

TALILA MICHAELI

CENTRE AND PERIPHERY IN ROMAN-BYZANTINE FUNERARY WALL PAINTINGS IN ISRAEL

(*Taf. CXXXI–CXXXIII, Abb. 1–11*)

Abstract

Les peintures découvertes dans les sépultures romaines en Israël révèlent des tendances de styles divers que l'on peut clairement distinguer. Les peintures trouvées dans des centres hellénistiques importants présentent un programme pictural très sophistiqué ainsi qu'un style libre, presque «impressionniste», s'accordant avec le style que l'on peut trouver dans d'autres centres importants, comme Alexandrie ou Antioche. En revanche, le style et l'iconographie des peintures murales dans les régions périphériques, dévoilent une tendance à une certaine rigidité et à une moindre complexité. Ces différences de styles sont évidentes dès que l'on s'éloigne, même légèrement du centre: la composition traduit une approche frontale, linéaire et directe. Parfois, sur des sites plus éloignés et isolés, le programme iconographique est limité à quelques motifs dispersés sur la surface sans qu'il y ait de correspondances entre eux; il en résulte des objets monochromes, qui donnent l'impression d'être dépourvus de volume. Cette différence d'approche entre les peintures murales du centre et celles de la périphérie se manifeste aussi dans la diversité de la palette des couleurs (caractérisée par sa richesse dans le centre et par une approche rigide et monochromatique dans la périphérie), et dans l'organisation générale des motifs selon un programme cohérent.

Ces différences de style des peintures funéraires sont analysées dans cet article à travers trois motifs représentatifs que nous avons privilégiés: le paon, pour la faune, la vigne pour la flore, et la femme, (commanditaire du tombeau) comme incarnation des êtres humains.

In the Roman funerary wall paintings discovered in Israel, several stylistic trends can be clearly discerned. Whereas the paintings found in the well-established Hellenistic centres reveal highly sophisticated pictorial programs and a free and almost "impressionistic" style, which is in accordance with the then prevalent style in other leading centres, in the periphery both the style and the iconography tend to display a greater rigidity and less complexity. These stylistic differences can already begin to be discerned even at places that are slightly more removed from the centre, where the artwork becomes more frontal, linear and direct in approach. In certain cases, especially in the more remote and isolated places, the pictorial program is limited to scattered motifs and the style is accordingly more simple as well. These differences in approach between centre and periphery also apply to the colour palette as well as to the general organization of the motifs into a coherent program.

In this article I will demonstrate the stylistic differences obtained among the painted tombs through the following motifs: the peacock, representing the fauna; the vine, representing the flora and the tomb's patroness, representing the human images.

PEACOCK

The peacock is the most frequently represented bird in pagan, Jewish and Christian funerary art; it is featured in seven painted tombs in Israel.

A large peacock is rendered striding diagonally downwards¹, on the vault of the mid-3rd century Tomb of the Peacock at Ashkelon (Abb. 2). Though rendered in a very general manner, the depiction provides the

¹ Michaeli 2009, fig. 235.

essentials that show its main characteristics. Thus, the emphatic movement of the tail, the non-linear portrayal and the diffusion of colours and shades are painted with firm and decisive brush strokes².

A large peacock is depicted held by a youth in the mid-3rd century AD Tomb with the Naked Youths at Migdal Ashkelon³. Although the colours have greatly deteriorated, the broad, powerful brush strokes and the use of colours rather than contours are still discernible. Its proportions are naturalistic and correspond to those used for the youth (Abb. 3).

In a mid-3rd century tomb at Hanita in the Upper Galilee a large motionless peacock occupies almost an entire panel (Abb. 4). Its large tail is schematic, frontal, and adorned with black circles to indicate the “eyes”. The tail itself is delineated by a red circle with short perpendicular lines, connected to the body with two long parallel lines. The head, in contrast, is in red monochrome, ending in a short beak with no contours except for an emphasized dark eye. The space left for the body, which no longer exists, is proportionally too small⁴.

On the ceiling of the Birds’ Cave in Jerusalem, from the end of the 3rd – beginning of the 4th century, a large impressive peacock is rendered striding across a corner. Its long tail is closed and drags heavily on the ground (Abb. 5). The tail feathers are rendered with free brushstrokes and adorned with multicoloured eyes. Its body is strong, delineated in dark contour and painted in various graduated shades of colour. The neck stretches upwards, the beak is slightly open and its large black eye is also focused upwards. The head is crowned with the typical three-feathered crest. It is well proportioned and corresponds naturally to the proportions of the other motifs⁵.

Of the probably end of the 4th century, seemingly Jewish tomb at Beit Guvrin, only a drawing from the 19th century remains⁶ (Abb. 1). A pair of large, motionless standing peacocks are depicted in profile facing left, with the left one’s head turned backwards. They differ in size and details: the one on the right is larger, its tail longer and more elaborate and a crest of three feathers crowns its head; while the other’s crest comprises a single feather. They were probably meant to represent a peacock and a peahen; however, as the artist may never have seen a peahen, it was simply rendered smaller and less impressive than the male. A similar formula was employed in the 4th century Jewish catacomb of Vigna Randanini at Rome⁷, in which the adjacent wall to that with a peacock/peahen features a cock and a hen⁸, further supporting a male-female/peacock-peahen identification.

Two red monochromatic peacocks facing each other – their front parts no longer exists – are rendered on the wall of the Byzantine Christian tomb at Beit Guvrin (Abb. 6). Their long, heavily dragging tails are adorned with the typical eyes, and their general proportions are represented naturalistically⁹.

A peacock standing upright facing an amphora is rendered on the *arcosolium* of the end of the 4th – beginning of the 5th century Christian tomb at Kibbutz Lohamey ha-Getaoth in the Western Galilee¹⁰ (Abb. 7). Its oversized head is crowned with an overlong crest of three feathers and its neck is too long and narrow, connecting to the too small body at an unrealistic angle. Its plumed tail is too short for its body and no sign of the characteristic eyes can be discerned. It is designed in free brush strokes of several shades, within a limited colour palette and without contours. Although generally rendered, its characteristics are well manifested and its relative size is in accordance with the other motifs.

A comparison between the seven above-noted peacocks reveals the Hellenistic heritage of the style employed in Ashkelon, particularly manifested in free and decisive brush strokes, usually using a variety of diffused colours but also delineating parts of the body where this appears necessary. Accuracy often seems

² Not yet published. For a short description see Michaeli 2009, 69. The fresco is now lost and only black-and-white photos have survived and are kept in the Israel Authority Antiquities archives.

³ Michaeli 1999, pl. 2.

⁴ Not yet published. See Frankel – Getzov 1997, 67 fig. 9.8.2.

⁵ Kloner 1975, pl. 100; Michaeli 2009, fig. 83. 90.

⁶ Bliss – Macalister 1902, pl. 91.

⁷ It has been questioned lately as to whether the *cubiculum* “c” of the Jewish Vigna Randanini Catacomb is also Jewish. See Nuzzo 2000, 135–136. I am grateful to my colleague N. ZIMMERMANN for drawing my attention to the problem. For a coloured photo see Michaeli 2009, fig. 236.

⁸ Goodenough 1953–68 III, fig. 15.

⁹ Moulton 1921, pl. 2; Moulton 1914, fig. 4–5.

¹⁰ Foerster 1986, 426 fig. 2; Michaeli 2009, fig. 203.

to have been abandoned in favour of fluency. Although the depictions in the Upper Galilee region are indeed more rigid and stylized than elsewhere, they still preserve naturalistic qualities and the compositions accord with the concrete reality. The style of the end of the 3rd – beginning of the 4th century depictions seen in Jerusalem is uncannily accurate and recalls that of the mid-4th century mosaics of Sta. Costanza in Rome¹¹. The style of the depictions in the Jewish and Christian Byzantine tombs at Beit Guvrin is similar and reveals both accuracy and a more schematic approach regarding details, concomitantly manifesting certain rigidity and obedience to relatively strict rules of symmetry. Its approach to colour appears minimal or is even abandoned in favour of monochromatic rendering. The style of the depictions in the Western Galilee, near the Mediterranean shore, is free, fluent and obeys no strict rules or conventions. It is unique in its approach to colour and shows a good understanding and acquaintance with the overall program, respecting the other objects and motifs. Precision is thus replaced here by freshness and vitality.

VINES

Vines and grapes are the most favoured flora in funerary art and are featured in ten painted tombs in Israel.

The 1st century AD Jewish Goliath family tomb at Jericho¹² shows large vines inhabited by birds spreading across its walls. The dark trellises and bunches of grapes and the brown leaves are painted in free brush strokes without contours. The characteristics of the vine are principally manifested in the general composition and in the use of different textures, with a non-naturalistic general approach to the individual elements.

The remnants of the vine that once covered the entire ceiling of the 2nd century tomb at *Caesarea Maritima* preclude any stylistic analysis other than relating to its general composition. What can still be discerned is that the twigs were painted in ochre without contours and the leaves were dark green¹³.

Two large vines spread diagonally from the opposite corners of the vault of the mid-3rd century Nymphs Tomb at Ashkelon¹⁴, covering its entire surface (Abb. 8). They are painted in free brush strokes, occasionally linearly and sometimes without contours, alternating between opaque and thick brush strokes for the brown and ochre trellises and almost transparent green for the dark-veined leaves, all rendered in different forms and directions. The bunches of grapes are casually depicted as well, somewhat obeying the law of gravity, and both the bunches and the harvested grapes in baskets are full and succulent, painted in different hues.

Vine trellises feature within panels in the tomb at Hanita (Abb. 4). The trellises reveal horizontal wavy red lines with undersized red leaves growing diagonally and parallel to each other¹⁵. The full and heavy bunches of grapes disobey the laws of gravity and are rendered symmetrically, back to back, on either side of a horizontal or vertical twig. Whereas the grapes are mostly succulent and depicted in a variety of colours and shades, several of the trellises are sketchy and linear, as illustrated in a red medallion with a bunch comprising three monochromatic red and detached grapes, seemingly in accordance with the tiny schematic bird inhabiting the medallion.

The tomb at Khirbet Humzin from the second half of the 3rd century, located not far from Hanita, features bunches of monochromatic red grapes scattered across the wall and soffit of one of its *arcosolia*¹⁶. They are very schematically rendered, suspended in midair, and the grapes are isolated (Abb. 9). A few single grapes appear as red dots pressed into the wet mortar.

Four vines are depicted growing from the four corners of the Birds' Cave at Jerusalem¹⁷, developing sideways across the walls and upwards to the flat ceiling (Abb. 5). They are meticulously treated, with attention paid to every detail. The twigs and trellises are painted in red brush strokes that imitate their real texture, and the leaves are equally detailed, with different colours and shades, as are the heavy bunches with their

¹¹ Michaeli 2009, fig. 229–230; Stern 1958, 200 fig. 33.

¹² Hachlili – Killebrew 1999, col. pl. 5.1, front cover, back cover.

¹³ Michaeli 2009, fig. 5 a–b. 19. 20.

¹⁴ Ory 1939, pl. 28 1,2. 29. fig. 2; Michaeli 2009, fig. 38–39. 50–51.

¹⁵ Frankel – Getzov, 1997, fig. 9.8.2; Michaeli 2004a, fig. 11.

¹⁶ Not yet published. See Frankel – Getzov 1997, 149 f., fig. on 152 f.; Michaeli 2009, fig. 227.

¹⁷ Kloner 1975, pl. 100; Michaeli 2009, fig. 79–88.

dark and succulent grapes. Though seemingly a free rendering, the overall arrangement reveals a very calculated and symmetrical approach, as exemplified by the corners: a single bunch of grapes and two open leaves at either side of a corner. Every line seems to be deliberate, and not one protrudes from the well-defined boundaries.

Not much has remained of the painted flora in the tomb at Or ha-Ner, dated to around 300 AD and located only a few kilometers south of Ashkelon. Faded remnants of vine trellises are still discernible on the vault summit¹⁸. The single surviving leaf shows free brush strokes using a diluted green colour¹⁹ and the parallel curved lines depict trellises rendered in opaque brown brush strokes, all without contours. Another single leaf, which has survived on the lower panel of the wall, is differently rendered, using thick and opaque green brush strokes, however also without contours²⁰. The very lightly, freely and generally rendered brown rounded forms, with an occasional very diluted green wash on their surface, can thus be identified as vine trellises and twigs.

Little can be said regarding the two painted bunches of grapes in the Early Byzantine Jewish tomb at Beit Guvrin (Abb. 1). Unlike the meticulously rendered birds, particularly manifested by the peacocks, the grapes are very schematic, suspended in midair and corresponding to nothing else; to a certain extent they resemble those of Kh. Ḥumzin (Abb. 9).

A large vine tree occupies the *arcosolium* of the Byzantine Christian Tomb with Birds at Beit Guvrin²¹. It was painted in red monochrome and is composed of a central free-floating short trunk with a vertical long branch, from which two wavy twigs extend horizontally to either side. A few small sketchy leaves and schematic bunches of detached grapes feature on its surface.

The western wall of the Christian tomb at Kibbutz Lohamey ha-Getaoth²² displays a large vine planted within a vessel and whose rounded scrolls spread across the entire surface of the *arcosolium* (Abb. 7). The trellises are designed in parallel tangential brown-and-beige opaque brush strokes. The few leaves reveal a very diluted green colour and the grapes are painted in homogenous dark brown. Even though the vine is highly organized into medallion forms, with bunches of grapes of different sizes, it is otherwise rendered freely and spreads across the surface. While the colouring and texture are non-realistic, the uneven surface is skillfully used to create a tangible three-dimensionality that, together with the illusionistic representation, establishes both balance and a sense of movement.

Similar stylistic characteristics to those revealed in the analysis of the peacock motif can also be found in the vine motif. The earliest example – that at Jericho – reflects a free composition and good understanding of the vine's characteristics despite not necessarily employing a realistic means of expression. The virtuosity of the artist is manifested through the lack of adherence to any strict rules, while still showing an admirable understanding of the whole rather than the parts. The paintings in the Upper Galilee reflect two styles: that exemplified in Ḥanita is well organized within panels, considerably schematic and often incoherent, while still preserving some of the realistic, if not illusionistic, qualities. Greater attention is given there to the particular rather than the general. The nearby Khirbet Ḥumzin tomb paintings manifest neither naturalistic nor abstract qualities, presenting monochromatic, isolated and inaccurately rendered motifs scattered randomly across the surface, as if simply stuck to the walls. In Beit Guvrin the style is symmetrical, with minimal choice of both motifs and colour (limited in fact to red), and tending to display isolated motifs detached from their surroundings. Both the Jewish and the Christian tombs share similar characteristics. In the Western Galilee Lohamey ha-Getaoth tomb the overall composition reflects a fresh, free and fluent style, apparent also in the various details, never too strict or too exact.

¹⁸ Tsafir 1968, pl. 19a; Michaeli 2004b, fig. 5a; Michaeli 2004a, fig. 4; Michaeli 2009, fig. 152a. 153.

¹⁹ Michaeli 2004a, fig. 4c.

²⁰ Michaeli 2004b, fig. 5a.

²¹ Moulton 1914, fig. 6; only a poor black-and-white photograph of this *arcosolium* taken in the early 20th century is known to date, and written documentation is also sparse. The location of this tomb is no longer known. See Moulton 1914, 62–71; Moulton 1921, 95–102.

²² Foerster 1986, 426 fig. 2; Michaeli 2009, fig. 202–208.

HUMAN BUSTS

Depictions of human figures feature in six painted tombs in Israel, either as busts or in full length, of both sexes, either dressed or naked, youths or adults. I would like to relate to the stylistic aspects of three deceased women, presumably representing the patronesses of the relevant tombs, rendered as busts. They seem to manifest and also to further emphasize the different styles with regard to both date and location.

The bust in the central part of the summit of the Nymphs tomb at Ashkelon, which I have identified as that of the patroness of the tomb²³, is rendered in three-quarter view (Abb. 8). Her locks of soft curly hair are gathered up on her head, and her complexion reflects graded hues using a light and shade technique to accentuate the three-dimensionality of her rounded, beautiful face and somewhat pensive or dreamy expression. A contour defines her countenance in a very delicate manner, emphasizing its roundness and merging with the other hues of her face and hair. The broadness of her shoulders, which is increased by the manner in which she holds up the bouquet, is however contrasted by the very light and indefinite hue of her garment. All these also contribute to the interplay between the physical and spiritual aspects of this exceptional figure.

At the Or ha-Ner tomb the principal decoration comprises fourteen busts within medallions, of which three represent women. The patroness of the tomb (Abb. 10), who is also the best preserved, heads the series of medallions²⁴. She is almost frontal, with oversized, highly emphasized eyes. Her oval, somewhat elongated face and each individual facial feature is firmly delineated by a broad red homogenous contour, while red shading on the cheeks and neck creates flat surfaces rather than emphasizing their roundness. Similar characteristics are discernible in the depiction of her blond hair, which is portrayed in a rigidly rendered style, without any real qualitative distinction, and gathered into a black net, arranged symmetrically at either side and collected on top of her head with a knot. The contours of the body are vague beneath several layers of clothing.

The patroness of the Byzantine Tomb with Busts at Beit Guvrin²⁵ is rendered in an extremely stylized manner as an approximately half-body, longer than a bust (Abb. 11). She is depicted frontally, leaning to her left and holding a wreath in her raised left arm. Her figure is very linear in design, outlined in a homogenous red contour with a red necklace around her long and narrow neck. The face forms an elongated oval, outlined by a thick red line, and the entire composition is rendered against a neutral background. An oversized wavy line indicates her lips, the lower part of her nose is delineated above the mouth, and the wide-open oversized eyes are located almost on the forehead. She seems to be wearing an impressive headdress tied at the side and descending to her left earlobe. What should be her body is flat and covered with an indefinite number of uncertain garments. No attempt seems to have been made to create light and shade or three-dimensionality.

Similar stylistic characteristics to those featured in the above analyses of the peacocks and vines (from free-style Hellenistic, to the more rigid, locally centered, to the almost sketchy works of the periphery) are emphatically expressed in these three female busts. This is perhaps particularly prominent due to the discovery of only three busts painted in different regions and at different times. The rendering of the patroness of the tomb in Ashkelon offers a diffusion of colours and shades, both primary and pastel, a three-quarter position, and a dreamy oblique gaze. At Or ha-Ner, which is located close to Ashkelon and dates to about fifty years later, the style reveals frontality, rigidity, linearity, a local juxtaposition of colours, and an utter disregard for corporality of the body; yet it is nonetheless figurative. The Beit Guvrin bust, dated to about fifty years later than the Or ha-Ner tomb, is monochromatic, sketchy and ignores the rules of depiction to the extent that some parts are unidentifiable. However, the general rendering is decipherable.

In conclusion, in all three discussed motifs in the analyzed painted tombs, representing the fauna, flora and human world, similar stylistic aspects can be discerned: in mid-3rd century Ashkelon (Mediterranean seashore) a deeply-rooted Hellenistic style dominates, albeit rendered in a variety of modes. A similar spirit can be seen to have emerged or continued about 150 years later in the Western Galilee, as manifested at

²³ Michaeli 2001, 166 pl. 21 (5) – (6).

²⁴ Michaeli 1998, fig. 7 a–c. 8 a–c; Michaeli 2009, fig. 141. 147. 149; Tsafirir 1968, pl. 14A. 16B.

²⁵ Michaeli 2008, pl. 1 (1) – (2) fig. 7.1.

Lohamey ha-Getaoth. Both centres seem to reveal an affinity to the important centre of Alexandria, from which little has been preserved; and perhaps also to Antioch. Another centre, dated to the end of the 3rd–beginning of the 4th century, with distinctive characteristics, would appear to have existed in Jerusalem, featuring precise and naturalistic motifs. Its style may reflect that of the then prevailing one in 4th century Rome. Another centre stylistically related to Rome, though little discussed here, undoubtedly existed in 2nd century *Caesarea Maritima*. A third artistic, albeit more local, school seems to have existed at Beit Guvrin in the Judean plain. Though not all of the same quality, the painted tombs in this latter region manifest common characteristics, expressed in monochromatic red images and isolated motifs, but organized into a coherent program and with a strong tendency towards symmetry.

The further the tombs are located from such centres as Ashkelon or Jerusalem, the more the local styles prevail, showing a schematic character, rigidity, limited colour palette and remoteness from naturalism or accuracy. This is particularly demonstrated in Hanita in the Upper Galilee, in relation to Lohamey ha-Getaoth, which still preserves a coloristic quality and a coherent arrangement, whereas such qualities have completely disappeared in the not very distant but much more peripheral Kh. Humzin. Similar tendencies can be discerned when comparing Ashkelon and Or ha-Ner. The lapse of about fifty years would seem to be a less significant factor in regard to the stylistic differences, as the above analysis has revealed the continuation, albeit with some development, of the earlier styles. Thus, the more isolated settlements seem to have developed a local style, often associated with more ‘eastern’ influences, like that of Jordan or Palmyra. Interestingly, no stylistic changes seem to have taken place with regard to the different religions. This could imply, as I have shown elsewhere, that the same artists, not only employing the same style but also using the same iconography, could have worked for different patrons, holding different religious beliefs.

Bibliographie

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bliss – Macalister 1902 | F. J. Bliss – R. A. S. Macalister, <i>Excavations in Palestine during the Years 1898–1900</i> (London 1902). |
| Foerster 1986 | G. Foerster, <i>A Painted Christian Funerary Cave near Kibbutz Lohamey ha-Getaoth</i> , in: M. Yedaiah (ed.), <i>Qadmonioth ha-Galil ha-Maaravi</i> (Tel Aviv 1986) 416–431 (Hebrew). |
| Frankel – Getzov 1997 | R. Frankel – N. Getzov, <i>Archaeological Survey of Israel. Map of Akhziv. Map of Hanita</i> (Hebrew with English summary) (Jerusalem 1997). |
| Goodenough 1953–68 | E. R. Goodenough, <i>Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period</i> , 13 Bd. (New York 1953–1968). |
| Hachlili – Killebrew 1999 | R. Hachlili – A. E. Killebrew, <i>Jericho. The Jewish Cemetery of the Second Temple Period</i> , <i>Israel Antiquity Reports</i> 7 (Jerusalem 1999). |
| Kloner 1975 | A. Kloner, <i>A Painted Tomb on the Mount of Olives</i> , <i>Qadmoniot</i> 8/1 (29), 1975, 27–30 (Hebrew). |
| Michaeli 1998 | T. Michaeli, <i>The Pictorial Program of the Tomb near Kibbutz Or-ha-Ner in Israel</i> , <i>Assaph Studies in Art History</i> , Secion B. 3, 1998, 37–76. |
| Michaeli 1999 | T. Michaeli, <i>The Wall Painting of the Migdal Ashqelon Tomb</i> , <i>Atiqot</i> 37, 1999, 211–223 (Hebrew with English summary). |
| Michaeli 2001 | T. Michaeli, <i>The Iconographic Program of the Tomb of the Nymphs at Ashqelon</i> , in: A. Barbet (éd.), <i>La peinture funéraire antique, IV^e siècle av. J.-C.–IV^e ap. J.-C.</i> , <i>Actes du VII colloque de l'AIPMA</i> , 6–10 Octobre 1998, Saint-Romain-en-Gal – Vienne (Paris 2001) 163–170. |
| Michaeli 2004a | T. Michaeli, <i>Iconography and Symbolism of Vaults and Ceilings in Painted Tombs in Israel</i> , in: L. Borhy (éd.), <i>Plafonds et voûtes à l'époque antique. Actes du VIII^e colloque international de l'AIPMA</i> , 15–19 Mai 2001 Budapest-Veszprem (Budapest 2004) 79–87. |
| Michaeli 2004b | T. Michaeli, <i>The Painted Tomb at Or-ha-Ner</i> , in: L. Borhy (éd.), <i>Plafonds et voûtes à l'époque antique, Actes du VIII^e colloque international de l'AIPMA</i> , 15–19 Mai 2001 Budapest-Veszprem (Budapest 2004) 379–384. |
| Michaeli 2008 | T. Michaeli, <i>A Painted Tomb in the East Cemetery</i> , in: G. Avni – U. Dahari – A. Kloner, <i>The Necropolis of Bet Guvrin – Eleutheropolis</i> (Chapter 7) <i>Israel Antiquity Reports</i> 36 (Jerusalem 2008) 187–199. |
| Michaeli 2009 | T. Michaeli, <i>Visual Representations of the Afterlife. Six Roman and Early Byzantine Painted Tombs in Israel</i> (Leiden 2009). |
| Moulton 1914 | W. J. Moulton, <i>A Recently Discovered Painted Tomb of Palestine</i> , <i>Art and Archeology</i> 1, 1914–15, 62–71. |
| Moulton 1921 | W. J. Moulton, <i>A Painted Christian Tomb at Beit Jibrin</i> , <i>Annual of the American School of Orient</i> 2–3, 1921–22, 95–102. |

- Nuzzo 2000 D. Nuzzo, *Tipologia sepolcrale delle catacombe romane. I cimiteri ipogei delle vie Ostiense, Ardeantina e Appia*, BARIntSer 905 (Oxford 2000).
- Ory 1939 J. Ory, A Painted Tomb near Ascalon, QDAP 8, 1939, 38–44.
- Stern 1958 H. Stern, Les mosaïques de l'église de Sainte-Constance à Rome, DOP 12, 1958, 157–218.
- Tsafrir 1968 Y. Tsafrir, A Painted Tomb at Or ha-Ner, IEJ 18, 1968, 170–180.

Abbildungen

- Abb. 1: Jewish tomb with birds at Beit Guvrin, general scheme, plan and sections. (After Bliss – Macalister 1902, Pl. XCI)
- Abb. 2: Ashkelon, Tomb of the Peacock, a striding peacock on the vault. (Courtesy Israel Antiquities Authority)
- Abb. 3: Migdal Ashkelon, Tomb with Naked Youths, a peacock held by a youth, det. of the second niche. (Courtesy Israel Antiquities Authority)
- Abb. 4: Ḥanita, peacock within vine trellises, first panel on the western wall. (Photograph T. MICHAELI)
- Abb. 5: Jerusalem, Mount of Olives, birds' Cave, peacock on the ceiling and north-western corner. (Photograph Z. RADOVAN, courtesy A. KLONER)
- Abb. 6: Beit Guvrin, Christian tomb with Birds, a peacock on the rear wall. (After Moulton, 1914, fig. 4)
- Abb. 7: Lohamey ha-Getaoth, birds within vine trellises, western *arcosolium*. (Photograph T. MICHAELI)
- Abb. 8: Ashkelon, Nymphs Tomb, before the latest restorations, summit of vault with vine trellises and the bust of the deceased patroness. (Photograph T. MICHAELI)
- Abb. 9: Khirbet Ḥumzin, soffit on the western wall, bunches of grapes. (Photograph T. MICHAELI)
- Abb. 10: Or ha-Ner, eastern wall, bust of the tomb patroness within medallion. (After Tsafrir 1968, col. pl. D)
- Abb. 11: Beit Guvrin, Christian tomb with busts, bust of the tomb patroness. (Courtesy Israel Antiquities Authority)

Talila Michaeli
Art History Department – Tel Aviv University
Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv
IL – 69978
michaeli@post.tau.ac.il

