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Abstract
Mosaic production in the Hellenistic period can be
divided into two broad regional types, eastern and
western, on the basis of stylistic and technical differ-
ces that are derived from varying local traditions of
paving. The characteristics of these schools are out-
lined, and the earliest mosaics at Pompeii are shown
to be derived from the western Greek tradition. How-
ever, comparison of the Pompeian floors with contem-
porary mosaics from Greek sites also reveals a signifi-
cant difference: the first Pompeian mosaics consist
almost exclusively of figured scenes set into relatively
plain pavements, whereas in Greek mosaics abstract
decoration is much more common, and figural motifs
are the exception rather than the rule. These differences
reflect a difference in the purpose of mosaics: Pompeian
patrons wanted the decoration of their houses to display
their familiarity with Greek culture, which encouraged
the production of copies and pastiches of Greek art-
works, and generic designs in Greek style.
The very specific demands of the Pompeian market
may have been served by a different process of pro-
duction: there are signs of a separation between the
manufacture of figured panels, which were probably
made by Greeks, and the laying of the pavement itself,
which may have been the work of local craftsmen.*

The well-known pavements from Pompeii tend to
dominate discussions of Hellenistic mosaics,1 but lit-
tle attention has been paid to the question of exactly
how they were related to mosaics elsewhere in the
Hellenistic world. There has been no attempt to set
them in the context of a comprehensive study of
Hellenistic mosaics since the work of Blake and Per-
nice published in the 1930s.2 Many new discoveries
have been made in the intervening period, espe-
cially in Greece, which have given us a much clearer
picture of the early development of mosaic. I have
produced an up-to-date survey, based on a complete
corpus of Greek mosaics of the period,3 and I hope
to show that consideration of the stylistic and tech-
nical differences between Pompeian and Greek mosa-
ics yields interesting insights into the tastes and de-
sires of the wealthy Italians who chose to decorate
their houses with Greek mosaics, and also throws some
light on the process of mosaic production. In this ar-
ticle, two broad regional stylistic schools of Hellenistic
mosaics are defined, and in the light of these, the rel-
ationship between the earliest mosaics at Pompeii
and the Greek mosaic tradition is examined.

The first mosaics at Pompeii are contemporary
with the First Style of wall painting, in the late sec-
ond or early first century B.C.; this article will be con-
cerned mainly with mosaics made during the period
of the First Style and the transition to the Second. In
the Greek world, tessellated mosaics had been in use
since the third century, but few of the surviving ex-
amples can be securely dated earlier than the mid-
second century, and most date from the second half
of the second century or later. Those on Delos, which
constitute about half of the total known from the
period, are thought to have been made in the pe-

* The work presented here was carried out at Manch-
ter University and the British School at Athens, and I
would like to thank both institutions for their generous fi-
nancial and practical support. I am also indebted to the
British School at Rome for a travel grant that allowed me
to study the Pompeian and Sicilian mosaics at first hand.
Thanks are also due to Roger Ling and the anonymous
A/JA referee for their comments on the paper; any errors
that remain are entirely my own. Mosaics on Delos are re-
ferred to in the text by Bruneau’s catalogue numbers (Bru-
neau 1972), cited in the form “Delos xxy.”
1 E.g., Robertson (1975) illustrates his discussion of Hel-
lenistic tessellated mosaics with six examples from Pompeii
and only one from the Greek world, and Charbonneaux et
al. (1973) illustrate seven mosaics from Pompeii and four
from Greek sites; Pollitt (1986) redresses the balance
somewhat with seven Greek mosaics and eight from
Pompeii, although this still does not reflect the fact that
Greek mosaics outnumber contemporary Pompeian ones
by at least ten to one.
2 Blake 1930; Percinse 1938. A more recent article by
Joyce (1979) is more restricted in scope, considering only
mosaics from Delos, rather than the whole Greek world.
3 Westgate 1995. The thesis is currently being updated
for publication in the series Oxford Monographs on Classical
Archaeology, and the statistics quoted here include addi-
tions to the corpus since 1995. However, in view of the un-
certainties of classification and dating, the figures should
only be taken as a rough indication of general trends.
period after the Roman intervention of 166. The final sack of Delos in 69 B.C. is a useful reference point for comparing developments in east and west, as the Second Style made its first appearance on the island at around the time of this disaster.4

Tessellated mosaics have been found all over the Hellenistic world: in Greece and the Aegean islands, Asia Minor, Israel, Egypt, Cyrenaica, Spain, Sicily, and southern Italy. Their basic design is the same everywhere: the composition is almost invariably concentric, consisting of one or more decorated borders framing a central field, which is sometimes decorated with geometric patterns or vegetal designs; a few examples have a central figured scene. This type of composition was originally designed for dining rooms, which were the most common location for mosaics, thus they usually have a broad undecorated border around the walls for couches to stand on, creating the impression of a patterned carpet laid on a plain floor (fig. 1).5

GREEK MOSAICS IN EAST AND WEST

Within this general tradition, there are two broad stylistic groupings, which may be described as eastern and western, although there is some geographical overlap. The regional variations in style and technique have often been noted individually, but considering them as a whole helps to illuminate relationships among mosaics in different parts of the Hellenistic world.

The most fundamental stylistic difference between east and west is that western mosaics are designed to mark out divisions of space more explicitly, both between rooms and within a single room. This is seen most clearly in the treatment of doorways. In the east the entrance to the room is often marked by a small decorated panel set in the undecorated outer border in front of the threshold (as in fig. 1). This type of threshold “mat” is derived from the design of Classical pebble mosaics in andrones, which often have a similar panel interrupting the raised surround on which the couches stood (fig. 2). The position of the panel is determined by the arrangement of the couches or a desire for symmetry, rather than by the location of the door, which means that occasionally the panel is not aligned with the door (e.g., Delos 261, 267).

This type of threshold panel is found in some mosaics in the west, but many western mosaics substi-

---

4 One house, the Maison de l’épée, was abandoned in the process of being redecorated in the Second Style (Al-abe 1991).

5 The origins of the concentric composition are discussed more fully in Westgate 1997–1998.
tute a decorated strip across the doorway itself, between the doorjambs (fig. 3); in exedras, a strip across the open front marks the boundary between the room and the circulation area beyond. Similar decorated strips are also used to create divisions of space within a room: in bedrooms a decorated band (often described by the Italian term *scendiletto*) sometimes marks the transition between the circulation area at the front of the room and the area at the back where the bed stood (fig. 4). The division is often reinforced by different decoration in different parts of the room: in bedrooms the pavement in the front part of the room tends to be finer and more elaborately decorated than the area under the bed (as in fig. 4, where the bed platform is paved in plain white tessellation, while the area in front has a decorated panel). In the east a single concentric design generally covers the whole floor, and thresholds or dividing strips are virtually unknown (for exceptions, see below).\

The origins of this difference lie in different regional traditions of decorated paving. The western use of mosaic decoration to mark out divisions of space is derived from pavements in *opus signinum*, a bright red mortar containing crushed terra-cotta, which the Greeks in Sicily and Italy adopted from their Punic neighbors in North Africa and western Sicily in the third century. By the late Hellenistic period it was the standard second-rate type of pavement in Italy and Sicily, at Greek and non-Greek sites alike. It was often elaborated by the addition of stone chips, tesserae, or insets of colored stone, and the varying density of these elements and the regularity and complexity of the patterns formed by them were used to distinguish and subdivide spaces. Doorways are sometimes marked by a concentration of chips or to the room shown in von Boeselager 1983, pl. xvii.33).

E.g., Morgantina, House of the Arched Cistern, room 24 (Tsakiris 1989, 405, cat. no. 9, fig. 20) and House of the Tuscan Capitals, room 22 (Tsakiris 1989, 404–5, cat. no. 12, fig. 24); Palermo, House B in Piazza della Vittoria, room 1 (von Boeselager 1983, pl. x:20); Soluntum, Hellenistic bath (“House 6”), east of the main street (entrance 69, pl. 70.

7 The differences in the relationship of eastern and western pavements to their architectural setting are explored in more detail in Westgate (forthcoming).

8 For a recent summary of the paving types in use at Punic sites, see Rakob 1991, 220–3, pls. 49–52, 60, 70.
tesserae, which occasionally form a true mosaic. Some of the earliest surviving tessellated mosaics at Greek sites are threshold panels of this type (fig. 5), and it has been plausibly suggested that the technique of tessellated mosaic, in the west at least, was derived from the use of tesserae in opus signinum. The decoration of opus signinum pavements continued to have a considerable influence on the design of Italian mosaics in the late Hellenistic period and beyond.

This influence was probably encouraged by the fact that pebble mosaic seems not to have been widespread in the west. The majority of surviving pebble mosaics are in the east, in Greece and the islands, Asia Minor, and the Black Sea area. Only one is known in Sicily, at Motya, and a few in Magna Graecia, all of rather poor quality and later than the main development of pebble mosaic in the east. Opus signinum, on the other hand, is rare in the Hellenistic east. The design of eastern tessellated mosaics is therefore derived directly from the pebble mosaic tradition and is thus more dependent on the type of composition originally designed for the Classical andron, with its single central “carpet” and threshold mat in front of the door (fig. 2).

The eastern and western “schools” of mosaic are also distinguished by certain technical features. In the east, the tesserae in undecorated areas are almost always set in rows parallel to the walls of the room (fig. 6), whereas western mosaicists often laid the tesserae in diagonal rows, at 45° to the walls (fig.

---

9 E.g., the Hellenistic baths at Megara Hybleaia are paved throughout in opus signinum decorated with simple scatterings and grids of white tesserae; across the broad opening between rooms d and f is a band marked out on either side by a single row of tesserae with a dense fill of colored stone chips. The doorway of room e is paved with white chips set closely to form a continuous surface and is decorated with green tesserae arranged at regular intervals.

10 The threshold mosaic between rooms d and g of the baths at Megara Hybleaia is a checkerboard of black, white, and red tesserae (Vallet et al. 1983, 53, figs. 59, 41); it must predate the destruction of the city in 214. An early tessellated threshold from Gela, decorated with a black-and-white meander (now lost), is based on the same principle but led into an andron paved in white stone chips rather than opus signinum (von Boeselager 1983, 24–6, pl. iii.6). This may be even earlier than the mosaic at Megara Hybleaia, as it probably dates from before the sack of Gela in 282.


12 Salzmann 1982, no. 72.

13 At Arpi (Salzmann 1982, nos. 12–14), Taras (Salzmann 1982, no. 124), and Metapontion (Salzmann 1982, no. S1). A group of monochrome pebble mosaics in Apulia, made with pebbles laid on edge to form patterns of texture, seems to belong to a local tradition unconnected with Greek pebble mosaics (e.g., Salzmann 1982, nos. 57–60 at Herdonia, and no. 27 from Ausculum).
7). The geographical distribution of diagonal setting does not correspond exactly to the distribution of threshold strips, however: at Cyrene diagonal setting of plain areas is found alongside eastern-style threshold panels.14

The technique of *opus sectile* (stone pieces cut to shape and fitted together) is also distinctively western. It is never used for entire pavements in the Hellenistic period; instead, it usually forms the central field of the pavement, sometimes framed by one or two stripes made of short strips of stone, with the outer borders in tessellated mosaic.15 Nearly all of the surviving Hellenistic examples of opus sectile at Greek sites are in the west,16 and all depict the same pattern of lozenges forming trompe l’oeil cubes. The lozenges are always alternately black, white, and grey-blue or grey-green (fig. 8).17 Eastern mosaicists represented this motif in tesserae and in much brighter colors, with red loz-

---

14 Both appear on the same pavement in the north hestiatorion near the Temple of Zeus and in the Casa del Mosaico ad Onda (Baldassare 1976, 203–10, figs. 12, 15–17). Diagonal setting is also found in the mosaics of the Casa del Mosaico Illusionistico (Baldassare 1976, 194–201, figs. 2–5), in a hestiatorion in the Sanctuary of Apollo (Baldassare 1976, 211–4, fig. 23), and in a pavement under the Temple of Apollo (Baldassare 1970, 57–61, pl. 17). There is also diagonal tessellation on two mosaics in Alexandria: on the threshold panel of the Erotes mosaic from Shatby (Greco-Roman Museum, no. 21643: Daszewski 1985, 103–10, no. 2, pls. 4, 6b), and in the central field of a mosaic depicting a pair of wrestlers, where outsized tesserae (2.2 cm) are used, aligned with the aid of lead strips (Guimier-Sorbets 1998, 272–4, figs. 9, 10).

15 A few mosaics make more limited use of sectile pieces in combination with tesserae; they fall into two groups, probably each associated with a single workshop. Four pavements in two houses at Morgantina have stone strips and triangles in meander patterns and specially shaped pieces for details in the figured scenes, including the well-known Ganymede (Tsakiris 1989, 397–401, nos. 1–4, figs. 10–15). Two Alexandrian pavements use opus sectile in an unparalleled combination with tesserae and pebbles: the threshold panel of the Erotes mosaic from Shatby (supra n. 14) is framed with a bead-and-reel and swastika-meander in opus sectile, and the fragments of the other pavement also included an opus sectile bead-and-reel (Daszewski 1985, 111–4, nos. 5–7, pl. 1).

16 Apart from the pavements in the House of the Consul Attalus described below, the only two eastern appearances of opus sectile are both thought to be post-Hellenistic replacements for original centerpieces in tessellation: one is in a mosaic from Rhodes (Drelissi 1990, 469–70, pl. 237b), and the other in the Marble Hall in the Heroon at Pergamon (Filgus and Radt 1986, 23–6, pls. 4.1, 14).

17 E.g., Palermo, Piazza della Vittoria, house B, room 1 (von Boeselager 1983, 48, pl. x.20); Segesta, Casa del Nava- carca, room B (Bechtold 1997, 136–7, pl. 11.7); fragments from Syracuse (Pernice 1938, 16, pl. 14.4); Soluntum, Casa di Leda, rooms g and o (von Boeselager 1983, 56, pl. xii.31), and fragments thought to be from house 1 (von Boeselager 1983, 64, pl. xii.34).
enges in place of grey (fig. 1), often alternated with yellow, and sometimes bright blue and green glass.18 Only two eastern pavements, both in the House of the Consul Attalus at Pergamon,19 have cubes in opus sec-tile and use the subdued western color scheme.

Finally, another difference between east and west is in the subsidiary materials used in combination with mosaic. In the finest pavements in both east and west the whole surface is made of squared tesserae, but it was common for customers to economize by having parts of the floor done in a cheaper material. In most cases the cheaper material is used only for the outermost or adjusting border, which must usually have been concealed under dining couches, but sometimes it extends over more of the surface. In the east the subsidiary material is usually rough chips of stone (figs. 1, 6)20 or occasionally pebbles;21 in the west, although chips are found in a few pavements, it was more common to use opus signinum, sometimes decorated with inset tesserae (fig. 7).22

On the other hand, one feature that has in the past been identified as exclusively eastern23 is in fact

---

18 This color scheme is found in several mosaics at Delos (Delos 15, 73, 167, 195, 215, 235, 242, 270, 315, 325, 334), Athens (Alexandri 1969, 72–3, pl. 60B), Demetrias (Salzmann 1982, no. 136), and Thmuis in Egypt (Daszews 1985, 163–4, no. 41, fig. 9, pl. 36b). The only parallel in the west is a small threshold mosaic in the House of the Arched Cistern at Morgantina, made in black, red, and yellow tesserae (room 24: Tsakiris 1989, 403, no. 9, figs. 20, 21). The mosaic is in the less elaborately decorated of the two courtyards of the house, which seems to have been a private and service area and perhaps did not warrant an opus sectile pavement: see my comments in Westgate (forthcoming).

19 In rooms 37 (Salzmann 1991, 440–4, fig. 10) and 38 (Dörpfeld 1907, 184, pls. xv, xvii.2).

20 Adjusting borders of stone chips are ubiquitous on Delos (e.g., Delos 54, 214, 215, 217, 264, 267, 270, 276, 277); more extensive areas of chips are combined with tessellation in Delos 165, 194, and 261.

21 Delos 50, 306, and 307 have adjusting borders of pebble mosaic.

22 Stone chips are used for an adjusting border in the House of the Official at Morgantina (room 14: Tsakiris 1989, 400–1, no. 4, fig. 14), whereas opus signinum is used for the same purpose in pavements at Gela (von Boeselager 1983, 24–6, pl. iii.6), Milazzo (von Boeselager 1983, 65–70, pls. xix.38, xx.39), and Taormina (von Boeselager 1983, 36–9, pl. vi.10–11), and more extensively in the House of the Tuscan Capitals at Morgantina (room 10: Tsakiris 1989, 403–4, no. 10, fig. 22), the Casa di Leda at Soluntum (room h: von Boeselager 1983, 56) and the peristy house at Monte Iato (Wilson 1987–1988, 141, fig. 47).

23 E.g., by Pernice (1998, 23).
found in mosaics all over the Greek world, namely the use of thin lead strips set on edge to outline the designs (fig. 9). In the case of at least one mosaic, a panel depicting an armillary sphere from the Casa di Leda at Soluntum, the presence of lead strips has been used as evidence of eastern manufacture.\(^{24}\) In fact, as von Boeselager points out,\(^{25}\) strips are quite common in Sicilian mosaics, including several in the Casa di Leda and elsewhere, which were clearly laid in situ.\(^{26}\) Fewer tessellated mosaics are known from Greek sites on the Italian mainland, and their quality is generally poor, but at least one contains lead strips;\(^{27}\) they are also used extensively in the Hellenistic mosaics at Cyrene.

Elements of both eastern and western stylistic traditions are found at Greek sites in Sicily and southern Italy, often combined in the same pavement, but in the east there are very few western-style mosaics. The clearest example of western influence in the east is the House of the Consul Attalus at Pergamon, which, as mentioned above, contains the only eastern examples of opus sectile trompe l’oeil cubes in the characteristic western color scheme. The pavements in the house have other western features too: room 38 has a raised platform at the back, perhaps a western-style bed alcove, paved in distinctively western opus signinum;\(^{28}\) and the neighboring room 39 has white tesserae laid in diagonal rows in the adjusting border.

Even on Delos, which had a large population of Italian merchants, the mosaics have surprisingly few western features. The Italians did commission a few

---

\(^{24}\) De Vos 1975, 198, figs. 11, 12; followed by Daszewski (1985, 18) and Medekszia (1990, 117–8).

\(^{25}\) von Boeselager 1983, 66.

\(^{26}\) E.g., in the peristyle (a), room h, and bedroom g of the Casa di Leda (von Boeselager 1983, 56); in “House 6” at Soluntum (von Boeselager 1983, pl. xvii.33); in fragments from Catania (von Boeselager 1983, pl. xxii.44), house B at Herakleia Minoa (von Boeselager 1983, pl. xxii.43), and the peristyle house at Monte Iato (Wilson 1987–1988, 141, fig. 47); and in an unusual pavement at Milazo, where the strips are used to draw the outline of a figure against a background of mortar (von Boeselager 1983, pls. xix.38 and xx.39).

\(^{27}\) An unpublished fragment displayed in the Museo Nazionale at Taranto, inv. no. 51380. Lead strips tend to be a feature of the finest and most carefully laid mosaics.

\(^{28}\) Salzmann 1991, 442, fig. 11.
pavements in their native style for their agora, but it seems that they preferred their homes to be decorated in purely eastern Greek style. The only exception is the Maison de Fourni, a large and unusually elaborate house that has three pavements in opus signinum with patterns in inset tesserae (Delos 326, 326, 339) and a mosaic of a table with victory prizes consisting of olive crowns, palm branches, and a purse (Delos 325), which is most closely paralleled in Italy and North Africa. A fragment from a Nilotic landscape is the earliest known example of this genre in the east, appearing at a time when it was already popular in the west. Fragments from the upper floor (Delos 333) include a filling motif of squares divided diagonally into four triangles of different colors, which is common in Italy but is found in the east only in the House of the Consul Attalus. Other features of the mosaics in the Maison de Fourni, however, are more eastern looking, including brightly colored trompe l’oeil cubes executed in tesserae (Delos 325, 334).

Hellenistic Mosaics at Pompeii

The majority of pavements at Pompeii in the late second and early first centuries B.C. were of opus signinum, lavapesta (a local variant of signinum, using crushed lava instead of terra-cotta), or various grades of stone chips set in mortar. Very few rooms were paved with tessellated mosaics, and they are concentrated in only a few houses, most notably the Casa

---

29 The niche of Ofellus (niche 18) is paved in a rough form of opus signinum, decorated with white tesserae (Delos 17), and the strip across the opening of niche 10, bearing the dedication of L. Orbius, might be read as a western-style threshold strip (Delos 16).

30 The destroyed lower part of the panel might have shown a pair of fighting cocks, which appear frequently in such scenes (Bruneau 1972, 75–6). Bruneau (1972, 113–4) also identified the fish depicted in Delos 328 as a typically western subject, although this is more debatable.

31 Delos 335, recently identified as a Nilotic scene by Guimier-Sobets and Nenna (1992, 617, pl. 4.1). Contemporary Nile scenes in Italy include the large mosaic at Palaestrina and the threshold of the Alexander Mosaic in the Casa del Fauno (Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 9990).

32 The motif appears in a Republican villa at Rome, on the Via Nomentana (room F: Lugli 1930, 533, pl. 21.2); at Pompeii in the Villa of the Mysteries (room 4: Pernice 1938, pl. 22.1); and in room 39 of the House of the Consul Attalus (Dörpfeld 1907, 184, pl. xvii.1).
del Fauno (VI.12.2).\textsuperscript{33} It must therefore be borne in mind that they reflect the taste of a very narrow class of the wealthiest inhabitants, and probably also represent the style of a limited number of craftsmen or workshops. The design and technique of these early mosaics are drawn from the western Greek tradition. The Casa del Fauno, for example, had a threshold strip decorated with tragic masks across the entrance to the house itself, between the fauces and the atrium (fig. 10), and further strips across the open fronts of the tablinum (33) and the exedra with the Alexander Mosaic (37);\textsuperscript{34} cubiculum 28 has two raised bed platforms with plainer and coarser paving than the rest of the floor; the tablinum is paved with trompe l’oeil cubes in black, white, and green opus sectile (fig. 8); some areas of plain tessellation are laid diagonally (the central part of room 28 and the adjusting border of the Alexander Mosaic). The opus sectile cubes are also found in the cella of the Temple of Apollo and in exedra u of the Casa di Ttntolemo (VII.7.5), and there are other early opus sectile pavements with different designs, which have no contemporary parallels at Greek sites in east or west.\textsuperscript{35} Dividing strips and diagonal setting of plain areas continue in Roman mosaics of later periods.

However, the Pompeian mosaics differ from contemporary Greek mosaics in one striking respect: lead strips, which are found in about half of the surviving Greek pavements, were not used in the mosaics at Pompeii.\textsuperscript{36} This is rather surprising, given the general assumption that the earliest mosaics at Pompeii are fairly typical examples of Hellenistic mosaic. Their motifs and subjects belong to the Greek mosaic repertoire, and in view of the well-attested influx

\textsuperscript{33} The relative rarity of tessellated mosaic is very clearly illustrated by the map at the back of Bragantini et al. 1981, which represents the distribution of the various types of pavement in A.D. 79; in the earlier period under discussion here, the area covered by mosaics would have been even smaller.

\textsuperscript{34} Mosaic in fauces 53 (Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 9994: Pernice 1938, pl. 73, 74.1–2); Nilotic landscape from 37 (no. 9990: Pernice 1938, pl. 68); threshold of 33, decorated with a perspective meander (reused in Naples Museum: Pernice 1938, pl. 42.5).

\textsuperscript{35} In the fauces (53) and impluvium of the Casa del Fauno (Blake 1930, pl. 6.3–4).

\textsuperscript{36} A single strip was occasionally used at the join between pavements in adjacent rooms; for example, in the Casa del Fauno, between the pavements of ala 29 and the atrium, and between room 11 and atrium 7 (Pernice 1938, 93, n. 1; Baldassare 1994, 102).
of Greek artists and craftsmen into Italy in the second century B.C., it is hard not to imagine that Greek mosaicists from Magna Graecia or Sicily, and perhaps further afield, might have been commissioned to work at Pompeii, bringing their native techniques with them. Certainly the work of at least one Greek mosaicist has been found at Pompeii: two panels from the Villa of Gcero are signed by Dioskourides of Samos, although, for reasons that will be discussed below, they do not prove that Dioskourides actually visited Italy. Moreover, lead strips do appear in at least one early mosaic at a non-Greek site on the Italian mainland.37

The absence of lead strips at Pompeii may be partly explained by their usual function in tessellated mosaic as an aid to accurate laying of patterns: they were slotted into guidelines incised in the penultimate layer of mortar to mark out the areas to be filled in by the mosaicists38 and therefore were used mainly in geometric motifs such as meanders and waves rather than in figured scenes.39 Most of the early mosaics at Pompeii have few or no decorated borders in which lead strips might have been used.

37 Decorated fragments containing lead strips have been found at Fregellae (terminus ante quem 125 B.C.): Coarelli 1995, 22, fig. 16.
38 This is particularly clear from a mosaic in Samos, where part of the surface has broken away, revealing the guidelines underneath (Giannouli and Guimier-Sorbets 1988, 558, fig. 7).
39 There are a few exceptions: lead strips outlining figures as well as geometric patterns are found on three tessellated mosaics in Alexandria, the pavements with Erotes and wrestlers (supra n. 14), and another from the library site, depicting a dog (Guimier-Sorbets 1998, 271–2, fig. 4). This might be an indication that they date fairly early in the development of tessellated mosaic, when techniques were still close to those used in pebble mosaic (where strips were used for the outlines and internal contours of figures). Another mosaic in Alexandria, the bust of Alexandria by Sophilos (Greco-Roman Museum, no. 21739; Daszewski 1985, 142–6, no. 38, pl. A), has lead strips in the figured panel, but only for the straight lines of a mast and yardarm and the curved rim of a shield, where they serve a similar purpose to the strips in geometric borders. The same need for precision may explain the lead strips outlining the complex ellipses of the armillary sphere at Soluntum (supra n. 24).
40 Out of a total of 308 mosaics, there are 18 with human figures, 22 with nonhuman creatures, and 12 that depict objects; a further 9 may once have had a figural element.
41 These figures are based on the catalogue of photographs published by Bragantini et al. (1981–1986). Mariette De Vos (quoted in Tammisto 1997, 442–3) assigned 15 figural panels to the First Style and an additional 6 to either the First or the Second Style. However, both the panels, which are reusable, and the undecorated mosaics are difficult to date.
strikingly large proportion of undecorated pavements, which account for almost a quarter of the total, compared to no more than 5% of contemporary Greek mosaics. But apart from the four pavements made partially in opus sectile, there are no tessellated mosaics with entirely nonfigural decoration comparable to those that constituted 80% of contemporary Greek production.

This pattern may be merely the result of unequal survival rates: the early excavators of Pompeii tended to preserve figural works in preference to nonfigural decoration, often cutting figured scenes out of floors and walls, and leaving the remainder of the decoration to deteriorate and eventually disappear. And it is possible that the ancient inhabitants of the houses behaved in a similar way, retaining fine figured mosaics and replacing less prestigious geometric pavements with more up-to-date ones. Where early mosaics have been preserved complete, however, comparison with contemporary Greek mosaics does underline the dominance of the figured panel. The Pompeian mosaics, as observed above, have very few decorated borders; some have a single border framing the central picture, which is often part of a prefabricated panel (emblema), and in most cases the rest of the floor is undecorated or has only a narrow stripe border (fig. 11). In the Greek pavements, on the other hand, the patterned borders extend over most of the floor and accordingly carry greater decorative emphasis; in fact, the central field is often left entirely plain.

In other words, in Greek pavements the picture-panel is only part of an overall decorative scheme—and by no means an essential part—whereas at Pompeii the central picture seems to be the main point of the mosaic. The absence of the decorative framework, which is such an essential element of Greek mosaics, suggests that Pompeian patrons wanted mosaics for different reasons from their Greek counterparts and therefore adopted only the features of Greek mosaics, that served their needs while abandoning the overall structure of the standard Greek design, which was derived ultimately from Classical andron mosaics. A similar process can be seen at work in the adaptation of Greek models in contemporary Pompeian wall painting: the Greek version of the Masonry Style conforms closely to the structure of actual masonry construction, with orthostats rest-

---

42 At least 11 and possibly as many as 15 Greek tessellated mosaics had no decoration; all but one are white. Most are from Sicily, which perhaps reflects a general western preference for plainer pavements.
ing directly on a low plinth, whereas in the Pompeian First Style the orthostats are placed higher up the wall, where they subsequently evolve into the principal decorated zone. The Pompeians, unconstrained by the original logic of the style, used it as a purely decorative motif, divorced from the structure of real masonry.\(^{43}\)

The Italians’ interest in mosaic pictures is readily explained in the context of the Roman fashion for Greek and Greek-style art in the second and first centuries B.C., which generated an extensive industry making copies and pastiches of Greek works. This industry is well-attested in sculpture, and mosaic production was clearly serving a similar demand: the same compositions and figure-types appear repeatedly in mosaics at Pompeii and elsewhere in the Hellenistic world.\(^{44}\) They are generally assumed to be copies of famous Greek works, usually paintings, although whether any of them is in fact an exact copy is open to question. It is instructive that in the one case where we are able to link a group of surviving mosaics to a known “original”—the mosaic of doves on a basin by Sosus of Pergamon, described by Pliny (\textit{HN} 36.184)—no two of the “copies” are alike: the earliest version, from Delos, has three doves perched on the rim of the basin (Delos 168; fig. 12); a slightly later one from Pompeii has six, including one in flight and two on the ground (fig. 13);\(^{45}\) and the best-known example, from Hadrian’s Villa at Tivoli, which is often thought to be closest to the original, shows four birds.\(^{46}\) None of them, however, adequately depicts the reflection of the drinking dove in the water, which Pliny says was so admired in the original. In other words, the mosaics are not copies in the literal sense, but examples of a genre, possibly initiated by Sosus, which the mosaicist reinvented each time or adapted to suit different purposes. For example, in a mosaic from Capua the motif is used as the basis of an anecdotal scene, with the addition of a cat creeping up on the birds, two of which are exotic parrots instead of doves;\(^{47}\) and in the fish mosaic from the Casa del Fauno tiny versions of these, with two parakeets, an owl, and a small brown bird perched on different metal vessels, are used as subsidiary motifs within the peopled scroll border (fig. 14).\(^{48}\)

In some cases the resemblance is close enough to suggest more or less literal copying, as in the erotic group of a satyr embracing a maenad that is repeated, with slight variations attributable to different hands, in emblemata from Thmuis in Egypt and the Casa del Fauno at Pompeii;\(^{49}\) or in the two emblemata with comic scenes by Dioskourides of Samos, one depicting three women seated round a table and the other a group of street musicians, which belong to a long-lived tradition of theatrical scenes that may be derived from manuscript illustrations.\(^{50}\) Presumably,

\(^{43}\) The differences are outlined by Bruno (1969, 309–11).

\(^{44}\) I have discussed the sources and transmission of these repeated scenes at greater length elsewhere (Westgate 1999).

\(^{45}\) Casa delle colombe a mosaico (VIII.2.34), room n, probably from the period of the Second Style; now Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 114281 (Tammisto 1997, 379, no. DM3, pl. 32 [top]).

\(^{46}\) Tammisto 1997, 376–7, no. DM1, pl. 31 (top). Opinions vary as to whether it is Hellenistic or Hadrianic; it has even been suggested that it is the original (Donderer 1991). Two copies of the same composition exist, on a mosaic at Ferrara and a gem in Munich, but the authenticity of both is in doubt (Parlasca 1963).

\(^{47}\) Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 9992 (Tammisto 1997, 380–1, no. DM4, pl. 32 [bottom]).

\(^{48}\) Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 9997 (Tammisto 1997, pl. 58).

\(^{49}\) Emblemata from Thmuis, now Alexandria, Greco-Roman Museum, no. 21738 (Daszewski 1985, 160–3, no. 40, pl. 35a; Casa del Fauno, cubiculum 28, now Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 27707 (Daszewski 1985, pl. 35b).

\(^{50}\) Naples, Museo Nazionale, nos. 9985, 9987 (Pernice 1938, pls. 70, 71). The scene with the musicians is repeated in a painting of the first century A.D. from Sabiae (Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 9034: Ling 1991, 219, fig. 236), and the figures were also made individually as terracotta figurines (Bieber 1961, 94, figs. 341, 342). The three women appear again on a mosaic of ca. A.D. 300 at Mytilene, which depicts a series of scenes from the plays of Menander, each labelled with the title of the play (in this case the \textit{Synanmlosa}), the act number, and the names of the characters (Charitonidis et al. 1970, pl. 5.1).
copies or sketches of famous paintings and other works of art must have been in circulation for this purpose, as was certainly true for sculpture.\footnote{Plaster casts made from various originals, including Aristogeiton from the Tyrannicides group in Athens, have been found in a copyist’s workshop at Baiae (Landwehr 1985).}

Many of the repeated scenes, however, such as the doves, seem to be variations on a theme rather than copies of a specific original. The most popular of these genres was a seascape with fish and other creatures, versions of which have been found at sites all around the Mediterranean, including Pompeii, Rome, Palestrina, Ampurias, Soluntum, Syracuse, Delos, Rhodes, and Kos (figs. 14, 15, 16).\footnote{Most are listed by De Puma (1969) and Meyboom (1977).}

For the most part the similarities between the scenes are no greater than might be expected, in view of the fact that all the creatures represented are common Mediterranean species. Some have a black background, while others are set against shades of blue and green, suggesting water, and a few have a more elaborate landscape setting with a rocky coastline and buildings. Only two details might indicate a common model: a small bird perched on a rock at one side and a central group of two or three creatures fighting. These details do not appear on every mosaic, however, and they vary enough to suggest that direct copying is unlikely: the bird appears in different positions, sometimes with a shrimp in its beak. And although only three creatures, an octopus, a spiny lobster, and a murena, feature in the fighting group, they appear in different permutations: two mosaics from Pompeii show the octopus grappling with the spiny lobster, and the murena coming in to attack (figs. 14, 15);\footnote{Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 9997, from the Casa del Fauno, room 35, and no. 120177, from House VIII.2.16.} one from Ampurias includes only the murena and the spiny lobster;\footnote{Barcelona, Museo Arqueologico, no. 4030: Tammisto 1997, 360–1, no. SS4, pl. 16 (top).} the mosaic in the Antro delle Sorti at

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{dove_mosaic}
\caption{Dove mosaic from Pompeii VIII.2.34, room n. (Courtesy Alinari/Art Resource, NY)}
\end{figure}
Palestrina depicts the octopus struggling with the murena; and the mosaic from Kos shows only the spiny lobster (fig. 16). It appears that an idea, rather than an image, has been transmitted, and it is likely that the origin of the fight motif is an observation first recorded in Aristotle’s *Historia Animalium* (7.590b): “The octopus is stronger than the spiny lobster, so that if the spiny lobster even senses an octopus in the same net, it dies of fear; but the spiny lobster defeats the murena, which cannot slip away from it because of its rough surface; and the murena eats the octopus, because the octopus cannot deal with it on account of its smoothness.” The passage paraphrased by Pliny the Elder (*HN* 9.185) and repeated by several later Roman writers. In other words, it is a stock motif or *topos*—which is exactly how it functions in the mosaics.

Two fish mosaics from Pompeii (figs. 14, 15), however, are more alike than any of the others and may give us an insight into the way in which these scenes were created. They seem to be by different hands, but the similarities between them are close enough to suggest a shared prototype: the central group of the octopus and the spiny lobster is almost identical in both, though the position of the murena varies; both include the little bird, in the same position; and some of the fish appear in the same place on both. In view of their common provenance, it is possible that these mosaics were based on the same set of cartoons, perhaps by different mosaicists in the same

---

55 Gullini 1956, pls. II, VIII–XII. A painted frieze of fish in the Casa del Centenario at Pompeii (IX.8.3) includes two different groups, one with an octopus and a murena, and elsewhere a spiny lobster and a murena (Meyboom 1977, figs. 12, 14).

56 The emblema was reused in the “Casa Romana,” a house of the third century A.D.; now in Kos Museum (Meyboom 1977, 67, figs. 18, 18a on pl. 56).
workshop, who varied the details to satisfy the requirements of different customers, and perhaps to suit different budgets. The panel from the Casa del Fauno is finer and more elaborate, with a shaded background and an intricate vegetal scroll border, whereas the one from VIII.2.16 is smaller, with a uniform black background and no decorated border.57 Two smaller emblematas from Pompeii, attributed to the same hand as the one from VIII.2.16, may have been designed to meet tighter budgets: they show fewer fish, omitting the group with the octopus, on a plain black ground.58 Motifs from different genres could be combined to increase the range of possible designs. A basic compositional formula for still-life scenes, consisting of objects arranged in two registers, could be filled with a variety of motifs. In the most common variant, known from the Casa del Fauno (fig. 17) and three other versions, the upper register contains a cat carrying off a trussed chicken, which was also available separately as a sculpture, and the lower band shows a pair of ducks holding a lotus flower, borrowed from the popular genre of Nilotic scenes.59 Once again, the Casa del Fauno mosaicist has produced a more elaborate version for his wealthy patron by adding some small dead birds and several fish and shells from the repertoire of the fish mosaics. An alterna-

57 In a similar fashion, a consignment of Roman relief plaques found at Piraeus, depicting pairs of figures copied from the shield of the Athena Parthenos, offered a choice of plain or architectural backgrounds, presumably at different prices (Stewart 1990, pls. 370, 371). The process might also be compared to the creation of bronze statues in series, as described by Carol Mattusch (1996, esp. 151–90).


59 Casa del Fauno, ala 30 (Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 9993; Tammisto 1997, 387–9, no. CM1, pl. 36 [top]); Rome, via Ardeatina, first century B.C. (Museo Nazionale Romano, no. 124137; Tammisto 1997, 389–90, no. CM2, pl. 36 [bottom]); Ampurias, first century B.C. or A.D. (Barcelona, Museo Arqueologico, no. 4029: Tammisto 1997, 390–1, no. CM3, pl. 37 [top]); and a second century A.D. mosaic now in the Vatican (Sala degli Animali, no. 420: Tammisto 1997, pl. 37 [bottom]). The cat is copied in a statuette from Damüls in Egypt (Cairo Museum, no. 27518: Daszewski 1985, pl. 46b). The exact poses of the ducks vary, but all can be paralleled in different Nilotic scenes.

Fig. 15. Fish mosaic from Pompeii VIII.2.16. (Courtesy Alinari/Art Resource, NY)
tive version of the same composition, known in two copies, retains the Nilotic ducks in the lower zone but replaces the cat with fish from the fish mosaics, while in other mosaics the same elements from seascape and Nilotic scenes are combined in a landscape setting.

In fact, the range of figural motifs in Hellenistic mosaics is surprisingly limited, although obviously the disproportionate number of surviving emblemata from Pompeii exaggerates this impression because they were probably made by a small number of workshops. Attempts have even been made to link mosaics from further afield to one of the Pompeian workshops on the grounds of repeated motifs, but it seems more likely that the similarities are the product of fashion and a shared method of composition. By using a repertoire of genres, motifs, and stock types, sometimes copying from specific originals and sometimes working from memory, the mosaicists were able to design a series of emblemata that were different enough for each to be individual but still recognizable as works in the Greek tradition: the owners of the dove mosaics may have been proud to display their appreciation of Sosus’s famous masterpiece, even if none of the mosaics is actually a copy of Sosus’s work.

Not only did the mosaic pictures themselves suggest familiarity with Greek art, but many of the subjects too seem to have been chosen to reinforce pretensions to Greek culture. The owner of the Casa del Fauno was making a very deliberate statement about himself when he chose a pair of tragic masks to mark the entrance to his house (fig. 10): every visitor who stepped over them would know that he was a man of culture.

The numerous scenes and masks from Greek comedy in Pompeian mosaics suggest lighter literary tastes,

60 Naples, Museo Nazionale no. 109371, from Pompeii, Casa del Granduca di Toscana (IX.2.27); and Chantilly, Musée Condé, probably also from Pompeii (Tammisto 1997, 391–3, nos. DF1, DF2, pl. 38). There are also several painted versions of the same basic composition in Naples Museum that depict fruit, seafood (including the spiny lobster and murena), shells, dead birds, and glass vessels (De Francis et al. 1991, figs 118, 153, 154, 155).

61 E.g., two mosaics of the first century B.C. from Rome: an emblemata from via Sistina 111 (Tammisto 1997, 358–9, no. SS3, pl. 14 [bottom]), and fragments from the area of S. Maria Liberatrice (Museo Nazionale Romano, no. 135886; Tammisto 1997, 45, n. 333, pl. 15 [bottom]).

62 The literary allusion is of course not the sole point of the mosaic: the masks and the rich garland of leaves and fruit linking them were presumably also intended to convey an impression of plenty, luxury, and hedonistic living; compare the effect of the decorated capitals described by Zanker (1998, 37).

63 E.g., the two emblemata by Dioskourides, and the mask-and-garland borders of the “Tiger-Rider” mosaic from the Casa del Fauno, triclinium 34 (Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 9991: Pernice 1938, pl. 59) and the dove mosaic from VIII.2.34 (fig. 13).
REGIONAL STYLES IN HELLENISTIC MOSAIC

Fig. 17. Still-life mosaic from the Casa del Fauno, ala 30. (Courtesy Alinari/Art Resource, NY)

while the group of seven philosophers debating, which is known in two versions, was presumably intended to advertise more intellectual interests. The popularity of fish mosaics has sometimes been attributed to enthusiasm for Greek scientific writings, although in view of the luxury status of fish in the ancient diet, they might have appealed to some customers for less elevated reasons. If the addition of a peristyle to the traditional Italian atrium house in this period was intended to recreate a Greek gymnasium in miniature, the works of art decorating the house were carefully chosen to create a correspondingly cultured ambience and provide an appropriate setting for the owner to indulge in Greek-style leisurely pursuits and impress visitors with his culture and sophistication. The importance of creating the right impression is vividly illustrated by the letters of Cicero to the agents in Greece who had been entrusted with buying works of art for his villa at Tusculum: he sends repeated demands for pieces that are gymnasiode, to decorate his own private "academy" (Att. 1.1.5, 1.4.3, 1.6.2, 1.8.2, 1.9.2, 1.10.3), then com-

---

64 One from the Villa of T Siminius Stephanus at Torre Annunziata (Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 124545; Richter 1965, I: 81–2, fig. 316); and one from Sarsina (Rome, Villa Albani, no. 668: Richter 1965, I: fig. 319; Bol 1994, 456–60, no. 545, pl. 273). The differences between the two emblematata have probably been exaggerated by the extensive restoration of the latter, which includes the heads of all but one of the figures (Parlasca 1958, 157–8).

65 As argued, e.g., by Dickmann (1997).
plains that some of the sculptures he has received will convey quite the wrong message about his tastes and interests (Fam. 7.23.1–3). But perhaps not every patron was as concerned as Cicero about the deeper significance of his interior décor: the obvious expense of fine mosaics would also have made an impression on the visitor.

METHODS OF MOSAIC PRODUCTION

The serial production of suitable images was facilitated by the method of manufacture, whereby many of the early figured panels at Pompeii were laid on stone or terra-cotta backing slabs, or in trays with raised edges, rather than set directly into the pavement. Prefabrication itself was not an innovation: the term emblema implies that it was usual for panels to be made off-site for insertion into the pavement, and recent reexcavation of the mosaics in Palace V at Pergamon has confirmed that this method of production was in use before the middle of the second century B.C. But solid trays seem to have been introduced earlier in Italy than in the east, which suggests that portability was a high priority for Italian customers. A tray or tile would have minimized the risk of damage in transit, as well as making it easier for the panel to be lifted and reused when the decor was updated.

The panels, therefore, could have been made entirely independently of the floors in which they were set. There is very little evidence for the organization of mosaic production in the Hellenistic world, but it is possible that different mosaicists were responsible for the fine figured elements and the coarser geometric patterns; a division of labor along similar lines has been postulated in wall painting, between the pictor imaginarius who painted the figured scenes and the pictor parietarius who did the decorative surroundings. If this was the case, the master mosaicist might either have worked as part of a team with less skilled workmen who laid the surroundings and foundations, or he could have operated independently, supplying figured scenes as required.

Close examination of the mosaics themselves suggests a difference in practice between Pompeii and Greek sites. All of the surviving figural scenes of this period at Pompeii are in fine opus vermiculatum, and all but one are in the form of panels that are small enough to have been prefabricated off-site, whereas only about 30 of the 52 surviving figured mosaics from Greek sites use opus vermiculatum for the figural element, and the rest are in standard opus tessellatum and were probably laid in situ. Moreover, in Greek pavements it is common to find areas of opus vermiculatum in outer borders as well as in emblemata, and often in combination with standard-sized tessellation, which suggests that the master mosaicist worked on-site at least some of the time. At Pompeii, on the other hand, fine opus vermiculatum is confined to the emblema, and the rest of the pavement is usually quite plain, so it may not have been necessary for the master mosaicist to be present at the site at all. We do not know whether

---

66 Three panels set in the pavements of the North-West Room had bases consisting of shells in a mortar matrix, whereas the remainder of the floor had the usual foundation of stones (Salzmann 1991, 436, fig. 2). This backing was presumably designed to reduce the weight of the panels, but it seems unlikely to have been very robust.

67 The earliest known tray emblema in the east is probably one from Kom Truga (Psennephia) in Egypt (Cairo, Egyptian Museum, no. J.E. 87295), dated by Daszewski (1985, 172–3, no. 47, pl. D.1) to the last quarter of the first century B.C. It is possible, however, that some of the missing emblemata from Delos were set in trays and thus were easily removed when the island was abandoned.

68 A fragmentary contract for the mosaics of a bath in Egypt (Cairo Zenon papyrus no. 59665) is of little help, as it dates from the mid-third century and could relate to a pebble mosaic rather than a tessellated one. It refers to a model (παράδειγμα) for the central motif, rather than a finished emblema, being supplied to the local craftsmen by a royal workshop or agent (ἐγέραιον), but this would be appropriate if the mosaic was in pebbles or some other relatively coarse technique where prefabrication was not practical.

69 The fourth-century price edict of Diocletian lists these two grades of painter, with different rates of pay
the emblemata were generally made to order or whether they could be bought ready-made: two small mosaic panels, set in travertine trays, were found in a shop at Pompeii (VII.13.23) along with a collection of bronzes and have been interpreted as stock for sale.73

In view of the stylistic and thematic connections between emblemata at Pompeii and elsewhere in the Hellenistic world, it is likely that the earliest panels were made by Greek or Greek-trained craftsmen. There is good evidence for mosaicists travelling long distances in the late Hellenistic period; for example, a mosaic on Delos is signed by [Askle]piades from Arados in Syria (Delos 210), and a recently discovered pavement at Segesta in Sicily bears the signature of Dionysios from Alexandria.74 As the emblemata were designed to be easily portable, it was not even necessary for the master mosaicist to work nearby, and some panels may well have been imported: the two signed by Dioskourides are set in marble trays, which suggests that they did not originate in Italy.75 Others are in trays of Italian travertine, a clear indication of local manufacture.76 Most, however, seem to have been in terra-cotta trays, which cannot be easily provenanced.

The plainer surrounds, on the other hand, are often of local types. Several of the early emblemata are set in pavements of large, irregular stones, polished smooth, which were very common all over Pompeii in the period of the First Style.77 In the Casa del Fauno, the colored pavements of this type surrounding the emblemata in the alae (29, 30; fig. 11) are probably contemporary with the pavement of irregular rectangular tesserae in cubiculum 31, which is also a characteristically western technique. It seems likely that the surrounds were made by local craftsmen; they could not be prefabricated, and presumably it was less economical to bring Greek workmen to Campania to do such unskilled work. The use of local craftsmen to make the surrounds would also explain the total absence of lead strips from the few geometric borders that were laid in situ.

CONCLUSION

The early Pompeian mosaics are certainly Hellenistic in the broadest sense, but they represent a very specialized strand in Hellenistic art that catered to Italian demand for copies and pastiches of Greek art; they are distinct from the contemporary mosaics found at Greek sites. It cannot be assumed, however, that the introduction of mosaics elsewhere in Italy was driven by exactly the same tastes and motives: other Italian sites, notably Arpi and Fregellae, have yielded early tessellated mosaics that seem closer to Greek prototypes.

At Pompeii the initial influx of Greek emblemata was followed, in the earliest phase of the Second Style, by a fashion for pavements that more closely resembled Greek mosaics in their overall design, with more extensive geometric decoration in bright colors, often creating very pronounced three-dimensional effects. In the Casa del Fauno, for example, the pavement in room 42, which is thought to be slightly later than the First Style mosaics, consists of an emblemata framed with a three-dimensional meander, set in a surround of white tessellation with an outer border of black-and-white wave pattern in the Greek style. The emblemata showed a lion in sharply foreshortened perspective, as if it was about to leap out of the pavement; this seems to have been a popular conceit at the time as it appears in at least two other contemporary mosaics.78 Some Second Style pavements have decorated "carpets" with geometric

73 Naples, Museo Nazionale, nos. 109679, 109687 (Per- nice 1938, 172, pl. 72.2–3; De Vos 1991, 45).
74 Pinna and Sfigiotti 1991, 906–8, pl. cclxxxix.1; of course, it is not certain which of the many Alexandrias Di- onysios came from.
75 Strocka 1991, 100.
76 E.g., the partridge and cockfight emblemata from the Casa del labirinto, Naples, Museo Nazionale, nos. 9980, 9982 (Strocka 1991, 99, figs. 322, 323); philosopher panel from the Villa of T Siminius Stephanus (supra n. 64; Blake 1930, 145). Examination of tesserae from the Casa del Fauno showed that they were made from local stone, but according to Daszewski (1985, 19, n. 40) only stones from the outer parts of the pavements were examined, so it cannot be assumed that the emblemata were also made locally.
77 The stones are generally larger and chunkier than those in eastern chip mosaics, which tend to be more splinter-shaped; they may be white, as in the surrounds of the fish emblemata in the Casa del Fauno (room 35) and the Casa dei capitelli colorati (VII.4.31/51, room 25), or multicolored, as in the Casa di Cipius Pamphilus (VII.6.38, room 29).
78 The emblem was left in situ and is now destroyed (Ballassarei 1994, 134, fig. 72). It is obviously impossible to tell whether it was made at the same time as the other emblemata in the house and reused in this pavement, although it may be significant that this and the erotic scene in room 28, which was also set in a Second Style pavement, are both in trays, unlike the other figural mosaics in the house. The group of similar lion mosaics has recently been studied by Auriemma (1995). The other versions are both dated to the period of the Second Style: one from the Casa delle colonbe a mosaico (VIII.2.34), triclinium o (Naples, Museo Nazionale, no. 114282: Auriemma 1995, fig. 5), where the lion has defeated a leopard, and the other from Teramo (Pernice 1938, pls. 8.1, 58.1), where it is struggling with a snake; in the latter pavement the emblem is set in a three-dimensional design imitating a coffered ceiling.
patterns occupying the central field. In an early Second Style mosaic in the Casa delle nozze d’argento, for example, the field is filled with a lattice of lozenges shown in perspective, and the same motif is repeated in a slightly later pavement in the Casa del labirinto, framed by a more elaborate border with a perspective swastika-meander and a row of colored chevrons. The composition and general effect are similar to Greek mosaics, but there are no Greek parallels for the three-dimensional lattice, which suggests that this was a local elaboration.

During the course of the first century B.C., however, the polychrome motifs from the Greek repertoire are translated into flat black-and-white patterns and supplemented by patterns borrowed from opus signinum. This renewed austerity in pavement design is often interpreted as a response to the increasing elaboration and illusionism of wall painting in the Second and later styles; in view of the remarks above about the geographical origins of mosaicists, it might also be seen as the native tradition of pavement decoration reasserting itself as local craftsmen who had worked alongside Greek master mosaicists took charge of their own workshops. Although the number of mosaics increases, the proportion of figured mosaics decreases, which may be connected with the fact that the Second and later styles of wall painting incorporated figured panels that often echoed the same compositions and figure types as the mosaics; painted panels must have been far cheaper to produce than mosaic emblemata, both in materials and time, and must therefore have been a much more widely accessible medium for customers wishing to display their acquaintance with Greek art and culture.
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