B.C.\textsuperscript{81} Numismatic evidence, found in the foundation level of the gateway, provides a slightly later \textit{terminus post quem}. This date would suggest the walls were one of the first construction projects at Jebel Khalid. These dates corroborate the idea that this settlement was a part of Seleucos Nikator’s foundation program. Defensive features were the first priority of this Hellenistic settlement. Syrian resistance to new, foreign leadership was particularly strong after the conquest of Syria by Alexander the Great. While these groups were less active by the late fourth century B.C., a series of military outposts held the Syrian interior secure as the Seleucids and Ptolemies waged war over Coele Syria.\textsuperscript{82} The knowledge of the topography, as utilized by the builders, shows a vested interest in controlling the surrounding territory. The situation of Jebel Khalid is meant to be imposing, both to assailants, those travelling through the area, and nearby residents. Like other cities in Seleucid Syria, Jebel Khalid was not built to house an excess population or for access to natural resources. Instead, it was built to mark and control swathes of territory within the new kingdom. Through an examination of the defenses, it is clear that Jebel Khalid was no meager outpost, but a settlement established to make a statement of Seleucid authority in the region.

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, pp. 17-19.
\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{82} Grainger 1990, p. 24.
Seleucid Fortifications

The curtain wall was built in the first phase of occupation, when ties to the Seleucid court and thereby Greco-Macedonian material culture were the strongest. A comparison of Jebel Khalid’s defenses with those of the Hellenistic world will demonstrate whether or not the same Greco-Macedonian forms of architectural and defensive principles governed how they were built. Monumental stone circuit walls, like those at Jebel Khalid, were a hallmark of the Hellenistic period. A comparison between the fortifications at Seleucia-in-Pieria, the port of Antioch, and Jebel Khalid demonstrates that the same building techniques were employed at both the royal port and the Syrian outpost. Both circuits were built with limestone blocks facing a rubble core, although some sections of wall employed “solid built” construction. The similarity in techniques may reflect the source of the builders. As a Seleucid foundation, construction at Jebel Khalid would have been commissioned by the royal administration. The first wave of inhabitants would have included those experienced in constructing fortification walls, including soldiers who were familiar with defenses of this nature. The similarity of building styles to other Seleucid settlements supports this notion. Of course, the scale of Jebel Khalid’s walls pales in comparison to those of Seleucia-in-Pieria. At the royal port the circuit wall is reconstructed to measure 12.5 km in length, with a wall thickness of 3 m, on average. Although the walls of Jebel Khalid are roughly the same thickness, 2.8 m, they enclose a much smaller area, only stretching 2.7 km in length. This difference is attributed to the respective size of settlement and population.

One aspect of the defenses in which Jebel Khalid outnumbers Seleucia-in-Pieria is the number of towers. Seleucia-in-Pieria has somewhere between five to twelve towers, depending on the

83 The following details come from original publication of the fortifications and can be found in Antioch III. For a synopsis see, McNicoll 1997, pp. 85-89.
reconstruction, whereas Jebel Khalid has thirty.\textsuperscript{84} The defensive nature and varying topography might account for this difference. Seleucia-in-Peria’s circuit wall was constructed to defend against naval attacks. The towers are focused along the sea and project to create fighting platforms. Fortifications at Jebel Khalid appear to have been built in a similar style to those at the political center of the Seleucid Kingdom, reflecting the common training of those who first built the walls.

Not all Seleucid settlements used the expensive stone to build; in some cases mudbrick fortifications were chosen instead of stone ones. At Dura Europos, another so-called garrison site, mudbrick was laid over a stone socle.\textsuperscript{85} Extensive fortification walls made entirely of mudbrick can also be found at the regional centers of Seleucia-on-the-Tigris and Aï Khanoum.\textsuperscript{86} The “inferior” construction material should not be the sole basis for determining royal investment. Local supplies and construction techniques are also determinative. The scale of fortifications becomes more important than the construction material. Mudbrick walls were of a similar thickness as those made of stone: Dura Europos measured 3.15 m, Seleucia-on-the-Tigris 2.75 m, and Aï Khanoum 2.80 to 3 m.\textsuperscript{87} The similarity in widths, despite construction material, is interesting because typically mudbrick walls should be thicker. The presence of a kingdom-wide standard for wall widths suggests that royally appointed architects were involved with a majority of fortification construction on some level throughout the kingdom. Uniform wall construction, in turn, demonstrates the vested Seleucid interest in building walls in a particular manner, walls that serve to strengthen their control over newly acquired territories. The consistency in

\textsuperscript{84} Athanassiou’s plan only shows five towers, McNicolls only identifies nine towers (p. 86), and Toselli’s plan features twelve towers, including a pair near the later harbor entrance.

\textsuperscript{85} Gerkan 1959 pp. 233-289.

\textsuperscript{86} For Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, see \textit{Reise II} pp. 50-56. For Aï Khanoum see, Leriche, \textit{Aï Khanoum V} pp. 85-98.

\textsuperscript{87} 2.80m is the thickness of the Hellenistic stone towers, while the mudbrick walls are often wider, approximately 3m, Leriche 1974, pp. 235-237.
defensive fortification was one of the ways in which a Seleucid identity was projected throughout their new territory.

Durable circuit fortifications, such as seen above, generally provided Seleucid cities with the defenses required. When scale alone was insufficient, a complex arrangement of towers and sally gates allowed for active counterattacks.\(^\text{88}\) A closer examination of all the aforementioned circuits shows that an architectural schema was executed in both stone and mudbrick. The above examples demonstrate that there are major commonalities between fortifications in the Seleucid Kingdom, with some differences in material. As is to be expected, each of the sites discussed used a similar baseline, a uniform conception, and adjusted to better suit the climate, topography, and potential threats. These sites are all influenced by the Seleucid system of defense, but that notion is not an inflexible blueprint.

Great circuit walls were the result of extensive investments of money and labor. Only a few Hellenistic inscriptions are preserved that illustrate the great costs. The cost of a single tower built in Kyzikos around the end of the 4\(^{\text{th}}\) century B.C. was 9,200 drachmas. Translated into labor costs, this would be the equivalent for pay of 50 men working 30 days.\(^\text{89}\) A smaller sum was needed to remodel a tower at Eleusis in 329/328 B.C. costing 1,686 drachmas.\(^\text{90}\) As the inscriptions record, these two towers were financed by civic munificence.\(^\text{91}\) New foundations, such as Jebel Khalid, did not have a pool of citizens, let alone wealthy citizens, to fund fortification projects. Instead the successor kings would have used money raised through extremely high taxes.\(^\text{92}\) Massive imperial expenditures, such as these fortifications, did not need

\(^{88}\) This style of defense is most clearly seen on the desert facing front of Dura Europos see, McNicoll 1997, pp. 102-103.

\(^{89}\) Duchre 1986, p. 135.

\(^{90}\) Duchre 1986, p. 135.

\(^{91}\) Maier 1959, pp. 241-242.

\(^{92}\) Aperghis 2004; Briant 2002 p. 178.
to be justified. Extensive defensive projects were constructed at numerous sites where self-sufficiency was not feasible. The need for the Seleucid Kingdom to physically transform and mark the landscape prevailed over financial concerns.\textsuperscript{93} Citizens of this new foundation could not have paid for the defenses. The fortifications of Jebel Khalid were constructed and supplied by means of imperial expenditure. Imperial construction was no unique phenomenon. This act indicates the importance of Jebel Khalid to the Seleucid Kingdom: that of a military stronghold, protecting valuable trade routes along the Euphrates River and through the Syrian deserts.

\textit{The Acropolis and Governor’s Palace}

Another key structure that shows the importance of Jebel Khalid within the Seleucid system is an administrative center, commonly called the Governor’s Palace. This administrative and martial center of the community was located within a secondary set of defensive walls, atop the highest point of the settlement. This section of the city stands apart from other contemporary towns throughout the kingdom because it is completely enclosed by two sets of circuit walls (Fig. 4).\textsuperscript{94} A straightforward explanation for this exists; the acropolis is situated on the highest point within the circuit walls. The highest elevation was the most valuable position for any Greek fortification because of the natural advantages (Polyb. 6.42).\textsuperscript{95} At other sites the acropolis, or natural high ground, was much closer to the circuit walls of the settlement and incorporated the pre-existing wall. The secondary fortification wall was built using the same construction techniques as discussed for the outer curtain wall, but has more stretches of solid built

\textsuperscript{93} Grainger 1990, pp. 68-83. Sites such as Seleucia-in-Pieria, Zeugma, and Kyrrhos were completely abandoned when their location no longer served a strategic purpose.

\textsuperscript{94} Grainger, writing in 1990, before this site was excavated, did not have the opportunity to know about Jebel Khalid when he stated that a feature of all acropoleis in Hellenistic Syria was that they were adjacent to a portion of the fortifications, p. 62.

\textsuperscript{95} Connor and Clarke 1996, p. 155.
construction, indicating a higher degree of investment. The increased security and structural durability of the acropolis walls further strengthens the argument that these initial structures were Seleucid commissions. A possible military barracks was identified within the Acropolis, emphasizing the martial nature of Jebel Khalid. The acropolis housed the most important administrative buildings; the royal court would have wished these to be the most defendable.

At the center of the acropolis is the so-called Governor’s Palace. This structure measures just over 2,747 square meters, easily the largest building in the town and occupies the highest point within the walls (Fig. 7). This structure is built around a large peristyle garden (26), flanked by two vestibules (1 and 23). On the horizontal axis, there are two large rooms (12 and 20), likely used for entertaining and dining, surrounded by service areas. Excavators have further suggested various spaces for storage (4, 8, and 9). Rooms 13 and 14 are labeled as a latrine and washroom because of their water features. The set of poorly preserved rooms in the southwest corner of the complex (22 and 24) are most likely administrative rooms, but may also have served as an armory or residential suite. An adjacent, large, similarly eroded, space (25) may have been a walled garden. The other small rooms in the palace are a hypothetical entrance (16), guardroom (15), and archive or treasury (17). Although only one story is preserved, stairs to an upper floor may have been located in spaces 2 and 18. Residential rooms would have likely occupied the second floor, allowing excavators to suggest that all the excavated rooms had public functions. Since the site of Jebel Khalid was systematically abandoned, the above designations are primarily based on architectural analysis.

Decorative features help to identify the most public and prestigious areas within the Governor’s Palace. One of the most easily identified functions of the Governor’s Palace is the

---

96 Clarke 1994, p. 72.
97 Clarke et. al. 2011, pp. 170-174
entertainment of guests, as can be seen through the elaborately decorated rooms and the refuse associated with entertaining. The plan directs attention to the finely decorated rooms for entertaining. Rooms 12 and 20 are considered to have been reception spaces; both rooms are flanked by service suites suitable for preparing food and drink. Additionally, these rooms are the most lavishly decorated in the palace: Room 12 had two Doric columns, fragments of wall plaster with vegetal decoration, and at least nineteen distinct patterns of marbled plaster. Similarly, Room 20 featured trompe l’oeil plastering in various colors, including a remarkable piece of white plaster with embedded gold leaf. No raised margins for klinai are present along the walls, but this absence is seen in multiple Hellenistic palaces and residences. High concentrations of pottery finds in Room 9, a room whose roof appears to have collapsed shortly after abandonment, provide evidence that the rooms surrounding 12 and 20 were service or storage rooms. Room 9, in particular, is reconstructed as crockery storage. The adjacent Room 8 has two large pithoi sunk into the floor, indicative of a storage magazine. Another material class that can help identify elite drinking practices is amphorae, as they indicate the consumption of wine at symposia. Refuse pits associated with the palace contain a majority of the imported amphorae found on site (see Chapter 4). The presence of these amphorae in a context associated with the Governor’s Palace is a material indicator of Greco-Macedonian social practices occurring at Jebel Khalid.

Scattered finds indicate the administrative nature of the palace. Two sealings were found sitting on the lowest floor level of Room 22, while another was found adjacent to the doorway.

98 Jebel Khalid I, pp. 37-44.
100 Jebel Khalid I, pp. 42-43.
101 Nielsen 1998, pp. 124-126. Bergquist (1990) argues for the flexible formation of smaller symposium groups within the formal dining space and Lynch (2007) argues that klinai were not even necessary for a symposium.
102 Finds from both Room 8 and 9 are discussed in Jebel Khalid I, p. 36.
into Room 22 (Fig. 8).\(^{103}\) One of these sealings featured Athena Nikephorus, another, Zeus Nikephorus, both common figures on Seleucid coins. Images such as these would have been used to mark the documents of a royal official and were disseminated from the Seleucid center.\(^{104}\) Certain discrepancies, such as the dais below Zeus’ throne and the drapery on Athena, suggest that these were not official seals, but rather personal ones using royal imagery.\(^{105}\) The third sealing found in the Governor’s Palace features an anchor, the symbol of the Seleucid royal treasury. This seal would have been used to close bags of Seleucid currency, or at least would be used exclusively on fiscal documents.\(^{106}\) Principal analysis suggests that these were official Seleucid sealings, sent from a major center to this minor outpost. The iconographic discrepancies between the seals and other Seleucid images cast some doubt on their legitimacy as royal administrative documents. If these three artifacts are official Seleucid seals there is direct evidence for correspondence with royal centers. If they are not, they still represent local officials assuming the same powers that a royal agent would, drawing on the same basic imagery as the center. Sealings would have been used on correspondence and financial documents, indicating that Jebel Khalid played an administrative role, at least, within the micro-region.

The Governor’s Palace at Jebel Khalid fulfills the same functions as a Hellenistic royal palace. Of Nielsen’s formal functions, the Governor’s Palace only fails to incorporate public institutions like a theater or library.\(^{107}\) The most pivotal function was that the palace and settlement served as a highly visible marker of Seleucid royal presence in Syria. Jebel Khalid’s Governor’s Palace served as a miniature, localized version of royal palaces, reinforcing Seleucid

\(^{103}\) *Jebel Khalid I*, p. 44.

\(^{104}\) See Aperghis 2004 for Seleucid financial administration, esp. pp. 263-296.

\(^{105}\) Hoover 2002, p. 49.

\(^{106}\) *Jebel Khalid I*, pp. 201-202. For Seleucid use of the anchor see McDowell 1935, pp. 34-43.

influence in the area. The establishment of the Governor’s Palace in the first phase of occupation demonstrates the importance of political administration at Jebel Khalid. Serving as the seat of the local representative, an official often appointed by or approved of by the royal administration, this structure likely shows the connection back to the capital.\footnote{Ramsey 2011.} Jebel Khalid appears to have initially served as an important link between the royal center and the region, as reflected in the levels of defensive investment by the Seleucid court.

*Palaces in the Hellenistic Kingdoms*

Although the palace, much like the defenses, was funded by the royal treasury, this structure provided more opportunity for incorporating Achaemenid architectural elements. Greco-Macedonian features include a central, peristyle courtyard, a prominently located reception space, and decorative elements featuring Doric or Ionian columns, mosaics, and statuary. These features are best defined by the palaces of Pella and Vergina, as well as elite residences from Pella.\footnote{Makaronas and Gioure 1989.} In contrast, Achaemenid palatial elements would include a monumental propylon, large hypostyle halls (*apadana*), and extensive parks and gardens.\footnote{Nielsen 1998, pp. 39-44.} These are features largely absent from the Governor’s Palace of Jebel Khalid. Seleucid palaces would often elements from Persian rule in order to further emphasize their legitimacy as inheritors not only of Alexander’s empire, but also of the previous dynastic power.

The few elements the excavation team considers to be hybrid features, primarily the garden, should be considered as having no direct influence as it does not pertain solely to one cultural group.\footnote{Xenophon’s *paradeisos An.* 1.2.7} The Governor’s Palace at Jebel Khalid has a garden, which does not take
advantage of the panoramic views over the Euphrates and surrounding countryside as many Greek gardens did.\textsuperscript{112} Excavators made note of the size of the courtyard being larger than seen in peristyle houses of that size, taking the large size of gardens from Achaemenid architecture. This particular garden does not incorporate enough clearly Persian elements to deem it a hybrid element. Instead this feature is indicative of the lavish style of entertaining that occurred both in Hellenistic palaces and possibly in this remote outpost.

The form and function of the palace at Jebel Khalid most closely resembles the known remain of other palaces in the Syrian interior.\textsuperscript{113} Governor’s palaces often served a similar administrative role as imperial palaces, but those in military colonies prioritized defensive aspects. Therefore the aesthetics of these structures can be “fortress like in appearance,” to use Clarke’s term.\textsuperscript{114} A martial foundation surely is the reason for this design. Further down the Euphrates, at Dura Europos, excavated portions of the Redoubt Palace, the Hellenistic governor’s palace, reveal a similar layout to that of the palace at Jebel Khalid (Fig. 9). Again, this structure does not seem concerned with the view or aesthetics. The floor plan at Dura Europos also features an axial structure with “broad” reception rooms in either wing.\textsuperscript{115} Gubernatorial palaces may have also been influenced by elite houses of the Persian period. The sixth to third century B.C. houses excavated at Babylon placed a similar emphasis on reception rooms.\textsuperscript{116} Unlike the palaces, these houses would not have been heavily influenced by the defensive character of the city, but nevertheless this could be one way in which a local identity

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, p. 46. \\
\textsuperscript{113} It should be noted that the majority of knowledge about Seleucid royal palaces is literary. For the Palace at Sardis see Vitr. 2.8.10 and Xen. \textit{Oec}. 4.20-24; at Gabae Strab. 15.3.3; at Seleucia Strab. 16.1.5; and at Antiochia Strab. 16.2.4-5 and Polyb. 30.25-26. \\
\textsuperscript{114} \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, p. 47. \\
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Doura Europos IV}, pp. 55-80. This is the floor plan for the so called redoubt palace. The earlier citadel palace, upon which it was constructed, thought to have been built around the same time as the one at Jebel Khalid, would likely have closer parallels. On dating these two structures see Allara 1986. \\
\textsuperscript{116} Nielsen 1999, p. 117.
was incorporated into the architectural style at Jebel Khalid. Communal dining spaces, like these broad rooms, could have been used to bring the community together during the early stages of occupation. At this remote site, dining and recreational activities within the Governor’s Palace would have reminded the inhabitants of their Seleucid foundation. No Persian palaces have been found in Syria and the Governor’s Palace at Jebel Khalid seems to draw primarily on Greco-Macedonian architectural forms, indicating a strong Greco-Macedonian influence at the time of construction. Nevertheless, royal titles, such as the Ptolemaic use of Pharaoh, the existence of multiple royal capitals, and a series of governors, like Persian satraps, were other ways in which Hellenistic kings incorporated elements of the previous ruling group. The essential duties of Seleucid bureaucracy were executed in space that took a majority of its cues from Seleucid and Hellenistic architecture, but more local practices were not absent in the administration.

Conclusion

The Seleucid Kingdom was able to assert their authority over new territory through the presence of strategically located, well built, and imposing settlements encircled by a system of circuit walls. Political security was not obtained through demonstrations of wealth and force alone; the Seleucids also drew on elements of both the Macedonian and Achaemenid courts to legitimize their rule. A majority of the population in Seleucid territory was non-Greek, necessitating some level of adaptation to create an effective administration. In addition to being tools for legitimizing rule, the incorporation of Persian elements by the Seleucid administration emphasizes their appropriation of the previous ruling ideology as a symbol of their own authority. This preference should be considered an active choice made by the Seleucid center and expressed in their settlements.

117 Kopsacheili 2011, p. 25.
The initial purpose for founding Jebel Khalid can best be seen in the impressive fortification system. The town was built to solidify Seleucid control over Syria. In order to control territory, a kingdom needs the elements of defense and administration. At Jebel Khalid the defensive walls meant a secure outpost was in the area, but, perhaps more importantly, they projected Seleucid power over the surrounding territory. The choice to build Jebel Khalid above the Euphrates, on a limestone bluff, was intentional. From this vantage point all movement in the area could be observed and controlled. Administrative buildings were also crucial to the initial settlement because they provided a connection back to the Seleucid royal court. Officials appointed by the king, such as the governor and tax administrators, presumably lived and worked in these buildings. In this first phase of occupation at Jebel Khalid, the architecture drew heavily on the Greco-Macedonian preferences of the Seleucid court. The defensive system was a costly enterprise and was justified by the need to establish an outpost of Seleucid power at this particular site. Since the Seleucid royal court made these choices, it is understandable that the circuit’s construction was executed in a manner reminiscent of other contemporary Seleucid sites. The architects and workmen of these projects built in the manner they were accustomed to. Jebel Khalid’s role as a Seleucid foundation would be reasserted through the presence of these fortification walls looming over the landscape and town. As the settlement continued to develop the initial identity of Jebel Khalid, as a Seleucid fortification, was consistently reinforced by the presence of the massive defensive walls.
Chapter 3: Residential Structures

Domestic structures can tell us a great deal about the cultural identity of Jebel Khalid’s inhabitants. Unlike in municipal constructions, such as the fortification system, individual owners had greater input over how their domestic spaces looked. As presented in the case of the Governor’s Palace, I plan to use the structure and design elements of houses in an attempt to identify the different ways in which inhabitants chose to express their cultural preferences. As mentioned in the introduction, Jebel Khalid offers a unique glimpse into the Hellenistic occupation layers of a town; other settlements provide only fragmentary evidence of this time period. To provide the most complete comparanda, I will be looking at houses in the Seleucid Kingdom as well as the other successor kingdoms, their colonies, and the Persian and Parthian east. In addition to obtaining parallels for architectural influences, I will also be looking at the relative elaboration of these houses to evaluate whether these are elite residences. Specifically, I will look at the houses themselves in comparison with similar examples from across the Seleucid world. The houses of Jebel Khalid are valuable because they demonstrate how the inhabitants perceived and portrayed their cultural identity in a way that public architecture cannot.

The Housing Insula of Jebel Khalid

The only excavated insula, named the Housing Insula, lies on a steep slope, about a kilometer north of the Acropolis. This position is beneficial because the houses are protected from harsh winds by the natural rise of the jebel (Fig. 3). Stone tumble on the surface of the
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118 This insula was excavated from 1988 to 2005. This introductory section draws heavily on the multiple field reports put out by the excavation team, particularly the reports of Heather Jackson. All excavation details are based on information from *Jebel Khalid III*; Clarke et. al 2005, pp. 119-128; Clarke et. al 2003, pp. 175-181; Clarke et. al 2000, pp. 127-130; Clarke et. al 1999, pp. 162-165. This final publication Clarke et. al 2005 is particularly valuable
outcrop, identified by survey, indicates the presence of another four insulae on the same ridge. The houses of Jebel Khalid are on a Hippodamian grid, aligned north south, just as prescribed by both Xenophon (Mem. 3.8, Oec. 9.4) and Aristotle (Oec. 1.4.7). The block measures 35 m east-west by 90 m north-south. Orthogonal grids are generally set in areas without pre-existing architecture. The presence of grids, combined with no evidence of pre-existing architecture, further demonstrates that Jebel Khalid was a new foundation. Despite the incline and difficult terrain of the outcrop, a high degree of planning was invested in the initial organization of this site.

The first houses in the Domestic Quarter of Jebel Khalid were constructed in the mid-third century B.C., also referred to as Phase A. Construction is dated by four coins of Antiochus I (278-261 B.C.) found below the first floor level. Attic black glaze and Attic West Slope ware, the earliest dateable ceramics, suggest a similar date.\(^{119}\) Around 150 B.C. there was a period of prosperity, in which renovations were made and many rooms were extended. This phase, Phase B, is also marked by the appearance of Eastern Sigillata A.

After what seems to have been a brief period of abandonment, there was a resettlement of this quarter in the early first century B.C. Jackson states that it is unclear whether the entire site was abandoned or just this particular block, suggesting that the inhabitants would be reluctant to leave their agricultural holdings.\(^{120}\) This subphase is noted by a significant rise of floor levels, up to 99 cm, with materials indicative of abandonment, such as vessel fragments, iron nails, and other building materials, found underneath the new floor layer.\(^{121}\) Though there was no hiatus in either the coin or pottery sequences, the degree of change in the architecture was sufficient to

\(^{119}\) Phasing and dating for the Housing Insula is based on Jackson 2011.
\(^{120}\) Jackson 2011, p. 147.
\(^{121}\) Jackson 2011, p. 139.
warrant some division, and therefore this subphase is referred to as Phase B+. During Phase B+, many rooms were divided into smaller spaces and appear to house multiple functions. The general quality of living appears to be less than in either of the previous occupation phases. Phase B+ was short-lived. Though portions of the site may have been abandoned earlier, in the 90s or 80s B.C., the settlement of Jebel Khalid appears to have been abandoned by about 76 B.C., and was never resettled. Multiple construction phases allow for the incorporation of local and Parthian forms of cultural expression in a way unseen in the fortification system, which suggests the Greco-Macedonian identity associated with the establishment of the site.

While the full publication by Jackson is forthcoming in *Jebel Khalid Volume IV*, a preliminary presentation and interpretation of the housing insula is available through the multiple field reports. Unfortunately, not all living surfaces have been uncovered. Only about 50% of floors were fully excavated. Of the three occupational phases, A, B, and B+, excavators did not dig past the Phase B floor level in numerous spots. Nonetheless, each house has trenches extending down to bedrock, providing a cross section for that discrete unit. Since domestic structures from Hellenistic Syria are almost non-existent, Jebel Khalid allows for a unique glimpse into residential life.

Originally, this block had at least seven distinct housing units, with an alleyway roughly dividing the block in two (Fig. 10). During Phase A the four houses on the northern side of the insula (South-West House, Western perimeter House, North-West House 1, and North-West House) were of a similar size, the average dimension being 325 m². In addition to a smaller structure (the North-East Area), the southern half of the block contained the two largest homes:
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122 Abandonment dates are based on coins from the site: *Jebel Khalid I*, pp. 295-297; see Hoover 2002, p. 48.
124 *Jebel Khalid III*, p. 3.
125 Heavy rebuilding in the subsequent phase makes the exact number unclear.
the House of the Painted Frieze, measuring 772 m², and the South-West House, measuring 500 m².\textsuperscript{126}

All the houses were constructed in the same manner, using local fieldstones available on the jebel for the lower walls; occasional ashlar blocks were used in the foundations. While some of the walls separating houses are party walls, we also see double sets of wall, such as between the South-West house and the Western Perimeter House. The predominant use of shared walls indicates some level of cooperation between house owners or builders. Shared walls further suggest that the construction of the entire insula was planned and executed simultaneously.\textsuperscript{127}

Walls are preserved up to a height of 2 m at the southern end of the insula. Only one house, North-West House 2, has traces of mudbrick preserved on the upper courses of walls, suggesting a second story built out of this lighter material.\textsuperscript{128} Additional evidence for an upper story was found during the 2002 season, when the lowest four steps of a staircase, hypothetically leading to a second level, were found in this same house. Overall, the construction of the houses was fairly uniform and utilized both the topography and local resources.

Within the houses, the same set of rooms is repeated, often in a similar arrangement. To start with, the houses were accessed indirectly from the street via a small antechamber leading into the central courtyard, allowing for more privacy. Only in North-West House 2 was the courtyard approached directly. Typically, immediately to the north of this central courtyard was what the excavators call the \textit{oikos}, the main room of the house. The \textit{oikos} was oriented for cooling and protection from the hot sun. Rooms for food preparation tended to be attached to the \textit{oikos} as suites, sometimes connecting to the kitchen. Besides dining, there is also evidence that

\textsuperscript{126} For a breakdown on the dimensions of all the houses see Clarke \textit{et. al.} 2005.
\textsuperscript{127} Nappo 1997, p. 96-99 discusses the benefits of constructing an insula as a whole unit.
\textsuperscript{128} Clarke \textit{et. al.} 2005, p. 129 for initial notes on the mudbrick; Jackson reaffirms this after the entire insula was excavated in \textit{Jebel Khalid III}, p.1.
weaving and food preparation occurred in these rooms. In addition, all the houses featured pastas-like spaces, a long porch-like space open to the courtyard, for household activities, as seen at contemporaneous sites such as Olynthus and Priene.\textsuperscript{129} It is likely that all members of the family used the oikos for a variety of different domestic purposes. This multifunctional nature of the space is applicable for the entire insula. Although none of the houses is an exact duplicate of another, they all make use of the same architectural components.

The houses of Jebel Khalid also share a decorative program. Traces of plaster decorated in the Masonry Style and molded and painted cornices were found in many houses, most regularly in the oikoi. Yellow, black, and red were often used to color the orthostates. Fragments of blue and green plaster, more expensive pigments, were also found.\textsuperscript{130} Although all the houses had painted plaster fragments, only one house, the aptly named House of the Painted Frieze, had evidence of a figural scene (see below).\textsuperscript{131} Further decorative elements seen in the houses include a pier capital, a section of a column drum, and a repurposed stone block used for flooring in North-West House 2, in the same courtyard as the stone steps mentioned above.\textsuperscript{132} In contrast to these decorative features, the floors were plain. In many places the bedrock was cut down to create a flat surface with a packed clay floor. There is no trace of mosaics.

Although the houses of this insula share many traits, there was some change and variety. Initially the insula contained houses that were roughly the same size and shape: rectangular houses approximately 325 m\textsuperscript{2}, plus the two larger houses and one smaller house previously

\textsuperscript{129} For a description of pastas and prostas style houses see, Nevett 1999, pp. 22-23. Overview also available in Ault and Nevett 2005.
\textsuperscript{130} While some of these fragments comes from the houses, the more significant quantities were found in the Governor’s Palace see, Jebel Khalid I, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{131} Jebel Khalid I, p. 127-130; Clarke et. al. 2003. For discussion of Hellenistic painting in Syria and this frieze in particular see, Jackson 2009. The following description of the House of the Painted Frieze is based on the discussion in Jackson 2009.
\textsuperscript{132} These architectural features are all reused and belong to Phase B. Their dimensions are that of a house, rather than a public building, and likely came from the earlier phase of the insula, see Clarke et. al. 2000, p. 129.
mentioned. Over time the perimeter of the houses changed. One clear example of this was the incorporation of Room 24 from the South-West House into an unnamed unit directly to the east of it (SE corner of Figs. 10 and 11).\footnote{For all of the expansions discussed in this paragraph see, Clarke et. al. 2005, pp. 119-126.} Jackson notes that in Phase B there was an upper floor corresponding to the level of a doorway between rooms 24 and 20. When excavators dug down further, into Phase A of the insula, they uncovered a wall delimiting these two spaces without any door connecting them. There is also an expansion of the House of the Painted Frieze to the west into room 53, and an expansion of the North-East House 1 to include rooms 67, 69, and 76 (Fig. 9). On a larger scale, North-West House 1 was probably two smaller houses merged together in Phase B: it had two courtyards (Rooms 90 and 92 on Fig. 11), and though would not signify a merger on its own, the later house also had two separate entranceways. For a majority of the site history, expansion and subdivision did not dramatically change the number of houses within the insula; Jackson’s later phase plan still clearly identifies eight houses (Fig. 11). It is only in the very final period of occupation, Phase B+, where hastily constructed partitions may have significantly increased the number of households living in the insula.

The presence of multiple courtyards was a status marker among the houses. Only two of the houses at Jebel Khalid have a double courtyard in Phase B, the House of the Painted Frieze and North-West House 1. Two large courtyards would have provided the residents with space for both agricultural activities and domestic tasks, such as weaving. Differentiating between the functions of these two courtyards is difficult because most of the material in them is not from primary deposit. I believe it is possible that the smaller courtyards were service areas. The areas surrounding the smaller courtyard of North-West House 1, Room 90, are smaller than those around the main courtyard. Compared to the identified oikoi, none of the rooms around the smaller courtyard are large enough to serve as the center for household activities. Instead, we see
spaces for production or storage around this courtyard, indicating it is more for domestic use, rather than for visitors. By creating discrete sections for public and private life, the owners of these homes were probably able to distinguish themselves amongst their neighbors.

Another feature that sets some houses apart is the ability to collect water. Both houses with two courtyards, the House of the Painted Frieze and North-West House 1, contained a cistern. In the House of the Painted Frieze this cistern was located in the smaller courtyard, while in the North-West House 1 the cistern was in the larger courtyard. Water collection at this site would have been a difficult task, since the only approach to the Euphrates River, the primary water source, was through a steep ravine. Since these two houses had direct access to water via private cisterns, the residents did not need to devote a portion of their day to water collection. The total volume of these cisterns was relatively low; the one in North-West House 2 could only hold 20,000 liters. Supplied by an annual rainfall of between 150-500 mm, these cisterns could have served as a supplemental water source. Based on both the lack of public access and the small size of the tanks, individual water consumption is believed to be around 1,800 liters a year; it appears that these cisterns were meant for personal use, not the entire insula. This investment in infrastructure is one of the ways residents could distinguish themselves.

When combining the aforementioned features, it becomes clear that the House of the Painted Frieze was the most elaborate house in the insula. This house has prestigious features such as two courtyards, what is likely, a private cistern, and an elaborate oikos suite. Room 19 (the oikos) had a large central door and two narrower, flanking doors opening onto a veranda overlooking the central courtyard (Fig. 12). On the eastern side were two small private rooms,
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135 Rapp 1976, p. 121.
137 Jackson 2011, p. 136.
only accessible from Room 19 itself (Rooms 9 and 10 on Fig. 12). This arrangement is reminiscent of dining suites in elite, even palatial, settings, such as the Palace of Demetrias at Thessaly.\textsuperscript{138} Only the South-West House and North-West 2 House have similar dining suites, while the other houses have a much simpler oikos.\textsuperscript{139} Jackson posits that the owner of such an elaborate house may have been a high-ranking officer.\textsuperscript{140}

The House of the Painted Frieze also had the most elaborate decor. The frieze after which it was named, in Room 19, features erotes in chariots pulled by goats (Fig. 13).\textsuperscript{141} Compositions with goats and erotes were common around the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{142} Sophisticated techniques such as highlighting, perspective, and variation in color were of a much higher quality in the figural frieze than in the patterned bands framing it.\textsuperscript{143} These patterned bands use six distinct styles commonly found in wall painting across the Mediterranean (Fig. 14). Blue and green pigments, otherwise only found at the Governor’s Palace, were present here.\textsuperscript{144} This frieze was located in the most visited room of the house, clearly meant to demonstrate the wealth of the owners and to delight visitors. Through this scene the owners of the house utilized an artistic koine seen across the Mediterranean, especially in regions with a high Greco-Macedonian cultural influence, in order to present themselves as members of the elite.

In Phase B+ subdivisions within the houses reduced some of these larger spaces, eliminating the potential for entertaining and display of wealth. These new, smaller rooms were

\textsuperscript{138} Neilsen 1999, pp. 93-94.
\textsuperscript{139} Clarke et. al. 2005, pp. 119-128.
\textsuperscript{140} Jackson 2011, p 136. This set up is similar to the Governor’s Palace at Jebel Khalid, with its large entertaining rooms with flanking suites, see Jebel Khalid I, pp. 33-43.
\textsuperscript{141} For the description of the frieze see, Jackson 2009.
\textsuperscript{142} Goats driven by erotes in figurine form come from Myrina, Mollard Besques 1963, p. 60, pl. 76b. As a sculptural frieze, it appears in the Theater of Pergamon, Ridgway 1990, p. 51. Erotes in chariots are frequent in painting, though sometimes with different animals, cf. House of the Vettii, Pompeii (erotes also ride goats there).
\textsuperscript{143} On the possible technique of block painting the forms before adding the later details see Brecoulaki 2002, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{144} While some amount of blues and greens was found in Jebel Khalid, it does not compare to wealthy towns such as Delos, see Westgate 2007, p. 399.
likely meant for more private functions than before. In Phase B, access into one the side rooms (Room 31) from the *oikos* in the House of the Painted Frieze was blocked off.\(^\text{145}\) The floor was only slightly raised. This lack of major change indicated that the lifestyle of inhabitants remained fairly similar between the first two phases of occupation. Then in Phase B\(^+\), the oikos (Room 19) was subdivided into several much smaller rooms (Fig. 12).\(^\text{146}\) In addition to the changes in the architecture, the type of decoration within these rooms was no longer of the same quality. There is evidence that some of the finely decorated Masonry Style wall plaster had fallen off of the walls in Phase B\(^+\). An oven was built up directly against the fieldstone wall in Room 32/33, indicating that the wall finishing was no longer standing at this time. No remnants of re-plastering still remain, but Jackson is quick to point out that plaster is poorly preserved at Jebel Khalid and we should not rule out later repair jobs.\(^\text{147}\)

During the first century B.C. Seleucid borders changed as the Parthian Empire expanded to the west. As a result of these changing boundaries, the strategic importance of Jebel Khalid may have diminished. Stripped of their role within the Seleucid network the settlers of Jebel Khalid may have lost some of their prestige and wealth, as is reflected through the diminished size of both rooms and houses. The changes seen at the housing insula may just be localized to this area of the settlement, but might also reflect a general decline at the site as the extent of Seleucid control shrank. The networks of exchange had a direct impact on the variety of cultural and social identities seen in the architecture of Jebel Khalid.
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\(^\text{145}\) The phases of this structure are laid out in Jackson 2011. The following description of Room 19 is based on this chapter.

\(^\text{146}\) The floor level was also raised by 99 cm, Jackson 2011, p. 139.

\(^\text{147}\) Jackson 2011, p. 139.
Comparable Domestic Structures

It is evident that the construction of domestic space involves significantly less administrative oversight than the construction of fortifications. Instead, the identities of the settlers are reflected in the material culture from the houses. By drawing comparisons to other houses in the Seleucid Kingdom and beyond, it is possible to show the cultural preferences of those living in them. Through examining how aspects of cultural identity were expressed, we can better understand the people occupying this site, and its function as a whole. The best parallels would be from within the Seleucid Kingdom, but few sites provide an entire Hellenistic house, let alone an insula. Additionally, by including houses from outside the Seleucid Kingdom, it is possible to see where the structures at Jebel Khalid were borrowing from a Hellenistic model and where they were incorporating Eastern elements.

Dura Europos and Seleucia-on-the-Tigris should provide the best Seleucid comparisons for houses, but no complete Hellenistic house plan can be convincingly reconstructed from Dura Europos, and the Hellenistic housing block at Seleucia-on-the-Tigris has not been fully studied. Based on the preserved evidence (mainly foundations), there was a much greater range of house sizes at Dura Europos than at Jebel Khalid: one house took up an entire block, approximately 35 m by 70 m, while others were simple two roomed structures.\textsuperscript{148} This degree of variation likely existed at Jebel Khalid, even if it is not present in the one excavated insula. At Dura Europos, like Jebel Khalid, the housing lots never appear to have been equally sized.\textsuperscript{149} Unfortunately, later occupation at Dura Europos means that we are unable to have as detailed a plan of the Hellenistic layout as at Jebel Khalid and the precise layout cannot be determined. It does appear that, like most Hellenistic sites, houses at Dura Europos were centered on a courtyard. At

\textsuperscript{148} Baird 2014, pp. 41-43.
\textsuperscript{149} For a critical reading of Hoepfner and Schwandner’s connection between equal lot sizes and political systems see Shipley 2005.
Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, the excavated Hellenistic houses were built on a much larger scale: Block G6 occupies a 140 m by 70 m insula near the center of the town. The Hellenistic occupation of this site is, once again, heavily obscured, but excavators suggest that the lots were divided into eight roughly square houses, centered on a peristyle courtyard. These examples suggest a consistency in the general layout of new foundations within the Seleucid Kingdom, but it is difficult to infer too much due to the fragmentary data from sites such as Dura Europos. To supplement this, we need to look further abroad to see the individual elements of domestic construction.

Olynthus, although it predates Jebel Khalid by half a century, provides some of the clearest examples of domestic space in a minor Greek polis. Houses were centered on the courtyard and fall mainly into either the pastas or prostras types. Unlike the houses at Jebel Khalid, at Olynthos the primary space for entertaining was the andron. Andrones typically had a small forechamber separating the activities within the outer courtyard. An andron was therefore further removed from the courtyard and visibility into the space was not as readily available as in the oikoi of Jebel Khalid. The other features of the houses are generally repeated, with a combination of workspaces, service rooms, and private spaces for the family. Although there are minor differences between the two towns, the common Greco-Macedonian house types, centered on an open court, dominate the archaeological record.

The houses at Jebel Khalid are further distinguished by the broad room plan, in which the dimensions of the oikos are wider than they are deep. The House of the Painted Frieze further elaborates this layout with an unusual arrangement where the main room is entered by three
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150 Hopkins 1972, pp. 28-34.
151 Nevett 1999, pp. 22-23.
152 Cahill 2002, p. 80.
doors, a larger one at the center with two smaller flanking entrances (Fig. 12). Such a three-door arrangement is only seen on the island of Delos, where most of the second century B.C. homes featured it. Broad room plans incorporating only one doorway are seen more widely in Hellenistic settlements, with examples appearing at Eretria in mainland Greece, at Phaistos on Crete, and even as far west as Morgantina in Sicily. Broad rooms were not strictly a Hellenistic Greek architectural feature, however. Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian architecture, continuously used by the Persians and later Seleucids, also prominently featured a broad room accompanied by flanking suites of rooms.

One site with a significantly different domestic floor plan is Aï Khanoum. Located on the geographic edge of the Seleucid Kingdom, Eastern influences can be seen through the presence of courtyards occupying half the house area. Although the domestic courtyards at Aï Khanoum are not colonnaded, the proportion of the house dedicated to the courtyard is reminiscent of hypostyle halls. Off this large courtyard was generally a reception room, but unlike the houses mentioned above, a series of corridors leading to private rooms surrounded the reception area. The domestic architecture of the larger houses does not follow a typical Greek organization, but is reminiscent of Parthian structures. Several smaller houses (three or four rooms) have also been excavated at Aï Khanoum. These smaller houses might show greater parallels to the homes of Jebel Khalid, but the current state of publications and presentations of this evidence
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154 For example, House of the Dolphins, the House of the Tritons, the House of Trident, and the House of Hermes, Trümper 2007.
158 Aï Khanoum IX, pp. 193-197.
159 For example the Parthian Red Building of Nisa in Turkmenistan, see Invernizzi and Lippolis 2008, pp. 83-150; or the Parthian residence in Abu Qubur, Iraq, see Gasche 1999.
makes comparisons difficult at this time. While Aï Khanoum offers an example of houses with Eastern architectural elements within the Seleucid Kingdom, those of Jebel Khalid show more western features. This final comparison is intriguing because it shows how cultures other than Greco-Macedonian impacted the architectural expression of identity in the housing quarter. Comparatively, the houses of Jebel Khalid indicate the strong presence of a Greco-Macedonian cultural identity among the inhabitants. Located more firmly in areas of Seleucid control, the impact of eastern material cultures was not as greatly felt at Jebel Khalid, leading to architectural expressions that draw more greatly upon Greco-Macedonian precedents.

The Question of Elite Status

The Housing Insula of Jebel Khalid has been called an elite residential area by Clarke and his team, based on the distance from the town gate, the size of the houses, and the quality of decorative elements.\footnote{Jackson 2011, p. 134.} As no comparable insulae on the site have been excavated, it can be difficult to make such a judgment. Using comparisons to some of the sites previously mentioned, parallels can be drawn that help determine the social status of the Housing Insula inhabitants. This is another type of identity that can be better understood by studying the material culture of Jebel Khalid and can help contribute to discussions of identities by indicating if we are only seeing a limited section of society.

Location within a town can often suggest the importance of a house. Block G6, in Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, was selected for excavation because of its location on a plain near the center of the town.\footnote{Hopkins 1972, p. 28.} Excavators expectations were met when they uncovered large, well appointed homes in this Seleucid city. Other coveted property included property along the
principal streets of the town or near important structures, like an agora. The houses at Jebel Khalid do not fit either of these criteria; they are located approximately 1 km away from the most important point of the city, the Governor’s Palace. Excavators argue that the removed location, away from the bustle of daily traffic through the town, adds to the prestige, but this is an urban setting, not a rustic retreat. It has also been argued that because the homes have no signs of attached shops, this is further evidence of elite status. None of the homes of Jebel Khalid have shops, but at many Hellenistic sites shops were incorporated into even the most elite houses. The absence of shops attached to the houses of Jebel Khalid does not immediately identify their owners as social elites; instead, we must consider multiple expressions of status.

Property size can also be seen as a sign of status. This method is effective when comparing houses within the same town, but Jebel Khalid does not have enough houses to draw such conclusions. Excavators have made comparisons to other Hellenistic settlements in an attempt to understand the houses of Jebel Khalid. One comparison that has been made is with the “modest” houses of Delos, which measure on average 120 m², 200 m² smaller than those at Jebel Khalid. This comparison is slightly flawed since property was limited and in high demand within the international port, conditions that did not exist in Seleucid Syria. At Olynthus, a slightly earlier mainland town, houses were on average 296 m², only 30 m² smaller than at Jebel Khalid. Both settlements were planned towns, somewhat removed from the borders of the kingdom. Examples of truly elite houses exceed the size of Jebel Khalid’s houses up to tenfold.

164 The elite houses from Seleucia-on-the-Tigris had shops along the street fronts, see Hopkins 1972, pp. 30-65. Perhaps the most notable example, from a slightly later time period, is the House of the Faun in Pompeii. The location of the houses may explain why there were no shops. At Olynthus shops tended to cluster near the main thoroughfares, see Cahill 2002, pp. 211-212.
165 Trümper (2005) classifies homes in Delos measuring approximately 120 m² as modest.
166 Cahill 2002, p. 75.
Elite houses in a Hellenistic capital, Pella, measured 3,160 m², those in a provincial capital, Aî Khanoum, measured over 2,000 m² and those at another so-called garrison site, Dura Europos, were 3,850 m². Even in a Syrian outpost, the houses could dwarf the size of those seen in the housing insula of Jebel Khalid. Comparisons to other towns are useful, but we can also compare these houses to the most elite residence of Jebel Khalid, the Governor’s Palace. The Governor’s Palace occupies 2,747 m², which is comparable to the elite houses at previously noted sites. Using property size as an indicator, the Housing Insula of Jebel Khalid probably represents middle class housing belonging to successful landowners, the recipients of kleroi.

The final indicator Jackson uses to argue that this insula is an area of elite houses is the presence of a figural scene within the House of the Painted Frieze. She notes that few houses in the Hellenistic world included figural scenes. As with the previous arguments for elite housing, this statement does not find support. The absence of figural scenes can be attributed to depositional processes. Figural scenes were often in the center of walls, the height of which rarely is preserved at archaeological sites. Plaster and the pigments on it are subject to erosion and fading. Although there are few well preserved sites, the ones that we do have indicate that painted walls were far more common than previously believed. Studies have shown that a range of painters was available and perhaps we should look at the quality rather than just the presence of a figural scene. While figural scenes are more complicated than simple masonry, they were still not as prestigious as narrative scenes. Looking at the entire decorative program within the houses of Jebel Khalid, there are key elements of elite houses missing. The most
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167 The House of Dionysus at Pella, see Makaronas and Yiore 1989, p.18.
170 Jackson 2009, p. 231.
171 Richardson (2000) used Campanian figural wall paintings to identify hands of painters, creating categories such as elite painter and itinerant painters to show the range of craftsmen available.
glaring absence is that of mosaics. Located on the Euphrates, the residents would have had ready access to the river pebbles commonly used in Hellenistic mosaics.\textsuperscript{172} Even the nicest houses have simple packed earth floors. The other decorative architectural elements are relatively scarce and seem to be reused elements from elsewhere on the site. Furthermore, there is a lack of marble, one of the most commonly prestigious building materials, among any of the houses.\textsuperscript{173} Although there are elements of elaboration at the houses of Jebel Khalid, it is not enough to justify calling them elite residences.

The excavated insula at Jebel Khalid appears to be occupied by a relatively comfortable middle class. They were able to incorporate certain embellishments into their houses, but those elements are not as lavish as seen elsewhere in the site and abroad. Identifying the settlers here as middle class can help contribute to the argument that these people were retired soldiers, since land parcels were often a reward for service.\textsuperscript{174} Within the kleroi system there were various lot sizes awarded to soldiers, presumably reflecting their rank within the military.\textsuperscript{175} The houses excavated at Jebel Khalid are probably not those belonging to the common foot soldier, but perhaps to an officer.

\textit{Conclusion}

When constructing the houses of Jebel Khalid the owners were influenced by local materials and forms, but included elements that were distinctly Hellenistic. Certain aspects of the

\textsuperscript{172} See Dunbabin (1979) for comments on pebble mosaics. See Robertson et. al. (2013, pp. 620-623) for the ubiquity of pebbles in the local region.
\textsuperscript{173} Note that both the Governor’s Palace and the temple show the sparse and strategic use of marble at Jebel Khalid in only the most prominent places. For the Governor’s Palace see, \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, pp. 36-40; for the temple see, Wright 2012, pp. 86-87.
\textsuperscript{174} Soldiers received \textit{kleroi} in Syrian Larissa as a reward after military success (\textit{FHG} II.XVII.21)
\textsuperscript{175} An inscription from Pergamon mentioned three different sizes of \textit{kleroi}, see Welles \textit{RC} 51, line 10-16. See also Billows 1995, p. 163-164 for other evidence.
house, such as the central courtyard, approached indirectly, were common elements seen in the Greek world. The emphasis on the *oikos* was also not unique. Elements such as the three-door access to the *oikos* can only be paralleled to Delos, a key Hellenistic port. Further refinements, such as the theme and artistic style of the erotes and goats in the figural frieze indicate that they were painted by someone trained in a Hellenistic school of painting. These houses only represent one social group living at Jebel Khalid. Without information about the lowest level of society, we can only discuss how those in the Governor’s Palace and the Housing Insula chose to present themselves. The details of the Housing Insula show preferences for Hellenistic features, particularly in the most prestigious elements of the homes.

The housing insula is useful for examining the social identity of the settlers and augments the types of identities that can be understood through examining the public architecture. As discussed in the previous chapter, the fortifications are a crucial part of the settlement’s foundation. Along with the walls, soldiers were needed to man those walls. Although soldiers, possibly in the form of retired veterans and their descendants, must have lived within the town, they would have needed to find some other means of income. Officers might have occupied these houses and run successful farms to supplement their lifestyle. As political borders shifted and as new trade routes developed, the inhabitants established new livelihoods that were not as entrenched in military activities. The subdivision of houses in Phase B+ may reflect a new way of life or new class of settlers. The partitioning of *oikoi* might represent a reduction of circumstances, as the initial military and economic functions of the settlement changed and decreased. In the last phase of occupation there is a clear decrease in the status of these homes. The nature of Jebel Khalid seems to have also changed—pressures on the edge of empire made the Seleucid kings shift their focus to the borders. This strategic outpost did not hold the same
value as before. Similarly the livelihoods of the inhabitants were affected by shifting political boundaries and new trade routes that were a result of these new borders. The military personnel no longer held the same role as before. As their role within the settlement changed so did the infrastructure they required, allowing for the partitioning. Based on the excavated portions of the city it becomes clear that the group living within the Housing Insula chose to represent themselves as a part of a Greco-Macedonian cultural group, in most aspects of their domestic life.
Chapter 4: The Ceramics

The ceramics used at Jebel Khalid can help trace how the trading networks and consumer preferences of the community changed throughout the different phases of occupation. These adopted preferences contribute to the identities present in the settlement. I will be focusing on three distinct groups: the imported fine wares, the stamped amphorae, and locally produced pottery. The imported fine wares and amphorae will help identify Jebel Khalid’s network of connections, thus identifying places where Hellenistic or other influences could have come from. Stamped amphorae handles from imported vessels can also identify some of the trade routes open to Jebel Khalid, but the locally produced stamped amphorae can provide additional information about the inhabitants of the site. For the locally produced pottery, I intend to look at both cooking and dining vessels to see whose material culture influenced the elite dining practices and the food preparation methods: local practices or more international forms. Ceramic assemblages have been particularly useful in identity studies because they provide information about the networks of contact and the activities of those using the vessels—both of which can be used to discuss cultural identity.\footnote{Antonaccio 2005.} Furthermore, the discrepancies between ceramic forms and wares used for different tasks can speak to variant identities extant within the same population group.\footnote{Mattingly 2004.} Pottery style and production can serve as another tool to describe the connections between Jebel Khalid and the Seleucid center.
**Imported Fine Ware**

The imported fine ware accounts for 5% of the ceramic assemblage at Jebel Khalid and the provenance of this pottery is indicative of patterns of trade and the behaviors of consumers. The imported pottery that found its way to Jebel Khalid cannot be shown to have been purposefully made for that destination. Most of the vessels probably arrived to the site when caravans travelling east from Antioch or ships sailing down the Euphrates River stopped in the town and unloaded a portion of their wares. Although these items do not demonstrate a direct connection between Jebel Khalid and the source of the imports, they imply that ideas, techniques, and even people from their source could have influenced the material culture of the site. The models for some of the architectural and decorative features with specific comparanda may have arrived to Jebel Khalid by these same channels.

The earliest phase of occupation, Phase A, has the greatest variety and proportion of imported fine wares. Vessels made in Southern Italy, Greece, the Cyclades, Egypt, and the Parthian Empire found their way to Jebel Khalid in small quantities. Although pottery from all of these sources was present at the site, imported fine wares from Antioch were predominant, consisting of 73% of the fine ware. Most of the trade to the site of Jebel Khalid would have filtered in through Antioch and it is no surprise that so many of the imported wares were produced there. The imported wares are distributed across the site, indicating that their consumption was not only limited to the Governor’s Palace. Southern Italian wares are the only exceptions to this distribution pattern. A handful of Pompeian Red Ware vessels and Campania
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178 *Jebel Khalid III* pp. 57-59, pp. 386-389
179 For Euphrates River crossing see Comfort and Ergec 2001; Gawlikowski 1996.
180 Geochemical analysis of the fabrics, in addition to visual identification, was used to trace provenance (*Jebel Khalid III*, pp. 527-545).
181 A similar percentage is seen with the coins, over 85% were minted at Antioch, but the stray coin from places as far as Rome still found their way to Seleucid Syria. *Jebel Khalid I*, p. 298.
B table wares are only found in deposits from the Governor’s Palace. Some Mediterranean imports, such as the Gnathian ware, are limited to the earliest phase of occupation. Other wares, primarily Attic black glaze and West Slope ware, were slowly replaced by ceramic types originating in the Near East. Jebel Khalid was not only a recipient of goods from throughout the Hellenistic world. Excavations at nearby Khamis produced a black varnished ceramic, similar to those made in Pergamon. Jebel Khalid is the most likely conduit, occasionally supplying the smaller settlements within its micro-region with these imported goods. While the preferences of the settlers were one factor in the ceramic supply, the changing economics of the Hellenistic period were another factor, i.e. the cessation of Athenian ceramic export. Although some of these imported ceramic types are found in later phases, the diminished quantities indicate decreased demand or accessibility. The decline of imported fine wares, reflective of Jebel Khalid’s possible decreased importance, mirrors the later partitioning of houses discussed in chapter 3.

In Phase B, pottery from the central Mediterranean rarely reached Jebel Khalid. Eastern Sigillata A and Burnished Grey ware became the most commonly imported fine wares after 150 B.C. Eastern Sigillata A was produced primarily in the northern Syrian littoral or in the region between Tel Anafa and Hama. Sigillata was used to distinguish between Phase A and B layers within the Housing Insula, since it was in production only after the second century B.C. Although Phase B shows limited trade with the Mediterranean, nine fragments of Cypriot
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182 The Pompeian Red ware is identified as Peacock Fabric 1 and is likely sourced to Campania, although the Eiffel-Rhine region is also a possibility, see Peacock 1977. For context see Jebel Khalid III, p. 325. For the Campana B plates, see Morel 1986, p. 473.
183 Alexandria is known to have produced Gnathian Ware and to have distributed it to the Near East. Although Apulia is a potential source, distance favors Alexandria, see Green 1995, p. 273.
184 See Rotroff (2002) for the later development of West Slope workshops either on the Syrian coast or smaller one in the interior.
185 Japp 2013; Schäfer 1968.
186 For a coastal production site see, Lund 2005.
187 For the period of production see, Herbert and Berlin 2003, p. 21.
Sigillata were found at Jebel Khalid.188 This general trend towards Seleucid and Eastern produced pottery is also confirmed by the popularity of Burnished Grey ware in Phase B. Burnished Grey ware began to appear at Jebel Khalid concurrent with the arrival of Eastern Sigillata A at the site. Burnished Grey ware is indicative of a highly localized Near Eastern tradition.189 As imports from the central Mediterranean were disappearing, the demand for fine ware ceramics were filled by more localized production centers choosing to produce finishes of more local origins.190 The production of a black/grey fine ware along the Euphrates extends as far back as the third millennium B.C.191 This type of finish does not seem to reach the Syrian coast and was likely traded up and down the Euphrates River.192 Geochemical analysis does not tie the fabric of Burnished Grey ware with any of the clay deposits found near Jebel Khalid.193 Based on distribution patterns within the region, it is likely that this pottery type was produced further downriver. By Phase B+, the Burnished Grey ware was the most popular fine ware at Jebel Khalid and imports from the Seleucid coast had virtually ceased. After 150 B.C. the extent of Jebel Khalid’s trade network appears to have contracted to exclude the Mediterranean. As Jebel Khalid’s international networks disappeared, it became a more localized settlement.

Another imported ware represented at Jebel Khalid is the Green-Glaze ware, more commonly referred to as “Parthian ware” (Fig. 15). This pottery type is called Parthian because it

188 Recent studies have indicated that both Cyprus and especially Nea Paphos were potential production centers for Cypriot Sigillata, see Hayes 2001, p. 149. Jebel Khalid III, p. 357-359.
189 For the general presence of this ware in Western Asia Minor and Syria see, Sardis Mon 12, pp. 31-31. For Dura-Europos see Dura-Europos IV i,ii; for Tel Khamis see Sèiquer 1999; for Aï Khanoum see Aï Khanoum I, pp. 121-188.
190 Local production using these common “international” forms occurred throughout many parts of the Seleucid Kingdom, for examples from Kadesh see Berlin et. al. 2014, esp. pp. 315-319.
191 The earliest known examples come from Mari on the Euphrates, see Mari I, pp. 208-209.
192 There are only two examples of Burnished Grey Ware at Antioch, see Antioch-on-the-Orontes IV, pp. 59-60.
193 For David Garnett’s geochemical work for the imported wares see, Jebel Khalid III, pp. 527-545.
is associated with Parthian levels of multiple sites in Syria.\textsuperscript{194} At Jebel Khalid this ware was found throughout all levels of occupation and experienced an increase in importation post-150 B.C.\textsuperscript{195} Although no production centers for Parthian ware have been identified, this ware occupies an increasingly larger percentage of ceramic assemblages as one progresses down the Euphrates.\textsuperscript{196} Green-Glaze ware accounts for 15\% of the imported pottery at Jebel Khalid. The numbers at Antioch are slightly lower, but farther south at Tel Anafa only 10 sherds of this ware have been found.\textsuperscript{197} This distribution pattern is comparable to that of the Burnished Grey Ware and indicates that the Parthian ware traveled along trade networks oriented along the Euphrates River. Such a dramatic change in the sources for pottery indicate that as Jebel Khalid becomes further removed from Seleucid supply networks, it sought out other producers, in this case Eastern ones. During this period, Parthian expansion had begun. The Seleucid Kingdom no longer needed to focus on establishing power throughout its territory, but needed to defend from invasion. Perhaps Jebel Khalid’s location in the geographic center of the kingdom did not require as much royal attention as settlements on the Parthian frontier. Since this attention was no longer needed, fewer goods moved from the Seleucid center.

Plates, dishes, cups and other types of tableware make up the fine ware assemblage of Jebel Khalid. Regardless of fabric and origin, Jackson notes that the fine ware was predominantly made of “international” Hellenistic shapes: particularly small open bowls with incurving rims and shallow fishplates.\textsuperscript{198} As the term “international” suggests, these shapes can be found throughout the Hellenistic world. Although the origins of fine wares were varied, fine

\textsuperscript{194} Dura-Europos provides some of the best examples of this ware produced in large quantities, see \textit{Dura-Europos IV}, \textit{i}, \textit{i}. For Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, see Debevoise 1934.

\textsuperscript{195} The amount of Green-Glaze ware found within the Housing Insula in Phase B is nearly double that of Phase A. For a full discussion and catalogue of all Green-Glaze ware see \textit{Jebel Khalid III}, pp. 431-495.

\textsuperscript{196} At Seleucia-on-the-Tigris and Failaka, over 800 km downriver, Green-Glaze Ware is the most common fine ware, see \textit{Ikaros II}, \textit{i}.

\textsuperscript{197} For Antioch see \textit{Antioch-on-the-Orontes IV}, pp. 80-82; For Tel Anafa see, \textit{Tel Anafa II}, \textit{i}, pp. 169-171.

\textsuperscript{198} \textit{Jebel Khalid III}, p. 24.
ware shapes, and assemblages more broadly, were fairly standardized. Parthian potters, creating Greco-Macedonian forms, meant there was an active demand for these shapes. Green-Glaze ware, for example, is primarily associated with shallow plates and open bowls. Only occasionally were forms like jugs with applied button decoration and wide grooving, which are not typical of Greco-Macedonian assemblages, found. Clearly, the market demanded Greek fashions for dining and potters responded to it. Indeed, dining in Seleucid Syria largely involved Greek style tableware and likely followed Greek fashions, which originated on the Greek mainland. However, the pottery used was often not manufactured on the mainland or in Hellenistic Greek contexts. The preference for Hellenistic shapes indicates that those living in the housing insula took part in Greco-Macedonian cultural practices. In summary, Jebel Khalid seems to fit these general patterns of locally produced pottery fitting in with a typical Hellenistic koine.

At Jebel Khalid, the changing proportions of fine wares and their origins indicate that trade became more localized in the later phases of occupation. In Phase A, Jebel Khalid’s networks allowed access to goods from most of the Hellenistic world, while in subsequent periods of occupation the variety of imported wares shrank and the importance of eastern production centers increased. Consumption and ownership of an “international” Hellenistic assemblage was more important than the actual ownership of pottery produced in a Greek or, in this case, Seleucid context. Pottery produced outside the Seleucid Kingdom was being made with a Hellenized audience in mind. The fine wares were modeled after Hellenistic styles, showing a preference in Jebel Khalid, for elite consumption using Greco-Macedonian precedents.
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199 For the classification of Greek and Mesopotamian jars see Ikaros II, i., pp. 36-37, Jebel Khalid III, pp. 462-465.

200 For a similar pattern of consumption with Etruscans see, Osborne 2001.
Stamped Amphorae

Stamped amphorae can be used to broaden the list of Jebel Khalid’s potential contacts and influences demonstrated by the fine ware. Stamps pressed into unbaked clay often bore the names or symbols of their production site. Other information sometimes included on these stamps are the names of magistrates or fabricants. Like the imported fine wares, imported amphorae are more popular in the initial phases of occupation (Phase A) and decrease from around 150 B.C. There are 112 stamped amphorae at Jebel Khalid.\(^{201}\) I will be using the stamped amphorae to see if the pattern of contraction seen in the fine wares is also visible in this ceramic class. A majority comes from Rhodes, a popular production center for this shape during the Hellenistic period.\(^{202}\) Rhodian amphorae were common throughout Seleucid Syria and the Eastern Mediterranean.\(^{203}\) In addition to the Rhodian pieces, three Cypriot, one Thasian, two Cnidian, and twenty-one locally produced amphorae were excavated at Jebel Khalid. While the stamped amphorae handles provide a good indication of who was trading with the Seleucid Kingdom, they do not necessarily represent the true proportions of amphora sources. The prevalence Rhodian amphorae are likely a reflection of a broader trend. This type of amphora proliferates throughout the Mediterranean in the Hellenistic period. Nonetheless, Cyprus, which is another major Hellenistic producer of amphorae and the wine shipped in them, is underrepresented in the assemblage of Jebel Khalid. The scarcity of Cypriot exports could be attributed to Ptolemaic dominance over goods from the island and the political tension between

---

\(^{201}\) This number is based on the data reported in *Jebel Khalid I*, pp. 273-190; Clarke 2005; Clarke 2008a. A comprehensive list is forthcoming, see *Jebel Khalid V*.

\(^{202}\) Dobosz 2013, pp. 215-220.

\(^{203}\) Eiring and Lund 2004.
the Ptolemies and the Seleucids.\textsuperscript{204} Goods did cross these political borders, but this was likely the result of secondary or tertiary trade.

Most of the imported amphorae were found in a dump associated with the acropolis.\textsuperscript{205} Other dumps outside the circuit walls did not yield high quantities of amphorae. The presence of amphorae near the most important building on site is indicative of the reception and entertaining that would have occurred within the Governor’s Palace. Imported, high quality wine would have been well suited for the reception of administrators from the Seleucid center or other elites hosted at the palace.\textsuperscript{206} Comparatively, there are much fewer imported stamped amphora handles from the Domestic Quarter—another possible argument against elites in the insula. The chronology of these amphorae can perhaps help shed light on the political significance of Jebel Khalid within the Seleucid Kingdom. There is a steep drop off in the amount of imported amphorae in the final phase of occupation; only nine amphorae have stamped handles that date to after 161 B.C.\textsuperscript{207} Although there is a general decrease in Rhodian exports during this period, other sites in the Seleucid Kingdom see a resurgence in imports after 145 B.C.\textsuperscript{208} Jebel Khalid does not rejoin this Rhodian network. The origins of stamped amphorae handles reveal a pattern similar to that seen among the fine ware, a contraction of networks beginning in Phase B. When considered alongside the visible architectural changes within the Housing Insula and the shrinking borders of the Seleucid Kingdom, the evidence of the amphorae suggests a diminished connectivity with the Seleucid center. Elite dining could still occur without the imported goods,

\textsuperscript{204} Only in the beginning of the Hellenistic period did Cypriot amphorae find their way to the Levant and Near East in significant quantities, see Finkielsztein 2013, p. 86.
\textsuperscript{205} Find spots and dating information for the amphorae are given in Jebel Khalid I, pp. 275-288; Clarke 2008a, pp. 105-113; Clarke 2005 pp. 175-184; for a brief statement about the importance of the acropolis see, Clarke 2008a, p. 113
\textsuperscript{206} For the conclusion that the chief export of islands such as Rhodes, Cos, and Thasos was wine see, Koehler 1996, p. 326.
\textsuperscript{207} Clarke 2005, p. 185
\textsuperscript{208} Finkielsztein 2001; Lund 1993.
but the types of commodities carried in amphorae, particularly foreign wine, would be central to elite Greek dining habits. This type of dining appears to have dramatically shifted towards using almost exclusively local products, especially local wine.

Locally produced amphorae began to appear in Phase B, perhaps indicative of an increased exploitation of local resources. Locally produced amphorae are significant within the overall assemblage, accounting for 19% of the stamped amphorae found on site. These vessels are made from local clay. The local amphorae are called Pseudo-Coan after their resemblance to Coan amphorae. Their handles are double-coiled, but unlike those made in the Mediterranean, they are fashioned out of one coil with a diving line carved into the clay (Fig. 16). Three of these local vessels are inscribed in Northern Mesopotamian Aramaic, but the remaining amphorae have Greek writing. The most notable inscriptions are three Semitic names, written in a Greek script. These names are: ΑΒΙΔΣΑΛΜΑ “Abidalma”, ΒΑΡΓΑΤΟΥΣ “Bargates”, and ΙΘΗΙΧΑ “Itheicha” (Fig. 17). These three names, the only names seen on locally produced vessels, are seen a total of eleven times.

Names on stamped amphora handles most commonly indicate the magistrate of the region or the producer of the goods being transported. If these names belonged to magistrates, this would mean that the Seleucid Kingdom had appointed a native official, or one with a local name. Recent work suggests that especially as the Seleucid Kingdom went into decline more officials of local origins were integrated into the political system. One suggestion, based on the presence of two handles within the temple precinct, was that these names belong to religious
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209 For petrographic analysis see, *Jebel Khalid III*, p. 265-278.
210 This dialect was identified by paleographer and Semitic language specialist Joseph Naveh, see Clarke et. al. *forthcoming.*
211 Clarke 2005, p. 185.
212 Grace 1934.
213 For the inclusion of native peoples into the royal court see, Strootman 2014, pp. 130-135. For the emergence of local leadership see Andrade 2011.
administrators.\textsuperscript{214} Alternatively, if these were the names of producers, they would have been wealthy landowners, or at least wealthy enough to be producing enough surplus for export. In either case, the presence of these names on stamped amphorae indicates the integration of local peoples into the Seleucid administration. Based on the implied economic or political role of these individuals, they held a prominent place within the social hierarchy of Jebel Khalid in that they were either magistrates or wealthy enough to be producing for export.

150 B.C. was a turning point concerning the pattern of imports into Jebel Khalid and also marks an increase in local production. It is unclear what goods the settlement could have been exporting. Archaeobotanical analysis revealed that grains were the most common crop, but olive pips and grape seeds were present in smaller quantities.\textsuperscript{215} Perhaps the inhabitants of Jebel Khalid were producing not only to fulfill their needs, but also to fill a gap in the larger market.

*Local Pottery Production*

In all phases of occupation, local pottery production is identifiable at Jebel Khalid. Petrographic analysis of local clays from the Euphrates River indicates that local potters were exploiting clay deposits within the vicinity of Jebel Khalid. The local clay is a coarse light brown pink fabric with flecks of mica and finished with a cream colored slip. Excavations did not reveal kilns or pottery workshops, but these are likely to exist somewhere on the jebel or in the valley below. Without a production site, there can be no absolute certainty that Jebel Khalid was producing these vessels, but as the largest settlement in the immediate vicinity it is the most likely candidate for overseeing production.\textsuperscript{216}

\textsuperscript{214} Wright 2012, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{215} Ethnobotanic data was published in Andrew Fairbairn’s two reports, included in Clarke et. al. 2005, pp. 158-160; Clarke et al. 2003, pp.182-183. Olive trees were also attested through charcoal analysis.
\textsuperscript{216} del Olmo Lete and Montero Fenollós 1999.
Ceramic production at Jebel Khalid was restricted to common wares, amphorae (as noted above), and utilitarian wares, but largely emulated the shapes represented by the imported wares. Plates, bowls, and cups are the most common locally produced shapes, and many of them were made in a fine or medium-fine fabric.\textsuperscript{217} Locally produced ceramics were used for dining in different parts of the site, including the Governor’s Palace, as evidenced by a stack of common ware fishplates found in one of the pantries.\textsuperscript{218} There are no signs that Jebel Khalid is producing for a mass market; instead they are likely responding to the demands of the micro-regional market.\textsuperscript{219} Still, there is a high degree of skill and standardization in the local semi-fine ware.

While the ethnic identity of the people living in the small settlements around Jebel Khalid cannot be affirmed, the presence of Hellenistic shapes indicates that these groups either took part in Greco-Macedonian cultural practices or saw some type of prestige in Greco-Macedonian material goods.

While locally made tablewares mirror Greek shapes, the cooking wares produced at Jebel Khalid belong to a traditional, local style. Cooking pots from Jebel Khalid are all round bottomed, globular pots. Slight variations in the styling of the neck and rim account for three different types (Fig. 18).\textsuperscript{220} There appears to be no chronological distribution of these three types of cooking pot. Similarly there is one primary vessel for food preparation, a deep bowl with a thick rim (Fig. 18).\textsuperscript{221} These cooking forms were common in Syria throughout the Persian period, and even in parts of the Iron Age.\textsuperscript{222} Compared to the variety of table vessels, the service ware can be called conservative and traditional. Other Seleucid settlements show a greater range

\textsuperscript{217} For the catalogue see, \textit{Jebel Khalid III}, pp. 103-262.
\textsuperscript{218} Clarke et. al. \textit{forthcoming}.
\textsuperscript{219} For regional production in forms similar to the center see, Knappet 1999. For different levels of production see, Wattenmaker 1998; Sinopoli 1988.
\textsuperscript{220} For cooking pots see, \textit{Jebel Khalid III}, pp. 85-92.
\textsuperscript{221} For these deep bowls see, \textit{Jebel Khalid III}, pp. 49-52; for kitchen jars and jugs see, \textit{Jebel Khalid III}, pp. 58-59.
\textsuperscript{222} Jackson and Tidmarsh 2013.
of cooking vessels and have the popular Hellenistic casserole, a vessel that is notably absent from Jebel Khalid. Jackson rightly points out that these are all indications of a limited menu, probably of local (non-Greek) base. None of the cooking vessels found at Jebel Khalid would have been used to grill foods. Unless they used metal vessels or spits to prepare food in this manner, the domestic assemblages indicate that their diet was more stew based than other parts of the Hellenistic world. The cooking vessels may reflect the activities of a group of people of people that we rarely see in the archaeological record, the servants. Local styles of cookware could also be indicative of marriage of Hellenized males, with local wives, the latter bringing methods of food preparation into the household. In this particular context, the presence of local style cookware presents a more local identity than the many Greco-Macedonian elements noted in the previous architectural chapters. Traditional cookware means traditional ways of food preparation were also being passed down, necessitating some level of intermingling between settlers and the local population. The limited role of Syrian ceramic forms indicates that the predominant place where local practices remained in favor was in cooking wares, while dining practices used Greek styled vessels. The presence of Syrian forms in food preparation concurrent with Hellenistic forms of tablewares is one example of how variable identities manifested themselves at the site of Jebel Khalid.

223 Other Seleucid sites closer to the coast have a much greater variety of cooking vessels. Sites include Gamla Gamal I with ten types and Tel Anafä Tel Anafa II, i with thirteen types. The one casserole from Jebel Khalid was found outside the domestic quarter, in Area S, Jebel Khalid III, p. 89.
224 Jebel Khalid III, p. 92.
225 Bourdieu 1990.
226 Intermarriage between Seleucid citizens and native women occurred on even the highest social levels, as indicated by the marriage of Seleucus I with Apame, the daughter of a Sogdian lord. For Alexander the Great forcing marriages between his officers and local women see, Arr. Anab. 7.4.4-7.5.6.
Conclusion

An analysis of the pottery is particularly useful in situating Jebel Khalid within the Seleucid Kingdom and in offering insights into the preferences of the local population. In the initial phases of settlement Jebel Khalid tapped into the preexisting Mediterranean networks and took advantage of Seleucid trade down the Euphrates River. After this initial phase, there was a reorientation of trading networks. Pottery produced in the Mediterranean was replaced by similar forms made within the Seleucid Kingdom or in Parthian production centers. Local production was also developed to include fine wares in “international” Hellenistic forms. The fine ware shapes suggest a clear preference for Greek style dining at the site. Conversely, the cooking vessels reflect a longstanding Syrian tradition. These different ceramic traditions suggest that different aspects of identity at this site were compartmentalized in different tasks. The initial settlers of Jebel Khalid may have been exposed to these Syrian traditions through their servants or local spouses and continued to use Syrian cooking methods in houses eating on Greco-Macedonian tableware. Another place where local identities and Greco-Macedonian culture met was in the local production of amphorae. The stamped amphora handles demonstrate that some locals were integrated into the settlement’s economic and perhaps social hierarchy. Stamped amphora handles with Semitic names indicate that some individuals were able to gain prominence, either as officials, or as successful producers. While architecture and elite goods suggest Jebel Khalid had very little local influence, the pottery offers a contrast, or at least a more nuanced view of how Seleucid settlers interacted with the Syrian population.
Chapter 5: The Temple

Within the Seleucid system, temples were one of the key characteristics that elevated the status of a settlement from a colony to a polis.\(^{227}\) As one of the few examples of temple architecture in this region, the temple at Jebel Khalid is one of the elements that highlights the importance of the settlement within both local and royal networks. In addition to serving as a center of religious life, temples also served as a social meeting place for local worshippers, Seleucid colonists, and administrative officials.\(^{228}\) As has been recently demonstrated with the temple at Aï Khanoum in modern Afghanistan, temple sites are full of potential for understanding complex interactions between local and non-local populations that contribute to forming identities.\(^{229}\) In this chapter, I will describe the religious architecture found at Jebel Khalid and then compare it to both Classical and local architectural styles. Architectural elements, combined with artifacts from the temple, can suggest the various influences that affected construction. As a final consideration, I will examine how the residents in and around Jebel Khalid may have viewed the temple. An examination of the architecture is helpful for identifying the factors influencing construction, but a consideration of how the inhabitants of Jebel Khalid used the temple allows for a better understanding of how they perceived and portrayed themselves.

\(^{227}\) Kosmin 2014, pp. 199-203.
\(^{228}\) Said referencing Aï Khanoum, but the same elements are present at Jebel Khalid, see Boyce and Grenet 1991, p. 169.
\(^{229}\) Mairs 2013.
Temple Phases

Located in a ravine between the Governor’s Palace and residential slope of Jebel Khalid, this temple is not in the canonical prominent location, atop the acropolis (Area B, Fig. 3). Despite this seemingly inconspicuous location, the temple was still highly visible. It could clearly be seen from both the Main Gate and the quay and steps along the Euphrates.230 One suggestion for this atypical location is that when determining the location of a new temple, city planners situated it in a space already used in informal, local religious practices.231 The earliest materials from the temple precinct are fragments of wheelmade lamps, found below the terrace paving (dated to 340-275 B.C.) along with coins of Lysimachos (306-281 B.C.) and Seleucos I (306-281 B.C.). No earlier material is present, suggesting a construction date of the first quarter of the third century B.C.232 The temple was among the settlement’s early construction projects, measuring 17 m by 13 m, with a temenos wall enclosing the complex.233 The temple was built primarily out of ashlar limestone blocks upon on a large platform. To the east of the temple there was a circular altar and a series of short, columnar, fluted incense altars were located at regular intervals around the periphery of the temple. These essential elements of the sanctuary would remain consistent throughout the subsequent occupational phases of the site.

Although the temple remained undisturbed until the site was abandoned, new construction occurred within the sanctuary. In Phase B, the temenos was enlarged and new internal buildings were constructed in the corners of the complex (Fig. 19). Wright suggests that the northeast structure may have served as a domestic space, either for ritual meals or housing
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230 This adheres to Vitruvius’ later description of temple orientation and partly situation (4.5.2)  
231 Wright 2012, p. 82.  
232 Clarke et. al. 2005, p. 131. See Agora XXIX (p. 496) for lamp parallels.  
233 Wright (2012) uses the terms Phase One for the temple between 300 B.C. and 145 B.C., and Phase Two for 145-74 B.C. For purposes of consistency with the Housing Insula, in this paper Phase One will equal Phase A and Phase Two will equal Phase B. Synthesis of the temple can be found in Wright 2012, pp. 81-90.
priests and pilgrims.\textsuperscript{234} Another space, in the northwest corner, contained vessels for storing liquids. These expansions appear to have occurred in tandem with the increased activity seen throughout Jebel Khalid. Unlike other areas of the site, this central portion of the settlement seems to have seen sporadic use after the abandonment. Scattered finds include a mid-first century B.C. denarius of M. Aemilius Scaurus and Augustan Eastern Sigillata A ceramics.\textsuperscript{235} By examining both the construction of the temple and the objects associated with it, more can be said about the development of a Seleucid identity at Jebel Khalid.

\textit{A “Pseudo Doric” Façade}

Many of the temples seen in the Hellenistic world drew heavily on Classical Greek precedents, incorporating architectural features such as temple podiums, colonnades, and tripartite division of space into pronaos, naos, and opisthodomos.\textsuperscript{236} The exterior decorations, including Doric, Ionic, or Corinthian columns, and the decorative elaboration in the metopes, frieze, pediment, and/or acroteria were also important. The Successor Kingdoms contained some of the most famous Hellenistic temples, such as the Temple of Apollo at Didyma and the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus, both modeled after Classical forms. Examples of “Greek” temples were even found deep in the Seleucid East at sites such as Failaka and Ai Khanoum.\textsuperscript{237}

The architectural appearance, however, was not the only important part of Greco-Macedonian temples; religious behaviors played a role in temple construction. Seleucid forms of worship are subsequently reflected in the material record.\textsuperscript{238} Some notable examples seen in the Greco-Macedonian world are the importance of altars for religious ceremony, libations, votives,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Wright 2012, p. 83.
\item Clarke et.al. 2009/2010, p. 218.
\item Wilson Jones 2014.
\item Hannested and Potts 1990.
\item Blide et. al. 1990.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
and the cult statues. One major change was the development of the Seleucid royal cult.\(^{239}\) The interaction between Greco-Macedonian settlers and local populations resulted in variations on Classical temple architecture throughout the Hellenistic Kingdoms.

The temple at Jebel Khalid possessed some features that were based on Classical religious buildings. To begin with, the religious space of Jebel Khalid included the key components of a sanctuary: an altar, a temenos, a temple, and probably a cult statue.\(^{240}\) The building itself is an amphiprostyle, hexastyle temple (Fig. 20). The western and eastern façade feature Doric columns, made of limestone drums, that sit \textit{in antis} on a deep pronaos. The addition of a porch extends the temple, giving it elongated proportions. A few courses of ashlar blocks are preserved along a major weight bearing line and many of these blocks have a large triangular masons’ mark that may be a Greek delta.\(^{241}\) The use of Greek letters might be a sign that the chief architect, if not the workers, was of Greco-Macedonian descent.

While there are certain Classical elements in the temple, the peculiarities in the floor plan diverge from the traditional Doric style discussed above (Fig. 21). The temple shape is more squared, rather than rectangular. Adding to a “squat” appearance is the proportion of the columns, measuring somewhere between 1:5.2 and 1:6.2, instead of the contemporary standard, of 1:7.\(^{242}\) Although the columns are considered Doric, Clarke calls them “debased.” The columns only have a single molded neck ring.\(^{243}\) Full-fledged Doric columns did appear elsewhere at the site– the Governor’s Palace has a peristyle with the canonical Doric order.\(^{244}\) The proportions of

\(^{239}\) Wright 2012, pp. 50-51.
\(^{240}\) This paragraph uses information from, Clarke 2006/2007; Clarke et. al. 2003
\(^{241}\) While a Greek letter is the most likely, this is also possibly a Phoenician delta or a Semitic S.
\(^{242}\) Clarke et. al. 2003, p. 171.
\(^{243}\) Clarke et. al. 2000, p. 125.
\(^{244}\) \textit{Jebel Khalid I}, pp. 26-31.
the temple columns represent an intentional action or the result of a craftsman unfamiliar with the Classical tradition.

Within the temple, the subdivision of the western half of the naos by internal walls formed a tripartite adyton. This separation was not common in Greco-Macedonian temples. A triple adyton would have allowed for multiple cult statues, and thereby the worship of multiple deities, within the one temple.\textsuperscript{245} The combination of Hellenistic sculptures of Greek gods and statues of local deities may account for the separation of space in the temple. During the Hellenistic period, most temples were still constructed as in the Classical period, with a stylobate surrounding the temple; this is clearly not present at Jebel Khalid with its narrow staircase. As can be seen above, numerous elements of the temple construction diverged from Greco-Macedonian predecessors.

In addition to the construction of the temple, the lack of decorative elements in the entablature shows a divergence from temples seen in the Seleucid homeland and littoral. There is a missing course between the Doric columns and the metopes.\textsuperscript{246} Furthermore, there are no decorative regulae or mutules, and in the pediment there is no evidence of sculptural decoration. Some of these missing decorative features may have been painted on.\textsuperscript{247} The absence of many of the refinements developed during the Classical period has led Clarke to call the temple “squat” and “archaic.”\textsuperscript{248} Although this might appear to be a clumsy attempt at constructing a Classical temple, perhaps the architect drew inspiration from local traditions instead.

\textsuperscript{245} This is the suggested case for the Oxus temple with evidence of Greek and Bactrian deities worshiped there, see Shenkar 2011, p. 121-123.
\textsuperscript{246} Descriptions in this paragraph are based on, Wright 2012, p. 82.
\textsuperscript{247} McKenzie (2007, pp. 57-58) discusses the continued tradition of temple painting with the Hellenistic temple at Hermopolis Magna, Egypt.
\textsuperscript{248} Clarke et. al. 2000, p. 126.
A Mesopotamian Formula

Mesopotamia had a longstanding tradition of temple building, complete with its own characteristic features that may account for some of the “peculiarities” seen at Jebel Khalid. While this region is to the south of Jebel Khalid, chapter 4 demonstrated that significant quantities of goods arrived from Mesopotamia. Ideas and models for temple architecture could have also been carried upriver. Attempts have been made to trace Hellenistic temple forms back to northern Syrian temples of the third and second millennia B.C., but there are too many chronological gaps to successfully argue such a leap.²⁴⁹ A more secure Mesopotamian predecessor to Hellenistic forms can be seen downriver, dating to the late Neo-Babylonian period.

Temple A at Ashur, in modern Iraq, is one of the earliest temples of the “Mesopotamian” type.²⁵⁰ Temple A is a small, almost square temple (18 m by 19 m) built in the late Neo-Babylonian period (Fig. 22).²⁵¹ A wall evenly divides the naos into two spaces, forming a broad room, distinct from the Greek long naoi. In addition, Temple A has a niche in the rear wall for the cult statue and an articulated façade. These characteristics are seen in other Mesopotamian temples throughout the Parthian and into the Hellenistic periods. As seen in the description above, the temple at Jebel Khalid adopts the square temple form (for example, the temple measurement at Jebel Khalid, without the porch, is almost a perfect square, 13 m by 14 m) and a broad naos divided in two.

The tripartite adyton present at Jebel Khalid appears to have been a Seleucid addition to Mesopotamian temple-types. The closest parallel, both architecturally and temporally, is the

²⁴⁹ Litvinsky and Pichikyan 2000, pp. 296-299.
²⁵⁰ For the use of Mesopotamian versus Iranian type temples in the Hellenistic period see, Shenkar 2011, p. 131.
²⁵¹ Downey 1988, pp. 149-150
Temple of the Indented Niches at Aï Khanoum, another Seleucid foundation (Fig. 23). This temple was built out of mudbrick and had larger proportions than the Jebel Khalid temple (24.5 m by 23.8 m). While the construction techniques at Aï Khanoum reflect a Mesopotamian predecessor, the materials found in the temple suggest that a Seleucid colonist would have all the familiar objects for worship. Libation vessels, altars, terracottas, and other items of Greco-Macedonian style worship were all found within the temple precinct. The central cult statue was a well-crafted, over life-sized sculpture of Zeus. A different temple layout that also favors a tripartite division, but in this case of the entire structure, can be seen in the Late Achaemenid/Early Hellenistic Oxus Temple at Takht-i Sangin in Bactria. The Hellenistic Dioscuri Temple at Dilberjin has a similar division into three sections. Most closely resembling the temple layout seen at Jebel Khalid, are the contemporary Extramural Temple at Aï Khanoum and the Temple of Zeus-Megistos at Dura Europos. Unlike the temple of Jebel Khalid, these other structures were all made of mudbrick; this distinction is likely due to the availability of materials rather than stylistic choice. These temples, located throughout the Seleucid Kingdom, all share a common architectural ancestor.

The construction of a temple with clear Mesopotamian features was purposefully chosen, but to what end? Although it is archaeologically unattested, Wright’s suggestion of continuity of space might explain for some of the features of Jebel Khalid’s temple. Located near the river and in the ravine, a pre-existing sacred space would have been easily reached by those traveling on the river and over land. Perhaps this is an example of Hellenistic temple planning accounting

253 Mairs 2013, pp. 95-96.
255 Litvinsky and Pichikyan 2000
256 Kruglikova 1986.
258 Downey 1988, pp. 79-86.
259 Wright 2012, p. 82.
for and respecting a sacred area.\textsuperscript{260} The concept of respecting Syrian traditions can also been seen in the hybrid temple architecture. It is worth remembering that there is no formalized temple space from the immediate region, which was extensively excavated during the construction of the Tishrin Dam.\textsuperscript{261} Any attempt to use non-Greek elements, much less Greek, in temple construction, would have been viewed as “foreign” by the local, Syrian population. Based on the excavated materials, they would have had no experience dealing with formal temple architecture. Unlike other areas of the site where there is a clear preference for Greco-Macedonian construction, here we might see Seleucid or colonial attention to the needs of an ethnically mixed population. Instead of a stamp of Hellenistic imperialism, the temple architecture can be read as an attempt to promote a new, integrated, Seleucid identity at Jebel Khalid.\textsuperscript{262}

\textit{The Sculptures}

Marble and limestone fragments comprising six possible statues were found within the temple precinct.\textsuperscript{263} Dowel holes and socket joints held these small fragments together. All marble sculptural fragments come from limbs. There are three feet (all of different scales), an elbow, a partial forearm, a knee, and two preserved heads. Marble was an import, as Syria has no natural marble sources.\textsuperscript{264} The prevalence of marble for skin indicates that these are fragments of acrolithic sculptures.\textsuperscript{265} In contrast, multiple pieces of drapery were found among the limestone fragments. Limestone, an easily available material on the jebel, would have not carried the same

\textsuperscript{260} Malkin 1987, pp. 145-146.
\textsuperscript{261} Olmo Lette and Fenollós 1999
\textsuperscript{262} For discussions on imperial-local relationships see Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002.
\textsuperscript{263} Jebel Khalid V will include a more detailed description of the finds. This section will use information from Wright 2012, pp. 86-89.
\textsuperscript{264} Although both discussions focus on the Roman period, the need for imported marble was also present in the Hellenistic period. Foerster 2008; Fischer 2007.
\textsuperscript{265} This was common Hellenistic practice. Take for example the cult statue of Athena at Plataia (Paus. 9.4.1). Wright (2012) suggests that less extravagant examples used clay or plaster for the torso and actual cloth for the garments.
prestige that marble did and may have been used for less prestigious portions of the statue, for example the drapery. Nonetheless, full statues were made of limestone as evidenced by two limestone heads and the upper torso of an animal. It is possible that at least some of the over life-sized marble fragments belonged to a cult statue.

The marble head is one of the most discussed pieces of sculpture from the site. This head is smaller than life-sized and made from Parian marble (Fig. 24). The subject of this statue cannot be identified. The features are heavily stylized, with deep-set eyes under a heavy brow, a straight nose, and a beardless face. The rear of the head is carved flat, indicating that it was likely set up against a wall or in a shallow niche. The stylized features have led to comparisons to Nabataean eye-betyl. This argument suggests that the Jebel Khalid statue is the product of secondary reuse. Upon close comparison, the marble head from Jebel Khalid has much more detail than the Nabataean figures. This piece may be in a reuse context, but consideration of the primary trade networks of Jebel Khalid do not indicate a connection to Nabataea. The more “rustic” carving should not exclude this statue from use within the temple; examples of temples housing both Hellenistic and indigenous style sculptures are well known from Alexandria. If this practice occurred in the Ptolemaic capital, it is conceivable that it would occur within a temple that has already demonstrated a hybridization of Greco-Macedonian and Mesopotamian architecture.

The other sculpted human head is limestone, also smaller than life sized, and bearing a trimmed beard and an elaborate hairstyle (Fig. 25). The hair is held back by a tainia and hangs down behind the ears in either ringlets or a braid. While the tainia is reminiscent of a diadem,
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266 For Southern Italian and Sicilian examples of limestone drapery with marble skin see, Marconi 2007.  
267 Patrich 1990, pp. 82-86.  
268 Wright 2012, p. 87.  
269 McKenzie 2007, pp. 52-55.
there is no indication that the band was knotted at the back of the head. The other outstanding feature is the earring on the statue’s right ear, a particularly “eastern” trait (Xen. *Ana.* 3.1.31). Other Seleucid statues, such as one from the temple of Zeus-Megistos in Dura-Europos, also wear an earring. The best parallels for the limestone head comes from the temple of Herakles in Susania. Both sculptures wear a short beard, have a full head of hair, and wear the earring in their right ear. We should also remember that Herakles is one of the gods whose attributes were incorporated into the royal cult, opening the possibility of this being a royal portrait. Another possibility is that a lack of familiarity with Greek portraiture resulted in a sculpture that was attempting to look Greek, but instead, appears to combine stylistic features of east and west. While the identification of this limestone head is uncertain, each of the possibilities involves the incorporation of eastern adornments onto a figure of Hellenistic origin. Creating an iconography that incorporates eastern and western features this sculpture may have been done to appeal to a wider, mixed audience.

Stable Isotope Ratio Analysis of three marble samples (two feet and the marble head) confirm that they were sourced from the Lychnites mine on Paros. Parian marble was a precious commodity and would have been costly to import. The subject of these sculptures had to have been important enough to merit the financial investment. Susa is the only known Hellenistic settlement to the east of Jebel Khalid to have imported this material. To further highlight the effort involved in procuring the raw material, marble in the Classical and Hellenistic periods was often ordered directly with a specific project in mind. The presence of
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multiple marble sculptures means it is unlikely that all of them were secondary use. Perhaps in the earliest days of the settlement, when trade networks with the Mediterranean were more active (as established by the imported fine ware in chapter 4), at least some of the marble was purchased for the sculptures. Although limestone was readily available, inhabitants opted for the expensive and prestigious Parian marble. In doing so, they took part in a display of wealth that encompassed the broader Mediterranean.

Conclusions

The pseudo-Doric, Mesopotamian-plan temple at Jebel Khalid architecturally blends together two styles used by different cultural groups within the Seleucid Kingdom. The choice to do so in a religious structure, when most of the other buildings previously discussed show predominantly Greco-Macedonian traits, suggests that this location was one where the two groups would meet. It is likely that this was a general function for the temple, as seen elsewhere in the Seleucid world. Furthermore, the incorporation of Mesopotamian elements might indicate that fostering cooperation between the two previously separate groups was valued in this part of the outpost. The architect behind this structure would have required knowledge of both Mesopotamian and Greek architectural traditions. Based on the spread of Greco-Macedonian culture before and during the campaigns of Alexander the Great, a native architect would have had exposure to Greek forms. The “rustic” Doric order is more likely the result of unfamiliarity, rather than inaccuracy, perhaps suggesting the architect or commissioner did not have experience in Classical architecture.

276 Mairs 2013.
277 Westh-Hansen (2011) uses small finds from Babylonian territory to argue for hybridity before cultural contact.
Architectural forms are beneficial for identifying the preferences of those who commissioned the temple, but this does not necessarily include all those who used the temple. While we can art-historically assign individual elements the labels of “Greek” and “Mesopotamian” in an attempt to discern identity, did those using the temple do the same? The Greco-Macedonian inhabitants of Jebel Khalid had access to all of the elements required for various forms of Seleucid worship. For those familiar with Greek religious architecture, the façade of the temple may have appeared “rustic,” but it was still clearly a Doric temple. For this group of settlers, likely the same group using the Governor’s Palace and living in the Housing Insula, the squared shape of the temple and tripartite division of the naos would not dramatically change the way in which they worshipped. In contrast, no previous temples or permanent religious structures are attested in the region for the use of the local Syrian peoples. The very concept of a formalized structure would have been “foreign” to a native Syrian audience, even if it was built in a style that was also “foreign” to the Greco-Macedonian audience. Therefore, any attempt by the Syrian population to identify elements of the temple as their own would have fallen short. If this was an attempt to create a local, hybrid identity, I believe it would not have been effective. Although it may be a laudable attempt towards inclusivity, the presence of a temple would not resonate with one of the groups living in the area. The temple at Jebel Khalid displays a high level of hybridization in its architecture, however architectural hybridity should not have a direct role in how we interpret cultural hybridity or interaction.
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Chapter 6: Conclusions

When dealing with a topic as complex as identity, there is no simple answer. Although the presence and absence of stylistic features associated with one cultural group are one aspect of identity, the formation of identity should not be described in simple binaries. Seleucid Syria provides an interesting case study for these processes in a previously, sparsely populated region. The lack of a settled native population provided the Seleucid administration with relatively free reign over where and how to build new foundations. While the initial planning and construction of settlements such as Jebel Khalid demonstrates a great deal of Greco-Macedonian influence, as time progressed, local Syrian groups were able to integrate themselves into the cultural and economic fabric of Seleucid settlements. Although these local groups were always present, they were only able to assert their material identity in the site’s later phases. Situated roughly in the geographic center of the Seleucid kingdom and along one of the major trade routes, the Euphrates River, Jebel Khalid was exposed to a variety of different cultures throughout its occupation. The material culture at Jebel Khalid indicates how the expression of identity at the site changes and is subject to the political and economic situation of the Seleucid Kingdom.

Civic architecture during the first phase of occupation demonstrates the influence of the Seleucid administration, and their tendency towards Greco-Macedonian expressions of identity, in the foundation of the settlement. The fortification walls, the earliest dateable structure at Jebel Khalid, are comparable to those found elsewhere within the kingdom, indicating a common architectural principle behind their construction. The fortification walls also serve to project a Greco-Macedonian identity over the surrounding territory in an attempt to assert the new political power of the Seleucids. Associated with the fortifications, located within the secondary
curtain wall around the acropolis, is the Governor’s Palace. This structure predominantly resembles other Greek palaces. While the architecture can be seen as an expression of Greco-Macedonian identity, the adaptation and appropriation of some Persian practices served as a tool to legitimize Seleucid rule through the continuation of traditions (such as the adaptation of satrapies), as well as a reminder that the new power had the authority to use these old symbols of authority. The architectural investment behind these structures indicates the importance of the garrison to the Seleucid royal court and the connection with the Seleucid administration during the third century B.C.

Domestic space can often provide insight into a different side of daily life and in this case, provides a more nuanced picture of the identities present at Jebel Khalid. When examining the architectural style of the buildings, prostas style houses, they resemble homes found around the Mediterranean. Elaborations from the prosperous Phase B, such as the wall paintings and the oikos room layout, also draw on preferences more commonly seen in the Mediterranean. The comparison of these houses to others within the Seleucid kingdom and abroad indicates that these belong to non-elites who chose to decorate their houses with status symbols from the Hellenistic world. Only with the partitioning of space and major architectural changes seen in Phase B+ do we begin to see some changes in the expression of social identity in this settlement. As the Parthian Empire encroached upon Seleucid controlled territory, the role of this settlement as an outpost along trade routes may have changed. The economic contraction visible in the Housing Insula may be a reflection of the settlement’s new role within the kingdom.

Not all aspects of Jebel Khalid’s material culture are encapsulated by the architecture; ceramic styles and their origins are also important for the discussion of identity. Dining preferences are represented by the tablewares. The tableware predominantly takes the form of
Greco-Macedonian style vessels, what Jackson terms “universal Hellenistic” forms. During Phase A, fine wares were imported from Antioch, Athens, and other production sites in the Mediterranean. A shift towards more localized production of the same forms occurs in Phases B and B+, where Syrian manufactured pottery becomes the most common, followed by vessels made in the Parthian Empire. The Parthians were making Greco-Macedonian forms, likely as a response to market demand as well as exporting fine wares in their own eponymous ware, Parthian or Green-Glazed ware. Changes in the sources of pottery shows how increased contact with the Parthian Empire in Phase B+ added a new influence in expressions of identity at Jebel Khalid. Political events affected the socio-economic life of Jebel Khalid, as evidenced by the reorientation of trade networks away from the Mediterranean and towards the east during the second century B.C.

Locally produced ceramics provide additional evidence regarding the various groups who contributed to the material expression of identity at the site. The locally produced stamped amphorae (mainly produced during Phase B) provide the majority of our written evidence, however small, from Jebel Khalid. A combination of Semitic and Greek scripts are present on the handles of these amphorae. While most of the inscriptions do not form recognizable words, three Semitic names written in Greek script appear on several of the amphorae. Since stamps usually record names of either magistrates or fabricants, the presence of a Semitic name on a handle produced in a Seleucid garrison site indicates a degree of either cultural or ethnic intermingling. Either the local population became integrated into the socio-economic fabric of the settlement or the settlers adopted aspects of Syrian culture such as names.

One place in which local Syrian material culture is favored in Jebel Khalid is in the cooking wares. The cooking assemblage is limited in comparison to other Seleucid sites and
lacks the variety of roasting and grilling implements seen elsewhere. Instead, the cookwares are predominantly stew pots—the sort that had been common in Syria since the Iron Age. Analysis of trade networks indicates that the settlers of Jebel Khalid interacted with groups who used a variety of cookwares. It would appear that the absence of these other forms of cooking vessels was a deliberate choice, possibly indicating that cooking was done in a local style. Cooking methods might reflect the presence of local Syrians in the household, either through marriage or as a part of the household staff. In the later phases of occupation more aspects of Syrian culture are present at different social levels, indicating that the cultural identity of the inhabitants embraced more local qualities.

Expressions of identity are also evident on the temple. This was a public structure, but did not serve to emphasize Seleucid control over the surrounding region in the same manner as the fortification walls and Governor’s Palace. The temple at Jebel Khalid is perhaps the best example of hybridization. From the exterior, the façade resembles that of a Doric temple, even if the proportions are slightly off. The interior of the temple, opens into a broad room, typical of Mesopotamian architecture, and has a tripartite adyton, a division seen in many eastern Seleucid structures. Classical Greek and Mesopotamian styles were rarely combined before the Hellenistic period. This temple style appears to be a conscious combination of elements from these two architectural styles. To a viewer versed in both Greek and Mesopotamian architectural styles the amalgamation is clear, but the lack of temple architecture at any of the other regional sites indicates that the local population did not have experience with either type of architecture. While the intention of construction may have been to build a hybrid style temple, incorporating elements from both the material culture of the colonizer and colonized, this intention may not have been perceived by all groups. The temple shows an interest in incorporating, and possibly
appropriating elements of conquered groups into the new Seleucid construction to make a statement about the integrated population of the region or possibly settlement.

The nature of the settlement, as a Seleucid garrison, is most strongly felt in the earliest phase of settlement, where a strong Greco-Macedonian identity pervades throughout the architecture and other archaeological remains. In this initial phase, Jebel Khalid benefits from the broader trading networks throughout the Mediterranean, receiving goods, albeit not always directly, from major Hellenistic production centers. As Seleucid power declines and the kingdom contracts as a result of Parthian expansion, we see a reorientation of trade networks to the east. This change is reflected through the cultural identity of the site as more local Syrian and occasionally Parthian modes of expression appear in the material culture. Jebel Khalid provides an opportunity to examine what the rise and fall of the Seleucid Kingdom means in material terms. The initial dominance of Greco-Macedonian expressions of identity gave way to the gradual incorporation of other local groups and even the Parthian “enemy” in a complex process that is deeply tied to the changes in the political map and economic activities in the Hellenistic period.
Abbreviations and References


*Tel Anafa II, i* = S. Herbert, *Tel Anafa II, i. The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery*, Ann Arbor, MI, 1997.
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Figure 1. Map of the Seleucid Kingdom with Jebel Khalid marked

(Wright 2011, p.118, fig. 1).
Figure 2 Tishrin Dam area with archaeological sites marked.

(Eidem 1999, p. 24).
Figure 3. Site plan of Jebel Khalid.

(Wright 2011, p. 119, fig. 2).
Figure 4 Map of city walls and towers.

(Jebel Khalid I, p. 2).
Figure 5 Northwest Tower, plan.

*(Jebel Khalid I, p. 7).*
Figure 6 Main Gateway, plan (Jebel Khalid I, p. 18).
Figure 7 Governor’s Palace, plan (Jebel Khalid I, p. 26).
Figure 8 Seals with Seleucid themes from the Governor’s Palace

(*Jebel Khalid I*, pl. 35, figs. 1-3).
Figure 9 Redoubt Palace at Dura Europos, plan

(Nielsen 1994, p. 117).
Figure 10 Housing Insula of Jebel Khalid during Phase A, plan.

(Clarke et. al. 2005, p. 120, fig. 1).

Figure 11 Housing Insula of Jebel Khalid during Phase B, plan.

(Clarke et. al. 2005, p. 121, fig. 2).
Figure 12 Oikos (Room 19) of the House of the Painted Frieze, plan of all three phases
(Jackson 2009, p. 234, fig. 3).
Figure 13 Goats and Erotes from the *oikos* in the House of the Painted Frieze.

(Jackson 2009, p. 238, fig. 7).
Figure 14 Reconstruction of northern wall from the *oikos* of House of the Painted Frieze (Jackson 2009, p. 245, fig.16).
Figure 15 Green Glaze ware, also known and "Parthian ware."

*(Jebel Khalid III, pl. IV).*

Figure 16. Drawing of a local pseudo Coan handle (Clarke et. al. 2005, p. 183).
Figure 17 Semitic names stamped onto locally produced amphorae 
(*Jebel Khalid I*, pl. 44).
Figure 18 Food preparation bowl (top) and cooking pot (bottom), both in traditional Syrian forms.

( Jebel Khalid III, p. 502 ).
Figure 19 Temple complex during Phase B, plan (Wright 2012, p. 83, fig. 118).
Figure 20 Temple reconstruction (Clarke et. al. 2005, p. 130, fig. 8).
Figure 21 Temple reconstruction, plan (Clarke et. al. 2003, p. 174, fig. 2).
Figure 22 Temple A from Ashur, plan
(Shenkar 2011, p. 133, fig 15.1).
Figure 23 Temple with Indented Niches from Aï Khanoum, plan
(Mairs 2013, p. 117, fig. 4).
Figure 24 Jebel Khalid marble head (Wright 2012, p. 87, figs. 129-130).
Figure 25 Jebel Khalid limestone head (Wright 2012, p. 88, figs. 131-132).