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Chapter One – Introduction

Fig. 1. Saint Michael monogram with footprint carving (courtesy of B. Reeves)

This paper presents a catalogue of symbols that are (or could be regarded as) Christian from the archaeological site of Humayma – a town in southern Jordan that transitioned from a Nabataean caravan stop and Roman military fort into a Christian settlement during the Byzantine period. I first developed the concept for this project while studying a collection of abstract symbols, which were documented by the Humayma Excavation Project’s petroglyph survey in 2014.\(^1\) As I was looking for possible connections between the petroglyphs from Humayma and those from other Near Eastern sites, I discovered that one of the symbols could be interpreted as a monogram for Saint Michael the Archangel (Fig. 1). The symbol was carved onto Panel 2 of the Eastern Cascading Plateau on the Jebel Qalkha, a location with three main phases of use.\(^2\) The colour of the petroglyph's patina indicates that it belongs to the panel's second phase, which is hypothesised to range from the 1st century BC

---


\(^2\) ibid
up until the 8th century AD. Interestingly, the Christian period at Humayma falls within the scope of that timeline, dating roughly between the 5th and 7th centuries AD; thus, a Christian interpretation for this particular symbol is viable. Christianity at Humayma has been thoroughly studied by archaeologists in the field, who have excavated several of the town’s churches and published extensively on the topic. However, the possibility of Christian activity in the area of the Jebel Qalkha has never before been documented. It is for this reason that I chose to pursue this topic; in an effort to highlight the role of symbolism in the practice of Christianity at Humayma, and to create a concise and comprehensive guide to both obvious and possible Christian symbols for future researchers in this field.

To begin, I provide a short introduction to the history of Humayma, and the record of archaeological investigations that took place there, with a particular focus on the Christian structures. I also briefly discuss the appearance of Christianity in Jordan between the 3rd and 5th centuries AD, the origins of Christian symbolism within the Roman Empire, and the issue of interpretation within a multi-cultural setting. The catalogue includes symbol types with documented Christian value from the Byzantine period, including crosses, stars, and monograms, which are presented on a variety of media throughout the site, including marble panels, jewellery, amulets, tomb stones, and coins. The catalogue focuses exclusively on abstract symbols and does not include other forms of religious imagery, such as footprints, zoomorphic and anthropomorphic figures, as these are addressed in other projects.

3 ibid
4 M. Barbara Reeves, “Stepping into History: A Contextual Analysis of the Footprint Images in Humayma’s Hills and Roman Fort,” ASOR Annual Meetings (Denver, CO) 2018; see also M. Barbara
To conclude, I summarise and analyse the findings, identify any visible trends within the use of the symbols, and discuss further research possibilities in this field.

Humayma is ideal for this study because of the excellent archaeological reports that have been and continue to be published post-exavation. As well, some Christian symbols have been identified in areas with secure and established archaeological contexts – specifically, the “Lower” Church (C101) and the Eastern Cascading Plateau, which are explained more fully in later sections. These examples significantly benefit this project as they provide a point of reference, which could confirm theories regarding lesser-known areas within Humayma and Jordan more broadly. This study is particularly valuable at Humayma due to the lack of surviving written documents from this period. While symbols cannot take the place of any such source, they can help to contextualize the presence of Christianity within the larger framework of Humayma, contribute to the timeline of the site, and deepen our understanding of the Christian experience at Humayma as a whole – something that extended beyond official worship within the church centres, into other areas of the town, and the natural landscape surrounding it.

In order to create this catalogue, I utilised the Humayma Excavation Project publications (HEP 1, 2, and 3), as well as the preliminary reports (published between 1995 and 2019), as my primary sources for data, images and some descriptions. For unpublished material, I relied on information and photographs provided by archaeologists M. Barbara Reeves, John P. Oleson, Robert Schick, Craig Harvey and Rebecca Foote. My contribution to this field is predominantly based in

the assessment of style, symbolism and meaning for those symbols identified as Christian.

Part One – History and Archaeological Investigations

The ancient site of Humayma is located 45 kilometres south of the Nabataean capital, Petra, in an arid desert region known as the Hisma. The original town was established in the 1st century BC by the Nabataean king Aretas III or IV, though archaeological evidence suggests that the area had been utilised sporadically since the Palaeolithic period. According to a foundation myth presented by Stephanus of Byzantium in his 6th century work, Ethnika, the site was chosen by Aretas after he received an oracle instructing him “to seek out a place [h]auara.” It was in the area of Humayma that Aretas encountered a spirit in a white cloak riding a white camel, as a mountain peak rose in the background; he interpreted this vision to be the answer to his prophecy. Strategically located along the King’s Highway, Humayma acted as an outpost from which the Nabataean monarchy could observe and monitor the nearby trade route, while simultaneously providing a comfortable rest stop for caravans and travellers moving through the region. The permanent settlement grew over time, as the development of a complex irrigation system allowed for unprecedented agricultural growth, animal rearing and water collection. Evidence of Nabataean houses, public buildings, as well as many rock cut tombs are visible

---

5 John P. Oleson, *HEP* 1, 21
6 ibid, 50
7 M. Barbara Reeves, “Humayma’s Notched Peak: A Focus of Nabataean and Roman Veneration and Civic Identity,” *Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy* 27, no. 2 (2016): 134-155; see also Oleson, *HEP* 1, 51
9 Oleson, *HEP* 1, 3, 57
10 ibid, 57
within the early archaeological layers of the town, further demonstrating the site’s steady expansion over the first century of its existence.\textsuperscript{11}

In 106 AD, the Nabataean kingdom was absorbed into the Roman Empire and converted into the province of Arabia. Unfortunately, little remains of the original town’s structures, as many of the materials were harvested by Roman soldiers and reworked into a large military fort. The decision to place a garrison within the Nabataean town was likely guided by the new government’s need to control travel along the recently constructed \textit{Via Nova Traiana}, and the presence of a fully functional water supply system, which could support the increased number of troops and civilians.\textsuperscript{12} Once settled, the Romans extended their reach within the town by adding a \textit{vicus} with a bathhouse, as well as a shrine dedicated to Roman and local deities.\textsuperscript{13} It would appear that the presence of Roman soldiers did not largely interfere with the cultural practices of the Nabataean inhabitants of the town, as their language and religion are well represented in the archaeological record.\textsuperscript{14} Through an inscription, scholars have learned that the fort was occupied by a unit of the \textit{Legio III Cyrenaica} during the 2\textsuperscript{nd} or 3\textsuperscript{rd} century AD; however, this would change in the fourth century, as a locally recruited auxiliary force was brought in.\textsuperscript{15} The Roman occupation of the fort at Humayma ended in the late fourth to early fifth century AD.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{11} ibid, 57
\textsuperscript{12} ibid, 59
\textsuperscript{13} M. Barbara Reeves, “A Nabataean and Roman Shrine with Civic and Military Gods at Humayma, Jordan,” \textit{Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy} 30 (2019): 134-155
\textsuperscript{14} Oleson, \textit{HEP} 1, 59
\textsuperscript{15} ibid
\textsuperscript{16} ibid
\end{flushleft}
The site was later built over by a Byzantine settlement with up to 30 houses, many of which repurposed the materials of the Roman fort.\textsuperscript{17} Evidence of “Christianization” is found throughout the new town, most visible in the form of at least five churches.\textsuperscript{18} As Robert Schick points out in his study of Christianity at Humayma, the number of churches is remarkably high, considering that the number of inhabitants during this time period was only roughly 500 people. It is possible that there was a need to accommodate a large quantity of travellers passing through the site, or that each church served a different tribe or cult; however, more research is needed in this area.\textsuperscript{19} In the 700’s, The Abbasid family took ownership of the town’s land, constructing a mansion, apartments, mosques and garden complex on the remains of the site’s earlier settlements.\textsuperscript{20} This phase is of particular importance to Islamic historians, as the mosque was said to have been the meeting point of a group of conspirators, who would lead a revolt against the current regime and put the Abbasid family on the throne.\textsuperscript{21} Due to increasingly limited trade connections with external cultures after that point, as well as environmental changes, Humayma entered a period of decline.\textsuperscript{22} While the town was largely abandoned in the following years, it appears to have experienced several cultural transitions, as archaeologists uncovered Fatimid, Ayyubid, Mamluk and Ottoman material culture.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{17} ibid
\textsuperscript{18} ibid
\textsuperscript{20} Oleson, \textit{HEP I}, 61
\textsuperscript{21} ibid, 61-62
\textsuperscript{22} ibid, 62
\textsuperscript{23} ibid
Humayma began to attract the attention of scholars during the 20th century, as studies of the *Via Nova Traiana*, Petra, and the Hisma brought archaeologists into the region. Prior to excavation, a number of structures were visible above ground, including the bathhouse, the fort, and two Byzantine churches (B126 and C101), which were recognizable even before excavation. Some clearance of the “Lower” Church (C101) took place under the watch of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan in 1962, though no records of their findings remain. In the early 1980’s, D. Graf and J. Eadie began an official archaeological survey of Humayma with the assistance of J. Oleson, and between 1986-1989, Oleson conducted the Humayma Hydraulic Survey, which focused on documenting Humayma’s ancient water supply system, including its cisterns, aqueducts and run-off fields. The Humayma Excavation Project (HEP) began in the 1990’s, leading to the excavation of Byzantine churches in fields C101, B100, F102 and C119 by J. Oleson, R. Schick and K. ‘Amr. The project was later expanded to include the Abbasid homestead, and the Roman fort and *vicus*, under the supervision of archaeologists R. Foote, J. Oleson, and B. Reeves. In recent years, a fifth church – named B126 – was identified and partially excavated by Schick.

---

24 Schick, “Christianity at Humayma, Jordan, 322; see also Oleson, *HEP 1*, 15-18
25 Schick, *HEP 2*, 221
26 Oleson, *HEP 1*, 19
27 Schick, “Christianity at Humayma, Jordan,” 322-323
28 Schick, *HEP 2*, 309
Part Two – The Development of Christianity

Christianity in Jordan

The transition from paganism to Christianity in Jordan was a slow and complex process; as Christianity first developed, paganism was still largely practiced throughout Jordan, and the two religions co-existed for centuries.29 Some scholars speculate that early Christian worshippers maintained some of the traditional practices of the Nabataeans, such as outdoor worship in “high places,”

---

and the use of Nabataean language in ritual.\textsuperscript{30} The discovery of a possible church in Aqaba built during the mid-3\textsuperscript{rd} century provides one of the first archaeological clues for the growing presence of Christianity in Jordan.\textsuperscript{31} A small number of 4\textsuperscript{th} century Christian sites have also been identified, including a monument dedicated to Moses at Mount Nebo in Northern Jordan;\textsuperscript{32} however, the turn of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century saw an explosion of Christian architecture, demonstrating that Christianity was on its way to becoming the “dominant” religion in Arabian society.\textsuperscript{33} This shift is particularly visible through the introduction of Christian symbols, which popularly appear in areas with known religious significance, such as in churches, sanctuaries and tombs. Interestingly, a number of these newly developed Christian sites were formed directly on top of, or within, already existing Nabataean spaces, such as the Christian monastery Jebel Haroun, which had been previously used as a centre for Nabataean cult activity;\textsuperscript{34} and the Urn Tomb of Petra, a Nabataean burial site that was later adapted into a Christian church.\textsuperscript{35} Looking specifically at Humayma, two churches were built above Nabataean graves, while a third is thought to sit on top of a Nabataean necropolis and/or temple.\textsuperscript{36} The re-purposing of these spaces could be interpreted as an act of aggression towards paganism; however, an alternative view


\textsuperscript{33} Politis, “Nabataean Cultural Continuity Into the Byzantine Period,” 190

\textsuperscript{34} Antti Laheima and Zbigniew T. Fiema, “From Goddess to Prophet: 2000 Years of Continuity on the Mountain of Aaron near Petra, Jordan,” Temenos 44, no. 2 (2008): 191-222

\textsuperscript{35} Perez, “Bar Sauma Versus Dushara,” 45-46

\textsuperscript{36} Oleson, HEP 2, 151-153, 214
would be that Humayma and its sacred spaces were evolving alongside the inhabitants, to better serve the newly Christianized population.

The Evolution of Christian Symbols

Early Christians relied almost exclusively on “written letter- and word-signs” to represent their cult figures, rather than depicting the physical appearances of Christ or God, which might have been viewed as idolatry. This concept can be seen in Christian manuscripts of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, where Sacra Nomina were written in contractions, and punctuated by a line across the top of the remaining letters. It is possible that early Christians were inspired by the approach taken in the Hebrew Bible, which identified God only by an abbreviation, as his name was too sacred to be known or spoken by man. The Christian Catacombs of Rome provide a glimpse into the earliest uses of these symbols within the Roman Empire, dating to approximately 200 AD. Here, numerous images of fish decorate the walls, likely referring to the first initials of the epithet “Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour,” which combined make the Greek word for fish (“Ichthys”). A carving of an anchor might be interpreted as an abstract Tau-Rho, which scholars have identified as an abbreviation for the term “Stauros,” meaning cross. Another important example would be the Chi-Rho, a monogram that was popularised as a Christian symbol during the reign of Constantine, who regularly employed this symbol as part of his

---

38 Ildar Garipzanov, *Graphics Signs of Authority in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, 300-900* (Oxford Scholarship Online, 2018), 27-28
39 ibid; see also Finaldi et al., *The Image of Christ*, 9-10
40 ibid
41 ibid
42 Garipzanov, *Graphics Signs of Authority in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, 300-900*, 29-30
imperial imagery after 320 AD. At this time, the cross was viewed negatively due to its role in the persecution of criminals and Christians throughout the Roman Empire; thus it was not until the “true” cross was re-discovered by Constantine’s mother, Helena, in the 4th century AD that cruciform images were directly represented, outside of monogrammatic interpretations. The cross eventually became the most iconic symbol of Christianity, taking on numerous forms and appearances based on the region and the time period in which it was used.

It is important to note that many, if not all, of these symbols have alternate meanings, which predate their Christianization. A primary example would be the Chi-Rho, which, prior to its adoption into Christian iconography, was associated with the sun god, Sol; it was also found on Roman cavalry standards; and used in art and writing to designate the term “auspicious” ("Khrestos"). When studying symbolism as a human phenomena rather than an isolated occurrence within a specific culture, it becomes apparent that commonalities exist in the styles and shapes of figures utilised by diverse groups. For this reason, context plays a key role in the interpretation of a symbol, as the meaning may shift when viewed through different cultural lenses. Throughout the catalogue, I look at the typology of each symbol, as well as its location, appearance, material, and the context in which it was found, in order to determine its most likely interpretation.

---

44 Finaldi et al., The Image of Christ, 10; see also Miroslav Verner, Some Nubian Petroglyphs on Czechoslovak Concessions (Praha: Universita Karlova, 1973), 58
45 Betlyon, “Following the Roman Paymaster,” 230-231; see also Finaldi et al., The Image of Christ, 10
Chapter Two – Catalogue of Christian Symbols from Humayma

This catalogue is divided into two parts – the churches and beyond the churches. Within these parts, the catalogue is further divided into archaeological fields. Each field features a brief introduction to the structure or space being discussed, followed by the catalogue entries. A glossary of the symbol types mentioned in this catalogue can be found in Appendix A.

Part One – The Churches

The “Lower” Church (C101)

Fig. 3. Aerial view of C101 photographed by W. Myers (reprinted from HEP 2, courtesy of J. Oleson)

The “Lower” Church’s placement in a slightly depressed area of the site earned it the title of “lower” in 1991, in an effort to distinguish it from the only other known church at that time (C119), which sat on a higher slope nearby. The structure is a triple-apse basilica, which features a wide central Nave that terminates in a large semi-circular apse in the east end of the building. The Nave is

---

46 Schick, HEP 2, 221
47 ibid
flanked by two parallel aisles, which also terminate in semi-circular apses in the east. A raised Chancel sits in front of the niche of the central apse. To the north of this area, the building contains a room which has been identified as a Sacristy (Room 2), as well as a large entrance hall (Room 4); while the south holds another small collection of rooms. The lower portions of the walls and some central pillars remain intact, with up to two metres of stone preserved in some areas. Benches made of rubble and mudbrick still line the north, south and western walls, while a staircase in the southwest corner seems to lead to an upper storey, which is no longer standing. Flagstones and pavers are still visible, though many have been lifted and removed from their original context by looters in search of goods. In the Nave, at least six burials were found below the pavement, containing the bodies of the deceased as well as some grave goods, which allowed scholars to date them to the Christian period. While this was a relatively common regional practice, the “Lower” Church is the only structure in Humayma that contains Christian burials, indicating that both the deceased and the church itself were unique or “privileged.” When compared to other known church structures in Jordan, the “Lower” Church appears to have numerous similarities to those constructed in the Byzantine period, including the 6th century Petra Church. A carbon sample recovered from the collapsed wooden roof of the structure dates the cutting of the

48 ibid
49 ibid
50 ibid, 225-227
51 ibid
52 ibid, 222
53 ibid, 241-252
54 ibid
wood used in the roof’s construction to between AD 465-595. As well, Schick has determined that the structure was no longer in use (due to abandonment or structural collapse) by the mid-7th century. Thus, the Christian symbols excavated here, having been found within this secure archaeological context, must date between the mid-5th and mid-7th centuries.

In this structure, nearly 30 Christian symbols have been identified, including but not limited to Byzantine crosses, eight-point crosses, Potent crosses, and Pattée Crosses. They were predominantly located within the Nave, Room 2, and Room 4, on a variety of materials, including marble panels, stone blocks, bronze pendants, and bone amulets. Some were associated with the church’s burials, while others appear to be ornamental. The extensive use of imported marble for decorative features within the church suggests that the Christian patrons of the “Lower” Church likely enjoyed an affluent lifestyle; however, this did not extend to the use of mosaic flooring, the lack of which distinguishes the churches of Humayma from other Christian towns in Jordan. These extant findings represent a small portion of the symbols that originally decorated the church, as many of its marble pieces (and presumably other objects) were removed from the structure after its abandonment.

---

56 Schick, “Christianity at Humayma, Jordan, “ 327; see also Schick, HEP 2, 239
57 ibid
58 ibid, 334-335, 340
59 ibid
**C101, Panel 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lower&quot; Church (C101). In the Nave and to the west of the raised Chancel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light blue/grey marble. Found in 13 fragments, partially joining but with many gaps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length: 0.73 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width: 0.55 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness: 0.031 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by R. Schick (HEP 2, chap. 13: 451-453), Fig. 13.1 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**
This panel appears to have had a rectangular border displaying imagery within. The bottom section features a symmetrical floral motif, while another symbol sits in the top left corner, which Schick describes as “a star with eight rays each ending in a small bulb.”

There are several possible interpretations for the “eight-point star” on this panel; it could represent two overlapping crosses, or a cross overlapping with Christ’s first initial (“X”). From these perspectives, a more accurate label for the symbol might be “eight-point cross.” Similar examples can be found within the Books of Jeu, an Egyptian Gnostic text written in the late 3rd or early 4th century AD. Here, the symbol is identified as a protective seal that was drawn onto the forehead or hand of worshippers during baptism rituals. At the centre of the panel, a three-ridge oval encircles what I suggest is a Byzantine cross with flared arms. A small "ovolo" or egg sits at the highest point, another common Christian image, which is thought to symbolise the resurrection of Christ.

---

60 Schick, HEP 2, 451
62 Garipzanov, *Graphics Signs of Authority in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, 300-900*, 35-39
63 ibid
**C101, Panel 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Image and discussion published by R. Schick (<em>HEP</em> 2, chap. 13: 451-453), Fig. 13.2 No. 3 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>“Lower” Church (C101). In the central Nave area and Room 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material and Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Marble. Found in 6 conjoining fragments, many parts missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Length:</strong> 0.51 m  <strong>Width:</strong> 0.33 m  <strong>Thickness:</strong> 0.032-0.035 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Analysis**

Although this panel was badly damaged, the remaining sections feature a rectangular border and a floral motif along the lower section within the border. The extant decoration of this panel is nearly identical to that of Panel 1; thus, it would be fair to assume that other aspects of the panel were similar as well, including the Byzantine cross, the eight-point cross, and the overall dimensions. Schick describes the shape at the centre as a “three-ridge circle”; however, based on its elongated appearance and similarity to Panel 1, it might instead be labelled an oval. It is very likely that Panels 1 and 2 were part of a “matching set,” which decorated the church in a symmetrical fashion, possibly on opposite sides of the Ambo, a stand from which sacred texts could be read.  

---

65 Schick, *HEP* 2, 453  
66 ibid, 451, 453
**C101, Panel 3:**

![Image of the panel]

**Location**

“Lower” Church (C101).
In the area west of the raised Chancel.

**Material and Preservation**

Light blue/grey marble.
Found in 2 large conjoining fragments, many pieces missing.

**Registration Number(s)**

1991.0253.01, 1991.0279.03.

**Dimensions**

Length: 0.41 m
Width: 0.20 m
Thickness: 0.025 m

**Description and Analysis**

The decoration of this panel includes a rectangular border along the outer edges, as well as a three-ridge oval at the centre, which contains a small “ovolo” at its highest point. While these features are similar to Panel 1, it is distinguished by the lack of eight-point crosses in the top corners. Instead, the upper section is decorated by a symmetrical floral motif. Schick states that the decoration within the oval “has broken away completely, though it would have likely contained a cross.”

I would argue that as the points of connection between the edge of the oval and the arms of the cross remain partially visible, and judging by the amount of space between each point of connection, it is likely that the arms of the cross were flared, like the Byzantine cross that was seen in Panel 1. It is also possible that it was decorated in a similar fashion to Panel 5, which features a Byzantine cross overlapping a *fleur-de-lis* cross. The back of this panel has the letter “A” inscribed into it, which was covered in red paint. This could represent a masons’ mark, or the signature of the artist.

---

67 Schick, *HEP 2, 454*
68 ibid
69 ibid
### C101, Panel 4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "Lower" Church (C101). In the area around the raised Chancel, and in Room 4. | **Length:** N/A  
**Width:** N/A  
**Thickness:** 0.03-0.04 m |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by R. Schick (*HEP 2*, chap. 13: 454-456), Fig. 13.3 No. 1-2 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

The decoration of this marble panel seems similar to those discussed previously, with a rectangular border, floral motif and a three-ridge oval at the centre. The backs of the fragments show two fastening holes.\(^{70}\) Based on the remaining fragments, Schick notes that the panel would have been significantly thicker than the earlier examples.\(^{71}\) For this reason, it was likely used in a separate manner within the church, possibly as a Chancel screen.\(^{72}\) Associated with this Panel is a small "open-work" cross,\(^{73}\) which I have determined to be an equilateral cross *Pattée*. Rather than being the central cross of the panel, this piece was likely incorporated into a lattice pattern that decorated the Chancel screen.\(^{74}\)

---

\(^{70}\) Schick, *HEP 2*, 454-456  
\(^{71}\) ibid  
\(^{72}\) ibid  
\(^{73}\) ibid  
\(^{74}\) ibid
**C101, Panel 5:**

- **Location:** “Lower” Church (C101). In the area west of the raised Chancel, and in Room 4.
- **Material and Preservation:** Marble. Found in 6 conjoining fragments, many pieces missing.
- **Registration Number(s):** 1993.0190.01-03, 1993.0261.04, 1992.0402.01, 1991.0279.06.
- **Dimensions:**
  - Length: 0.39 m
  - Width: 0.27 m
  - Thickness: 0.032 m

**Source:** Image and discussion published by R. Schick (*HEP 2*, chap. 13: 455-457), Fig. 13.3 No. 4 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

At the centre of this panel, a three-ridge oval encircles a cross, which appears to have been Byzantine in style. In *HEP 2*, Schick identifies two *fleur-de-lis* branches between the arms of the central cross. Upon further investigation, I suggest that those branches were actually part of a *fleur-de-lis* cross, which overlapped with the Byzantine cross to create the illusion of an eight-point cross. In Christian literature of the Middle Ages, flowers were predominantly associated with “the abstract qualities of the major saints,” and the lily with those qualities related to purity and chastity. Some modern scholars have associated the three petals of the *fleur-de-lis* with the Holy Trinity, or viewed them as a possible representation of the reed held by Christ prior to his crucifixion. While it is difficult to say which interpretation is accurate within this context, the image of the *fleur-de-lis* has been found on several other marble decorations from the Lower Church, indicating that it held some symbolic significance for Christian worshippers at Humayma. Above the oval, another cross fills the corner, also in the Byzantine style.

---

75 Schick, *HEP 2*, 457
### C101, Panel 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lower&quot; Church (C101). In the area west of the raised Chancel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length:</strong> 0.45 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width:</strong> 0.43 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thickness:</strong> 0.04 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light blue/grey marble. Found in 5 conjoining fragments, many pieces missing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by R. Schick (*HEP 2*, chap. 13: 458-460), Fig. 13.4 No. 2 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

When reassembled, this panel depicts a simplistic carving of a Byzantine cross, with no other visible decoration surrounding it. The thickness of the marble indicates that it was likely used as a Chancel screen, although Schick notes that this particular style does not have any known parallels.\(^{78}\)

---

\(^{78}\) Schick, *HEP 2*, 450
### C101, Panel 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Lower” Church (C101). In the area west of the raised Chancel, and in Room 4. | **Length:** N/A  
**Width:** N/A  
**Thickness:** 0.025-0.036 m |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light blue/grey marble, with darker streaks throughout. Seven fragments are associated with this panel. Some join together to create three segments; however, the total dimensions are unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Source:
Image and discussion published by R. Schick (*HEP 2*, chap. 13: 458-460), Fig. 13.4 No. 4 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

### Description and Analysis

Along the upper and right border of this panel, a Greek inscription has been carved, which translates to: “Lord remember thy servants... as Moses T... as Abdak... [Anast] asios.”<sup>79</sup> A small cross has been added to the end of the inscription, thus confirming the Christian nature of the prayer. Based on the photograph, the cross appears to be a Latin cross or cross Potent. The stone’s colour is unique among other marble samples on site, and the writing style matches another sample found at the Jebel Haroun Church.<sup>80</sup> It is very possible that this panel was commissioned in another region of Jordan and brought into the church separately from the other marble panels.

---

<sup>79</sup> Schick, *HEP 2*, 460

<sup>80</sup> ibid
**C101, Panel 9:**

Source: Image and discussion published by R. Schick (*HEP 2*, chap. 13: 458-461), Fig. 13.4 No. 5 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

Location

“Lower” Church (C101). In Room 4.

Material and Preservation

White marble. Found in two large fragments (only one is pictured.) They do not join together thus the total dimensions are unknown.

Dimensions

Length: N/A
Width: N/A
Thickness: 0.04 m

Registration Number(s)

1993.0261.05-06.

Description and Analysis

At 0.04 metres, this panel is significantly thicker than any other found on site.\(^{81}\) The centre of the panel is decorated with a cross, which has been carved into the surface to a depth of 0.02 metres.\(^{82}\) I speculate that the cross was Greek or Latin in style. No other decoration is visible on this panel, and its purpose within the church is unknown. However, its placement within the church supports its Christian interpretation.

---

\(^{81}\) Schick, *HEP 2*, 461

\(^{82}\) ibid
**Oil Lamp:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Lower” Church (C101). In Room 2. | **Length:** 0.095 m  
**Width:** 0.06 m  
**Height:** 0.04 m |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze. The lamp is missing the upper part of the ring handle, as well as the hinged lid; however the rest is intact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991.0126.01.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Source:**

Image and discussion published by J. Oleson and M. Smith (*HEP* 2, chap. 12: 440-441), Fig. 12.15 No. 34 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

---

**Description and Analysis**

This lamp is mostly decorated with linear and curvilinear symbols. Two symbol types are identified in the archaeological report: “fish bones” that flank the handle of the lamp, and “eight-pointed stars” that sit on either side of the central opening.\(^{83}\) Given the lamp’s presence within the church, I would argue that the symbols likely held Christian significance, and that the eight-pointed stars should instead be labelled as eight-point crosses, matching those used in Panel 1. As well, while it is possible that the symbols flanking the handle are fish bones, they can also be interpreted as palm branches – a popular motif that represented life, victory, and the birth of Jesus within Christian contexts.\(^{84}\) Similar figures have been found on Christian lamps from Tell Hesbân in Jordan,\(^{85}\) as well as on Christian grave markers from Ghor Es-Safi (Byzantine Zoora),\(^{86}\) further supporting this interpretation. The presence of two known Christian symbols side-by-side on this item encourages the Christian identification of both.

---

\(^{83}\) Oleson and Smith, *HEP* 2, 441  
\(^{84}\) Paul Popoene, "The Date-Palm in Antiquity," *The Scientific Monthly* 19, no. 3 (September 1924): 321-325  
\(^{86}\) Yiannis Meimaris and Kalliope Kritikakou-Nikolaropolou, "Inscriptions from Palaestina Tertia vol. 1a: The Greek Inscriptions from Ghor Es-Safi (Byzantine Zoora)," *Meaethmata* 41 (Athens, 2005) 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paver, C101 Burial 1:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cross Dimensions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Image](image.png)      | “Lower” Church (C101). In the central area of the Nave, above Burial 1. | **Length:** ca. 0.20 m  
**Width:** ca. 0.20 m  
**Thickness:** N/A |
| **Source:**              | **Material and Preservation** |                     |
| Image and discussion published by R. Schick (*HEP* 2, chap. 7: 240-243), Fig. 7.20 No. 1 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson. | Stone. Intact, with some wearing on the exterior. |                     |
| **Registration Number(s)** |                     | **N/A**               |

**Description and Analysis**

This paver was found with at least seven other similarly marked stones. A thin border runs along the edge of the stone, with what I have determined to be an equilateral cross *Pattée* sitting at the centre, encircled. Below the paver, archaeologists uncovered a burial, suggesting that the stone acted as a grave marker. The dimensions for encircled crosses *Pattée* carved into stones across the site seem to have been standardized, though the blocks used vary greatly in size. The style could be indicative of the connection between the deceased and the church; as Schick notes in his report, intramural burials were considered “privileged.” This burial location would likely have been reserved for upper class individuals with connections to the church, or who held ecclesiastical status. The style of this cross aligns with known examples of “Type A” consecration crosses, as classified by John Henry Middleton. Other scholars have associated the flared arms of this style with the cross of resurrection, which would make sense considering its use above a burial; however, more evidence is needed to confirm this theory.

---

87 Schick, *HEP* 2, 241  
88 ibid, 241-242  
89 ibid, 241-243  
90 ibid  
**Paver, C101 Burial 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cross Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Lower” Church (C101). In the western area of the Nave, above Burial 2. | **Length:** ca. 0.22 m  
**Width:** ca. 0.24 m  
**Thickness:** N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone. Intact, with some wearing on the exterior.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by R. Schick (HEP 2, chap. 7: 240-243), Fig. 7.20 No. 2 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**
This paver follows the same pattern as the earlier example found with Burial 1; both feature a thin border along the outer edges, and an equilateral cross *Pattée* at the centre, encircled. It is one of two pavers associated with Burial 2, likely acting as a grave marker, or decoration for the space. See the analysis for “Paver, C101, Burial 1” for further details on the style and possible interpretations for this cross.
**Paver, C101 Burial 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Cross Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "Lower” Church (C101). In the western area of the Nave, above Burial 2. | **Length:** N/A  
**Width:** ca. 0.20 m  
**Thickness:** N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stone.  
Intact, but heavily worn on the exterior. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by R. Schick (*HEP 2*, chap. 7: 240-243), Fig. 7.20 No. 3 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

This paver is the second of two grave markers associated with Burial 2. It seems to follow the same decorative pattern as both of the previously mentioned pavers, though the extreme amount of external wearing makes it difficult to be certain. The use of two identical stones to mark a single grave is unique among the other burials found at this site, and the reason is unknown. See the analysis for “Paver, Burial 1” for further details on the style and possible interpretations for this cross.

---

93 Schick, *HEP 2*, 245-247
**Cross Pendant, C101 Burial 1:**

![Cross Pendant](image)

**Location**

"Lower" Church (C101).
In central area of the Nave, below the pavement in Burial 1.

**Material and Preservation**

Bronze.
The pendant is intact, with some corrosion.

**Dimensions**

- **Length:** 0.04 m
- **Width:** 0.03 m
- **Thickness:** 0.009 m

**Registration Number(s)**

1992.0516.02.

**Source:**

Image and discussion published by L. Shumka (*HEP* 2, chap. 11: 382, 384-386), Fig. 11.1 No. 1d reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

This bronze cross was found in Burial 1 on the ribs of the deceased, who was identified as a child under the age of 12, and whose gender is unknown.\(^94\) The design of the pendant is relatively simple, in the style of a Byzantine cross. There seems to be some confusion in the archaeological report, as the image of the cross does not match the description, which mentions a raised button at the centre.\(^95\) Cross pendants, as well as other forms of jewellery, are regularly found in association with child burials of the Byzantine period, possibly due to high mortality rates among children during this time.\(^96\) The pendant was most likely worn as a protective amulet to keep away demons and other evils.\(^97\) Some scholars have speculated that the heightened occurrence of pendants in young female burials might be indicative of a performance of a “marriage to death” ritual, though more evidence is needed to support this claim.\(^98\) One other bronze cross pendant was found at Humayma in the burial of a young female, also within the Nave of the “Lower” Church.\(^99\)

---

\(^{94}\) Shumka, *HEP* 2, 384

\(^{95}\) ibid

\(^{96}\) Sam Cleymans and Peter Talloen, “Protection in Life and Death: Pendant Crosses from the Cemetery of Apollo Klarios at Sagalassos, Turkey,” *European Journal of Archaeology* 21, no. 2 (2018): 292-295

\(^{97}\) ibid

\(^{98}\) ibid

\(^{99}\) ibid
**Cross Pendant, C101 Burial 2:**

![Cross Pendant, C101 Burial 2](image)

**Location**

“Lower” Church (C101). In the western area of the Nave, below the pavement in Burial 2.

**Material and Preservation**

Bronze. Intact.

**Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Thickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.032 m</td>
<td>0.02 m</td>
<td>0.009 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Registration Number(s)**

1992.0604.11.

**Source:**

Image and discussion published by L. Shumka (*HEP 2*, chap. 11: 385-386, 393-394), Fig. 11.2 No. 13 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

This pendant was found on the sternum of the deceased, a young female between the ages of 8 and 11.\(^{100}\) The gender was determined by the size of the skeleton and the grave goods associated with the burial, including various beads and jewellery.\(^{101}\) Like the pendant from Burial 1, this cross is Byzantine in style and features a suspension loop at the top of the vertical arm.\(^{102}\) The only visible difference between the two pendants is the raised circle at the centre of this pendant, which the image of the other version seems to be lacking. According to Shumka, the richness of the grave goods found in this burial was unique among the burials in this space, indicating that the child came from a wealthy Christian family with ties to the church.\(^{103}\) See the analysis of “Cross Pendant, Burial 1” for further details on the style and use of this cross.

---

99 Shumka, *HEP 2*, 385  
100 ibid, 385  
101 ibid  
102 ibid, 393  
103 ibid, 396
**Cross Amulet, C101 Burial 2:**

![Cross Amulet Image](image)

**Location**

“Lower” Church (C101). In the western area of the Nave, below the pavement in Burial 2.

**Material and Preservation**

Bone. Found in one piece, with the ends of the horizontal arms of the cross missing. Some corrosion found at the top of the upper arm.

**Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length:</th>
<th>0.03 m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width:</td>
<td>0.012 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness:</td>
<td>0.004 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Registration Number(s)**

1992.0604.08.

**Source:**

Image and discussion published by L. Shumka (*HEP* 2, chap. 11: 386, 394), Fig. 11.2 No. 14 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

This is one of two bone crosses found alongside the deceased in Burial 2. It appears to follow the typical Byzantine style, with outwardly flared arms. Shumka notes that the amulet was marked with five circular decorations, though two are no longer fully visible due to damage on the body of the cross.\(^{104}\) In terms of Christian symbolism, I suggest that the five circles on this cross were likely intended to replicate the Five Wounds of Christ, inflicted during his crucifixion. Depictions of the Five Wounds were commonly found in association with the dead and dying in the Middle Ages, as they were considered to be “the ‘doors’ and ‘wells’ of salvation,” which held protective and healing powers.\(^{105}\) In addition, the three visible circles could be described as concentric circles, a frequently used symbol that was thought to repel evil.\(^{106}\) Similar decorations were found on other grave goods within this burial, including a bone ring, a mirror, and a spindle whirl, although it is unknown if they all held the same symbolic meaning.

---

\(^{104}\) Shumka, *HEP* 2, 394

\(^{105}\) Finaldi et al., *Image of Christ*, 135, 160-163

\(^{106}\) Shumka, *HEP* 2, 394-395
### Cross Amulet, C101 Burial 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lower&quot; Church (C101).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the western area of the Nave,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below the pavement in Burial 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found in one piece, with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lower arm of the cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length:</strong> 0.015 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width:</strong> 0.012 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thickness:</strong> 0.0035 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Source:
Image and discussion published by L. Shumka (*HEP 2*, chap 11: 386-394), Fig. 11.2 No. 15 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

### Description

This is the second of two bone crosses found within Burial 2. It has the same visual appearance as the first, although it does seem to be slightly smaller in size.\(^{107}\) See the analysis for “Cross Amulet, C101 Burial 2” for further details on the style and use of this cross.

---

\(^{107}\) Shumka, *HEP 2*, 394
### Description and Analysis

Although much is missing from the image, Oleson has identified the upper arm of a cross on the remains of this slab, which "terminates in a small crescent."\(^{108}\) Two short finger-like extensions reach out from the end of the visible arm, differentiating it from other styles of crosses seen in the "Lower" Church thus far. Based on its appearance and similar examples found in other areas of the site, I speculate that this is a cross *Fourchée*. The addition of the fingers likely added a deeper significance to the symbol; the eight total fingers of the cross could hold similar baptismal value to the eight-point crosses identified earlier, or perhaps could represent the eight biblical beatitudes.\(^{109}\) Besides a possible border along the top of the slab, there are no other visible decorations, and its use within the structure is unspecified. Its presence within the church confirms its Christian interpretation.

---

\(^{108}\) Oleson, *HEP 2*, 508  
**Building Block:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Photographed by C. Harvey in 2008. (Not mentioned in *HEP 2.* | “Lower” Church (C101). Exact location not recorded. | Length: N/A  
Width: N/A  
Thickness: N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibly sandstone. Found in one piece, with a large section missing from the top of the block.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Analysis**

This block appears Nabataean in origin due to the presence of angled grooves, which were likely created when the stone was quarried. Into those markings, a cross Potent has been carved, with the lower arm forming a “T.” The horizontal line at the top of the block cuts into the cross, making it difficult to see where the upper arm terminates. It is very likely that this stone was recycled from an earlier Nabataean structure. Because the block was found out of context, it is difficult to say with certainty how it was used, or when the cross was carved; it is possible that it existed during the Christian period, or that it was added after the block had been displaced. However, its presence within the church encourages its Christian interpretation.
**Storage Jar:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lower&quot; Church (C101). In Room 4, north of the arch pier; possibly part of a dump deposit.</td>
<td>Length: N/A Width: N/A Thickness: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pink-grey ceramic. Found in numerous fragments. The majority do not join together, thus the total dimensions are unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993.0264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**

Image and discussion published by K. ‘Amr and R. Schick (‘Amr and Schick, 2001: 111). See also *HEP* 2, chap. 7: 267. Fig. 7.49 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

This storage jar was found alongside numerous other fragments from similar objects, in a locus that is believed to have been a dump deposit due to its odd placement beside the door of the room. One of the remaining pieces features a singular “wavy” cross, the only one of its kind recorded on site thus far. The dump has been dated to the mid 7th century, around the time of the church’s abandonment. Its discovery within the church indicates that the symbol may have held Christian significance, and due to its presence on a storage container, it is possible that the cross was carved as a means of sanctifying and protecting the jug’s inner contents. The unconventional “wavy” arms of the cross may have been drawn in an attempt to thicken the symbol, making it more visible when viewed from a distance.

---

110 Schick, *HEP* 2, 267
112 ibid
The “Upper” Church (C119)

This particular church was situated on the western side of Humayma’s ancient settlement, on the eastern slope of Ridge 1 above the other four churches, which are on the desert plain.\textsuperscript{113} Though poorly preserved in areas, it appears to have been a single-apse basilica, with a central Nave, two Pastophoria, and a collection of smaller rooms to the south and west of the main church area.\textsuperscript{114} The structure has one visible construction phase, which dates to the late Byzantine Period, roughly between the 6\textsuperscript{th} and 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD.\textsuperscript{115} Like the “Lower” Church, sections of the walls are somewhat intact, reaching a height of almost 1 metre; however, it does not seem to have benches lining the interior, nor does it have an identifiable Sacristy.\textsuperscript{116} The Chancel stood several steps above floor-level, though Schick notes that the exact placement of the altar and pulpit within the church is

\textsuperscript{113} Schick, \textit{HEP 2}, 299
\textsuperscript{114} ibid, 299-300
\textsuperscript{115} ibid
\textsuperscript{116} ibid, 300-302
unknown.\textsuperscript{117} The style and appearance of this church were quite common in Byzantine Jordan, with numerous parallels found throughout the region; some examples include the Ridge Church of Petra, and the Jebel Haroun Church.\textsuperscript{118} During the excavation of this church, only one Christian symbol was identified. The lack of other extant symbols is likely due to the looting and removal of the church's furnishings before the building collapsed.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{117} ibid, 303-305
\textsuperscript{118} ibid, 307
\textsuperscript{119} ibid, 308
**C119 Panel 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dimensions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Upper” Church (C119). In the southeast *Pastophorion.* | **Length:** N/A  
**Width:** N/A  
**Thickness:** 0.05 m |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Material and Preservation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light blue/grey marble. Found in 2 large fragments (only one is pictured). They do not join, thus the total dimensions are unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Registration Number(s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993.0381.02-03.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description and Analysis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This panel features a large central cross, which I have determined is Byzantine in style. According to Schick, the thickness of the marble indicates that it was likely not used as a Chancel screen and instead may have been a table.(^{120}) He also notes, however, that the depiction of the cross is an unusual feature for a table, thus its use is still a point of speculation.(^{121}) Its presence within the church and similar design to other crosses confirms its Christian nature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

120 Schick, *HEP 2*, 478  
121 ibid, 478
Byzantine Church Complex (F102)

The F102 Byzantine Church was constructed in the southeast section of Humayma's ancient settlement, in an area with a long history of use. Originally, the space accommodated a Nabataean cistern, dating to the late 1st century BC, or early 1st century AD. In later years, the site seems to have been used as a necropolis, as several cist graves were uncovered, dating to between the 1st and 5th centuries AD. During the early 7th century, the land became the home of a large church complex, structured as a single-apse basilica with three parallel aisles and multiple courtyards. Like the previously studied examples, this church featured a raised Chancel in the space in front of the apse, where the altar was likely positioned. Several smaller “ancillary” rooms connected to the Nave, which the excavators

---

122 'Amr and Oleson, *HEP 2*, 153
123 ibid, 154
124 ibid
125 ibid
speculate might have acted as Sacristies, meeting rooms, or rectories.\textsuperscript{126} The space previously used as a cistern may have been adjusted to store equipment, or to house animals.\textsuperscript{127} The structure underwent renovations in later phases, though the extent to which this altered the church’s original appearance is unknown. It is likely that the church was destroyed by an earthquake in 749 AD, after which it was reconstructed as an Abbasid period house.\textsuperscript{128} There is only one other Byzantine church that follows a similar layout in Jordan – Church 29 of Khirbat as-Samra.\textsuperscript{129} Within the F102 church, three objects with Christian symbols have been identified - a stone block, an oil lamp, and a coin.

\textsuperscript{126} ibid
\textsuperscript{127} ibid
\textsuperscript{128} ibid
\textsuperscript{129} ibid, 158
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Stone block:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Dimensions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Stone block image](image) | Byzantine Church complex (F102). In surface rubble above Room A. | **Length:** 0.56 m  
**Width:** 0.18 m  
**Height:** 0.18 m |

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by K. ‘Amr and J. Oleson (HEP 2, chap. 5: 110-111). Fig. 5.20 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Material and Preservation**
Sandstone. The block was found in one large piece. The sides are quite worn down, with some parts missing.

**Registration Number(s)**
N/A

**Description and Analysis**
A Latin cross adorns the side of the block, signalling its outward-facing side. According to ‘Amr and Oleson, this block is too short to have acted as a door’s lintel, thus it is very likely that it was used to support a window within the church.\(^{130}\) This item was found on the surface, thus it is difficult to determine the date of the symbol; however, its association with the ruins of the church supports its Christian interpretation.

\(^{130}\) ‘Amr and Oleson, *HEP 2*, 111
**Oil Lamp:**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine Church Complex, (F102). In Room D2, Phase III or IV.</td>
<td>Length: N/A Width: N/A Height: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material and Preservation**

Brown/grey ceramic. The exterior of the lamp is partially burned.\(^{131}\) It also appears to be missing a substantial part of the handle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992.0558.01.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Analysis**

Dated to the late 4\(^{th}\) or early 5\(^{th}\) century AD,\(^ {132}\) this lamp is predominantly decorated with linear and curvilinear symbols, in a similar fashion to the bronze lamp found in the “Lower” Church. In the space above the spout, a cross is intersected by a vertical line, which then connects with a large circle drawn around the opening at the top of the lamp. While I am not yet aware of any exact matches for this style, similar lamps have been identified at ‘En Ya ‘Al in Jerusalem and Tell Hesbân in Jordan, with some featuring Byzantine crosses, palm branches, and variations of the quote: “the light of Christ shines for all,” written in Greek.\(^ {133}\) Due to its date, its comparable appearance to known Christian lamps from nearby sites, and its placement within the church, it is likely that the symbol drawn onto this lamp held Christian significance. It is possible that the figure above the spout is a Chi-Rho or Iota-Chi.

---

\(^{131}\) ‘Amr and Oleson, *HEP 2*, 122

\(^{132}\) ibid

\(^{133}\) Eugenia Nitowski, "Inscribed and Radiated-Type Byzantine Lamps," 18-34; see also Anna De Vincenz, "Ceramic Oil Lamps and Vessels from the Burial Cave at ‘En Ya ‘Al, Jerusalem," *Atiqot* 76 (2013): 123-134
**F102, Coin 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weight</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine Church Complex (F102). Church entrance area, Room G.</td>
<td>15.5g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material and Preservation**
Copper alloy. Intact, with some corrosion.

**Registration Number(s)**
1992.0473.01.

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by J. Oleson (*HEP* 2, chap. 12: 424-425). Fig. 12.8 No. 25 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**
This coin is dated between AD 498-518, during the reign of Anastasius I. The reverse features a large “M,” to demarcate the value of the coin. There are two small six-point crosses on either side of the "M", while a Byzantine cross sits above. There is no visible inscription on this side of the coin.

---

134 Oleson, *HEP* 2, 425
Byzantine Church (B100)

This church was constructed at the centre of the ancient settlement, above a Nabataean necropolis that was likely connected to a nearby Nabataean temple.\textsuperscript{135} In later centuries, the church was appropriated into an Umayyad complex and many features from the earlier phases were destroyed. However, the apse of the Byzantine church remains visible in the newly renovated structure, named Room E by excavators.\textsuperscript{136} Within Room E, evidence of a raised Chancel was found, confirming the Christian nature of the Byzantine structure.\textsuperscript{137} The Nave of the church extended eastward from the apse, though the total length of this space is unknown. Schick estimates that the church was roughly 19 metres long by 13 metres wide, a “substantial and impressive building when intact.”\textsuperscript{138} Four possibly Christian symbols were found on the upward-facing sides of several bricks, which had been intentionally placed side-by-side in the apse of the church. They were found in locus 12, located below a separate layer of flagstone pavement that has been attributed to

---

\textsuperscript{135} Oleson, \textit{HEP 2}, 161
\textsuperscript{136} ibid, 161-163
\textsuperscript{137} ibid
\textsuperscript{138} Schick, “Christianity at Humayma, Jordan,” 338; see also Oleson, \textit{HEP 2}, 215
the early Abbasid period. Within this context, it stands to reason that the bricks date to an earlier period than the flagstone pavement, possibly the late Byzantine, during Humayma’s Christian phase. As I explain in the first entry of this section, the symbols on the bricks may not have held Christian value originally; however, it is certainly possible that they were interpreted as Christian later in their history and used in the church for ornamental purposes, in a similar fashion to the decorative Pavers of the “Lower” Church. One other Christian symbol was found on a Byzantine coin within the church, providing further information regarding the possible date of this structure’s Christian phase.

Fig. 7. Brick floor in B100 apse with possible Christian symbols (courtesy of J. Oleson)

139 Oleson, HEP 2, 169-170
**Brick 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Byzantine Church (B100). In the apse. | **Length:** ca. 0.22m  
**Width:** ca. 0.225m  
**Thickness:** N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick. Found in one piece, with some damage to the exterior. Some mortar still attached.</td>
<td>1991.0460.T1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**

**Description and Analysis**

This item was found with three other bricks in the floor of the apse, adjacent to the curved wall. Due to the presence of mortar on each brick, Oleson suspects that they were originally used in the Roman fort or bathhouse, and were later placed in the church. The upward-facing side of the brick features an eight-point star or cross, which would have been drawn by the brick maker prior to the firing process. While the symbol may not have been intended to hold Christian meaning at the time of its creation, its placement within the church's apse suggests that it might have been interpreted by the townspeople differently, and brought into the church to serve a Christian function. The bricks, which Oleson speculates may have been part of a paved floor, were not connected to any other surface in the space.

---

140 Oleson, *HEP 2*, 170
141 M. Barbara Reeves and Craig Harvey, "A Typological Assessment of the Nabataean, Roman and Byzantine Ceramic Building Materials at Al-Humayma and Wadi Ramm," *Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan XII* (2016): 463-466, 471-472; see also Reeves and Harvey, *HEP 3*, "Ceramic Building Materials" (in preparation)
142 Oleson, *HEP 2*, 170
143 ibid, 169-170
**Brick 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Byzantine Church (B100). In the apse. | **Length:** ca. 0.22 m  
**Width:** ca. 0.22 m  
**Thickness:** N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brick. Found in one piece, with some damage to the exterior. Some mortar still attached</td>
<td>1991.0460.T2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
Image courtesy of B. Reeves. Discussion published by J. Oleson (*HEP 2, chap. 6: 169-170*).

**Description and Analysis**

This brick was found alongside the previous entry in the apse of the B100 Church, adjacent to the curved wall. The style of the imprint is slightly different, with a simple “X” drawn on with two fingers. In a church context, the symbol on this recycled brick could have been viewed as a Greek cross. See the analysis for “Brick 1” for further interpretations of this item.
### Brick 3:

**Location**
- Byzantine Church (B100).
- In the apse.

**Dimensions**
- **Length:** ca. 0.22 m
- **Width:** ca. 0.22 m
- **Thickness:** N/A

**Material and Preservation**
- Brick.
- Found in one piece, with some damage to the exterior. Some mortar still attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Source:**
- Image courtesy of B. Reeves.

**Description and Analysis**

Like the previous two entries, this brick was found in the apse of the B100 Church, adjacent to the curved wall. The symbol appears to be a five-point star or cross, drawn with two fingers. Within an ancient Christian context, five-point stars, commonly referred to as pentagrams, were used to represent the Five Wounds of Christ, the star that guided the three kings to Jesus, and the body of Christ.\(^{144}\) While it is not in the form of a typical pentagram, the five arms of this symbol may have been interpreted similarly. It also may have been identified as a Greek cross or Iota-Chi. See the analysis for “Brick 1” for further interpretations of this item.

---

\(^{144}\) Maria Urmă, “The Pentagram as a Living Cross,” *Anastasis: Research in Medieval Culture and Art 3*, no. 1 (2016): 76-87
**Brick 4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Image courtesy of B. Reeves. Discussion published by J. Oleson (*HEP 2*, chap. 6: 169-170). | Byzantine Church (B100). In the apse. | **Length**: ca. 0.22 m  
**Width**: ca. 0.22 m  
**Thickness**: N/A |

**Material and Preservation**

Brick. Found in one piece, with some damage to the exterior. Some mortar still attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description and Analysis**

This is the fourth brick found in the apse of the B100 Church, adjacent to the curved wall. The brick is marked with a simple "X" drawn on with two fingers. Like “Brick 2” (91.0460.T2), this might have been viewed as a Greek cross within a Christian context. See the analysis for “Brick 1” for further interpretations of this item.
**B100, Coin 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine Church (B100) Room D.</td>
<td>10g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copper alloy. Intact, with some wearing on exterior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992.0351.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by J. Oleson (*HEP 2*, chap. 12: 424, 426-427). Fig. 12.8 No. 54 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

**Description and Analysis**

This coin was minted between AD 527-538 in Constantinople, during the rule of Justinian I.\(^{145}\) The reverse features a large “M” at the centre indicating its value, with what appears to be a Byzantine or Latin cross sitting above, and six- or eight-point crosses on either side. There is no visible inscription on this side of the coin.

---

\(^{145}\) Oleson, *HEP 2*, 426-427
Byzantine Church (B126)

This structure is located in the ancient town’s domestic centre. It was documented in 1933 by Frank and identified as a triple-apse church in 1935 by Albrecht Alt, who also noted that the space had experienced “recent digging” by local inhabitants.\(^{146}\) B126 is significantly smaller than the other churches found on site, with little in the way of extant furnishing or decoration.\(^{147}\) During the mid-1900’s, the structure was converted into a barn, which remained in use until 1996, when it was abandoned.\(^{148}\) Although some excavation did occur within the barn led by Schick in 1996 and 2009, the appearance and dimensions of the original church are still unknown.\(^{149}\) At least one apse is still visible, with another possibly in the southern-most room of the structure. An empty Reliquary was located below one of the few enduring flagstones in the main room of the church.\(^{150}\) Within the structure, an Arabic inscription carved into an ancient block in the 20\(^{th}\) century reads: “there is

---

\(^{146}\) Schick, *HEP 2*, 309; see also Oleson, *HEP 1*, 15-16  
\(^{147}\) ibid, 309-310  
\(^{148}\) ibid  
\(^{149}\) ibid, 320  
\(^{150}\) ibid, 315
no god but God and Muhammad is the messenger of God.” The centre of the block has been chipped away, indicating that something viewed as undesirable, such as a cross or inscription, may have been there originally. While the barn did not necessarily have a religious function, this inscription shows that it still existed within the religious context of Humayma. Some symbols were carved onto the stone alongside the modern Arabic inscription; however, they do not seem to have any Christian meaning. To date, no Christian symbols have been published from this church, likely due to the looting and repurposing of the structure.

Fig. 9. Arabic inscription on an ancient block, B126 (reprinted from HEP 2 courtesy of J. Oleson)

---

151 ibid, 309
152 ibid, 309
Field D128

Fig. 9. Field D128 with the Roman fort in the background (courtesy of R. Schick)

Field D128 is located approximately 740 metres west of the Roman fort, below the eastern slope of Ridge 1 and Tomb Group A115 in the Nabataean necropolises. While the area has not yet been excavated, a ground-penetrating radar survey in 2004 identified several rectangular and circular anomalies below the surface, leading scholars to believe that the space had at one point been used as a cemetery. This coincides with evidence found on the surface, including burnt pottery and possible tombstones, which point to funerary activity. Due to its visibility from the Roman fort and the style of offerings, Oleson hypothesises that this was the burial site for Roman soldiers, although more research is needed to confirm this theory. The presence of crosses on at least two tombstones suggests that some Roman soldiers may have been Christian in the 4th century AD, prior to

154 ibid, 334
155 ibid; see also Oleson, *HEP* 2, 91
the construction of the local churches. Alternatively, it could indicate that the
cemetery remained in use throughout the Christian period. In recent years a
structure was built on the site, which incorporated at least 12 ancient blocks
featuring various forms of crosses, likely gathered from a nearby church or
graveyard. Robert Schick photographed a selection of the symbols in 2002 and
2008, and kindly permitted me to use his images. As part of this catalogue, I give
examples of each type of symbol found in D128’s modern structure and the
surrounding area, as evidence of Christian activity in the area. Presented are the
cross *Fourchée* (open and encircled), cross Potent, and Greek cross (encircled).
### Christian Grave Marker:

![Image of Christian Grave Marker](image)

**Location**

D128.

**Material and Preservation**

Stone. Found in one piece, with corners broken off. Some wearing on the exterior.

**Dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Registration Number(s)**

N/A

### Source:

Image and discussion published by J. Oleson (*HEP* 2, chap. 4: 91). Fig. 4.61 reprinted with permission from J. Oleson.

### Description and Analysis

This stone features a cross *Fourchée*, with two finger-like extensions that reach out from the ends of each arm. The stone's placement within the possible Roman military cemetery has encouraged its identification as a grave marker. This style of cross has several parallels on site, including a stone slab located in the “Lower” Church (C101), and stone blocks used in the modern structure of D128. See the analysis for “Paver” (1993.0390.01) in C101 for further details on the style of this cross. Due to its similarities to others found within Christian contexts, it is most likely that this example is Christian.
### Christian Grave Marker with Greek Inscription:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D128. Recycled; built into the northern wall of a modern structure.</td>
<td><strong>Height:</strong> 0.35 m <strong>Width:</strong> 0.24 m <strong>Thickness:</strong> N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Umm Ishrin Sandstone. Found in one piece, with part of the bottom half broken off.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Source:
Image courtesy of J. Oleson.
Discussion published by J. Oleson (Oleson et al., 2003: 54-55).

### Description and Analysis

The cross on this gravestone is described by Oleson as an equilateral cross with “terminal cross bars.”156 This style, which I have identified as the cross Potent, has parallels in several areas of Humayma, including C101, the modern structure of D128 (not pictured), and F103. The Greek inscription is not entirely preserved, however several letters suggesting the name “Galerios” or “Gaios Alexandros” are somewhat legible.157 The presence of the cross and the use of Greek rather than a local language provide some information about the identity of the deceased; he was likely Christian, and possibly a Roman soldier. Unfortunately, because it was removed from its original context, it is difficult to say which grave the stone would have marked. Its presence in the area of D128 supports the previously asserted idea that the cemetery had been used by Christians during the early Byzantine period, though further research in the area is needed to confirm this theory.

---

157 ibid
**Block:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Photographed by R. Schick in 2008 and used with his permission. | D128. Recycled; built into the wall of a modern structure. | **Length:** N/A  
**Width:** N/A  
**Thickness:** N/A |

**Material and Preservation**

Stone. Found in one piece, with some wearing on the exterior.

**Registration Number(s)**

N/A

**Description and Analysis**

This is one of several ancient blocks used to construct a modern building in Field D128. As mentioned previously, Schick reported (personal communication, May 2019) that at least 12 of the blocks used in the structure are decorated with Christian imagery, suggesting that they were looted from a nearby church or graveyard. Unfortunately, because they were removed from their original contexts, the exact location and their purpose within each are unknown. This block features a cross *Fourchée*, which has been encircled. Another smaller cross sits between the fingers of the upper arm, encouraging the Christian interpretation of the symbol. See the analysis for “Paver” (1993.0390.01) in C101 for further details on this style of cross.
**Block:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photographed by R. Schick in 2002 and used with his permission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D128. Recycled; built into the wall of a modern structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stone. Found in one piece, with some wearing on the exterior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Analysis**

This is another example of a possible Christian symbol found on a block used in the modern structure of D128. This block differs slightly from the previous example, as it features a simple equilateral Greek cross, though it is also encircled. As with the others in this structure, the block was found outside of its original context, thus its intended purpose remains unknown. A similar symbol appears on a ceramic lamp from E116.
The Bathhouse Complex (E077)

Prior to the construction of the Roman Bathhouse in E077, this area was the site of two Nabataean structures, located in the southern region of the field. These buildings were destroyed at the end of the 1st or beginning of the 2nd century AD, and materials from these phases were looted and repurposed by the incoming Roman soldiers.\textsuperscript{158} Construction of the Roman bathhouse began in the 2nd century AD, utilising the existing Nabataean foundation as a base, and expanding beyond into the northern area of the field.\textsuperscript{159} The new structure follows standard formatting for Roman bathhouses as ascribed by Vitruvius, with heated pools in the south and western-most rooms, and cold pools in the north.\textsuperscript{160} This phase of the Bathhouse ended in the late 3rd century, likely due to the removal of the Roman forces from Humayma, though it was reoccupied once again during the 4th century.\textsuperscript{161} At this point, the structure underwent renovations that drastically reduced its size to include only five rooms, possibly in an effort to accommodate the now much smaller garrison at Humayma, and to minimize the structure’s fuel and water usage.\textsuperscript{162} One example of a Christian symbol, a lead cross pendant, has been identified in an area of the bathhouse that was abandoned during the 4th century downsizing.

\textsuperscript{159} ibid
\textsuperscript{160} ibid, 113
\textsuperscript{161} ibid, 109
\textsuperscript{162} ibid, 115
**Cross Pendant:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathhouse complex (E077). Found on the flagstone floor in the abandoned area north of the Byzantine Bathhouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material and Preservation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Registration Number(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead. Intact, with some damage on the exterior.</td>
<td>2012.0398.01.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
Image and discussion published by B. Reeves (Reeves et al., 2017: 120-121). Fig. 15 reprinted with permission from B. Reeves.

**Description and Analysis**

This pendant was made in the shape of a Byzantine cross, with slightly flared, rounded arms. The upper arm has a hole, allowing a string or thread to be looped through to create a necklace. The centre of the cross is indented, possibly the result of injury to the material after production. The use of lead, a relatively inexpensive metal, could indicate that the wearer was from a lower social class than those who wore the bronze pendants found in Burials 1 and 2 from the “Lower” Church. As well, the discovery of the pendant outside of a funerary context supports the notion that cross pendants were worn by the citizens of Humayma both in life and in death, as protective amulets. The pendant was found in the Roman area of the bathhouse below a recycled column drum, thus it is possible that the space was re-used in some capacity during the Byzantine period as a temporary lodge, or that the owner of the pendant was looting rubble from the area.

---


164 Reeves et al., “Report on the Humayma Excavation Project’s 2010 and 2012 Field Seasons,” 120
The Cascading Plateau site is situated west of the town’s centre, among the sandstone peaks of the Jebel Qalkha. The site was first documented by Reeves and her team in 2014, and features six panels with over 100 carvings of varying shapes, styles and sizes. The gradient colours of the patinas indicate that these images were produced over a wide time frame; some older specimens are barely noticeable against the dark stone, while others are a stark white or beige, suggesting that they were carved in recent history.165 Among the more abstract images are numerous impressions of feet and sandals, a widespread motif that dates back to the Palaeolithic period in some regions of Europe, the Near East and Northern Africa.166 In other areas of the Near East, sandal prints have been associated with prehistoric ritual practices, as well as with later Nabataean, Christian and Islamic worship.

Other types of carvings on the Cascading Plateau site include inscriptions, zoomorphic and anthropomorphic images, scratch marks and abstract symbols, all

165 Reeves and Harvey, “Photogrammetric Documentation and Phasing of a Rock Carving Gallery at Humayma” (in press)
166 Reeves, “Stepping into History: A Contextual Analysis of the Footprint Images in Humayma’s Hills and Roman Fort,” ASOR Annual Meeting (2018); see also Verner, Some Nubian Petroglyphs on Czechoslovak Concessions, 16
of which are commonly found in areas with known or assumed religious associations.\textsuperscript{167} Thus, the presence of these symbols could be interpreted as evidence for the Cascading Plateau site’s role as part of the sacred geography of Humayma. While this catalogue will not include all of the images present on the Plateau, their importance for understanding the context of the site cannot be understated. Through a photogrammetric study of the Plateau, Reeves and Harvey have established that three main phases existed for the carvings on Panel 2.\textsuperscript{168} For the purpose of this paper, I will be looking at possible Christian symbols that were produced during Phase 2, which is thought to have ranged from the Nabataean town’s foundation up to the early Islamic period.\textsuperscript{169}


\textsuperscript{168} Reeves and Harvey, “Photogrammetric Documentation and Phasing of a Rock Carving Gallery at Humayma” (in press)

\textsuperscript{169} ibid
### Petroglyph A:

**Location**
Panel 2 of the Cascading Plateau site on Jebel Qalkha.

**Material and Preservation**
Sandstone (likely abraded using a rock). The patina has darkened to a degree that indicates it is part of the Panel 2’s second phase. Some damage is visible.

**Dimensions**
- **Length:** ca. 0.1 m
- **Width:** ca. 0.15 m

**Registration Numbers**
N/A

### Description and Analysis

This symbol has two main components; the first is a central cross, with an elongated horizontal bar. At the point of intersection between the lines of the cross, two triangles of equal size are connected to form a labrys. Similar versions of this symbol, as well as different variations of it, have been found in numerous sites in the Near East, including the temples of Amada and Mussawarat in Nubia;\(^\text{170}\) one has also been found tattooed onto a mummified body.\(^\text{171}\) Scholars speculate that this type of symbol is most likely a monogram for Saint Michael the Archangel, which was used to demarcate sacred spaces, as a sign of worship or as a request for protection from the archangel.\(^\text{172}\) The symbol’s placement on the Plateau directly beside a petroglyph of a footprint with the same patina colour (Fig. 1) suggests that both images were drawn at the same point in time, and encourages their shared Christian interpretation. Alternatively, this symbol could be viewed as a wasm, although no regional parallels are known. It is also the only symbol of its kind at Humayma. Further analysis of this symbol and its context can be found in Chapter 3.

---

\(^\text{170}\) Verner, *Some Nubian Petroglyphs on Czechoslovak Concessions*, 78


\(^\text{172}\) ibid
### Petroglyph B:

![Image of Petroglyph B]

**Location**
Panel 2 of the Eastern Cascading Plateau site, on Jebel Qalkha.

**Material**
Sandstone (likely carved using a rock or knife). The patina has darkened to a degree that indicates it is part of the Panel’s second phase.

**Registration Number(s)**
N/A

**Dimensions**
- **Length**: ca. 0.4 m
- **Width**: ca. 0.3 m

### Description and Analysis

There are two overlapping petroglyphs here, the first of which appears to be an inscription or image, possibly from Phase 2 of the Panel. The second is a large, cross-shaped scratch mark that has been intentionally carved above the original inscription, also possibly during Phase 2. This is one of many examples on the Plateau of intentional erasures.\(^{173}\) The artist’s choice to carve a cross could indicate that they were Christian, and that they were removing a previous image or message that was non-Christian. Because of the known religious value of this space, it is also possible that these scratch marks (as well as others on the Plateau) hold a similar value to the pilgrim/sacred gouges that have been found on temples and churches throughout the Eastern Mediterranean.\(^ {174}\) Alternatively, it could be interpreted as a wasm representing the roots of a tree or scissors.\(^ {175}\)

---

\(^{173}\) Reeves and Harvey, “Photogrammetric Documentation and Phasing of a Rock Carving Gallery at Humayma” (in press)


The Roman Fort (E116)

The occupation of Field E116 is divided into at least six phases, the first of which is represented by a selection of Nabataean ceramics in the site’s archaeological record, and dates prior to the Roman annexation. Phase II began in the early-mid 2nd century AD, with the construction of the Roman military fort. This effort was led by Trajan’s military engineers and followed the standard castrum layout – four curtain walls forming a large rectangle, an entrance gate on each wall, and watchtowers on every corner. A large reservoir in the north-western corner of the fort connected to a branch of the Nabataean aqueduct, providing fresh water for the soldiers. The fort’s principia was centrally located, and was flanked by a large praetorium and horreum. The fort was temporarily abandoned in the late 3rd century (Phase III); however, it was once again occupied in the early to late 4th century (Phase IV). After its military abandonment, some areas of the fort were likely repurposed for civilian usage, though this phase (Phase V) came to an end by the early 5th century. Phase VI of the fort saw the looting of building materials for the Byzantine churches. As well, a small structure was built against the northern fort wall in Area L.

Christian imagery has been associated with several of the fort’s phases. Two lamp fragments were found with various forms of crosses, which could date to

---
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Phase III or later. In addition, a coin featuring a Latin cross was found in Area L, which has been attributed to Phase VI. Most recently, in the 20th century, a shed was constructed on the perimeter of the fort’s western wall, which utilised at least two ancient blocks decorated with Christian crosses.
**Oil Lamp:**

![Image of Oil Lamp]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Roman Fort (E116). Reservoir probe 12. | Length: N/A  
Width: N/A  
Height: N/A |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ceramic.  
Found in one piece, with much of the lamp missing. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004.0334.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
Image courtesy of J. Oleson.  
Site to be published in *HEP 3* (in preparation).

---

**Description and Analysis**

The extant fragment of this lamp is decorated with numerous small dots, as well as a large eight-point cross that has been encircled. Each arm ends in a bulge, much like the eight-point cross that was depicted in Panel 1 from the “Lower” Church. See the analysis for “C101, Panel 1” for further details on the style and use of this cross. Eight-point crosses were also found on the bronze oil lamp from C101, though that version was not encircled. This item was not located within a church; however, its decorative similarities to other Christian items support the possibility that the symbol could be interpreted as Christian. A similar lamp was found at Humayma in E077, though it was not included in this catalogue, as it is not yet published (Reeves, personal communication, July 2019).
**Oil Lamp:**

- **Location**
  - The Roman Fort (E116).
  - Found in the upper fill of Room D, *horreum*.

- **Material and Preservation**
  - Ceramic.
  - Found in one piece, with much of the lamp missing.

- **Registration Number(s)**
  - 2000.0057.

- **Dimensions**
  - Length: ca. 0.08 m
  - Width: ca. 0.03 m
  - Height: N/A

**Description and Analysis**

This lamp is decorated with vertical lines radiating out from the opening at the top, as well as a small Greek cross that has been encircled. Based on its style and similarities to other documented lamps, this item has been dated to AD 325-520, the early Byzantine period, and thus could be interpreted as Christian.\(^{184}\) Based on this date, the lamp is associated with Phase III or IV of the fort. A similar symbol appears on a stone block from D128.

\(^{184}\) Zantur, *HEP 3* (in preparation)
### Block:

![Image of block](image)

### Location

The Roman Fort (E116). Recycled, used in the construction of a modern shed (back wall).

### Cross Dimensions

- **Length:** ca. 0.22 m
- **Width:** ca. 0.22 m
- **Thickness:** N/A

### Material and Preservation

Stone (marl). Found in one piece, heavily worn on the exterior.

### Registration Number(s)

N/A

### Description and Analysis

This is one of two cross images carved onto stones that were incorporated into a 20th century shed on the fort's perimeter wall. These stones may have been repurposed from the local churches or cemeteries, much like those found in the modern structure of D128.185 The only visible decoration on this particular block is a central cross *Pattée*, which has been encircled. The circle features some curvilinear and linear patterns, as well as an *ovolo*.186 There are also later graffiti carved into the front of the block, overlapping with the cross.187 Unfortunately, because this stone was found outside of its original context, it is difficult to say what the purpose of this item was prior to its use in this structure. However, as its appearance matches the Pavers of C101, a Christian interpretation is likely. See the analysis for “Paver, C101 Burial 1” for the style and possible use of this type of cross.

---

185 Reeves, *HEP 3*, “Christian Crosses”
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**Block:**

![Block Image]

**Location**
The Roman Fort (E116). Recycled, used in the construction of a modern shed (front wall).

**Material and Preservation**
Stone. Found in one piece, heavily worn on the exterior.

**Cross Dimensions**
- **Length:** ca. 0.19 m
- **Width:** ca. 0.22 m
- **Thickness:** N/A

**Registration Number(s)**
N/A

**Description and Analysis**

This is the second block found in the shed of E116, featuring an equilateral cross Pattée. Due to extreme weathering and overlying plaster, the image is greatly obscured. In the photograph it is difficult to tell whether it was encircled, or if the block was decorated with any other designs. Like the previous example, it is no longer in its original context, thus its original purpose is unknown. It likely came from a church, graveyard, or civic structure.\(^{188}\)

---

\(^{188}\) ibid
**E116, Coin One:**

**Location**
The Roman Fort (E116).
L01.03.

**Material and Preservation**
N/A.
Heavily damaged with chisel and hammer marks.

**Registration Number(s)**
2000.0569.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description and Analysis</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oleson has determined that this coin dates to the reign of Justinian I, and was likely printed in Constantinople between AD 527-538. The reverse features a large “M” at the centre, demarcating the value of the coin, with a Latin cross in the right field. There is no visible inscription on this side of the coin. Although the fort had been abandoned by Roman forces before this coin type was minted, some rooms were reoccupied later in the Byzantine period (Phase VI), including Area L where the coin was found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

189 Oleson, *HEP 3*, “Coins”
Roman Platform and Byzantine Houses (E121)

This field was located on the south-western slope of a mound near to the Roman fort, in the Roman vicus.\textsuperscript{190} Excavations in this area revealed a square stone platform, as well as several structures, which have been dated to the Roman and early Byzantine period.\textsuperscript{191} The only Christian symbols in this field were found on a collection of bronze coins dating to the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD. This collection was found in the fill layer, 0.2 metres above the floor of an abandoned structure (Structure A).\textsuperscript{192}

\textsuperscript{191} ibid, 244
\textsuperscript{192} ibid
### E121, Coin One:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image and discussion courtesy of C. Harvey. Site published by I. Babbitt and B. Reeves (Reeves et al., 2009: 241-246).</td>
<td>E121.07.15</td>
<td>1.188g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze. Intact, with some damage to the exterior.</td>
<td>1995.0391.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description and Analysis**

This coin, dated to AD 349-450, was minted under Theodosius I, Valentinian II, Arcadius or Honorius. The reverse depicts Victoria holding a trophy, accompanied by a prisoner. In the left field, there appears to be a cruciform symbol, which I have determined is a Tau-Rho. The inscription reads: SALVUS RE[I/PUBLICAE]. Found with several other similar or identical coins.

### E121, Coin 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image and discussion provided by C.</td>
<td>E121.07.15</td>
<td>1.386g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material and Preservation</th>
<th>Registration Number(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze. Intact, with some wearing on the exterior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location**

E121.07.15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harvey. Site published by I. Babbitt and B. Reeves (Reeves et al., 2009: 241-246).</th>
<th>1995.0423.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Description and Analysis**

This coin dates to the reign of Theodosius, who is depicted on the obverse wearing a diadem, between AD 383-394. Like the previous type, the reverse shows Victoria leading a prisoner, with a Tau-Rho in the left field. The inscription reads: SALVSREI[PVBLICA].

---

**E121, Coin 3:**

![Image](image_url)

**Location**

E121.07.16

**Material and Preservation**

Bronze. Intact, with some damage to the exterior.

**Registration Number(s)**

1995.0422.03

**Description and Analysis**

This coin was minted by Theodosius, Valentinian II, Arcadius or Honorius, between AD 349 and 450. Like the previous types, the reverse depicts Victoria and a prisoner, with a simple Latin cross in the left field. The inscription reads: SALVSREI[PVBLICA].
**E121, Coin 4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E121.07.16</td>
<td>1.39g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material and Preservation**
Bronze.
Intact, with some wearing on the exterior.

**Registration Number(s)**
1995.0422.05

**Description and Analysis**
This coin dates to AD 395-408, and was minted under the rule of Arcadius. The reverse shows Victoria, leading a prisoner away, with a possible Tau-Rho in the left field. The inscription reads: SALVSREI/PVBLICA.
Early Islamic Qasr and Mosque (F103)

In this area, two major structures were uncovered and excavated. The first was the Qasr of the Abbasid family, which consisted of at least 25 rooms with a central courtyard. The structure experienced six construction phases - the first three took place during the late 7th to early 8th centuries, while the later phases occurred during the Ottoman period. In addition to the Qasr, two mosques were constructed in this field, the dates for which are unknown. One item featuring Christian symbolism was found in the Qasr, which may have been recycled from a nearby Christian structure.

194 ibid, 440
### Block:

![Block Image]

### Location
- Early Islamic Qasr (F103).
- Recycled; found in the Triple Bin Room, Pier 9.

### Dimensions
- **Length:** ca. 0.45 m
- **Width:** ca. 0.25 m
- **Thickness:** N/A

### Material and Preservation
- Sandstone.

### Source:
- Image provided by R. Foote.
- Discussion from Oleson et al., 1998.

### Registration Number(s)
- N/A

### Description and Analysis

This block was found in the Triple Bin Room of the Qasr, as part of an arch pier.\(^{196}\) The outward-facing side of the block is decorated with three crosses. My assessment of the piece is that two are the form of a cross Potent, while the third (centre) is in the shape of a Tau-Rho. Although the individual styles are found in several areas of the site, their combination on a single block is entirely unique. As well, this is the only example of a Tau-Rho found at Humayma that has been used outside of coinage. Due to the appearance of Christian images on this block, Foote speculates that it was removed from its original Christian context and repurposed within the Qasr.\(^{197}\) The phasing of the pier is not provided in the preliminary report.

---


\(^{197}\) ibid
Chapter Three – Conclusion

Symbol Distribution, Trends, and Reliability of Interpretations

As part of this catalogue, nearly 50 Christian symbols have been identified and documented, from 10 different areas of Humayma. The most common symbol catalogued was the cross, most often represented in the Byzantine or Pattée style. Other standard variations included the Greek cross, Latin cross and eight-point cross. In contrast, some symbols appear to be singularities within the archaeological record of Humayma, including the “wavy” cross, the monogram of Saint Michael, and, surprisingly, the Chi-Rho. A large number of symbols were found on building materials, marble panels, coinage, and lamps, while less appear on pottery fragments and gravestones, or in the form of amulets and pendants. The greatest concentration of symbols was found in the “Lower” Church (C101), which had nearly 30 symbols within its walls at the time of excavation. It also contained the most diverse range of styles and materials. The remaining symbols are more evenly distributed throughout the other areas of the site, with each area containing between one and five symbols.

Besides C101, Humayma’s churches do not seem to contain any more symbols than the areas identified as “non-Christian,” likely due to the intense degree of looting and restructuring experienced by all churches except C101 at the end of the Christian period. Many symbols that would have originated in Christian spaces were removed and repurposed in later construction projects, including the shed of E116, the modern structure of D128, and the Qasr. For this reason, it is important to note that the presence of Christian symbols in an area does not necessitate that
Christian activities occurred there, particularly in the case of recycled materials that were brought into a space for practical purposes. Even so, the inclusion of out-of-context symbols in this study is still important, because they contribute to our understanding of the quantity and diversity of Christian symbols at Humayma, as well as the treatment of Christian iconography in later periods. A similar argument can be made for the study of Christian symbols on coinage found at Humayma. Although the coins were not minted on site and may not directly represent the religious beliefs of Humayma's citizens, they offer some insight into the types of symbols that the citizens were exposed to, and were perhaps influenced by, at that time. It is also important to mention that several of the archaeological fields of Humayma did not have any documented Christian symbols, including the Roman and early Islamic house E122, the Nabataean and Roman Shrine in E125, and the tomb groups A104-A116. Though the reason for this is unclear, it is likely because some of these spaces were no longer in use during the Byzantine period (the Shrine), or they were looted and emptied prior to excavation (the tomb groups).

Within this study, I have found that the level of certainty surrounding a symbol's Christian interpretation can vary greatly, and relies on a number of factors, including its appearance, material, location, context, and proliferation. For more popular symbols like the Byzantine cross, its Christian nature is very likely; however, in the case of less common symbols like the monogram of Saint Michael,
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198 Reeves, “Nabataean and Roman Shrine with Civic and Military Gods at Humayma, Jordan,” 137; see also Reeves, “Landscapes of Divine Power at al-Humayma,” 333
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which only appears once and exists within a complicated context, the interpretation is less certain. Overall, the symbols with the highest degree of certainty are those that have a formal appearance, are found within an identifiably Christian context, and have known parallels on site, such as the symbols depicted on marble panels, pavers, and pendants from C101, C119, and F102. The recognition of reliable Christian symbols can also help to guide the interpretation of symbols found outside of an identifiably Christian context, such as the cross Pattée carvings from the modern shed in E116, which visually match those on the pavers from C101. The least reliable symbols are those that are considered informal, found out-of-context or in a complex context, and have no known parallels on site, such as the carvings on the Cascading Plateau site.

Throughout Humayma and other Christian sites in the Near East, symbols appear to have served a plethora of purposes. They have been used to identify a person or space as Christian; to claim land from other religious groups or Christian factions; to guard an individual or space against the attacks of evil; and to compel the grace and protection of God. According to Dr. Ine Jacobs in her work “Cross Graffiti as Physical Means to Christianize the Classical City,” citizens of the Eastern empire were prone to developing anxiety about the presence of unknown evils, due to long-held and deeply-rooted spiritualistic beliefs in Near Eastern society. For this reason, Near Eastern sites may contain a heightened number of Christian

---

200 Ines Jacobs, “Cross Graffiti as Physical Means to Christianize the Classical City: an Exploration of Their Meaning, Topographical and Socio-historical Contexts,” in Graphic Signs of Identity, Faith, and Power in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, ed. Ildar Garipzanov, Caroline Goodson and Henry Maguire, CURSOR 27 (Turnhout: Belgium, 2017), 180-181
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imagery, especially graffiti, produced in an attempt to dispel personal and communal fears.\textsuperscript{202} This explanation could certainly be plausible at Humayma, particularly in areas with known or assumed funerary contexts, such as C101 and D128, or in areas with previous pagan associations, such as the Cascading Plateau site (which I will address more fully in the following section). While it is difficult to know the purpose of every symbol present on site, it is clear that the majority were intended as a form of communication between people, the environment, and the supernatural.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{distribution.png}
\caption{The Distribution of Christian Symbol Types Across Humayma’s Archaeological Fields}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{202} ibid
Theories and Future Research Possibilities

Based on the evidence presented in this project, I propose two arguments regarding the archaeological site of Humayma. First, I suggest that the possible Roman graveyard (D128) may have been used by Christians in the early Byzantine period, due to the high number of Christian symbols found in the area. It is possible that Roman soldiers who identified as Christian were buried in that location, or that Christians continued to utilise that space for burial purposes after the area surrounding the fort was abandoned by the Roman soldiers. If the latter were true, a Christian church likely would have been in close proximity. Although official excavations of D128 have yet to take place, John Oleson has suggested (personal communication, May 2019) that the modern shed in D128 was built above the ruins of an ancient structure, possibly a church. It is my recommendation that this area be fully excavated, in order to determine the nature of the structure, as well as its relationship to the nearby graveyard and the town of Humayma more generally. This is particularly important, because it is currently unknown where the majority of the Christian inhabitants of Humayma were buried, with only a handful having been identified in C101. Uncovering more burials would provide further insight into the funerary and religious practices of the early Christians, both in Humayma and Jordan more broadly.

Secondly, I propose that a symbol carved onto the Cascading Plateau of the Jebel Qalkha may be a monogram for Saint Michael the Archangel. This is based on the symbol’s visual similarities to documented examples from Nubia, some of which are identified in Miroslav Verner’s text, “Some Nubian Petroglyphs on Czechoslovak
Concessions,” as well as in Marie Vandenbeusch and Daniel Antoine’s article, “Under Saint Michael’s Protection: A Tattoo from Christian Nubia.” While the symbol on Humayma’s Plateau is not a perfect match for any of those recorded by Verner or Vandenbeusch and Antoine, it serves the same purpose by overlapping the letters from the Greek name “MIXAHA.” It also maintains a cruciform shape, thus supporting its Christian interpretation. As mentioned previously, the symbol exists within the complicated and layered context of Panel 2, an area with a long history of Nabataean, Roman, and Islamic use. As a Christian icon, it stands alone against numerous carvings and inscriptions from earlier generations, many of which are associated with pagan cultures and worship. The choice to carve a Christian symbol here could have stemmed from the artist’s fear of the Jebel Qalkha, the Plateau, and the site’s connections to paganism and the spirit world, which can be traced back to the foundation of Humayma, when Aretas, a pagan prince, first glimpsed a white spirit riding a camel in front of the mountain’s peak. By evoking Saint Michael, a powerful archangel and warrior, the artist may have been trying to protect themself, as well as future Christians travelling through the area, from the evil spirits that lurked in the shadows of the Jebel Qalkha. Because this is the only known reference to Saint Michael at Humayma, it is very likely that the artist was a traveller or nomad passing through the town, perhaps from Nubia, where Saint Michael is the patron. In the area directly beside the monogram, two footprints have been carved. Based on the relative colours of their patinas, the left footprint predates the
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right footprint and the Saint Michael monogram, which are both attributed to Phase 2.\footnote{Reeves and Harvey, “Photogrammetric Documentation and Phasing of a Rock Carving Gallery at Humayma” (in press)} The addition of the later carvings (in particular the monogram) effectively Christianizes the left footprint, which may have originally been dedicated to a pagan deity.\footnote{ibid}

This assessment inevitably leads to more questions – why was this Christian traveller on the Plateau? What brought him or her to Humayma? Was it common for Christians to pass through the town during their pilgrimage to the Holy Land? My recommendation is that Reeves and Harvey continue their important work, surveying and documenting the landscape around the Plateau, in order to develop a more holistic understanding of its role in the sacred geography of Humayma. I am keen to know if more evidence of Christian activity exists in the area, particularly in the form of symbols. If Humayma were a popular stop for Christians on a pilgrimage route, it would help to explain the high number of churches within the town, which would have been needed to accommodate a large influx of religious tourists.

Other areas of the site that I feel deserve further attention are the B126 church; the modern structures on sites, which contain ancient materials; and the water-supply system’s structures, particularly the walls of the cisterns, which often receive protective crosses at other Near Eastern sites.\footnote{Eitan Klein, Boaz Zissu and Nir Distelfeld, “Byzantine Graffiti in Underground Water Facilities in the Galilee and Judean Foothills,” Revue Biblique 125, no. 3 (2018): 406-435} While they have all been studied to some degree, there is a strong possibility that more symbols exist in these

\footnote{Reeves and Harvey, “Photogrammetric Documentation and Phasing of a Rock Carving Gallery at Humayma” (in press)}
\footnote{ibid}
areas, which were hidden from view or perhaps overlooked at the time of excavation.

When documented and studied within their context, symbols have the capacity to inform our interpretation of a site, by providing insight into the nature of the interactions between the site and its inhabitants, and the ways that the site has evolved and changed over time. Through the documentation and analysis of Christian symbols found on site, I have demonstrated that Christianity was not confined to the churches of Humayma – it can be found throughout the town and in traditionally “non-Christian” spaces, such as the local bathhouse, the Roman fort, and the Plateau site. Based on the volume and diversity of Christian symbols documented, it is clear that symbolism played a multitude of roles in the practice of Christianity at Humayma; symbols were imbued with a sacrality that offered inhabitants and travellers passing through comfort and protection against unknown evils, while also providing a method of identification and communication that connected worshippers with diverse groups of people, the landscape, and even the divine. My hope is that researchers continue to look for symbols as evidence of Christian activity in future archaeological investigations of Humayma. As well, I hope that they are able to refer to this project as a point of comparison and guide for analysis.
# Appendix A: Glossary of Symbol Types

## Crosses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Symbol Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>Cross with an elongated vertical bar, with all arms flaring outwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Eight-Point</td>
<td>Two overlapping crosses, to a total of eight arms. Some have bulbs at the end of the arms, while others do not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Fourchée</td>
<td>Cross with four arms that “fork” at the end. This creates two finger-like extensions at the end of each arm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Fleur-de-lis</td>
<td>Cross with four arms that end in the <em>fleur-de-lis</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Equilateral cross with straight arms, forming an “X”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Cross with an elongated vertical bar and straight arms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Pattée</td>
<td>Equilateral cross with four arms that flare outwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Potent</td>
<td>Cross with four arms that end in a bar, making each arm look like a “T”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Example" /></td>
<td>Wavy</td>
<td>Cross with four arms drawn with a wavy pattern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monograms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Symbol Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Chi-Rho" /></td>
<td>Chi-Rho</td>
<td>Monogram of overlapping Greek letters “XP”. Cruciform appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Saint Michael" /></td>
<td>Saint Michael</td>
<td>Monogram for the name “Michael” in Greek, consisting of overlapping letters “ΜΙΧΑΗΛ” Cruiform appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Tau-Rho" /></td>
<td>Tau-Rho</td>
<td>Monogram of overlapping Greek letters “TP”. Cruciform appearance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Symbol Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Five-Point Star" /></td>
<td>Five-Point Star</td>
<td>Star or cross with five arms or points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Ovolo" /></td>
<td>Ovolo</td>
<td>Small egg or oval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Sigla


*HEP 2* – Oleson and Schick, 2013.

*HEP 3* – Oleson, in preparation.

*ADAJ* – Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan

*ASOR* – American Schools of Oriental Research

*SHAJ* – Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan
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