

A Head from the Frieze of the Temenos Gate at Petra

Robert Wenning¹

Abstract

A female head in the old Cave Museum at Petra is attributed by the author to the great frieze of the Temenos Gate at Petra. This discovery gave reason to resume the discussion of that frieze by L. Tholbecq and S. Delcros in 2015. The frieze depicted the seven Planetary Gods, but also a couple of Moon Gods and a Dionysos. The new head represented either Venus or Luna. We know 12 of the original 15 slabs from that frieze. On this basis groupings and placements of the sculptures are proposed. Furthermore, the first hypothetical visual reconstruction of the frieze is offered to give a better understanding of the frieze. Finally, the historical and cultural contexts, as well as the possible meaning of the sculptures, are discussed. We are dealing with a monument from the early period of *provincia Arabia* with a specific propaganda. It is debated to interpret this in a “Nabataean reading” or a “Roman reading”.

Keywords: Petra, Temenos Gate, Sculpture, Planetary Gods, Moon Gods, Provincia Arabia.

Introduction

The Temenos Gate is the monumental propylaeum to the Temenos of the Qaṣr al-Bint in the centre of Petra. It is predominantly perceived as a large architectural monument, but several sculptures found near to the gate and the row of three bust reliefs surviving on the northern central pilaster indicate that it was also a vehicle for sculptural decoration (Fig. 1). Tholbecq and Delcros (2015) have demonstrated the richness of this decoration and correctly compared the gate and its sculpture with the Qaṣr adh-Dhariḥ and the sanctuary of Khirbat at-Tannūr, dating the three monuments to the same period in the 2nd century AD. The complete sculptural programme of the gate cannot yet be reconstructed. Nevertheless, based on what we do know it is possible to propose some new ideas regarding context and meaning of the sculpture that adorned the frieze of the gate.

The planetary gods

The sculpture belonging to the Temenos Gate has been known for a long time, but was not recognized as such since 2015. Previously, there has been some

¹ Corresponding author: email, robwenn@uni-muenster.de, (Wenning, Robert). Orcid number: <https://orcid.org/000-001-5978-1380>, Professor of Classical and Biblical Archaeology (retired).

Received on 6/9/2020 and accepted for publication on 24/11/2020.

uncertainty over whether certain sculptures found near the gate actually belong to it, and where they were originally placed within the decorative scheme. While Kader 1996: 132-136 did not recognize the sculptures of the frieze, McKenzie 1988: nos. B 2-13; McKenzie *et al.* 2013: 275 was the first to make a suggestion. Since then, the most thorough study has been provided by Tholbecq and Delcros (2015), who solved many problems concerning this sculpture.



Figure. 1 The Temenos Gate, Petra (neg. R. Wenning)

The earliest noted sculptural relief depicts a Victory, mentioned by Kinnear in 1839. It is documented in BD I 1904:178 together with a head and bust of Mercury from the same provenance (Kader 1996: 109-110, 132-133, “Gruppe A”; Tholbecq - Delcros 2015, Figs. 2-4). At that time, the finds were re-buried in the same location. In 1955-1956 they were again uncovered by the Department of Antiquities, together with the bust of Jupiter (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: 114-115 with Fig. 1). Later, based on size and comparison, a second Victory and the bust-relief of Saturn were added to the group (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: Figs. 18 and 6).

Tholbecq and Delcros (2015) established the criteria for identifying sculptures belonging to the frieze of the Temenos Gate based on material, dimensions and the characteristics of the reliefs². They first presented these results at a colloquium on Nabataean sculpture held in Brussels in 2014, and later published two short notes (Tholbecq 2016: 1057; 2017, 52). Carved in sandstone, the original dimensions of the frameless slabs are 95 cm wide and 76 cm high. The heads of the busts extend above the tops of the slabs and there is a small amount of free space either side of

² I would like to thank Laurent Tholbecq for his help and advice with the subject. He kindly read the paper, gave helpful comments and discussed the sculptures with me in Petra in April 2019. I am also grateful for the valuable comments of Lucy Wadson and the editor. What is written here naturally remains my responsibility.

them. Based on the identification of Saturn, it became clear that the frieze depicted the seven planetary gods (Luna, Mercury, Venus, Sol, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn). This was supported by a comparison between the Jupiter of this frieze with that from the frieze of the planetary gods at Khirbat at-Tannūr (Parr 1957: 6; Wenning 2016b: 194-195). Anyone who has seen the bust of Jupiter in the Visitor Centre in Petra in recent years can envisage how monumental the frieze must have been. It is likely that other friezes depicting planetary gods existed in Petra. For example, bust reliefs of planetary gods on a smaller scale have been discovered. However, these have not yet been attributed to a particular monument (compare Roche 2001: 354-355 no. 18-20)³.

In their study, Tholbecq and Delcros (2015: Fig. 5) suggest that a headless bust, currently set up at Nazzal's Camp, could be identified as the Venus of the frieze based on material, size (74 cm wide, 48 cm high) and subject. However, it can be debated whether this bust indeed belongs to the frieze due to some apparent differences to the other busts. For example, it appears to be a bust in the round and there are no parts of a relief background. However, the rear of the slab is flat, thus it is a relief (Parr 1957: 9-10 no. 8). The relief itself lacks the depth of those of Jupiter or Saturn, although the real volume is in the carving of the heads. This difference cannot be explained by weathering, as all the reliefs in the field have suffered severe weathering.

Based on my own study of the sculpture at Petra, I would like to add a female head to the frieze. This head has not received much attention in scholarly research (Fig. 2)⁴. It is stored in the now-closed Old Museum or Cave Museum in Petra on the slope of al-Habis. Carved in sandstone, it measures 41 cm in width, 57 cm in height⁵, and 34 cm in depth. The back is flat, which indicates that the head was raised in relief. It is entered in the inventory book of the Petra Museum as "J.P. 518, Nike, 1963". The year "1963" puts the head among the finds from the Colonnaded Street discovered between 1954 and 1967. The head is listed only by McKenzie 1988: 94 no. 53⁶ and El-Khoury 2010: 102-103 with Fig. 119, and is depicted in colour in Stannard 1995: Fig. on page 32. El-Khoury adopts the old classification as "Nike" and compares it with a fragmented head of a Nike from the frieze at Khirbat at-Tannūr, which McKenzie *et al.* 2013: 81 Fig. 133 prefer to assign to a bust of a planetary deity. However, I classified the head as depicting Venus (Wenning 2016a: 528 note 104).

³ For lists of bust-reliefs from Petra see Wenning-Hübner 2004, although the term "Nabataean" could be misleading. The reliefs belong to the 1st and 2nd centuries AD.

⁴ I express my thanks to Abdallah Rawashdeh (DOA) and Ibrahim Farajat (PDTRA), who made access to the closed Cave Museum at Petra possible for me to restudy the head in April 2019. I first documented the head in October 2013 as part of the project "The Sculptures from Ancient Petra" (SAP), which was approved and supported by the Director General of the Department of Antiquities, Dr. Monther Dahash Jamhawi.

⁵ The height can be compared with that of the heads of Jupiter (56 cm) and Hermes (55 cm).

⁶ Photo: Manar al-Athar 035_JMCK_133-00a: www.manar-al-athar.ox.ac.uk.



Figure. 2 Head of Venus from the large frieze (neg. R. Wenning)

The fact that the head has received so little attention in scholarship can be explained by the serious damage to the face, which severely impairs the identification. This is not due to iconoclasts, but partly to recent water infiltration and improper handling and storage. The chin is worn away, the lips are mostly cut off, as are the tip and ridge of the nose. The curls of the hair on top are partly broken off and large parts of the hairstyle of the left side no longer survive. All areas of the face and hair are cut and bits of the surface have flaked or rubbed off. The damaged areas appear white, which contrasts brightly with the reddish sandstone.

Stylistically, the head accords with the heads of the Temenos Gate frieze (for e.g. Jupiter and Mercury). It depicts a full face with a strong nose and a large eye area. The hairstyle combines a centre parting with a wavy coiffure above the forehead, pushed down by a short and rounded diadem, and three curly strands at the top falling sideways down to the ears. There seems to be no knot on the top of the head, although the strands rise somewhat in the middle. Behind the strands, part of the relief background is preserved. This hairstyle is familiar to representations of Venus (compare Bieber 1967: Fig. 293) but is not limited to this goddess alone. More often the hair is tied up with a hair-band.

It was not possible in April 2019 to bring the relief bust of the suggested Venus at Nazzal's Camp and the museum head together to prove if they indeed belong together. The sculptures are too big and heavy to be moved without equipment. Therefore, some doubts still remain whether the bust belongs to the frieze, even though the head fits the criteria of the frieze. No fragments have been found for the planetary gods Luna, Sol and Mars who should be included in the Temenos Gate frieze⁷.

⁷ Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: Figs. 15-17 (see below) can possibly be compared for Luna, and McKenzie *et al.* 2013: Fig. 129 give an idea of how Sol may have appeared.

Framed bust reliefs – just Moon Gods?

The frieze of the planetary gods at Khirbat at-Tannūr is interrupted by reliefs of related deities on the epistyles. The frieze continues with one relief on the lateral sides. The same arrangement can be assumed for the Temenos Gate. Four sandstone blocks from Petra with similar dimensions to the slabs of the planetary gods are the best candidates for the epistyles here. The width of the epistyles measures c. 1 m compared to the 94 cm of the reliefs. The blocks differ from the slabs of the planetary gods by having framed busts (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: Figs. 8, 9, 15-17, 21). There is not much known about the provenance of the reliefs, but they were always seen near the Temenos Gate and even today are still lying there. The assemblage of sculptures near the Temenos Gate was published by Roche 1990.

A corner block with a moon goddess and Dionysus on its two figural sides is fixed on the right northern corner of the gate (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: Fig. 9). At Petra, Duṣarā and Dionysus have been compared as vegetation gods related to water. Therefore, it can be assumed that the position of Dionysus facing the Wādī Mūsā was not accidental. Although the Temenos Gate was inserted between existing structures, its northern face was not hidden by them because the older North Tower directly adjacent to the gate was erected slightly more to the west.

Such a corner solution can probably also be assumed for the southern end of the frieze, since the wall near the so-called vestibule directly adjacent to the Temenos Gate would not have reached up to the height of the frieze. The complex around the so-called vestibule cannot yet be adequately assessed. None of the preserved blocks seems to be suitable as a counterpart to Dionysus, since they do not have two busts or a corresponding connection. Tholbecq and Delcros 2015: Fig. 21 discovered a block of a moon god with only the right half of the bust, which has been taken to the lapidarium of the Qaṣr al-Bint excavations⁸. The measurements can be added here as 72.5 cm in width, 42 cm in height, and 52 cm in depth. It is only a suggestion to put this block at the southern end.

Putting the two blocks at the corners, a third block with a moon god (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: Fig. 8) can be placed on one of the inner epistyles, as well as a fourth block (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: Figs. 15-17). The fourth block represents either a veiled moon goddess (Wenning - Hübner 2004: 164 no. 11.10) or a Tyche (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: 126 Figs. 15-17). The interpretation as a moon goddess is based on seeing a horn of the crescent moon in the curved broad element between the long folds of the veil and the torch (or sceptre?), which touches the corner of the relief. The surface of the crescent moon is cut off, as well as the narrowed top of the horn. To understand this interpretation, one needs to consider the upper left fragment of the relief, still shown in 1990 (Lyttelton - Blagg 1990: 99 Fig. 6.11) but now missing. If this interpretation is correct, it means that all four reliefs of the epistyles depicted moon gods. Although the dimensions of this block

⁸ The relief was kindly shown to me by L. Tholbecq in April 2019.

correspond with the busts of the frieze, differences have also been pointed out. The composition of the bust looks different with the long veil falling diagonal down to the base, and the contrasting folds of the chiton on the breast, which are stepped like a cascade. On the other hand, there are important stylistic similarities. Side views show that the original design of the hair and folds of the cloak on the shoulder are comparable to those of the Jupiter bust.

The multitude of moon deities in the frieze is surprising, even if the lunar aspect corresponds to the cosmological character of the frieze of the planetary gods. In addition to the connotations associated with Selene/Luna in Greek and Roman mythology, it should also be remembered that solar and lunar features of the worshipped deities in the East are widely documented. The morning star and evening star also played an important role in the Arab world during the Roman period. In Petra itself there are a few monuments related to moon gods⁹, but the significance of Allāt as a moon goddess seems to be rather limited (Wenning 2016a: 517-518). I have already considered interpreting astral deities instead of Nabataean deities at Khirbat at-Tannūr in the early days of *provincia Arabia* (Wenning 2009: 583), but more investigation of the implications of this choice is needed.

Finally, there are two other framed reliefs that are similar to those from the epistyles, but are slightly smaller in width (76 cm and 87 cm) (Tholbecq - Delcros, 2015: Figs. 7 and 10). They depict Saturn and Mars, again two planetary gods. It has not yet been determined where these reliefs should be placed. We should consider the freestanding crowned columns in front of the eastern façade and the western facade of the gate, to which no sculptures have yet been assigned. On the other hand, why are there only two reliefs of this size? This problem currently remains unsolved.

Considering a reconstruction of the frieze

Tholbecq and Delcros (2015: Fig. 22) follow the measurements and reconstruction of the eastern façade of the Temenos Gate proposed by Kader 1996: Fig. 70 but suggest a pediment with a figural semi-circular tympanum instead of a plain entablature (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: 130-131)¹⁰. They also consider the friezes of Qaşr adh-Dhariḥ and Khirbat at-Tannūr for the length of the Temenos

⁹ Such as various monuments and artifacts with a crescent moon or a *lunula*, votive niches, terracotta figurines, lamps, and a coin (Wenning 2016a: 517-518).

¹⁰ Tholbecq and Delcros 2015: 130-131, Figs. 12 and 23 attribute two blocks of a different character to the tympanum, referring to parallels from Khirbat at-Tannūr, Qaşr adh-Dhariḥ and the Sextius Florentinus Tomb. I have suggested identifying the head (Fig. 23) as the personification or nymph of Ain Mūsā or Wādī Mūsā (Wenning 2009: 582 Fig. 9). The head shows curly hair and leaves on the face and was surrounded by (traces of) tendrils. This bears similarities to the nymph in the tympanum from Khirbat at-Tannūr (McKenzie *et al.* 2013: 204 with Fig. 160). Therefore, the suggestion of Tholbecq - Delcros should be considered. It should also be noted that the type of the “*Rankenfrau*” from the Khazne and the Sextius Florentinus Tomb is not identical to the nymph type, although both share some features. The Tyche (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: Fig. 12), on the other hand, resembles busts from certain epistyles, such as those of the Khazne and the Lion Triclinium (McKenzie 1990: Pls. 87c and 136b) where the busts are placed in an acanthus leaf at the bottom.

Gate frieze, which they propose as 17.40 m. Taking the width of the slabs of the planetary gods and considering the short free spaces between the busts, they argue there were eleven busts depicted in the frieze - the seven planetary gods and the four framed reliefs of the epistyles, plus two slabs with Victories.

On the frieze of the planetary gods at Khirbat at-Tannūr, the busts of the gods are framed by ten Victories (McKenzie *et al.* 2013: Fig. 92)¹¹. The slabs of the Victories from Khirbat at-Tannūr are much smaller (33-44 cm) than the two slabs from Petra (94 cm). Ten slabs of the size of the two existing Victories from Petra would be too large for the frieze of the Temenos Gate. Therefore, while a combination of planetary gods and Victories was possible on the Khirbat at-Tannūr frieze, the composition at Petra must have differed. Thus, Tholbecq and Delcros assumed that just the two existing Victories belonged to the frieze and suggested that they must have flanked the central bust of Jupiter situated over the main entrance (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: 124, Figs. 1, 3, 18, esp. 19; better representation in Tholbecq 2016: 1057 with Fig. 2). This grouping appears very convincing for the original conception of the frieze¹². There is an older example for a centralised Jupiter surrounded by six planetary gods in the Temple of Bel at Palmyra, dated between 17/19 and 32 AD. (Simon 2009: No. 22, Pl. 663.22); other scholars classify the central figure as Bel in the type of Jupiter (Gawlikowski 1990: 2611).

Although the so-called Pythagorean sequence (Luna, Mercury, Venus, Sol, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn) was widespread in the Hellenistic-Roman period¹³, local sequence were not unusual, especially on monuments¹⁴. It makes sense to put Saturn to the right side due to the turning of his head to the right, which corresponds to the Pythagorean sequence and suggests which general sequence could be chosen for this frieze¹⁵. The head of Mercury turns to his right, while the head of Venus turns to her left. Thus, the heads are not oriented towards the central group.

The evidence does not allow an objectively based reconstruction of the frieze of the Temenos Gate beyond the central group, especially concerning the sequence of the planetary gods. Nevertheless, based on the above considerations, I present here a visual illustration to provide an idea of how the frieze may have looked by

¹¹ Also compare with the frieze from Qaṣr adh-Dhariḥ with Victories flanking the slabs of the Zodiac (McKenzie *et al.* 2013: Fig. 377).

¹² A relief found within the Petra Church depicting Jupiter framed by Victories (Roche 2001: 354-355 No. 18) could be a citation of that grouping.

¹³ For the various sequences compare Boll 1912: 2561-2570; not to be confused with the sequence of the gods of the seven days of a week (Simon 2009).

¹⁴ For the significance of the planets and their possible meaning, see Roscher 1897-1909 and Gundel - Gundel 1950.

¹⁵ The Sol from the Khirbat at-Tannūr frieze was found near the southeastern end of the façade (McKenzie *et al.* 2013: 79-81). That also corresponds to the Pythagorean sequence and supports placing Sol in the southern part of the Petra frieze. It is possible that the frieze from Khirbat at-Tannūr is a citation of the frieze at Petra. Contrary to its find-spot, the bust of Sol from Khirbat at-Tannūr is placed in the middle of the frieze in McKenzie's reconstruction (McKenzie *et al.* 2013: 579 with Fig. 3).

placing the reliefs hypothetically in line following the Pythagorean sequence, apart from the central group. This illustration also demonstrates how much of the frieze is preserved (Fig. 3).



Figure. 3 Hypothetical illustration of the large frieze of the Temenos Gate, Petra (not to scale) (neg. R. Wenning)

Historical and local implications

It is debated whether the Temenos Gate was a triumphal arch or even an arch dedicated to Hadrian. This has been suggested based on the title “Hadrianē Petra Metropolis” on the city coins since Hadrian (Schmitt-Korte 1978: 240) and on the general dating of the gate. However, there are no traces of a dedicatory inscription on the entablature. Hadrian travelled through Syria and Palestine in AD 129 to 130 and visited Bostra and Gerasa, but there is no evidence that he also visited Petra. Following the continuation of his journey towards Jerusalem, such a visit seems less probable. Hadrian possibly conferred the title as an honour to the capital of *Provincia Arabia*. Nevertheless, along his route in the East, arches were erected in his reign for various reasons, such as the one at Gerasa. Therefore, an arch at Petra would not be surprising, even if he did not visit the city.

This connection and dating is also supported by the stratigraphic classification of the Temenos Gate. As far as the date is concerned, the changes in the paving of the gate (Parr 1960: 131-132; not accepted by Kader 1996: 131-132) in comparison with the pavements of the Colonnaded Street and the Temenos of the Qaṣr al-Bint suggest a time after the Trajanic Colonnaded Street (McKenzie 1990: 36, although her early dating is not acceptable; compare Graf - Schmid - Ronza 2007: 224-229). Nevertheless, the above considerations are not strong enough to establish the dating of the gate. I prefer a dating into the Hadrianic period, but a later period is also possible. Tholbecq and Delcros remain cautious, claiming the façades of Khirbat at-Tannūr and Qaṣr adh-Dhariḥ, the Tomb of Sextius Florentinus at Petra (c. AD 129) and the Temenos Gate belong to a group of monuments conceived at the end of the reign of Trajan (AD 98-117), or more likely at the end of the reign of Hadrian (AD 117-138), with eventual decoration in the time of Antoninus Pius (AD 138-161) (Tholbecq - Delcros 2015: 130-131; cf. Tholbecq 2017: 51-52, “the first decades of the 2nd century AD.”).

We also lack information about the patron of this monument. It could have been the Roman administration, i.e. the governor of *Provincia Arabia* or the *legio III*

Cyrenaica as attested elsewhere. T. Haterius Nepos was governor around AD 130-134 and he possibly followed L. Aninius Sextius Florentinus. It may also have been the *boulē* of Petra or some local donor, as was the case with the arch of Trajan on the stairs to the Upper Market at Petra. It was dedicated in AD 114 by the city of Petra, which had received the title “Metropolis” from Trajan (Sartre 1993: 67-68, No. 37).

The Temenos Gate was a public building of high propagandistic due to its positioning and rich sculptural decoration, which must always be considered. The sculptural decoration with the frieze, the pilaster panels, and possibly other reliefs on the walls and in the tympanum create a distinctive character for this architectural monument. The sculptural programme conveys an important message, which we are only just beginning to understand. However, the overall picture is not yet complete.

Firstly, we must consider the interpretation of Jupiter, whose central position in the composition of the frieze, accompanied by Victories, suggests an intentional emphasis on this god. Thus, the figure should not be taken exclusively as the planetary god Jupiter. Tholbecq and Delcros 2015: 115 address the Jupiter as “Zeus-Dusares” like McKenzie *et al.* 2013: 275¹⁶. They point to the betyl in the wreath of Jupiter which seems to support their nomenclature. For every Nabataean, a betyl was first and foremost connected to Duṣarā. This interpretation is a possible reading that starts from the supremacy of Duṣarā in Petra and some equality with Zeus as his Greek counterpart or manifestation, and now as successor. The change from a local high god to a Zeus (type) is testified in the East as the result of the Hellenization/Romanization of many places. I am more reserved on such an exchangeable identity concerning Duṣarā (Wenning 2016b: 194-198).

The above interpretation can be classed as a “Nabataean view”, but a “Roman view” is also possible: The incorporation of the Nabataean Kingdom into *Provincia Arabia* in AD 106 did not occur without problems and some resistance. In the archaeological record, the abandonment of many places that were previously used for tribal gatherings and religious activities is conspicuous¹⁷. The inscriptions and papyri of early *Provincia Arabia* demonstrate an effective military government. The Jupiter of the frieze would not then be portraying Duṣarā, but the Roman state god Jupiter-Capitolinus. In this case, the Roman god has proudly inserted an identifying feature of Duṣarā into his crown and presents himself – that is Rome, the Imperium Romanum – with the Victories as victor over the Nabataeans. By being placed in the centre of the frieze of planetary gods he is also presented as ruler of the cosmological order¹⁸. The Nabataeans are now ruled and

¹⁶ More often the bust is called “Zeus-Sarapis”, although there is no indication of Sarapis.

¹⁷ Such as the Aṣḥā-triclinium-complex, the Isis veneration complex at the Wādī Siyyagh or the soc. Obodas Chapel: Gorgerat – Wenning 2013: 232; Tholbecq 2016: 1067.

¹⁸ Considering the victories, this view could concern the events of AD 106, but also the suppression of the Bar Kokhba revolt in AD 132-135 with the support of T. Haterius Nepos, the governor of *Provincia Arabia* (Eck 2000: 354-357).

protected by eternal astral gods and Rome instead of some local deities.

We are not currently able to decide which reading is preferable or if both meanings ought to be considered simultaneously.

Contributor

Robert Obert Wenning:

Received his degrees from Muenster University and Eichstaett University, and was a Professor of Classical and Biblical Archaeology until retirement. He did research at Petra since 1995, especially a survey of votive niches (baetyls), the excavation of the Aslah Triclinium Complex, and (in preparation) a documentation of figural Petraean sculptures.

تمثال رأس الأنثى من إفريز النحت في البوابة المقدسة في البترا

روبرت اوبرت ونينج

ملخص

أرجع هذه الدراسة تمثال رأس الأنثى الموجود في متحف الكهف القديم في البترا إلى إفريز النحت في البوابة المقدسة في البترا، وقد أعطى هذا الاكتشاف سبباً لاستئناف نقاش ذلك الإفريز من قبل ل ثولبيك و س ديلكروس في 2015، ويمثل الإفريز المعبودات السبعة الكوكبية، وزوجين من معبودات القمر والمعبود ديونوسيوس، أما الرأس الجديد فيمثل إما المعبودة فينوس أو لونا، ونعرف من ذلك الإفريز 12 قطعة حجرية منحوتة من أصل 15. وعلى هذا الأساس، فسندقم هذه الدراسة مقترحاً لمجموعات المنحوتات ومواضعها في الإفريز، إضافة إلى إعادة تركيبها الإفريز الافتراضية الأولى لتعطي فهماً أفضل له. أخيراً، ستناقش الدراسة السياقات التاريخية والحضارية والتفسير المحتمل للمنحوتات. ولما كنا نتعامل مع معلّم من الفترة المبكرة للمقاطعة العربية ذات الدعاية المحددة، فهناك جدل في ما إذا كان من الممكن تفسير ذلك في قراءة نبطية أو رومانية.

الكلمات الدالة: البترا، البوابة المقدسة، النحت، المعبودات الكوكبية، معبودات القمر، المقاطعة العربية.

REFERENCES

- Bieber, M. (1967) *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*. Revised Edition². New York: Columbia University Press.
- Boll, F. (1912) Art. „Hebdomas“, in *Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (RE)* VII 2, 2547-2578.
- Brünnow, R. E. and A. v. Domaszewski (BD) (1904) *Die Provincia Arabia*. Erster Band. Strassburg: Verlag Karl J. Trübner.
- Eck, W. (2000) Vier mysteriöse Rasuren in Inschriften aus Gerasa: Zum ‚Schicksal‘ des Statthalters Haterius Nepos, in *EPIGAΦAI. Miscellanea Epigrafica in Onore di Lido Gasperini*, ed. G. Paci. Tivoli: Editrice Tipigraf, 347-362.
- Gawlikowski, M. (1990) Les dieux de Palmyre, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. Part II, Volume 18.4, 2605-2658.
- Gorgerat, L. and R. Wenning (2013) The International Aşlah Project (2010-2012): its contribution to “Early Petra”, in *Men on the Rocks. The Formation of Nabataean Petra*, (eds.) M. Mouton and S. G. Schmid, Berlin: Logos, 223-236.
- Graf, D. F., S. G. Schmid and E. Ronza (2007) The Hellenistic Petra Project: Excavations in the Qaşr al-Bint Temenos Area: Preliminary Report of the Second Season, 2005. *ADAJ* 51, 223-238.
- Gundel, W. and Gundel, H. (1950) Art. „Planeten“, in *Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (RE)* XX2, 2017-2185.
- El-Khoury, L. (2010) *Nabataean Stone Sculptures at Petra*. Wadi Mousa: Bait Al-Anbat.
- Kader, I. (1996) *Propylon und Bogentor*. Damaszener Forschungen 7, Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- Lyttelton, M. and T. Blagg (1990) Sculpture in Nabataean Petra, and the Question of Roman Influence, in: *Architecture and Architectural Sculpture in the Roman Empire*, (ed.) M. Henig. Oxford Committee for Archaeology 29. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 91-107.
- McKenzie, J. S. (1988) The Development of Nabataean Sculpture at Petra and Khirbet Tannur. *PEQ* 120, 81-107.
- McKenzie, J. S. (1990) *The Architecture of Petra*. British Academy Monographs in Archaeology 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKenzie, J. S. et al. (2013) *Architecture and Religion. The Nabataean Temple at Khirbet et-Tannur*, Vol. 1, *Annals of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 67. Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Parr, P. J. (1957) Recent Discoveries at Petra. *PEQ* 89, 5-16.
- Parr, P. J. (1960) Excavations at Petra, 1958-59. *PEQ* 92, 124-135.
- Roche, M.-J. (2001) Figurines, Sculpture, and Reliefs, in: *The Petra Church*, (eds.) Z. T. Fiema, C. Kanellopoulos, T. Waliszewski and R. Schick. American Center of Oriental Research Publications 3. Amman: American Center of Oriental Research, 350-358.
- Roscher, W. H. (1897-1909) Art. „Planeten“, in *Roscher's Mythologisches Lexikon* III 2, 2518-2540.
- Sartre, M. (1993) *Pétra et la Nabatène méridionale du Wādi al-Hasa au golfe de 'Aqaba*. Inscriptions de la Jordanie IV. IGLS XXI. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Schmitt-Korte, K. (1978) A Bronze Coin with a Monogram of ‚Petra Metropolis‘, in A. Spijkerman, *The Coins of the Decapolis and Provincia Arabia*, ed. by M. Piccirillo. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 238-241.

- Simon, E. (2009) Art. "Planetæ", in *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC) Suppl.*, 1003-1009.
- Stannard, D. (1995) *Jordanien*. APA Guides, München: Polyglott.
- Tholbecq, L. (2016) La géographie religieuse de la capitale nabatéenne: nouvelles recherches de la Mission Archéologique Française à Pétra (Jordanie). *CRAI* 2016 II, 1053-1074.
- Tholbecq, L. (2017) Les sanctuaires de tradition indigène en province d'Arabie: identités regionales et territoires civiques. *Syria* 94, 41-54.
- Tholbecq, L. and S. Delcros (2015) Étude architecturale des blocs sculptés de Pétra: les reliefs figurés des Propylées du Qasr al-Bint, in: *Mission Archéologique Française "De Pétra à Wadi Ramm: Le sud jordanien nabatéen et arabe" Rapport des campagnes archéologiques 2014-2015*, (ed.) L. Tholbecq. Bruxelles: Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles, 113-133.
- Wenning, R. (2009) The Message of the Khirbat at-Tannur Reliefs. *SHAJ* X, 577-584.
- Wenning, R. (2016a) The Great Goddesses of Petra: A Critical Review of the Evidence, in: *The Nabataean Sanctuary and the Byzantine Monastery. Petra – The Monument of Aaron*, Volume II, (eds.) Z. T. Fiema – J. Frösén – M. Holappa. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 511-537.
- Wenning, R. (2016b) The Many Faces of Dushara – A Critical Review of the Evidence. *SHAJ* XII, 189-209.
- Wenning, R. and U. Hübner (2004) Nabatäische Büstenreliefs aus Petra – zwei Neufunde, in: *ZDPV* 120, 157-181.