

THE KHAZNE AT PETRA : A REVIEW

I. INTRODUCTION : The chronology remains problematical in spite of a bulk of controversial literature, mainly German from the first quarter of this century.

II. DESCRIPTION : **III. ASCRIPTION :** A monumental tomb, which is most likely, at the same time, a shrine — not a distinct temple.

IV. EXPLANATION : Two schools of interpretation of such façades, the Pictorial and the Architectural.

V. DATE : Outline of previous speculation. Examination of possible sources of information: (a) Epigraphical, (b) Topographical (c) Style of Ornament (d) Design of monument: (I) Typological position in the sequence of Nabataean rock-cut tombs. (2) Relations with built monuments at Petra (3) Relations with other Nabataean Architecture (4) Relations with late Hellenistic Architecture. — The baroque spirit and the duration in the Greek East for the first two centuries of the Empire of the Hellenistic building tradition.

APPENDIX I : The Khazne and the Pompeian Styles.

APPENDIX II : Connections with the *scaenae frontes*

TABLE OF ILLUSTRATIONS

- Plate XI Fig. 1 : Plan of Khazne (from Dalman, *P.E.F. Annual* 1911 Fig. 1 and Pl. XV).
- Plate XII Fig. 2 : Façade of Khazne (from Dalman, Pl. XVI).
- Plate XII Fig. 3 : Section of Khazne (from Dalman, Pl. XVII).
- Plate XIII Fig. 4 : The Nile boat of Ptolemy IV. An imaginative reconstruction of a non-existent feature (from Caspari, *J.D.A.I.* 1916).
- Plate XIII Fig. 5 : The Library at Epheos. 115 A.D. Perspective Reconstruction of Façade. (from Robertson, Fig. 120).
- Plate XIV Fig. 6 : Scaenae Frons of the Theatre at Aspendos, c.150 A.D. (from Robertson, Fig. 117).
- Plate XIV Fig. 7 : The North Internal Façade of the Great Peristyle in the Colonnaded Palace at Tolmeita. (from Pesce, Pl. X).

LIST OF REFERENCES

(Giving contracted title as cited herein, and an indication of the
significance for this study).

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| T. ASHBY | : | The Architecture of Ancient Rome,
London, 1927. |
| M. AVI YONAH | : | Oriental Elements in the Art of Palestine in
the Roman and Byzantine periods. <i>Q.D.A.P.</i>
XIII, 1948, <i>et alii</i> (An excellent survey of the
underlying spirit in the art form of the region.
<i>Avi Yonah</i>). |
| R.E BRUNNOW & A.V. DOMASDEWSKI | : | Die Provincia Arabia, Strassburg, 1909. (The
basic source for the monuments of Petra and
other Nabataean sites). <i>B. & D.</i> |
| H. C. BUTLER | : | Pt. II of the Publications of an American Ar-
chaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900.
Architecture and other Arts. New York, 1903.
<i>A. E.</i> |
| H. C. BUTLER | : | Publications of the Princeton University Ar-
chaeological Expedition in Syria in 1904 - 1905
& 1909, Division II. Ancient Architecture in
Syria. Leyden, 1909. (These two works form,
together with <i>B. & D.</i> , the basic source for
related Nabataean monuments). <i>P. E.</i> |
| F. CASPARI | : | Das Nilsschiff des Ptolemaios IV. <i>J.D.A.I.</i> XXXI,
1916 (gives a reconstruction of the famous
houseboat, which featured a tholos on the
upper deck). |
| G. DALMAN | : | Petra und seine Felsheiligtümer. Leipzig, 1908
<i>P. u. s. F.</i> |
| G. DALMAN | : | Khasnet Far'aun at Petra, <i>P.E.F.</i> Annual 1911.
(A good architectural description of the
monument accompanying excellent drawings
by T. Newton). <i>KHAZNE</i> |
| G. DALMAN | : | Neue Petra Forschungen. Leipzig, 1912 (con-
tains an expanded version of the chronological
opinions expressed in the preceding work).
<i>N. P. F.</i> |
| T. FYFFE | : | Hellenistic Architecture, London. |
| J. HITTORF | : | Mémoire sur Pompeii & Petra. <i>R. A.</i> , VI, 1866,
pt. II, p. 7 (First notice of resemblances
between the Khazne and wall paintings at
Pompeii). <i>Hittorf</i> |

- G. HORSFIELD
A. IPPEL
RR. PP. JAUSSEN & SAVIGNAC
A. KAMMERER
SIR A.B.W. KENNEDY
D. KIRKBRIDE
H. KOHL
A. W. LAWRENCE
P. LEHMAN
R. PAGENSTECHER
P. J. PARR
P. J. PARR
G. PESCHE
H. PLOMMER
- : Sela — Petra. Q.D.A.P. VII *et elii* (of little direct interest for Khazne). *Horsfield*
: Der Dritte pompejanische Styl, Berlin, 1910. (Draws comparison between the Khazne façade and murals of the Third Pompeian Style - not available in the Levant). *Ippel*
: Mission Archéologique en Arabie, Paris, 1909-22 (The basic authority for the Nabataean Tombs at Medain Saleh in the Northern Hijaz). *J. & S.*
: Pétra et La Nabatène, Paris, 1929. (An invaluable compendium of information on all aspects of the subject - a convenient, secondary source). *Kammerer*
: Petra, Its History & Monuments, London, 1925 (Well illustrated popular description). *Kennedy*
: A Short Account of the Excavations at Petra, 1955-6 A.D.A.J., IV-V 1960 P. 117 ff *Kirkbride*
: Kasr Firaun in Petra, Leipzig, 1910. (Draws close parallels between the stucco decoration of the Qasr Bint Far'un and the rock cut façades, thus likening the latter to pure decorative work). *Kohl*
: Greek Architecture, London 1958. *Lawrence*
: Roman Wall Paintings from Boscoreale, Cambridge Mass., 1953 (Subjects some old assumptions about Pompeian Wall Paintings to critical re-examination). *Lehman*
: Alexandrinische Studien, Heidelberg, 1917. (Grapples with the problem of the true nature of the relationship between the Khazne and the Pompeian wall paintings. Sensibly decides that the resemblance is collateral and not one of direct influence). *Studien*
: Recent Discoveries at Petra. P. E. Q. Jan - June, 1957, p. 1. ff. *Discoveries*
: Excavations at Petra. P. E. Q., July - Dec., 1960, (Brief reports of recent work of excavation and clearance at Petra). *Excavations*
: Il Palazzo delle Colonne in Tolmeide di Cyrenaica, Rome, 1950, (Illustrates and describes a façade in a palatial house which is very close to the Khazne). *Pesce*
: Ancient & Classical Architecture, London 1956. *Plommer*

- O. PUCHSTEIN : J.D.A.I., 1910 (Collates B. & D.'s typology with the results of J. & S.'s work, opines for a second century A.D., date for the Khazne).
Puchstein
- D.S. ROBERTSON : A hand-Book of Greek & Roman Architecture, Cambridge, 1953 (Contains a brief and sensible setting of the Khazne into the general contemporary scheme of architectural development).
Robertson
- C. RONCZEWSKI : Kapitelle des el Khazne in Petra, A.A., 1932, col. 38., (minute examination of the Khazne capitals. Sees resemblances with early Imperial work at Rome).
Kapitelle
- M. ROSTOVITZEFF : Caravan Cities, Oxford, 1932 (A popular account which expresses a "Hellenistic" date for the Khazne — interesting because its plain language, stripped of *apparatus criticus*, reveals the tenuous and personal basis for most chronological opinions on the Khazne).
Rostovtzeff
- D. SCHLUMBERGER : Les formes anciennes du Chapiteau Corinthien en Syrie, en Palestine et en Arabie. *Syria*, 1933, p. 290. (An important study giving chronological significance to a simple classification of these Capitals - deductions qualified by Avi Yonah and G.R.H. Wright).
Schlumberger
- F. STUDNICZKA : Der Symposium Ptolemaios II. (Unavailable in the Levant).
- F. STUDNICZKA : Tropaeion Trajani. (A study of the monument at Adamklissi, which gives some argument for Seleucid antecedents for the Khazne façade. Not available in the Levant).
- H. THIERSCH : Die Alexandrinische Königsnekropole. J.D.A.I., XXV, 1910 (calls into evidence Cleopatra's Tomb known from Plutarch's incidental description, as a model for the Khazne).
Thiersch
- R. VALLOIS : L'Architecture Hellénique et Hellénistique à Delos, Paris, 1944. (contains a survey on the broadest lines of the oriental Hellenistic tradition of building to which the Khazne belongs - useful for its wealth of references).
Vallois
- C. WATZINGER : Denkmäler Palästinas, Leipzig, 1935 (A forceful statement of "Hellenistic" dating for the bulk of the Petra monuments).
Watzinger

- T. WIEGAND : Petra (Heft 3 in Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen des deutsch-türkischen Denkmalschutz Kommandos) Leipzig, 1921 (contains a brief section on the Khazne by Wiegand himself, which strongly asserts his preference for a pre-Augustan date. A very important section by K. Wulzinger works out the pictorial explanation of the Petra façades). *Wiegand*
- G. R. H. WRIGHT : The Structure of the Qasr Bint Far'un in Petra. P. E. Q., Jan. — June, 1961, p. 1. (Sets this temple in an outline history of Nabataean Architecture). *Qasr*
- G. R. H. WRIGHT : The Arched Gate at Petra. P. E. Q., July - Dec., 1961. (Shows the use of provincial Nabataean architectural elements on an Arch of the mid second century A.D. Some of the forms mentioned appear on the Khazne). *Arch*

The following periodicals are referred to in abbreviated form :

- A. A. Archaeologischer Anzeiger.
 A. D. A. J. Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan.
 B. A. Biblical Archaeologist.
 J. D. A. I. Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archaeologische Instituten.
 P. E. F. Palestine Exploration Fund Annual.
 P. E. Q. Palestine Exploration Quarterly.
 Q. D. A. P. Quarterly of Department of Antiquities of Palestine.
 R. B. Revue Biblique.
 R. A. Revue Archéologique.

The façade comprises two superimposed Corinthian orders. The lower is hexastyle, but to limit the height of the pediment, this is thrown across the central four columns only, which feature together with the two terminal columns and their crowning breaks out *en ressaut*⁵; the whole order is surmounted by an attic with which the pediment etc., is engaged. This attic in turn serves as a podium for the upper stage which consists of a central tholos framed by lateral, distyle features, each crowned by a broken pediment. The tholos stands free for two thirds of its depth and the lateral features return in replica of their façade, i.e., laterally opposing the tholos with the two columns and broken pediment with which they frame it frontally⁶. The relief (or *ressaut*) of the upper story is thus 6 m. The "pavillion" roof⁷ of the tholos is crowned with a Corinthian capital surmounted by an urn⁸. The broken pediments bear eagle acroteria and above them truncated obelisks of rock⁹ run up into the roof of the cutting.

This façade is superbly ornamented¹⁰. The Corinthian capitals belong to that Syrian type which M. Schlumberger in an important study¹¹ has designated "Heterodox". There are two types. Those of the main (lower) order, where the base of the bell is wreathed with two rows of acanthus leaves, and the other (the upper order, the finial of the pavillion and those of the entrances to the lateral chambers) where there is only a single row of acanthus leaves¹². The unfluted columns stand on attic bases and diminish without entasis. The entablature consists of an architrave with moulded taenia and the customary two fasciae, and a richly decorated frieze with a dentated cornice. In the lower order the frieze has those twining, foliate forms (*rincaux*) beloved in Nabataean art, alternating with griffons heraldically opposed about a crater. The tympanon again has the intertwining wreath, and there are heads in the coffers above the end columns¹³. The frieze of the upper order shows strings of flowers, leaves, and fruits¹⁴ interrupted by masks¹⁵.

In addition there is a considerable amount of figured sculpture¹⁶. This was first treated in an informed fashion by the French Duke de Lynes¹⁷ one hundred years ago. Surprisingly enough, although passing dissent¹⁸ has been expressed on individual matters, this iconographic survey has never been specifically replaced by more rigorous modern research¹⁹. De Lynes recognized the central acroterion of the lower order as the symbol of Isis (solar disc between horns, with ears of wheat). The female figure above it, in the central intercolumniation of the tholos, which might be thought of as the president of the group, he considered as a Tyche. B. & D., seeing in addition to the cornucopia, a veiled modius on her head and a sistrum²⁰ in her right hand, unhesitatingly named her as Isis. The other intercolumniations of the tholos and the lateral pavillions each bear an Amazon²¹ with shield brandishing the Bipennis. The winged figures in the recesses separating the tholos and the lateral pavillion de Lynes calls Victories; this B. & D. deny seeing among their attributes, sistra and snakes, so they become unnamed goddesses²². The two male, equestrian figures which flank the main façade are the Dioskouroi²³. Here B. & D. (23 a). See another snake present on the left hand figure.

Finally surmounting the lateral columns of the main order are two beasts of prey, variously panthers or lions, while as akroteria for the broken pediments of the upper order there are eagles. These must have been once very impressive and minatory in their realism.

This matter has been well brought out by Kammerer³⁵, whose conclusion seems the only common-sensical one: "Il est plus logique d'admettre que le Khazne n'est pas plus que les autres tombeaux un véritable temple".

IV. EXPLANATION:

The elements of the façade of this temple-tomb have been described briefly, the execution is of rare excellence, it remains to give some explanation of the design. This is a field admitting, as it does, the deployment of learned and ingenious theories, which has had a peculiar fascination for German scholars³⁶. This school of comment was directed principally to elucidating the Alexandrian antecedents³⁷ of the monument. Various specific structures were called into account, e.g. the Tomb of Cleopatra³⁸, the Nile Boat of Ptolemy IV³⁹ (v. fig. 4) each of which, like almost all other Alexandrian architecture, has vanished utterly⁴⁰. Above all the Alexandrian origins were traced *per media* of Pompeian interior decoration.

The connection with Pompeii is a feature which was early siezed on, and has been developed exhaustively. As early as 1866 Hittorf published his *Memoire sur Pompeii & Pétra*. The intriguing chain of conjecture there advanced⁴¹ is scarcely of contemporary concern, but he quite correctly drew attention to the undeniable similarities between façades like the Khazne and some mural compositions of the Second Style (e.g., in the House of the Labyrinth and in the Villa at Boscorede. Since then reference to the Pompeian styles have come into almost every treatment of the Khazne. The exegeses may follow the lines of Hittorf or controvert them (e.g. Ippel, *Der dritte Pompejanische Stil*, pp. 29ff); Caspari, *Das Nilschiff*, pp. 55ff); but the framework of reference is the same.

Strangely enough, in contrast to this mass of opinion, the attempts to link the Khazne with actual, known structural remains have been relatively rare. It is this aspect which raises the suspicion that some of the literature is concerned more directly with the theory than the monument itself.

Perhaps then, before advancing any opinion, some effort should be made to analyse in summary form the impressive bulk of material devoted to the explanation of the Khazne façade. The following is presented with deference and should be regarded as a sketch only, since some of the original sources are not available at the time of writing.

It may be said that examinations of the composition of the facade can be divided into two groups; the pictorial, and the architectural⁴². The first group, at times, even seeks to disassociate the façade completely from architecture proper; they emphasize its decorative affinities and assert that explanations are to be sought in the composition of analogous schemes of decoration such as wall paintings, where the principles involved are quite other than structural. As has been stated, this type of enquiry is better represented than the other "architectural" analysis which sees the Khazne as "architecture" to be allied with buildings and explained in similar terms.

analysis⁵³. Again the Pompeian paintings can be called into account, since certain motifs there expressed are undoubtedly scenic motifs — e.g., the framing of a tholos by two broken pediments. More especially the breaking out and back of the entablature over projecting columns would seem to originate in the late Hellenistic theatre.

Such is a truncated, imperfect account of the issues which have been raised in seeking to explain the Khazne façade. In the face of it all, what is it possible to add by way of conclusion?

Inevitably, that there is some truth in most of the comment. A creative artist is influenced by all the aspects of his climate, often unconsciously, and to another day and age facets of this family likeness seem overwhelming. That there is much to recall the murals of Pompeii, is scarcely surprising. These reflected the favourite architectural motifs of the day used decoratively, and however the artist of the Khazne façade conceived his monument, it is undeniable, that the independence of the elevation from structural dictates allowed him, in practice, to proceed with a freedom approaching that of a decorator⁵⁴.

However it is scarcely likely that the façade would have been far divorced from the appearance of a familiar type of building. Doubtless it is the accidents of preservation which have caused so much attention to be devoted to wall paintings, for it is a regrettable fact that of the Hellenistic building which might have explained the Khazne, there is almost no trace⁵⁵. If Antioch and Alexandria had suffered the date of Pompeii, the exegeses would have a markedly different complexion. It is this one-sided survival which clouds the issue we have attempted to clarify; for those who assert "the real presence", so to speak, of the Petra rupestrian architecture are paradoxically driven to the wall paintings to illustrate their position.

No better summing up of the whole matter can be given than by rehearsing some of the main points made by Pagenstecher in his *Alexandrinische Studien* (pp. 34-40). Here he comes on the question of the inspiration of the Petra façades incidently, while seeking to debate the Alexandrian origin of the Pompeian Styles.

This is an honest work, full of hesitations in the face of difficulties raised by common sense, to sweeping theoretical interpretation. Basically, he is flatly contradictory to the thesis that the Petra façades, like the Khazne, are pure decoration, and that they derive directly from Pompeian wall paintings. For Pagenstecher, these façades are versions of a real architecture known to the makers and copied by them, just as the wall painters of Pompeii copied architectural originals. "Aber liegt denn wirklich die Imitation von Wandmalerei vor? Die Malerei kopiert doch reale Architekturen oder nimmt von ihnen wenigstens ihren Ausgangspunkt. Konnte der petraische Architekt nicht die gleiche Absicht haben, ohne den Weg aber die Malerei zu nehmen?"

He asserts that there were real buildings in late Hellenistic times, private houses, palaces, with features such as are displayed on the façade of the Khazne, i.e., with a tholos framed by proticos set on the upper storey⁵⁶. Alas however, he must and does

What is the reason for this uncertainty? Perhaps the matter will be clear if we consider separately, in turn, the various possible chronological indicia. First epigraphic sources — this matter is summarily dealt with, there are absolutely none. Second, what one might call topographical indications — again there is a blank. It is quite impossible to derive any information from the position of the Khazne with respect to adjacent monuments⁷¹ of known date, indeed its siting is detached and unique.

Next comes the important question of the stylistic analysis of the ornament. This has been undoubtedly one of the main promptings to an early ("Hellenistic") dating. Wiegand again may be referred to here for his forceful expressions. He appraises the distinction of execution of the foliate motifs in the frieze and tympanon by comparing them to the best Hellenistic silver beakers⁷².

More recently the capital forms have been thought to give significant chronological information⁷³. These capitals were considered in minute detail by Ronczewski⁷⁴, a specialist in this field. The raw material of his observations was incorporated into a very influential study by D. Schlumberger "Les formes anciennes du chapiteau corinthien en Syrie, en Palestine et en Arabie"⁷⁵. This work defined the essential nature of the "normal or orthodox" Corinthian capital (e.g. that described by Vitruvius). Proceeding from this, a dichotomy of form, "orthodox and heterodox" was recognised in the Corinthian capitals of the region. It was then sought to give this a rigid, chronological basis, so that the heterodox forms would be prior to the Romanization of the area, beginning in Syria during the reign of Augustus and during the first century A.D., in Arabia; and the orthodox form subsequent to this. While recognizing the virtue Schlumberger's formal distinction, the author has had occasion recently⁷⁶ to criticise the validity of his chronological inferences. There seems to be convincing evidence that the heterodox forms survived, and their occurrence is not the yardstick Schlumberger asserts.

The specific monument which prompted this revision⁷⁷ was the Arched Gate at Petra, Wiegand's Strassentor⁷⁸. This monument, a considerable amount of the fabric of which still survives, formed a gate (across the Colonnaded Street) to the Sanctuary Area where stood the Qasr el Bint⁷⁹. Recent clearance (effected by the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem under the direction of Mr. P. J. Parr in the years 1958-60) has revealed that the arch was built with free-standing columns adorning its outer face. This, combined with its triple passage ways, proclaim it a late, developed form of the Triumphal Arch, dating, most probably, from the mid or latter part of the second century A.D. — certainly a date in the first century A.D., would be revolutionary. Now the main capital forms employed are M. Schlumberger's unorthodox type No. 2, and of these the capitals of the angle pilasters of the centre arch⁸⁰ have the same form as those of the jambs of the doors to the lateral chambers in the Khazne, and of the upper order of the Khazne. This not only serves to negate M. Schlumberger's theory, but is obviously important positive evidence for the dating of the Khazne. "Hellenists" may seek to argue that the execution of the ornament on the Khazne is of an entirely different standard from that on the Arched Gate, but close argument will be required to support a basic chronological distinction between these examples of the one form. Obviously much

detailed comparative study of related monuments of known date is required before it can be reiterated that the ornament of the Khazne is incompatible with a date subsequent to the Roman annexation.

Finally, and most important, in the quest for chronological evidence, there is the form of the monument itself, its design as a whole. A consideration along these lines has many aspects and leads off into many channels of comparison. The existing literature is extensive and perhaps not invariably practical; however some attempt must be made to indicate the main issues.

In the first instance the Khazne is of the same type as several other of the rupestrian monuments at Petra⁸¹ and this type forms one of the four or five main types which comprehend all the rock cut tombs at Petra, Medain Saleh (Hegra), and one or two outlying places in the vicinity⁸². Manifestly some chronological information is to be derived from a study of the typology of these tombs. This was first worked out by B. & D., on the basis of their exhaustive survey of the monuments at Petra. Their classification⁸³ is well known; it runs in suggested order of evolution: Pylongrab, Stufengrab, Proto Hegrtyp, Hegrtyp, Bogengrab, and Römische Tempelgrab, with the first types showing oriental motifs, while thereafter classical motifs become more and more predominant, culminating in the category of the Roman Temple Tomb. What might at first appear to be an alien classification, that proposed by Dalman in 1908⁸⁴, is in fact entirely in harmony with B. & D.'s classification, since the Bogengrab is rare and of little importance in the typological development.

Dalman's scheme was very simple. He divided the tombs into three groups according to the predominant architecture complexion: a) Nabataean Style⁸⁵; b) Hellenistic Style; c) Roman Style. Thus Dalman's Nabataean group conform to the Pylongrab; his Hellenistic group comprehend the Stufengrab, the Proto Hegrtyp and Hegrtyp; while his Roman group are, of course, B. & D.'s Römische Tempelgrab, characterised by the pediment as a crowning feature for the monument. Before proceeding further, it should be pointed out that B. & D., were undoubtedly correct in their analysis, which referred to the situation at Petra. This has been utilised as a basis by all subsequent investigators and no subsequent discovery has shown that their evolutionary order was not in the main valid for Petra⁸⁶. Both B. & D., and Dalman suggested absolute dates for their categories, but this is best considered after mention of the very important discoveries announced in 1909.

In that year PP. Jaussen and Savignac published their rigorous and methodical inventory of the rock cut tombs at Medain Saleh, the ancient Hegra, in the Northern Hejaz — an important station on the trade route leading to Petra from the South⁸⁷. The many rock cut tombs there were dated by epigraphy, all falling within the first three quarters of the first century A. D., after which Hegra apparently lost its position and such activity ceased. The types of tomb represented during this period were the Pylongrab, Stufengrab and of course the Proto Hegrtyp. These were all in use throughout the period, and except for one example of the Bogengrab, neither this form nor the Römische Tempelgrab

appeared. Here was chronological information indeed, but, perhaps because of its salient character, it has often been superficially misused.

It does not disprove an artistic evolution as postulated by B. & D., (indeed the Pylongrab at Hegra has something of the air of survivals), but it does show that so far as the four types of Pylongrab, Stufengrab Proto Hegr and Hegr were concerned, this evolution was complete when the tombs were cut at Medain Saleh⁸⁸. It shows also the survival and conservatism in Nabataean taste, partially dictated, doubtless, by questions of economy, since the simpler forms were obviously cheaper⁸⁹.

More to the point it raises the strongest of presumptions that the Romische Tempelgraben, crowned by pediments and incorporating various baroque features (superimposed orders, tholoi, broken pediments), were not yet received during this period⁹⁰. It is quite permissible to contravert this on the ground that Hegra architecture was provincial and therefore did not make use of the most splendid resources of the metropolis⁹¹, but the *prima facie* evidence carries conviction.

Here then is positive evidence which would seek to date the series of tombs to which the Khazne belongs, as emerging sometime towards the end of the first century A.D.⁹². It is a strong argument, and to speak at large and prematurely, there is little to refute it. Let us set down more precisely what this argument entails. First it is not casually linked with 106 A.D. Many elements of the Romische Tempelgrab appear at Petra, before the Roman annexation and one example at least of this group, the Tomb of Sextius Florentinus⁹³, is manifestly post Roman annexation. Other examples almost certainly are because of the dress shown on statues of the dead exhibited in niches⁹⁴, e.g., the tomb of the Roman Soldier⁹⁵. Thus if B. & D.'s Romische Tempelgrab is a valid homogenous group, and it is agreed that the Khazne falls within it⁹⁶, we arrive at a reasonable date for it by consideration of the internal evolution of the series of tombs to which it belongs. This date is equally consonant with the Khazne being the tomb of one of the latest Nabataean sovereigns⁹⁷, or of an important personage in the Roman province.

The relative position within the type occupied by the Khazne is at this stage scarcely a matter for further argument. The main features which distinguish the Khazne from its fellows are the purity of its ornament, i.e., the absence of barbarisms (or perhaps better, provincialisms), and the free standing main order of the façade. In view of the demonstrable survival in the repertoire of the various types and elements, I do not see that either of these characteristics can be adjusted into a typological sequence more narrowly. The Khazne is different, better perhaps, but whether it is earlier or later than its fellows must be derived from extrinsic evidence⁹⁸.

Of course, if it is argued that the differences between the Khazne and the Romische Tempelgrab are so great as to disassociate it entirely from that group, this is a different matter altogether. Wiegand (p.10) does say this in no uncertain terms: "How face to face, one can compare the Khazne with so gross and clumsy a thing as the Deir and force them to be contemporaneous... I cannot understand".

Others however, while treating of the Khazne within the framework of B. & D. 's typology arrive at this position on some other score, e.g. Dalman (p. 13) "Thus the time of such Nabataean kings as Aretas IV, Philodemos, a contemporary of Christ, or Rabbelos II, Soter, at the end of the century seems very suitable". Kammerer, in particular, is remiss in this respect. He gives an excellent exposée of B. & D. 's typological classification, and for the Romische Tempelgrab he states that their fully developed form, the colossal tombs, necessitate individual description (p. 474). Later (p. 492) he specifically refers to "les sépultures riches du second siècle ne sont plus seulement des portails de Temples, mais les façades de Temples romains complètes etc."; yet when he does accord the Khazne his promised individual treatment he concludes (p. 500): "Nous ferons volontiers la supposition que les quatre tombeaux colossaux sont ceux des quatre derniers rois de la dynastie Nabatéenne. Le Khazne, le plus ancien parce que le plus pur, le plus harmonieux, serait alors le Mausolée d'Obodas III, 30-9 B. C...".

This, after an excellent stylistic enquiry (p. 491) dating the emergence of the characteristic features of these very tombs to the end of the first century A. D. ! It is too bad, and unfortunately characteristic of the way grounds are changed to suit personal predilections in dating these monuments. The received typology does afford some chronological evidence, and if monuments are to be taken out of this, it must be explicitly stated so, and some convincing stylistic argument must be advanced for this, not merely general opinions such as: "The pomp of late Roman Architecture is completely wanting, the style being more Hellenistic than Roman"⁹⁹; or "Le plus ancien parce que le plus pur".

The most straight forward aspect of the Nabataean chronological problem, viz., the relation of the Khazne to the other rock cut tombs, has occupied an excessive part of this study. This is only justified by the fact that in the past it has tendered to be scamped in favour of the more involved and obscure aspects. Before passing on towards these, however, some mention must be made of another immediate issue: the relations of the Khazne with the built monuments of Petra. This matter has already been introduced through the comparison of the capital forms of the Khazne with those of the Arched Gate. Here it was seen what revision of outlook was necessitated by the results of recent excavation in the city area of Petra. And this is indeed the main thing to be said generally in this connection.

In the past our only information on this subject was that obtained from the work of Wiegand's party during two weeks in 1917¹⁰⁰. They had thus no opportunity for excavation. Furthermore their enthusiasms were for pre-Roman material, and they, accordingly, saw most of the built monuments in this light. A trenchant summary of their outwork was given later by Watzinger in his *Denkmaler Palaestinas*. He says (p. 76) that very soon after the first reception of Hellenistic elements into the tomb façades, the city itself was given a new classical habit as the result of a refoundation by a king, probably Aretas IV. Forming part of this were the Temple (i.e. Qasr Bint Far'un) the Baths, the Palace, and the Gymnasium; so that the Khazne, the funerary monument of the city founder stood at the entrance to his new city... For dating the architecture elements are decisive; the Corinthian capital is similar on all the known monuments and belongs to the late Augustan age¹⁰¹.

Such a confident statement could not fail to impress and, e.g., when Schlumberger came to make his study of the Corinthian capitals already mentioned, he accepted this position without hesitation. In attempting to survey the Hellenistic monuments of Syria, he notes correctly that "the great majority of Graeco-Roman monuments... belong to the period from the Flavians to Diocletian"; but in the sparse residue he includes, on the evidence of stylistic analysis, "almost all the buildings and tombs at Petra"¹⁰². Foxes have their holes, birds of the air have their nests, but the population of Roman Petra had not where to lay its head.

That the bulk of the built city of Petra should date from pre-Roman times, is an astonishing view point to hold. There is no evidence of a sudden decline in the prosperity of Petra after the Roman annexation — indeed recent opinion suggests this produced a positive renaissance¹⁰³. This being the case, the common sense view is that the surviving built remains of the city are largely Roman in date. Experience in comparable Hellenistic sites incorporated into the Empire shows generally how sweeping was the Roman building or rebuilding programme¹⁰⁴.

Not only are Wiegand's ideas against common sense, but recent excavation (restricted in scope though it has been) has cut at their roots. The previously mentioned work on the Arched Gate, which certainly imports a date well on in the second century for this monument, is very damaging, since Wiegand wanted to link all the buildings in the vicinity on the same orientation in a complex dated to the period of the Nabataean Kings. Certainly he specified the latter days¹⁰⁵, but even this is too early for the Gate. Similarly a recent study of the Qasr el-Bint by the author¹⁰⁶ has argued for its dating to Antonine times, because of its relations with other examples of Syrian temple buildings in the same tradition, of known date. Furthermore the recent work of clearance and soundings in and about the main Colonnaded Street, undertaken by the Department of Antiquities¹⁰⁷ and the British School of Archaeology¹⁰⁸ has confirmed that this feature, in its present form, is posterior to the Roman annexation.

Thus it will be seen that the surveys of surface evidence made by Wiegand's party, brilliant work though they were, are not a satisfactory basis for our knowledge of the built city of Petra. Their chronological inferences, drawn from stylistic comparison, must be checked by excavation. Further excavation in the city area of Petra is a pressing need. In the absence of this, the conclusion is that connections such as similarities in the capital forms of the Khazne with those of the built monuments of Petra¹⁰⁹ are of little force in supporting an early date for the Khazne; they are much more prone to set it in the second century A. D.

Moving abroad from Petra in our search for analogous monuments which may throw light on the Khazne, it is reasonable, initially, to attempt to set the Khazne in its next immediate context — i. e., the development of Nabataean architecture as a whole. This subject (so far as it concerns temples) was recently treated in outline by the author¹¹⁰, and he can but recapitulate his conclusion. "Thus, we have a uniform result, that Nabataean temples, with a plan that is most probably derived from a Persian antecedent, flourished from the end of the first century B.C., to the beginning of the second century

A. D. ; whereas temples which are based on a Syrian plan more or less Hellenised came into vogue at A. D. 150 and were built freely in the prosperous Antonine period" ¹¹¹.

This, taken with earlier perceptions of Butler, gives us a tripartite division. First a purely Hellenistic phase, then an oriental reaction, and finally a resuscitation of the classical spirit under Roman auspices. Type monuments would be e.g. the tomb of Hamrath at Suweida (now destroyed) — early first century B.C. ¹¹², the Sanctuary complex at Si' - c. 33 B.C., ¹¹³ and the Temple at Atil - 151 A.D. ¹¹⁴ Manifestly the Khazne does not belong to the second, oriental, phase ; and its baroque character would seem to advance it from the first to the third phase in which it takes its place with the Qasr el-Bint. This analysis was prefigured forcefully by Robertson, who says, in his *Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture*, "Though some of the details of the Khazne have been thought pre-Roman, the general baroque effect is most easily paralleled from work of Trajanic or later times such as... the round temple at Baalbak. The Tomb of Hamrath at Suweida in the Hauran, a purely Greek Nabataean building, dated by its inscription to the first part of the first century B.C., is quite unlike the Khazne... Still less can the Khazne be compared to the somewhat later half oriental Nabataean temples at Suweida and Si' ¹¹⁵. The limitations of this generalized outlook are manifest, but it cannot be denied that it has a measure of value precisely because of its generality.

It will be seen that so far, in considering the design of the Khazne as a whole, we have related it to Nabataean monuments, either in Petra itself or in the surrounding realm. Such a procedure, of course, cannot fail but give a forshortened and truncated view of the problem. The Khazne belongs to the Koivn of the later Hellenistic tradition in the orient, which stretched from Cyrenaica to Mesopotamia, from Scythia to Nubia, and cast its influence beyond. It seems well high incredible that, when we seek to extend our inquiry to this continuum we should be confronted with a dearth of direct evidence. It is however, a melancholy fact that, of the monumental building in the heart lands of Syria and Egypt ¹¹⁶ from the period 100 B. C. — 100 A. D., there are practically no remains surviving in coherent form which are material to our purpose. Such as exist have been worked over many times, and their small compass has led scholars to extend their researches to those which no longer exist ¹¹⁷. Manifestly, in this short and factually review, it is impossible to assess all this argument in detail.

Indeed at the outset, it may be remarked that much of this material, so far as the chronological argument is concerned, is devoted more to demonstrating the early existence of theoretical models for the Khazne, i.e., to arguing when the Khazne might have been built, rather than when it was built. Aspects of the composition of the Khazne are seized on — it is of two storeys, it has a tholos, a tholos on the upper storey, a tholos framed by broken pediments, a tholos surrounded by porticos etc. — and the type history of these features are then examined minutely. All this background study is perhaps, a little remote from the present purpose. That structures of several storeys, funerary, sacred and domestic, were not unusual in the orient from Hellenistic times and before, is well known — for the Orient is the original home of the skyscraper, as a visit to Aden,

or any South Arabian town will demonstrate. Here we may note Horsfield's apt evocation of the original aspect of a Petraean residential quarter¹¹⁸, and compare its relevance with a facade like the Stockwerkesgrab. Indeed, as has been said, "En ce qui concerne les monuments funéraires, les de développement en hauteur de types divers... est un phenomene assez generale¹¹⁹. The Lion Tomb at Cnidos, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassos, the monuments at Amrith, the tombs in the Kedron Valley (the Tomb of Absalom etc.), the tower tombs at Palmyra, not to mention the Monument of the Julii at San Rémy, and for good measure, the Mausoleum of Augustus and that of Hadrian, all show how widespread in time and place is this conception.

As for the tholos and its manifestation, its various architectural settings, its associations, its symbolism, this has been the subject of even more voluminous research. It is welcome then to quote a recent work which disposes of the chronological and functional significance of the form as such. "Both the tholos and the monument or building placed in the centre of a precinct framed by porticos, were structural and formal types applied to a variety of functions in the Greek and Roman world; hence it is needless to consider the several purposes for which such a tholos was used"¹²⁰.

Let us cut short this recital by agreeing that a study of elements in the composition of the Khazne show theoretically that it perhaps could have been built at an early "Hellenistic" date. Both technically and conceptually, it perhaps could have been pre-Augustan. But is it? This is the question which cannot be left entirely un-answered because of the difficulties adverted to in an attempt to set the Khazne in its general architectural background. Some effort must be made in this direction as a conclusion. Since lack of space prevents a re-examination of the details of the facade, the only path open is to attempt to consider the architectural style of the facade as a whole and to examine its relations.

Viewed in this light it is soon appreciated that those who refer to this matter almost all use the term Baroque. B. & D.¹²¹ speak of "the baroque style of the Khazne", Wiegand¹²² classes the Khazne in the style which he calls the Antique Baroque, Rostovtzeff¹²³ refers to "this monument that calls to mind the baroque ...", Fyffe¹²⁴ opines that "It might be even more to the point to call the front of El Khazne baroque", and Robertson¹²⁵ talks of "the general baroque effect...". Here then we have a striking concurrence on this point. Aesthetically, the style of the Khazne facade is a "baroque" style. This should be of some chronological import. Before proceeding with this question however, we should note that there is also some insistence of reference to another aspect of the facade: its purity and refinement. This aspect, which accords somewhat strangely with the appellation baroque, is however seen to be a mode of the German school who wished to emphasize the "Hellenistic" affinities of the Khazne. Moreover, it is the ornamental elements rather than the composition, to which they apply the description, e.g. Wiegand says, "The innumerable refinements in execution of the ornament undoubtedly is in accord with Hellenistic character". Certainly it cannot be doubted that the composition does give an impression of lightness and there is nothing overloaded about it — yet this notwithstanding, the composition is truly a "baroque" one; perhaps even as

This is the "Palazzo delle Colonne" characterised (p.92) as "Una casa d'abitazione signorile" which (p.94) "per la sua eccezionale, vastità e grandiosità en vero e proprio 'palazzo'".

Here at last we have a Palace early enough to bear on the discussion of the Khazne façade. Strikingly it displays, as its most prominent ornamental feature (v. fig. 7) a façade which is exactly of the order of that of the Khazne. Before discussing the chronological implications, let us describe this.

It is the internal north facade of the "Great Peristyle"¹³³. Its function in the building scheme can be seen clearly from Plates VI, IX & XI. It is the north façade of the main peristyle (here characterised as a "private basilica"); this part on the north is in Tolmeita exposed to the burning, South, desert wind, the Ghibli (i.e., the Khamseen), and consequently the upper floor is not in the form of an open balcony, but instead there is some superb, scenic architecture which serves to screen off the terracc behind from the wind. This is supported on a functional, lower order Tetrastyle in Antis, Corinthian with very "normal" capitals (although very "Heterdox" ones were used elsewhere in the building). The entablature of the lower order is very reminiscent of the Khazne, including rinceaux, masks, and eagles. The upper order is a scenic back drop, designed in tripartite form. The central feature is not a tholos, but a niched aedicule, and it is framed by two plain aedicules. Each of the latter is flanked by two architectural elements, composed of coupled columns (set one behind the other) crowned by a sharp angle of broken pediment ("frontini angolari a spicchi") which rakes on both faces¹³⁴. This entablature breaks out and back over the various features. It is the Khazne façade in very essence; and the unmistakable "frontini" cause the author to note the connection — v. p. 101, where he relates it to the "facciate di edifici rupestri di Petra, quali specialmente di quelli detto "el Khazne".

Here then we have a most germane example of "façade" architecture in a related "Hellenistic" art province, and naturally we might expect it to cast considerable chronological light on the Khazne. It does not. Pesce deals with his problem justly, and covers much the same ground as the present work. He correctly notes that the Palazzo delle Colonne belongs to the trabeated masonry tradition as opposed to the "Roman", arcuated construction in concrete; but that this tradition in the lands of the Greek East endures through Roman times¹³⁵. He also notes that constructions in several storeys are by no means unknown in Hellenistic architecture¹³⁶. Thus, although the elements which comprise the structure have Hellenistic origins, and affinities with Delos and the Hellenistic Orient of Syria and Asia Minor are noted¹³⁷, it is equally certain that these elements appear in Imperial times ("ma scontra anche in ambiente imperiale", p. 104). In short the dating of the monument is "una problema cronologica di non facile soluzione".

"L'Edificio colonnato di Tolmeide, per i suoi caratteri generali ed essenziali, s'adequa alla tradizione d'arte ellenistica. Ma poiche in generale, questa tradizione continua a svolgersi durante i primi due secoli dell'impero romano, massime nelle regioni di civiltà greco, e greco-orientale..." (p. 105). All this might be said as well of the Khazne, and it forms the concluding lesson, viz., I doubt if on stylistic, architectural grounds it is possible to date the Khazne closely in this continuum. Exact dating must come from new extrinsic evidence.

APPENDIX I.

THE KHAZNE AND THE POMPEIAN STYLES (“PETRA NOT A SEMITIC POMPEII”)

Since Hittorf first published his *mémoires*, no discussion of the Petraean façades has proceeded far without the intrusion of Pompeii. In this review a direct note on the significance of the Pompeian Styles has been pointedly reserved unto this last, so that Pompeii at length can be put in to its proper place, i.e., an appendix. The accidents of preservation play a tyrannical part in archaeology, but surely this has never been more patent, and patent for ill, than with Pompeii. The eruption of Vesuvius has, in effect, been represented as changing the course of art history from one end of the Hellenistic world to the other. General architectural evolution has been derived from, and dated by local fashions in interior decoration. One speculates what chaos the discovery of intact Adams' interiors will have on a new cycle of archaeology.

In the face of this specialized study which has grown up, common sense can sound disconcerting. The Pompeian styles represent local evolutions of the taste for interior decoration based on architectural motifs, which was general in the Hellenistic world. This did not commence with the Tufa Period, nor end with the eruption of Vesuvius though our knowledge of it is so largely derived from this interval. The various Pompeian styles made use of a varied selection of architectural motifs. The particular selection constituted the style, which changed with a change in taste for interior decoration and not according to changes in contemporary architecture. Still less did contemporary architecture change because of the evolution of interior decoration in Pompeii, though as much is solemnly asserted from time to time. The appearance of a certain architectural motif in Pompeian wall paintings serves to date the wall painting, not the original structure, i.e., *ad absurdum*, the fact that tholoi surrounded by porticos were painted at the turn of the eras means such was the Pompeian taste at that time, not that such tholoi were built then and not before or afterwards.

And these limits should be set on further discussions of Petra in terms of Pompeii.

APPENDIX II.

CONNECTIONS WITH THE SCAENAE FRONTS:

The influence on the Khazne façade of the architectural *scaenae frons* has often been adverted to. Indeed the specific influence of the theatre at Petra was even been called into account (by Pagenstecher, v. Wiegand, n.10 — who sensibly discounts the matter). The connections are manifest, to state the resemblance is a turism; but it is questionable what import there is to note in this. Obviously all forms of “facade” architecture will exhibit a family likeness. This has been seen already in the Library at Ephesos, and the Villa in Tolmeita. Likewise, in addition to the Petra facades, Triumphal

Arches and Nymphaea show some scenic features. Perhaps the only real concern is to enquire whether any chronological information is to be derived from these resemblances. This throws us back onto a study of the late Hellenistic theatre, unhappily a poorly documented subject. However the general agreement is that this type of multiple storey, architectural front is Roman in origins, and develops early in the first century A.D. Thus Lawrence (p.287) "... the application to the scene building of architectural decoration as permanent background to the raised stage... first became habitual in the Roman type of theatre, and the only instances which can plausibly be dated much before the time of Christ are in Sicily, at Segesta and Tyndaris, and seem from their resemblance to theatres at Pompeii to be semi-Roman".

This would seem to strengthen the general showing of the related monuments that such a developed, baroque feature is more likely to be from the second century A.D., than pre-Augustan. However this type of *scaenae frons* is not considered to be an original *deriga* but to represent the facade of "The Hellenistic Palace", the most appropriate, permanent scenery for dramatic action. But here once more we are driven to reference to the non-existent.

- of the Colonnaded Palace at Tolemeita, v. *infra*, fig. 7. (v. Pesce p. 101, for a treatment of these "frontini angolari a spicchi").
- ⁷ The curve of this conical roof simulates the sag of fabric, and sometimes such a feature is carved with the representation of fabric (for the tent origins v. G.R.H. Wright, *Tents and Domes in Persia*, *Man* LYIII 2)²¹⁰.
- ⁸ This urn is supposed to hold the treasure and has been, therefore, much damaged by Bedouin musketry. It gives the monument its contemporary local designation.
- ⁹ These may, or may not have been meant as "Nefesh".
- ¹⁰ Or was, prior to its defacement at Bedouin hands.
- ¹¹ v. Schlumberger, but also v. G.R.H. Wright, *Arch.* An exhaustive study of the capitals is given by K. Ronczewski.
- ¹² With these flatter capitals go, in compensation, a projecting, necking band, classically thought to be proper only to antae, but common in Pompeian decoration and obviously not unusual on columns in the architecture of the period.
- ¹³ The nature of these heads is amusingly in dispute — rams, asses, satyrs etc.
- ¹⁴ Vine leaves, grapes, ivy, laurels, poppies according to Dalman, *N.P.F.* p. 75.
- ¹⁵ This ornament is less typical than that of the lower order, and in the latter the griffons and craters are distinctive. A useful survey of this genre of ornament is given by Vallois p. 290, "Rameaux de Vigne et Autres Helices Vegetales", where the Nabataean predilection for it is noted. It is considered to reflect in stone, luxurious toreutic originals of Asiatic origin disseminated by the luxury of the great Hellenistic courts and capital cities. It appears at Pompeii and in Roman art acquires funerary associations which descend to the present day.
- ¹⁶ Which has suffered appallingly from iconoclastic enthusiasm.
- ¹⁷ Quoted in B. & D. p. 294.
- ¹⁸ More especially by B. & D., in the interest of their "Heroön of Isis" theory, v. p. 179.
- ¹⁹ This is most regrettable as it is just such a critical examination which is likely to yield the most valuable chronological information on the Khazne.
- ²⁰ Denied by Wiegand (p. 9) following Dalman.
- ²¹ De Lynes was especially ingenious in his recognition of the African Amazon, Myrina who conquered Arabia.
- ²² The predominance of female figures led H. Tiersch to suggest that the Khazne was the tomb of a queen (v. Tiersch p. 68).
- ²³ These Dioskouroi have been the subject of much speculation and have been specifically related to the Dioskouroi of Alexandria, the Kabires. v. Vallois, p. 348 n. 4, which gives a resume and references.
- ^{23a} v. B. & D. p. 179.
- ²⁴ A good summary of this ornament, its analogies and possible symbolical significance is given in Vallois pp. 348 - 50.
- ²⁵ Perhaps clearance here might produce information of chronological value.
- ²⁶ Set into a wooden frame.
- ²⁷ e.g. by Dalman p. 5.
- ²⁸ Cuttings for lodging the doors are still visible.
- ²⁹ The floors of the lateral chambers are yet 0.5 m. higher.

- 30 N.B., the sump and drainage channel, cut at the entrance step of the main hall (v. figs. 1.3). This is to receive funerary libations and is exactly the same arrangement as is found in monumental tombs about Jerusalem, e.g., the Tomb of the Kings. A detailed plan and section of this feature is given in Dalman. N.P.F. fig. 61.
- 31 v. pp. 179 ff.
- 32 v. p. 364. For a denial of the specific relation of the tholos with a single specific architectural function v. Lehman p. 119.
- 33 Dr. A. Dajani has intimated that the finial urn of the Deir is "hollow", and has speculated that such urns might have contained cremated ashes.
- 34 v. Horsfield, Q.D.A.P. VIII pp.93-4, announcing the clearance by the Trans-jordanian Department of Antiquities of the Palace Tomb (Stockwerkes-grab.), the Urn Tomb and the Tomb of the Roman Soldier.
- "In the latter the unexpected discovery was made of a sarcophagus base... The only other cleared chambers in the same great row of tombs were also found to be empty and the size and shape for sarcophagi. High up in the central chamber of the Palace Tomb are rock cut bases for four more; and if Nabataean grandees were interred in this manner, that most sumptuous monument of all, the Khazne, is explained as a tomb..."
- 35 v. pp. 495-6.
- 36 Taken in context with general problem of the Nabataean facades, the subject has received detailed attention in (e.g.), the following works: Dalman, p. 59; Kohl; Pagenstecher; Thiersch, p. 67; Wiegand.
- 37 Studniczka in his Tropaion Trajani, has the Seleucid architecture of Antioch as a background.
- 38 Thiersch p. 67.
- 39 v. Caspari pp. 115 ff.
- 40 Hence their attraction as sources to the ingenious.
- 41 Identifying the Khazne as a replica of the Esculapeion at Puteoli.
- 42 This analysis which is in some measure suggested by the work of Vallois, seeks to clarify tendencies. It is not to be thought that individual exponents always explicitly avow one programme or the other, indeed at times, they appear to be arguing from both stand points indiscriminately.
- 43 In the upshot Hittorf appears to regard that the Khazne facade as a conflation of various distinct elements of its proto-type, although no theory of perspective projection seems to be advanced. However, parallel to this, there is an ambivalent insistence on the structural feasibility of the composition: interesting engravings are given showing the elements disposed as a free standing monument, and the intriguing comparison is drawn with the concepts of the High Renaissance architects, e.g., Bramante and his St. Peters scheme (c.f. "superimposing the Pantheon on a basilica").
- 44 v. Petra, *Erklärung der peträischen Felsfassaden*, pp. 12 ff.
- 45 v. *ibid* p. 27.
- 46 v. Kohl p. 13 and pp. 40ff., "ein rein dekorativer... in der monumentalen Architektur des Altertums ganz undenkbar".
- 51 v. A. Ippel p. 29; Studniczka, Tropaion Trajani, p. 67; Pagenstecher pp. 34-40; Caspari, p. 55.
- 52 v. Vallois, p. 312, where doubt is cast on this interpretation.
- 53 The fundamental affinities of scenic architecture and Pompeian wall painting, and the close correction of both with facades like the Khazne is adverted to by Kohl (p. 41) where he seems

- to set the Khazne as a source, rather than as a derivation: "... die nach seiner Meinung innerhalb des zweiten pompejanischen Stiles bleibende Scaena des Apaturios als uberladene und architektonisch etwas freie Weiterbildung des schonen seleukidischen Fassadentypus von Petra bezeichnet". (Pace Licymnius) For Apaturios' Scaena, v. Vitiuvius, VII, V, 5. An interesting sketch reconstruction of Apaturios "folly" is to be found in Beyen, Die pompejanische Waddekoration, III p. 51, fig. 128,10b.
- ⁵⁴ c.f. Kohl, who takes the extreme position (p. 41): "So lässt sich von Fall zu Fall die Anschauung bestätigen dass die petraischen Felsfassaden als Wanddekorationen aufzufassen seien die zunächst der Idee eines Malers oder Struckateurs entsprungen, auf die grossen Felswände wie auf eine schon gespannte Leinwand übertragen und dann in dem weichen Sandstein plastischer, als es der Pinsel oder das Stuckmesser vermocht, ausgeführt worden sind".
- ⁵⁵ c.f. *ibid* p. 40. "Solche seleukidischen oder ägyptischen Gebäude sind aber sonst nirgends nachzuweisen".
- ⁵⁶ v. Pagenstecher p. 36. "Aber ist denn ein Palast in der Art der Petrafassa-de denkbar? Ist die Tholos auf dem Dach möglich? Darf man sich eine solche Säulenhalle imoberen Stockwerk vorstellen? Ich meine, alle diese Fragen lassen sich mit ja beantworten".
- ⁵⁷ c.f. also, their use as store rooms for fruit and the like. v. Lehmann pp. 100-1.
- ⁵⁸ He notes that since it is thought that the simpler tombs, i.e., the *Pylongraben* etc., are versions of Nabataean private houses (v. Kammerer p. 476, and fig. 12, after Wiegand figs. 11 & 12 — but such houses are, of course entirely hypothetical) it is only logical to suppose that the rich façades are versions of rich, princely dwellings, i.e., palaces.
- ⁵⁹ v. J. Wilson, cited by B. & D. p. 228.
- ⁶⁰ v. A.D. Stanley, cited by B. & D. p. 229.
- ⁶¹ v. de Lynes, cited by B. & D. pp. 294 ff.
- ⁶² v. Wiegand pp. 8-10.
- ⁶³ v. Kohl, pp. 40 ff.
- ⁶⁴ v. Watzinger, *Antike Synagogen*, pp. 162 ff., and *Denkmäler Palästinas*, pp. 76 ff.
- ⁶⁵ v. Thiersch, p. 67.
- ⁶⁶ v. Studniczka, *Das Symposion* p. 62; *Tropaion Trajani*.
- ⁶⁷ v. Pagenstecher, pp. 34 ff.
- ⁶⁸ v. Ashby, p. 131.
- ⁶⁹ v. Robertson, p. 220.
- ⁷⁰ v. Plommer, p. 352.
- ⁷¹ As an instance of this type of enquiry may be cited the speculations of M. Starcky in an as yet unpublished study of Petra, kindly communicated to the author. Considering the range of temple tombs occupying the east cliff of the city area, Starcky notes that the tomb of Sextius Florentinus is at the northern extremity, so that doubtless the rest of this cliff face was already occupied — i.e. the Corinthian Tomb, the Urn Tomb and the Stockwerkes-grab were probably pre-Roman. This is not a very strong argument, but it is some argument. Nothing of the kind is available for the Khazne.
- ⁷² Wiegand, pp. 8-10. In point of fact this foliate ornament of spirals and wreaths belongs to a genre widespread in oriental Hellenistic centres (v. *supra*, n. 15) and it is highly characteristic in Nabataean lands, where it can be observed on numerous monuments, many of them dated, some prior and some subsequent to the Roman annexation. In the face of this material, Wiegand's bare statement of stylistic affinity is not an adequate authority for establishing chronology.
- ⁷³ e.g. M. Starcky (*loc. cit.*), states: "Les chapiteaux sont d'un type libre, antérieur à la condiction de Vitruve. A lui seul, ce trait n'est pas décisif, mais il crée une forte présomption pour une date antérieure à l'emprise définitive de Rome".

- ⁷⁴ v. Kapitelte, He sees comparisons with Roman examples of the beginning of the Imperial age. Vallois (p. 287 n. 3), questions "si les rassemblements qu'il a relevée... an sont pas plutot l'indice d'une source commune l'art Syrien du premier siecle av. J.C. ...".
- ⁷⁵ v. Schlumberger p. 290.
- ⁷⁶ v. G.R.H. Wright, Arch, Appendix.
- ⁷⁷ Similar qualifications had already been expressed by Avi Yonah p. 52.
- ⁷⁸ v. Wiegand pp. 56 ff.
- ⁷⁹ v. G.R.H. Wright, Qasr.
- ⁸⁰ v. G.R.H. Wright, Arch, fig. 6; Wiegand, fig. 47.
- ⁸¹ e.g. The Deir, The Urn Tomb, the Corinthian Tomb.
- ⁸² For a summary account of these minor sites in the "Land of Midian", v. Kammerer, p. 482 and notes, citing Ruppel, Burton and Musil.
- ⁸³ v. B. & D. pp. 137-173; also J. & S. I pp. 306-404 (N.B. p. 388); II, pp. 78-108; Atlas, pl. XXXVIII — LIV. Also Dalman P. u.s. F. P. 47. Convenient recent reviews of this maerial are available in Kammerer, pp. 471 ff.; and Vallois, pp. 313 ff.
- ⁸⁴ v. Dalman P.u.s.F. p. 417.
- ⁸⁵ It is strictly erroneous to see all examples of the Pylongraben as purly oriental or Nabataean for classical elements are disposed in the doors of some developed members of this group. c.f., a somewhat similar observation of Vallois p. 316 n. 2 quoting Puchstein's earlier perception. C f., also, the common sense statement of Kennedy (p. 51). "In the course of their development the Nabataean architects had by that time, assimilated many Graeco-Roman ideas ... These had been applied, however, chiefly to the enrichment of the doorways, rather than to the design of the façade as a whole".
- ⁸⁶ It is advisable to make this point for superficial appraisal of the results of the epigraphic re-searches of J. & S., at Hegra have provoked some unwarranted gibes at B. & D.'s classification — v. e.g. Rostovtzeff, p. 49; c.f. Kammerer, p. 472.
- ⁸⁷ v. J. & S. passim.
- ⁸⁸ v. Vallois, p. 317; c.f. J. & D., p. 391.
- ⁸⁹ c.f. Vallois, p. 317; we of course have no similar proof of a corresponding survival of forms at Petra itself, but there is nothing against such a presumption, c.f. Kammerer, p. 472. One obvious inference to be drawn from this co-existence of styles at Hegra is that B. & D.'s dating for the initial stages of the sequence is much too high. Their sixth century B.C., should be reduced to something like the third or second century B.C., as indicated by Dalman.
- ⁹⁰ v. Kammerer, p. 490.
- ⁹¹ v. Robertson, p. 220, "It is true that Medain Saleh is far from Greek centres, and that such a monument as the Khazne must have been carved by foreign workmen, but it is natural to conclude that these monuments are later than those of Medain Saleh.
- ⁹² c.f. Kennedy p. 51, "The fact that no single monument of the (classical) type exists at Medain Saleh, where during the first century A.D., nearly every one of the other Nabataean varieties were copied (and dated), affords a fair presumption that there were no classical monuments at Petra before, at the earliest, the very end of the century. We may reasonably infer that the classical monuments came into existence after the taking over of the Nabataean Kingdom by Trajan, A.D. 106.
- ⁹³ v. B. & D., fig. 194, p. 170 and No. 763, figs. 428-30, pp. 382-84. This tomb bears a Latin inscription reciting the distinguished career in the Imperial Service of the defunct; v. also Kammerer, p. 468, for a text.
- ⁹⁴ v. Kammerer, p. 493.

- ⁹⁵ v. B. & D. No. 239, fig. 305, pp. 273-4, pl. XXVII, also Kammerer. Atlas pl. 40.
- ⁹⁶ B. & D., do not specifically refer to it in this group, because they wish to see it as a Sanctuary (of Isis) and not a tomb. They say (pp. 179 ff.), that the slight influence which the Khazne has had on the grave architecture of Petra makes it clear that this building belongs to the last period, that of Roman Rule. They also see the Deir as a fusion of the Roman Temple Grave with the façade of the Khazne. Thus for chronological purposes it falls within the Romische Tempelgraben and generally it is implicitly included in the group even when distinctions are being pointed out.
- ⁹⁷ As suggested by Dalman, p. 13: "It will therefore be open to conjecture that the 'Treasury of Pharoah' was the sepulchral monument of one of Petra's last kings". However the sequel to this, viz. "before the Roman conquest put an end to all Royal Splendour"... is most obscurantist. Petra certainly became more splendid after the Roman annexation, and the date 106 A.D., is in no account to be seized on as a watershed in the art history of Petra.
- ⁹⁸ e.g. The Tomb of Sextius Florentinus is late (i.g. post annexation) yet it has a plethora of the most offensive Nabataean provincialisms — e.g., dwarf pilasters and the like. B. & D.'s typological sequence stems in general, from a progressive classicising tendency, yet no one would put the Khazne after the Tomb of Sextius Florentius on this account.
- ⁹⁹ v. Dalman, Khazne, p. 13.
- ¹⁰⁰ v. Wiegand, *passim*.
- ¹⁰¹ v. Watzinger, *Denkmäler Palästinas*, 1935. This Corinthian capital is, of course, Schlumberger's Heterodox type II 2 referred to previously.
- ¹⁰² v. Schlumberger, p. 284 n. 8.
- ¹⁰³ v. G.R.H. Wright, *Arch*, *passim*: P.J. Parr *Discoveries*, p. 15.
- ¹⁰⁴ e.g. in cities of the Cyrenaican Pentapolis like Ptolemais and Teuchira, it is extremely difficult to come across any thing at all pre-Roman within the city pounds.
- ¹⁰⁵ v. Wiegand, p. 56, "in die ausgehende Petraische Dynastienzeit".
- ¹⁰⁶ v. G.R.H. Wright, *Qasr*, *passim*.
- ¹⁰⁷ v. Kirkbride, pp. 119 ff., (giving notice of an important dated inscription).
- ¹⁰⁸ v. P.J. Parr, *Excavations*, pp. 130 ff.
- ¹⁰⁹ As in the passage from Watzinger quoted above, followed by Schlumberger who specifically set down (p. 289) as the main examples of his Heterodox type II 2, i.e., capitals with central floral motifs in the form of scrolls, the "Petra" capitals on the Khazne, the Baths, the Arched Gate, the Qasr Bint Far'un and the peripteral Temple.
- ¹¹⁰ v. G.R.H., *wright*, *Qasr*, pp. 29 ff.
- ¹¹¹ v. *Ibid*, p. 36. The floruit of the "orientalising" period is at the time of Christ, the floruit of the latter phase, Antonine, thus the turn of the first century represents a medial point. Note that neither in the analysis of Nabataean building in general, nor of that at Petra in particular, does an accidental, political date, like 106 A.D., appear climatic. Note also that the analysis in this article is centred on aspects of Nabataean architecture other than those at issue in the Khazne. In the former case it is the functional planning of a temple which provides the categories; however the material is not entirely irrelevant.
- ¹¹² v. (For convenience) Kammerer, Atlas pl. 106 (1); & B. & D. III p. 98.
- ¹¹³ v. Butler, P.E. p. 69.
- ¹¹⁴ v. Butler, A.E. p. 343; B. & D. II, pp. 102-105.
- ¹¹⁵ v. Robertson, p. 220 c.f. Kennedy (p. 54), "But on general grounds perhaps the date of Hadrian would appear more likely to be too early than too late".
- ¹¹⁶ So far as Syria is concerned, all general surveys comment on the absence, e.g. Robertson, p. 220, "In Syria and Palestine there are few Greek buildings earlier than the reign of Augustus". As for Egypt, a perusal of the section on architecture in Noshy, *The Arts in Ptolemaic Egypt*, London 1938, will reveal the gap forcefully.
- ¹¹⁷ e.g. The Tomb of Cleopatra (Thiersch) and the late Seleucid Palaces at Antioch (Studniczka).
- ¹¹⁸ v. Horsfield p. 15, "The cliffs were closed with well built walls which dispeised now gaping inte-

- rriors, and gave the appearance of a normal city with buildings several storeys high, like those in South Arabia, set in rising terraces.
- 119 v. Vallois p. 335.
- 120 v. Lehman, p. 118. N.B., one such purpose was apparently the "Trophy" Here the tholos took a storied form, and this has attracted some superficial attention in connection with the Khazne v. Der Rundbau auf dem Panajir Dag (Forschungen in Ephesos, I, 1906, Vienna), which also gives an illustration of the Tropaeon Alpium of Augustus at Nizza (fig. 106) and references to the Tropaeon Trajani at Adamklissi.
- 121 v. B. & D., p. 179.
- 122 v., for convenience Kammerer p. 500.
- 123 v. Rostovtzeff p. 43.
- 124 v. Fyffe, p. 83.
- 125 v. Robertson, p. 220.
- 126 It is a difficult but necessary point to make that, although the baroque outlook seems to be linked with Imperial ostentation the architectural expression of it in the orient remained essentially "Hellenistic" in its elements. Wiegand made much use of the term "Antique Baroque" to describe the phenomenon here outlined, which he thought of as "the late period of Syro-Hellenistic". This it is, indeed, but one must not confuse Hellenistic in the stylistic sense, with Hellenistic in the political sense; i.e., we must never see in the architecture of the Greek East a "Hellenistic Phase" succeeded by a "Roman Phase", c.f. Robertson, p. 205. "In speaking of Roman architecture it is vital to remember that the architecture even of the Empire, especially in the Greek East, was at bottom Hellenistic, and that Rome's political dominance caused no sudden break in its development. At the same time it is certain that the centralisation of government had an immense effect..." This a good suggestion of the complex problem of the interaction of "Hellenistic" and "Roman" traditions, a vital matter which is only now receiving the detailed attentions it deserves.
- 127 Robertson especially notes the Round Temple (that of "Venus"), dated sometime from the early second to the early third century A.D., v. Robertson, pp. 264 - 5, fig. 112 and pl. XIX.
- 128 v. (for convenience) Robertson, pp. 289 - 91, & fig. 120 Note the special circumstances of its siting which make it very pertinent to the Khazne (p. 289). "It was hemmed in by other buildings, and partly sunk into rising ground, so that only the façade was externally important. This however was richly and whimsically decorated in a manner strongly suggestive of a *scaenae frons*). Almost inevitably such a façade must show affinities with the theatre, and the nature of this link is best considered briefly in an appendix.
- 129 v. (for convenience) Robertson, pp. 276-279 and fig. 117.
- 130 It can and is argued that these dates do not give us the beginning of the baroque in the orient; that this is lost with late Seleucid and Ptolemaic architecture. This is possible; one can only repeat that the latest neighbouring monuments we have which are definitely pre-Imperial such as at Priene, e.g., the Theatre, have none of the baroque spirit.
- 131 The monument has caught the eye of Plomner, and is cited by him, pp. 241 - 2.
- 132 v. the forthcoming publication of the Oriental Institute, embodying work (in which the author shared) from 1954 - 57.
- 133 The reconstruction here illustrated is reasonably well founded (most of the elements can be seen illustrated in the plates and their find spots are cited).
- 134 These "frontini angolari a spicchi" have already been referred to, v. n. 6 above, for their importance in establishing the "real presence" of the Petraean façade architecture.
- 135 v. p. 99 "di tradizione ellenistica e la struttura in pietra la taglio, che domina in questa, come quasi in tutti la contruzioni antichi dell'Africa settentrionale e della Siria anche durante l'epoca romana".
- 136 v. p. 99, "Non e ignota all'architettura ellenistica la soprelevazione dipiani superiori al piano terreno ... e dal tipo scena teatrale ellenistica generalmente a due piani".
- 137 v. p. 104.
- 138 v. p. 101, "ad avanzata epoca imperiale", e.g., in the Quadrifrons of Severus at Lepcis Magna, which is quoted.

G. R. H. WRIGHT