

Robert Wenning
Institut für Altonentafistih
und Vorderasiatische Archäologie
Universität Münster, Rosenstr. 9, D-48143
Münster, Germany
robwenn@uni-muenster.de

Robert Wenning

Approaches to Nabataean Religion - Sculpture and Religion

When I first began researching the religion of the Nabataeans I followed the work of Jean Starcky and Fawzi Zayadine, who then dominated the field. The well-researched and structured article on Petra by Starcky (1966) laid the groundwork for the study of the Nabataean deities in the meaning of Nabataean religion. Almost all subsequent scholars rightly followed this work, which then culminated in Healey's monograph (2001). The latter still remains the best study on the subject. For the last couple of years, I have been arguing for an alternative approach which I follow here. I touched on some issues at the Washington conference (Wenning 2009) and then presented my ideas at the Berlin conference (Wenning 2016a). There are three fields of research which I would like to explain.

The Discussion of the Deities is not a Description of the Religion

In most studies of Nabataean religion, the focus is on a discussion of the Nabataean deities, based on J. Starcky's work. The deities are undoubtedly part of Nabataean religion and the best researched aspect so far. However, this is a limited view of what we can describe as the

Nabataean religion. I have no complaints about the interest on the deities, which seems justified and this research ought to be continued. Almost all studies of the religion of the Nabataeans begin with a discussion of the deities. Their names are listed and discussed on the basis of epigraphical and literary evidence. Unsurprisingly, many of these studies have been conducted by Semitists. Nevertheless, to approach Nabataean religion we must consider more aspects of it, as was done by Healey (2001).

The quality and scope of Healey's study is such that many scholars believe that not much else can be said on the subject for the time being. While that may be true to an extent, this does not mean that we should not continue researching the subject and seeking alternative approaches. Some additional insights were made by Alpass (2013), based on new finds and research over the last 15 years. Despite criticising the traditional approach to the topic, Alpass himself follows this (Wenning 2016c). Healey wrote "*The Religion of the Nabataeans*" as a Semitist, and cannot be blamed for not incorporating more relevant archaeological evidence if such evidence has not been properly discussed.

There are undoubtedly many aspects of the religion that we will never know about due to a lack of texts describing certain topics. If the sources do not explain Nabataean religion extensively, there are two approaches to overcome this problem. The first is to consider parallels and models. It is no surprise that scholars of the Old Testament made a comparison with the religion of the Israelites, while Arab scholars utilised sources from the Koran and the period immediately before the rise of Islam. Both focus on the veneration of aniconic stones, but highlight the differences with Nabataean religion and elucidate quite different periods and contexts. This is equally true for ethnological approaches which compare the beliefs and religious practices of Arab Bedouin in the last centuries.

The second approach is to analyse the evidence more precisely and broadly than has been previously done. We know very little about Nabataean myths, beliefs and theology, but evidence of religious practices is reflected in the material culture. Of course, we must distinguish whether the evidence relates to individual worship, family and clan religion, official cults, dynastic or political activities, local cults or worship by foreigners. The interpretation of these practices needs more attention than it has received in previous research. Although some elements of cultic activities have been mentioned here and there, and although Healey considered them more comprehensively, often it involves a listing of religious monuments and a discussion of related terms. When monuments are analysed and described in greater detail one by one, rather than discussed in general, they can provide new information.

Sometimes it is constructive to review the early literature on this topic. The earliest description of “The religion of the Nabataeans” is found in Dalman (1908: 49-63). Brünnow and von Domaszewski (1904) listed the monumental tomb facades, while Dalman described carefully what he called the “rock-cut sanctuar-

ies”. This gave him a broad basis upon which to define Nabataean religion and to connect the epigraphical evidence with the monuments. Although Dalman is outdated, and his treatment is rooted in his time, he describes some features of religious practices which are lacking in other contributions. Neither Kammerer (1929), Robinson (1930) or Murray (1939) followed Dalman’s broad presentation in their chapters on Nabataean religion. The discussion of Nabataean religion was at that time dominated by the new finds from Khirbat at-Tannūr from 1937 onwards until Starcky (1966) put the Nabataean deities into focus. Dalman’s descriptions and summaries could have been the starting point for a more complete view of Nabataean religion.

Dalman compared the betyl with anthropomorphic sculptures, the *šalmā*, referring to the statue of Obodas Theos. He differed between the venerated devotional images and votive pictures of betyls in rock-cut niches or set up in temples, which were also venerated. The arguments for the conclusion of venerated rock-cut niches are installations at the niches and a bilingual inscription in a triclinium (Br. 465/D. 462), where *masgidā* is translated into Greek *proskynema*. This term literally means going down on one’s knees following an Achaemenid custom, but expresses more generally an attitude of respect and adoration with lowering the head.

The installations at the rock-cut niches are numerous and diverse. Some features are self-evident, while others need interpreting. We must keep in mind that we are dealing here with family religion and individual veneration of tutelary deities. If a betyl was not rock-cut in the niche, it was possible to set a portable betyl into a groove in the floor at the back of the niche. Other small hollows in the floor of the niche allowed offering small gifts like fruits, grain or incense (FIG. 1). Small holes in the back of the niche above the betyl, and so-called double-holes or sand-glass cuttings at the edges



1. Votive niche with betyl and installations for offerings. Petra, northern slope of Jabal Khubtha (photo R. Wenning).

of the niches or nearby, could have been used to hang up flowers, festoons, textiles or more precious gifts like necklaces, bracelets or other jewellery. The bottom of the niche sometimes protrudes for the deposition of more offerings. Otherwise, various large rock-cut benches or ledges and steps allowed the deposition of offerings. A small rock-cut cup-hole with water below the niche gave the worshipper the opportunity for a ritual lustration of the fingers before touching the betyl. Large rock-cut water basins near the niches could either be used for purification or for storing water, which was needed for libations. At some niches a few steps lead up to them indicating the sacral sphere. At other niches the niche itself is cut above a massive protruding block or pedestal, which is to be interpreted as the *mōtab*. These features reflect the large *mōtab* we know from the Great High Place and the temples, and make the niches miniature sanctuaries. This is underlined by architectural elements in the frame of the niches.

These features which I have mentioned refer to particular religious practices and illustrate Nabataean belief. Considering the large numbers of such votive niches at Petra, they are testimony of Nabataean piety.

The niches are only one example. The same could be demonstrated with triclinia or temples (Wenning 2017a). There are more than inscriptions and particular forms of rock, symposia and the *circumambulation*, processions and sacred meals, offerings and ex-votos. If we look at the monuments in more detail and go beyond classifying them as niches, altars, triclinia or temples, we can consider their function and their real “*Sitz im Leben*”, their setting. This will allow us more insights into Nabataean religion. We can learn much more from the monuments by simply describing them carefully.

Local Religion Instead of Nabataean Religion

In my opinion, the usual treatment of Nabataean religion neglects the local aspects. By describing the Nabataean deities, a Nabataean belief was created. Such a belief is debated by Alpass (2013: 4-9), but this is an old debate. I do not agree with most of his arguments and do not like to comment on his study. Contrary to Alpass, I still believe that we are dealing with Nabataeans and a Nabataean religion, and that the Nabataeans are the moving force behind this religion. In general, I am more convinced by the reconstruction of Healey. However, I differ in one point from both: I believe that Nabataean religion is locally shaped, not regionally, like the inscriptions. We should take the regional character and local beliefs seriously and should no longer homogenize the sources from different regions, periods and contexts to reconstruct a Nabataean religion, at least not yet.

We must consider that many discussions of Nabataean religion belong to encyclopaedias or give an overview. Here it seems legitimate to collect all available data for a particular deity from various contexts and to compile the infor-

mation into an overall picture of the character of this deity. Locally we do not find seven or more supreme deities, which are presented in these articles as “the Nabataean deities”. We find rather very few deities without a hierarchic pantheon, with the veneration of mainly one god or goddess with some associated deities. The supreme deities change from place to place and some appear to exist only in particular regions. This discrepancy in the general overview has been observed. The local differences were explained by referring to different social groups of worshippers, while it seemed that the structural system was the same everywhere independently of what name or aspect of a deity was present at a particular place. It may be that this assumption is a correct interpretation, although I am not convinced that the deities should have been almost interchangeable.

Nevertheless, we should still first interpret the local evidence site by site and check how it fits the general picture. We must also admit that the local deities deserve our undivided attention. I would like to emphasise that local deities are independent deities. It is this aspect that I feel we have to further investigate. At the same time we should avoid overloading the local supreme deity with all the information we have for a deity with this name from other places. The character of the local deity arises from the local evidence, from the needs of the local population or worshippers. Only after this is researched should we look for further aspects. Placing the local evidence at the top of research of deities and religious installations will lead to a better understanding of Nabataean religion.

Over the last five years I have studied the deities of Petra and have published several articles. Three basic contributions have recently been published (Wenning 2015; 2016a-b) which include key data on the supreme deities of Petra. In “*Great Goddesses*” I critically analyzed all the evidence for the female deities venerated at Petra; in “*The many faces of Dhushara*” I revealed Dhushara in various contexts

and aspects; and in “*Obodas Theos*” I studied the provenance and the development of a particular type of a deity.

I am fully aware of the special situation of Petra as the religious and political centre of the Nabataeans. We must differentiate between local supreme deities, local minor deities or family deities venerated by the inhabitants of Petra, and deities, which are not local deities, “the deities of Petra”, but found veneration by Nabataeans from outside Petra or by foreigners. Among the local minor deities is the “*Lord of the stonemasons*” (Wadeson and Wenning 2014, 2015), who we believe is the tutelary deity of the stonemasons, perhaps Dhushara. We should not make a division between “foreign deities” and “Nabataean deities” based on their provenance. Otherwise Isis would be a “foreign deity”, whereas she is an important local Nabataean deity at Petra. Among the deities who do not belong to the local deities of Petra, in my opinion, are Atargatis from Membidj/Hierapolis, although she is depicted in the Nabataean type of the eye-betyl (Lindner and Zangenberg 1993), and Ba'alshamin, the god of Manku (Wenning 2011: 287-288). In both cases, worshippers from Syria seem to be behind the donations. The votive niche on the way to the plateau of Jabal alKhubtha dedicated to “al-‘Uzza and the Lord of the Temple” could refer to worshippers from Hegra (Nehmé 2005/06: 188-194). Niches decorated with a crescent could have been dedicated to the moon goddess al-Lat and then possibly refer to worshippers from Northern Arabia (Wenning 2016b: 517-518). We do not know who “The goddess of Hayyan” is, but the type of the face-betyl is imported from Southern Arabia (Wenning 2013: 343 Figs. 1a-c).

I see Dhushara as a single deity at the top of the local supreme deities, while others are associated deities. I have discussed the many faces or aspects of Dhushara at the Berlin conference so will not repeat here (Wenning 2016a). The only other male deity at Petra besides Dhushara was Obodas Theos. This deity is much more im-

portant than previously believed (Nehmé 2012; Salameen and Falahat 2014; Wenning 2015). I have demonstrated that the Sidonian type of Eshmun was chosen to depict Obodas Theos at Petra (FIG. 2). Fifty percent of all known statuary of this type has a Nabataean context (19 items). The origin of both deities is local.

Dhushara could be connected with other deities, for example his mother al-‘Uzza. I doubt that she was his consort. There is little evidence of al-‘Uzza at Petra, especially when we put aside the eye-betyls (Wenning 2016b: 512-516). Most, but not all, eye-betyls will have represented al-‘Uzza. al-Kutba, Atargatis, Isis, and possibly Dhushara, are evidenced in exactly the same way (Wenning 2001: 83-84). While there are traces of a certain veneration of al-Lat at Petra, there is no evidence that she was one of the great goddesses there (Wenning 2016b: 516-518). Isis in fact has the greatest amount of evidence among the female deities at Petra (Wenning 2016b: 519-524). She seems to have been the most popular deity beside Dhushara. This seems to be restricted to Petra. It could be that Isis was of some importance in the dynastic cult. This could have also been the case concerning Tyche, but to a smaller extent (Wenning 2016b: 524-525).

A Critical Consideration of the Sculptural Evidence

Surprisingly it was not the great amount of sculpture (a total of about 100) found in the excavations of P. J. Parr and the Department of Antiquities between 1954 and 1967 in the centre of Petra (Parr 1957), nor was it the richly illustrated volume “*Deities and Dolphins*” (Glueck 1965) which led to the integration of sculpture in the research of Nabataean deities. However, it was the first time that Nabataean figural art was introduced more broadly into the discussion of Nabataean religion. In order to classify the sculptures at Khirbat at-Tannūr and to interpret the various types and motifs, Glueck referred to a broad range of parallels,



2. Relief bust of Obodas Theos. Mā‘īn, village (photo H. Merklein).

including several from Petra. His book is often taken as a model for the interpretation of Nabataean sculpture, but it has not been given the same importance in the discussion of Nabataean religion. However, Glueck’s aim was to interpret the sculpture of Khirbat at-Tannūr, not to conduct a study of Nabataean religion. The first major step in integrating Nabataean sculpture into the discussion of Nabataean deities took place with the publication of the “*Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (LIMC)*”, beginning in 1981:

- 1981. J. Starcky, Allath, in *LIMC* I: 564-579.
- 1984. C. Augè, Ares (in periphèria orientali), in *LIMC* II: 493-498.
- 1984. F. Zayadine, Al-‘Uzza Aphrodite, in *LIMC* II: 167-169.
- 1986. H.J.W. Drijvers, Dusares, in *LIMC* III: 670-672.
- 1994. C. Augè, Seeia, in *LIMC* VII: 704-705.
- 1997. P. Linant de Bellefonds, Nike (in periphèria orientalia), in *LIMC* VII: 879-882.
- 1997. F. Zayadine, Hermes/al-Kutbay, in *LIMC* VIII: 616-619.
- 2009. F. Zayadine, Isis à Pétra, in *LIMC* Suppl. 1: 297-299.

This was also an integration of Nabataean sculpture into Classical Archaeology, which occurred at the same time as exhibitions on the Nabataeans in Europe (since 1970). The latest general studies of the sculpture include those of El-Khouri (2010) and McKenzie and Reyes (2013).

Nevertheless, the problem has not been the integration of the sculpture into studies of Nabataean religion, but how to interpret and use it. There is a general trend in Roman Near Eastern Archaeology to interpret figural depictions of the local deities in an *interpretatio Graeca*, which means for example that a depiction of Zeus will be taken as the representation of the local male supreme god. Although this model of interpretation does work in some cases, it does not mean it is always the correct classification. I have demonstrated the problem at the Berlin conference concerning the identifications which were proposed for Dhushara (Wenning 2016a: 194-200). Misinterpretations can occur if sculptures are interpreted only by motif or type. The best example for such a misunderstanding is the huge bust of Jupiter, which was interpreted, among others, as Sarapis and Zeus-Dhushara. At the Berlin conference I indicated that this bust could be the planet god Jupiter, and concerning some Nike reliefs we should expect a monumental frieze of the planet gods at Petra (Wenning 2016b: 195) (FIG. 3). L. Tholbecq presented a reconstruction of such a frieze at a conference at Brussels and connected it to the Temenos Gate in Petra (Tholbecq and Delcros 2017). Therefore, the bust of Jupiter is a Graeco-Roman subject and there is no reason to connect it to Dhushara.

A few bilingual inscriptions which translate the names of Nabataean deities into names of Greek deities are taken as an argument for the



3. Bust of the Planet God Jupiter and Nike. Petra Church R 18 (photo R. Wenning).

interpretatio Graeca. Again, we must be cautious. The evidence is slight and some of the bilingual inscriptions are found outside the Nabataean kingdom. There it seems that the Nabataean deity was rather explained to the people and visitors of these places as a god or goddess like the local deities familiar to the foreigners. For example, an inscription from Cos, dated to AD 9, connects al-‘Uzza with Aphrodite. The inscription was found near the sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos and Aphrodite Pontia. This context seems to be of importance, but I have a problem accepting that all sculptures of Aphrodite found at Petra should be interpreted as al-‘Uzza, especially those dating to the 2nd/3rd century.

Beyond the often discussed monuments and supreme deities there are a few reliefs referring to deities which have not been noticed before. In the Festschrift to J. F. Healey, I published three formerly unknown votive reliefs with an upraised snake (Wenning 2012) (FIG. 4). The idea is of protection by the snake-god and a protection against snakes bites, although we are not able to give the deity a name.

It remained more accidental that sculptures were used in the discussion of Nabataean deities. Often the sculptures were barely more than an illustration of the deities. This is reflected as well in the fact that the context of the illustrated sculptures was rarely considered in the way it should be. In general, unlike the inscriptions, local sculptures were not yet understood as another source for the study of Nabataean religion, although there are many contributions which go in this direction. A selection of mainly always the same sculptures is shown at the exhibitions. The Basle-Leiden-Amman exhibition on “*Petra- Wonder of the Desert*” was an exception with a broad range of exhibited sculptures. Although these are clearly the “goodies” and it is quite understandable that they are shown, the majority of Nabataean sculpture is either less well published or completely unknown. An all-embracing consideration of the sculpture has



4. Rock-cut relief of a snake. Petra, Wādī Qanṭara (photo D. Kühn).

never been undertaken.

Sculptures of Ancient Petra (SAP)

Due to the situation described above and the wish to protect the sculptures by documentation, the project “Sculptures of Ancient Petra (SAP)” was initiated. Considering the political situation in the Middle East it seemed preferable to postpone the publication of my nichesurveys for a while and to begin work on the sculpture. In October 2013, the Director General of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, Dr. Monther Dahash Jamhawi, kindly agreed to a proposal I made on behalf of the Institut für Altorientalische Philologie und Vorderasiatische Altertumskunde of the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster and the German Research Association (DFG) to document all sculptures of ancient Petra. By including Prof. Dr. Thomas Maria Weber-Karyotakis, this became a joint project with the Institute of Archaeology of the University of Jordan. The Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology and Tourism, Prof. Dr. May-

soon al-Nahar, kindly accepted this cooperation. Dr. Monther and various members of the Department of Antiquities, including Aktham O. Abbadi, Jehad Haorun, and Mohammad A. al-Marahleh, Dr. Emad Hijazeen and Tahani as-Salhi of the Petra Park Authority have been helpful with the permits and making working conditions efficient. I would like to thank all of them, as well as my colleagues who conducted excavations at Petra and kindly allowed me to integrate their sculptural finds into the SAP project.

The project will continue until 2019. The first description of the SAP, including an extensive bibliography, is published by Wenning (2017b). The catalogue includes all figural sculptures made in stone, plaster, bronze and bone. Terracotta figurines are excluded because they have been treated elsewhere. While the plain betyls, floral decorations, figural vessels and figural pictures on lamps, coins, seals and frescoes are not included, they are considered. The documentation will be organized by findspots in chronological order of their research, first those in the centre of Petra, then the valleys and suburbs around Petra. This helps to preserve complexes. The catalogue will be put into a data-bank (FileMaker) with additional photographs after publication.

List of the first expeditions to Petra with the amount of newly discovered figural sculptures

Survey E. Brünnow/A. von Domaszewski 1897, 1898; publ. 1904	23
Survey A. Musil 1896, 1902; publ. 1907	2
Survey G. Dalman 1904, 1906, 1907, 1909, 1910; publ. 1908, 1912	20
Survey by T. Wiegand 1916; publ. 1921	5
Excavations by G. and A. Horsfield 1929, 1934-1936; publ. 1938-1941	11
Excavations A. Conway/W. F. Albright 1929, 1934; publ. 1935, 1960, Conway HP	1
Excavations by M. A. Murray/J. C. Ellis/J. A. Saunders 1937; publ. 1940	4

Survey N. Glueck Kh. Braq 1937; publ. 1939	1
Excavations DoA/P. J. Parr/D. Kirkbride 1954-1956, street, gate, publ. 1957	9
Excavations P. J. Parr/P. C. Hammond 1958-1959, street, Katuta, gate, Qaşr, city walls	12
Survey P. J. Parr/C.-M. Bennett 1959, Kh. Braq	2
DoA 1960	1
Survey P. J. Parr/C.-M. Bennett 1960, W. Abu Olleqa/Isis	1
Survey P. J. Parr/J. Brown 1962, high loculi/Br. 772	5
Excavations DoA/P. C. Hammond 1961-1962, publ. 1965, theatre	5

After four seasons of documentation in Petra, 2013-2016, the catalogue now contains approximately 750 figural sculptures. 78 are made of marble, 54 of bronze, 65 of stucco, and 11 of bone. Up to 128 objects are sculptured in the round, 583 are worked as reliefs. 97 reliefs belong to rock-cut reliefs and 391 belong to architectural reliefs. 112 sculptures are still *in situ*. Another 64 sculptures are lying in the field. Many of the sculptures are broken or damaged by iconoclasm or other reasons. Many sculptures which have been exhibited or stored formerly at the Amman Archaeological Museum were returned to the Petra Museum in 2014, where preparations for a new larger museum are in progress.

The large number of architectural reliefs at Petra has been realized by other scholars who have based their own projects on it (Adrian, Delcros and Tholbecq 2013). The late C. Augé, J. Dentzer-Feydy and P. Linant de Bellefonds researched the sculptures from the Apsidial Monument. M. Sharp Joukowsky will present further sculptures in her “Great Temple” Vol-

ume III. The finds from the Petra Church are discussed by M.J. Roche 2001. L. El-Khoury (2010) published a small catalogue of the stone sculptures from Petra with 113 entries. S.G. Schmid has discussed aspects of the Petraean sculptures on several occasions. There are many other smaller contributions in the excavation reports. The finds from Khirbat at-Tannūr and Qaşr adh-Dharīḥ allow further large corpora of Nabataean-Roman sculptures.

I prefer to speak of “Petraean sculptures” instead of “Nabataean sculptures”, because “Nabataean” describes a style, which would exclude many of the “Petraean sculptures”. “Petraean” as a toponymic term is always better than any “ethnic” term. Nevertheless, “Nabataean” is useful for local sculptures from the period of the Nabataean kings. On the other hand, a Nabataean style continued down into the late second century AD as we can see from the French excavations at the Apsidial Monument in the Temenos of the Qaşr al-Bint. Here I prefer to use the term “Provincial Era” instead of “Roman”, while “Roman” could refer to sculptures earlier than 106 AD and especially to imports. It is not the aim of the SAP to define a Nabataean style and establish its development, but the SAP can hopefully present those sculptures which are needed for such a definition to be determined in the future.

Dating the Petraean sculpture is still a problem and the term “Nabataean” has contributed to this. The Snake Monument (Br. 302) dated to the late 2nd century BC predates the beginning of the real production of local sculpture. We can establish the timeframe for when this production started by comparing the beginning of Nabataean coinage in 35 BC and the emergence of Nabataean terracottas in the last quarter of the 1st century BC and the relief of Isis from the Wādī Siyyagh, dated to 26/25 BC. But most Nabataean sculptures date to the 1st century AD (Wenning 2016d: 54-58). We also start to recognize that many sculptures belong to the Provincial Era. With the sculptures from the

frieze with the Planet Gods and those from the Apsidial Monument we now have a good basis for comparison to describe the techniques and treatment of local sculptures from this period. Of course, most of the marble sculptures are imports from the Roman period (FIG. 5), but the majority of the sculpture dating from the 1st and 2nd century AD is locally made. When Strabo, Geogr. 16.4.24 mentions “*moulded works are not produced in the country*” he was misled.

The number of sculptures with religious subjects is strikingly high at Petra, forming at least one third of all sculptures. Therefore, an analysis of these monuments can be another source for the discussion of the deities of Petra and Nabataean religion. It is too early to present an analysis here, but some statistics can perhaps demonstrate the potential for further research. There is a small group of figures in the rock-cut niche-reliefs and another one with the rock-cut tombs. Of the 106 bust reliefs most are busts of

deities. Beside the deities there are some mythological figures. 30 monuments depict Erotes and 16 monuments depict Tyche-figures with cornucopia. Both refer to the prosperity which is secured by the deities. 19 Medusa-monuments demonstrate the apotropaic aspect, although the Medusa degenerated more and more into an ornament. The figural capitals with winged lions, elephants, goats and eagles expressed protection and power. The number of animals and mixed creatures totals 100 (FIG. 6).

For each of these figural sculptures we have to first research the “*Sitz im Leben*”, before we can continue with an interpretation. All the above subjects will be discussed in the documentation in separate paragraphs, where other figural depictions and sources will also be considered. I am certain we can gain much more information from a closer study of the sculptures in the various fields of the religious, political and social world of Petra and the Nabataeans¹.



5. Torso of the Small Herculaneum Woman, Roman import, marble, Petra Museum (photo R. Wenning).



6. Architectonic relief of a griffin, Petra, Complex of the Temple of the Winged Lions (photo H. Merklein).

1. I would like to thank Lucy Wadeson for commenting and proof-

reading of this article.

List of subjects among the Petraean sculptures (2016)

Zeus	9 items	Obodas	4	Nymph	2
Apollo	3	Moon-God	3	Dioscuri	1-2
Artemis	3	Isis	11-12	Muse	1
Athena	5	Harpocrates	6	‘Rankenfrau’	5-6
Ares	4-8	Osiris	1	eagle	16
Aphrodite	13-16	Sarapis	3	lion	45
Hermes	10	Bes	1	elephant	5
Heracles	4	Sphinx	5	goat	4
Dionysus	9	Eros/Putto	30	dolphin	4
Helios	1-2	Maenad	1	snake	6
Nike	13-14	Medusa	19	camel	5
Asklepius	1-2	Nereide	3	horse	3
Tyche/-figure	16	Hippocampus	6	mask	67
Cronos	2	winged lion	5	eye-betyl	22-29
al-Lat	1	herm	7	incense block	8-15
Atargatis	1	Amazon	6		

Bibliography

- Adrian, J., Delcros, S. and Tholbecq, L. 2013. Étude Architecturale des Blocs Sculptés de Pétra. Pp. 103-106 in L. Tholbecq (ed.), *De Pétra à Wadi Ramm: Le sud jordanien nabatéen et arabe. Rapport des campagnes archéologiques* 2012. Paris: Mission Archéologique Française.
- Alpass, P. 2013. *The Religious Life of Nabataea*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Brünnow, E. and Von Domaszewski, A. 1904. *Die Provincia Arabia* I. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Dalman, G. 1908. *Petra und seine Felsheiligtümer*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- El-Khouri, L. 2010. *Nabataean Stone Sculptures at Petra* (in Arab). Wadi Mousa: Bai Al-Anbat.
- Glueck, N. 1965. *The Story of the Nabataeans. Deities and Dolphins*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Healey, J.F. 2001. *The Religion of the Nabataeans*. Leiden and Boston and Köln (Brill).
- Kammerer, A. 1929. *Pétra et la Nabatène*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Lindner, M. and Zangenberg, J. 1993. The Re-discovered Betyl of the Goddess Atargatis in the Şiyyağ Gorge of Petra (Jordan) and Its Significance for Religious Life in Nabataea. *ZDPV* 109: 141-151.
- McKenzie, J.S. and Reyes, A.T. 2013. Iconographic Programme. Pp. 189-289 in J.S. McKenzie et al. (eds.), *Architecture and Religion. The Nabataean Temple at Khirbat et-Tannur* Vol. 1. AASOR 67. Boston: ASOR, and Oxford: Manar al-Athar.
- Murray, M.A. 1939. *Petra. The Rock City of Edom*. London and Glasgow: Blackie and son.
- Nehmé, L. 2005/06. Inscriptions Nabatéennes vues et revues à Madā'in Šālih. *Arabia* 3: 179-225.
- 2012. Le dieu Obodas chez le Nabatéens: Hypothèses Anciennes et Découvertes Récentes. Pp. 181-224 in I. Sachet and C. Robin (eds.), *Dieux et Déesses d'Arabie: Images et Représentations*. Actes du Colloque de Paris, 1er et 2 Octobre 2007. Orient & Méditerranée 7. Paris: de Boccard.
- Parr, P.J. 1957. Recent Discoveries at Petra. *PEQ* 89: 5-16.
- Robinson, G.A. 1930. *The Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization*. New York: Macmillan.
- al-Salameen, Z. and Falahat, H. 2014. An Inscribed Nabataean Bronze Object Dedicated to Obodas the God from Wādī Mūsā, Southern Jordan. *PEQ* 146: 293-307.
- Starcky, J. 1966. Pétra et la Nabatène, *SDB* VII: 886-1017. Paris: Letzouzey and Ané.
- Tholbecq, L. and Delcros, S. 2017. Rethinking the Context of Sculpture. From Random Blocks to Architectural Programmes. In L. Tholbecq and L. Wadson (eds.), *Nabataean and Roman Sculpture in Petra: Current Research and Perspectives*, Proceedings of a Workshop at Brussels, 6 December 2014. Brussels (in press).
- Wadson, L. and Wenning, R. 2014. The “Lord of the Stonemasons” I. The “Sword Deity” at Petra. *PEQ* 146: 56-73.
- 2015. The “Lord of the Stonemasons” II. ‘Standing figure with betyls’ at Petra. *PEQ* 147: 20-38.
- Wenning, R. 2001. The Betyls of Petra. *BASOR* 324: 79-95.
- 2009. The Message of the Khirbat at-Tannur Reliefs. *SHAJ* X: 577-584.
- 2011. Tribale Frömmigkeit und royale Religionspolitik. Gottesverehrung der Nabatäer. Pp. 279-304 in

- A. Lykke and F. Schipper (eds.), *Kult und Macht. Religion und Herrschaft im Syro-Palästinischen Raum. Studien zu Ihrer Wechselbeziehung in Hellenistisch-Römischer Zeit*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 319. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- 2012. Snakes in Petra. Pp. 235-254, 279-282 in G.A. Kiranz and Z. Al-Salameen (eds.), *From Ugarit to Nabataea. Studien in Honor of John F. Healey*. Gorgias Ugaritic Studies 6. Piscataway: Gorgias Press.
- 2013. Nabataean Niches and “Early Petra”. Pp. 343-350 in M. Mouton and S.G. Schmid (eds.), *Men on the Rocks. The Formation of Nabataean Petra*. Proceedings of a conference held at Berlin 2-4 December 2011, Berlin: logoc.
- 2015. Obodas Theos. Der Statuarische Befund Eines Nabatäischen Gottes. *ZDPV* 131: 44-58.
- 2016a. The Many Faces of Dushara – A Critical Review of the Evidence. *SHAJ* XII: 189-209.
- 2016b. The Great Goddesses of Petra - A Critical Review of the Evidence. Pp. 510-537 in Z.T. Fiema, J. Frösén and M. Holappa (eds.), *The Nabataean Sanctuary and the Byzantine Monastery. Petra – The Mountain of Aaron*. Vol. II. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- 2016c. Review of Alpass, P. 2013. *The Religious Life of Nabataea*. Leiden and Boston: Brill: *Gymnasium* 123: 199-200.
- 2016d. Herodes und Petra – Eine vielschichtige Nachbarschaft. Pp. 47-60 in J.K. Zangenberg (ed.), *Herodes. König von Judäa*. Darmstadt: WBG.
- 2017a. A Survey of Nabataean Religious Identity by Temple-Sanctuaries. Pp. 109-125 in R. Raja (ed.), *Contextualising the Sacred in the Hellenistic and Roman Near East: Religious Identities in Local, Regional and Imperial Settings*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- 2017b. “The Sculpture of Ancient Petra (SAP) – Description of a project. In L. Tholbecq and L. Wadson (eds.), *Nabataean and Roman Sculpture in Petra: Current Research and Perspectives*. Proceedings of a Workshop at Brussels, 6 December 2014. Brussels (in press).