

 A decorative flourish consisting of a stylized, symmetrical scrollwork design with a central circular motif and leaf-like extensions on either side.

INTRODUCTION

I

DURA-EUROPOS: THE SITE AND THE EXCAVATIONS



Modern exploration of the site of Dura-Europos began with the discovery by one Captain Murphy of the British army of the paintings in the Temple of Bel. On the basis of a short visit, James Henry Breasted of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago published these paintings.¹ Franz Cumont carried out excavations in 1922–23, with the aid of French soldiers. The major excavations were conducted by Yale University and the French Academy from 1928 to 1937.² Since 1986, a French-Syrian mission under the direction of Pierre Leriche has undertaken a program of excavation and conservation of the site.³

Dura-Europos, located in a commanding position on the cliffs above the Euphrates in modern Syria, was founded as a military settlement by a certain Nicanor, probably a general of Seleukos Nicator, and given the Macedonian name *Europos*.⁴ A few objects predating the Hellenistic period have been found on the site. The most significant of these is a Babylonian tablet used in the mudbrick of the Temple of Atargatis. Dated to the reign of Hammurabi, king of Khana, whose capital is at modern Ashara, approximately thirty kilometers north of Dura, it probably gives the name of the site in the second millennium: *Damara* (= *Dawara*),

1. J.H. Breasted, *Oriental Forerunners of Byzantine Painting*, Oriental Institute Publications 1 (Chicago, 1924).

2. The history of the discovery and early excavations of Dura-Europos has been told many times. See, e.g., M.I. Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and Its Art* (Oxford, 1938); A. Perkins, *The Art of Dura-Europos* (Oxford, 1973); C. Hopkins, *The Discovery of Dura-Europos* (New Haven, 1979). For Cumont's excavations, see F. Cumont, *Fouilles*.

3. Numerous articles on these excavations have appeared, especially in the series *Doura-Europos Études*, of which four volumes have appeared, from 1986 to 1997. For a summary of the results of the work of the Mission franco-syrienne de Doura-Europos from 1986 to 1994, see P. Leriche and A. Mahmoud, "Doura-Europos: Bilan des recherches récentes," *CRAI*, 1994, 395–420.

4. See F. Cumont, *Fouilles*, xv–xvii; A.R. Bellinger, "Seleucid Dura," *Berytus* 9 (1948–49), 51–67; C.B. Welles, "Population," 252–53. For the changing terminology (*Europos/Europaioi*, *Doura/Dourenoi*), see C.B. Welles, *Dura Final Report* 5.1, *The Parchments and Papyri*, 7.

meaning “fortress.”⁵ P. Leriche speculates that there was an outpost of the kingdom of Khana on the site of the Hellenistic citadel.⁶ No architectural remains predating the Hellenistic period have been found.

Probably around 113 B.C., Dura-Europos was taken by the Parthians.⁷ The conquest of the Roman emperor Trajan left little mark, save for the erection of a triumphal arch erected some two kilometers north of the city in A.D. 116.⁸ The expedition of Lucius Verus in A.D. 165 brought the Roman army into the city, and the garrison was greatly strengthened around A.D. 210.⁹ In anticipation of an attack by the Sasanians in the 250s A.D., the garrison built an embankment of mudbrick and earth against both the inner and outer faces of the western city wall. The embankment on the interior ultimately engulfed all of the buildings in the blocks immediately on the east side of the street that runs along the wall (Wall Street).¹⁰ The city was nonetheless taken by the Sasanians in approximately A.D. 256.¹¹

The form of the Seleucid colony has recently come under scrutiny. The Yale excavators assumed that the Hippodamian grid was laid out at the founding of the colony in the late fourth or early third century B.C., creating blocks of equal size; the agora, intended to occupy a set number of blocks; the Temple of Artemis and, later in the Seleucid period, the Temple of Zeus Olympios; and an administrative building (the Strategeion, also known as the Redoubt Palace).¹² Recent excavations by the Mission franco-syrienne

5. A few seals of Neo-Babylonian type have been published: see M.T. Nettleton, *Dura Report* 4, 258–59; C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 6, 181, 209, pl. 27.3, 4. To these may be added a terracotta head (no. 56; fig. 52). The tablet is published in F.J. Stephens, “A Cuneiform Tablet from Dura-Europos,” *Revue d’Assyriologie et d’archéologie orientale* 34 (1937): 183–90. Stephens suggests that the tablet may have been brought up to the plateau from the floodplain below the site or from Doueir, five kilometers to the north, but, as P. Leriche points out (see n. 6 in the present chapter), the tablet could easily have been fabricated from local clay. Some fragments of pottery found at Dura have been identified as Assyrian.

6. P. Leriche, “Pourquoi et comment Europos a été fondé à Doura?” 194–95, with nn. 11–13. To my mind, it remains debatable whether these few objects attest to a much earlier occupation of the site or were brought from elsewhere.

7. See A.R. Bellinger, “Seleucid Dura,” 64–67; C.B. Welles, “Population,” 252–53.

8. See C.B. Welles, “Population,” 253. For the inscription on the arch, see S. Gould, *Dura Report* 4, 56–65; R. Fink, *Dura Report* 6, 480–82.

9. See C.B. Welles, “Population,” 253–57.

10. The clearest description of this embankment is in C. Kraeling, *The Synagogue*, 4–5, pl. 1.2, plan 4. Hoards containing coins of Valerian and Gallienus minted in A.D. 256 provide a terminus ante quem for its construction (see A.R. Bellinger, *Dura Report* 7/8, 421–22, 425). Wall Street is a name given by the excavators to the street along the east side of the west wall of the city.

11. See A.R. Bellinger, *Dura Final Report* 6, 209–10. Doubts about the coin evidence as pinpointing the exact year of the fall of Dura are raised by Simon James in “Dura-Europos and the Chronology of Syria in the 250’s A.D.,” *Chiron* 15 (1985): 111–24.

12. See, e.g., F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 19–20; M.I. Rostovtzeff, *Dura-Europos and Its Art*, 11–13, 34–35; A. Perkins, *The Art of Dura-Europos*, 3–13.

de Doura-Europos challenge this assumption, suggesting instead that the initial settlement was a small military garrison on the citadel hill and adjacent areas, unlike the fully laid out colonies of Sicily and south Italy, and that the fortifications, the Hippodamian grid, and the associated buildings were constructed only in the second century B.C.¹³ The early date for the Temples of Artemis and Zeus Olympios is also suspect.¹⁴

After the Parthian conquest of about 113 B.C., the area of the agora ceased to exist as a public space, being covered with private houses whose plans are related to Babylonian, rather than Greek, house types.¹⁵ The street grid remained the organizing factor of the Parthian city, though some blocks became rather irregular.¹⁶ A major burst of temple building occurred between about 50 B.C. and A.D. 50; not only are the divinities mostly Semitic, but the temple plans are based on Babylonian forms.¹⁷

The next major transformation came with the arrival of the Roman army in the late second and early third centuries A.D. Much of the northern part of the city was occupied by army headquarters, barracks, and other buildings constructed by the army for its use, such as a small amphitheater and, almost certainly, baths. Welles and others assume that this entailed the eviction of the original inhabitants and that the military area, often called a camp, was separated from the southern part of the city by a mudbrick wall.¹⁸ It seems unlikely that the “camp” area was fully closed off, however, since soldiers were billeted in houses elsewhere

13. See P. Leriche, “*Chreophylakeion*,” 158–69; P. Leriche, “Pourquoi et comment Europos a été fondé à Doura?” 191–210. For the suggested limits of the original military colony, see the plan in P. Leriche, “Materiaux pour une réflexion renouvelée sur les sanctuaires de Doura-Europos,” *Topoi*, 1997, 890–91, fig. 1. The work of the Mission franco-syrienne de Doura-Europos from 1986 to 1994 is summarized in P. Leriche and A. Mahmoud, “Doura-Europos: Bilan des recherches récentes,” *CRAI*, 1994, 395–420.

14. This observation is based on work in the Temple of Zeus Megistos from 1992 to 1998. For reports on the 1992 excavations, see S.B. Downey, “New Soundings in the Temple of Zeus Megistos at Dura-Europos,” *Mesopotamia* 28 (1993): 169–93; “Excavations in the Temple of Zeus Megistos at Dura-Europos, 1992,” in *DEE*, vol. 4 (Beirut, 1997), 107–16. The results of the 1994 season are reported in S.B. Downey, “Excavations in the Temple of Zeus Megistos at Dura-Europos, 1994,” *Mesopotamia* 30 (1995): 241–50. For a brief summary of the results of the 1996 season, see S.B. Downey, “Excavations in the Temple of Zeus Megistos at Dura-Europos, 1996,” *AJA* 101 (1997): 340. The implications of the first three seasons of work are analyzed in P. Leriche, “Materiaux pour une réflexion renouvelée,” 980–92. Cleaning of one of the walls used by F.E. Brown in his reconstruction of the earliest phase of the Temple of Artemis (see *Dura Report* 6, 409–11) shows that its construction differs drastically from that of structures of the Seleucid period, such as the Strategeion. See also S.B. Downey, “The Transformation of Seleucid Dura-Europos” in *Romanization and the City*, ed. E. Fentress, *JRA* Suppl. 38 (Portsmouth, RI, 2000), 154–72 on this and other information in this section.

15. For this transformation, see F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 28–68.

16. See P. Leriche, “*Chreophylakeion*,” 169.

17. See S.B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*, 88–129, with references to earlier literature.

18. C.B. Welles, “Population,” 258–59, with references.

in the city and since there is abundant evidence for an army presence outside the camp area.¹⁹

Evidence for the organization of civic life in Seleucid Dura is sparse. By 184 of the Seleucid era, or 129/8 B.C., part of the agora (Block G 3) housed a *chreophylakeion* (archives building); it is a matter of dispute whether civic records were originally housed elsewhere or whether the division of the city into lots did not occur until the third quarter of the second century B.C.²⁰ It appears that civic life was organized in the Greek manner and that the Parthians did not seriously disturb this arrangement, though it is notable that a *boule* (assembly) is not recorded until after the Roman occupation.²¹

Evidence from inscriptions, graffiti, parchments, and papyri suggests that the Greco-Macedonian aristocracy maintained itself during the period of Parthian control and even after the conquest of Verus. The chief magistrate of the city continued to be called *strategos kai epistates*, as in the Seleucid period, and the office was held by men from Macedonian families.²² Also, the majority of the women whose names are inscribed on the seats in the *salles aux gradins* (small sacred theaters) of the Temples of Artemis, Atargatis, and Azzanathkona-Artemis bear Greek names, as do their husbands and fathers, though a few Semitic names appear even there.²³ Citizens of Dura were called *Europaioi* at least until A.D. 180, and those so designated bore Greco-Macedonian names. Welles notes that in a papyrus of about A.D. 180, persons with Semitic names are characterized as *Europaioi* for the first time in our record. He takes this as a sign that citizenship was

19. See C.B. Welles, "Population," 259–60, with references. N. Pollard ("The Roman Army as 'Total Institution' in the Near East? Dura-Europos as a Case Study," in *The Roman Army in the East*, ed. D. Kennedy, *JRA* Suppl. 18 [Ann Arbor, 1996], 211–17) has argued that there was very little interaction between the army and the civilian population at Dura, but it seems to me that he puts too much weight on negative evidence.

20. F.E. Brown (*Dura Report* 9.1, 169–76) argues that the records must have been stored elsewhere before 129/8 B.C. On the contrary, P. Leriche ("*Chreophylakeion*," 166–68) suggests that the *chreophylakeion* was created only in 129/8 B.C.

21. See C.B. Welles, "Population," 252–53; C.B. Welles, *Dura Final Report* 5.1, 7. Recent work by the Mission franco-syrienne de Doura-Europos in the small theater in the precinct of Artemis has demonstrated that that structure was the bouleuterion of the city. P. Leriche and E. El 'Ajjî, "Une nouvelle inscription dans la salle à gradins du temple d'Artémis à Doura-Europos," *CRAI*, 1999, 1309–46.

22. See C.B. Welles, "Population," 262–64; J. Johnson, *Dura Studies* (Philadelphia, 1932), 17–34.

23. See C.B. Welles, "Population," 262–64. The inscriptions from the *salles aux gradins* of the Temples of Artemis and Atargatis are published in F. Cumont, *Fouilles*, 427–43, nos. 85–121. For the inscriptions of the *salle aux gradins* of the Temple of Azzanathkona, see P. Arnaud, "Les salles W9 et W10 du temple d'Azzanathkona à Doura-Europos: Développement historique et topographie familiale d'une 'salle aux gradins,'" in *DEE*, vol. 4 (Beirut, 1997), 117–43. See also S.B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*, 90–91, 99, 104–5.

extended to other elements of the population.²⁴ Later, however, in the third century, the citizens were generally called *Dourenoi*, and persons with Semitic and Iranian names serve as *bouleutai*. Welles argues that after about A.D. 200, the old Greco-Macedonian aristocracy essentially disappeared.²⁵

Unfortunately, this history does not necessarily clarify the uses of the terracotta figurines and plaques of Dura-Europos, for reasons detailed in the remaining chapters of this introduction. It is highly probable that the great majority of the terracottas belong to the second and third centuries A.D., that is, to the latter part of the city's life. The few exceptions are noted in chapter 3 of this introduction, on the finding places of the terracottas. Connecting the terracottas with even general groups of the population, let alone with specific users, is also extremely difficult. Nonetheless, it is possible to make some suggestions; for these, see chapter 3 of this introduction.

24. C.B. Welles, "Population," 254–55; C.B. Welles, *Dura Final Report* 5.1, 6–7.

25. C.B. Welles, "Population," 269–73; C.B. Welles, *Dura Final Report* 5.1, 5, 7–10.

THE PLACE OF TERRACOTTAS
IN THE CULTURE OF DURA-EUROPOS 

Determining the meaning and uses of terracotta figurines in the ancient world is generally difficult. It is often hard, for example, to distinguish between divine and mortal images, to determine whether figurines functioned in a religious context, as talismans, or as toys, to name only a few possibilities.¹ Contexts are often unclear, which hinders interpretation.² Recent scholarship has addressed the issue of interpretation of figurines from a variety of perspectives, often anthropological. Much of the discussion has arisen in response to interpretations of prehistoric figurines as representations of a mother goddess, interpretations that have been used to draw large conclusions about social structure.³ Several essays in the volume edited by Goodison and Morris cited in note 3 address the problematic relation between figurines and goddesses known in literary and epigraphical texts. It is not clear to what degree the methodology used to interpret early figurines is applicable to Greco-Parthian Dura-Europos.

Approximately three hundred figurines and small plaques in terracotta are recorded from the excavations of Dura-Europos. The presence of so many terracottas may suggest that Dura-Europos was culturally closer to

This chapter of the introduction is an attempt at a general synthesis of the types and possible meanings of terracotta figurines and plaques in the culture of Dura. More detail on individual categories is provided in the introductions to relevant sections of the catalogue.

1. There are many discussions of the possible meanings of figurines, both generally and in given contexts. For a brief discussion, centered on prehistoric figurines, see R. Tringham and M. Conkey, "Rethinking Figurines: A Critical View from Archaeology of Gimbutas, the 'Goddess,' and Popular Culture," in L. Goodison and C. Morris, *Ancient Goddesses*, 40–43.

2. See J. Marcus, "The Importance of Context in Interpreting Figurines," *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 6, no. 2 (1996): 285–91. Marcus's essay makes excellent use of archaeological context and ethnographic reports, but so much detailed information is rarely available, certainly not in the case of Dura.

3. See the essays by various authors in "Viewpoint: Can We Interpret Figurines?" *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 6, no. 2 (1996): 281–307; see also the essays in L. Goodison and C. Morris, *Ancient Goddesses*.

Mesopotamia than to the Greco-Roman cities of Syria in this aspect, as in others.⁴ No terracottas have been found at Apamea, for example, according to Jean Balty.⁵ Palmyra shares with Dura a category of terracotta plaques, discussed later in this chapter, but figurines are not reported from that site, and none are on display in the museum. The apparent paucity of figurines in other Greco-Roman sites of Syria may be due to lack of reporting. Very few terracottas from Dura-Europos—only those judged iconographically interesting—were published in *The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Preliminary Reports* and by M.I. Rostovtzeff in “Dura and the Problem of Parthian Art.”⁶ These few examples gave no indication of the number and variety of terracottas from Dura. Lack of reporting is almost certainly responsible, in part, for the apparent infrequency of terracottas in Syria. Nonetheless, terracottas seem to have played a more prominent role in Greco-Roman Asia Minor⁷ and in Seleucid and Parthian Mesopotamia than in Syria. However, the terracotta production of Dura-Europos differs significantly from that of a number of sites in Mesopotamia, including old cities that survived into the period of Greek and Parthian control, such as Uruk (modern Warka), Assur, and Babylon, and new colonies, such as Seleucia on the Tigris. Signs of this difference are the prominence at Dura of terracotta plaques, apparently of religious character, and the paucity or absence of types of figurines that are prominent in Mesopotamian sites of the Greco-Parthian period. This subject will be discussed in more detail shortly.

The majority of the figurines from Dura-Europos are handmade, whereas moldmade figurines generally predominate at other sites. The handmade terracottas of Dura appear to have been produced locally and to fall within a rather restricted range of types. Horses, either with or

4. E.g., the forms of religious architecture are related to Mesopotamia rather than to Greco-Parthian Syria: see S.B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*.

5. Personal communication.

6. Rostovtzeff discusses terracotta figurines and plaques from Babylonia and Syria in “Parthian Art,” 178–89. Terracottas from Dura are illustrated in his figs. 6, 21, and 27–28. Previous publications of Dura terracottas are noted in the catalogue entries in the present book.

7. In Asia Minor, Myrina was a major center of terracotta production, and terracottas are also known from such sites as Troy, Pergamon, and Tarsus. For Myrina, see D. Burr, *Terracottas from Myrina in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* (Vienna, 1934); S. Mollard-Besques, *Musée national du Louvre, Département des antiquités grecques et romaines, Catalogue raisonné des figurines et reliefs en terre-cuite grecs, étrusques, et romains*, vol. 2, *Myrina* (Paris, 1963). For Troy, see D.B. Thompson, *Troy: The Terracotta Figurines of the Hellenistic Period*, Supplementary Monograph 3 (Princeton, 1963); for Pergamon, E. Töpperwein, *Terrakotten von Pergamon*, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Pergamensische Forschungen 3 (Berlin, 1976); for Tarsus, H. Goldman, ed., *Excavations at Gözlu Kule, Tarsus*, vol. 1, *The Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Princeton, 1950). In “Mother, Are You There?” *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 6, no. 2 (1996): 304, P. Ucko remarks on the lack of speculation about why some societies manufactured figurines and others did not.

without a rider, are by far the most common subject among the hand-made figurines; camels are relatively rare, as at other Near Eastern sites, and there is a scattering of other animals, such as cows. Human figures of both sexes, generally quite simply rendered, are frequent.

The few moldmade figurines were probably imported. Most are distinguished from the bulk of the coroplastic production of Dura-Europos by technique, style, and type of clay.⁸ Most are made in double molds, a technique developed in Greece that does not appear in the Near East before the Greek conquest.⁹ One example is a figurine of a youthful Hermes (no. 57; fig. 53) found in a hypogeum in the Necropolis.¹⁰ It is made in a double mold, of finely levigated red clay, unlike the beige clay used for the majority of the terracotta sculpture of Dura. The figurine also stands out in style and in its generally Greco-Roman iconography, as do a small fragment of a Negroid (?) head (no. 82; fig. 75) and another that might represent Attis (no. 81; fig. 74), both of which can plausibly be associated with the Roman army. Two female heads of vaguely Greco-Roman type (nos. 51, 54; figs. 47, 50) and a torso of a woman dressed in a chiton and himation (no. 45; fig. 43) are made in double molds, but in clay like that used for most of the handmade terracottas, as are two apparently identical moldmade terracotta busts of a young man, set on a stand and with two holes for suspension on the top of the head, found in adjoining shops in the agora-bazaar area (nos. 75–76; figs. 69–70). As discussed in the catalogue, they probably imitate a similar type of bust in bronze, hollow and intended to serve as vessels, which is fairly widely distributed in the Roman provinces.¹¹ A specimen in bronze belonging to a Negroid type was found at Dura,¹² perhaps suggesting that the terracotta busts were locally made imitations. Dura also produced two examples of

8. A number of scholars at a conference on Arabia Antiqua held in Rome in 1991 argued against the idea that type of clay is an indication that a piece was imported. Several scholars (e.g., Evelyn Klengel-Brandt, Kerttu Karvonen-Kannas, and Antonio Invernizzi) stated that the coroplastic production of sites with which they are familiar exhibits considerable variety of clay color, probably due to such factors as the exact pit from which the clay was taken and the firing. However, several of the Dura figurines that are Greco-Roman in style utilize clay that is strikingly different from that of the bulk of the figurines from the site. S.L. Dyson, in his publication of the commonware and brittle ware from Dura (*The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report 4.1.3, The Commonware Pottery: The Brittle Ware* [New Haven, 1968], 2, 58–59), cites difference in fabric as one reason for thinking that the brittle ware was imported rather than locally made. On naturally differing colors of clay at Palmyra, see Du Mesnil, *Tessères*, 20.

9. See M.-T. Barrelet, *Figurines et reliefs en terre cuite de la Mésopotamie antique*, BAHBeyrouth 85 (Paris, 1968), 130.

10. N.P. Toll, *Dura Report* 9.2, 56, 110–11, pl. 46.

11. See F.F. Jones, "A Bronze Head-Vase," *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University* 46 (1987): 16–23.

12. P.V.C. Baur, *Dura Report* 4, 232–35, pl. 11.5.

the so-called Parthian rider (nos. 88–89; figs. 81–82), which belong to a category well represented in Near Eastern sites after the Greek conquest. It is notable, however, that exact duplicates rarely occur. One of the Dura examples (no. 88; fig. 81) was found in a hypogaeum in the Necropolis. Four moldmade figurines of women—three musicians and one woman with children (nos. 39–41, 43; figs. 37–39, 41)—find parallels at Mesopotamian sites. Musicians figure prominently among the Seleucid-Parthian terracottas of Mesopotamia and constitute the largest group of that period in Babylon,¹³ yet at Dura, they are few in number and probably imported, except for one homemade figurine of a woman holding a tympanon that was probably inspired by the moldmade musicians (no. 42; fig. 40). The prominence of musicians among the terracottas of Mesopotamia probably has to do with the importance of music in ritual, while there is little evidence that music played an important role in cult at Dura.¹⁴

Nude or very scantily clad female figures, often with a hand or hands under their breasts or with the arms down by the sides, constitute a prominent part of the repertory of terracotta figurines in most Mesopotamian sites, both before and after the Greek conquest. Even in Seleucia, figurines of nude females that are similar in iconography and often in style to types that predate the Greek conquest occur.¹⁵ In contrast, nude females are poorly represented among the terracottas of Dura. There is only one example of a nude female supporting a breast (no. 48), though two female figurines that either certainly or probably were clothed adopt this posture (nos. 44, 50; figs. 42, 46). In addition, some types prominent in Greco-Parthian Mesopotamia, such as a nude or half-draped woman reclining on a kline,¹⁶ are missing altogether. The paucity at Dura of terracotta figurines of nude females is particularly striking in view of the relatively large number of representations of Aphrodite or of types based on Aphrodite among the stone and plaster sculptures of the site, as well as in a few paintings. I have argued elsewhere that the number of representations of

13. See E. Klengel-Brandt, "Die hellenistische Kultur in Babylon: Das Zeugnis der Terrakotten," *Arabia Antiqua*, 190; see also the introduction to "Musicians" in the section "Female Figurines" in the catalogue in the present book.

14. See the introduction to "Musicians" in the catalogue.

15. See the introduction to "Nude or Scantily Clad Females" in the section "Female Figurines" in the catalogue. For nude female figures from Babylon, see E. Klengel-Brandt, *Arabia Antiqua*, 185–90, figs. 1–2, 4–5.

16. For examples of this type from Seleucia, see W. Van Ingen, *Figurines from Seleucia*, 181–83, nos. 613–26, pl. 43.309–10 (nude); 184–88, nos. 627–53, pl. 43.311–14; 44.315–16 (half-draped). For Uruk, see C. Ziegler, *Terrakotten von Warka*, 108–10, nos. 726–31, 733–37, figs. 399–404, 406–8. For Babylon, see E. Klengel-Brandt, *Arabia Antiqua*, 186–87, figs. 4–5; K. Karvonen-Kannas, *Terracotta Figurines from Babylon*, 135–36, nos. 142–45. See also the introduction to "Nude and Scantily Clad Females" in the catalogue in the present book.

Aphrodite in sculpture and painting suggests the continuing importance of the old Mesopotamian type of the nude female,¹⁷ but the terracottas do not support that thesis. It is also notable that Heracles is prominent in the stone and plaster sculpture of the site, perhaps because he continues the idea of the Mesopotamian nude hero,¹⁸ but is not represented at all among the terracottas. There are also few figurines that unambiguously depict nude males, a point that will be addressed shortly. In contrast, terracottas of Heracles and Aphrodite are known at Seleucia and Babylon.¹⁹ The lack of Aphrodite and Heracles among the coroplastic production at Dura would suggest that terracottas played a different role from that played by painting and sculpture and perhaps that terracottas were used largely by the less Hellenized segments of the population. This idea does not, however, explain the relative paucity of nude females supporting their breasts (no. 48) or with their arms down by their sides (nos. 17, 47; fig. 16); one might have expected that these old Near Eastern types would continue among the terracottas. Again, the contrast to Seleucia is striking. Invernizzi argues that the nude female figurines at Seleucia continue types associated in pre-Greek Mesopotamia with popular religion and thus were probably made to be sold to citizens who followed traditional Babylonian religion. He thinks that this is true even when Greek stylistic elements are present.²⁰

The majority of the figurines that are presumably male can plausibly be interpreted as riders (nos. 60–74; figs. 56–68). (The basis for the identification is discussed under “Riders (?)” in the catalogue section “Male Figurines.”) In many cases, where there is no clear indication of sex, the identification as male is based largely on the absence of breasts and/or the presence of attributes, such as weapons, that are generally carried by men.²¹ It is not always clear whether these figures are meant to

17. S.B. Downey, *Stone and Plaster Sculpture*, 153–69.

18. See S.B. Downey, *Heracles Sculpture*.

19. For Aphrodite, see K. Karvonen-Kannas, *Terracotta Figurines from Babylon*, 64–67, 142–43, nos. 187–95, pls. 33–35; Karvonen-Kannas emphasizes the relative rarity of Aphrodite among the coroplastic production of Babylon. For Heracles, see E. Klengel-Brandt, *Arabia Antiqua*, 192, figs. 9, 10; K. Karvonen-Kannas, *Terracotta Figurines from Babylon*, 75–77, 151–52, nos. 260–67, pls. 46, 88.

20. A. Invernizzi, “Osservazioni in margine al problema della religione della Mesopotamia ellenizzata,” in *Electrum*, vol. 2, *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean World: Proceedings of an International Conference in Honor of Professor Josef Wolski Held at the Jagiellonian University, Cracow, in September 1996*, ed. E. Dabrowa (Kraków, 1998), 89–91.

21. A list of these figures, with brief characterizations, follows.

No. 58. Figure with a flat body. No indication of genitals; incised lines on body (perhaps indicating a garment or shield?)

No. 59. Torso only. Flat chest; deep vertical slash on chest.

No. 60. Rider. Flat body covered with punched holes; no genitals.

be clothed, and indications of genitals would not necessarily be expected on clothed men.

Recent scholarship on prehistoric figurines has noted the frequency of sexually ambiguous figurines that occur alongside clearly gendered ones.²² This discussion occurs primarily in the charged context of “goddess literature,”²³ a context that is not strictly relevant to the Greco-Parthian period. In any case, the implications of the prehistoric sexually ambiguous figurines are not clear. Nor are they clear for Dura; the lack of obvious identifiers is probably merely a reflection of the simple modeling that characterizes many of the figures.

Moldmade plaques and medallions, rare to nonexistent in the coroplastic production of Near Eastern sites in the Greco-Roman period, constitute an important group among the terracottas of Dura (nos. 1–40). Since many of the same types are found at Palmyra, these plaques probably represent local production and provide evidence of shared culture in the two cities.²⁴ The majority of the images are clearly divine. Seyrig identifies the examples from Palmyra as *ex-votos*,²⁵ but the Dura examples were not found in temples.

One of the more common types, represented at Dura in six examples and known at Palmyra, shows a female figure in a polos headdress and cut short at the thighs (nos. 1–6; figs. 1–5), which might suggest that it was intended to be inserted into an installation, though none of the surviving examples shows traces of any material on the back. Only one of these figures was found in a meaningful context, in Tower 20 of the city wall, a

No. 61. Rider. Flat body marked with diagonal slashes (indicating a garment?); no genitals.

No. 62. Rider. Flat body marked with diagonal slashes (indicating a garment?); no genitals; holds two swords.

No. 63. Rider. Seems to be nude; flat body; no sex organs shown.

No. 64. Rider. Has beard but prominent breasts; seems to be nude. A protrusion on the stomach and one just below are not in the right position for genitals.

No. 74. Flat body. Seems to be nude; no indication of genitals.

Only the torso and (usually) the head of the other probable riders (nos. 67–73) are preserved.

22. See, e.g., R. Tringham and M. Conkey, “Rethinking Figurines: A Critical View from Archaeology of Gimbutas, the ‘Goddess,’ and Popular Culture,” and L. Meskell, “Twin Peaks,” in L. Goodwin and C. Morris, *Ancient Goddesses*, 26–27, 51–52; N. Hamilton, “The Personal Is Political,” in “Viewpoint: Can We Interpret Figurines?” *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 6, no. 2 (1996): 284–85; P. Ucko, “Mother, Are You There?,” *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 6, no. 2 (1996): 300–304.

23. See, e.g., L. Goodwin and C. Morris, *Ancient Goddesses*; “Viewpoint: Can We Interpret Figurines?”

24. See H. Seyrig, “Plaquettes votives”; S.B. Downey, “Terracotta Plaques as Evidence for Connections between Palmyra and Dura-Europos,” in *Palmyra and the Silk Road*, 253–60. For a more detailed analysis of these plaques, see the introduction to “Moldmade Plaques and Medallions” in the catalogue in the present book.

25. H. Seyrig, “Plaquettes votives,” 301–2.

location that might suggest an apotropaic function. Similarly clad goddesses are depicted on other plaques (nos. 7, 9–10; figs. 6, 8–9). A particularly intriguing issue is raised by no. 7. This plaque, with an image of a goddess in an aedicula, was made in a mold cut down from one that included also a male worshiper clad in Parthian dress (fig. III).²⁶ Eight plaques and one mold with only the male figure have also been found at Dura (nos. 23–31; figs. 22–29), and three others show similar figures (nos. 32–34; figs. 30–32). At Palmyra also both components of the original plaque occur independently. It is not clear whether the male on the plaques where he appears alone is intended as a worshiper or a divinity; the latter identification is perhaps more likely.²⁷

Some figures on plaques and medallions from Dura-Europos may be versions of cult images in the city; this is almost certainly true of the mold for a figure of Atargatis (no. 18; fig. 17), and it can be argued also for the three identical medallions with Artemis (nos. 11–13; figs. 10–12), the three with a bust of Hadad (nos. 20–21; figs. 19–20), and the mold for a medallion with a camel-riding figure, probably the god Arsu (no. 38; fig. 36). These medallions might have been made to be sold to the faithful, perhaps for use in household worship, like small reproductions of images of the Virgin in Catholic households. They might even have been set into the walls of houses or other places in need of protection. Of the group of medallions discussed here, only no. 13 was found in a house, and no. 37 came from Block E 8, a block of houses turned into barracks. A few other plaques and medallions that may or may not depict divinities were found in houses (nos. 15 [Palace of the Dux Ripae], 26, 34–35; figs. 14, 25, 32–33). Thus, the evidence is not strong.

There is considerable evidence for domestic shrines at Dura. Many houses have altars, usually in the court,²⁸ and reliefs of divinities were found in houses.²⁹ Wall shrines, generally consisting of a plaque of plaster

26. The two figures appear together on a mold purchased by Friedrich Sarre in Syria (F. Sarre, *Die Kunst des alten Persien* [Berlin, 1923], pl. 65). The existence of positives made from this mold at both Dura and Palmyra suggests that the mold might have come from one of the two sites. For more detail on this subject, see the introduction to “Moldmade Plaques and Medallions” in the catalogue in the present book.

27. See the discussion in the introduction to “Moldmade Plaques and Medallions” in the catalogue.

28. See, e.g., C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 53–55 (G 1, House B). Fragmentary images of Heracles and Aphrodite were found in the court discussed by Hopkins, who tentatively identified the fragmentary relief of Aphrodite as a man beside an altar: see *ibid.*, pl. 19.1, 2; S.B. Downey, *Heracles Sculpture*, 57; F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 161–62, fig. 86 (G 3 J 1). A small figure based on the Aphrodite of Cnidus was also found in the court; F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 162, pl. 17.1.

29. In addition to the images already cited, see, e.g., F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 87, 163, pl. 17.1 (G 3 H 10 [wall of stair unit]); 98 (G 3 G 1 [court]); 109, 164, pl. 18.2 (G 7 H 7 [storeroom (?)]); 115, 165–6, pl. 28.3 (G 3 F 4 [chamber]); 141 (G 1 A 14 [stable]).

covered with haphazardly arranged dots and frequently repainted, are also common; these are usually located in the divan.³⁰ It is possible that plaques and other terracotta figurines were sometimes used in the household cult, but none were found in a context that makes this possibility certain.

Figurines of horses and riders play a prominent role in the coroplastic production of Dura. Groups of horses and riders made in one piece are frequent (nos. 91–98; figs. 84–95), and a number of male figures, either whole or fragmentary, may plausibly be interpreted either as broken off from a horse or as meant to be set on one (nos. 68–74; figs. 62–68).³¹ The interpretation of these groups is difficult. This is true also of figurines of horses and horse-and-rider groups from other Near Eastern sites, both predating and postdating the Greek conquest. Scholarly opinions differ, ranging from the idea that most are religious or at least funerary to the suggestion that they were used as toys.³²

Gods on horseback, often appearing together with a camel-riding god, are frequent in Palmyra and its hinterland (the Palmyrène),³³ and a god on horseback also is known at Dura.³⁴ It is not at all clear, however, that the Dura figurines represent divinities. None have any obvious attributes of divinity. However, except for the occasional presence of rays, this is also true of the rider gods depicted in sculpture, whose identification is usually based on inscriptions or the presence in a relief of an altar and/or worshippers. The finding places of the horse-and-rider groups and the presumed riders do not show a clear pattern, certainly not one suggestive of a religious function.³⁵ The idea that at least some of the equine figurines, whether ridden or not, were toys seems plausible.

30. See F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 86, 112, 121–22, 162–63, fig. 8 (G 3 J 6, G 5 E 3, G 5 B 2, E 3 [divans]; A 5 E 1 [court]). In House C in Block G 5, a relief of Aphrodite was probably set into the wall of the divan (room 2) and surrounded by plaster painted with a trellised arbor (see *ibid.*, 117, 166–67, pl. 19). For other plaster wall shrines, see M. Pillet, *Dura Report* 4, 35–36 (C 7 F 1 [court of the House of the Frescoes]); C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 36 (C 7 A 2 [three rooms]); 41 (C 7 E 2 [room off court]); M. Crosby, *Dura Report* 6, 118 (C 3 D 8 [basement room]).

31. None of the probable rider figures can be set onto the existing horses, nor do any of the horses show signs of having a rider added, such as differently baked clay where a rider might have been placed.

32. This subject is treated in more detail in the introduction to “Horse-and-Rider Groups” in the animals section of the catalogue, where references will be found. For a summary of the views of various scholars on the meaning of the horse-and-rider groups from Babylon, see K. Karvonen-Kannas, *Terracotta Figurines from Babylon*, 93, with references.

33. See H. Seyrig and J. Starcky, “Gennéas,” *Syria* 26 (1949): 230–57; H. Seyrig, “Les dieux armés et les Arabes en Syrie,” *Syria* 47 (1970): 77–112.

34. For rider gods at Dura, see S.B. Downey, *Stone and Plaster Sculpture*, 57–60, no. 45; 199–201.

35. For the finding places, see the introduction to “Handmade Horses, Horse-and-Rider Groups, Other Animals, and Birds” in the animals section of the catalogue.

Three fragmentary figures that probably depicted riders have unusual, almost unhuman heads, with a beaklike nose (nos. 67–68, 70; figs. 61, 62, 64); the form suggests a special status, since they stand out from other, merely clumsy figures. They might represent some sort of demonic or talismanic figure. It seems possible that the birdlike heads of the riders were to some degree influenced by the style of Mesopotamian female figurines of the third millennium B.C.³⁶ One head of this type, probably broken off of an early terracotta, was found at Dura (no. 56; fig. 52), which might suggest that a local model was available. Some of these riders also wear a large necklace, rather like a torque, with pellets of clay probably representing jewels. Necklaces of this form are worn by some horses as well (nos. 93–95, 112; figs. 88–89, 110–11; G 1505, G 1580, G 1891, known only from drawings), and one appears on a mysterious fragment, probably the head and neck of a camel (no. 128; fig. 125). No. 128 is thickly studded with knobs as well, and no. 112 is covered with rosettes, both in relief and incised. Another animal figure, a packhorse or camel, is similarly studded with rosettes (no. 111, figs. 108–9), but it lacks the necklace. The necklace is probably a status symbol, and this whole group, both riders and horses, probably represents a special class, though their meaning is unclear.

Other figures that probably represented riders also have extremely schematic heads. In some cases, the faces were made by pressing the clay to create a triangular shape; eyes and mouths may be formed by slashes or by holes pressed with the fingers (nos. 61, 65, 72–74; figs. 57, 60, 66–68). Invernizzi has characterized figurines from Seleucia in which facial features are formed by pinching or pressing in on the clay and eyes are often rendered by adding circles of terracotta as “fantocchi,” or puppets,³⁷ and this type is well represented among the figurines of Failaka and Assur as well.³⁸ In some cases, it is not clear that the heads were intended as human. If they were not, one must ask whether the figurines were intended to represent some kind of unusual being, though this interpretation presses the evidence.

The number of horse or camel figurines at Dura that have equipment but no traces of a rider and that thus probably represent pack animals is striking in view of the paucity of pack animals among the coroplastic production of other sites. In this respect, the local character of the Dura

36. See, e.g., W. Andrae, *Archaischen Ishtar-Tempel*, 87–90, types 126, 132, pls. 51.a, f; 52; 55.b, c, e, o; E. Klengel-Brandt, *Terrakotten aus Assur*, 21–25, nos. 1, 2, 8, 27, 33, 38, 39, pls. 1–2.

37. A. Invernizzi, “Problemi di coroplastica tardo-mesopotamica,” *Mesopotamia* 3–4 (1968–69): 290–91, figs. 148–52.

38. See the introduction to “Riders (?)” in the section “Male Figurines” in the catalogue, with references.

ensemble is again evident. Figurines of saddled but unriden horses are also known at Assur, demonstrating again the similarity of the ensembles from the two cities. Klengel-Brandt's suggestion that this group of figurines from Assur might be a symbol of a god, an offering, or even funerary³⁹ is not supported at Dura by the evidence of the finding places. At Dura, as at sites in Mesopotamia, horses apparently far outnumber camels, though it is admittedly difficult to identify the species when only the head and neck are preserved or when the back is damaged, as is frequently the case. The one exceptional site, Uruk in the first millennium B.C., where a large number of terracotta camels appeared, is difficult to explain; Ziegler suggests a votive function for these terracottas but does not feel that she can exclude the possibility that they were toys.⁴⁰ The fact that some of Dura's probable riders and a few of the site's other figures seem to have been made to be set onto something, such as another figurine, might support the idea that some were toys or even gaming pieces (nos. 64–66, 69, 72–74 [riders]; no. 49 [female figure]; figs. 59–60, 63, 66–68, 45).⁴¹

Another factor that should be considered in interpreting the meaning of the equine and cameloid figurines of Dura-Europos is their evident relationship to paintings and graffiti of the same subject from the site.⁴² In addition to stylistic similarities, which will be discussed in more detail shortly, the horses in these media wear tack, armor, and other equipment similar to those on the terracottas. A major difference, of course, is that many, it not most, of the paintings and graffiti show horsemen engaged in an activity, such as hunting or fighting; this is sometimes true even when no enemy is depicted. Horses in paintings and graffiti tend to be in motion, often rapid motion (see, e.g., figs. IV–VI); this is not true of most of the figurines. The one example in terracotta of a horseman and an enemy (no. 90; fig. 83) is anomalous both among the terracottas and in comparison to depictions of riders in battle in other media. That most of the riders in painting, graffiti, and dipinti are embedded in a narrative or ceremonial context,⁴³ even if a very simple one, differentiates them from the terracottas. It is possible, though perhaps unlikely, that some of the figurines might have been arranged in groups, conceived as engaging in or at least standing for activities like those represented in two-dimensional

39. E. Klengel-Brandt, *Terrakotten aus Assur*, 89.

40. C. Ziegler, *Terrakotten von Warka*, 173–74; see the section “Animals Other Than Horses” in the animals section of the catalogue in the present book.

41. I owe this suggestion to Oleg Grabar.

42. The relationship between graffiti and equine terracottas is discussed in individual catalogue entries.

43. For graffiti and dipinti depicting scenes of hunt and war, see M.I. Rostovtzeff, “Parthian Art,” 262–72.

media. One can easily imagine two or more horsemen arranged as if in combat. The terracottas do not seem to include animals that would have served as hunters' prey, such as gazelles, though it is possible that some of the fragmentary and unidentifiable quadrupeds might have been such animals. I have suggested that one unusual figurine might represent a successful return from a hunt, with a dead animal draped across the saddle (no. 101; figs. 101–3).

The stylistic similarity between representations of the horses or horses and riders in graffiti, dipinti, and terracottas raises another issue: that of the place of terracottas in the visual culture of Dura-Europos. Analyses of the visual arts in Dura-Europos have concentrated on sculpture and painting. In these analyses, graffiti, dipinti, and terracottas are generally used only as illustrative of themes. For example, terracottas do not figure in Ann Perkins's *The Art of Dura-Europos*, and Rostovtzeff included them in his "Dura and the Problem of Parthian Art" (*YCS* 5 [1935]: 155–304) but not in the illustrations to his *Dura-Europos and Its Art*.

The preceding discussion leads into the issue of whether many terracottas and graffiti/dipinti belong to a category that has been characterized as "popular art."⁴⁴ This is a very charged term, and here I am making a distinction between, on the one hand, elaborate painted ensembles (e.g., those of some of the pagan temples and the Synagogue) and some sculptured representations (e.g., cult reliefs and other images) that were presumably made by professionally trained painters and sculptors and, on the other hand, designs scratched or painted on walls, presumably by amateurs. It seems that the elaborate painted ensembles, stone sculpture, and graffiti frequently share subject matter, allowing for differences imposed by function, as in the Synagogue, the Christian building, and the Temples of Bel and Zeus Theos. They also share some stylistic traits, such as frontality and linearity, though shading is used in some of the more elaborate paintings. In other respects, such as the depiction of clothing and features, there are considerable stylistic differences. Taking as an example the category of horse/horse and rider, it is notable that, while the paintings provide parallels for the type of tack worn on the figurines, the style of the terracotta horses is much simpler and closer to that of graffiti. For example, in the paintings and elaborate dipinti, such as the dipinto depicting the sacrifice to Iarhibol from the Temple of Azzanathkona, the bodies of horses are more rounded and the heads more subtly shaped than in the figurines,⁴⁵ while those in graffiti tend to be simplified (see, e.g.,

44. See, e.g., R. Bianchi-Bandinelli, "Arte plebea," *DialArch* 1 (1967): 7–18.

45. For the dipinto from the Temple of Azzanathkona, see C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 153–58, pl. 36.1–3. For the paintings of Mithras as a hunter from the Mithraeum, see F. Cumont and M.I.

figs. IV–VI),⁴⁶ as in the handmade figurines. In terracottas, the bodies of human figures are frequently simply rendered, often with no indication of sex, and facial features are formed by pinching or pressing in on the clay, adding both circles of terracotta for eyes and incised lines.

An important and obvious distinction between the riders in paintings and graffiti (and also carved reliefs), on the one hand, and handmade figurines, on the other, is the posture of the riders. In paintings, relief sculpture, and the two moldmade rider figures (nos. 88–89; figs. 81–82), the riders face outward, frontally, even in narrative scenes, such as those in the Synagogue and the Mithraeum.⁴⁷ In contrast, the position of the bodies of the terracotta riders, both those made in one piece with their mount and those apparently meant to be set on horses or camels, shows that the riders' heads faced forward, in the direction of the horses' heads. The different media thus use different stylistic conventions in this important respect.

Another feature that many terracotta figurines share with graffiti and dipinti is the use of incised lines, sometimes in rather abstract patterns (e.g., nos. 42, 44, 58, 61–62; figs. 40, 42, 54, 57–58); in many cases, these incisions seem intended to represent clothing or armor, but the exact intentions are often obscure (e.g., fig. VII).⁴⁸ In contrast, the clothing or weaponry in painting is generally rendered in a clear, if simplified, fashion. Some terracottas are covered with punched dots, the meaning of which is obscure (nos. 49, 60, 84–85; figs. 45, 56, 77–78), but dots do not occur on graffiti. I have interpreted these dots as representing patterns of clothing or armor, but other scholars have suggested that the bodies might have been conceived as pierced, in a kind of apotropaic magic, and even that objects, such as needles, might have been inserted in the holes in a kind of sympathetic magic.⁴⁹

The terracottas seem to occupy a somewhat anomalous position: many of the handmade figurines—those representing men and women as well as

Rostovtzeff, *Dura Report* 7/8, 112–15, pls. 14–15. For horses in the Synagogue paintings, see C. Kraeling, *The Synagogue*, 95–97, 152–54, 202–5 (the horses are very badly damaged in this panel), pls. 55, 64, 73.

46. See, e.g., M.I. Rostovtzeff, *Dura Report* 4, 215–16, pls. 20.3, 21.1–3; C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 157–58, pls. 35.3, 4.

47. On frontality at Dura, see S.B. Downey, *Stone and Plaster Sculpture*, 283–87, with references.

48. For incised lines apparently intended to indicate clothing or armor in graffiti, see, e.g., M.I. Rostovtzeff, *Dura Report* 4, 207–21, pls. 19–22; C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 127–28, pls. 34.1, 2, 4; 35.1, 2. Crosshatches for horse armor appear on a dipinto from the Palace of the Dux Ripae (A. Perkins, *Dura Report* 9.3, 66–68, fig. 6) (fig. V in the present volume).

49. Participants in an informal art history seminar at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey, in the fall of 1999 made this suggestion in response to my presentation of this material.

horses and other animals—are extremely simple (indeed, crude), yet the clay is relatively pure, and the figurines are fired professionally. There is no clear explanation for this somewhat contradictory situation. One might suggest that the cruder figurines were made by apprentices, a practice for which there is some ethnographic evidence,⁵⁰ or even by children. However, the existence of defined types (indeed, near duplicates), particularly of horses and riders, suggests professional work, even if on a low level. Since terracottas were presumably inexpensive, it is a natural assumption that the primary clientele was the less affluent sector of the population, though there is no direct evidence for this. The few imported figurines were presumably more expensive, but again there is no clear evidence that figurines of more Greco-Roman style, such as the Hermes (no. 57; fig. 53) or the two male busts found in shops (nos. 75–76; figs. 69–70), were bought by or aimed at the more Hellenized inhabitants.

The terracotta production of Dura-Europos is a unique ensemble, though parallels to individual pieces can be found at other Near Eastern sites. Certain types that are common elsewhere, such as a type of rider with a slablike body pressed against the horse's neck,⁵¹ are absent at Dura. More striking is the absence from Dura of ape figurines.⁵² The lack of figurines showing nude or partially draped women reclining on a kline, very common in Babylonia, has already been mentioned. The large proportion of handmade figurines is particularly unusual; in this respect, as in others, Dura resembles Assur.⁵³ The reason for the similarity of the ensembles in these two relatively distant cities is not clear. There is no direct evidence for contact between Assur and Dura. However, four inscriptions in the Aramaic of Hatra, located not far from Assur, have been found at Dura, providing evidence of relations between those two cities, perhaps as

50. Frederick Matson reported observing this practice among potters in Afghanistan (personal communication).

51. For this type, see the introduction to "Horse-and-Rider Groups" in the animals section of the catalogue.

52. E. Klengel-Brandt dates the ape figurines from Assur to the first millennium B.C. and suggests that those from other sites in Mesopotamia belong to the same period (*Terrakotten aus Assur*, 106–7, nos. 704–14, pl. 22). Most of the ape figurines from Assur were found in houses, which would support E.D. van Buren's interpretation of the type as apotropaic. C. Ziegler agrees with this dating of the terracotta apes from Uruk and suggests tentatively that they may have played a role in cult (*Terrakotten von Warka*, 93, 174, nos. 626–28, figs. 324–25). For other references to ape figurines from Mesopotamia, see K. Karvonen-Kannas, *Terracotta Figurines from Babylon*, 107 and n. 31. Many of the ape figurines of Seleucid and Parthian date from Babylon play musical instruments: see *ibid.*, 107–8, 191–92, nos. 603–8, pl. 80. Karvonen-Kannas's no. 602 and nos. 609–614 (pl. 90) are apes that do not play musical instruments.

53. E. Klengel-Brandt (*Terrakotten aus Assur*, 13) comments on the preponderance of handmade figurines in Assur at the late period, in contrast to other Near Eastern sites.

early as the first century A.D.⁵⁴ Not enough is known about the population or social structure of Parthian Assur to allow a comparison.⁵⁵

It is perhaps not surprising that Greek influence is essentially lacking in the handmade figurines of Dura, but the paucity of terracottas of Greek type is striking in comparison to Seleucia. Perhaps this is merely another instance of the scarcity of remains of the Seleucid period at Dura. The moldmade plaques, with their largely religious character, follow Near Eastern iconography and perhaps represent Syrian production.

54. See R. Bertolino, "Les inscriptions hatréennes de Doura-Europos: Étude épigraphique," and P. Leriche and R. Bertolino, "Les inscriptions hatréennes de Doura-Europos: Le contexte archéologique et historique," in *DEE*, vol. 4, 199–206, 207–14.

55. The architecture of the site and a few sculptures, paintings, graffiti, and dipinti, some accompanied by inscriptions, have been published in W. Andrae and H. Lenzer, *Die Partherstadt Assur*, WVDOG 57 (Leipzig, 1993; reprint, Osnabrück, 1967).

THE FINDING PLACES
OF THE TERRACOTTAS 

For both the establishment of chronology and assessments of the possible meaning and function of terracottas, including the probable users, accurate information about where they were found is essential. Unfortunately, such information is often either not available or, when available, not particularly helpful. Three factors contribute to these problems. First, many terracottas were found in contexts that are, by their nature, uninformative. Second, the recording of the find spots was quite imperfect, and contradictory information is given in some cases. Finally, even when the finding places are accurately recorded, information about the context is often poor or lacking altogether. I will here address these issues in order.

A very large number of terracottas came from Wall Street, in the mudbrick and dirt heaped up against the west wall of the city in the face of the Sasanian siege.¹ All one can say is that the objects were both in the city and probably in use when the embankment was constructed, but the original context is lost. Mudbrick was also built into the buildings that lined Wall Street. In some cases, it is known that a given terracotta was found in this mudbrick (e.g., no. 14; fig. 13), and this may be true also of other terracottas from buildings along this street, further compromising the usefulness of the finding places in determining possible function or user. Several terracottas are listed as found in trenches dug in the Necropolis. No information about those trenches is available in the archives, but it is possible to deduce from N. Toll's publication of the Necropolis (*Dura Report* 9.2) and C. Hopkins's *The Discovery of Dura-Europos* that these trenches were dug into debris brought out of the city

1. For the embankment, see chapter 1 of this introduction, on the history of the site. Its construction can be dated to no later than A.D. 256, because hoards containing coins of Valerian and Gallienus minted in that year were buried by the embankment. See A.R. Bellinger, *Dura Report* 7/8, 421–22, 425.

during the Roman period. According to both Hopkins and Toll, the debris contained large amounts of ash, presumably from the Roman bath near the gate. Though the debris was stratified, the excavators argue that the stratification was not meaningful, since pottery ranging from the Greek through the Parthian and Roman periods and coins from Seleukos I (ruled 311–281 B.C.) to Gordian III (ruled A.D. 239–44) were included, in positions that bore no relation to the layers within the mound of debris.² In the case of the terracottas, it is not certain that they would have been in use when they were accidentally included in the debris; they might well have been buried and dug up when the refuse was being shoveled out. Other terracottas were found in streets, and some are surface finds.

The information provided here about the finding places is taken from the catalogue cards in the archives of the Yale University Art Gallery. The degree of reliability and helpfulness of the information varies considerably. In some cases, the information in the archive contradicts notes taken in the field. Sometimes, the room number given in the catalogue appears to be based on a preliminary numbering system, and it is not always possible to make a correlation with the system used in the published reports. In any case, at Dura, as in other ancient sites, it is often difficult to determine the function of rooms within a house in the absence of significant finds or built-in furniture or installations, such as altars.³ This is particularly true for smaller rooms. In addition, it is not always possible to identify the inhabitants of a house. Graffiti, inscriptions, and paintings include names. Some of these names presumably refer to inhabitants or users of the building, and accounts may give the names of customers. The types of names—Greek, Semitic, occasionally Latin—indicate ethnicity. However, the usefulness of this information in determining who used the terracottas found in the buildings is questionable. The preservation of graffiti is a matter of chance, and there is no guarantee that the persons recorded were contemporary with the terracottas. In addition, both the

2. N.P. Toll, *Dura Report* 9.2, 3–4; C. Hopkins, *The Discovery of Dura-Europos* (New Haven, 1979), 184, 188, 230.

3. E.g., in his publication of the houses in the area of the agora/bazaar, F.E. Brown frequently gives rooms rather generic designations, such as “chamber” or “women’s chamber (?)”; the identification as a women’s chamber is generally based on such factors as a relatively secluded location within the house. See F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 68–167. For problems of identifying the functions of rooms in Parthian Assur, see P.A. Miglus, *Das Wohngebiet von Assur*, WVD OG 93 (Berlin, 1996), 68–69, 97–98. Miglus (50–51) also discusses the difficulty of identifying the finding places of small finds from the early excavations at Assur. Current literature on the social function of spaces in Roman houses is dependent in part on textual evidence that is not available for Dura or, indeed, Syria in general. For analyses of Roman houses as social units, see A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton, 1994); Ray Laurence and A. Wallace-Hadrill, eds., *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*, *JRA Suppl.* 22 (Portsmouth, R.I., 1997).

excavation and the publication of houses in particular varies considerably, as documented by the work of A. Allara and C. Saliou.⁴

From the field drawings and the catalogue cards, it appears that attention was rarely paid to stratification, in even the simplest sense, in recording the find spots of terracottas. This, of course, means that in buildings that underwent transformations in the course of their life, it is generally not possible to determine to what phase of a building a figurine belongs. Exceptions are noted as they occur. Hopkins reports that under the first field director, the importance of find spot and depth had not been recognized; in fact, the field director, M. Pillet, in reporting objects found in the excavations, tends to give only general references to buildings. In the early seasons of excavation, a system of rewarding the workers with baksheesh for good finds was in place, as was common in excavations in the Near East at the time. Hopkins stresses that this system was designed to encourage the workers to sift the earth carefully and that after some early problems, all finds were catalogued,⁵ but it is clear from the records that in many cases, an exact spot, even a room within a house, was not recorded. It is also not clear that terracottas would have counted as “good” finds; the number that were discarded on the site by the excavators argues that ones of poor quality were regarded as of little value. It is also notable that in the preliminary reports, only a small number of terracottas appear in the sections devoted to minor finds.

In addition, the excavation records for many blocks are poor to nonexistent. Some blocks were published in preliminary reports, and notes about others are available in the Dura archives. In some cases, however, this kind of information is fully or partially lacking.

These problems are endemic to excavations, particularly early excavations, in the Near East. As C. Ziegler and E. Klengel-Brandt state in their publications of the terracottas from Uruk and Assur, respectively, terracottas last well and may end up in strata much later than the time of their creation. This is particularly true of sites in which mudbrick is used in construction, as it was at Dura. In remodeling of buildings, older material may mix with newer. Types may persist over the years. Hand-made animal figurines are almost impossible to date on the basis of style alone.⁶ At Uruk, no figurines found in the area of the great Seleucid sanctuaries, the Bit Rēš and the Irigal, can be dated to the Seleucid period

4. A. Allara and C. Saliou, “Constitution d’un repertoire de l’architecture domestique à Doura-Europos,” in *DEE*, vol. 4 (Beirut, 1997), 145–54.

5. C. Hopkins, *Discovery of Dura-Europos*, 50–52.

6. See C. Ziegler, *Terrakotten von Warka*, 141–42; E. Klengel-Brandt, *Terrakotten aus Assur*, 11, 54.

on the basis of stratigraphy.⁷ E. Klengel-Brandt remarks that the finding places of terracottas at Assur are often only generally noted and that many terracottas there from the Parthian period were surface finds or came from the upper layers of the excavations.⁸ The chronology and context of terracottas is a persistent problem for scholars. The difficulties with the Dura material are exacerbated by the factors outlined earlier. It is likely that the majority of the terracottas date from the second and third centuries A.D. Exceptions are no. 91; figs. 84–85, the so-called Persian rider, which, on the basis of both type and finding place, might date to the second century B.C., and no. 55; fig. 51, an antefix.

A list of the areas of the city where terracottas were found and a discussion of the evidence available for each area follows. The list excludes surface finds, streets, and finds from unexcavated blocks. In this compilation, I will give a brief account of the occupation of the block and name any factors that facilitate or complicate an understanding of where terracottas from that block were found. The list begins with Blocks G 1–G 8, the area of the old Seleucid agora. It moves south from there and then counterclockwise around the city, ending in the southwest corner with the Temple of Aphlad. (See Fig. II, Plan of Dura-Europos.)

BLOCKS G 1–G 8: AGORA AND BAZAAR

This part of the city was initially reserved, according to Brown, for the Hellenistic agora. The gypsum foundations of Seleucid shops and office buildings (including a *chreophylakeion*, or record office) remain in Blocks G 1, G 3, and G 5. Brown suggests that an original, ambitious plan was truncated due to lack of funds. The date of early shops and offices is disputed. Brown argues for a date not later than the middle of the third century B.C.⁹ Recent work by the Mission franco-syrienne de Dura-Europos suggests that work began only in the third quarter of the second century.¹⁰ An antefix (no. 55; fig. 51) built into early rubblework foundations under the court of House H in Block G 7 must have belonged to the Seleucid buildings.¹¹

In any case, the entire area was built over in the Parthian and Roman periods. Blocks G 1–G 5 and probably also Blocks G 7–G 8, as well as the

7. See C. Ziegler, *Terrakotten von Warka*, 175.

8. E. Klengel-Brandt, *Terrakotten aus Assur*, 12, 69.

9. F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 3–22.

10. See P. Leriche, “*Chreophylakeion*,” 166–68.

11. See F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 11, 165, fig. 88, pl. 18.1.

southern part of Block G 6, were covered with shops and houses. Much of the southern part of Block G 1 was occupied by a single large house, House A, that itself underwent several phases. A working plan in the Yale archives makes it possible to pinpoint the find spot of one terracotta (no. 35, fig. 33) to an early room, later converted into part of a court. The other terracottas found in this block (nos. 24, 75–76; figs. 23, 69–70) came from shops and were presumably part of the merchandise at the time of the city's destruction. Shop 118, where no. 75 was found, also contained coins ranging in date from Septimius Severus (ruled A.D. 191–211) through Elagabalus (ruled A.D. 218–22); a similar distribution is seen in several other nearby shops.¹² In the Roman period, the northern part of Block G 6 and the southern part of Block G 5 became a court lined with columns and surrounded by shops.¹³

Some of the rooms recorded on the catalogue cards in the Dura archives appear to have been based on a preliminary numbering system. In some cases, drawings in the archives permit correlation of the preliminary system with the final one, but this is not true for Block G 5.

BLOCK H 1: TEMPLE OF THE GADDÉ

This block was originally occupied by houses. In A.D. 159, a Palmyrene, Hairan, built a temple to the Gaddé, or Fortunes, of Dura and Palmyra.¹⁴ The few terracottas found there (nos. 16, 115, 128; possibly no. 41; figs. 15, 39, 113, 125) are not obviously religious in character but were probably used by the Palmyrenes who worshiped in the temple.

BLOCK H 2: PRIESTS' HOUSE

A large house in Block H 2 has been identified by its proximity and entrances connecting it to the Temples of Artemis and Atargatis as probably belonging to the priests of the temples.¹⁵ The terracottas found there (nos. 26, 98; figs. 25, 94–95) were presumably used by the inhabitants. One of these (no. 26) is a plaque with a warrior; the possible significance of this type is discussed in the introduction to the catalogue section "Moldmade Plaques and Medallions." The house continued in use into

12. This information is derived from the coin list made by F.E. Brown in the field.

13. F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 9.1, 28–158.

14. S.B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*, 115–18.

15. A. Naudy, *Dura Report* 3, 25–27; H.T. Rowell, *Dura Report* 3, 33–36.

the third century, as attested by a coin hoard found there. The dates of the coins vary widely, but Bellinger argues that the hoard must have been put away in A.D. 217–18, since tetradrachms of Elagabalus are lacking.¹⁶

BLOCK C 7: PRIVATE HOUSES

This block is published in a preliminary fashion. The drawings for the published plan, which is so small as to be largely illegible, are available in the Dura archives. According to Hopkins, House A, in which two terracottas were found, was probably the first built in the block. The one name found in the house, *Tiber[ia]no[s]*, is Latin written in Greek letters. House D, where no. III was found, was one of the largest on the block. In contrast, House G 2, which perhaps contained no. 145, was a small house constructed by taking rooms from two other houses. A graffito from House C attests to the presence in the block of soldiers, who were perhaps billeted there.¹⁷

BLOCK C 9: STRATEGEION (REDOUBT PALACE)

This large building was constructed in the Hellenistic period, presumably as an administrative structure.¹⁸ It underwent a number of modifications and continued in use until the end of the city. Not enough detail is given about the find spot of the one terracotta from the Strategeion to determine its probable date. The piece, a relief of a horseman and a fallen enemy (no. 90; fig. 83) is unusual and was probably imported.

BLOCK C 3: HOUSES AND ROMAN BATH

This area at the foot of the Strategeion included a number of houses, as well as a bath built in the Roman period. It has been published in a preliminary

16. A.R. Bellinger, *Dura Final Report* 6, 167–69. The hoard, then considered two separate deposits, is also discussed by Bellinger in *Dura Report* 4, 259–61.

17. See M. Pillet, *Dura Report* 4, 33–38, pl. 5; C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 34–46.

18. See P. Leriche and A. Mahmoud, “Bilan des campagnes de 1986 et 1987 de la Mission franco-syrienne de Doura-Europos,” in *DEE*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1988), 18–23; P. Leriche and A. Mahmoud, “Doura-Europos: Bilan des recherches récentes,” *CRAI*, 1994, 403; M. Gelin, “Le palais du Stratège à Doura-Europos: La fouille des pièces de la façade nord,” in *DEE*, vol. 4 (1991–1993) (Beirut, 1997), 61–76. The numismatic evidence from Gelin’s excavations is discussed on her pp. 68–69.

report by M. Crosby.¹⁹ The lower stories of the houses were constructed in the cavities left by the quarrying of blocks of gypsum. Since these blocks were presumably used to construct the *Strategeion*, the houses may well date originally to the second century B.C., and Hellenistic pottery was found in House B. The finds from this house also include Parthian pottery and drawings of Parthian horsemen. The abundant coin evidence, going down to the reign of Trebonianus Gallus (A.D. 251–53) and including one Sasanian coin, shows that the house was in use until the end of the city's life. Graffiti from the house give an equal number of Greek and Semitic names (in Greek letters); two Latin names, *Flaveio[s]* and *Quinta* (also in Greek letters), and one possible Iranian name. Welles argues that the names are different from those attested in Dura before the army presence.²⁰ A medallion of Artemis (no. 13; fig. 12) came from this house. Room 10 in House D, in which nos. 34 and 42; figs. 32, 40 were found, was perhaps a shop. The house must have been in use late in the life of the city, since numerous coins of the third century A.D. were found there.²¹ A plaque with a dancing figure (no. 37; fig. 35) and a head of an animal (no. 155; fig. 145) were found in the bath.

BLOCK C 11: AREA SOUTHEAST OF EXCAVATION HOUSE

This area is currently being excavated by the Mission franco-syrienne de Doura-Europos. Work has consisted of surface clearing of the entire zone, with selected sondages and the excavation of a late house. The sector has produced material dating from the Greek period through the Roman occupation of the site. The upper levels seem to consist of irregular streets and houses. These excavations have not yet been published. The one terracotta from this sector (no. 30) was found in a street.

BLOCK B 2: PRIVATE HOUSES

Block B 2, located on the slope at the south face of the citadel, was developed with private houses, using the spaces quarried out for the building of the citadel as cellars and foundations. Construction therefore presumably began shortly after the building of the citadel, and this date is confirmed by the finding of pottery characteristic of the second half of the century B.C.,

19. M. Crosby, *Dura Report* 6, 106–39.

20. C.B. Welles, "Population," 268; see M. Crosby, *Dura Report* 6, 109–11.

21. M. Crosby, *Dura Report* 6, 115–23.

according to notes by F.E. Brown in the Dura archives. His notes also record extensive remodeling. Coin hoards from Houses C and D show that the houses continued in use until the end of the life of the city. Hoard 7, from House D, runs from the Severi through Trebonianus Gallus (i.e., from the late second century through A.D. 253), and the very large combined hoards 8 and 9, from House C, run up to the reign of Decius (A.D. 249–51).²² The block has been thoroughly studied by Anny Allara.²³

Interestingly, all nine terracottas found in this block depict horses, with or without riders.²⁴ Unfortunately, it has been possible to coordinate the terracottas found here to rooms in houses only in a general way, and they cannot be fixed chronologically. Some of the room numbers given in the cards cannot be found on the block plan and must represent a preliminary numbering system. House A, where four terracottas were found, had graffiti with a few Semitic names, and the extensive accounts in House C include a preponderance of Semitic names, though the Greek name *Lysi-anios* also appears there.

BLOCK C 9: CITADEL

The catalogue cards in the Dura archives give numbers and sometimes letters of areas within the citadel, but only in the case of one terracotta (no. 91; figs. 84, 85) has it been possible to link the information on the cards to the published plan. That figurine, the sole example at Dura of the “Persian rider” type, might well date to the second century B.C. (See discussion under the catalogue entry.) Photographs in the locus file show a series of rooms, apparently built against the inside of the citadel wall. The rooms are labeled W 4, W 5, W 5-4. No information is available about these rooms, and no unpublished plans are available in the archives.

BLOCK X 7: PALACE OF THE DUX RIPAE

The Palace of the Dux Ripae is identified as the official residence of a Roman military commander in charge of troops on the Euphrates, on the

22. A.R. Bellinger, *Dura Report* 7/8, 391–421; *Dura Report* 6, 467–69; *Dura Final Report* 6, 170–75.

23. A. Allara, “L’*élot* des potiers et les fours à Doura-Europos: Étude préliminaire,” in *DEE*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1992), 101–20. (Same as *Syria* 69 [1992]: 101–20.) See also Allara’s “Architettura domestica di periodo partico in Mesopotamia: Nuove ricerche a Doura-Europos” (thesis, Università di Torino, 1985–86).

24. Several of the figurines listed as coming from this block were discarded in the field.

basis of dipinti mentioning one Domitianus Pompeianus, Dux Ripae; a dipinto that has been restored as containing the name and filiation of Elagabalus (ruled A.D. 218–22) establishes a terminus ante quem for the building.²⁵ Thus, the terracottas found there probably date to the third century A.D. and were used by members of the Roman army.

BLOCK F 3: BLOCK INCLUDED IN ROMAN CAMP, WITH BATHS
AND AMPHITHEATER

Brown tentatively dated the baths in this block to the Parthian period, apparently largely to allow enough time for their destruction by fire and the building of an amphitheater into the remains in A.D. 216 by troops of the IV Scythian and III Cyrenaican legions.²⁶ However, the presence of hypocausts and the use of a type of fired brick unknown at Dura before the Roman period raise doubts about the Parthian date, and Perkins suggests that the baths were built in the late second century for the use of the garrison.²⁷ It is probable that the terracottas found here (nos. 22, 133, 136, 148, 159) were used by soldiers.

BLOCK E 8: BLOCK OF HOUSES CONVERTED INTO BARRACKS FOR
THE ROMAN CAMP

The excavations in this block were never published, and no field notes or photographs are available. The only available information is a plan in the Dura archives that shows earlier and later walls. It is possible to coordinate the recorded finding places of the figurines from this block with the rooms on the plan. Three hoards found in the block (hoards 14–16) contain coins ranging from the time of the Severi through the reign of Philip the Arab (A.D. 244–49) or Decius (A.D. 249–50);²⁸ two of these hoards came from room 56, where no. 19 (fig. 18) was found.

It is striking that several of the terracottas found in this block (nos. 19,

25. For the inscriptions, see M.I. Rostovtzeff et al., *Dura Report* 9.3, 27–35, nos. 945–47; 93–96. See also S.B. Downey, “The Palace of the Dux Ripae at Dura-Europos and ‘Palatial’ Architecture in Late Antiquity,” in *Eius Virtutis Studiosi: Classical and Postclassical Studies in Memory of Frank Edward Brown*, Studies in the History of Art 43 (Washington, D.C., 1993), 183–98.

26. F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 6, 49–79.

27. A. Perkins, *The Art of Dura-Europos*, 25 and n. 1. See also S.B. Downey, “The Transformation of Seleucid Dura-Europos.” In *Romanization and the City*, ed. E. Fentress, *JRA Suppl.* 38 (Portsmouth, RI, 2000), 165–69, fig. 11.

28. See A.R. Bellinger, *Dura Final Report* 6, 179–81, 185–87; *Dura Report* 7/8, 424–25.

81–82; figs. 18, 74–75) are particularly Greco-Roman in type and style. It is tempting to connect this style with the presence of soldiers.

WALL STREET

Wall Street is the name given to the street along the east side of the west wall of the city. As discussed in chapter 1 of this introduction, on the site and the excavations, the street was filled with an embankment of earth in an attempt to protect the city from the Sasanian attack. Many terracottas were found in Wall Street, and presumably the great majority came from the fill, though this is specified in only a few cases.

Some catalogue cards assign numbers, such as W 1, W 2, W 3, and so on, to objects found in Wall Street. A plan of Block M 8 that includes Wall Street shows that the numbers designate north-south segments of the street. The numbers in Block M 8 run from W 1 at the north through W 7 at the south. W 1 designates the area just north of Tower 17, and W 2 and W 3 are divisions of Wall Street behind Block M 7. According to C. Hopkins's daybook, Wall Street behind Block N 7 was similarly given numbers running from south to north; in order, they are W 4, W 2, W 1, and W 3. N 8 W 10 designates the area just behind the sanctuary room of the Temple of Aphlad. An unpublished plan of the Persian mines in the southwest corner of the city by H. Pearson shows a different system. Here the sections of Wall Street running north from tower 14 are numbered W 7–W 11. Each of these segments is one meter long except for W 11, which is five meters long. Some numbers, such as L 8, W 105, W 106 and L 7, W 56, W 100, remain enigmatic.

BLOCK J 7: MITHRAEUM, PRIVATE HOUSES, AND EMBANKMENT

Only the Mithraeum has been published.²⁹ The archives contain a plan of the sector, with annotations by H. Pearson. He suggests that houses built against the city wall before the construction of the first Mithraeum in A.D. 168 were destroyed about A.D. 210, when the northern part of the city was converted into a Roman camp. The rooms in which terracottas were found were ultimately covered by the mudbrick embankment constructed at the time of the Sasanian attack. These terracottas (nos. 124, 127; figs.

29. See H.F. Pearson, M. I. Rostovtzeff, et al., *Dura Report* 7/8, 62–128.

121, 124) were probably brought in with the building material of the embankment.

BLOCK L 7: SYNAGOGUE AND PRIVATE HOUSES

No terracottas were found in the Synagogue. Soldiers were billeted in the houses in this block, and the names in the graffiti from the block and on plaster fragments from Wall Street behind it include a roughly equal number of Greek and Semitic names, as well as some Latin and Iranian names and even one Thracian name.³⁰ No terracottas were found in the largest house in this block, House A, called the House of the Roman Scribes because it was taken over by officers of the Roman army.³¹ A number of terracottas came from Wall Street to the west of this block, but I have been unable to understand the numbering system for Wall Street in this area.

BLOCKS M 7–M 8: PRIVATE HOUSES, ROMAN BATH, AND CHRISTIAN BUILDING

The private houses and the embankment in Blocks M 7–M 8 have been published, though the minor finds there are incompletely noted.³² The names in the abundant inscriptions from House W in Block M 7,³³ where apparently a number of terracottas were found, are exclusively Semitic. The diwan (room W 6) was decorated with paintings of a banquet scene and a hunting scene; the participants in the scenes, who are identified by inscriptions, were presumably inhabitants of the house.³⁴ The bath in Block M 7 has also been published, though the report on the finds is again deficient.³⁵ There are both a preliminary report³⁶ and a final report³⁷

30. See H.F. Pearson, C. Hopkins, et al., *Dura Report* 6, 212–308; C.B. Welles, “Population,” 268–69.

31. See H.F. Pearson, M.I. Rostovtzeff, et al., *Dura Report* 6, 265–308. C.B. Welles (“Population,” 268–69) argues that this house appears to have been in the hands of one Barginnias in the last period of the city and that this is a sign of a major social shift, because a fresco fragment found elsewhere in the block bears the name of Bithnanaia, daughter of Conon, a member of the Macedonian aristocracy who dedicated a painting in the Temple of Bel in the late first century A.D.

32. C. Hopkins et al., *Dura Report* 6, 140–87.

33. The unfortunate choice of the letter *W* to designate a house that borders Wall Street introduces a certain ambiguity.

34. See C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 6, 142–67. For the inscriptions, see R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, C.C. Torrey, and C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 6, 167–72.

35. See F.E. Brown, *Dura Report* 6, 84–90.

36. C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 238–53 (the terracottas are mentioned on p. 253).

37. C. Kraeling, *Dura Final Report* 8.2 (the terracottas are discussed on pp. 31–32).

on the Christian building in Block M 8; for the terracottas found there (nos. 7, 14; figs. 6, 13), the final report is more illuminating. C. Kraeling suggests a date in the first quarter of the third century A.D. for the construction of the house in Block M 8 that was transformed into the Christian building.³⁸ One of the two terracottas found in the Christian building (no. 14) came from the mudbrick of the embankment, and this is probably true of the other (no. 7) as well. It is not possible to coordinate the reported finding places of the other terracottas from Block M 8 with the published numbering system. There was a notable military presence in the houses of this block.³⁹ C.B. Welles's count of the names in these two blocks includes fifteen Semitic, three Latin, and six Greek names; none of the Greek names are characteristic of pre-Roman Dura.⁴⁰

BLOCKS N 7–N 8: TEMPLE OF ZEUS KYRIOS

The Temple of Zeus Kyrios/Baalshamin was built against the city wall in A.D. 28/29–31. It underwent modifications, and the single terracotta from there (no. 150; fig. 143) was found beneath the latest floor, which was probably laid after the earthquake of A.D. 160.⁴¹

BLOCK N 8 (SOUTHWEST ANGLE): TEMPLE OF APHLAD AND WALL STREET

The Temple of Aphlad, an otherwise unknown god, existed by A.D. 54, the date of the inscription on the cult relief. It is clear that the worshipers took pains to secrete the cult relief before the construction of the embankment.⁴² It is by no means certain that any of the terracottas found in this area were connected to the temple. It is interesting, however, that one medallion with a bust of Hadad came from this area, since Aphlad may be associated with Hadad.⁴³

38. *Ibid.*, 34–38.

39. See C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 6, 176–78.

40. C.B. Welles, "Population," 268.

41. See S.B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*, 101–2, with references to earlier literature.

42. See S.B. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture*, 110–12, with references to earlier literature; for the careful disposition of the cult relief and the dedicatory inscription, see C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 104.

43. See C. Hopkins, *Dura Report* 5, 112–20.

NECROPOLIS

The majority of the terracottas from the Necropolis were found in trenches apparently dug into debris thrown out of the city during the Roman period, as discussed earlier in this chapter. Two of the terracottas (nos. 57, 89; figs. 53, 82) were found in hypogaea. The evidence for dating those hypogaea is discussed under the catalogue entries.