ORIENT - OCCIDENT

Volume 21/1
2017

*Ouvrage publié avec le concours
de la Société des Amis de la Bibliothèque Salomon Reinach*

Comité d'honneur (au 01.01.2018) :

Jean ANDREAU, Alexandre FARNOUX, Ian MORRIS, †Georges ROUGEMONT, Catherine VIRLOUVET

Comité de Rédaction (au 01.01.2018) :

Marie-Françoise BOUSSAC, Roland ÉTIENNE, Jean-François SALLES, Laurianne MARTINEZ-SÈVE, Jean-Baptiste YON

Responsable de la Rédaction : Marie-Françoise BOUSSAC

Adjoint : Jean-Baptiste YON

Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée — Jean Pouilloux

5/7 rue Raulin, F-69365 Lyon Cedex 07, France

marie-francoise.boussac@mom.fr

www.topoi.mom.fr

<http://www.persee.fr/collection/topoi>

Diffusion : De Boccard Édition-Diffusion, 4 rue de Lanneau, F-75005 Paris

Topoi. Orient-Occident 21, Lyon (2017)

ISSN : 1161-9473

Illustration de couverture : Chapiteaux de Beyrouth et d'Anjar (dessins H. Kahwagi-Janho).

Illustration du dos : Le grand palais d'Anjar (photo H. Kahwagi-Janho).

SOMMAIRE

Fascicule 1

Sommaire	5-8
Index des auteurs	9-10
Études	
M.MINARDI, «The Zoroastrian Funeray Building of Angka Malaya»	11-49
R.RAJA, «Representations of the so-called “Former Priests” in Palmyrene Funerary Art. A Methodological Contribution and Commentary»	51-81
H.KAHWAGI-JANHO, «De Baalbeck à Anjar. À propos de quelques séries de chapiteaux antiques»	83-103
A.-K.RIEGER, «Text and Landscape. The complementarity of the Papiro Vaticano Greco 11 R (<i>PMarm</i>) to landscape-archaeological results from the arid Marmarica (NW-Egypt/NE-Libya)»	105-146
Dossier «La question des crises dans l’Antiquité»	
V.CHANKOWSKI, «Introduction: la question des crises dans l’Antiquité»	147-149
Cr.VIGLIETTI, «Les crises frumentaires dans la Rome alto-républicaine et la question des consommations alimentaires entre croissance et limitation»	151-172
Fr.DE CALLATAY, «Crises monétaires et crises du monnayage dans le monde gréco-romain. Une vue perspective»	173-192
Ch.DOYEN, «Crise économique ou révolution comptable ? Évolution des normes monétaires et des pratiques comptables à l’époque hellénistique»	193-206
Th.FAUCHER, «La grande mutation. Aspects et impacts d’une “crise monétaire” dans l’Égypte ptolémaïque»	207-216
X.DERU, «Croissance et crise dans le nord de la Gaule romaine»	217-232
D.HOYER, «Regionalism in Rome’s Third Century Fiscal Crisis. A Statistical Approach to Ancient Economic History»	233-262
Chroniques	
Fr.CROISSANT, «Du nouveau sur les terres cuites grecques. À propos de quelques publications récentes»	263-280
L.MARTINEZ-SÈVE, «Sur la nature du pouvoir séleucide»	281-289
Chr.J.ROBIN, «L’Arabie à la veille de l’islam dans l’ouvrage de Aziz al-Azmeh, <i>The emergence of Islam in Late Antiquity</i> »	291-320

SOMMAIRE

Fascicule 2

Sommaire	325-326
----------	---------

Comptes rendus

Études thématiques : géographie antique et sacrée, paléobotanique

P.-O. LEROY, S. Bianchetti <i>et al.</i> , <i>Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography</i> (2016)	327-333
P.-O. LEROY, D. Dueck, <i>The Routledge Companion to Strabo</i> (2017)	335-339
M. ALBALADEJO-VIVERO, Strabon, <i>Géographie XV</i> (éd. P.-O. Leroy) (2016)	341-343
S. AMIGUES, Ph. Beaujard, <i>Histoire et voyages des plantes cultivées à Madagascar</i> (2017)	345-355
S. AMIGUES, P. Lieutaghi, <i>Une ethnobotanique méditerranéenne</i> (2017)	357-359
A.-C. PANISSIÉ, N. Belayche <i>et al.</i> , <i>Fabriquer du divin</i> (2015)	361-367
M. LESGOURGUES, P. Struck, <i>Divination and Human Nature</i> (2016)	369-377
M. SARTRE, Y. Lafond, V. Michel, <i>Espaces sacrés</i> (2016)	379-384

Orient ancien, Iran, Inde

F. DE ROMANIS, K.I. Karttunen, <i>Yonas and Yavanas in Indian Literature</i> (2015)	385-386
V. LEFÈVRE, L. Fogelin, <i>An Archaeological History of Indian Buddhism</i> (2015); B. Ahmed, <i>Buddhist Heritage of Bangladesh</i> (2015)	387-396
J.-Fr. SALLES, F. De Romanis, M. Maiuro, <i>Across the Ocean</i> (2015)	397-406
A. DE SAXCÉ, D.A. Agius <i>et al.</i> , <i>Red Sea Project VI</i> (2017)	407-412
R. BOUCHARLAT, P. Callieri, <i>Architecture et représentations dans l'Iran sassanide</i> (2014)	413-419
V. MESSINA, J.M. Schlunde, B.B. Rubin, <i>Arsacids, Romans and Local Elites</i> (2017)	421-423
V. MESSINA, J. Wiesehöfer, S. Müller, <i>Parthika</i> (2017)	425-429
C. SALIOU, D. Parayre, <i>Le fleuve rebelle</i> (2016)	431-436

Grèce depuis l'époque archaïque

N. KOUROU, Fl. Gaignerot-Driessen, <i>De l'occupation postpalatiale à la cité</i> (2016)	437-441
B. HOLTZMANN, V. Barlou, <i>Die archaische Bildhauerkunst von Paros</i> (2014)	443-455
B. HOLTZMANN, R. Di Cesare, <i>La città di Cecrope</i> (2015)	457-470
J. ZURBACH, H. van Wees, <i>Ships and Silver, Taxes and Tribute</i> (2013)	471-481
J. ZURBACH, S. Mitray, <i>The Collapse of the Mycenaean Economy</i> (2017)	483-485
J.G. MANNING, A. Bresson, <i>The Making of the Ancient Greek Economy</i> (2016)	487-488
J. FAGUER, J. Blok, <i>Citizenship in Classical Athens</i> (2017)	489-499

Monde hellénistique et romain

R. ÉTIENNE, C.A. Picón et S. Hemingway, <i>Pergamon and the Hellenistic Kingdoms</i> (2016)	501-503
Fr. QUEYREL, H. Kyrieleis, <i>Hellenistische Herrscherporträts aus Paphos</i> (2015)	505-510
L. MARTINEZ-SÈVE, A. Coşkun, A. McAuley (éds), <i>Seleukid Royal Women</i> (2016)	511-519
L. CAPDETREY, Chr. Feyel et L. Graslin-Thomé (éds), <i>Le projet politique d'Antiochos IV</i> (2014)	521-533
J.-Chr. COUVENHES, R. Oetjen, <i>Athen im dritten Jahrhundert</i> (2014)	535-541
R. DESCAT, J. Labuff, <i>Polis Expansion and Elite Power</i> (2015)	543-544
P. FRÖHLICH, W. Mack, <i>Proxeny and Polis</i> (2015)	545-551
G. REGER, N. Badoud, <i>Le temps de Rhodes</i> (2015)	553-563
G. PETZL, J.-L. Ferrary, <i>Les mémoires de Claros</i> (2014)	565-571
M.-Th. LE DINAHET, E. Le Quéré, <i>Les Cyclades sous l'empire romain</i> (2015)	573-577
Fr. KIRBIHLER, L.-M. Günther, <i>Bürgerinnen und ihre Familien</i> (2014)	579-596

Égypte et Orient de l'époque hellénistique à l'islam

J. MARCHAND, J. Engemann, <i>Abū Mīnā VI</i> (2016)	597-599
Chr. THIERS, V. Grieb et al., <i>Alexander the Great and Egypt</i> (2014)	601-606
H. AUMAITRE, Th. Faucher et al., <i>Egyptian Hoards I</i> (2017)	607-613
J.-Cl. BÉAL, E. Rodziewicz, <i>Ivory and bone sculpture in Alexandria</i> (2016)	615-618
A.-E. VEISSE, S. Coussement, 'Because I am Greek' (2016)	619-622
R. SEIGNOBOS, A. Merrills, <i>Roman Geographies of the Nile</i> (2017)	623-626
R. BAGNALL, P. Reinard, <i>Kommunikation und Ökonomie</i> (2016)	627-638
A. DALLA ROSA, A.-V. Pont et Fr. Lerouxel, <i>Propriétaires et citoyens</i> (2016)	639-645
O. BORDEAUX, B. Kritt, <i>The Seleucid Mint of Ai Khanoum</i> (2016)	647-656
V. MESSINA, R. Wellenfels, <i>Hellenistic Seal Impressions</i> (2016)	657-658
M. SARTRE, T. Kaizer, <i>Religion, Society and Culture at Dura-Europos</i> (2016)	659-663
M. ZELLMANN-ROHRER, A. Sartre-Fauriat et M. Sartre, <i>IGLS XIV, La Batanée et le Jawlān oriental</i> , BAH 207 (2016)	665-689
L. THOLBECQ, Z.T. Fiema et al., <i>Petra – The Mountain of Aaron II</i> (2016)	691-697
J.-B. YON, M. Blömer, <i>Steindenkmäler römischer Zeit aus Nordsyrien</i> (2014)	699-709
C. SALIOU, A. Schmidt-Colinet et U. Hess, <i>Das Nymphäum von Apamea</i> (2015)	711-713
C. SALIOU, R. Cribiore, <i>Between City and School</i> (2015)	715-721
D. GENEQUAND, G. Tate et al., <i>Serğilla</i> (2013)	723-731

Rome et Occident

R.-M. BÉRARD, V. Nizzo, <i>Archeologia e antropologia della morte</i> (2015)	733-742
J.J. PALAO VICENTE, Fr. Bérard, <i>L'armée romaine à Lyon</i> (2015)	743-750

REPRESENTATIONS OF THE SO-CALLED “FORMER PRIESTS” IN PALMYRENE FUNERARY ART

A methodological contribution and commentary

Introduction¹

Tadmor/Palmyra, the oasis city in the Syrian Desert, has since its rediscovery attracted much attention in scholarly circles.² Since the legendary city was rediscovered by the British travellers Robert Wood and James Dawkins in

-
1. I thank the Carlsberg Foundation for financing the Palmyra Portrait Project in the period 2012-2015, as well as for the generous prolongation of the project from 2016 until the end of 2019. The support of the Danish National Research Foundation (grant number: 119) for the Centre of Excellence Centre for Urban Network Evolutions, which has granted new research opportunities feeding into my research on Palmyra should also be acknowledged. More can be learned about the Palmyra Portrait Project on the following webpage: <http://projects.au.dk/palmyraportrait/>. I would also like to thank Jörg Rüpke and the ERC group ‘Lived Ancient Religion’ for sharing their knowledge with me over the last four years. The funding by the ERC should also be acknowledged, which was received under the 7th Framework Programme of the European Community under agreement no. 295555 (ERC-Advanced Grant ‘Lived Ancient Religion’).
 2. See SMITH 2013 for a recent monograph on Palmyra as well as the important publications by COLLEDGE 1976; HENNING 2013; KAIZER 2000; SARTRE and SARTRE-FAURIAT 2008, 2014, 2016; SCHMIDT-COLINET and AL-AS’AD 2013 as well as YON 2002 for further references. Also see the newly published edited volume by KROPP and RAJA 2016a, which brings together a set of articles by leading Palmyra scholars. Furthermore see RAJA 2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2016a-b, 2017a-d, forthcoming, for further references.

1751, the city quickly gained an important standing in research.³ Not least due to the legendary Queen Zenobia who expanded Palmyra's geographical territory immensely and led the revolt against the Romans, the city received much attention, not only in scholarship, but also in the arts.⁴ Furthermore since the early 20th century archaeological missions have been undertaking campaigns in the city, excavating numerous monuments as well as restoring several others. Since the outbreak of the civil war in Syria the site has gained renewed attention, not least due to the serious damage which has been done to the site and its surroundings.⁵ From the first century AD until the city was sacked by the Romans in 273 AD as a consequence of Zenobia's expansion politics, the city flourished immensely, not least due to the trade which passed through and to a large extent was organised by Palmyrene merchants. The trade networks of Palmyra extended both to the East and West, as well as North and South, which in turn brought many connections and cultural contacts to the city.⁶ Certainly it was because of the trade that the city flourished and grew quite a bit in the first three centuries AD. The increase in wealth in turn had an impact on the architectural and artistic development in the city.⁷ One of the realms which underwent an immense development was the funerary sphere⁸ and the local production of the limestone funerary sculpture flourished.⁹ These sculptures which existed for several centuries and can be divided into several typological groups still consist of more than 3,000 portraits of deceased individuals from Palmyra. This makes this corpus the largest group of representations of individuals from the Roman period stemming from one single

-
3. WOOD 1753 for the earliest travel account reporting on the rediscovery of Palmyra. Also see SARTRE and SARTRE-FAURIAT 2016 for an account of travellers and the history of Palmyra. The recent book by VEYNE 2015 also deserves mention, despite criticisms.
 4. For a recent contribution on the reception of Zenobia in the arts see SARTRE in KROPP and RAJA 2016.
 5. See for example the recent publication «Palmyre, cité martyre», in AL-MAQDISSI and ISHAQ 2016.
 6. SELAND 2015; MEYER, SELAND and ANFINSET 2016 for a collection of articles on the Palmyrena, the region of Palmyra.
 7. See for example HENNING 2013 as well as SCHMIDT-COLINET and AL-AS'AD 2013 also for further references. Also see the monograph by ANDRADE 2013 for a chapter on Palmyra and further references as well as the recent monograph by SMITH 2013.
 8. See HENNING 2013 for the tower tombs as well as further references.
 9. See SADURSKA and BOUNNI 1994. For an earlier contribution, which remains a standard work on Palmyrene funerary sculpture see INGHOLT 1928.

urban context.¹⁰ In itself this makes this group of portraits unique when one works on issues of social and cultural representations and the funerary sphere in general in antiquity. Through the work done within the framework of the Palmyra Portrait Project it is now possible to among other things make statistical analysis across the various representational groups as well as across the chronological span of the portraiture.

The representations of Palmyrene priests make up a crucial group within the funerary portraiture.¹¹ These representations, of which the earliest date to the middle of the first century AD, make up approximately 10 percent of the total amount of individuals in the funerary sculpture and almost 20 percent of the total amount of male representations (*Fig. 1*).¹² These are significant numbers, which were sustained over more than 200 years with an increase in numbers produced in the late second and third centuries AD. This group of portraits presents the opportunity to study aspects of priesthood in Palmyra through the archaeological evidence, aspects which are not presented to us in the written sources. The epigraphic as well as the literary sources do not give much information about how Palmyrene priesthoods were structured or which status a priesthood held within Palmyrene society.¹³ Earlier studies have dealt with some aspects of the iconography of Palmyrene priests based upon the available and collected material by various scholars.¹⁴ These contributions have laid an important basis for

-
10. See KROPP and RAJA 2014, 2015 and RAJA 2016a for introductions to the project and further references.
 11. RAJA 2016a gives the first methodological study of the priestly funerary representations focusing on *oculus* reliefs showing priests together with family members.
 12. See RAJA 2016a. The three earliest dated heads of priests, stemming from the funerary sphere and registered in the database of the Palmyra Portrait Project are: **1)** A priest head, dated: 50-150 AD, measurements (in cm): Max. H: 32; W: 14; D: 18.5, location: Museum of Grenoble, Grenoble, France, I.N.: MG 1581, PS Number: 604, bibliographical references: Ingholt Archives; COLLEDGE 1976, p.248. **2)** A priest head, dated: 50-150 AD, measurements (in cm): Max. H: 32; W: 21, location: Archaeological Museum, Istanbul, Turkey, I.N.: 3718, PS Number: 155, bibliographical references: Musée Impérial Ottoman 1895, 168; INGHOLT 1928, p.107; COLLEDGE 1976, p.248. **3)** A priest head, date: 75-125 AD, measurements (in cm): Max. H: 32; W: 16; D: 18, location: Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria, I.N.: CD 28/67, bibliographical references: GAWLIKOWSKI 1984, p.98, cat. 13, fig.151; COLLEDGE 1976, p.248. There are numerous representations of priests which date to the third century AD, too many to be mentioned here.
 13. See in particular: KAIZER 2002, chapter 4, p. 213-259, for a discussion of the evidence related to groups of worshippers, priests and beneficiaries. KAIZER 2002, p.237-238, considers the terms, which are connected with priestly titles in Palmyra.
 14. GAWLIKOWSKI 1966, HEYN 2008, KAIZER 2002 as well as STUCKY 1973 for considerations on the Palmyrene priests. See RAJA 2016a-b, 2017a-d, forthcoming, for contributions based on the Palmyra Portrait Project corpus.

considerations on the visual representations of Palmyrene priesthoods. However, these studies have naturally been hampered by the fact that no corpus of these representations existed. Therefore these have had to rely on a more or less random number of representations. Some of the earlier contributions have also considered the representations of the so-called “former priests”.¹⁵ These representations, which will be the focus of the present contribution, have in all literature either been interpreted as depicting “former priests” or as depicting men “belonging to a lower rank within the clergy, or layman who, in recognition of some religious benevolence, had received the *modius*, but without the right to wear it”.¹⁶ These representations make up a distinct group spread across all types of Palmyrene funerary sculpture and their particularities were noted already early on, as the contribution from the 1930s by Harald Ingholt testifies to.¹⁷ These representations show men depicted with beards and hair and their priestly hat, the so-called *modius*, displayed next to them on a pedestal, being presented to them by a male person or simply being held by another male person.¹⁸ This contribution presents for the first time all the examples held in the database of the Palmyra Portrait Project and discusses the implications this group of representations has for our understanding of them and of priesthood in Palmyra in general.¹⁹

-
15. STUCKY 1973, 169-170, p. 174-175 mentions the type, but does not conclude anything about their potential meaning in this context. Stucky’s contribution, however, remains a methodologically sound contribution with interesting observations and further references. HEYN 2008, p. 184-185 gives a comprehensive summary of other scholars’ interpretations as well as further references but does not give a conclusion herself. Also see KAIZER 2002, p. 236 for the conclusion that these representations probably referred “to a priestly position held in the past” as well as for further references. Another important reference is INGHOLT 1934, p. 32-43.
 16. See note 15 as well as INGHOLT 1934, p. 34-35 for the quote above.
 17. See notes 15 and 16.
 18. Although the term *modius* is used in the literature, we in fact do not know what this hat was called in antiquity. This gives raise to some methodological problems and has influenced the way in which we see this item that certainly was part of the priestly dress, but in no way can be said to be connected to the *modius*, corn measure of Serapis, for example. I suggest that the term is not used, despite the fact that I have used it in earlier publications.
 19. In other contributions I have discussed priests shown in constellations with family members in the loculus reliefs (of which only four examples exist): RAJA 2016a and furthermore in a number of contributions I have discussed what the priestly representations in general may add to our knowledge about priesthood and its meaning in Roman period Palmyra, RAJA 2017a, 2017c-d. This contribution is the first one which deals with the collection of representations of the so-called “former priests”.

The Palmyrene funerary sculpture and the priestly representations

As far as the evidence from Palmyra is concerned, we can conclude that Palmyrene funerary sculpture came into existence in the first century AD.²⁰ It did so in a world, which long had been part of a Hellenistic koine and we might have expected to find portraiture in Palmyra stemming to before the Roman period. However, the archaeological evidence does not allow insight into whether this indeed was the case.²¹ As in so many other places of the Near East, the Hellenistic period remains one, which is almost impossible to grasp in the archaeological evidence.²² We do not have conclusive evidence that portraiture existed in Palmyra before the first century AD. The few earlier stelae grave markers depicting under-life size full figures and the stelae-loculus reliefs from the grave buildings in Palmyra, certainly seem to have drawn on Hellenistic forerunners.²³ These may indicate that knowledge of portrait representations were known in the region and were either continued, re-introduced or introduced for the first time in Palmyra in the first century AD together with the introduction of new grave monuments, which in turn would have called for new types of decoration and forms of commemoration.²⁴ New research points to the conclusion that Palmyrene funerary portraiture did not, as earlier suggested, come into being only as a result of Roman influence.²⁵ Furthermore it does not seem plausible that reliefs of freedmen and their family members were the prime models for Palmyrene funerary portraits.²⁶ The Palmyrene funerary portraiture was a medium for the Palmyrene elite. These families, belonging to the highest level of society, viewed themselves within their own cultural and societal environment, which the genealogies given in many of the funerary inscriptions also indicate. These individuals did not view

-
20. INGHOLT 1928 remains a standard work on the chronology of the Palmyrene funerary sculpture and its stylistic developments.
 21. See RAJA 2017b for an account of the state of the evidence from the Hellenistic period and further references. Also see SCHMIDT-COLINET and AL-AS'AD 2013 for a publication regarding excavations that aimed at recovering Hellenistic phases in Palmyra, but in the end rather found Roman period phases.
 22. For the general discussions surrounding this see MILLAR 1993 as well as SARTRE 2001.
 23. RAJA 2015c.
 24. See RAJA 2015c, p.335 as well as PARLASCA 1976, p.34-39, and PARLASCA 1982, p.22-23. Parlasca has undertaken seminal studies on the Palmyrene funerary portraiture, which to some extent remain valid, but in other respects are outdated due to the much-improved state of the evidence today.
 25. RAJA 2017b.
 26. See for example ZANKER 1992 for such a line of argumentation.

themselves as middle-class citizens of the expanding Roman Empire of which they coincidentally had become a part and they would not have looked to monuments of freed slaves for inspiration about how to commemorate family members in the graves.²⁷ The shift in funerary customs and the monumentalisation of the tombs in Palmyra, which began with the tower tombs, and was followed by the underground tombs and temple tombs, would have called for new ways of conducting funerary commemoration.²⁸ The ideal medium was found in the portrait busts, which in fact were more than busts, and extended down until right above the navel area of the depicted individual.²⁹ Such more than bust size depictions were a Palmyrene speciality. These busts, as we call them here for sake of convenience, were carved on rectangular locally quarried limestone slabs, which in turn were placed in front of the loculi (burial niches) and closed off the burial. Through their extension until the navel area more space for the display of visual elements and attributes was created. Each individual representation could be displayed with even more details through the extra space, allowing for full depictions of arms and hands and the things placed in arms and hands.³⁰

The funerary sculpture from Palmyra falls into several categories. The loculus reliefs were by far the most common representation used in the graves. These consisted of, as described above, a rectangular limestone slab upon which a relief bust of the deceased was carved.³¹ Some of the loculus reliefs carried

27. See RAJA 2017b-c and forthcoming, for considerations on Palmyrene identity as expressed through the funerary sculpture.

28. See RAJA 2017b for considerations on the development of the grave monuments and the “genese” of the funerary portraits. See HENNING 2013 for the tower tombs; SCHMIDT-COLINET 1992 for one of the rarer temple tombs as well as RAJA and SØRENSEN 2015 also for a temple tomb. See SADURSKA and BOUNNI 1994 for several of the hypogea with in-situ portraits. All also give further references for other monuments.

29. See KROPP and RAJA 2014 as well as RAJA 2015c for elaborations and further references.

30. See HEYN 2010 and 2012 for studies on gestures and attributes. Also see KRAG 2016 for a contribution on female portraiture from the funerary sphere in Palmyra and KRAG forthcoming for a comprehensive monograph drawing together for the first time all known female funerary portraits from Palmyra upon the database of the Palmyra Portrait Project.

31. The Danish scholar Harald Ingholt in 1928 published the first overview study of these portraits based on his archive. INGHOLT 1928 remains a standard work on the Palmyrene funerary sculptures, despite slight adjustments to his chronological outline.

more than one individual.³² Within the category of the *loculus* reliefs, the *stelae* motif showing an under-life size individual in full figure presents a distinct group. These *stelae*-motifs sometimes carried more than one individual.³³ Banqueting scenes displayed either as large plaques sitting in niches or *exedras* in the graves or used as *loculus* reliefs also constituted a separate category within the funerary representations.³⁴ In the second century AD sarcophagi were introduced. The sarcophagi lids displayed elaborate family scenes. Further family members could be depicted on the boxes of the sarcophagi.³⁵ A few wall-paintings as well as ceiling decoration also display funerary busts.³⁶ Sculpture in the round is not frequently found in the evidence from the graves.³⁷ In the few cases where we have evidence it is difficult to tell in which specific situations it was used. To sum up: *loculus* reliefs with different modes of representations (more than busts, full figure motifs and banqueting scenes), large banqueting reliefs and sarcophagi were the most commonly used modes of representation of individuals in the Palmyrene graves. The *loculus* reliefs, and on top of that the representation of a single individual, were by far the most commonly encountered type of representations used throughout the centuries in which the funerary sculpture was produced.

Across the centuries in which the funerary sculpture was produced and across all categories of funerary representations priestly representations are encountered. These make up a distinct group within the funerary portraiture. By far most common were the single representations of priests on *loculus* reliefs which are much more common percentage-wise than those of single male, female and child-representations.³⁸ Only in four cases are priests on *loculus* reliefs shown together

32. In the Palmyra Portrait Project database 145 *loculus* reliefs with multiple representations are registered.

33. In the Palmyra Portrait Project database 29 *loculus* *stelae* motif reliefs with multiple representations are registered.

34. In the Palmyra Portrait Project database 93 banqueting reliefs are registered, four of these with single representations.

35. In the Palmyra Portrait Project database 193 sarcophagi are registered. Some of these are, however, only fragments. Also see PARLASCA 1984 for further considerations on the Palmyrene sarcophagi as well as SCHMIDT-COLINET 2009 for the famous sarcophagus depicting the same individual on the lid as well as on the box.

36. In the Palmyra Portrait Project database around 20 examples are registered.

37. See RAJA and SØRENSEN 2015 for a recent publication where hitherto unpublished fragments of sculpture in the round from a Palmyrene tomb, Qasr Abjad, are considered.

38. RAJA 2017b.

with family members.³⁹ The other significant group of representations of priests are found on the later introduced sarcophagi, both on the lids in the family scenes as well as on the boxes.⁴⁰ We also encounter priestly representations in the public and religious sphere.⁴¹ Reliefs from sacred contexts, for example such as from the Sanctuary of Bel and the Sanctuary of Nebo represent Palmyrene priests in ritual action.⁴² Statues, which have been interpreted as honorific statues and depict priests have also been found.⁴³ The so-called banqueting tesserae are most likely the medium which presents us with the largest amount of miniature representations of Palmyrene priests.⁴⁴ These small clay objects found in sanctuaries and a few domestic contexts in Palmyra functioned as entry tickets to religious banquets in Palmyrene sanctuaries.⁴⁵ These tiny objects give us the best insight into the organisation of the religious life in Palmyra.⁴⁶

Priesthood in Palmyra and representations of priests in Palmyrene funerary sculpture

Representations of Palmyrene priests in the funerary sculpture has been the subject of earlier contributions.⁴⁷ However, the corpus compiled within the framework of the Palmyra Portrait Project gives a statistically coherent overview, since it comprises just above 3,000 portraits. The representations on the banqueting tesserae have also been addressed within the framework of the knowledge that the

39. RAJA 2016a.

40. RAJA 2017c.

41. See RAJA 2016a; HEYN 2008; STUCKY 1973 as well as GAWLIKOWSKI 1966 for further references to monuments from the public and religious sphere.

42. STUCKY 1973, p. 164-165 for the reliefs from the Sanctuary of Bel and STUCKY 1973, 167-168 for the relief from the Sanctuary of Nebo.

43. STUCKY 1973, p. 165-166. However, one of the examples given as most likely stemming from the public sphere STUCKY 1973, p. 166 might well have come from a funerary context.

44. See RAJA 2015a and 2015b for recent contributions on the Palmyrene banqueting tesserae. Furthermore see the catalogue of the tesserae published by INGHOLT, SEYRIG and STARCKY 1955. One must also not miss the important publication of a complete set of tesserae published by AL-AS'AD, BRIQUEL-CHATONNET and YON 2005.

45. SEYRIG 1940, p. 51-58. Furthermore see STUCKY 1973, p. 12.

46. See RAJA 2015a and 2015b for discussions and further references.

47. See for example HEYN 2008 also for further references. Furthermore STUCKY 1973 remains a standard work on the priestly representations in Palmyra.

corpus has produced on the priestly representations. It can now with certainty be said that representations of Palmyrene priests make up the largest single group of priestly representations from the Roman period coming from outside of Rome, accounting for approximately 20 percent of all male funerary representations from Palmyra, spread over a timespan of more than 200 years.⁴⁸ Whereas the epigraphic and literary evidence from Palmyra does not provide noticeable insight into what it meant to hold a priesthood and even less so about how such priesthoods were organised, the funerary representations offer new lines of enquiry.⁴⁹ In contrast to other places in the ancient world, we do not know anything about professional associations within the sphere of the religious life in Palmyra, neither do we have evidence which speaks to us about funerary associations.⁵⁰ Research on the Palmyrene banqueting tesserae does suggest religious associations did exist and were central agents in the religious life of the city.⁵¹ However, what is clear is that the firmly family-based social structure of Palmyrene society cannot be disputed.⁵² In the funerary sphere individuals in some cases trace their families up to five generations back in time.⁵³ This would have underlined the importance of the family as well as situated the individual within the broader network of families in Palmyra. Despite the numerous inscriptions which also accompany the representations of priests in Palmyra it remains impossible to extract what sort of position priesthood held in Palmyra in the Roman period, since not one of these representations mentioned the deceased as being a priest.⁵⁴ However, what does seem clear is that, apart from a bit of evidence of a sanctuary and a possible priesthood of the imperial cult, the structure of Palmyrene religious life seems to have remained uninfluenced by Roman traditions.⁵⁵

48. RAJA 2016a for methodological considerations on the priestly representations.

49. See KAIZER 2002, p.213-259 for the until now most comprehensive summary and discussion related to the evidence on the Palmyrene priests. Furthermore see RAJA 2016a, p.128-129, also for further references.

50. KAIZER 2002, p.215-216.

51. RAJA 2015a and 2015b.

52. See for example YON 2002.

53. KROPP and RAJA 2014 also for further references.

54. RAJA 2017d. There is one example of an individual being labelled as a '*pkl*' (priest) SADURSKA and BOUNNI 1994, p.27. However, he is not depicted with the priestly hat, but with the liturgical objects. The word is, however, unusual: as a rule *kmr* means priest. KAIZER 2002, p.236, note 120.

55. KAIZER 2002, p.239; p.148-149 for further references. Also see GNOLI 2016, p.31-41 for a recent contribution and overview of the sources connected to religious dining at Palmyra.

The overview of the evidence for priesthoods in Palmyra, leads us to the conclusion that the visual representations of priests from the funerary sphere constitute the most substantial group of evidence through which we might learn more about priests in Palmyra. In the Palmyra Portrait Project corpus 289 portraits of Palmyrene priests are registered.⁵⁶ These are divided on a total of 250 objects including *loculus* reliefs, banqueting reliefs, sarcophagi, freestanding sculpture and ceiling decoration.⁵⁷ On top of this there is a large group of single heads (99), which still remain to be contextualised within their group of origin. Many of these will have come from sarcophagi lids, since these were easy to cut off the lids and sell on the art market.

Palmyrene funerary sculpture, as mentioned above, came into existence in the first century AD.⁵⁸ A steady increase in the production of these sculptures can be observed until the production ceased when Palmyra was sacked by the Roman troops in 273 AD.⁵⁹ The representations of priests in the funerary sculpture follow this production pattern as well. The priestly representations can be divided into three major chronological groups and show an increase from the late first century AD into the middle of the second century AD. From the middle of the second century AD until 273 AD the increase became less steep, but is still noticeable. There was no exception in the representations of priests from the general pattern in the steadily increasing number of funerary portraits in general. The only exception which can be noted was the group of so-called “former priests”, to which we shall return below.

Priests are almost exclusively depicted alone on the *loculus* reliefs. Only four cases out of 87 show them in constellations with family members.⁶⁰ I have argued elsewhere that the decision to be depicted alone as a priest was due to the high status

56. This number has slightly increased, but does not change the overall statistical work which has been done. The corpus which includes more than 3,000 portraits by now, has since reaching a 1,000 portraits displayed a steady statistics, which has not changed any of the overall detectable patterns in the funerary sculpture.

57. These are divided as follows: 87 priestly portraits displayed on 86 *loculus* reliefs; two priestly portraits displayed on two *loculus* stela reliefs; 10 banquet reliefs displaying a total of 84 priests; 84 portraits of priests displayed on in total 49 sarcophagi (a few complete, but most fragmented to some extent); three freestanding sculptures of priests; one ceiling decoration displaying two priestly representations as well as 10 loose objects in total displaying 12 priestly portraits. The table has been published in RAJA 2016a, p. 131.

58. RAJA 2015c, p. 337.

59. SADURSKA and BOUNNI 1994. INGHOLT 1928 for overview of the chronology of Palmyrene funerary sculpture. Also see COLLEDGE 1976.

60. See RAJA 2016a for the first publication making this observation.

of families in Palmyra within which priesthoods were held.⁶¹ The representations of priests so to say carried an implicit status, the importance of the family did not need to be underlined. The graves, however, would naturally have functioned as large family portrait galleries, although not as static as often assumed.⁶² The situation within the sarcophagi representations was quite the opposite as that found within the loculus reliefs. On sarcophagi, both on the elaborate lids and the decorated boxes, up to five priests could be represented within one family scene.⁶³ This, however, should not come as a surprise, since the sarcophagus presented a more flexible medium where lids could carry numerous full figure representations of individuals and further individuals could be depicted on the boxes. Because of their elaborate representations the sarcophagi must have been quite expensive to produce, and so were reserved for the richest families or branches of families, which also would have included the families within which priesthoods were held. The sarcophagi were so to say extended showcases of Palmyrene family status.⁶⁴

The basic representation of priests, on loculus reliefs as well as on sarcophagi, did not change much over the centuries. Priestly representations stayed, as did male representations in general, fairly conservative in their expressions.⁶⁵ The basic scheme included a depiction of the individual in priestly garments consisting of a cloak fastening on the shoulder, a tunic which could be embroidered underneath the cloak, the priestly hat placed on the shaved head, a clean shaven face and the liturgical objects, the libation pitcher as well as an incense bowl held in the hands.⁶⁶ In contrast to the male representations, including the priests, the female portraiture showed a wide variety of on the one hand stylistic developments over

61. RAJA 2016a also for further references.

62. The situation within the graves are, however, highly complex and the few in-situ situations we rely on, do not give a complete overview. From cession texts displayed on the entrance to underground graves, we for example know that funerary portraits were taken down and new ones put up. Burials could also be cleaned out and new extensions of underground graves put into the place of earlier ones. Parts of graves could also be sold on to other families. For a collection of sources concerning these matters, see RAJA 2017b for further references. Also see the recent contribution by CUSSINI 2016, p.42-52 for a number of examples concerning the extensions and selling of parts of graves.

63. RAJA 2017b and RAJA forthcoming d.

64. Out of a total of 193 sarcophagi, 84 carry representations of priests.

65. RAJA 2016a for a general introduction to the iconography of the priests. Also see STUCKY 1973.

66. HEYN 2008; STUCKY 1973.

time and on the other hand diversity within the genre itself.⁶⁷ Variety within the representation of men, hereunder priests, was found in the way in which different facial traits, clothing details and the attributes were combined as well as the inscription which often accompanied the deceased and could mention the family's genealogy up to five generations back in time. Furthermore variety was displayed through the combination of the different family constellations visible in the various groups of funerary sculpture. Representations of Palmyrene men in the funerary sculpture were clearly not meant to display too much variety, but rather underline their belonging within Palmyrene society. Only subtle details expressed individualism, which in turn was perhaps not even decided upon by the deceased, but rather by the workshop who produced the sculpture and the family.⁶⁸ The priestly representations in general also fall under the category of male representations. They kept to the dominating conventions expressing a strong communal Palmyrene elite identity as well as the identity of the deceased through the combination of features as described above.

However, there was one group of male representations which displayed a digression from the norm. These are the group of representations of men displayed with the priestly hat next to them on a pedestal, having it presented to them by another male person or simply having it held by another male person. They are depicted in the ordinary clothing normally worn by men in the funerary portraiture – Greek and Parthian style clothing – and furthermore they all have hair, some of them displaying elaborate hairdos. A number of them carry beards as well. In the Palmyra Portrait Project database 24 of such representations are registered divided on 23 objects. They are presented here together for the first time in order to be contextualised within the wider group of the priestly representations.

The representations of the so-called “former priests”

This particular representational type, depicting men with the priestly hat displayed next to them, is a particular phenomenon, which deserves methodological attention.

In total there are 24 of these representations displayed on 23 objects. These representations make up approximately 8 percent of the priestly representations in the Palmyrene funerary sculpture in total.⁶⁹ These 24 representations of so-

67. Krag forthcoming for a comprehensive overview of the female representations; Krag and Raja 2016 for a contribution on the representations of women and children depicted together in the *loculus* reliefs.

68. Raja 2017b for discussions about production economy and the funerary sculpture in Palmyra.

69. These have been catalogued at the end of the text including further references.

called "former priests" are divided into a variety of categories within the funerary sculpture. One depiction is found on a loculus relief displaying a stele-motif depicting two men and a priestly hat placed on a pedestal centrally on the relief (cat. no. 1). It dates to the third century AD. 11 loculus reliefs carry depictions of "former priests" (cat. nos. 2-12). Five of these date to the second century AD (cat. nos. 2-6). One dates to the transition between the second and the third centuries AD (cat. no. 7), while another five date to the third century AD (cat. nos. 8-12). On all 11 loculus reliefs the priestly hat is placed on a pedestal. In ten of the cases it is placed above and behind the right shoulder of the male person and in one case it is placed above and behind the left shoulder (cat. no. 4).⁷⁰ All these representations are single loculus reliefs, meaning that none of the men are shown together with other family members. Single loculus reliefs were by far the most common representation used in the funerary sphere. However, when a motif consequently appears only in single constellations, this usually carries an implicit meaning either pertaining to the motif itself or to the typology.⁷¹ In this case the fact that all these men in the 11 loculus reliefs are shown on their own, only with their priestly hats next to them, apparently has to do with the type of the motif, which would not have allowed enough space for the depiction of further family members. The motif does not seem to have something to do with the choices made within the representation of priests on loculus reliefs for example, where the status of the priesthood was enough to allow for depiction alone.

Five banqueting reliefs, a sub-group to the loculus reliefs, which were most probably all of more or less the same size, display men with their priestly hats next to them (cat. nos. 13-17). Four of these hats are displayed on pedestals (cat. no. 13, 14, 15, 17), while one is being presented to the reclining male figure by another male figure (cat. no. 16). Only on three examples (cat. nos. 13, 15, 16) the male figure is fully visible. In all three cases the men have elaborate hairdos and in two cases they wear a beard as well (cat. nos. 13 and 16). In four of the reliefs (cat. nos. 14, 15, 16, 17) the reclining male person is accompanied by a male individual standing at the foot of the kline. However, as noted above only in one case does the standing individual present the hat to the reclining male (cat. no. 16). In the cases where the clothing of the reclining men is visible, it is clear that they are wearing elaborate Parthian style banqueting dress, which was richly decorated. In four cases the banqueting mattress is also visible and displays decoration (cat. nos. 13, 14, 15, 16).

70. Cat. no. 8 does in fact not seem to display a priestly hat on a pedestal but rather a wreath with a central decoration. The male person is furthermore wearing some sort of diadem, also with a central decoration. He also carries what might be a patera, but no libation pitcher. This relief has been included here due to the patera, but might in fact not represent a Palmyrene priest.

71. RAJA 2016a on priests in constellations.

On five sarcophagi priestly hats are put next to male figures. Three of these representations are found on sarcophagi lids next to reclining male figures. In two cases the hat is placed on a pedestal (cat nos. 20 and 21) and in one case it is carried by an individual placed behind the reclining man (cat. no. 18). Two sarcophagi boxes display in total three priestly hats. One is the famous example from the Palmyra Museum, with one priestly hat as well as a wreath (cat. no. 19).⁷² The other one also stems from the Palmyra Museum and displays two male persons engaged in sacrifice with priestly hats on pedestals placed between the men and behind the altar (cat. no. 22). The last example is a fragment of a person, who is holding a priestly hat (cat. no. 23). This fragment stems from a sarcophagus lid and would originally have fitted within the category above together with cat. no. 18.

Nine of the representations of the priestly hats with certainty carry the small busts, which are known from the priestly hats.⁷³ These are centrally placed on the front of the hat. Five of these busts are priestly male busts (cat. nos. 4, 5, 9, 11, 14), while four show the young male bust (cat. nos. 2, 6, 7, 13). On a further three objects it is uncertain whether busts were placed on the priestly hats (cat. nos. 19, 18 and 22). The rest do not carry busts. This pattern seems to follow what is observed in general in the priestly depictions, where a certain amount of the priestly hats carry either a bust depicting a priest or what seems to be a young male person. The meaning of these busts have been discussed, but remains somewhat unclear.⁷⁴

Five objects date to the second half of the second century AD (cat. nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6). One object dates to the late second–early third century AD (cat. no. 7). Seventeen objects date to the third century AD and one of these (cat. no. 22) holds two representations (cat. nos. 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23). There is a clear tendency towards more representations in the third century AD. There are no representations at all which can be dated to the first century AD. Based purely on the dating of these representations, it might be suggested that we have to do with a fashion phenomenon and not as has been suggested with representations of a different category of priests, i. e. lower ranking clergy for example.⁷⁵ It seems highly unlikely that the structure of Palmyrene priesthoods should have undergone a sudden change in the second century AD, which would then not also have been firmly conveyed to us through the visual evidence. The plentiful tesserae evidence does for example not hold one single example which

72. SCHMIDT-COLINET 2007 and 2009.

73. See INGHOLT 1928, as well as STUCKY 1973 and HEYN 2008.

74. See STUCKY 1973 and HEYN 2008 who both do not come with firm conclusions.

75. INGHOLT 1934.

depicts a male representation with a priestly hat next to the person depicted.⁷⁶ Such a conclusion is underlined by further observations.

For example it is striking that the representations are spread across all categories within the funerary sculpture, *loculus* reliefs including single representations, one *stele*-motif as well as banqueting reliefs. The sarcophagi representations also occur. Furthermore the fact that this category of representations with men displayed with their priestly hats next to them only make up 8 percent of all the priestly representations, indicates that this was a representational choice, which had to do with stylistic trends, rather than an indication of a different kind of priesthood.

Out of the 24 representations 18 still carry the portrait or parts of it of the male person depicted next to the priestly hat (cat. nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22). 6 portraits are missing (cat. nos. 1, 14, 17, 18, 21, 23). All the visible male portraits carry elaborate hairdos and in all but one case (cat. no. 15), they also wear beards. One depiction (cat. no. 15), a banqueting relief, shows a reclining male together with a male person standing at the end of the *kline*. The priestly hat is placed on the pedestal behind the reclining man. Interestingly the reclining man, to whom we must assume that the priestly hat belongs, wears a conical hat. This is the only representation of a man with a priestly hat next to him, with another kind of headgear on. None of the other representations have this sort of double headgear.⁷⁷ In general headgear worn by male persons in the funerary sculpture is rare, apart from the priestly representations. There are some cases of wreaths being worn by male persons. However, in general men are not represented with headgear.

In terms of the clothing of the men to whom the priestly hats belong, 14 wear the traditional Greek style dress worn by most men in the funerary sculpture (cat. nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 22 [two representations both with Greek style dress]).⁷⁸ In the case of the banqueting reliefs and on the sarcophagi lids the male representations wear the traditional Parthian style clothes (cat. nos. 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21). In three cases the clothing cannot be made out (cat. nos. 2, 14, 23). In the case of cat. no. 14, however, Parthian style clothing may be assumed, since this is a fragment of a banqueting relief.

76. The observation is based on a survey of INGHOLT, SEYRIG, STARCKY 1955.

77. Except if we count cat. no. 8, which however as mentioned above might not depict a Palmyrene priest.

78. KROPP and RAJA 2014 and KROPP and RAJA 2015 for further references.

Conclusion

These representations, which make up a small, but significant group within the representations of Palmyrene priests, have been a subject of discussion since decades and as pointed out above it has usually been suggested that they depict men who had held a priesthood earlier in their lives or even men who belonged to a lower kind of clergy. However, through the overview given here and the analysis of the various categories and elements it becomes clear that these representations were a purely representational choice, which allowed for male depictions to become more diverse and display a number of identities, which involved the depiction of priesthood as well as that of hair and beard fashions. That this sort of representation came into fashion in the middle of the second century AD went hand in hand with the increasing focus on hair and beard fashion, which is observable in general in the funerary sculpture representing men. Furthermore it was also in this period that increasing adornment was introduced in the female portraiture. Furthermore the elaborate sarcophagi were also introduced in this period. From the middle of the second century AD onward there was in general an increasing focus on decorative elements in the funerary sculpture such as jewellery, decorated textiles, headgears, elaborate coiffeurs and beards as well as an increasing number of attributes. The flourishing economy of Palmyra made its firm imprint on the funerary sculpture and spurred the introduction of further categories of representations and sub-categories of representations.

The representations of the so-called “former priests” have been a theme in the discussion about Palmyrene priesthood since the 1930s. For the first time an overview of these representations has been given here. This collection of representations, which in total only includes 24, but within the extensive amount of portraits collected within the Palmyra Portrait Project must be said to be solidly representative statistically speaking, clearly indicates that this sort of representation was a choice with had to do with fashion phenomena rather than the structure of priesthood in Palmyra. It is within the context of the growing interest in the display of on the one hand several identities (local, regional and imperial) as well as on the other hand a richer combination of portrait features, which included more than the portrait itself, namely also attributes, clothing, hair and beard styles, that this group of representations needs to be seen.

Rubina RAJA
Classical Art and Archaeology, Centre for Urban Network Evolutions
Jens Chr. Schous vej 5
Building 1461-326
Aarhus University
8000 Aarhus C
Denmark
Rubina.Raja@cas.au.dk

Catalogue of items registered in the Palmyra Portrait Project Database displaying priestly hats next to male persons

Fig. 1 – Loculus relief of the stele-motif type depicting two men and a priestly hat placed on the pedestal centrally in the relief. Date: AD 230-250. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, Denmark, I.N. 1024. (Courtesy of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen).

Catalogue number: 1 (Fig.1)

Database number: NCG077

Loculus relief with full figure stele motif depicting two men and a centrally placed priestly hat on a pedestal.

Date : AD 230-250

Measurements (in cm): Min. H: 55; Max. H: 56; W: 47; D: 15; D. (Field): 8.5

Location: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, Denmark

Inventory Number : IN 1024

PS Number : 303

Inscription :

CIS: 4322 *PAT*: 0679

Inscription reads :

Alas! Yarḥai, son of Yarḥai, son of Yarḥai Yedī'bēl Ya'ūt.

References: CHABOT 1922, p.119, no. 5, pl.XXVIII,17; INGHOLT 1928, p.135; COLLEDGE 1976, p.67, 243, pl.35; HVIDBERG-HANSEN and PLOUG 1993, p.156-157, no. 126; PLOUG 1995, p.255-257, no. 126.

Catalogue number: 2

Database number: PM446

Loculus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date : AD 150-200

Measurements (in cm): Max. H: 27; W: 42

Location: Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

Inventory Number : B 8522/2321

PS Number : -

References: COLLEDGE 1976, p.251; GAWLIKOWSKI 1987, p.291, no. 9; CHARLES-GAFFIOT *et al.* 2001, p.271, p.347, no. 163.

Catalogue number: 3

Database number: DGAM033

Loculus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date : AD 150-200

Location: Directorate-General of Antiquities and Museums, Damascus, Syria (04/08/2014)

PS Number : -

References: COLLEDGE 1976, p.252-253; <http://www.dgam.gov.sy/index.php?d=239&id=1206>.

Fig. 2—Loculus relief depicting a man with the priestly hat situated behind his left shoulder on a pedestal. Date: AD 150-200. Last known location: Baron Poche collection, Aleppo, Syria (Ingholt Archive, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen).

Fig. 3—Loculus relief with a male displayed next to a priestly hat. Date: 150-200. Location: State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, Russia, I.N. 171SM (Ingholt Archive, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen).

Catalogue number: 4 (Fig.2)

Database number: BaronPoche002

Loculus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date: AD 150-200

Location: Baron Poche, Private, Aleppo, Syria

PS Number: 230

Inscription:

CIS: 4468 PAT: 0829

Inscription reads:

Ḥaggagu, son of 'Ogê, son of Iedî'b[êl]. Alas!

References: Ingholt Archives; INGHOLT 1928, p. 116; COLLEDGE 1976, p. 250.

Catalogue number: 5

Database number: MLP011

Loculus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date: AD 150-200

Measurements (in cm): Max. H: 52; W: 44; D: 24

Location: Musée du Louvre, Paris, France

Inventory Number : AO 2398

PS Number : 221

Inscription :

CIS : 4381 *PAT* : 0740

Inscription reads :

Yarḥai son of Elabbêl. Alas !

References : CHABOT 1922, p. 123, no. 20 ; INGHOLT 1928, p. 115 ; MACKAY 1949, p. 162, pl. LII,3 ; COLLEDGE 1976, p. 68-69, 250, pl. 79 ; DENTZER-FEYDY and TEIXIDOR 1993, p. 190, no. 191.

Catalogue number : 6 (Fig.3)

Database number : SHM008

Locus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date : AD 150-200

Measurements (in cm) : Max. H: 50.5 ; W: 39.5

Location : State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, Russia

Inventory Number : 171SM

PS Number : 210

Inscription :

PAT : 1767

Inscription reads :

Mezabbenâ, son of Iarhibôlâ, (son of) Refabôl (son of) Bogdan, Annâ his guardian, made this for him. Alas !

References : INGHOLT 1928, p. 113 ; 1938, p. 131-132, pl. XLIX,1 ; COLLEDGE 1976, p. 250.

Catalogue number : 7 (Fig.4)

Database number : NCG010

Locus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date : AD 190-210

Measurements (in cm) : Max. H: 55 ; W: 49 ; D: 22 ; D. (Field): 15

Location : Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, Denmark

Inventory Number : IN 1043

PS Number : 293

Inscription :

CIS : 4611 *PAT* : 0972

Inscription reads :

Alas !

References : SIMONSEN 1889, p. 21-22, pl. 13 ; CHABOT 1922, p. 119, no. 23, pl. XXVII,4 ; INGHOLT 1928, p. 123 ; COLLEDGE 1976, p. 252-253 ; HVIDBERG-HANSEN and PLOUG 1993, p. 114-115, no. 70 ; PLOUG 1995, p. 174-176, no. 70.

Fig. 4 – *Locus* relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal. Date : AD 190-210. Location: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, Denmark, I.N. 1043 (Courtesy of Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen).

Catalogue number: 8

Database number: LSS001

Locus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date: AD 175-225

Measurements (in cm): Max. H: 53

Location: Liebieghaus Skulpturen Sammlung, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Inventory Number: 853

PS Number: 676

Inscription reads (translated by Jean-Baptiste Yon):

... d/rj, ..., son of Našra' .. Alas!

References: COLLEDGE 1976, p.250; BÖHME and SCHOTTRUFF 1979, p.3-7, 37-38, pl.III; PARLASCA 1985, p.347-348, pl.146, 3; 1995, p.66-67, fig.9; RUMSCHEID 2000, p.214-215, cat. 247, pl.68,1.

Catalogue number: 9 (Fig.5)

Database number: PM397

Locus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date: AD 175-225

Measurements (in cm): Max. H: 52; W: 45; D: 15; D. (Field): 1.8

Location: Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

Inventory Number: 1757/6581

PS Number: 675

Context: Hypogeum of Šalamallat, Valley of the Tombs

Inscription:

PAT: 1834

Inscription reads:

Alas! Ma'n son of Wabbî.

References: BOUNNI and SALIBY 1957, p.48, pl.VI,2; BOUNNI 1961-1962, p.160-161, no. 20; GAWLIKOWSKI 1974, p.23-24, no. 43; COLLEDGE 1976, p.250; TANABE 1986, p.324, pl.293; SADURSKA and BOUNNI 1994, p.160-161, cat. 211, fig.113.

Fig. 5 – Locus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat next to him on a pedestal. Date: AD 175-225. Location: Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria, I. N. 1757/6581. (Ingholt Archive, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen).

Catalogue number: 10 (Fig.6)

Database number: BM024

Locus relief depicting a man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date: AD 200-273

Measurements (in cm): Max. H: 49.53; W: 35.56; D: 32

Location: British Museum, London, England

Inventory Number: BM 125346

PS Number: 286

Inscription:

CIS: 4337 PAT: 0695

Fig. 7–Loculus relief of the banqueting motif type with a reclining male and a priestly hat on a pedestal. Date : AD 200-273. Sold by Christie's, New York in 2002. (Photo from auction catalogue).

Fig. 8–Loculus relief of the banqueting motif type showing parts of a reclining man, a standing male figure and a priestly hat on a pedestal. AD 200-273. Location : Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria. (Ingholt Archive, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen).

Inventory Number : 1794/6643

PS Number : -

Context : Hypogeum of the Bôlbarak family, central exedra, Valley of the Tombs

References : COLLEDGE 1976, p.252-253 ; SADURSKA and BOUNNI 1994, p. 146, cat. 194, fig.129.

Catalogue number: 13 (Fig.7)

Database number: Christie's043

Loculus relief with a banquet motif showing a reclining man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date : AD 200-273

Measurements (in cm) : Max. H: 31.8; W: 41.3

Location : Christie's, New York, USA

PS Number : -

References : Christie's 2002, December 12th, New York, lot 303.

Catalogue number: 14 (Fig.8)

Database number: PM276

Loculus relief with a banquet motif showing a standing man, a reclining man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date : AD 200-273

Fig. 9– Loculus relief of the banqueting motif type showing parts of a reclining man, a standing male figure and a priestly hat displayed on a pedestal. Date : AD 200-273. Location: Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, Connecticut, USA, I.N.: 1931.38 (Courtesy of Yale University Art Gallery).

Measurements (in cm): Max. H: 40; W: 29; D: 14

Location: Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

Inventory Number: CD 27

PS Number: 1064

References: MICHALOWSKI 1966, p.49-50, cat. 3, fig.57; TANABE 1986, p.465, pl.439.

Catalogue number: 15 (Fig.9)

Database number: UAG006

Loculus relief with a banquet motif showing a standing man, a reclining man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date: AD 200-273

Measurements (in cm): Min. H: 44; Max. H: 52; W: 56; D: 8; D. (Field): 4

Location: Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

Inventory Number: 1931.38

PS Number: 1059

References: Ingholt Archives; INGHOLT 1954, no. 11; VERMEULE 1964, p.107.

Catalogue number: 16

Database number: PM092

Loculus relief with a banquet motif showing a standing man, a reclining man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date: AD 239-273

Measurements (in cm): Max. H: 42; W: 48; D: 5

Location: Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

Inventory Number: 1793/6642

PS Number: -

Context: Hypogeum of the Bôlbarak family, main exedra, Valley of the Tombs

References: TANABE 1986, p.464, pl.437; SADURSKA and BOUNNI 1994, p.145-146, cat. 193, fig.253.

Fig. 10— Sarcophagus lid with a seated woman, a reclining male and three standing individuals as well as a priestly hat on a pedestal. The box depicts two female busts. Date: AD 230-273. Location: Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria. (Ingholt Archive, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen).

Catalogue number: 17

Database number: DGAM012

Locus relief with a banquet motif showing a standing man, a reclining man and a priestly hat on a pedestal

Date : AD 200-273

Location : Directorate-General of Antiquities and Museums, Damascus, Syria (30/03/2014)

PS Number : -

References : <http://www.dgam.gov.sy/index.php?d=239&id=1199>.

Catalogue number: 18 (Fig.10)

Database number: PM329

Sarcophagus lid with a seated woman, a reclining man and three standing individuals as well as a priestly hat on a pedestal. The box depicts two female busts.

Date : AD 230-273

Location : Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

PS Number : -

Context : Temple grave no. 186, Valley of the Tombs

References : COLLEDGE 1976, p. 252, 264 ; PARLASCA 1984, p. 290-291 ; abb. 7 ; SCHMIDT-COLINET 1992, taf. 73 a ; WIELGOSZ 1997, p. 71, pl. IV.1.

Catalogue number: 19

Database number: PM494

Sarcophagus with a reclining man, a standing individual, a priestly hat on a pedestal and a horse ; box with a priest and six male representations.

Date : AD 200-273

Location : Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

Inventory Number : B 2093/7431

PS Number : -

References : RUMSCHEID 2000, p. 223-224, kat. 272, taf. 66,1.

Catalogue number: 20 (Fig.11)

Database number: PM274

Sarcophagus lid with two seated women, reclining man and two standing individuals as well as a priestly hat on a pedestal. The box displays three female and two male busts.

Date : AD 239

Measurements (in cm) : Max. H: 143 ; W: 199 ; D: 12 ; D. (Field): 2

Location : Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

Inventory Number : 1795/6644, 1796/6645

PS Number : 985

Context : Hypogeum of the Bôlbarak family, Valley of the Tombs

Inscription reads :

This image is of Bôlbarak, son of Moqîmû Bôlbarak, the exedra, and the podium in front of it, in the month of Nîsan, year 550 (239).

Atâ, daughter of Gaddâ, his mother.

Amathdateh, daughter of Bôlbarak, the wife of Bôlbarak.

Šalmat, daughter of Bôrefâ, wife of Bôlbarak.

Moqîmû, his son.

Fig. 11 – Sarcophagus lid with two seated women, a reclining man, a standing man and a priestly hat displayed on a pedestal. The box carries busts of three women and two men. Date : AD 239. Location : Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria. (Ingholt Archive, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen).

Šalmat, his daughter.

Busts on sarcophagus box :

Amatnanai, his daughter.

Bôlbarak, his son.

Atâ, his daughter.

Wahballat, his son.

References : COLLEDGE 1976, p.252, 264; TANABE 1986, p.424-426, pl.393-395; SADURSKA 1988, p.16, fig.1; 1994, p.16, fig.3; 1995, p.587-588, fig.11; SADURSKA and BOUNNI 1994, p.146-148, cat. 195, fig.247.

Catalogue number : 21

Database number : PM487

Sarcophagus lid with a seated woman, a reclining man and a priestly hat on a pedestal and two standing individuals, a priest and a man

Date : AD 200-273

Measurements (in cm) : Max. H : 117 ; W : 176

Location : Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

PS Number : -

Context : Temple grave no. 36, Valley of the Tombs

References : SCHMIDT-COLINET 1987, p.241, abb. 20; 1992, p.148, cat. B 1, taf. 34.

Catalogue number: 22

Database: number: none as of yet

Sarcophagus box with two male persons, who are sacrificing. Two priestly hats are displayed between them on pedestals. Furthermore two women and two men are represented on the box.

Date: AD 200-273

Location: Palmyra Museum, Palmyra, Syria

References: RUMSCHEID 2000, p. 222-223, kat. 271, taf. 65,1; KAIZER 2002, p. 180, pl. VI.

Catalogue number: 23

Database number: SMB011

Fragment of standing individual carrying a priestly hat. The fragment stems from a sarcophagus lid

Date: AD 200-273

Location: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Inventory Number: 2209

PS Number: -

References: WARTKE 1991, p. 87, cat. 18.

Figures: All images (except figs. 7 and 9) copyright: The Palmyra Portrait Project.

Bibliography

- AL-AS'AD Kh., Fr. BRIQUEL-CHATONNET and J.-B. YON 2005, «The sacred banquets at Palmyra and the functions of the tesserae: Reflections on the tokens found in the Arṣu temple», in E. CUSSINI (ed.), *A journey to Palmyra: Collected Essays to Remember Delbert R. Hillers*, Boston, p. 1-10.
- ALBERTSON F.C. 2000, «Three Palmyrene reliefs in the Colket Collection», *Syria* 77, p. 159-168.
- AL-MAQDISSI M. and E. ISHAQ 2016, *La Syrie et le désastre archéologique du Proche-Orient*, Beirut.
- ANDRADE N. 2013, *Syrian Identity in the Greco-Roman World*, Cambridge.
- BOUNNI A. 1961-1962, «Inscriptions palmyréniennes inédites», *AAS* XI-XII, p. 145-162.
- BOUNNI A. and N. SALIBY 1957, «Madfan šalam allât (The Tomb of Shalamallat)», *AAS* VII, p. 25-52 (in Arabic).
- BÖHME-SCHÖNBERGER A. and W. SCHOTTROFF 1979, *Palmyrenische Grabreliefs*, Frankfurt am Main.
- CHABOT J.-B. 1922, *Choix d'inscriptions de Palmyre*, Paris.
- CHARLES-GAFFIOT J. H. LAVAGNE, J.-M. HOFMAN *et al.* 2001, *Moi Zénobie reine de Palmyre*, Milan.
- Christie's 2002, December 12th, New York, lot 303 (Auction catalogue).
- COLLEDGE M. 1976, *The Art of Palmyra*, London.
- CUSSINI E. 2016, «Reconstructing Palmyrene legal language», in KROPP and RAJA 2016, p. 42-52.

- DENTZER-FEYDY J. and J. TEIXIDOR 1993, *Les antiquités de Palmyre au Musée de Louvre*, Paris.
- GAWLIKOWSKI M. 1966, «Les prêtres de Palmyre. Problèmes d'iconographie», *Studia Palmyrenskie* 1, p.74-95.
- GAWLIKOWSKI M. 1974, *Recueil d'inscriptions palmyréniennes provenant de fouilles syriennes et polonaises récentes à Palmyre*, Paris.
- GAWLIKOWSKI M. 1987, «Objektbeschreibungen, nr. 1-76», in Kh. AL-AS'AD and E.M.RUPRECHTSBERGER (eds.), *Palmyra. Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur der Syrischen Oasenstadt*, Linz, p.287-339.
- GNOLI T. 2016, «Banqueting in honour of the gods: Notes on the *marzēaḥ* of Palmyra», in KROPP and RAJA 2016, p.31-41.
- HENNING A. 2013, *Die Turmgräber von Palmyra: Eine lokale Bauform im kaiserzeitlichen Syrien als Ausdruck kultureller Identität*, *Orient-Archäologie* 29, Rahden.
- HEYN M.K. 2008, «Sacerdotal activities and Parthian dress in Roman Palmyra», in C.S.COLBURN and M. K. HEYN (eds.), *Reading a Dynamic Canvas: Adornment in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Newcastle, p.170-193.
- HEYN M.K. 2010, «Gesture and identity in the funerary art of Palmyra», *AJA* 114, p.631-661.
- HEYN M.K. 2012, «Female portraiture in Palmyra», in S.L.JAMES and S.DILLON (eds.), *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*, Chichester, p.439-441.
- HVIDBERG-HANSEN F.O. and G. PLOUG 1993, *Palmyrasamlingen. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*, Copenhagen.
- INGHOLT H. 1928, *Studier over Palmyrensk Skulptur*. Copenhagen.
- INGHOLT H. 1934, «Palmyrene Sculptures in Beirut», *Berytus* 1, p.32-43.
- INGHOLT H. 1954, *Palmyrene and Gandharan Sculpture: An Exhibition Illustrating the Cultural Interrelations between the Parthian Empire and Its Neighbors West and East*, *Palmyra and Gandhara*, New Haven.
- INGHOLT H., H.SEYRIG and J. STARCKY 1955, *Recueil des tessères de Palmyre*, Paris.
- KAIZER T. 2002, *The Religious life of Palmyra: A Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period*, *Oriens et Occidens* 4, Stuttgart.
- KRAG S. 2016, «Females in group portraits in Palmyra», in KROPP and RAJA 2016, p.180-193.
- KRAG S. Forthcoming, *Representations of Palmyrene Women in Funerary Sculpture from the First Century BC to the Third Century AD*, *Studies in Classical Archaeology*, Turnhout.
- KRAG S. and R.RAJA Forthcoming, «Representations of women and children in Palmyrene funerary loculus reliefs, loculus stelae and wall paintings», *Zeitschrift für Orientarchäologie* 9, p.134-178.
- KROPP A.J.M. and R. RAJA 2014, «The Palmyra Portrait Project», *Syria* 91, p.393-405.
- KROPP A.J.M. and R. RAJA 2015, «The Palmyra Portrait Project», in J.M.ÁLVAREZ, T.NOGALES and I. RODÀ (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVIIIth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, vol. II.: Centre and Periphery*, p.1223-1226.

- KROPP A.J.M. and R. RAJA (eds.) 2016, *The World of Palmyra*, Palmyrene Studies 1, Scientia Danica H, 4, 6., Copenhagen.
- MACKAY D. 1949, «The jewellery of Palmyra and its significance», *Iraq* 11, p. 160-182.
- MEYER J.C., E.H.SELAND and N. ANFINEST (eds.) 2016, *Palmyrena: City, Hinterland and Caravan Trade between Orient and Occident*, Oxford.
- MICHALOWSKI K. 1966, *Palmyre. Fouilles polonaises 1963 et 1964*, Warsaw.
- MILLAR F. 1993, *The Roman Near East, 31 BC – AD 337*, Cambridge Mass.
- PARLASCA KI. 1976, «Probleme Palmyrenischer Grabreliefs: Chronologie und Interpretation», *Palmyre: Bilan et Perspectives. Colloque de Strasbourg 18–20 Octobre 1973 à la mémoire de Daniel Schlumberger et de Henri Seyrig*, Strasbourg, p.33-44.
- PARLASCA KI. 1982, *Syrische Grabreliefs hellenistischer und römischer Zeit: Fundgruppe und Probleme*, Trierer Winckelmannsprogramme 3, Mainz: von Zabern.
- PARLASCA KI. 1984, «Probleme der palmyrenischen Sarkophage», in B.ANDREAE (ed.), *Symposium über die antiken Sarkophage: Pisa 5.-12. September 1982*, Marburg, p.283-297.
- PARLASCA KI. 1985, «Roman Art in Syria», *Ebla to Damascus; Art and Archaeology of Ancient Syria*, Washington D.C., p.386-388.
- PLOUG G. 1995, *Catalogue of the Palmyrene Sculptures Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*. Copenhagen.
- RAJA R. 2015a, «Cultic dining and religious patterns in Palmyra: The case of the Palmyrene banqueting tesserae», in S. FAUST, M. SEIFERT and L. ZIEMER (eds.), *Antike. Architektur. Geschichte: Festschrift für Inge Nielsen zum 65. Geburtstag*, Gateways 3. Hamburger Beiträge zur Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des antiken Mittelmeerraumes, Aachen, p. 181-200.
- RAJA R. 2015b, «Staging “private” religion in Roman “public” Palmyra: The role of the religious dining tickets (banqueting tesserae)», in C. ANDO and J. RÜPKE (eds.), *Public and Private in Ancient Mediterranean Law and Religion. Historical and Comparative Studies*, Berlin, p. 165-186.
- RAJA R. 2015c, «Palmyrene funerary portraits in context: Portrait habit between local traditions and imperial trends», in J. FEJFER, M. MOLTESEN and A. RATHJE (eds.), *Traditions: Transmission of Culture in the Ancient World*, Acta Hyperborea 14, Copenhagen, p.329-361.
- RAJA R. 2016a, «Representations of priests in Palmyra: Methodological considerations on the meaning of the representation of priesthood in Roman period Palmyra», *Religion in the Roman Empire* 2/1, p. 125–146.
- RAJA R. 2016b, «In and out of contexts. Explaining religious complexity through the banqueting tesserae from Palmyra», *Religion in the Roman Empire* 2/3, p. 340-371.
- RAJA R. 2017a, «Networking beyond death: Priests and their family networks in Palmyra explored through the funerary sculpture», in E.H.SELAND (ed.), *Proceedings of the conference Sinews of Empire: Networks and Regional Interaction in the Roman Near East and beyond*, Oxbow, p. 121-136.
- RAJA R. 2017b, «Powerful Images of the Deceased. Palmyrene Funerary Portrait Culture between Local, Greek and Roman Representations», in D.BOSCHUNG and Fr.QUEYREL

- (eds.), *Bilder der Macht. Das griechische Porträt und seine Verwendung in der antiken Welt*, München, p. 319-348.
- RAJA R. 2017c, «You can leave your hat on. Priestly representations from Palmyra – between visual genre, religious importance and social status», in R. GORDON, G. PETRIDOU, and J. RÜPKE (eds.), *Beyond Priesthood: Religious Entrepreneurs and Innovators in the Imperial Era*, Berlin, p. 417-442.
- RAJA R. 2017d, «To be or not to be depicted as a priest in Palmyra. A matter of representational spheres and societal values», in T. LONG and A.H. SØRENSEN (eds.), *Positions and Professions. Palmyrenske Studier 2*, Copenhagen, p. 115-130.
- RAJA R. Forthcoming, «Family matters! Family constellations in Palmyrene funerary sculpture», in J. FEJFER, M. MOLTESEN and A. RATHJE (eds.), *Acta Hyperborea 15*, Copenhagen.
- RAJA R. and A.H. SØRENSEN 2015, «The “Beauty of Palmyra” and Qasr Abjad (Palmyra): New discoveries in the archive of Harald Ingholt», *JRA* 28, p. 439-450.
- RUMSCHEID J. 2000, *Kranz und Krone. Zu Insignien, Siegespreisen und Ehrenzeichen der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Istanbuler Forschungen 4, Tübingen.
- SADURSKA A. 1988, «Le portrait officiel romain et la diffusion du portrait funéraire dans les provinces orientales», in N. BONACASA and G. RIZZA (eds.), *Ritratto Ufficiale e Ritratto Privato. Atti della VII Conferenza Internazionale sul Ritratto Romano, Roma 26-30, settembre 1984*, Rome, p. 75-86.
- SADURSKA A. 1994, «L’art et la société: recherches iconologiques sur l’art funéraire de Palmyre», *Archaeologia* 45, p. 11-23.
- SADURSKA A. and A. BOUNNI 1994, *Les sculptures funéraires de Palmyre*, Rome.
- SARTRE M. 2001, *D’Alexandre à Zénobie. Histoire du Levant antique. IV^e siècle av. J.-C. – III^e siècle ap. J.-C.*, Paris.
- SARTRE M. 2016, «Zénobie dans l’imaginaire occidental», in KROPP and RAJA 2016, p. 207-221.
- SARTRE M. and A. SARTRE-FAURIAT 2008, *Palmyre. La cité des caravanes*, Paris.
- SARTRE M. and A. SARTRE-FAURIAT 2014, *Zénobie de Palmyre à Rome*, Paris.
- SARTRE M. and A. SARTRE-FAURIAT 2016, *Palmyre. Vérités et légendes*, Paris.
- SCHMIDT-COLINET A. 1987, «Das Tempelgrab einer Aristoratenfamilie», in Kh. AL-AS’AD and E. M. RUPRECHTSBERGER (eds.), *Palmyra. Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur der Syrischen Oasenstadt*, Linz, p. 228-243.
- SCHMIDT-COLINET A. 1992, *Das Tempelgrab Nr. 36 in Palmyra: Studien zur palmyrenischen Grabarchitektur und ihrer Ausstattung*, Mainz.
- SCHMIDT-COLINET A. 2007, «Zwei Neufunde Palmyrenischer Sarkophage», in G. KOCH (ed.), *Symposium des Sarkophag-Corpus* (Marburg 2001), Mainz, p. 271-278.
- SCHMIDT-COLINET A. 2009, «Nochmal zur Ikonographie zweier palmyrenischer Sarkophage», in M. BLÖMER, M. FACELLA, and E. WINTER (eds.), *Lokale Identität im Römischen Nahen Osten – Kontexte und Perspektiven, Erträge der Tagung, Oriens et Occidens 18*, Stuttgart, p. 223-234.
- SCHMIDT-COLINET A. and W. AL-AS’AD 2013, *Palmyras Reichtum durch weltweiten Handel. Archäologische Untersuchungen im Bereich der hellenistischen Stadt I*, Wien.

- SELAND E.H. 2015, «Palmyrene long-distance trade: Land, rover, and maritime routes in the first three centuries CE», in M.N. WALTER and J.P. ITO-ADLER (eds.), *The Silk Road: Interwoven History*, Cambridge, p.101-131.
- SEYRIG H. 1940, «Les tessères palmyréniennes et le banquet rituel», in L.H. VINCENT (ed.), *Mémorial Lagrange*, Paris, p.51-58.
- SIMONSEN D. 1889, *Skulpturer og indskrifter fra Palmyra i Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek*, Copenhagen.
- SMITH A.M. 2013, *Roman Palmyra. Identity, Community, and State Formation*, New York.
- STUCKY R.A. 1973, «Prêtres syriens. 1. Palmyre», *Syria* 50, 1-2, p.163-180.
- TANABE K. 1986, *Sculptures of Palmyra I, Memoirs of the Ancient Orient Museum*, Tokyo.
- VERMEULE C.C. 1964, «Greek and Roman Portraits in North American Collections Open to the Public. A Survey of Important Monumental Likenesses in Marble and Bronze Which Have Not Been Published», *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 108/1, p.99-134.
- VEYNE P. 2015, *Palmyre, l'irremplaçable trésor*, Paris.
- WARTKE R.-B. 1991, «Palmyrenische Plastik im Vorderasiatischen Museum», *Forschungen und Berichte* 31, p.67-100.
- WIELGOSZ D. 1997, «Funeralia Palmyrena», *Studia Palmyreńskie* X, p.69-75.
- WOOD R. 1753, *Les Ruines de Palmyre, autrement dite Tedmar au desert*, London.
- YON J.-B. 2002, *Les Notables de Palmyre*, Beirut.
- ZANKER P. 1992, «Bürgerliche Selbstdarstellung am Grab in römischen Kaiserreich», in H.-J. SCHALLES, H. VON HESBERG and P. ZANKER (eds.), *Die römische Stadt im 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr. Der Funktionswandel des öffentlichen Raumes*, Köln, p.339-359.