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José María Blázquez Martínez (Professor of Ancient History and Fellow of the Spanish Royal Academy of History) passed away on March 26, 2016, in the city of Madrid (Spain) after a full life devoted to teaching, scientific research and the spread of antiquity; and leaving all of us -who have had the immense fortune to enjoy his mastership and overwhelming personality-, with an immense sadness.

Prof. Blázquez graduated in Philosophy and Letters from the University of Salamanca in 1951 and defended his PhD in the Complutense University of Madrid in 1956. During the next decade, Prof. Blázquez continued his training under the supervision of Prof. Pallottino at the University of La Sapienza in Rome and, granted by the DAAD, at the University of Marburg, under the supervision of Prof. Matz and Prof. Drerup. Subsequently he made other successful research stays at the University of Tel Aviv, the British Academy of Rome, the University of Catania, and in the German Archaeological Institute branches at Istanbul, Damascus and Riyadh. In this regard, Prof. Blázquez always defended the importance of international networks that, through academic contact with other schools and colleagues, conceived as essential for personal development and the progress of scientific research.

After this intense formative period, José María Blázquez obtained a position as Professor of Ancient History at the University of Salamanca (1966-) and shortly after at the Complutense de Madrid (1969-), where he was designated as Professor Emeritus. At the same time, he was an active member of the former Institute of Archaeology "Rodrigo Caro" (CSIC), that he directed during more than ten years (1973-1985). Finally, in recognition to his academic trajectory, Professor Blázquez was elected as a Fellow of the Spanish Royal Academy of History. In all these institutions Prof. Blázquez developed a brilliant contribution to the promotion of Ancient History in Spain, especially important was his capacity for mentoring (he supervised more than 40 PhDs during his academic life) large teams of teachers and researchers, that obtained several tenured positions in different universities and academic institutions. He was also a prolific author publishing many handbooks and monographs that are authentic milestones in history the Spanish scholarship (i.e. La Romanización, Historia social y económica. La España Romana. Economía de la Hispania romana, Bilbao, 1978, Historia de España Antigua, I. Protohistoria, Madrid, 1980; Historia de España Antigua II. Hispania romana, Madrid, 1978). Largely influential was also his leadership in the direction of the scientific journals as Archivo Español de Arqueología (1973-1987) and Gerión (1983-2010). In addition, Prof. Blázquez directed numerous archaeological excavations at Caparra (Cáceres), Cástulo (Jaén), La Loba (Fuenteovejuna, Córdoba), and in the Monte Testaccio (Rome).

By virtue of its training and its wide perspective, Prof. Blázquez's research trajectory was the reflection of the scientist dedicated to the study of antiquity, with a masterful management of
José María Blázquez Martínez in memoriam
diverse written and archaeological sources, always connected with current intellectual debates of all social and human sciences. During his career published more than 37 books, acting of editor in other 9 monographs. He also published 234 articles in the most prestigious, both Spanish and International, scientific journals and several chapters in collective volumes. His research interests covered multiples areas on the study of antiquity: the Phoenician and Greek colonization of the Western Mediterranean, the Late Iron Age communities of the Iberian Peninsula, the study of Pre-Roman religions, the Impact of primitive Christianism in the Late Roman Empire, and, of course, the ancient economy of Roman Spain, with a special focus on the exports of Baetican olive oil.

Finally, we would like to highlight his research on Roman mosaics, whose first publication dates from 1975 - "Arte y Sociedad en los mosaicos del Bajo Imperio" [Art and Society in the mosaics of the Late Roman Empire] Bellas Artes 75, 1975, pp. 18-25 -soon followed by- "Mosaicos romanos del Bajo Imperio" [Roman mosaics of the Late Empire], Archivo Español de Arqueología 50-51, 1977, pp. 269-293., In this regard, Prof. Blázquez continued the a research line previously initiated by his teacher Prof. Antonio García y Bellido. Since 1976 to 1996, Prof. Blázquez promoted and directed the Corpus of Mosaics of Spain, within the framework of the international project sponsored by the AIEMA. Through this monumental labor, Prof. Blázquez contributed to establish the study of Roman mosaics as an authentic sub-discipline in the field of the Spanish Classical archaeology.

The obtention of several I+D Research projects, funded in competitive calls by the Spanish Ministry of Science (acting as Principal Investigator from 1976 to 1997) and an International Project of the Joint Hispanic-American Committee, with the University of West-Lafayette, Purdue (Indiana-USA), allowed Prof. Blázquez to create a permanent research team on the study of Roman mosaics. This team, which I (Prof. Neira Jiménez) am honored of have been part, managed the realization of the above mentioned Corpus de Mosaicos de España (CME), a work continued afterwards by its dear colleague, Dr. Guadalupe López Monteagudo (CSIC). In addition to the publication of 12 volumes of the CME, he presented numerous papers on the Hispanic, African and Near Eastern Roman mosaics in the most prestigious conferences on these topics, such as the International Congresses organized by the AIEMA or L’Africa romana conference, organized by the Centro di Studi sull’Africa Romana of the Università degli studi di Sassari, as well as in countless courses and seminars in other institutions and universities, such as the Roman Mosaic Seminar of the UC3M, to which he attended every year, without missing any of the 9 editions celebrated.

Prof. Blázquez was a firm believer in the work developed by AIEMA, having been named member of Honor of this scientific association. He also formed part of the editorial board of the Journal of Mosaic Research, where he published various articles, and presented papers in both the 11th International Colloquium on Ancient Mosaics, held in Bursa on 2009, and in the 5th Colloquium of AIEMA Turkey, held in Kahramanmaraş on 2011. Prof. Blázquez was a true lover of Turkey.

Prof. Blázquez was an unavoidable reference in the international scholarship on ancient mosaics, many colleagues who share our pain remember his vitality even in the XIII. AIEMA Congress held in Madrid on September 2015, where he gave the inaugural conference. As a testimony of his enthusiasm for the study of ancient mosaics, he was already thinking of traveling to the next AIEMA Congress scheduled for 2018 in Cyprus. Proof of his infinite generosity, he prepared
tirelessly until the end of his days a text on Diana in the mosaics of Roman Spain for X SMR, held in September 2016 at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.

His decisive contribution to the study of antiquity has earned him numerous recognitions from many international academic institutions and associations: Fellow of German Archaeological Institute (1968), Board member of the L’Association Internationale d’Épigraphie grecque et latine (AIEGL), Member of the Hispanic Society (1974); Fellow of the Academy of Arts and Archaeology of Bolonia (1980), Fellow of the Spanish Royal Academy of History (1990), Fellow of the New York Academy of Sciences (1993), Fellow of the Academia Nazionale dei Lincei (1994), Fellow of the Fine Arts Academy of Santa Isabel de Hungría (Seville) (1995), Fellow of the Real Academia de Bones Letres de Barcelona (1997), or Fellow of the Académie de Aix-en-Provence (1999), among others. He also received many prizes as the Franz Cumont prize from the Académie Royale de Belgique (1985), the Great Silver medal of Archaeology from l’Académie d’Architecture de Paris (1987), or the Cavalli d’Oro prize from Venice (2003). Prof. Blázquez was named doctor honoris causa by the universities of Valladolid (1999), Salamanca (2000), Bolonia (2001), León (2005), and Universidad Carlos III de Madrid (2015), and received the Orden del Mérito Civil, one of the highest recognitions granted by the Spanish govern.

He was a genius as scholar, but also a genial person. For both reasons, colleagues, students, and friends of many countries, that have the fortune of meet Prof. Blázquez during his life, feel a great emptiness for the loss of our dear teacher.

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Şahin
Bursa Uludağ University

Prof. María Luz Neira Jiménez
Universidad Carlos III de Madrid
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Abstract

Germanicia has been hosted by many civilizations since Antiquity and is located in the Kahramanmaras province at the intersection of East, Southeast and Mediterranean Regions. Even though the localization cannot be done completely, it is thought that the city was located on the southern hillside of Ahir Mountain in 2339 meters high. It is thought that the ruins discovered at the district of Dulkadiroğlu, located in the east of Kahramanmaras city center at the beginning of 2000s, may belong to Germanicia ancient city. It is known that Germanicia was an important episcopal city in the Early Byzantine period and many bishops such as Eudoxius, Nestorius, Suras, Salamanes (Salamias), Anaphora Thomas and John were called “Germanikeia” Agnomen. The villa room and corridor mosaics mentioned in the article belong to the Early Byzantine Period. The finds in the district of Dulkadiroğlu were unearthed in the archaeological excavations in 2001 and 2016. Various plants, domestic and wild animal species were depicted together on these mosaics. These mosaics give us information about fauna and flora of Germanicia. The mosaic that forms the subject of our article and animal depictions had importance in Roman art since the 1st century BC. Village life, nature, animals and hunting scenes (Emblemata) began to appear on mosaics in North Africa in the 2nd century AD, in Anatolia, Europe and Adriatic in the 4th century AD and later. However, the meaning of these themes changed in the Jewish and Christian communities and were perceived as religious symbols. Village life, nature, animals and hunting scenes are associated with stories in the Old and New Testament.

Keywords: Kahramanmaras, Germanicia, Late Roman, mosaic, Opus Tessellatum.

Öz

Germanicia, Antik Çağlardan beri birçok medeniyete ev sahipliği yapan Doğu, Güneydoğu ve Akdeniz Bölgesi’nin keşifine noktalarında yer alan Kahramanmaras ilinde yer almaktadır. Lokalizasyonu tam olarak yapılaması da konulmuştur, 2339 metre yükseğindeki Ahir Dağı’nın güney eteklerinde yer aldığı düşünülmektedir. 2000’li yılların başında Kahramanmaras il merkezinin doğusunda yer alan Dulkadiroğlu ilçesinde ortaya çıkartılan kalıntıların Germanicia Antik Kenti’ne ait olabileceği düşünülmektedir. Erken Bizans döneminde, Germanicia’nın önemli bir piskoposluk merkezi olduğu bilinmektedir. Eudoxius, Nestorius, Suras, Salamanes (Salamias), Anaphora Thomas ve John gibi birçok piskopos, “Germanikeia” Agnomen ile anılmıştır. Makalenin konusuna oluşturulan Erken Bizans Dönemi’ne ait mozaikler 2001 ve 2016 yıllarında arkeolojik kazılarda Dulkadiroğlu ilçesinde bir villa da ortaya çıkartılmıştır. Bu mozaikler üzerinde köy yaşamı, çeşitli bitkiler, evcil ve vahşi hayvan türleri bir arada tasvir edilmişdir. Bu mozaikler bize Germanicia’nın fauna ve flora ile ilgili bilgilere de vermektedir. Makalenin konusuna oluşturulan mozaik üzerinde gözlemlenen hayvan betimlemelerinin İÖ I. yüzyıldan itibaren Roma resim sanatında önemli bir yer tuttuğu bilinmektedir. Köy yaşamı, hayvan ve av sahnelerinin (Emblemata) mozaikler üzerine yansımları Kasey Afrika’da IS II.
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History

Germanicia has been hosted by many civilizations since Antiquity and is located in the Kahramanmaras province at the intersection of East, Southeast and Mediterranean Regions. Even though the localization cannot be done completely, it is thought that the city was located on the southern hillsides of Ahir Mountain, 2339 meters high.

Germanicia (Greek: Γερμανίκεια) which means “the emperor city”, was founded in 38 AD in honor of empire by IV. Antiokhos, King of Commagene (Magie 1950: 549; Millar 1993: 228-229; Zoroğlu 2005: 303-304). The first information about the city is found in the books of Ptolemaios (Millar 1993: 228; Zoroğlu 2005: 305-306; Tekin 2010: 167) called Geography (Ptol. geogr. V.15.10), Gaius Asinius Quadratus Parthikas (Millar 1993: 229) and Stephanus Byzantinus’ Ethnic (Billerbeck 2006: FGrHist 97 F 10). It is known that coins were minted on behalf of the Roman Emperors Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus and Commodus between 161-180 AD (Tekin 2010: 173).

In the Early Byzantine Period, it can be obtained from the sources that there were important people related to the city. For example, Eudoxius, born in Arabissos (Kahramanmaraş - Afşin) who defended Aryanism in the 4th century AD, was an episcopalist in Germanicia (Lippold 1964: 408; Sinclair 1999: 653-654; Kaçar 2008: 145-159; Dumankaya in print b), Nestorius (386-451 AD), the founder of Nestorianism, who deeply influenced Christianity in the 4th century AD and Byzantine Emperor III. Leo (717-741 AD) was born in Germanicia (Vasiliev 1943: 297-298; Foss 1991: 845; Gregory 1991: 1460). As it is known, the bishops were named according to the regions where they served. According to sources Germanicia was an important episcopal city. As it is known, the bishops were named according to the regions where they served. In the Early Byzantine Period, many bishops such as Suras, Salamanes (Salamias), Anaphora Thomas and John were called Germanikeia Agnomen2 (Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 90-165; Chadwick 2004: 275, 578; Clayton Jr 2007: 32). However the contribution of the aforementioned bishops to Germanicia is still unknown.

Localization

A source giving detailed information about the localization of the city could not be identified. For this reason, evaluations and opinions about the localization of the city were obtained from the historical sources, the researches (Texier 2002: 141-142; De Giorgi 2016: 114-115) and the information from the excavations3.

At the beginning of the years 2000, it is thought that the remains revealed in the district of Dulkadiroğlu, east of Kahramanmaraş, may belong to the ancient

---

1 In 38 AD, known the time that the city was founded, the Roman Empire was ruled by Gaius Iulius Caesar Augustus Germanicus (Caligula). IV. Antiokhos was brought to the Kingdom of Commagene by Gaius. Although it was stated as gratitude to the Emperor Gaius that the name of the city is “Germanicia”, there are different opinions about to whom the name was dedicated and the date of the foundation of the city (Ürkmez 2014: 79- 81; Dumankaya in print a).

2 http://syri.ac/diyarbakir-turkey-meryem-ana-kilisesi-diyr-00334 Manuscript Names: DIYR 00030 – DIYR 00066 – DIYR 00253 – DIYR 00269 – DIYR 00334 –BORG. SIR. 159.

3 For other opinions and suggestions; (Dumankaya in print a).
city of Germanicia. Many archaeological cultures exist from the Roman Period to the Ottoman Period in this area where is called “Kara Maraş” by the people. Although the region has many cultural properties, the district of Dulkadiroğlu has a dense modern housing. This situation prevents to be carried out of archaeological excavations and to obtain scientific data. Despite the negative process, the first archaeological excavations were carried out in 2001, 2009, 2010 and 2016 in the cadastral block number 461 of Dulkadiroğlu district by Kahramanmaraş Museum. As a result of the archaeological excavations carried out in the cadastral block number 461, mosaic-floors were uncovered. The lack of archaeological findings prevents the right definitions and dating. In this structure which we thought was a villa, two different floor mosaics were uncovered. One of the mosaics was revealed in the central hall of the villa, and the other one was revealed at the room and corridor. Three different panels on the mosaic found in the central hall include village life, nature, human, animal, structure, geometric patterns, mythological scenes and plant descriptions (Fig. 1). The daily life depicted in the different panels of the mosaic gives us information about the period and the social structure, fauna, flora and the architecture of Germanicia (Ersoy 2017: 115-144).
Room Mosaic

The mosaic, which was discovered in 2001, is still exhibited at the Kahramanmaraş Museum (Küçük – Yar 2012: 89-95 fig. 11). The preserved horizontal surface of the “L” shaped mosaic in the exhibition is 2.79 m x 4.32 m and its vertical surface is 1.47 m x 1.63 m and totally 14.45 m² (Fig. 2, Drawing 1). The size of the mosaic tesseræ made in the Opus Tessellatum technique varies between 0.5 cm and 1 m. The lotus blossoms (Décor I: pl. 62a) arranged in opposite directions side by side encircle the mosaic. Black, gray, beige and white tones were used in lotus blossoms looking towards to the main panel but in outward looking lotus blossoms, a composition in red, pink, beige and white tones was preferred. Vine branches come out in two branches from kantharos with domestic and wild animals in various species and surround the entire scene form the main theme of the mosaic. The tones of pink, brown and green were used on two vine branches. The pupy bear, pigeon, deer, purple gallinule, bull and bear, which are observed in different stages in a single panel, will be evaluated separately in the article.

5 This mosaic was named “Corridor Mosaic” by Ersoy (2017: 145). However, although the width of the vertical surface of the “L” shaped mosaic is 1.52 m, the width of the horizontal surface is 2.62 m. Therefore, the mosaic floor must belongs to a room with a corridor. For this reason, the mosaic in the text is called “Room Mosaic”. Ersoy 2017 was taken into consideration in the mosaic evaluation in the exhibition.
Pupy Bear

The back part of the pupy bear and some parts of vine branches have undergone destruction. The puppy bear between vine branches was depicted in position, sitting on their hind legs (Fig. 3). Extensively black and gray tesserae were used on pupy bear, but white tesserae were used on its eyes and teeth. In order to give a natural appearance and to show the effect of light and shadow on the puppy bear, correct tonalities of colors were tried to be caught.

Pigeon

Green, red, pink and yellow tesserae were used on the pigeon depicted in the right side of the vine leaves (Fig. 4). In order to give a natural appearance, smaller tesserae were used to catch natural tonalities and to show the effect of light and shading on the pigeon.

Deer

The deer - the left foot on the front - was depicted while eating the vine leaves. On deer, different tones of brown, gray, light-pink and pink tesserae were used (Fig. 5). In order to reflect the muscles and limbs naturally, different color tonalities were used from the back to the abdominal.
Purple Gallinule (Porphyrio Porphyrio)

It was depicted walking to the rightward among the vine leaves (Figs. 6-7). Black, brown, light pink and gray were used on the body of the purple gallinule and darker *tesserae* were used from its body to the wings. The black and green were used on its neck and head but the red colors were used on its foot, beak and comb.

Bull

The Bull - the right foot on the front - was depicted while eating the vine leaves. On the Bull, brown, gray, white, pink and dark red *tesserae* were used in different tones (Fig. 8). The lighter color *tesserae* were used from the back to the abdominal. So that the shadow could be shown to the viewer naturally. In order to show the muscles more clearly, different colors were used in the contours. The impression of a well-fed animal was tried to given but there is a mismatch between back and the front legs of the bull.

Bear

The bear was depicted rightward between the vine leaves, while eating grapes, two legs on the front (Fig. 9). The black and the gray *tesserae* were used intensively on the eyes and teeth of the bear, while the red *tesserae* were used in the tongue. Light color *tesserae* were used from the back to the abdominal to give a natural appearance and to show the effect of light and shading on the bear. In order to show the muscles clearly, different color tones were used in contours.
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Corridor Mosaic

The continuation of the floor mosaic was revealed on the same axis in a corridor in 2016. Since 2016, a total of three pieces-corridor mosaics were uncovered. Since they were removed in pieces, each mosaic will be evaluated within itself in the article (Figs. 10a-b).

Figure 10a
Localization of 3rd Parcel Corridor Mosaics.

Figure 10b
General View of 3-5th Parcel Mosaics (Ersoy 2017: 115, 145).
First Piece

The corridor mosaic which extends towards the northwest direction, is 55 cm x 2.15 m in size (Fig. 11, Drawing 2). Only the lotus blossoms were preserved on the mosaic (Décor I: pl. 62a). Black, gray, beige and white tones tesserae were used in the lotus blossoms looking towards the main panel. However, pink, beige and white tesserae were included in lotus blossoms looking outward.

Second Piece

A floor-mosaic was also uncovered about 2.5 m away from first piece and 4.6 m x 2.50 m in size, on the same axis (Fig. 12, Drawing 3). Lotus flowers can be seen on the protected bordures of the mosaic. In the middle part of it, the vine branches, the grapes and male black francolin (Francolinus Francolinus) can be seen. Male black francolin was depicted as looking towards eastward (Figs. 13-14). The light tones of pink color and dark red were used on its neck, legs and wings but white tesserae were used on its eyes. On the other hand, the different

---

6 Male black francolin was decorated with more vivid colors, neck red ring and colors are suitable for natural environment. Naturally, it spreads in the Mediterranean coast, especially in Çukurova. Male black francolin spreading in Hatay, Şanlıurfa, Kahramanmaraş, is also located in Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Jordan, except Anatolia. For details see http://www.trakus.org/kods_bird/uye/?fsx=2fsdl17@d&tur=Tura%E7.
tones of gray and green were used on its body. Two and three rows of green tones *tesserae* were used on the vine leaves in the mosaic. Red *tesserae* contour on the outside and light-pink *tesserae* on the inside were used on the grapes in this mosaic.

**Third Piece**

This mosaic which is 50 cm x 90 cm, was destroyed in an advanced level (Figs. 15-16, Drawing 4). Lotus blossoms and grapes are observable on the mosaic. The other parts of the mosaic are not observable due to the destruction. Considering that it is the continuation of the same mosaic, it is highly probable that there are domestic or wild animals among the vine branches as it was in the second part.
As of 2016, a total of five mosaic floors have been identified in pieces along with the mosaic which is called life mosaic and those are located in number 461 cadastral block. The destructions and the lack of archaeological findings prevent to determine what kind of structure it is. For this reason, the dating of the structure was made on the village life, nature, human, animal, structure, geometric patterns, mythological items and plant descriptions observed on the mosaics.

The mosaic that forms the subject of our article and animal depictions observed on other mosaic (Ersoy 2017: 114-115) in the same structure had importance in Roman art since the 1st century BC. Village life, nature, animals and hunting scenes (Emblemata) began to appear on mosaics in North Africa in the 2nd century AD, in Anatolia, Europe and Adriatic in the 4th century AD and later (Levi 1947: 489-490; Kondeleon 1994: 254-258; Merrony 1998: 442-482; Dunbabin 1999: 109-110; Hales 2003; Hachlili 2009: 175-178; Omari 2012: 124-127; Eraslan 2013: 227; 2014: 448; Ersoy 2017: 220-238). The scenes observed in North Africa began to appear in Anatolia as a result of the political and cultural
interaction in the region. Thus, this interaction was further advanced by the agreements (Malalas Chron. XIV. 23; Bahadır 2011: 689; Eraslan 2013: 227 etc.) made between Byzantine and Sassanian states during the IVth-Vth century AD. Similar scenes observed in Germanicia mosaics are a result of political and cultural interactions. In the Early Byzantine Period, similar scenes are observed on the mosaics located in villas and public structures such as baths. With Christianity being the official religion, these scenes were used in the decoration of the monumental structures (Kolarik 1991: 791). In the spread of similar scenes in Anatolia, itinerant craftsmen and patrons had a great effect. (Dunbabin 1978: 24-29; Campell 1979: 287-292; Merrony 1998: 452-460; Hachlili 2009: 273-281).

In many civil and religious structures dated to the 4th and 6th centuries AD, many examples similar to the kantharos, vine, domestic and wild animal species on chamber mosaics have been identified. The mosaics of the Konya Tatköy Monastery (Ermişler 1992: 35-43 fig. 17-25), The Grand Palace of Istanbul (Jobst et al. 1997: figs. 12-42, Dunbabin 1999: 233 figs. 244-248), Osmaniye province, Düzüçi district Church (?) and Köyundaş Basilica (Tülük 2004: Vol. I 88-93; Vol. II figs. 9.1-10; Vol. I 124-125; Vol. II figs. 16.1-16.12), Burdur province Gölhisar district Yusufça Early Byzantine Period Church (Ekinci 2005: 125-126 fig. 8), Bursa Büyükorhan district Derecik Basilica (Okçu 2007: 35-44 fig. 20), Erzincan Altün tepé Church (Can 2009: 1-9 figs. 8-17), Tekirdağ province, Marmara Ereğlisi district, Perinthus Basilica (Öztürk 2009: 29-31 figs. 8-12), Karabük Province Eskişehir district Paphlagonia Hadrianopolis Church (Patacı 2011: 30-49 figs. 5-44), Samsun Amisos Antique City Structure (Aybek – Öz 2012: 20 fig. 8), Hâleplibahçe Bath (Kara불ut et al. 2012: 56 fig. 60), Hatay province, Kırıkhan district, İncirlik Village Structure (Çelik 2013: 1-6 figs. 1-7), İzmir, Kemalpaşa district, (Nymphaios) villas (Tok et al. 2013: 66-87 figs. 7-94, drawing 2), are examples of similar themes.

In Syria, Jordan and Israel, similar scenes such as the struggles of predators and hunting animals, hunting scenes, vine motifs, various animal figures eating vines or certain bird species were depicted in many civil and religious structures dating from the Late Antiquity. During the Roman Empire period, many vines and grape motifs on mosaics were associated with God Dionysos (Şahin 2004; Hachlili 2009: 111). However, the meaning of these themes changed in the Jewish and Christian communities and were perceived as religious symbols. (Omari 2012: 126-127; Tok et al. 2013: 96-97). Village life, nature, animals and hunting scenes are associated with stories in the Old and New Testament.

Iconographic Assessment

The vine plant coming out from Kantharos

The symbolic meaning of the vine scrolls that come out from kantharos and extend to the entire area indicates to Jerusalem and the Prophet Jesus in the Old and the New Testament.

Genesis in the Old Testament (Genesis 40:9-11) 9: “So the chief cupbearer told Joseph his dream. He said to him, “In my dream I saw a vine in front of me, 10: and on the vine, were three branches. As soon as it budded, it blossomed, and its clusters ripened into grapes. 11: Pharaoh’s cup was in my hand, and I took the grapes, squeezed them into Pharaoh’s cup and put the cup in his hand”.  

For examples see; Hachlili 2009.
(Genesis 49:11-12) 11: “He will tether his donkey to a vine, his colt to the choicest branch; he will wash his garments in wine, his robes in the blood of grapes. 12: His eyes will be darker than wine, his teeth whiter than milk”.

(Leviticus 25:5) 5: “Do not reap what grows of itself or harvest the grapes of your untended vines. The land is to have a year of rest”.

(Leviticus 25:11) 11: “The fiftieth year shall be a jubilee for you; do not sow and do not reap what grows of itself or harvest the untended vines”.

(Numbers 13:23) 23: “When they reached the Valley of Eshkol, they cut off a branch bearing a single cluster of grapes. Two of them carried it on a pole between them, along with some pomegranates and figs”. Emphasizes the importance of the vine plant with these expressions.

(Hosea 9:10) 10: “When I found Israel, it was like finding grapes in the desert…”. With these expression, vine and Israel are likened to each other.

(Psalm 80:8-14) 8: “You transplanted a vine from Egypt; you drove out the nations and planted it. 9: You cleared the ground for it; and it took root and filled the land. 10: The Mountains were covered with its shade, the mighty cedars with its branches. 11: Its branches reached as far as the Sea, its shoots as far as the River. 12: Why have you broken down its walls, so that all who pass by pick its grapes? 13: Boars from the forest ravage it, and insects from the fields feed on it. 14: Return to us, God Almighty! Look down from heaven and see! Watch over this vine”. The sacred meaning is attached to the vine plant. In the New Testament, the sacredness of the vine plant is associated with the Prophet Jesus and the Holy Spirit.

(John 15:1-5) 1: “I am the true vine, and my Father is the gardener. 2: He cuts off every branch in me that bears no fruit, while every branch that does bear fruit he prunes so that it will be even more fruitful. 3: You are already clean because of the word I have spoken to you. 4: Remain in me, as I also remain in you. No branch can bear fruit by itself; it must remain in the vine. Neither can you bear fruit unless you remain in me. 5: I am the vine; you are the branches. If you remain in me and I in you, you will bear much fruit; apart from me you can do nothing”. With these words, the vine plant is personalized. As it is understood from the texts of the holy books, after the first century when Christianity began to spread, the most important metaphor was vine for the Prophet Jesus. The wine obtained from grape represents the blood of the Prophet Jesus in the Christian liturgy (Dimitrova 2006: 181-182).

Puppy Bear and Bear

The puppy bear is located in the upper corner of the main scene and the bear is in the middle part. In the Christian liturgy, the bear symbolizes evil and oppression.

(Daniel 7:5) 5: “And there before me was a second beast, which looked like a bear. It was raised up on one of its sides, and it had three ribs in its mouth between its teeth. It was told, ‘Get up and eat your fill of flesh!’”. In this verse, the evil kingdom of Persia is compared with a bear. The puppy bear symbolizes renewal and reshaping in the Christianity. In the same sense, Jesus helps to reshape and regenerate the sinners.

8 For a detailed iconographic evaluation see; http://www.christiansymbols.net/animals_2.php
Pigeon

The pigeon on the mosaic is located on the lower edge of the main scene. In Judaism and Christianity, the pigeon is forefront as an important religious symbol.

(Genesis 8:8-12) 8: “Then he sent out a dove to see if the water had receded from the surface of the ground. 9: But the dove found no rest for the sole of her foot, and she returned unto him into the ark, for the waters were on the face of the whole earth: then he put forth his hand, and took her, and pulled her in unto him into the ark. 10: He waited seven more days and again sent out the dove from the ark. 11: When the dove returned to him in the evening, there in its beak was a freshly plucked olive leaf! Then Noah knew that the water had receded from the earth. 12: He waited seven more days and sent the dove out again, but this time it did not return to him”. Pigeon returns to the ship with an olive branch in its mouth and this is heralded as a reconciliation between God and man. With this event, the olive branch and the pigeon are regarded as symbols of eternal peace (Yılmaz et al. 2014: 130).

(Matthew 3:16) 16: “As soon as Jesus was baptized, he went up out of the water. At that moment heaven was opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him”. With these expressions, the Holy Spirit and the pigeon are associated.

(Matthew 10:16) 16: “I am sending you out like sheep among wolves. Therefore be as shrewd as snakes and as innocent as doves”. With these words, the pigeon is seen as a symbol of purity and cleanliness9 (Dimitrova 2006: 183; Yılmaz et al. 2014: 131-132).

Deer

(Psalm 42:1) 1: “As the deer pants for streams of water, so my soul pants for you, my God.” In this sentence, a relation is established between God and man. The stories of deer that kills the serpent at the beginning of Christianity, are influential in the fact that deer is a symbol of Jesus. The deer depictions associated with baptism in the Christian liturgy are depicted with different mythological scenes on mosaics (Kazdhan - Carr 1991: 598-599).

Purple Gallinule (Porphyrio Porphyrio)

It is located in the middle part of the mosaic. Since 2500s BC, Purple Gallinule has emerged as an important decorative figure representing the richness of the nature. The Purple Gallinule motif was used in many religious and civil structures from Roman period to Middle Age (Arnott 2007: 286-287; Lopez et al. 2016: 581-587).

Bull

The bull motif which is located in the middle part of the mosaic is seen as a symbol of patience and strength in Christianity belief. In some sources, it is regarded as a symbol of the Prophet Jesus10.

(Deuteronomy 33:17) 17: “In majesty he is like a firstborn bull; his horns are

---

9 For a detailed iconographic evaluation see; http://www.christiansymbols.net/animals_5.php
10 http://www.christiansymbols.net/animals_13.php
the horns of a wild ox. With them he will gore the nations, even those at the ends of the earth. Such are the ten thousand of Ephraim; such are the thousands of Manasseh”. With these words, power and force are symbolized with the strength and horns of the bull. The mythological scenes related to domestic and wild animals shown in the same panel are associated with Isaiah 11:7 in Old Testament.

(Isaiah 11:7) 7: “The cow will feed with the bear, their young will lie down together, and the lion will eat straw like the ox”. The cow and puppy bear seen in the main panel, can be seen as a reference to this verse.

Conclusion

As of 2018, there is not any completed excavation structures in the district of Dulkadiroğlu where mosaics were found. So, our knowledge about the structures is insufficient due to the uncompleted archaeological excavations. For this reason, the dating of mosaics was made by comparing them with the similar mosaic examples. When we compare the characteristic features of the mosaics found in the structure with the examples of similar structures mentioned above, it is possible to say that the structure was used during the IVth-VIth century AD. However, the two-hundred-year time frame is quite wide for a structure. It is not possible to make a certain dating because of uncompleted archaeological excavations and the lack of in-situ findings.

Another finding which gives us important information about the Germanicia of IVth-VIIth century AD, was found in a church excavation in the neighborhood of Çokyaşar, about 30 km away from the town center of Dulkadiroğlu in 2017 (Başpinar et al. in print). Similar animal depictions located in Germanicia mosaics are also observed on the mosaics in this church. And also the ranks and names of priests were written in the middle nave of the church. The fact that similar descriptions are included in civil and religious structures cause them to be perceived as Christian mythology. As a matter of fact, the similar mosaics depicted the wild and domestic animals together are also observed in Adana (Albak 2016:575-577) and Şanlıurfa (Onal 2017) religious and civil and structures.

The animal depictions observed on the mosaics may not include only symbolic meanings, but also provide important clues about the domestic animal species living in the area. These mosaics and the other mosaic called “Life Mosaic” in the same structure give us information about the architecture of the Germanicia, the fauna, the flora and the social life of the period. However, it is not possible to give detailed information about Germanicia through the mosaics identified only in one structure. There is no doubt that detailed information can be obtained after the completion of the excavations of other structures identified throughout of Dulkadiroğlu district.
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