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ABSTRACT

Roman Funerary Reliefs and North African Identity: A Contextual Investigation of Tripolitanian Mausolea and their Iconography

Julia Salome Nikolaus

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Leicester

During the Roman-period, hundreds of mausolea were commissioned by the local Libyan elite in Tripolitania (Libya). While funerary sculpture was rare in pre-Roman Tripolitania, during the Roman period many were vividly decorated with symbolic and figural sculpture.

This Ph.D. provides the first extended discussion and comprehensive catalogue of Tripolitanian mausolea and their decorations. Based on the data from this catalogue, it aims to highlight the broad spectrum of decorations, and seeks to demonstrate how aspects of Roman, pan-Mediterranean, and North African imagery were re-formulated to create an iconography with local relevance through which complex layers of identity, beliefs, and symbolism were expressed.

After setting the mausolea within their historical, geographical, and social contexts, this Ph.D. will provide an overview of their main architectural types and the principal iconographic themes displayed. Next, the sculptural decorations will be investigated through select case studies by focusing on their regional context together with the inscriptions and the architecture of the monument, along with the local socio-economic circumstances. Finally, this study will explore how the iconography helped to express the different layers of identity of the commissioner, and how other actors, such as the viewer and the craftsmen, may have influenced the range of imagery that was ultimately displayed. This way we can detect subtle differences in the iconography of the sculptural decorations, which otherwise may stay hidden.

Instead of viewing this funerary sculpture as a failed attempt of Roman art, or merely a product of resistance against Rome, this study demonstrates that the iconography was very complex. By contextualising the mausolea within their local setting, it becomes clear that North African, Roman, and pan-Mediterranean imagery was reinterpreted to convey messages that were relevant within the regional setting of Tripolitania, reflecting local socio-cultural concerns and identities.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been accomplished with the help and support of many people along the way. First and foremost, I would like to thank my Ph.D. supervisor David Mattingly for his invaluable advice and unwavering support throughout this, at times, difficult, endeavour. His endless enthusiasm and expertise in North African archaeology made me fall in love with the subject during my Masters at the University of Leicester, and his positive and supporting nature helped me immensely during my studies. I would also like to thank David in his capacity as field director first in Libya, and now in Morocco and for giving me the opportunity to work in those amazing countries and get to know its wonderful peoples. Another special thanks goes to my second supervisor David Edwards, for many long and stimulating discussions and his invaluable feedback on the final draft of the thesis, and for his friendship throughout. I am also very thankful to the University of Leicester for providing me with the funding for this research in the form of a scholarship.

Much of this research would not have been possible without the permission of the Society for Libyan Studies that gave me access to their rich archive and to allow me to reproduce the relevant images and records that were held in their collections. The Society for Libyan Studies also provided me with a grant to conduct research in the archives at the British School at Rome, and at Aix-en-Provence, for which I am very grateful. Further thanks extends to the archivists and scholars at the British School at Rome and the Centre Camille Julian in Aix-en-Provence who helped me to locate look at relevant materials, in particular Véronique Blanc-Bijon, Alessandra Giovenco, and Valerie Scott. Furthermore, I would like to thank Phillip Kenrick for giving me his images of mausolea in Tripolitania, David Mattingly for providing his private images, and Muftah Al-Haddad for giving me the photographs of the object in the museum at Bani Ulid. I am indebted to Andrew Merrills and Craig Cipolla for their feedback and advice on my Ph.D. upgrade document. Martin Sterry has been particularly helpful in locating the mausolea on Google Earth, which was, at times, rather like finding a needle in a haystack. Further thanks goes to Nichole Sheldrick, with whom I had fruitful discussions about the archaeology of Tripolitania, and I am thankful for having had the opportunity to read her thesis, which was very inspiring for my own research. I also would like to thank her for her friendship and many good chats over lunch and drinks. I am also hugely indebted to Claire Gathercole, who had the painstaking task of proofreading the thesis.

A very special thank you must go to Lady Olwen Brogan, whose work forms the foundation of this thesis. Without her meticulous recordings of the mausolea of Tripolitania, this thesis could not have been written. I wish I could have met this extraordinary woman to thank her in person.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Susan Walker for many fruitful and inspiring discussions about art at the periphery of the Empire. I learned a great deal from her vast knowledge, experience, and expertise. I am also grateful for her advice and guidance as my PI on the ‘Libyan Antiquities at Risk’ project together with David Mattingly. It is a great pleasure to be part of a project that will help to protect the very monuments that I have studied over the last years.
A huge thanks goes to all the staff at the School of Archaeology and Ancient History at the University of Leicester. It has been a pleasure to be part of such an open and friendly environment. Special thanks go to Simon James, who was my course coordinator during my Masters at Leicester, who helped us all to pull through that stressful year successfully. Neil Christie has been an invaluable source of advice during my Masters and Ph.D., for which I am grateful. I also would like to thank Emma-Jane Grahame for many good discussions about mortuary archaeology, Ruth Young for her support and friendship since I have been at Leicester, and Sarah Tarlow and Graham Shipley for their advice. Of course, nothing would ever work without the brilliant administrative team that helped me overcome many hurdles. Thank you so much Sharon North, Selina Thraves, Adam Thuraisingam, Rachel Godfrey, Kathie Ashley, and Lara Callaghan for your support and friendship. Special thanks also goes to Mark Pluciennik, who was greatly supportive during my time working for Distance Learning and throughout my Ph.D.

I have had great times during time spent on fieldwork in North Africa, formed many lasting friendships and learned an immense amount about the practice of archaeology in the field. I extend my thanks to David Mattingly, Martin Sterry, Andrew Wilson, and Lisa Fentress, for giving me the opportunity to work on their projects and to learn from their experience.

Much of my gratitude must go to the many friends at Leicester in particularly Beth McFadden, Daan Van Helden, Niccolò Mugnai, Hayley Dunn, Borbala Nyiri, Marcella Raiconi, Sarah Newstead, Maria Gatto, Tyr Fothergill, Sergio Gonzalez Sanchez, Tammy Macenka, Anna Booth, Denis Sami, Andy Valdez-Tullett, Martin Sterry, Meghan Mahoney, Rebecca Gordon, Andrea Zocci, Ahmad Saad, Mohamed Hesein, Mohamed Omar, and Ahmad Buzaian for many good times and great memories.

A special thank you must go to Sabine Imperiale, Alemdina Knorr, Tina Bender, Verity Bennett, Alex McPerson, and Goshia Jakimow-Canton who have been great friends and invaluable support over the years.

I am very grateful to my wonderful family who has always supported me along my way. I am forever indebted to my parents Roswitha and Erwin and my brother Sebastian, my grandmother Juliana, and my aunts Gisela and Friedel, whose unwavering support, love, and friendship helped me to achieve all I have accomplished.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my fiancé, Nick Ray, without whom I would not have been able to complete this thesis. He brightened up long and gloomy thesis writing days and endlessly encouraged me along the way.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ........................................................................................................................................... i
Acknowledgements .......................................................................................................................... ii
List of Figures ................................................................................................................................... viii
List of Tables ................................................................................................................................... xiv

CHAPTER 1 Introduction, Research Aims, Objectives, and Methodology ..........1
  1.1 Introduction .............................................................................................................................. 1
  1.2 Aims ........................................................................................................................................ 3
  1.3 The Data Set ............................................................................................................................. 4
  1.3.1 Advantages and Limitations of the Data ............................................................................. 6
  1.4 Research Background .............................................................................................................. 9
  1.4.1 Romanisation ....................................................................................................................... 11
  1.4.2 Research Background: the Mausolea of Tripolitania ........................................................... 13
  1.4.3 The Study of Provincial Art ................................................................................................. 18
  1.5 Theoretical Approaches ......................................................................................................... 19
  1.5.1 Agency and Social Identity ................................................................................................. 21
  1.6 Summary ................................................................................................................................ 26

CHAPTER 2 Geographical, Social and Historical Overview ........................................ 28
  2.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................. 28
  2.2 The Geographical Background ............................................................................................... 28
  2.3 The Social Background .......................................................................................................... 30
  2.4 Historical Background ............................................................................................................ 31
  2.4.1 Tripolitania before Rome .................................................................................................... 31
  2.4.2 The Roman Period ............................................................................................................. 33
  2.5 Summary ................................................................................................................................ 42

CHAPTER 3 Distribution and Architecture ......................................................................... 44
  3.1 Introduction ............................................................................................................................. 44
  3.2 The Distribution of Mausolea Across Tripolitania ................................................................. 44
  3.2.1 The Coast ............................................................................................................................ 46
  3.2.2 The Gefara ........................................................................................................................ 48
  3.2.3 The Gebel ........................................................................................................................ 49
  3.2.4 The Pre-desert .................................................................................................................. 51
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.5</td>
<td>Sirtica</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.6</td>
<td>The Desert</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.7</td>
<td>The Distribution of Mausolea – Discussion</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>The Architecture of Mausolea – an Overview</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>The Architecture of Early Romano-Libyan Period Mausolea (First and Second century AD)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Mid-to-Late Romano-Libyan Period: The Rise of the Temple Tomb (Third century AD – Fourth century AD)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>Continuity and Innovation: the Further Development of the Temple and Obelisk Mausolea</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER 4  Main Iconographic Themes and their Wider Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Imagery and traditions of pre-Roman Tripolitania</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Mausoleum B at Sabratha</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Pre-Roman Statues</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>Painted Hypogea</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The Imagery: Main Themes, Distribution, and Iconography</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>Mythological Scenes and Mythological Personifications</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Representation of Deities</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Religious Activity</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3</td>
<td>Images of the Deceased</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.4</td>
<td>Agricultural Activity and Domestic Animals</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.5</td>
<td>Fertility and Prosperity</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.6</td>
<td>Animals, Hunting, and Games</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.7</td>
<td>Economic Activity</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.8</td>
<td>Martial Activity</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHAPTER 5  Funerary Iconography and Regional Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>The Coast</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>Gasr Duierat</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>The Gefara</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>El-Amrouni</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2</td>
<td>Henchir el-Ausaf</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6  the Comissioner, the Craftsmen and the Viewer ........................................... 181
  6.1  Introduction ........................................................................................................... 181
  6.2  The Commissioner and the Deceased: Depicting the Self, the Family, and the Ancestor ..................................................................................................................... 186
    6.2.1  Types of Portraiture .......................................................................................... 189
    6.2.2  Pose, Symbols, and Facial Expressions .............................................................. 191
    6.2.3  Dress and Headdress ........................................................................................ 194
    6.2.4  Discussion: Defining Identity - Power, Status, and Gender .............................. 202
  6.3  The Commissioner and the Artist: Workshops, Genres, and Trends............... 205
  6.4  The Commissioner and the Viewer - Intention, Perception, and the Impact of Monumentality .................................................................................................................. 212
  6.5  Summary ................................................................................................................ 222

CHAPTER 7  Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research ........................................ 223
  7.1  Conclusions ............................................................................................................. 223
  7.2  Future Research ...................................................................................................... 226
APPENDIX ONE ..............................................................................................................228
Appendix 1.1: The Geographical Zones of Tripolitania: ...........................................229
Appendix 1.2: Inscriptions ..........................................................................................232
Appendix 1.3: Architectural types of mausolea .........................................................237
Appendix 1.4: Themes Depicted on Mausolea by Region ........................................242
Appendix 1.5: Decoration on Gasr across Tripolitania .............................................249
Appendix 1.6: Maps of the Location and Distribution of Mausolea – Coast, Gefara and Gebel .................................................................255
Appendix 1.7: Maps of the Location and Number of Mausolea in the Pre-Deser .......256
Bibliography ..................................................................................................................258

APPENDIX TWO ...........................................................................................................On Accompanying CD
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Lepcis Magna, portrait relief from an unknown funerary monument found in the Old Forum probably dating to the early second century AD (Image: Buccino 2011, 25-27, Figure 13). ................................................................. 6

Figure 1.2: Displaced relief sculpture from Tuil el Cherm near Mizda (>Tu001-A-01). a) Relief sculpture in the museum at Tripoli, unlabelled (Image: Mattingly); b) The same relief as photographed by Brogan near Mizda (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). ................................................................. 7

Figure 1.3: Funerary bust that was covered by debris from the mausoleum in the Wadi N’f’d (Nf030-A-04; Image: Abdussaid 1996, Plate b). ........................................................................................................ 8

Figure 1.4: Interrelationship of influences on ancient sculpture (Johns 2003b, 32, Figure 6). .............................. 25

Figure 2.1: Map of the extent of Tripolitania from Gabes to Ras el Aali and major Roman roads (Data for roads taken from the Barrington Atlas). ........................................................................................................ 29

Figure 2.2: The use of Latin and Punic in different contexts at Lepcis Magna (Fontana 2001, 171 Figure 14.6). ........................................................................................................ 34

Figure 2.3: The boundary between Lepcis Magna and Oea indicating the location of milestones and the mausoleum of Gasr Doga (Ahmad 2010, Figure 2.8). ................................................................. 37

Figure 2.4: Comparison between the development and decline of settlement around the area of Silin and the pre-desert (Munzi et al. 2004, Figure 13a). ........................................................................................................ 41

Figure 3.1: Distribution of mausolea across Tripolitania. .................................................................................. 44

Figure 3.2: Plan of first century AD hypogeum ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ at Sabratha (Di Vita 2015 II, 571, Figure A, drawing: Arch. G. Ortolani). ........................................................................................................ 45

Figure 3.3: Soldiers in the late nineteenth century standing in front of mausolea that once stood at the western or south-western cemeteries of Lepcis Magna. (Image: Matoug 1997, Plate XCb). ........................................................................................................ 47

Figure 3.4: The distribution of mausolea in the Gefara. .................................................................................. 48

Figure 3.5: Distribution of mausolea in the Gebel area. .................................................................................. 50

Figure 3.6: Mosque at Mezgura with integrated relief sculpture from mausoleum (Image: Romanelli 1930, 68, Figure 13). ........................................................................................................ 51

Figure 3.7: Distribution of mausolea in the pre-desert .................................................................................. 52

Figure 3.8: Types of tower mausolea in Tunisia (1, 3, 4, 7, 8) and Tripolitania (2, 5, 6, 7) from the Punic and Roman periods. (1) Thugga (Punic); (2) El-Amrouni, (Roman); (3) Henchir Jouf (Punic); (4) Kasserine, Flavii mausoleum (Roman); (5) Mselliten (Roman); (6) Uadi N’f’d (Roman); (7) Mactar (Roman); (8) Sidi Aich (Roman). (Image: Bentivogli 2007-2008, 94, Figure 46). ........................................................................................................ 55

Figure 3.9: Early obelisk mausolea. a) Mselliten, Wadi Merdum (>Md001-A and B; Image: Kenrick); b) Bir Gebira (>Md023-A; Image: ULVS Archive) c) El-Amrouni, elevation of east façade (>Ea001-A; Image: Ferchiou 1989, Figure 3). ........................................................................................................ 58

Figure 3.10: Tower mausolea with aedicula. a) Wadi El-Amud (>Lm001-A; Image: UVLS Archive); b) Wadi Migdal, (>Mg001-A; Image: ULVS Archive) ........................................................................................................ 59

Figure 3.11: Location of decoration on obelisk mausolea: a) Ghirza (>128-A; Image: SLS Archive); b) Umm el-Agerem (>Ag002-A; Image: ULVS Archive); c) Wadi N’f’d (>Nf031-A; Image: ULVS Archive); d) Wadi Migdal (>Mg001-A; Image: ULVS Archive). ........................................................................................................ 60

Figure 3.12: Gasr Doga. a) The remains of Gasr Doga in the Gebel Tarhuna (Image: Kenrick); b) Plan of Gasr Doga (Image: Bigi et al. 2009, 28, Figure 4; drawing: G. Schingo); c) Reconstruction of frontal elevation (Image: Bigi et al. 2009, 36, Figure 20; drawing: G. Schingo); d) Numidian shrine at Chemtou, Tunisia from the second century BC (Image: Author). ........................................................................................................ 61
Figure 3.13: Peripteral temple mausolea. a) Ghirza with decorated panels indicated in red (Image: Kenrick with colour idications by author); b) Gasr Banat (Image: ULVS Archive). ........................................................................................................ 63

Figure 3.14: arcaded temple mausoleum, Ghirza (GH129-B) (Image: Mattingly) b) temple mausoleum at Mylasa, Turkey (Image: Texier 1882, 87); c) temple mausoleum Brad, Syria (Image: respect-discussion.blogspot.co.uk/2012/04/mama-will-baba-roumieh-pope-from-rome.html). ... 64

Figure 3.15: Location of sculptural decoration on Mausoleum North C at Ghirza (128-C; Image: ULVS Archive). ........................................................................................................ 65

Figure 3.16: Possible tetrastyle mausoleum Gasr el Ajdab (AJ001-A). a) Mausoleum showing northern and eastern façade (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Column found at Gasr el Ajdab (Image: ULVS Archive); c) South side of Gasr el Ajdab showing alterations over time and top of large interior niche in north wall (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). ............ 66

Figure 3.17: Rectangular mausolea: a) Gasr Legbeda, Wadi Lebda, view from the north-west (>GL01-A; Image: Matoug 1997, Plate XCa); b) Plan of Gasr Legbeda, Wadi Lebda (Image: Matoug 1997, 212, Figure 1, drawing: Michele Cilla). ........................................ 66

Figure 3.18: Open peristyle mausolea. a) Wadi Meseuggi with open peristyle and decorations on top of the first storey and on the first tier of the obelisk (>Me001-A; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Gasr Duierat with its vivid decorations (Gd001-A; Image: Mattingly); c) Bir el-Uaar with its two open porticoes and vivid decorations (Ua001-A; Drawing: Author). ........................................................................................................ 67

Figure 4.1: Pre-Roman figural decorations. a) Statue fragment from Henchir Burgu, Jerba (Image: Ferchiou 2009, 117, Figure 9.14); b) Relief of Bes from Sabratha, note the traces of stucco on the relief (Image: M. Benassai, Di Vita 2015, 350, Figure 31); c) Sculpture of lion from the mausoleum at Sabratha (Image: M. Benassai, Di Vita 2015, 354, Figure 38a); d) Hercules and lion, Sabratha mausoleum (Image: M. Benassai, Di Vita 2015, 351, Figure 33). ........................................................................................................ 72

Figure 4.2: Pre-Roman statues. a) Statue from Lepcis Magna (1.40m height, Image: Di Vita 1968, Figure 14); b) Statue from Lepcis Magna holding symbol of Tanit in the right hand (1.52m height, Image: Di Vita 1968, Figure 13); c) Statue from Sabratha (0.98 m height, Di Vita 1968, Figure 17); d) Head from Lepcis Magna (0.49 m height, Di Vita 1968, Figure 15); e) Detail of sign of Tanit of statue depicted in Figure b (Di Vita 1968, Figure 13); f) Head from Lepcis Magna (0.43 m height, Di Vita 1968, Figure 15). 74

Figure 4.3: Painted tomb of Zanzur from the first century AD (Image: Di Vita 2010, Figure 6). ........................................................................................................ 75

Figure 4.4: Hypogoeum ‘Defunto Eroizzato’. a) Portrait of male coronae; b) Entrance chamber of Defunto Eroizzato with a large gorgon is depicted on the ceiling. (Image source a and b: http://archeologiaiateneo50.unimc.it/it/104/scavi-e-restauri-in-corso-a-sabratha-larea-sacro-funeraria-di-sidret-el-balik-e-le-tombe-dipinte) .................................................................... 77

Figure 4.5: Sphinxes in Tripolitania. a) Pre-desert, Ghirza sphinx (128-D-06; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Gefara, Dehibat (>Gu001-B-02; Image: Trouset); c) Sphinx on the arch of Marcus Aurelius on north-west side, Oea (Image: http://www.livius.org/pictures/ribipoli/oca-arch-marcus-aurelius-nw-sphinxes-right/); d) Gefara, El-Amrouni (>Ea001-A-04) (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). 80

Figure 4.6: Winged figures in Tripolitania. a) Winged male figure holding fruit in a basket in front of him, el-Amrouni, Gefara (>Ea001-A-01; Image: Brogan: SLS Archive); b) Winged figure with a plough from Gasr Duierat, Lepcis Magna (>Ea001-A-05; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) The four seasons from a mosaic at the villa of Zlitien, Lepcis Magna. (Image: http://www.livius.org/a/libya/zlitien/d_ar_buc_ammera_seasons_tripoli_mus01.jpg). 82
Figure 4.7: Sacrifice scene.  a) Bull sacrifice Ghirza North A (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive; >Gh129-A-02);  b) Arch of Septimius Severus at Lepcis Magna, bull sacrifice (Image: http://www.livius.org/a/libya/lepcis__magna/arch_severus/arch__severus_ne2.jpg);  c) Bull sacrifice Wadi Al-Binaya (Image: Al-Haddad; >Bin001-A-01)................................................................. 88

Figure 4.8: Adoration pose.  a) Wadi Migdal, pre-desert, four women with their arms raised above their heads (there were two further women on out-facing side of stone; >Mg001-A-05; Image: ULVS, SLS Archive);  b) adoration pose from the Wadi Merdum (>Md001-C-02; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  c) and d) adoration pose on altars found in the temple of Ghirza (Building 32; Image: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 139 a and b)................................. 89

Figure 4.9: Mausoleum in the Wadi Lella.  a) Reliefs depicting a basket with figs, a cup and some long vegetables (>Le001-A-04; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  b) Two fish and root vegetables (>Le001-A-03; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  c) fish on a tray sitting on a folding table and four loaves of round bread (>Le001-A-06; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive)........................................................................................................... 90

Figure 4.10: Portrait reliefs.  a) Ghirza, man (centre), woman (right) and perhaps child (left) (>Gh128-C-01; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  b) Wadi Khanafes, man (right), woman (centre) child? (left) (>Kn005-A-02; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  c) Portrait of two figures, Wadi Merdum (>Md001-C-001);  d) Portrait relief from the Wadi Mimoun (>Mm079-A-01; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). ................................................................. 91

Figure 4.11a) So-called chiefdom scene from North C at Ghirza (Drawing: Author);  b) Drawing by Duvytier of a stone he saw at the oasis town of Ghadames (Image: Duvyvier 1864, 250, Plate X). .......................................................................................... 92

Figure 4.12: Ploughing scenes.  a) Photograph taken in the 1950s of ploughing with a camel in Tripolitania (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  b) Ploughing with a camel on a relief from the Wadi al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-03; Image: Haddad). ........................................................................................................... 93

Figure 4.13: Threshing scenes:  a) Threshing scene from Ghirza North cemetery (>Gh129-B-14; Drawing: Author);  b) Threshing scene from the Wadi Binaya (>Bin001-A-10; Drawing: Author);  c) Mosaic from the villa at Zliten sowing a threshing scene (Image: Dunbabin 1978, Plate XXXVI, 96). ........................................................................................................... 95

Figure 4.14: Dress and rural scenes.  a) Ploughing scene from Tigi, Gebel (>Eau001-A-05; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  b) Person holding a basket for Ghadames (>Gha001-A-014; Image: Author);  c) Harvesting scene from Tabunyah (>Tb045-A-03; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  d) harvesting scene from Ghadames (>Gha001-A-05; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive) ........................................................................................................... 96

Figure 4.15: Birds:  a) Two peacocks to the left and right of a cup from Bou Guerba in the western Gebel (>Bo001-A-01; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  b) Cockerel from Taghigga, pre-desert (>Tag001-A-03; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  c) Two birds on columns left and right of an archway from Tabunyah, pre-desert (>Tb045-A-07; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  d) Peacocks left and right of a cup from Oued Beni Bell, Gefara (>Ob001-A-07; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive);  e) Two birds (peacocks or doves) left and right of a cup, Ghirza North A (Gh129-A-12; Image: Kenrick);  f) Two birds left and right of a cup from Ghadames (>Gha001-A-06; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive) ........................................................................................................... 101

Figure 4.16: Animal fighting.  a) Naked individuals fighting felines on a relief from the Wadi al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-12; Drawing: Author);  b) Naked individuals fighting felines on a relief at Ghirza (>Gh129-B-16; Drawing: Author);  c) Mosaic from the villa at Zliten depicting circus games such as the wild animal hunts, animal fights, and naked individuals damned to the wild beasts. (Image: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Damnatio_ad_bestias#/media/File:Bestiarii.jpg) ........................................................................................................... 110

Figure 4.17: a) Relief from the area around Mizda depicting a group of people arriving at a large structure (Drawing: Author);  b) Mosaic depicting a group of people arriving at a villa
Figure 5.1: Displaced relief sculpture that may come from mausolea at Lepcis Magna. A) Frieze from Gasr Duierat (top; >Gd001-A-17) and a frieze probably from another mausoleum (>Lp001-B-03; bottom; Image Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Doric frieze integrated into the Byzantine wall (>Lp001-B-01; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) Frieze seen by Bartoccini in the museum at Lepcis Magna (>Lp001-B-02; Image: Bartoccini 1926, 76, Figure 57)................................................................................................................111

Figure 5.2: Gasr Duierat, corner stone (>Gd001-A-11). a) Interpretation after Vérité with bull (red), bird (blue), dog (yellow) scorpion (green); Image: Vérité 2014; b) Interpretation by author: snake (green), birds (red); small animal (blue); Image: Brogan, SLS Archive with colours added by author. .....................................................................................................................120

Figure 5.3: Capsa from Lepcis Magna and from Chieti. a) Capsa from Chieti, Italy with a very similar lock (Image: Schäfer 1998, Plate 51); b) The capsa of Gasr Duierat, the round disk-like shapes represent the scrolls (>Gd001-A-007; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive)......121

Figure 5.4: Location of mausolea in the Gefara. Names of mausolea discussed in more detail in this chapter are indicated on map. .............................................................................................................................................125

Figure 5.5: Incised contour technique at Beni Guedal and at el-Amrouni a) Ploughing scene at el-Amrouni with oxen and camels (>Eau001-A-05; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive; b) Ploughing scene at Beni Guedal with oxen (Gu001-B-03; Image: Toutain 1914, Plate xxx) ; c) Sphinx from el-Amrouni (>Eau001-A-04; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Sphinx from Beni Guedal (>Gu001-B-02; Image: Trouset).............................................................................................................................................132

Figure 5.6: Location of mausolea in the Gebel. Names of mausolea discussed in more detail in this chapter are indicated on map. .............................................................................................................................................137

Figure 5.7: Drawings provided by Saladin sketching out the decorations and a proposed reconstruction of the mausoleum at Bou Guerba (Saladin 1902, Plate XLVII)........140

Figure 5.8: Offering tables. a-c) Offering tables from the cemeteries at Timgad, Algeria (Images: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Offering table with carved offerings (fish in centre, dates in upper right bowl) from Tabuniyah, found near mausoleum Tb045-A (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); e) Offering table from Wadi el-Amud near the mausoleum Lm001-A (Image: ULVS, SLS Archive); f) Offering table from Wadi Umm-el Agerem with libation channel found near Ag002-A (Image: Daniels, SLS Archive)........................................141

Figure 5.9: Unpublished location map of Chormet el-Bousaila drawn by Kenrick in 1971 (Image: Kenrick, SLS Archive).............................................................................................................................................144

Figure 5.10: Capitals from Chormet el-Bousaila with ‘prickly Acanthus’ (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). .....................................................................................................................................................145

Figure 5.11: a) Mosaic from Chebba, Tunisia, second century AD, of Neptune and his sea horses, Triton with his crab-claws to the left, and Aphos to the right. Image source: http://www.theoi.com/Gallery/Z24.4.html; b) Chormet el-Bousaila, head of a gorgon, perhaps Medusa (>Ch001-A-06; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) Chormet el-Bousaila, Neptune, with four sea horses b behind him, holding a triton and wearing a crown of seaweed (>Ch001-A-01; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Chormet el-Bousaila, bearded male with crab-claws to the left and right of his head Image: Brogan, SLS Archive. ......146

Figure 5.12: Location of mausolea in the pre-desert. Names of mausolea discussed in more detail in this chapter are indicated on map. .................................................................149

Figure 5.13: Partial family tree from the Wadi Umm el-Agerem cemetery, second/third century AD (after Mattingly 1995, 164). ..............................................................150

Figure 5.14: Settlement distribution in the Wadi Ghirza of open farms and gsur. .................155
Figure 5.15: Comparisons between 128-E and 129-A. a) Lion hunting prey 129-A (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Lion on 128-E (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) Eagle and hare 129-A (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Eagle and hare from 128-E (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). .......................... 159

Figure 5.16: Evolution of hunting scenes on the mausolea of the southern cemetery of Ghirza. a) The nude hunter with his hunting dog and spear, Gh128-C (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Nude hunter with fighting a stag (portrait?) Gh128-C (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) Hunter on horseback perusing an ostrich with his two hunting dogs, Gh129-C (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). .......................... 161

Figure 5.17: Pre-desert sculptures of lions holding bovine skull between them: a) Ghirza Gh128-C-02; (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Ghirza Gh128-G-07 (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) Ghirza Gh128-D-02 (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Wadi Khanafes, Kn05-C-03 (Image: Kenrick); e) Wadi Taghigga, Tag001-A-02 (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). .......................... 167

Figure 5.18: The fasces indicated in red on two reliefs at Ghirza. a) Gh129-C-04 (Image: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 78); b) Gh129-C-16 (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). .......................... 168

Figure 5.19: Stelae depicting obelisk mausoleum found at Ghadames, now in the Ghadames museum (Image: Author). .......................... 174

Figure 5.20: Ghadamese headdress a) close up of ceremonial scene showing that the headdress was arranged of small plates (>Gh001-A-10; Image: Author); b) traditional bridal dress at Ghadames, still used today. A wig of small braids is placed on the head, together with a distinctive ponytail-style arrangement that is placed on top of the head somewhat recalling the headpiece shown on the relief (Image: Author). .......................... 177

Figure 6.1: The mausoleum of the Flavii at Kasserine. a) Reconstruction showing the position of the statue amongst the columns of the third-storey aedicula (drawing: Holtzinger 1906, 23, Figure 16); b) The side of the inscription on the second storey, and the poems on the first storey above the door to the funerary chamber (Image: Andrew Wilson from Pillinger 2013, Figure 2). .......................... 183

Figure 6.2: Comparison of early first century AD and fourth century AD portrait busts. a) Wall painting of a woman from the early first century AD Hypogeum at Sabratha ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ (Image: Di Vita 1984, Table CXLVI.4); b) Portrait relief from Ghirza (>Gh128-E-01; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). .......................... 188

Figure 6.3: Quarry in the Wadi Merdum circa 1 km north-west of the Mselliten mausolea (Md001) and Faschia el Habs, a large opus africanum farm (Mattingly 1996, 178, Md011; Image: ULVS, SLS Archive). .......................... 206

Figure 6.4 Tool marks on Tripolitanian funerary sculpture. a-b) Relief from an unknown mausoleum in the pre-desert showing tooth chisel tool marks (>Bu001-A-07; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c-d) Deep grooves probably produced by a drill around the necklace and neckline and the deep folds of the headdress, Ghirza (>Gh128-A-13; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). .......................... 207

Figure 6.5: Ploughing scene from el-Ausaf in the Gefara which shows the carved and corrected outline of ploughman’s face (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive). .......................... 208

Figure 6.6: Walls for hunting with a net(?) indicated in red in the Wadi Khanafes. The topography on higher ground suggests that these walls were not for water management, but for another purpose, such as funnelling animals into a smaller space. .......................... 211

Figure 6.7: Modern examples of the veneration of the dead in Libya, a) Islamic tomb (marabout) with incense burners at Germa (Image: Mattingly and Edwards 2003, Figure 6.5); b) offering vessels on graves at Guddwa (Image: Mattingly and Edwards 2003, Figure 6.47). .......................... 213

Figure 6.8: Map of temples and sanctuaries in Tripolitania, (Data: Brouquier-Reddé 1992). .......................... 216
Figure 6.9: a) and b) Altars found in the temple of Ghirza (Building 32; Image: Brogan and Smith 1984, 21a; 22a); c) Stone head found in the temple of Ghirza (Image: Smith, SLS Archive); d-e) Stone heads from the cemeteries at Ghirza (Image: Smith, SLS Archive); f) Relief from 128-F at Ghirza showing the preparation for an offering, perhaps in a temple (Image: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 125a); g) Relief depicting a head on a shelf from the Nesma in the Wadi Sofeggin (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).

Figure 6.10: Decorations from gsur. a) Gasr Azziz in the Wadi Merdum (ULVS Md28; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Displaced relief, Tarhuna from a mausoleum or gasr (>Gar001-A-03; Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive); c) Gasr Isawi (ULVS Nf037; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Relief from Gasr or mausoleum, Tarhuna (>Gar001-A-01; Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive); e) Phallus from gasr, Wadi Mansur (ULVS Mn006; Image: ULVS Archive); f) Eagle, Ghadames, from gasr or mausoleum (Image: Author; image enhanced with brown overlay); g) Wadi Musa, stone from Gasr or mausoleum (Image: ULVS Archive); h) Relief from gasr or mausoleum, Tarhuna (>Gar001-A-02; Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive).

Figure 6.11: Decorations from gsur. a) Gasr Azziz in the Wadi Merdum (ULVS Md28; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Displaced relief, Tarhuna from a mausoleum or gasr (Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive); c) Gasr Iswai in the pre-desert (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Relief from Gasr or mausoleum, Tarhuna (Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive); e) Phallus from gasr, Wadi Mansur (ULVS Mn006; Image: ULVS Archive); f) Eagle, Ghadames, from gasr or mausoleum (Image: Author; image enhanced with brown overlay); g) Wadi Musa, stone from Gasr or mausoleum (Image: ULVS Archive); h) Relief from gasr or mausoleum, Tarhuna (Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive).
LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Number of relief panels that depict mythological scenes and personifications by geographical region. .......................................................... 79
Table 4.2: Number of relief panels that depict scenes related to religious activities. ....... 86
Table 4.3: Number and distribution of agricultural scenes across Tripolitania. ................. 93
Table 4.4: Number and distribution of scenes depicting birds across Tripolitania. ........ 100
Table 4.5: Number and distribution of scenes with wild animals across Tripolitania. ....... 104
Table 4.6: Number and distribution of hunting and games across Tripolitania. ............... 108
Table 5.1: Figural decorations on Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebda. ........................................ 117
Table 5.2: Scenes depicted on el-Amrouni. .................................................................. 127
Table 5.3: Main themes displayed on Eau001-A and Eau001-B. ..................................... 130
Table 5.4: Themes on displaced stones that were collected at Tatahouine. ..................... 134
Table 5.5: Imagery depicted on mausolea in the western Gefara. ......................... 142
Table 5.6: Main themes and decoration for An001-A. ............................................... 153
Table 5.7: Themes from the Wadi al-Binaya. ......................................................... 170
Table 5.8: Scenes from Ghadames ............................................................................ 176
Table 6.1: Types and distribution of portrait sculpture in Tripolitania. ....................... 189
Table 6.2: Types and numbers of figural decorations displayed on domestic buildings in Tripolitania. ................................................................. 218
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION, RESEARCH AIMS, OBJECTIVES, AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

‘No art form expresses the cultural variety of the Roman Empire better than the funerary monument’ (Zanker 2010, 170).

The integration of Tripolitania into the Roman Empire in the mid-first century BC led to a profound change in elite funerary structures from cairns, cist burials and hypogea to substantial ashlar mausolea. By the fourth century AD, hundreds of mausolea stood across the Tripolitanian territory, forming an integral part of the funerary landscape. The mausolea were carefully placed within the landscape in highly visible positions, along roadways, trade routes, major thoroughfares or land boundaries.

The expansion of the Roman Empire brought with it an unprecedented rise in the number of mausolea across the Empire¹, even in areas where this type of funerary monument was previously unknown (see for instance Toynbee 1971; Von Hesberg 1992). Within the North African context, mausolea were already used by the elite before the Roman period, with temple and tower mausolea evident in Cyrenaican and Numidian territories (Ferchiou 2009; Quinn 2013; Rakob 1979; Stucchi 1987). However, there were significantly fewer mausolea in Tripolitania before Rome took control of the area; only three Numidian tower mausolea are known at the coast, two at Sabratha (Mausoleum A and Mausoleum B, Di Vita 2010) and one at Jerba (Henchir Bürgü, Ferchiou 2009), although there may originally have been more.

The Tripolitanian mausolea were richly decorated with figural and symbolic sculpture that was placed on the external façade of the monument, in highly visible positions, including scenes of hunting, agriculture, ceremonies, and portraiture. In contrast, in neighbouring Cyrenaica and Tunisia (Africa Proconsularis) such a variety of relief sculptures was rare. In Cyrenaica portrait busts and statues were prominent and they were placed in niches of rock cut tombs (Rosenbaum 1960; Cherstich 2011; Oldjira and Walker 2016). In

¹ Over 340 were recorded in neighbouring Tunisia (Moore 2007, 75); see also Bentivogli 2007-2008 for a detailed study of mausolea in Tunisia.
Tunisia (Africa Proconsularis) some relief sculptures were present, although to a much lesser degree and primarily depicting scenes from the Graeco-Roman repertoire, such as Erotes with downward-pointing torches, bull sacrifice, Dionysiac or zodiac themes (Moore 2007, 86). Free-standing sculpture can only occasionally be associated with mausolea in Tripolitania. In contrast, for Punic-period mausolea in North Africa, free-standing sculptures were much more common (Di Vita 1964; 2010), and in Roman-period Tunisia, they were the dominant decorative element (Moore 2007, 186). In modern Tunisia and Algeria so-called ‘Saturn’ or ‘Baal Hammon’ stelae were much more widespread but, in turn, these are absent in Tripolitania (Wilson 2005, 403). Interestingly, the style of the decorations on Tripolitanian mausolea was very similar to Punic traditions on the ‘Saturn’ or ‘Baal Hammon’ stelae but, crucially, the iconographic repertoire was different.

From the above it already becomes apparent that Tripolitanian mausolea are distinctive within the North African context in their richness of figural relief decorations and the broad spectrum of themes that were depicted. The style of decoration conforms to what, in modern scholarship, is commonly broadly classed as provincial art; it is very different from Graeco-Roman conventions, with figures bearing large heads and eyes while the body is rather small. Tripolitanian traditions of figural funerary art before the Roman period were limited and the decorations on the mausolea constituted a new form of visual expressions. Consequently, the commissioners and sculptors drew on the Roman image pool to enable them to say something about their own culture. This led some scholars to apply classical criteria to analyse the imagery, concluding that this funerary art was merely a (bad) attempt to emulate Roman art (e.g. Rosenbaum 1960, 101-123; Toynbee 1971; Huskinson 1975; Zimmer 1981). Yet, the near absence of mausolea decorated in purely Graeco-Roman conventions suggests that the ‘un-classical’ style of the imagery was indeed seen as appropriate and suitable, or even desirable, to decorate the mausolea of the Tripolitanian elite. Essentially, the funerary monuments addressed a local audience, not a global one, and the aim was not simply to emulate Roman art and culture. Instead, the iconography served a new purpose: the visualisation and (re-)affirmation of local traditions, identities, elite power and subsequent social hierarchies.

The notable rise in number of mausolea and profound changes in ways of self-representation on the tombs after the Roman conquest reflect a substantial change in the

---

2 Locations of funerary monuments bearing relief decorations in Tunisia. Garlands: mausoleum at Bit el Hajar, mausoleum of C. Marius Romanus at Henchir el Khima, two mausolea at Haidra, the mausoleum of the Iulii in Makthar; Erotes with garlands: tower tomb mausoleum at Haidra, the ashlar monument at Yasmina Necropolis at Carthage; Flower motif: mausoleum at El Bouia and on the mausoleum of Q. Iunius Rogatus at Sidi Aisch (Moore 2007, 86-87). See also Ferchiou 1995.
structure of Tripolitanian (elite) society during this period, instigated by the imposition of
direct Roman rule and administration. The large number of mausolea reflect a change of
power relations, land use, a rise in (elite) prosperity and a change in elite mentality towards
the representation of self- and group identity on funerary monuments. As Zanker touches
on in his quote above, funerary art provides us with a unique opportunity to study the
regional varieties and cultural preferences in self- and group representation, beliefs, and the
socio-cultural environment. The art and architecture of the Tripolitanian mausolea reflect
the context in which they were created. The final appearance of the mausoleum was
influenced by several factors that operated at the time of its construction, including: the local
iconographic traditions and ‘tastes’; the commissioner’s preference in self-representation and
identity; the target audience who had to be able to comprehend the iconography; the socio-
cultural environment and historical circumstances; the availability of craftsmen; and the
available raw materials that could influence the style of carving (Johns 2003b, 31).

Until now, no full and detailed catalogue of all recorded decorative elements that
adorned the funerary monuments has been established. Because of this, no systematic
comparative study has yet been undertaken. Due to the lack of a comprehensive catalogue,
the majority of previous studies have been limited to a select number of sites or particular
monuments and have predominantly concentrated on iconographic scenes that conform
either to Roman or Punic traditions (Brogan and Smith 1984; Bentivogli 2004; Ertel 2003;
Goodchild and Ward-Perkins 1949).

1.2 Aims

The aim of this study is record and critically analyse the figural stone carved decorations of
the mausolea to investigate the interactions and negations between local and Roman
traditions that were deemed appropriate and meaningful to commemorate the dead in the
different areas of Tripolitania. It will examine how the local elite actively chose, negotiated
and re-formulated foreign imagery to create an iconography with local relevance, in an area
where figurative representations were previously rare. Through this, regional expressions of
complex self- and group representation, identities, religious beliefs, and symbolism will be
explored, reflecting the interactions and negotiations between locals and the imperial power
of Rome during different stages of Roman occupation.
In the remainder of Chapter 1, the terminology, literature review, theory and methodology that support this work will be laid out. An overview of the historical, geographical, and social background of Tripolitania will be given in Chapter 2 to highlight the complex circumstances in which the iconography developed. Chapter 3 then provides an overview of the distribution, the architecture, and the chronology of the mausolea, as well as the placement of the decorations upon them. Chapter 4 introduces the dataset and investigates the main iconographic themes within their wider Mediterranean and North African context. In Chapter 5 the mausolea and their decorations are considered in terms of their regional socio-cultural settings, taking into account their architecture, inscriptions, the surrounding settlements, and the historical development of the region. Chapter 5 will conclude by comparing the differences and similarities between the coastal areas, the Gefara and the Gebel with the pre-desert and desert areas. Chapter 6 will then look in more detail at the impact of monumentality in relation to the decorations. It will explore the expression of identities through portraiture and the influence the viewer, the craftsmen, and the local resources had on the type of imagery that was chosen. Finally, Chapter 7 will highlight the main conclusions of this study and offers suggestions for future work.

1.3 The Data Set

This Ph.D. project draws together the stone-cut decoration from Tripolitanian mausolea. The vast majority of the decorations were relief panels carved of local stone, while the use of marble was rare. Statues in the round are less frequent across the region, consisting of portrait statues, winged figures, lions or eagles.

The data for this study has been collected from archives (notes, record-sheets, photographs, maps, and drawings), early accounts of nineteenth and twentieth century travellers and more recent survey work. Over 230 mausolea and 499 sculptured decorations are recorded in the catalogue. The relief panels vary in size, from moderately sized panels (0.50 m in length and 0.30 m in height) to larger panels that are almost 2 m in length and 1 m in height. The final count only represents a part of the ornamented mausolea that once stood in Tripolitania, since many of them are now destroyed. However, it constitutes a body of data large enough to distinguish some patterns in the choice and function of the decorations in the different areas of Tripolitania.
The majority of the data comes from the Society for Libyan Studies Archive (SLS Archive hereafter) and the UNESCO Libyan Valleys Survey (ULVS Archive hereafter) at the University of Leicester. Further materials are from the Ward-Perkins Archive at the British School at Rome, Italy (BSR Archive hereafter), and the Centre Camille Julian Archive in Aix-en-Provence, France (CJ Archive hereafter). The SLS Archive holds an impressive collection of images, site reports, maps and notes collated by scholars that visited Libya from the 1930s onwards. Olwen Brogan’s collection together with the ULVS Archive form the basis of my catalogue, and additional information is drawn from the records of Charles Daniels, David J. Smith, Philip Kenrick, John Dore, David Mattingly, and John Bryan Ward-Perkins (for the SLS Archive in more general, see Leitch and Nikolaus 2015). The Ward-Perkins Archive at the BSR holds a number of photographs of mausolea taken in the late 19th and early 20th century as well as images taken by John Bryan Ward-Perkins himself, depicting mausolea in particular around the area of Lepcis Magna and the pre-desert. The CJ Archive in Aix-en-Provence holds records and images of mausolea collected by Pol Trousset, René Rebuffat, and Maurice Euzennat, in particularly from the western Gebel (now south-east Tunisia).

The data has been collected in a Microsoft Access database, which has allowed the detailed recording of a number of decorations linked to one single site or monument. All mausolea, with or without evidence for decoration, have been recorded. For some decorations only a hand drawn sketch or a description survived; the main theme can often be identified, and while they are included in the overall numbers, the sketches and drawings are not analysed in detail. Displaced stones have only been included if it was very likely that they once adorned a mausoleum. The evidence at the coast is more ambiguous due to the large range of funerary markers. Some displaced stones from Lepcis Magna could have come from funerary stelae or smaller funerary monuments, and they have not been included. For instance, a portrait relief found in the Old Forum at Lepcis Magna most likely has a funerary context, but its original location and type of monument are unknown (Figure 1.1; Buccino 2011, 19; 25-26). The data is displayed in the catalogue in Appendix 2. Cross-references to specific entries are indicated in the text by referencing the catalogue number in brackets, for instance (>Gh129-A-10).
1.3.1 Limitations of the Data

Many mausolea and their decorations have now disappeared or are severely damaged, particularly in the densely populated coastal zone and the Gebel area, where urban and agricultural development is most intense. Here, stones from mausolea are frequently recycled in more recent structures, especially if the stones were easily removable. For example, Edward Rae made a drawing of an obelisk mausoleum that stood on the western outskirts of Lepcis Magna before 1877 (Rae, 1877). This tomb was later destroyed by an earthquake. By the time Romanelli visited the site in the first half of the twentieth century, the stones had all but disappeared (Romanelli 1925, 164). Reuse of stones also occurs within the less densely settled areas such as the pre-desert, although to a lesser extent. The ULVS failed to find the third of three mausolea in the el-Amud which was recorded by Brogan some 15 years earlier, just to name two examples (Brogan 1964; Mattingly 1996a, 165).
I have taken care to try to (re)locate and record the mausolea and decorations in their original location. Some reliefs have been displaced over the course of the last century, in particular during the Italian occupation between 1911 and 1947.\textsuperscript{3} For instance, the provenance of a relief housed in Tripoli Castle depicting a camel carrying two amphorae followed by a person has not been previously determined (Figure 1.2a). Brogan’s notes and photographs, however, indicate that the relief comes from a site called Tuil el Cherm, very close to Mizda, in the pre-desert (Figure 1.2b; >Tu001-A-01; Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive). Thus, archival material, as well as early archaeological and travel accounts, can provide an invaluable source of information to link displaced elements back to their original location. Combined with more recent survey work, and careful evaluation, this material can significantly broaden our understanding of the mortuary landscape of Tripolitania during the Roman period.

There were, of course, limitations to this kind of data collection. In archives, images are frequently unlabelled and in some cases the original location of some mausolea or relief sculpture could not be determined. It is likely that the majority of unlabelled photographs of relief sculpture come from monumental tombs since the figural decoration on farms and gsur was limited. It is possible that some decoration on later gsur may well have come from earlier mausolea (see section 6.4). Sometimes important details are missing on the descriptions stored in the archives, such as the size of the object, the type of stone, or a general description of its finds context, such as other surrounding burial features, or settlements. These materials have been included in the catalogue but have been used with caution in the analysis.

\textsuperscript{3} See for instance Altekamp 2000; 2004 or Munzi 2012 for an account of the Italian colonisation of Libya.
A further problem is the large number of collapsed mausolea. In many cases, it is not possible to determine their architectural type or their level of decoration without excavation. For example, the re-erection of an obelisk tomb in the Wadi N’f’d in the 1990s revealed a stone carved bust (Figure 1.3) that was covered with debris from the tomb and, as a result, was not previously noted (Abdussaid 1996).

Figure 1.3: Funerary bust that was covered by debris from the mausoleum in the Wadi N’f’d (Nf030-A-04; Image: Abdussaid 1996, Plate b).

Additional restrictions are created by the limited amount of chronological data associated with the tombs which makes the current dating of the mausolea is problematic. It predominantly relies on the assessment of architectural features and other forms of decoration, such as the types of dress and hairstyle, or the artistic ‘style’. The lettering of inscriptions is also used to date the monument, as well as pottery fragments found nearby. However, building style and pottery evidence can only supply us with broad indicators (Brogan and Reynolds 1985, 20) since the majority of mausolea are still unexcavated and associated dating materials such as pottery have been surface finds. A thorough study of their architectural features (which has yet to be undertaken) may shed some more light on the chronology, but this also has its limitations; just like the figural decorations, many of the architectural elements are a complex mix of local, Punic, Greek, Egyptian and Roman
influences which makes their accurate dating very difficult. For the same reasons, the dating of artistic styles for statues and reliefs is very problematic (Wilson 2005, 403). Neo-Punic inscriptions themselves are also not a precise chronological indicator either, since we do not know how long they were in use, especially in the pre-desert and desert regions (Brogan and Reynolds 1985, 20). All available means of dating were carefully and critically considered and a broad time frame of the individual mausolea will be provided in the catalogue. The time periods will be in keeping with the ULVS: Early Romano-Libyan (first and second century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (third century AD), Late Romano-Libyan (fourth century AD), and General Romano-Libyan. Although the Roman occupation went beyond the fourth century AD, the evidence available suggests that mausolea did not post-date this.

1.4 Research Background

Until recently, research on North Africa has been profoundly influenced by a colonial perspective because of its recent colonial history. Only in the last few decades has the idea of the superiority of Rome over the ‘local’ peoples been deconstructed (Quinn 2003, 7). Tripolitania has been colonised by the French and Italians more recently, and the Turkish beforehand. Thus, many written accounts and observations about the Roman period reflect the colonial viewpoints. For instance, in 1928 Coro, an Italian traveller, stated:

‘Tutto ciò significa che la regione era in passato molto abitata e coltivata … provato da ruderi … che di quando in quando s’incontrato attraversando la vasta zona, e che altro non sono che le trace indelilibi di Roma Imperiale’ (Coro 1928, 23).\(^4\)

Much of the early work was written by French and Italian scholars, military officials or ‘gentleman’ travellers that focused on Roman achievement and success. An Italian officer describes the mausolea at Ghirza in the Tripolitanian pre-desert in the following terms:

‘One sees … these age old monuments, majestic and full of grace in their delicate colonnades, contrasting indescribably with the surrounding squalor, abandon and loneliness, resisting the ravages

\(^4\) Translation: This means that the region was inhabited and cultivated in the past … which can be proven by many remains … that one occasionally comes across in this wide area, and which merely are the permanent trace of Imperial Rome.
of time and remaining to attest the boundless power and greatness of Rome the dominator’ (cited in Beechey and Beechey 1828, 504-512).

To Captain Smythe, the first European traveller who wrote about the mausolea at Ghirza, the monuments were a disappointment in comparison with other ‘Roman’ art from the coast, such as at Lepcis Magna:

‘And although I had not allowed my imagination to rise at all in proportion to the exhilarating accounts I had heard, I could not but be sorely disappointed […] I found them of mixed styles, and in very indifferent taste, ornamented with ill-proportioned columns and clumsy capitals. The regular architectural divisions of frieze and cornice being neglected, nearly the whole depth of the entablatures was loaded with absurd representations of warriors, huntsmen, camels, horses and other animals in low relief, or rather scratched on the freestone…. The human figures and animals are miserably executed, and are generally small, though they vary in height from about three feet and a half to a foot in height, even on the same tombs, which adds to their ridiculous effect’ (Captain Smythe, quoted in Beechey and Beechey 1828, 504-512).

This perspective of the superiority of Rome, and thus western culture as a whole, was used to justify the claim to be the rightful inheritors of North Africa, and consequently, disinherited the local people of their cultural achievements (Mattingly 1996b, 51). As a result, the local populations were portrayed as ‘barbarians’ and ‘savages’, unable to organise themselves politically and, because of this, were colonised continuously by Carthage, Rome, the Vandals, and so on. This led to a scholarly perception of Berbers and Romans as polar opposites (Mattingly 1996b, 51-52). This perspective is still reflected in MacKendrick’s book ‘The African Stone Can Speak’, in which he claims that the Berbers were ‘backward and un-innovative with no gift for politics or urbanisation’ (1980, 330). The opposition we find within the concept of Romanisation, the superior Rome vs. the ‘other’ and the ‘barbarians’, grew out of this idea and has a long and strong tradition in North African scholarship and is, therefore, worth exploring in more detail.
1.4.1 Romanisation

Within Roman archaeology, the concept of Romanisation was the prominent paradigm until the 1980s. It was developed by Theodor Mommsen (1901) in Germany and Francis Haverfield (1923) in England in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, an era when colonialism was at its peak, and the Zeitgeist of this time is very much reflected (Hingley 2003, 111). Challenges to the Romanisation paradigm came only a few decades ago, mainly through the introduction of an increasing variety of post-colonial elements and positions in the theoretical framework. Exhaustive studies have been conducted by, for instance, Greg Woolf (1998), Philip Freemen (1996), Richard Hingley (2003; 2005; 2010) and David Mattingly (1997; 2003; 2004b; 2010; 2011), which explore the colonial context in which the Romanisation paradigm has been developed.

In many ways the concept of Romanisation is a difficult one since it is a modern construction rather than a process that was explicitly acknowledged in Roman times. In fact, no Roman-period author used, or was aware of, this term (Hingley 2005, 15). Essentially, Romanisation has been seen as a process by which the Romans acculturated their conquered subjects. The degree of success of Romanisation was measured by the level of acculturation in all spheres of life (art, architecture, politics, administration, goods used in everyday life and so on). The concept in its original form is oversimplified and focuses almost exclusively on the elite (Hingley 2005, 14). The Romanisation debate has been polarised between the traditional interventionist approach, which assumes that Rome deliberately taught the indigenous elites to ‘become Roman’, and the noninterventionist approach, which argues that Rome did not intentionally pursue a Romanisation policy (Pitts 2007 693).

The problem with Romanisation is not necessarily the very core idea: Roman conquest and expansion influenced the people that were colonised. Ignoring the cultural changes contingent on these imperial relations would mean to turn away from one large aspect we study and pretend it did not exist: Rome. But it must be seen as problematic to use one term for various different processes, whether they be political, social or administrative; similarly we need to consider whether these processes occurred all across the Roman Empire over a long period of time, or whether they applied in various degrees to peoples who lived at a particular time and place. Roman imperialism did have an effect, but trying to name it as a large, single process is misleading and ignores how ‘Rome’ was perceived and reacted to in a myriad of different ways by different peoples (Mattingly 1997a, 9; 2010, 284-287; Revell 2009, 1-5).
Within the study of North Africa, the divide created by the concept of Romanisation is traceable in numerous publications of the twentieth and twenty-first century. In 1929, Broughton, in his *The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis*, saw the people of North Africa as ‘emotionally intense but individualistic without power to cooperate in large groups’ (1929, 6). He doubted their ability for self-development, arguing that the indigenous peoples of North Africa would not have been able to develop a sophisticated social and political organisation without outside influences such as Rome (1929, 6). One of the main problems of many previous studies is that they have investigated the different local groupings of North Africa from a ‘Roman’ perspective. It is acknowledged that they existed, and that they had their own, sometimes long-lasting traditions and rituals, but the primary focus has been on the ‘Roman’ aspects. Raven’s *Rome in Africa* (1969) focuses on the Romanisation of the North African provinces. It concentrates on the change that Roman rule brought, while the continuity or altered form of native traditions is barely acknowledged. This approach ignored the hybrid nature of the provinces, influenced by both the coloniser and the colonised, although they both have ‘vital inputs into the structure of power, domination and resistance as a result’ (Gosden 2001, 243). The common assumption existed that the stronger colonialist (the Romans) would overwhelm the culture of the colonised North Africans (Gosden 2001, 242-3). The problem with this approach is the creation of stereotypes that ignores the voice of the colonised (Mattingly 2011, 203-207).

By the 1970s scholars such as Laroui were drawing attention to the resistance of local people to the Roman Empire in North Africa (Laroui 1977, 31). He focused on aspects that previously have been underplayed such as the numerous local uprisings that appeared during the Roman occupation (1977, 31-38). His work essentially sparked the ‘Romanisation-Resistance’ debate that went on for decades (Mattingly and Hitchner 1995, 169). However, this concept was also problematic because it places the argument on the other end of the scale, from acculturation to resistance, and, like Romanisation, the idea of ‘us’ and ‘them’ (Mattingly 1996b, 58; Quinn 2003, 8). Because North Africa has been studied against a profound ideological background, we have to be aware that resistance is only one of many facets, and discrepant experiences have to be taken into account (Mattingly and Hitchner 1995, 170).

Some more recent studies are still focusing on the ‘Roman point of view’, such as MacMullen’s *Romanisation in the time of Augustus* (2000). His section on Africa (2000, 30-49) mainly looks at the large cities at the coast. His emphasis is on the assimilation of the mostly local elite to the Roman Empire in forms of art, architecture and religion. He sees the
continuity in form of government and administration from Punic periods in Tripolitania as
the local population ‘being clearly conservative in this respect’ (2000, 36) and, thereby, gives
the emphasis on continuity a rather negative undertone. His focus is on how the city slowly
became more and more Roman; how, for instance, temples that initially served native deities
were remodelled and dedicated to Roma and Augustus (2000, 39); or how indigenous
ancestral gods such as Shapdrapa and Milk’ashtar, were ‘replaced and diminished’ (2000, 41).
He does not ignore the Libyan or local aspect of culture altogether; for instance he stresses
‘local loyalties’ being revealed by coins showing Livia as well as the emblems of the local
goddess Tanit (2000, 40). However, taking a predominantly one-sided viewpoint is highly
problematic since it only reveals a small part of the bigger picture: that of the city elite and
of a thriving harbour city from the perspective of Roman culture.

1.4.2 Research Background: the Mausolea of Tripolitania

Tripolitanian mausolea with elaborate decoration have long been considered as a product of
three major cultural influences, namely Roman, Punic or Hellenistic (Stone 2007a, 138-139).
Under the Romanisation paradigm the ‘otherness’ of the monumental tombs was frequently
highlighted, in particular when they were judged against the high standards of Roman art
(Mattingly 2011, 248-253). The success of the Roman influence was celebrated, for instance
in the reliefs on the tombs at Ghirza. Ghirza is situated approximately 250 km south-east of
Tripoli in the eastern pre-desert on the west side of the Wadi Ghirza close to the Wadi
Zemzem. The settlement was one of the largest in the pre-desert, established in the late first
to early second century AD, though the visible structures are predominantly late Roman
farms, a few larger (perhaps communal) complexes and at least one temple (Brogan and
Smith 1957; Brogan and Smith 1984, 45-99; Smith 1985). Not far from the settlement were
two cemeteries with monumental tombs. The earliest mausolea were constructed in the
Middle Roman Period at some point during the mid-third century AD but the majority of
them date to the Late Romano-Libyan period (Brogan and Smith 1984, 121-206). There are
three tomb types evident: the first and most frequent type was the arcaded temple
mausoleum (ten in total), the second type was a peripteral temple mausoleum (one in total),
and the third type was the obelisk mausoleum (one in total). All were elaborately decorated,
with reliefs on the architrave that were highly visible to the viewer (Brogan and Smith, 1984,
121-206).
Goodchild and Ward-Perkins suggested that Ghirza was occupied by settlers from the coast, possibly Italian colonists (1949, 94-95). Brogan and Smith argued towards an indigenous elite, but believed that the chiefs were ‘Romanised’ and thus regarded themselves as Roman, especially because inscriptions from some of the monuments display Roman nomen (Brogan and Smith 1984, 223; Smith 1985, 227-235). Nevertheless, this argument underplays the evidence of Libyan cognomina represented on inscriptions. Zanker, in his article about ‘self-representation at the desert margins’, claimed that the wish to build mausolea must stem from the local elite seeing similar monuments at the Roman towns at the coast (Zanker 2008). He argued that together with the Latino-Punic inscriptions they are an indication of a ‘desire to belong’ and are, consequently, evidence of the Romanisation of the local elite (Zanker 2008, 215). However, by the time the majority of the Ghirza mausolea were built, there would have been plenty of mausolea close by which would have served as inspiration. Zanker did note that the reliefs themselves did not represent the desire to belong to the Roman Empire, but were reflecting pride and achievements of the local elite, and their belonging to a distinctive civilisation that developed at Ghirza (2008, 226).

The most comprehensive study on provincial funerary art in Tripolitania is still that of Olwen Brogan. The data extracted from her meticulous records and publications form the basis of this thesis, and her work is worth discussing in more detail. Not only did Brogan record and interpret the funerary reliefs of Ghirza together with Smith (1984), but she also published numerous articles on funerary art and funerary inscriptions found in Tripolitania during her many trips around Libya between 1950 and 1980 (see Buck and Mattingly 1985, xii-xvi; Mattingly 2004a for an extensive bibliography of Brogan’s publications). Over the course of her work, a shift is visible from understanding the mausolea and decorations as being the remains of Italian settlers to associating them with the local elites. In this sense, she was one of the pioneers in starting to question the core concept of Romanisation by considering the local elites as players in wider colonial power structures. In an article from 1954, where she examined the arrival and use of the camel in Tripolitania, she uncritically cited Goodchild and Ward-Perkins’ (1949) idea about centenaria occupied by Italian settlers (Brogan, 1954). However, a progression away from the centenaria idea is visible in her article from 1964 when Brogan analysed the ‘Roman’ remains in the Wadi el-Amud. She agreed with Levi Della Vida (1964, 57-63) that, on the basis of Libyan and Punic names on inscriptions, the ‘Roman’ farms were inhabited by ‘Romanised’ and ‘Punicised’ Libyans who built their mausolea in the pre-desert area (Brogan 1964, 54). Nonetheless, her article from 1965 on the decoration of the mausolea near Tigi still, to some extent, accepted Picard’s idea
that it was colonists originating south of the Lesser Sirtis who built those mausolea, but rejected the idea of Italian settlers having commissioned them. Instead, she linked these funerary monuments and inscriptions to ‘Romanised’ Libyan families (Brogan 1965, 55-56; Picard 1959-1960, 39). In a paper published in 1975 she explicitly focused on the Libyan alphabet and inscriptions (Brogan 1975). Throughout this article it became apparent that her emphasis was no longer on the Roman aspects, but she started to focus on the diverse local peoples, or ‘tribes’, as she called them, that lived in Tripolitania. With this viewpoint, she was ahead of many other established researchers of her time like Ward-Perkins or Goodchild. Inscriptions found at the farms or mausolea again confirmed that these people were predominantly of Libyan descent and not dependent on the Roman army (Brogan 1964; 1975; Mattingly 2004a, 6), a realisation that is valued as a ‘crucial interpretive breakthrough’ (Mattingly 2004a, 6), and which was later confirmed by the ULVS who found evidence for numerous first century AD farms (Barker 1996; Mattingly 1989, 145-146; 1996a; 2004a, 7, 16).

Through careful observation and in having an open mind to new approaches, Brogan was also one of the first scholars to notice that the evidence of settlement in the pre-desert dated from the first century AD, not much later as others assumed (Brogan 1964; Reynolds 1985, 23). This also led to a re-appraisal of the date of many tombs in the pre-desert. For instance, the tomb in the Wadi Antar, in the eastern pre-desert, could be dated to the Flavian period (between AD 70 and 96) rather than the third century AD as previously assumed. This is based on the early letter form as well as the name on the inscription: Titus Flavius Ninus. The nomenclature indicates that he probably received his citizenship during the Flavian period, rather than in the third century AD (Brogan and Reynolds 1985, 18). Furthermore, Brogan, together with Joyce Reynolds, noticed that the rough style of the carving was due to the type of stone rather than the ‘rough form of late workmanship’ (Brogan and Reynolds 1985, 15).

Brogan’s most extensive work was the monograph on Ghirza together with David Smith (Brogan and Smith 1984). She started work at Ghirza in the 1950s, rigorously cataloguing, recording and drawing evidence from the settlement and the cemeteries. Not only are the detailed recordings of the site remarkable but her interpretation of the reliefs remains inspiring since she managed to relate the iconography of the images to the social life at Ghirza (Brogan and Smith 1984, 215-226). She not only realised that the funerary reliefs

5 Contrary to Goodchild’s and Ward-Perkins (1949), who argued, on the basis of inscriptions, for a much later development in the third century AD.
represented symbolism that was shared within the wider North African and Mediterranean world, but also recognised that they represented very local aspects, which she called ‘aspects of ordinary life’ (1984, 215), as well as Punic influences in their style of carving (Brogan and Smith 1984, 227). Additionally, she observed that the Latin inscriptions on the tombs had Libyan names on them while other inscriptions were in Libyan or in Punic. She suggested that the inscriptions point towards the importance of family lineage, the rituals surrounding the tombs, and the importance of their maintenance (Brogan and Smith 1984, 262-263). Through this, she drew attention to the fact that the tombs were built by the local Libyan or Libyo-Phoenician elite. They were not merely structures for the dead but also had continuous religious significance for the living, and were adorned with symbols of power of the individual leader (Brogan and Smith 1984, 215-227; Mattingly 2004a, 8). Furthermore, she started to draw links and comparisons to other, similar tombs and imagery in Tripolitania such as those from the oasis town of Ghadames (Brogan and Smith 1984, 207-208; 264).

Overall, Brogan’s work contributed much to our knowledge of wider tendencies of Tripolitanian and North African provincial art, but still lacked a more nuanced and contextualised approach to specific sites or regions.

After Brogan’s work on the mausolea, the already limited scholarly interest in the mausolea started to dwindle. The work by the UNESCO Libyan Valleys Survey (ULVS hereafter) sparked a renewed interest in the Roman period of Tripolitania, especially on the economic aspects of the region. The ULVS-team recorded a significant number of sites in the pre-desert area, including over 70 mausolea or mausoleum-like tombs, but no full analysis of their architecture or decoration had been undertaken (Barker 1996; Mattingly 1996a).

Based on Brogan and Smith’s extensive study (1984) in the last two decades several scholars have revisited the mausolea at Ghirza offering more nuanced interpretations. Fontana’s work on the pre-desert mausolea marks a departure away from the Romano-centric view, and he started to bring the mortuary monuments back into research focus (Fontana 1997). He noticed a change in the mode of self-representation during the third century AD, from portraiture to interactive scenes that showed individuals exercising power over others. He concentrated in particular on the messages that were displayed, and he argued that there was a change in how elites represented themselves on the mausolea during the third century AD.

Mattingly’s work on the monumental cemeteries at Ghirza demonstrated how Roman imperial art could provide an image pool that was manipulated to represent indigenous traditions and values to support the legality of Roman power within local society.
Zanker drew attention to the sometimes intricate details on the reliefs at Ghirza, such as height or dress, to convey complex messages of status and accomplishment, primarily aimed at the local viewer (Zanker 2008). Subtle differences in dress and hairstyle on portraiture at Ghirza were explored in detail by Audley-Miller (2010; 2012).

The studies by Brogan, Fontana, Mattingly, Zanker, and Audley-Miller show how we can get insights on local traditions, religion, power structures and social values when we look at the funerary iconography. Mattingly’s work demonstrates the importance of moving beyond Romanisation by illustrating how Roman imperial art could provide an image pool to support the legality of power within local society, but also how this was used to represent indigenous traditions and values (Mattingly 2011, 268). However, these studies only touch on how the monuments with their vivid iconography fit into wider social and cultural patterns within Tripolitania and North Africa. The primary focus is on the site of Ghirza, which provides a rather limited view of cultural variations and preferences. The only other mausoleum decorated with sculptures that has been studied in more detail is at El-Amrouni in the western Gebel of Tripolitania (Ferchiou 1989), which has led some scholars to the assumption that mausolea in North Africa ‘rarely carry figurative architectural decoration’, with the exception of Ghirza and el-Amrouni (Baratte and Chaisemartin 2015, 517). Despite a shift in the perception of the provincial funerary art of Tripolitania, studies on the figural sculptures are still few and far between. This thesis will start to fill this gap in research.

A further problem presented within North African studies of the Roman period is that, until recently, much of the research has heavily relied on textual sources, such as private or official inscriptions, and much of our knowledge of the history of Roman North Africa is based on them (Hitchner 1994, 124). In the 1980s, Shaw criticised the preference for epigraphy over other archaeological evidence to reconstruct the history of the area. This preference led to an ‘imbalance in North African studies that would be hard to match in any other region of the Empire’ (Shaw 1980, 32-34). In urban centres such as Lepcis Magna the archaeological remains of Roman date have been prioritised for excavation and conservation (Mattingly and Hitchner 1995, 6) and there is a distinct lack of archaeological research in the countryside (Shaw 1980, 32-34). In recent years, archaeological research has advanced through surveys such as the UNESCO Libyan Valleys Survey in Tripolitania (Barker 1996; Mattingly 1996a), the Roma Tre survey around the countryside of Lepcis Magna (Munzi et al. 2004; 2005; 2010a; 2010b; 2016; Musso 2010), and the Tarhuna Archaeological Survey (Ahmed 2010). These have contributed much to our understanding of North African history and society, as well as the changing landscape and agricultural patterns.
1.4.3 The Study of Provincial Art

Provincial funerary art has received increased attention in recent years, with a noticeable shift away from a Romano-centric understanding of provincial art as a mere process of emulation into a hierarchical and progressive structure for cultural change (Mattingly 1997a, 17). However, there is a need for more research on provincial art in Tripolitania and, indeed, North Africa in general. A few recent studies have moved away from mainly being concerned with style, to focus on the regional cultural aspects that are reflected (see for instance Moore (2000) on the La Ghofra stelae and Wurnig (2006) on funerary and Saturn stelae of Africa Proconsularis).

In the past, Roman provincial art has frequently been perceived as degenerate or lacking in taste (Scott 2003, 1; Stewart 2010, 3). It was long argued that the art that was produced by the local peoples in the provinces was a (poor) attempt to imitate the art of Rome, especially when measured against classical art parameters (Scott 2003, 1). There was the general idea of ‘high-quality’ Mediterranean art while provincial art was a mere lower quality copy for people who attempted to be Roman in the deep hinterlands of the Empire. Classical art still highly influences the perception of some scholars, leading to a vocabulary of ‘lack and failure’ (Kampen 2014, 403). For instance, Zanker perceives the lack of likeness in some funerary portraits from the Empire as a mere failure in the artist’s ability. He describes some northern Italian funerary portraits as ‘formulaic and very badly executed faces, which reveal that the craftsman intended to create a portrait but failed dismally’ (Zanker 2010, 170). It is, of course, unquestionable that the skill and experience of the craftsman played a big part in the way the works are executed (see especially Johns 2003a and 2003b). Some of the decorations of Tripolitanian mausolea were undoubtedly carved by unskilled people as, for instance, the relief of a camel from the Wadi Mizda (Figure 1.2). Yet, it was deemed appropriate to adorn a mausoleum. What much of this provincial art reflects are local preferences and styles rather than simple attempts to emulate Graeco-Roman art (Stewart 2008, 160).

Studies of the provincial art of Roman-period Britain further changed the idea of superior Roman art versus the mere (failed) attempts of uncritical copying in the effort to become more Roman. Research and interpretation developed from understanding Roman provincial art as a form of ‘poor’ and ‘underdeveloped’ art to an agent that carried and expressed meanings, traditions, religions, identity, and negotiated power relations. As a result, it shows that the study of provincial art can tell us much about the complex cultural
relationships, regional preferences or traditions, and preferred ways of self- and group representation in the Roman provinces. In particular, Martin Millett’s *Romanization of Britain* (1990) marked a shift in approach. He drew attention to the potential of ‘Romanised’ artistic expressions that had enabled the indigenous population to express power and status. At the same time, he stressed the importance of the ‘native’ contributions to Romanisation. However, he still argued that the lack in quality of art was a response to the lack of demand by the patrons (Millett 1990, 117). One of the most detailed studies has been undertaken by Martin Henig, who highlighted the distinctive and innovative features of Romano-British art. Nevertheless, his focus was still primarily directed at establishing a certain style or aesthetical and technical merit (Henig 1995; for criticism see Scott 2003, 5; 2006, 634). Although Henig has moved from denigration of provincial art to rehabilitation, he still places great emphasis on the ‘Roman’ aspects. Aldhouse-Green rejected the notion of the existence of ‘bad art’ and instead argued that some provincial art deliberately rejected Graeco-Roman conventions to ‘make statements concerning resistance, independence and an assertion of cultural identity involving both cosmological perceptions and ideologies associated with not being Roman’ (2003, 47). This, of course, places the argument at the other end of the spectrum and denies to the creators, commissioners and audiences of provincial art the possibility of a complex negotiation between local and Roman influences. More recent studies are moving away from one-sided views of either ‘wanting to be Roman’ or ‘resistance’ and are focusing on the complex negotiation that took place when provincial art was selected, produced and viewed, and how symbols of other cultures were used to say something about their own culture (see, for instance, Audley-Miller 2010; Mattingly 2011).

1.5 Theoretical Approaches

As demonstrated above, over the last two decades the study of provincial art has moved away from solely judging objects on their artistic merit. Similarly, there has been an apparent shift in focus away from the Romano-centric viewpoint to studying provincial art in its own right within its regional context. Within the study of archaeology new, multidisciplinary approaches include theoretical concepts from other social sciences, such as sociology, social psychology, anthropology, and art history. In particular, I shall discuss the study of identity which has recently become very popular but has also been fiercely criticised as not being a suitable analytical tool (see below). This section will give an overview of theoretical
approaches relevant to this thesis, and how the study of identity, combined with other methods can be a useful tool to explore the expressive funerary iconography of Tripolitania.

Traditionally, art history is predominantly concerned with aesthetics and aesthetic value as well as authenticity, creativity and connoisseurship (Haskell 1993; Tanner 2003), particularly in the development of western art as opposed to non-western, indigenous art traditions (Rampley 2005, 525). The concept of analysis of art in terms of aesthetics as we understand it today evolved in Europe during the Renaissance period (Shiner 2001, 3). New approaches in art history are more concerned with the social history of art, encompassing aspects such as cultural identity, power, social status and gender, the making of art, and the reception of it by the viewer. These approaches appeal to classical archaeologists as well as historians (Stewart 2008, 6).

Anthropological studies show how the Western idea of art and aesthetics does not apply to non-western societies. The art object is not seen as a separate entity, but encompasses actions and experiences and is set within a cultural system that incorporates activities surrounding the object, such as dance, eating, festivals, trade and ritual (Harrington 2004, 26). Since the idea of aesthetics today is very much a western one, it appears that the imagery of non-western societies is instead deeply embedded in wider political, social and religious values (Rampley 2005, 526).

The sociology of art is concerned with the context of the art object, the characteristic social structure of the period under study, and the objects’ functional contribution. The discipline is interested in the different social groups that form and the social fabric in which the object is created and used (Mannheim 1982, 89; Tanner 2003, 14). In sociology, material preconditions, cultural diversity of discourse, and historical flux are key themes (Harrington 2004, 31). Especially interesting is the work developed by Arthur Danto (1964) and George Dickie (1974). They argue that what distinguishes ‘art’ from ‘non-art’ is not the quality or what can be observed with the naked eye, but the status certain social institutions have given to it. This refers especially to modern art, and the institution of the ‘art world’.

Sociological and anthropological approaches are intriguing for the study of provincial art, which often lie on the periphery and do not model themselves on the ideals of classical canons and aesthetics. However, sociology is concerned with very recent issues of larger groupings with particularly institutionalised characters (Tanner 2003, 2), while anthropology is more concerned with ‘the immediate context of social interaction’ (Gell 1998, 8). While it is hazardous to apply approaches firmly set within contemporary society to the past, they do highlight that objects carry meaning that is socially and culturally constituted and set in a
network of many actors. At the same time, the object is influenced by the historical discourse, power relations, and political settings. These studies also show that meaning is not static but can change over time or according to the audience and their socio-cultural reality.

1.5.1 Agency and Social Identity

The venture into the fields of anthropology and sociology by archaeologists and art historians has offered new ways of thinking about the past. The concept of ‘agency’, which became popular within archaeology in the last decades of the twentieth century, drew attention to the fact that people ‘played a role in the formation of the social realities in which they participated’ instead of passively reacting to changes that happened around them (Barfield 1997, 4). However, it is important to stress that people are never entirely free agents. They are constituted through their relationship to others, their social and cultural constraints (Brück 2001, 655; Gardener 2004). Antony Giddens’ structural theory explored how social identity was negotiated through material culture and agency. Giddens understood agency as the ability of people to act in more than one way while forms of constraint could also enable a person to ‘enact agency’ (Giddens 1984, 9, 15, 173). His structural theory is interesting since he realised the importance of time and space and understood the structures within society as an ongoing process. The ‘duality of structure’ is central to his approach, where he placed mutual importance on constitutive relationships between human agency and social structure in the centre of social life (Gardner 2002, 326).

However, Giddens does not place much emphasis on the different facets of identity that influence a person or a group, although he ‘positions’ the social actors within the network according to their identity. Yet, identity is important within this structural framework, since it is ‘providing a necessary mediation element within the duality of structure’ (Gardener 2002, 326). Gardner argues that ‘identity is the connection between the interaction and the institutional dimension of social life’; therefore, agency and identity cannot be seen as separate (2002, 346). But, just like agency, identity can be incredibly vague, and is born out of the field of modern western social sciences.

The study of identity in archaeology and art history (and indeed across the social sciences) is not a new one, but has been rather popular over the last 20 years (Meskell 1999; Laurence and Berry 1998). The rise of identity studies marks a shift within the study of Roman archaeology and, in particular, away from the concept of Romanisation. It rose out
of the general dissatisfaction with the Romanisation idea which was questioned and, to some extent, discredited from the mid-1990s onward (Barrett 1997; Hingley 1996, Mattingly 1996b). Identity was seen as a valid alternative concept because it does not distinguish between elites and non-elites (both display forms of identity), and it provided a more flexible and fresh approach to study social dynamics across the complex social hierarchies, which were far from rigid and ‘set in stone’ as the concept of Romanisation led us to believe, allowing for the study of the ‘interactive, heterogeneous and dynamic nature through which the “we” is constructed by opposition to a significant “they”’ (Gosselain 2000, 188; see also Hill 2001; Mattingly 2004b; 2006; Webster 2001). The study of identity really gained momentum during the first decade of the twenty-first century, especially within the subject of Roman Archaeology (Mattingly 2011, 208-209; 2014, 42). However, concerns have been raised about the validity of the concept as an analytical category, not only within archaeology but also within the social sciences (see for instance Bell 2008, 20-24; Brubaker and Cooper 2000; Cooper with Brubacker 2005; Hölscher 2008, 52-54; Pitts 2007). One of the biggest problems with the concept is that it is used uncritically. Identity has become a buzz-word, with the current trend being that many use the term, but fail to define how they understand and use it, which largely strips it of any analytical value (Bell 2008, 21).

When used uncritically, identity ‘tends to mean too much (when understood in a strong sense), too little (when understood in a weak sense), or nothing at all (because of its sheer ambiguity)’ (Brubaker and Cooper 2000, 1). Further concern has been raised about identity being a very recent concept that is peculiar to western society and, according to Cooper (Cooper with Burbacker 2005, 81), ‘does not travel well’, particularly into the ancient past (Bell 2008, 23), and should not be used as a neutral cross-cultural tool (Hander 1994, 27). Since identity is a relatively modern concept, Hölscher questions if people and communities in the past were wondering about who they were in the same way as we do today (2008, 53). In contrast to the social sciences which deal with current applications of identity, for archaeological materials, we cannot get any sense of the ‘inner troubles’, and we are unable to get down to the complex layers of ‘individual identity’ with the material we have left. Ultimately, the value of identity studies does not lie in the pursuit of trying to analyse the person’s individual identity, but it lies in the concept of social identity and group identification.

Essentially, identity is a social construct, in which we recognise, categorise and define ourselves, but also the people around us (Jenkins 2008, 17, 29). Social identity is ‘part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from a person’s knowledge of his membership of a
social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership' (Tjafel 1978, 63). Broadly speaking, identity is always formed against the background of other people through social interaction, such as the ‘us’ and ‘them’, but this rigid division tends to over-simplify the complex construction of social identity, imply that identities are fixed, and invite the application of stereotypes (Wearing 2011, ix), such as Rome versus the provincial other. Sen (2004) draws particular attention to the multiplicity and contrasting aspects of identities. He raises awareness that the illusion of a single fixed identity, whether it is religious or ethnic, has generated much violence in modern day society. If we emphasise singular identities, we are, as a result, ignoring the many other ways in which people see and perceive themselves such as through politics, class, profession or morals. By categorising a large number of people into one group, whether it be for instance territorial or religious, other sub-groupings stay hidden under this broader categorisation (Sen 2004, 1-23). The further importance of his work lies in the realisation that these multiple identities may be not only conforming but also contrasting. Therefore, giving priority to one identity does not imply having to reject another. However, during conflict, a person has to decide on the relative importance of the particular decision that has to be made: one will have to make a choice (Sen 2004, 28). But choosing our own identity can be considerably restricted and constrained particularly by aggressors or outsiders (Sen 2004, 29-32). Thus, ‘the other’ plays a significant role in the formation of modern identities, arguing that society is constituted through the actions and practices of people. This, in turn, is largely governed by the social expectations of others. Additionally, it is also of importance how identity, whether group or individual, is perceived by outsiders and how we ‘lump’ those groups together. As Gardner (2004) and Pitts (2007) stress, issues of identity need to be broken down into specific factors, such as language, class, social group, profession, religion, and ethnicity, while also considering the local and communal aspects of identity. Additionally, at the other end of the scale, the viewpoint of the state (Rome), which seeks domination and control, also needs to be considered (Mattingly 2009, 285).

Mattingly’s work on ‘discrepant identities’ in the provinces, especially Britain and North Africa, draws on Sen’s work by recognising that the construction of identity and ethnicity is frequently represented by a ‘compression of multiple possibilities for defining identities into a singular and potentially misleading focus’. He understands ‘identity’ as being ‘integrally bound up with power in society. As such, the creation of provincial identities cannot have taken place in a vacuum, isolated from the power negotiations between the Roman Empire and its subject peoples. What is often lacking is consideration of how these
power dynamics operated, both top down and bottom up (Mattingly 2004b, 6-7; 2011; 2014). Furthermore, he argues that a crucial point about the relations between Rome and its subject people was that there was scope for a significant mismatch between the self-image of ethnic identity generated within indigenous communities, and the imposed ethnic stereotypes of an imperial power, the latter often explicitly proto-racist (2011, 215). He proposes a number of factors and aspects that predominantly influenced group and individual identity in the Roman world that were emphasised differently according to discrete social situations and different phases of life: status (incorporating the ancient sense of class); wealth (above and below subsistence, linked to market economy etc.); location (urban, rural, military/civil zone, transient); employment (possession of craft skill, membership of guild, army); religion; linkage by service or profession to imperial government (or not); language and literacy; gender; age; and origin. He stresses that these different aspects of identity were emphasised in various phases of life and in distinct social situations (Mattingly 2011, 217).

Catherine Johns’ work on ‘taste in style’ in Romano-British art provides an excellent example of how to define the different actors in the network. She investigates the relationship between the indigenous population and the ‘incomers’ from other parts of the empire, such as military or civilian. She stresses that a more sophisticated approach is needed to analyse the influence of style by outsiders. She argues that if we ignore the factors that operated at the time of the creation of the object we ignore their influence; we will not understand the intention or motivation behind the art object (Figure 1.4; Johns 2003b, 31). However, her research is asking slightly different questions to those in this study, being more concerned with the skill of the artist and the ‘style’ that was being adopted. Johns’ work is nevertheless relevant to this study since she looks in detail at the interrelationships that influenced the final appearance of the ‘artwork’. My research is looking at people(s), their agency, and aspects of social identity in more detail and from different levels (outlined below). By expanding on her idea of various interactions and influences in the production of art, different levels of networks and identities can be incorporated in one flexible theoretical and methodological framework.

My work on the mausolea of Roman-period Tripolitania will study these monuments and their iconography within their wider North African and Roman context and their regional socio-cultural setting, while also taking into account their architecture and inscriptions. Through this, I will be able to explore the subtle nuances and differences in how the local elite has chosen to represent themselves and their families through their prestigious funerary monuments. Furthermore, I will explore the impact different actors had
on the iconography, including the commissioner himself, the deceased (who was not always the commissioner), the family group, the viewer consisting of the local community with its distinct traditions, and the workmen who built the monument. Choices and decisions were further influenced by external factors such as the regions’ historical development, the geographic location or the availability of resources. In turn, I will also investigate the impact the monument (and its monumentality) had on the viewer.

Figure 1.4: Interrelationship of influences on ancient sculpture (Johns 2003b, 32, Figure 6).

By exploring the mausolea from different perspectives, we can go beyond viewing the reliefs as an expression of either ‘aspiring Romanness’ or ‘native’ resistance. As outlined above, to meaningfully study aspects of identity we need to investigate in more detail the expressions of identities such as status, dress, or gender within their regional setting. Through this, we can start to see how the stone carved decorations reflect the social transformation that took place after the Roman conquest of Tripolitania in an area where figural art was not previously prominent. When the iconography was chosen to be permanently displayed, imagery was selected that was deemed appropriate to reflect both the self and the cultural values of the surrounding social group, the viewers. The patron, creator or viewer of the iconography can only ‘interrogate’ the image on the grounds of their own past experiences, knowledge, and social, cultural and historical background. This is why it is important to study the iconography within its local context, to be able to carve out the subtle nuances in self- and group representation that may be displayed in the different regions of Tripolitania. New
nuanced regional art-forms and iconographies developed by borrowing from pre-Roman, Punic and Libyan art, as well as Roman iconography. These were manipulated by the local elite with the help of the craftsmen in order to express the elite’s own ideas of what they deemed appropriate to display on their tombs to the surrounding community. This, ultimately, led to the development of a new art-style and funerary iconography across the region (see for instance Hunter 2008 for the development of new art ‘styles’ in Britain).

1.6 Summary

Funerary reliefs in Tripolitania were used as a visual aid by people who wanted to express their regional socio-cultural values and underline their elite identity as well as to assert or re-assert their power in the different regions of Tripolitania over local resources and communities. The work by Fontana, Brogan, Ferchiou, Mattingly, Zanker, and Audley-Miller demonstrates this for specific sites or monuments. It exemplifies how Libyan and Punic ancestral traditions, as well as Roman and Hellenistic artistic styles, were manipulated to suit local needs. However, previous studies that have been undertaken on Tripolitanian funerary iconography all lack the comparative understanding of how the iconography at individual sites was placed within the regional and wider context. As such, differences or similarities in traditions, religions and power relations cannot be detected.

This thesis will fill this gap by contextualising the iconography within its socio-cultural environment. Consequently, this research will improve our understanding of Tripolitanian provincial (elite) funerary art and the expression of individual, group and social identity. By exploring similarities and differences in aspects such as local dress, particular themes in depictions, traditions, and religion, we can learn more about the nature of the different societies that occupied Tripolitania during the Roman period, and how they compared to the rest of North Africa the and Roman Empire at large. It will explore the divergence from external norms and styles to enhance our understanding of how local peoples used foreign symbols that enabled them to express aspects of their own culture. Furthermore, by systematically considering levels of discrepant identities and the networks they operated in, this project can help us to gain a better understanding of the social, cultural, and political relationships between the different regions and peoples. I shall explore the sometimes subtle diversities of local (sub-) groups which are inevitably glossed over when we only look at broader cultural or ethnic identities or only focus on one individual site or
monument. The next chapter will investigate in more detail the geographical, social, and historical environment in which the mausolea were created, factors which shaped and influenced the iconography chosen to represent self- and group identity.
CHAPTER 2
GEOGRAPHICAL, SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

1.7 Introduction

This chapter will place the mausolea within their broader geographical, historical, and social context. First, I will give a short overview of the distinct geographical zones that form the extent of the study area (see also Appendix 1.1). Next, I will give a broad outline of the population of ancient Tripolitania to highlight the diversity of peoples that lived in the different geographical regions. In the last section of this chapter, I will provide a historical outline of the pre-Roman and Roman period on the basis of the major written sources as well as through archaeological evidence. Rather than drawing up a comprehensive and detailed history of Tripolitania, the primary focus will be on key events that will help in the investigation of the purpose and meaning of the iconography within its historical setting. I will briefly outline the history of Tripolitania before its integration into the Roman Empire to shed light on the existence of strong pre-Roman cultures and traditions. I will then move on to discuss the historical developments relevant to this study, from the incorporation into the Roman Empire in the late first century BC to the Vandal conquest in the early fourth century AD. Chapter 3 will then highlight in more detail the distribution, architecture, and chronology of the mausolea in Tripolitania.

1.8 The Geographical Background

Tripolitania is situated in north-west Libya. The modern borders extend from the centre of the Syritic gulf in the east, Fazzan to the south, and Tunisia to the west; the Mediterranean Sea forms a natural boundary to the north. During the Roman period, the borders extended further to the west and east, reaching beyond the modern-day border between Libya and Tunisia, as far as Gabes (Tacapae) and towards the east to Ras el-Aâli (Arae Philaenorum) (Figure 2.1; Mattingly 1995, 5).
Tripolitania’s geographical make-up differs noticeably from its eastern and western neighbours Cyrenaica and Tunisia (Haynes 1959, 13; Mattingly 1995, 1; 2000, 529). The landscape and climate are much more substantially Saharan with only a thin strip of coastline that is similar to the Mediterranean climate, while the pre-desert and desert zones reach very close to the coast (Mattingly 1995, 1-6). In contrast, Cyrenaica to the east has a much more Mediterranean climate, with lush mountains (the so-called ‘Green Mountains’) running along the coastline sporting the highest diversity of faunal species and the richest vegetation in Libya (Hegazy et al. 2011, 1898). Tunisia to the west benefits from fertile plains that reach deep into the hinterland.

Tripolitania essentially consists of six diverse geographical zones: (1) the immediate coastal zone; (2) the Gefara plain; (3) the fertile mountainous Gebel zone; (4) the much drier pre-desert zone (5) the Sirte basin, with a more fertile coastal area and a pre-desert steppe interior; (6) the desert zone, with its big sand seas and oasis centres (Appendix 1.1 provides a more detailed a summary of each of these zones).

These diverse landscapes required different strategies for people to be able to adapt to the varying environmental and geographical conditions and to succeed with agricultural production. Furthermore, the various regions had slightly different histories in their development of settlement and habitation that led to a vast diversity of cultural expressions.
1.9 The Social Background

It is important to stress from the outset that, in contrast to neighbouring Tunisia, Tripolitania did not have a big influx of Roman colonists. In fact, it appears that immigrants from the Italian peninsula formed a rather marginal group (Birley 1988, 3-5; Mattingly 1995). Therefore, the land was settled, cultivated, and developed mainly by people who were coming out from the coastal cities that had a mixed Libyan and Punic population, or by Libyan people that may have already lived in those areas previously.

The numerous indigenous groupings that lived in Tripolitania (and across North Africa) are notoriously difficult to define. Ancient sources already struggled to make sense of the complex social organisation (see Mattingly 1995, Table 2.3 for a useful listing of all relevant ancient sources). Pliny claimed that there were 516 populi in North Africa, excluding Cyrenaica and Mauretania (although he only named 25; *Natural History*, 5.24ff). Other ancient sources such as Scylax (*Periplus*, 108-110), Herodotus (*The Histories*, 4.174), and Ptolemy (*the Geography*, 4.36, 4.66, also provide information about names and locations of peoples (Mattingly 1995, 19). There are, however, significant problems when drawing on these sources for information. First and foremost, they were not written by the local peoples, but by ‘outsiders’. Unfortunately, no written accounts produced by local people exist that talk about life in the different groupings. Furthermore, in many instances we do not know if the information provided by the ancient authors was generated by themselves or taken from some earlier source, not to mention the vastly different time periods in which these sources were written. Over time communities moved around and new groupings appeared while others disappeared (Mattingly 1995, 18). Thus, mapping the different peoples according to the ancient sources is inherently difficult (see Desanges 1962 for an attempt).

Unfortunately, the data is not fine-grained enough to make close associations between all the different areas and the Libyan population groupings that are mentioned in the ancient sources. However, in some regions, we can be confident about what broader groupings might have lived there. For instance, some larger confederations can be identified that were formed of smaller individual groupings during the Roman period: the Gaetuli, the Macae, the Phazanii, the Nasamones, and the Garamantes. Very broadly speaking, it appears that the Gaetuli were used as a blanket reference by ancient authors for the lesser groupings that lived in the marginal areas of the pre-desert (Mattingly 1995, 30). The Macae are frequently mentioned in the ancient sources and appear to have consisted of many sub-groupings probably covering the areas at the coast, the Gebel and parts of the pre-desert.
The Phazanii are associated with the interior of Tripolitania, around the area of Ghadames (notably, not Fazzan despite the similarity of the name; Mattingly and Sterry 2010). The Nasamones can be associated with the greater Sirtes, and the Garamantes had their heartlands in the Fazzan (Mattingly 1995, 30-41; 2003). It appears, however, that these confederations only had a single leader during wartime (Mattingly 1983, 97). Smaller sub-groupings existed that seem to have been more autonomous, and it appears that Rome established treaties with them (Mattingly 1983, 97-98).

1.10 Historical Background

1.10.1 Tripolitania before Rome

In the middle of the first half of the first millennium BC, the Phoenicians started to establish trading posts, so-called *emporia*, along the coast of North Africa. They originated from the East, approximately from the region that today is Lebanon (Aubet 1993, 6) and were strongly involved in Mediterranean trade. Carthage was founded as a Phoenician colony perhaps as early as the ninth century BC, as radiocarbon dates of burned bone fragments suggest (Hoyos 2010, 7). Firmer evidence is provided by the remains of houses that date to the early to mid-eighth century (Docter et al. 2007, 59-67), as well as three large necropoli from the eighth to the sixth centuries BC (Aubet 1993, 190-196). Carthage had a strong relationship with the mother city of Tyre (Bonnet 2014, 289) and quickly developed into a colonial city of high status and influence. It grew in wealth and strength to become one of the major cities within the Phoenician trading network and gradually expanded its power and trading network over the western Mediterranean (Aubet 1993, 187). During this process, Carthage developed its own administrative and political structures that differed from the Phoenician institution of kingship. These included a system of magistrates (*suffetes*) drawn from the elite but elected by the citizen body. It appears that the elite system was not strictly limited by birthright, but was also determined by personal wealth and competence (Hoyos 2010, 20).

The development of the three Tripolitanian *emporia* is closely linked to Phoenician expansion and the rise of Carthage. The archaeological evidence for the earliest periods of the *emporia* is very scanty. Lepcis Magna can be tentatively dated to the mid to late seventh century BC, Sabratha to the end of the sixth century BC, and Oea to the fifth century BC (Mattingly 1995, 50). The three *emporia* were probably established as Carthaginian colonies.
as a result of Greek advances in and beyond Cyrenaica, instead of being Phoenician foundations (Mattingly 1995, 50), though the evidence for this is not very clear. They developed into relatively independent towns that controlled their own hinterland and administered their own laws and institutions (Dossey 2010, 12, 41). However, they remained under Carthaginian control and paid tribute to them until the defeat of Carthage by Scipio Africanus in 201 BC at the end of the second Punic War. Epigraphic evidence from Lepcis Magna from the Roman period suggests that the system of magistrates (suffetes) was also employed in the Tripolitanian emporia. The nomenclature on inscriptions indicates that intermarriages between the local population and new settlers led to a mixed population at the coast, which was strongly influenced by Punic and indigenous culture (Mattingly 1995).

From 246 to 146 BC Rome fought three fierce wars with Carthage over dominance in the western Mediterranean that ultimately led to the fall and destruction of Carthage in 146 BC and the establishment of the new Roman province Africa Vetus. For a period after 146 BC Tripolitania was subject to the Numidian rulers, having to pay tribute to them instead of Carthage. The destruction of Carthage as the major commercial rival of Tripolitania must have had a significant impact on the increasing wealth of the Tripolitanian cities (Mattingly 1995, 51). It appears that Tripolitania remained relatively independent under Numidian rule, and that it favoured relations with Rome, which is suggested by Lepcis Magna’s alliance with Rome to gain protection during the Jugurtha war from 112 to 105 BC (Mattingly 1995, 51). The first tower mausolea were built during the Numidian period, but no inscriptions survive that may give us an idea about their dedicators. Mausolea A and B at Sabratha were not strictly speaking mausolea since no burial was associated with them (Di Vita 2004, 220). The Jerba mausoleum, however, was a true burial monument, probably also of the obelisk type (Ferchiou 2009, 113-122). All three monuments fit well into what is broadly classed as ‘royal’ Numidian burial architecture (see Appendix 2.3.1); the decoration of the mausoleum at Sabratha is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

The influence of Punic culture in the Tripolitanian hinterland is much less clear. Some settlement and farming did exist in the Gebel and pre-desert region before the Roman period but on a much smaller scale. The Numidian kingdom was fostering agriculture much further to the west, and it may well be possible that farming was encouraged in the pre-desert regions to the east (Brogan 1977, 125). Carthaginian coins were found in the Wadi Sofeggin (Di Vita 1966, 80), and the number of early neo-Punic inscriptions recorded suggests an
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6 See IPT31 for a late second or early first century BC dedication from Lepcis Magna.
occupation of this area from at least the Augustan period, if not earlier (Brogan 1977, 125). Some of the hilltop settlements recorded by the ULVS could be of pre-Roman date as some diagnostic pottery suggests, comparable to the settlement of Zinkekra in Fazzan (Mattingly and Dore 1996, 117-118). However, ‘the Punic contribution to the pre-desert landscape (still) remains a mystery’ (Barker and Jones 1982, 6). Agricultural exploitation in the hinterland of Lepcis Magna and the Gebel region is evident from the late Punic and early Numidian periods (second to first centuries BC) when farms become more numerous (Ahmad 2010; Fontana et al. 1996; Mattingly 1995; Munzi et al. 2004; Oates 1953; 1954).

1.10.2 The Roman Period

From the historical records, we have little information about the expansion of Roman Africa in the Early Imperial period (Mackensen 2006, 62). The Numidian kingdom was annexed by Caesar after his victory at the battle of Thapsus in 46 BC and the new province of Africa Nova was founded. Tripolitania was incorporated into the Roman Empire at some point after 46 BC as part of Africa Nova. The Numidian kingdom supported Pompey’s forces during the civil war and was thus punished by Caesar after his victory. This led to Lepcis Magna’s fine of three million pounds of olive oil yearly (De Bello Africo 97.3), a fine which could have only been paid off if the hinterland and the Gebel were already farmed intensively (Ahmad 2010, 25; Mattingly 1988; Mattingly 1995). Lepcis Magna briefly lost its former allied status and was devoted to the status of tributary city (civitas stipendaria). At around 27 BC, the two provinces of Africa Nova and Africa Vetus were united as Africa Proconsularis.

It seems that the Tripolitanian emporia maintained some of their previous independence into the first century AD due to their remote location, as well as to the similarities of Punic government and Roman government (Mattingly 1995, 51, 57). From the beginning of Roman rule, inscriptions from Lepcis Magna suggest a continuity of power structures within the city: Punic magistracies continued to be held, dedications bore Punic names (suffetes) instead of imperial title, and inscriptions were written in neo-Punic as well as in Latin (Mattingly 1995; Wilson 2012, 313). Latin as the official language in Tripolitania was only really established after the Caesarean and Augustan colonisation, and Punic remained the primary spoken language during the Roman occupation. Throughout most of the first century AD the inscriptions were mainly in Punic, with Latin nomenclature and language appearing much later in the cemeteries than on public inscriptions (Figure 2.2; Fontana 2001,
The use of neo-Punic on public buildings is more prominent in the region of Tripolitania, whereas elsewhere it is mainly associated with funerary or votive contexts (Wilson 2012, 269).

Figure 2.2: The use of Latin and Punic in different contexts at Lepcis Magna (Fontana 2001, 171 Figure 14.6).

The bilingual building inscriptions of Lepcis Magna, most famously those of Annobal Taparius Rufus in the macellum (IPT 21 inside the macellum and IRT2009, 319 on the outside wall of the macellum) and the theatre (IRT2009, 321 and IPT 24a) from the late first century BC/beginning of the first century AD show the complex negotiation of elite identities between indigenous traditions and newly establishing aspects of Roman traditions. The neo-Punic inscription from the macellum displays an interesting treatment of the Latin titulature, using comparable Libyan and Punic terms to avoid Latin borrowings (Adams 2003, 222; Wilson 2012, 276) while the Latin inscription renders Annobal’s name in the tria nomina format (Wilson 2012, 278). The neo-Punic inscription of the theatre does not mention the imperial titles at all, but they are laid out in the Latin counterpart (Wilson 2012, 275-278).

The Latin and Punic inscriptions essentially both had the same message but were tailored to different audiences. Latin titulature appears to have been of less interest (or did not mean much) to the local reader of the Punic script (Wilson 2012, 280). Public inscriptions in the cities of the coast, however, ceased to be written in the Punic language at
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7 For a discussion of local elites who adopted Latin elements in their names see Birley 1988.
the beginning of the second century AD (Kerr 2010, 7). In contrast, funerary inscriptions placed on urns inside burial structures were executed in neo-Punic until the mid-second century AD. Punic and Libyan names still appear as part of internal and external inscriptions at the coast until at least the third century AD, although the Latin nomenclature became more and more dominant over time (Fontana 2001).

The integration of Tripolitania into the Roman Empire brought with it a period of unrest. Rome had to deal with several revolts involving confederations of indigenous peoples. The most well-known account of this period is by Pliny, who tells us about the campaign of Balbus against the Phazanii and Garamantes (Pliny *Natural History*, 5.35-37, *CIL* 2.50) which was celebrated in a triumph *ex Africa* in 19 BC (see Merrills 2016). Both Dio (55.28.1-4) and Velleius Paterculus (2.16) mention a major revolt that took place in AD 3-6, in which some Tripolitanian peoples were, most likely, involved; this is suggested by a celebratory inscription put up at Lepcis Magna stating ‘the province of Africa was freed from the war with the Gaetuli. The city of Lepcis (set this up)’ (Mattingly 1996b, *IRT*2009, 301, translated by Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952).

The revolt of the Tacfarinas led to the posting of the IX Hispana legion from Pannonia to Lepcis Magna in AD 22. Part of this war seems to have been fought in Tripolitania (Mattingly 1995, 52; 1996c, 320). In AD 69, Lepcis Magna and Oea fought a war over territory in the Gebel. The Garamantes from Fazzan came to help following a request of the citizens of Oea. This siege of Lepcis Magna provoked the Romans to launch a series of campaigns into the Garamantian heartland, which finally resulted in a diplomatic solution. In AD 70, political relations were established with the Garamantes (Grahame 1998, 96). The last major revolt by the Nasamones in AD 85-86 was probably sparked by land delimitation for tax assessment, suggested by a boundary stone from the adjacent Macae territory (Mattingly 1996c, 321, for inscription on the boundary stone see Appendix 1.2.1).

Despite periods of unrest in the early imperial period, there was a boom of settlement development, especially at the coast. A survey of the area around the villa of Silin at the coast recorded 47 new sites alone from the first century, including lavish villas and farms (Munzi *et al.* 2004, 21). Not all of the coastal villas were purely for leisure as some are associated with large agricultural estates with several oil presses (for instance near Silin, Munzi *et al.* 2004; also previously suggested by Mattingly 1995, 141). Surveys conducted in the hinterland of Lepcis Magna (Fontana *et al.* 1996) and the Gebel (Ahmad 2010) show similar trends, with an explosion of settlements from the first century onwards.
Agricultural activity in the hinterland of Lepcis Magna increased in the second century BC (four rural villas and five farms). The number of farms rose rapidly during the first century AD, and by the first half of the second century, evidence for 15 villas and 26 farms, cultivating mainly olive oil, survive. These villas showed evidence of luxury features such as mosaics, wall painting and marble slabs (Munzi et al. 2004, 19-24). The settlement hierarchy in this area, combined with the high number of rural sites, suggests that the hinterland of Lepcis Magna was firmly integrated into the regional agricultural economy, and controlled by the elite of Lepcis Magna (Ahmad 2010, 104; Hobson 2015, 95-99). This growth of settlement and intensive agricultural activity carried on throughout the second and parts of the third century AD. Ahmad recorded over 200 presses in the Gebel Tarhuna alone, showing that farms in the Gebel produced surplus quantities of olives for oil and, in some regions, grapes, leading to the increasing prosperity of Lepcitanian elite (Ahmad 2010; Mattingly 1987; 1988; 1995).

Hand in hand with the agricultural ‘boom’, large mausolea started to be commissioned by the early-to-mid first century AD, corresponding to the increased settlement patterns and intensification of agriculture in the region. The very large temple mausoleum of Gasr Doga was one of the first Roman-period mausolea (>Dog001), dating to the first two decades of the first century AD. It was built by a prosperous indigenous family as indicated by the Punic inscription (Bigi et al. 2009, 25). Its location close to the south-western limits of Lepcis Magna’s territory, overlooking the boundary established in 75 AD between Lepcis Magna and Oea, is significant. It may have marked the boundaries of family lands, particularly after the raid on Lepcis Magna by Oea with the help of the Garamantes just a few years previously (Tacitus, Histories, 4.50; Di-Vita Evrard 1979; Bigi et al. 2009, 25-27). It was located near the road that connected the Gebel Tarhuna to Lepcis Magna, built by Proconsul Aelius Lamia in 16-17 AD (Goodchild 1952; Di Vita Evrard 1979, 89-91; Mattingly 1995). The end of this road appears to mark the south-west boundary of Lepcis Magna territory (Figure 2.3). The location of Gasr Doga indicates that the large mausolea served as important landmarks and boundary markers, and it highlights the growing wealth of the local elite through increased agricultural activities during the first century AD (Bigi et al. 2009, 44; see section 3.3.3 for more detail).
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8 This mausoleum has been recently re-dated. It was believed to belong to the third century AD, but based on a neo-Punic inscription and architectural elements it can now be dated much earlier (Bigi et al. 2009).
During the reign of Vespasian (AD 69-79), Lepcis Magna became a *municipium* and Roman citizenship was acquired by local magistrates (Di Vita Evrard 1984). Colonial status was granted under the reign of Trajan (AD 98-117), together with citizenship to all (Gascou 1972, 75-80). The mausoleum of Gasr Gelda (>Ged001) located in the south-east hinterland of Lepcis Magna belonged to the influential family of the Flavii, who, most likely, acquired their citizenship during this period (Fontana 2001, 164). The influence of North African families in Rome rose steadily, and by the reign of Trajan, some of the leading families of Lepcis Magna may already have reached senatorial status (Fontana 2001, 162). For instance, a hypogeum at the western outskirts of Lepcis Magna contained the burial of an individual of senatorial status, buried in an alabaster urn engraved with his initials and $C(larissimus) V(ir)$ (Fontana 2001, 164). Thus, the growing wealth of elite families of the coastal cities through the export of agricultural products led to an increase of political power. Some senatorial estates were present in the Gebel, as indicated by amphora stamps which depicted the letters C.V. (*clarissimus vir*) and C.F. (*clarissima femina*) and were destined for Testaccio as part of the oil supply for Rome (Aguilera 2007; Hobson 2015, 153).
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Figure 2.3: The boundary between Lepcis Magna and Oea indicating the location of milestones and the mausoleum of Gasr Doga (Ahmad 2010, Figure 2.8).

The relative peace after the revolts of the first century AD also led to a rise in settlement in the pre-desert areas. Arid wadis were transformed into a fertile and profitable region and intensive farming was established with the aid of water-management technology,
such as the channelling of flood water by constructing wadi walls. This meant that, despite the low rainfall, cereals, and even vines and olive trees, could be cultivated to form a dietary staple (Mattingly 1995, 3). Farmsteads built in opus africanum style along with the first obelisk- and tower mausolea are attested from the Flavian period onwards (AD 69-96). Inscriptions in neo-Punic, Libyan and Romano-Libyan, as well as Punic and Libyan names on Latin inscriptions, have been found all over the rural countryside. This provides substantial evidence that the people who farmed the pre-desert were native Libyans and not colonisers such soldier-farmers or settlers from the coastal cities (Mattingly 1996c, 323). While at the coast the use of neo-Punic inscriptions ceased in the early second century AD, in the Gebel and pre-desert Neo-Punic or Latino-Punic inscriptions were prominent until the end of the Roman period. Latino-Punic inscriptions were rendered in Punic language which was written in the Latin graphemes rather than the Punic script. No less than 42 per cent of all inscriptions found in the Gebel and 79 per cent of all inscriptions in the pre-desert were in Latino-Punic. In fact, only nine were in Latin (Kerr 2010, 10). Hence, Latin letter forms were adopted, but they carried different meanings, to suit the local context and the local language. As we will see in Chapter 5, this corresponds to images on the mausolea, which are, to a large extent, taken from the Greco-Roman image pool, but adapted to carry local messages and meaning.

The increase in settlement is vividly demonstrated by the results of the ULVS survey (see Barker 1996; Mattingly 1996a). This marks a substantial change of lifestyle in this region, from a primarily pastoral to a more sedentary lifestyle. However, pastoral groups did still exist, especially in the southernmost areas of the pre-desert (Clark, 1986; Mattingly 1995, 22, 59; van der Veen et al. 1996: 257-258). It is not entirely clear if the increase in settlement, especially in the pre-desert was a side-effect of the new political and socio-economic conditions, or if it was the result of Roman policy (Mattingly 1996c, 321). What did occur during the first century AD was a re-organisation of the territory. Whether the land was divided on the basis of the Roman model, or on existing local practices that were in accord with Roman policy is not clear (Mattingly et al. 1991, 113). We know that parts of western Tripolitania were surveyed in AD 29-30 (Trousset 1978) and the lands of the Tripolitanian cities in the eastern Gebel region were surveyed by the imperial legate, Rutillius Gallicus in AD 74. The pre-desert may have been surveyed in a similar manner, allocating new holdings to the indigenous elite (Di Vita-Evrard, 1979; Mattingly 1996c, 321). It is probable that some elite families were not already resident in the pre-desert before the Roman period, but established themselves with the help of Rome during the first century AD. The importance
of the ancestral family lineage is reflected in the funerary inscriptions. They stress, in particular, the male line, and express the desire to be visited by many generations to come. Therefore, mausolea may have also functioned to assert property rights by establishing and maintain an ancestral lineage. For instance, some mausolea appear to serve as property markers a distance away from their associated settlement (Jones and Barker 1983: 53; Mattingly 1995, 321; Mattingly with Flower 1996: 188–189; Fontana 1997). For instance the obelisk mausoleum of Ghirza (>Gh128-A), which constitutes the oldest monumental burial of the settlement, probably dating to mid-Romano-Libyan period, was located 2km south of the settlement, near an even older cemetery (Brogan and Smith 1984, 100-118). Two mausolea in the Wadi N’f’d are located opposite each other on the two sides of the wadi right at the beginning/end of the wadi wall field and irrigation system (>Nf030-A; >Nf031-A). This also begs the question about the relationship between water rights and the placement of mausolea, since some appear to be placed in close proximity to cisterns.9 It is likely that the land was divided up into larger estates, rather than small independent farms (Mattingly 1996c, 321-324). Furthermore, opus africanum farms, often associated with oil presses, seem to form the top of the settlement hierarchy in the first two centuries AD, which is supported by the close proximity of mausolea that can be associated with them (Mattingly with Dore 1996, 118-119).

Boundary stones found in the Gebel suggest that the Roman administration was heavily involved in the demarcation of lands during the late first and early second centuries AD. Here, most of the land was divided up into large estates belonging to the city elite, but some smaller independent farms did also still exist (Ahmad 2010; Mattingly 1995). However, one of the major differences between the Gebel and the pre-desert region is probably that a large number of landowners in the Gebel lived in the cities at the coast, since most of the Gebel farms were of strictly utilitarian character (Ahmed 2010, 67-68). The elite in the pre-desert were, most likely, resident there as indicated by the Punic and Latino-Punic inscriptions showing Libyan names and stressing family lineage (Mattingly 1995, 324).

The rise in the number of settlements, farms and mausolea continued throughout Tripolitania in the second century AD. Prosperity amongst the local peoples of Tripolitania increased, leading to the rise of a wealthier class of local peoples. Undoubtedly the ultimate success story of the Libyan local elite of the second century is highlighted by the Severan
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9 Cisterns are located within approximately 200m of Ag002, Bs011, Bs012, Bs022, Bs072, Dog001, Haj078, Md019, Md023, Mg011, Mm079, Nf038. This potential deliberate placement of mausolea in the landscape to assert property or water rights would be worth exploring in more detail in a separate study which would reveal more examples.
family of Lepcis Magna. Lucius Septimius Severus became Emperor of the Roman Empire in AD 193. He initiated lavish building projects in his home city of Lepcis Magna increasing its size by over 150 hectares (Kenrick 2009, 4). An estimated population of 50,000 inhabited the city, which made Lepcis Magna the second largest city of Africa Proconsularis after Carthage (Di Vita Evrard 1993, 295-297).

The second and third century, however, were not entirely without conflicts, which is suggested by the establishment of military posts at Gasr Rhelane (Tisavar) and Remada (Tilibari) (now southern Tunisia) during the middle to late second century AD. The military fort at Bu Njem in the pre-desert was built in AD 200-201 while other military posts were established in Ghadames and Garia el Gharbia to protect the inhabitants and traders of the region from possible raids from the south. Gasr Duib, another military post, was established in AD 244-246 by which time the garrison at Ghadames had been withdrawn (Mattingly 1995, 75). Brogan draws attention to the advantages these posts might have brought to the surrounding population by providing the remote garrisons with supplies such as wheat, olive oil and animals (Brogan 1977, 126). Evidence from Bu Njem of an extramural settlement suggests that this was indeed the case, with supplies being delivered by the local population (Mattingly 1995, 89). In AD 238 the Legio III Augusta was disbanded by Gordian III. (Rebuffat 1970a and b; Marichal 1979, 448-451). However, the Laguatan had started to threaten Tripolitania from the Syrtic hinterland by the AD 290s (Mattingly 1983, 97) forcing Maximian to engage them in two campaigns (Corippus i, 480-483; v. 178-180; viii, 530-533).

It appears that at least the coastal areas of Tripolitania suffered economically from the third-century crisis and recession (Munzi et al. 2004). Between the late third and the fourth century AD, there was a distinct decline in settlement around Lepcis Magna, with farms being abandoned and only a few new ones being established (Fontana et al. 1996, 72; Munzi et al. 2004). On the basis of the little dating evidence we have for the mausolea at the coast, Fontana notes that the majority seem to have been built from the first to the mid-third century AD. It is conceivable that perhaps the decline of mausolea corresponds with the decrease of settlement and wealth in that region. Munzi et al. argue that the population dropped by almost 50 per cent from the mid-third century onwards (because of the absence of African red slipware C and D; 2004, 21). Major earthquakes that shook the coastal areas of Tripolitania in the early and mid-fourth century AD probably further contributed to the decline of settlement in these areas. Sabratha and Lepcis Magna were severely damaged during these earthquakes (Di Vita 1978b, 18-22; Kenrick 1986, 5-6, 315-316; Mattingly
The number of settlements in the Gebel (at least the Gebel Tarhuna) appears to have stayed relatively constant. By the fourth century AD, many open farms were replaced by fortified farms, indicating an increasing demand for security and defense (Ahmad 2010, 170-171). In contrast, the pre-desert flourished during the third and fourth centuries with an increase in (fortified) farms and settlements (Figure 2.4). The arcaded and highly decorated temple mausolea of the large monumental cemeteries of Ghirza can be dated to this period, corresponding with what appears to be the most prosperous period of the Ghirza settlement (Brogan and Smith 1984).

In the fourth century, there seems to have been a further rise in tensions with peoples from the interior of Tripolitania resulting in a major crisis in AD 363. The Austuriani, who possibly are the same confederation as the Laguatan (Mattingly 1983), raided the territory of Lepcis Magna, as a consequence of the execution of their leader Stachao (Kenrick 2009, 6). They were not camel riding nomads from the east as was long suggested, but a confederation of locally established peoples and new groups of peoples (Mattingly 1983, 96-97). Further raids occurred in AD 365 and AD 366 as well as later in the fourth century, during which numerous estates outside Lepcis Magna and Oea were looted. It seems that military resistance was small, and by the late fourth century the reduced military sources were no longer under the control of the governor of the province but were under other local officials (Mattingly 1995, 172-173). In this period, it appears that the coastal cities experienced a loss in the number of inhabitants, and vast areas of the cities were abandoned even before the
Vandal invasion. The series of earthquakes that struck during that time would have added to the upheavals (Mattingly 1995, 183-184).

The archaeological evidence of the pre-desert and Gebel regions of Tripolitania, where much of my data comes from, largely reflects the upheavals of the time. Fortified farms, so-called gsur, are evident from the third century, but their construction reached a peak during the fourth century AD (Ahmad 2010, 170-172; Mattingly 1995, 202). It seems that the elite of the pre-desert, during this time, were growing increasingly more loyal to the new federations of the interior and thus slowly turned away from the Roman Empire. The Roman imperial authority gradually lost its power in the Libyan pre-desert, as well as in the mountainous hinterland of Numidia and Mauretania, (Mattingly 1987; Merrills 2004, 3). This, in turn, strengthened the power of local polities (Merrills 2004, 3). The historical records suggest that local cults, such as at the temple at Ghirza, seem to have notably increased in popularity in the later Roman period when Rome lost its influence over the pre-desert region and political power shifted (Merrills 2004, 5-6). In AD 428, the Vandals, a Germanic group counting Goth, Romans, and Alans amongst their numbers, invaded Mauretania Caesariensis, reaching Tripolitania in AD 435 (Merrills 2004, 3) which marks the end of the Roman period in Tripolitania.

1.11 Summary

The construction of the Tripolitanian mausolea was closely linked to the complex geographical, historical, economic and socio-cultural environment. The varied landscapes required different strategies to be able to thrive and to have enough surplus money to be able to afford an expensive and elaborate burial monument. The influence of Roman culture was more prominent at the coast, where there was more direct contact and interaction with Rome and the Empire. Some families elevated themselves to senatorial status and, as noted, Septimius Severus even succeeded in becoming the Emperor of Rome. The countryside experienced an agricultural ‘boom’, with large estates for olive oil production as well as other food crops. The owners of many large estates in the Gebel and the Gefara were closely linked to the coastal cities while the pre-desert seems to have operated more independently. As we will see in Chapters 5 and 6, the figural decorations strongly reflect the geographic and socio-cultural environment in which they were created. The next chapter will explore the
distribution and architecture of the mausolea in the different regions, to start to highlight regional preferences, similarities, and differences over time.
CHAPTER 3
DISTRIBUTION AND ARCHITECTURE

1.12 Introduction

The previous chapter provided an outline of the social and historic background of Tripolitania to place the mausolea within their socio-cultural context. This chapter will offer an overview of the distribution of the mausolea in the landscape, will highlight their architectural diversity, and will explore the positioning of the decorations on the mortuary monuments. Chapter 4 will then look in more detail at the main iconographic themes that were displayed across the region to put them into their wider pan-Mediterranean and North African contexts.

1.13 The Distribution of Mausolea Across Tripolitania

Mausolea dotted the landscape of every zone of Tripolitania, from the coast, across the Gebel and deep into the pre-desert and desert areas. As already touched on in the previous chapter, their distribution is not a random occurrence but is closely linked to the successful establishment of farms and agricultural estates (Figure 3.1; see Appendix 1.6 and 1.7 for more detailed maps).

Figure 3.1: Distribution of mausolea across Tripolitania.
Another popular form of elite burial that was employed at the coast and in the Gebel was the underground burial chamber, so called hypogeum (Figure 3.2). They are evident at Leptis Magna (De Miro and Fiorenini 1977; Di Vita-Evrard et al. 1995; 1996; Fontana 2001), Oea (Di Vita 2010; El-Faloos 2013) and Sabratha (Di Vita 1980-1981; 1983; 1984; 1990; 1992; 1997; 2007; Griffith 2008) and, in the Gebel (Ahmad 2010) and could be in use for generations. This form of burial was used in the Punic period but went out of use in Carthage and other African cities during late Hellenistic times. However, in Tripolitania, they were in use for much longer. At Leptis Magna and Sabratha they remained in use until at least the third century AD (Fontana 2001, 163; Di Vita 2010, 129) and thus they represent another popular mode of ancestral burial (Fontana 1996; 2001, 163). Some of the funerary chambers were adorned with figural wall paintings or decorated with stucco, presenting some parallels with the decorations found on mausolea, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 4 and 6.

Figure 3.2: Plan of first century AD hypogeum ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ at Sabratha (Di Vita 2015 II, 571, Figure A, drawing: Arch. G. Ortolani).
1.13.1 The Coast

The evidence for mausolea in the coastal areas is scanty, and a minimum of 22 could be recorded in total. Of those, 19 were situated around Lepcis Magna, with one large mausoleum situated near Zlitan, 28 km south-east of Lepcis Magna, and two mausolea at Silin, 14 km to the north-west of the city. The remains of 12 mausolea were recorded during surveys of the hinterland of Lepcis Magna by the Roma Tre team, of which one had a hypogeum-chambers, with a monumental makers above ground (Munzi et al. 2016, 84; 86). The small number of mausolea in this region is partly due to extensive stone robbing, and it is highly likely that there were many more. This area is (and always was) densely populated, and their stones have been recycled in more recent structures. As a result, many of the mausolea mentioned by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century travellers and archaeologists have now disappeared or are severely damaged.

Archaeological evidence shows that cemeteries lined the roads in and out of Lepcis Magna. They held a wide range of mortuary structures, including tower and temple mausolea, hypogea, small monuments mimicking large tower mausolea and smaller tomb structures such as cairns and cist burials (Cifani 2006; Fontana 1996, 80-81; 2001, 163; Romanelli 1925, 157-167; Munzi et al. 2016). In the early twentieth century, Romanelli recorded numerous mausolea near Lepcis Magna (1925, 157-167). He mentioned several mausolea that stood at the side of the road towards Es-Sahel to the east of the city (1925, 162). Edward Rae (1877) recorded a tower mausoleum at the western outskirts. Clermont-Ganneau, who also visited the area around Lepcis Magna in the late nineteenth century, indicates that south of the city once stood a mausoleum, of which no trace remains. Furthermore, he saw several tower mausolea in the area between Al-Khums and El-Mergeb towards the south-west of the city, and he mentions the fragments of two marble statues associated with the mausoleum of Gasr Duierat and perhaps Gasr Gelda (Clermont-Ganneau 1903, 341-343). A photograph taken in the late nineteenth century in the eastern and southern cemeteries of Lepcis Magna shows at least two substantial mausolea, which were turned into military barracks (Figure 3.3; Matoug 1997). They were destroyed during the development and expansion of the modern city of Al-Khums.

---

10 Three-quarters of the modern population of Libya lives in the coastal areas (Haggett 2002, 2176).
Figure 3.3: Soldiers in the late nineteenth century standing in front of mausolea that once stood at the western or south-western cemeteries of Lepcis Magna. (Image: Matoug 1997, Plate XCb).

Gasr Shaddad (>Gs001-A) is one of the very few mausolea still standing to some height, 500m to the east of the Wadi Lebda. Today, it stands in isolation but scattered archaeological remains show that the area around the mausoleum, and indeed much of the Wadi Lebda, once housed a much larger cemetery comprising mausolea, hypogeas, and smaller tombs (Romanelli 1925; Fontana 1996, 80-81; 2001, 163; Munzi et al. 2010, 738-741). Further up the Wadi Lebda, ca. 1.5 km south-east of Lepcis Magna, stood the tower tomb of Gasr-ad Dueirat (>Gd001),¹¹ and Clermont-Ganneau mentions another tomb a 20-minute walk to the south of the latter. This was perhaps Gasr Gelda (>Ged001) which was recorded by the survey team of the Missione Archeologica dell'Università Roma Tre in 2007 (Clermont-Ganneau 1903, 341-343; Munzi et al. 2010, 738; 2016, 86). During a recent survey around Silin two further mausolea were recorded (>Sil001-A and Sil001-B; Munzi et al. 2004, 14: sites 17 and 49). The mausolea in the hinterland of Lepcis Magna, further removed from the city’s big cemeteries, can be associated with nearby farms and estates and villas (see, for instance, Munzi et al. 2004; 2010; 2016, 84-86). The near absence of mausolea elsewhere on the coast is notable. Approximately 20 km south-east of Lepcis Magna near Zlitan in the Wadi Caam are the remains of a very large tower mausoleum named Al-Jumaa (>Ju001-A; Kenrick 2009, 148-149).

¹¹ This mausoleum is now re-erected in the forecourt of the Lepcis Magna museum.
1.13.2 The Gefara

The Gefara is still severely under-explored and sand dunes cover much of the area, but a minimum of 31 mausolea can be attested. Most sites are located close to the foot of the Gebel, where farms and settlements took advantage of the watershed that flowed from the Gebel down onto the Gefara (Figure 3.4). Some mausolea, such as Henchir Schiugaff (>Sc001-A) were constructed with a mix of rubble and cement, perhaps with ashlar facing. Others, such as el-Amrouni near Tatahouine (>Ea001-A) were solid ashlar construction (Brogan, unpublished Notes SLS Archive, Trouset 1974, Ferchiou 1997).

Brogan conducted a brief survey of the Gefara around Tripoli and towards the Gebel in the 1960s and 1970s. She recorded the large foundations of a mausoleum measuring 5.90 m x 5.65 m located approximately 105 km outside Tripoli, 4.5 km to the east of the road between Yefren and Bir Ghnem (>Rr001). Some 2 km west of Bir Aiad are the footings of a smaller mausoleum (>Es001-A). Above the Wadi Hagiar dressed stones (some of which were decorated) indicate the presence of another mausoleum (>Es001-B). The stones were rounded in shape, suggesting that this mausoleum had circular features. A marabout tomb near Giosc (>Jo001) contained many dressed stones (Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive).

Figure 3.4: The distribution of mausolea in the Gefara.
In the early twentieth century, Coro (1928, 89-92) saw three mausolea near Giosc that had already been severely looted for lime burning (>Gi001). Furthermore, he noted the existence of relief sculpture in the form of a human figure walled into a house in the village of Giosc (>Jo001; Coro 1928, 95-99). Brogan, however, could not relocate the mausolea or the relief when she visited the area (Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive).

More detailed work has been conducted in the western part of the Gefara, at the foot of the central and western Gebel. The best published example is that of el-Amrouni near Tatahouine (>Ea001-A), a second mausoleum stood in the vicinity of Tatahouine (Berger 1895; Brogan 1965; Trouset 1974, 127-133, Site 127; Ferchiou 1989; >Tat001-B). Others include a group of four mausolea at Beni Guedal (>Gu001), the mausoleum el-Ausaf near Tigi (>Eau001), the mausoleum of Oued Beni Blell (>Ob001), and at least two mausolea at Henchir Snem (>Sn001-A and B; Coro 1928, 107-118; Brogan 1965; Trouset 1974). More recently, the remains of a mausoleum have been discovered in the settlement of Rogeban at the bottom of the Gebel, together with blocks of figural decorations (>Ro001; Zenati 1995, 156).

1.13.3 The Gebel

The presence of mausolea in the Gebel is slightly better attested despite the problem of stone robbing due to intense agricultural activities (Ahmed 2010; Faraj et al. 1997; Oates 1953). Overall, 50 have been recorded in this area (Figure 3.5). Coro mentions some 10 examples from his travels in the Gebel Nefusa in 1922, most of them already in a rather ruinous state (Coro 1928). Brogan came across over 30 during her many visits from the 1960s through to the 1980s, including some that Coro had mentioned. She stated that there were the remains of many more in the hinterland of the Gebel in very fragmentary condition (Brogan unpublished notes, SLS Archive). Unfortunately, not all mausolea she encountered were recorded.

The Gebel can be divided into two zones, the eastern Gebel and the western Gebel. Parts of the western Gebel were surveyed by Pol Trouset (1974) who established a catalogue of sites in this region. He identified 14 sites that held the remains of 21 mausolea, all of them in a rather ruinous state. They broadly follow the line of the Gebel, which also
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12 Gz001; Mgu001; Sb001; Ob001; Kr001; Ta001; Ta002; Dou001; Sn001; Ea001; Re001; Ao001; De001; Gu001.
formed part of the limes-zone of western Tripolitania. They are often situated close to Roman forts that dotted the limes, but Roman-period farms can also be associated with the structures.

Figure 3.5: Distribution of mausolea in the Gebel area.

The evidence for the existence of mausolea in the westernmost part of the eastern Gebel is very scarce. Their former presence is indicated by decorated stones that were later incorporated into other structures, mainly mosques (Brogan 1970-1971, 11-12; Brogan and Kenrick 1971; 1972; Brogan an Kenrick unpublished report, SLS Archive; Romanelli 1930). For example, two sculptured stones that most likely come from a nearby mausoleum were found integrated into a mosque at Mezgura, approximately 8 km west of Giado (Figure 3.6) (>Bg001; Romanelli 1930, 68). Recently, the remains of a small mausoleum have been discovered near Giado, confirming the presence of mausolea in this area (>As001; Zenati 1995, 156).

The remains of mausolea are slightly better preserved in the eastern part of the eastern Gebel, where 15 have been recorded. The majority are situated in highly visible positions along the edge of the escarpment such as Gasr Doga (>Dog001) or Henchir Suffit (>Hs001), and many were of respectable size. A number of mausolea stood further inland where the eastern Gebel gradually merges into the pre-desert, such as Bir el-Uaar (>Ua001) and Chormet el-Busaila (>Ch001; SLS Archive, Brogan unpublished notes). Across the Gebel, the monumental tombs often stood in isolation or in pairs in highly visible positions.
An exception is the now completely obliterated cemetery south-east of Cabao in the eastern Gebel mentioned by Coro (1928; >Se001-A-H), which held up to eight mausolea. Ahmed’s survey on the Gebel Tarhuna shows that the mausolea can be associated with large farms and estates (>Haj087; Gz001; Ahmed 2010).

Figure 3.6: Mosque at Mezgura with integrated relief sculpture from mausoleum (Image: Romanelli 1930, 68, Figure 13).

1.13.4 The Pre-desert

By far the largest number of extant mausolea come from the pre-desert; at least 103 once stood in this region (Figure 3.7). Some mausolea are in a relatively good state of preservation, still standing up to two storeys high, while others are severely damaged and only the presence of some architectural remains or decoration integrated into huts suggests that a mausoleum once stood in the vicinity. The ULVS recorded over 70 mausolea in a relatively small survey area, together with a large number of farm dwellings and small settlements (Barker 1996; Mattingly 1996a). Brogan mentioned additional mausolea in her notes, which had either disappeared by the time the ULVS team visited or were in areas that were not included in the latter survey (Brogan 1977; Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive).
As in the Gebel, the location of the mausolea closely corresponds to the location of large farms and estates (see Barker 1996; Mattingly 1996a). It is noticeable that mausolea frequently stand in groups of two or three, and some form rather substantial monumental cemeteries with more than three monuments (>Bs010, Gr022, Kn005, Lm001, Mm209, Sf023). Ghirza has the two largest monumental cemeteries, with the so-called North tombs (>Gh129) and South tombs (>Gh128), with six mausolea each (Brogan and Smith 1984). A cemetery of six mausolea and numerous smaller burials is situated in the Wadi Umm el-Agerem (>Ag002).

1.13.5 Sirtica

The limited amount of survey undertaken in this region means that not much is known about the monumental funerary landscape. Old travellers’ accounts mention two obelisk tombs, but the French survey group of the ULVS did not see any evidence for them (Reddé 1988, 72); and a more recent survey from 2007 to 2009 in the Sirte basin did not record any structures that may have been mausolea (LeQuesne et al. 2010).
1.13.6 The Desert

The only evidence for mausolea in the desert comes from the Asnam cemetery in the oasis settlement of Ghadames (>Gha001-A). It held at least 10 monumental tombs of considerable proportions, of which some were perhaps even larger than those at Ghirza (Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 9). They were constructed of ashlar masonry with a rubble and cement core, closely resembling the arcaded temple mausolea of Ghirza. Not much is known about the Roman-period settlement of Ghadames, but it is likely that the Asnam cemetery was located on the edge of the Roman-period oasis settlement along the major caravan route (Mattingly and Sterry 2010). Its remote location, a nine-day journey by foot or camel from Tripoli according to Richardson (1848, 91-92), suggests that Rome had some kind of treaty with the peoples of the settlement. A Roman military garrison was installed there in the early third century AD and maintained until at least AD 235 (Mattingly 1995; Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 18).

1.13.7 The Distribution of Mausolea – Discussion

The distribution of mausolea in the landscape is closely related to the agricultural settlements. They frequently can be associated with substantial nearby farms, which yielded enough surplus wealth to allow the owner to build such substantial funerary monuments. The large number of tombs in the pre-desert and parts of the eastern Gebel stands in stark contrast to the relatively small number in the rest of the region, even if the uneven state of preservation is taken into account. Limited survey work along the coast and around Oea and Sabratha, as well as the extensive reuse of stones in other structures, accounts, at least in part, for the small number of mausolea in the coastal areas. Furthermore, underground burial chambers (hypogea) were an alternative mode of burial for the upper strata of the city’s inhabitants. Another aspect that may have influenced the number of mausolea at the coast was that some of the rich city dwellers wanted to be buried on their country estate in the hinterland of Lepcis Magna or the Gebel. The mausolea noted during the survey between Ras el-Mergeb and Ras el-Hamman, in the hinterland of Lepcis Magna, can be associated with nearby farms (Munzi et al. 2010, 738; 2016 84-85). Within a rural setting, large funerary monuments had a much more striking impact than amongst the densely built-up cemeteries lining the roads in and out of the major cities. However, it is conceivable that the richest and most influential
absentee landowners preferred to erect their funerary monuments closer to the city to display their wealth and status, rather than on their country estates. As only a few prestigious municipal positions were available in the urban centres, the rural environment provided an alternative for the less prominent elite families to gain, maintain and execute considerable powers (Haeussler 2013, 242). Thus, for many, a funerary monument on their estate was much more effective, since they did not have to compete with the monuments of the urban elite in the cities.

As already discuss in Chapter 2, the landowners of the pre-desert farms were most likely resident there. Partial family trees can be reconstructed from the names on inscriptions from mausolea, such as at Ghirza, the Wadi el-Amud, the Wadi Antar, or the Wadi Umm el-Agerem, which suggest that more than one generation of the local elite was resident in the area (Mattingly 1995, see also Chapter 5). The elite families had sufficient surplus money to afford these expensive monuments, due to their substantial influence over local trade, agriculture, and irrigation systems, which yielded substantial wealth and political authority in the region.13

1.14 The Architecture of Mausolea – an Overview

This section will provide a short overview of the different architectural types of mausolea in relation to the placement of the decorations investigated in this thesis. In studies on mausolea in general, or North African mausolea in particular, the Tripolitanian examples are frequently only mentioned in passing. I will not attempt a comprehensive analysis of the architectural elements here since this merits a larger and more detailed study than is possible within the scope of this work. Instead, I will give an overview of the development of the different architectural forms of mausolea (Figure 3.8).

In the context of this study, the term ‘mausoleum’ defines a group of funerary monuments that were constructed of ashlar masonry and that displayed Mediterranean architectural features such as cornices, mouldings, pediments, capitals, pilasters and columns (following Mattingly 2007b, 142). Three pre-Roman mausolea are known in Tripolitania, two

---

13 Earle 1997, 7 about the economic and political power yielded by controlling the irrigation system in Hawaii; Hitchner, 1995, 495; the importance of irrigation is also mentioned in the poem of the Julii mausoleum A53: et nemus exorant.
from Sabratha and one from Jerba. For a brief overview of their architecture see Appendix 1.3.1.

Of the 203 mausolea recorded during this study, three broad types could be identified: tower mausolea, temple mausolea, and rectangular mausolea (Appendix 1.3.2). Tower mausolea are the most prominent, followed by temple mausolea, and a small number of rectangular mausolea. 75 were too damaged to identify a type. Tower and temple mausolea can be divided into sub-types of various architectural arrangements: (1) tower mausolea: obelisk mausolea, multi-storey aedicula mausolea, tower mausolea with integrated open peristyle (Appendix 1.3.3); (2) temple mausolea: peripteral temple mausolea, arcaded temple mausolea, tetrastyle temple mausolea (Appendix 1.3.4).
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Figure 3.8: Types of tower mausolea in Tunisia (1, 3, 4, 7, 8) and Tripolitania (2, 5, 6, 7) from the Punic and Roman periods. (1) Thugga (Punic); (2) El-Amrouni, (Roman); (3) Henchir Jouf (Punic); (4) Kasserine, Flavii mausoleum (Roman); (5) Mselliten (Roman); (6) Uadi N’T’d (Roman); (7) Mactar (Roman); (8) Sidi Aich (Roman). (Image: Bentivogli 2007-2008, 94, Figure 46).

1.14.1 The Architecture of Early Romano-Libyan Period Mausolea (First and Second century AD)

The number of mausolea in Tripolitania increased dramatically from the Flavian period onwards. This dramatic rise is remarkable and points towards the development of a more
numerous, richer, and more influential elite in Tripolitania. It was long believed that many farms and mausolea were of the third century AD or later. However, survey work by Brogan (1971) and ULVS (1996a; 1996b) showed that early Roman pottery could be associated with a high number of farms and related mausolea.

Although mausolea were relatively new to Tripolitania, the veneration of the dead did have a long-standing tradition (see for instance Camps 1961; Hitchner 1995; Mattingly 2007a and b). Ancestral worship was an integral part of Libyan culture, evident through tomb furniture such as offering tables or libation bowls, which suggests the continuous re-visiting of the tombs (Mattingly 1995a and 1995b; 2003; 2007). It is not unusual to find stelai or large stones deliberately placed at the edge of burials, sometimes coated with ochre, a substance linked to burial practices and sacred places from the Sahel to the Sahara (Lancel 1995, 291; Mattingly et al. 2011). The importance of the ancestors did not cease during the Roman period. Many mausolea show evidence of libation channels that lead into the tombs, and some mausolea had offering tables associated with them (Stone and Stirling 2007, 22-23).

This very local tradition was consciously integrated into the relatively new form of burial monument for the region (see also section 6.4) On the one hand, the construction of highly decorated mausolea signifies a departure from previously common burial customs in the region, indicating significant changes in socio-political structures. On the other hand, the existence of offering tables and libation channels on some mausolea still maintains an important link to ancestral traditions. More detailed excavations of monumental cemeteries would reveal much valuable insight into the ritual that was associated with the mausolea.

**Tower Mausolea**

The architectural type that was employed most frequently during the early Romano-Libyan period is the tower mausoleum. They were constructed of local limestone in ashlar masonry, occasionally with a rubble core and ashlar facing. Independent architectural forms of this type of mausoleum developed, which cannot be easily linked to Roman forms of monumental burials; instead, they developed out of local traditions (von Hesberg 1992, 45). Already in the first and second century AD, tower mausolea developed a surprising array of architectural variations which sets them apart from other tower mausolea and their predecessors in North Africa.
Obelisk Mausolea

Perhaps the most striking new sub-form of tower mausoleum that had evolved out of the tower tomb during the early Romano-Libyan period is the obelisk mausoleum. These were taller and thinner than other North African tower tombs and were topped with a long and slender pyramidal roof. The tower tomb at Sabratha from the first century BC already shows the tendency to a more slender shape. This type was evident across Tripolitania, and typically consisted of two or three superimposed storeys that reached a height up to 18 metres above the subterranean burial chamber. Pilasters, engaged columns, and mouldings served as architectural decoration, while friezes frequently displayed animals, human figures, rosettes, vegetal scrolls or busts. The form of the obelisk tomb drew clear links to pre-Roman tower mausolea but constituted a new sub-form due to its slender appearance.

The style of obelisk tombs was ever changing and adaptable. There are still clear references to the basic form of the tower and obelisk tomb, but additional features were added to give the monument a very individual appearance. Mausoleum A at Mselliten in the Wadi Merdum is rather squat in appearance like tower tombs in Tunisia but can already be classed as an obelisk tomb because it featured the distinct long obelisk roof. The tomb itself lacks any figural or ornamental decoration. Pottery finds of first century terra sigillata, and Gaulish ware as well as a neo-Punic inscription, suggest that this tomb was erected during the first century AD (Figure 3.9a; >Mд001-A; Brogan and Smith 1967, 141; Brogan 1971, 124-125; 1977, 104-106; Mattingly 1996, 173). The inscription is, unfortunately, badly weathered. A second obelisk tomb (>Mд001-B) from the same site is much more slender in appearance and bears some ornamental decoration. It is 18 m in height and measures 2.42 m x 2.45 m. It is plausible that this tomb was built after Мд001-А, showing the development towards a more slender appearance. Bir Gebira (>Mд023-A) is similarly rather squat in appearance and bears no evidence of figural or ornamental decoration (Figure 3.9b). A weathered neo-Punic inscription reads ‘Tamar, daughter of...’ Early pottery from a nearby associated site suggests that this tomb was also built during the first century AD (Brogan 1971, 125; Brogan 1977, 109; Mattingly 1996a).

Early obelisk mausolea can also be found in the western Gebel, south of Tatahouine, at El-Amrouni (>Eа001; see Ferchiou 1989 for a detailed study on this mausoleum). Ferchiou found it difficult to date this mausoleum on the basis of its architectural elements, the decorations, and its inscription, and tentatively assigned it to the early to mid-second century AD. This obelisk mausoleum was rather squat in appearance and probably only had
one storey below the pyramid (Ferchiou 1989, 60-68; Figure 3.9c). What sets it apart, however, is the conspicuous sculpture that decorated the monument, a trend that started to emerge in the early second century AD, which we will be discuss in more detail in Chapters 5 and 6.

Over time obelisk mausolea developed into taller and more slender monuments that displayed ornamental and figural relief decorations. One of the earlier decorated obelisks is that of the Wadi Umm el-Agerem (Figure 3.11b; >Ag002-A), which has been dated to the second century AD on the basis of its inscription. Ag002-A belonged to Yillul, whose son, Masauchan, built the second mausoleum in the same cemetery (>Ag002-B). According to the inscription, Masauchan paid for his tomb in *denarii*, which went out of use during the second half of the third century AD, and were replaced by *folles* (Brogan 1971, 126). Another early example may be found in the Wadi N’fd (Figure 3.11c; >Nf031); Brogan suggests that the capitals are of pre-Hadrianic type and it is likely that the later tomb on the opposite side of the wadi, dating to no later than the third century AD, was modelled on this earlier tomb (1971, 125).

**Multi-storey Aedicula Obelisk Mausolea and Tower Mausolea**

Multi-storey aedicula tombs were popular across the Empire (see von Hesberg 1992, 121-158) and were present in Tripolitania. The striking development here is that the aedicula was integrated into the basic form of the tower and obelisk tomb. In the Wadi el-Amud, the
debris scattered around a collapsed mausoleum (>Lm001-A; Figure 310a) suggests that this was one of the earliest of this type, dating to the early Romano-Libyan period (Brogan 1964, 49-50; 1971, 123-124 Mattingly 1996, 165). The first storey sits on a square base (2.95 m x 2.95 m); above the cornice of the first storey, which is otherwise plain, is the aedicula that was supported by columns, facing east. The plinth at the back of the aedicula is decorated with three false doors. The largest is situated behind the aedicula facing east, another is on the north side, and the third is on the south side. The debris surrounding the tomb suggests that it had a pyramidal roof and that it was not otherwise ornamented with reliefs. It is not clear if this mausoleum had the slender pyramid of the obelisk tomb or a shorter pyramid. An associated early Roman-period farm and the Neo-Punic inscription indicate that this tomb was built at some point during the late first and early second century AD (Brogan and Reynolds 1985, 15). A similar tomb can be found in the Wadi Migdal (>Mg001-A; Figure 3.10b). It had a wider platform that formed the aedicula with three columns in front of the plinth that formed the ‘cella’. No false door is evident. Pottery from the surrounding farms suggests that the tomb is from the second century AD. Ghirza South A (>Gh128-A), which is dated to late second to mid-third century AD, featured two narrow vaulted aediculae that held two statues on the first storey (Figure 3.12a, Brogan and Smith 1984, 182-185).

Figure 3.10: Tower mausolea with aedicula. a) Wadi El-Amud (>Lm001-A; Image: UVLS Archive); b) Wadi Migdal, (>Mg001-A; Image: ULVS Archive).

Decorations
The earliest mausolea such as Mselliten A (>Md001-A), el Amud (>Lm001-A) and Bir Gebira (>Md023-A) were undecorated. By the second century AD, vivid figural and ornamental decorations start to appear (Figure 3.11). The decorations are placed on top of
the first and/or second storey under the cornice in highly visible positions. The obelisk tomb at Ghirza features two statues that were placed in the aedicula. The arch of the niche is also decorated.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Image-1.png}
\caption{Location of decoration on obelisk mausolea: a) Ghirza (>128-A; Image: SLS Archive); b) Umm el-Agerem (>Ag002-A; Image: ULVS Archive); c) Wadi N’I’d (>Nf031-A; Image: ULVS Archive); d) Wadi Migdal (>Mg001-A ;Image: ULVS Archive).}
\end{figure}

\textit{Gastr Doga – the Exception to the Rule}

The monumental tomb of Gastr Doga (>Dog001) near Lepcis Magna was long believed to date to the third century AD (Figure 3.12a – 3.12c), in keeping with the appearance of the temple tomb type in Tripolitania (see below). Recent work, however, came to the conclusion that this temple tomb can, in fact, be dated to the early first century AD on the basis of architectural elements and a newly discovered Neo-Punic inscription (see Bigi et al. 2009 for a detailed account).

It has three storeys: a solid plinth and a solid second storey above a cornice topped by a free-standing portico that runs around all sides of the monument. The U-shaped plan of the tomb is unusual and does not appear elsewhere in Tripolitania. The funerary chamber is situated below ground. While the general shape of the monument refers to Hellenistic traditions, the architectural decorations are predominantly of Italic type (Bigi et al. 2009, 44). There are, furthermore, links to Numidian monuments from the second century BC, such as the temple of Chemtou (Figure 3.12d) or Kbor Klib in Tunisia (Bigi et al. 2009, 44; Ferichiu 1991; 2009). The monument is otherwise undecorated.

\textsuperscript{14} The development of the stone-cut decorations is further discuss in Chapter 5.
Hellenistic architecture in North Africa was primarily adopted because of its link to dynastic cults (Bigi et al. 2009, 44; Coarelli and Thébert 1988). The owner of this tomb, most likely a member of the local elite, referred to forms of self-representation typical of Hellenistic burials (Bigi et al. 2009), while, at the same time, drawing on Numidian ancestral links. This monument is an early testimony to an emerging and powerful local elite, which continued to flourish over the next four centuries.

1.14.2 Mid-to-Late Romano-Libyan Period: The Rise of the Temple Tomb (Third century AD – Fourth century AD)

At some point during the late second and the third century AD, temple tombs gained in popularity in Tripolitania. Bigi et al. (2009) argue that perhaps Gasr Doga served as inspiration. However, the architectural types of the temple mausolea are distinct enough to argue that they were introduced separately. They became popular all across the Roman Empire from the first century AD onwards, especially in the Western provinces (von Hesberg 1992, 187-188). In Palmyra the number of temple mausolea rose dramatically from the second century AD, where they were chosen over the traditional tower mausolea (von
Hesberg 1992, 188). It appears that in Tripolitania temple mausolea became popular a century later, in particularly in the pre-desert and desert areas such as at Khanafes, Ghirza and Ghadames.

The Peripteral Temple Tomb

The peripteral temple tomb took its inspiration from the Hellenistic peripteral temple. Three rather large tombs of this type from this period have survived to today: tomb North A at Ghirza (>Gh129-A; Figure 3.13a), Gasr Banat (>Nf038; Figure 3.13b), and Kser Banat (>Sf003; Figure 3.13c) in the pre-desert. Free-standing columns run along all sides of the chamber, which sits on a podium over the lower burial chamber. The roof is flat without a pediment but, in the case of Ghirza, is decorated with roof ornaments such as palmettes or scrolls. Ghirza North A appears to be the first mausoleum built in the Northern cemetery. This is suggested by its position closest to the wadi as well as being the first in a row of mausolea. The dating is difficult, but the architectural decoration and the lettering of the inscription suggest that it was built no earlier than the mid-third century AD (Brogan and Smith 1984, 125).

Figural and ornamental decorations adorn the mausoleum around the false door (now destroyed), around the last course of stones on the upper part of the cella, and around the entablature below the roof (Figure 3.13a). Gasr Banat (>Nf038-A) is architecturally very similar to Ghirza North A (Gh129-A) but does not bear any figural or ornamental decoration (Bauer 1935, 73; Brogan and Smith 1984, 264-264). It is situated some 60 km north-north-west of Ghirza as the crow flies. The inscription, together with the architectural decoration, suggests that it was built in the early third century AD and could have served as inspiration for Ghirza North A (Brogan and Smith 1984, 269). A possible third peripteral temple tomb is located in the Wadi Sofeggin named Kser Banat (>Sf003-A). This very large structure (8.66 m x 4.74 m) may have been surrounded by columns, very similarly to Gasr Banat or Ghirza 129-A (Al Khadduri 1996, 220-223; Mattingly 1996, 280).
The Arcaded Temple Mausolea

This type of tomb is unique to Tripolitania within the North African context. It features a central pier, which is often decorated with a false door in relief. The surrounding colonnade supports monolithic arches that are placed directly on top of the columns on which the arcuate lintels and highly decorated friezes are placed. The roof did not have a pediment but, like the rectangular temple tomb, was crowned with roof ornaments. The burial chamber was placed underneath the podium. They were particularly popular at Ghirza, where eight out of twelve mausolea were of this type (Figure 3.14a). Other examples can be found in close proximity to Ghirza at Bir Nesma in the Wadi Sofeggin (>Nf092-A), and in the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-A) and, remarkably, in Ghadames in the true desert (Gha00-A). Their architecture, albeit in a damaged state, displays close similarities to the arcaded temple mausolea at Ghirza, by featuring a high podium and a solid plinth in the centre. This suggests a date range from the late third to the fourth century AD (Mattingly and Sterry 2010). The tombs at Ghadames, however, appear to be larger than the ones at Ghirza. Both are amongst
the largest settlements in their respective region, and the existence of the same type of tomb may point towards close trade links or family ties between the two important centres.

The exceptional features of this type of tomb are the decorated monolithic arches that sat on top of the columns of the peristyle that surrounded the central pier. Similar examples of this type are located in Turkey, such as the tomb of Mylasa (Figure 3.14b) or the mausoleum at Kimar and Brad in Syria (Figure3.14c; von Hesberg 1992, 150-151), though they lack the decorated monolithic arch heads as at Ghirza (Figure 3.14a). The arches were, in fact, arcuate lintels, with the cut out arch reducing their weight. They were excellent supports for the above frieze, and could, themselves, be decorated (Brogan and Smith 1984, 209). In an aesthetic sense, the cut out arches gave the structure a much lighter and higher appearance. This type of arch head alone was not an innovation, for it was already known from windows or aedicula mausolea (see for instance Ghirza South A (Gh128-A). Thus, this type of arch may have simply been the easiest and most economical way for the builders to construct the tombs (Brogan and Smith 1984, 209).

A further feature that distinguishes this type of tomb from other, similar examples is the high level of figural and ornamental decoration. This was sometimes placed around the top of the first storey, especially around the larger mausolea but predominantly on the monumental arches and on the frieze above (Figure 3.15)
The third type of temple tomb is the ‘tetrastyle’ temple mausoleum, which has a solid cella at the back that is preceded by free-standing columns and frequently topped by a roof forming a pediment. This type of tomb was popular across Tunisia, but only two of this type are evident in Tripolitania: Perhaps Gasr Ajdab (Figure 3.16a-c; >Aj001-A) in the pre-desert and Caf Tobbi (>Cr001-A) in the eastern Gebel were of this type. Gasr Ajdab, probably dating to the second or third century AD (Zenati 1997, 224-225), had tall columns discovered lying in front of its west face. No figural or ornamental decorations can be determined on these structures. A third mausoleum that was perhaps of this type was located at Ras el-Hammam in the hinterlands of Lepcis Magna (Munzi et al. 2016, 92-93), although this could have also been a multi-storey aedicula obelisk mausoleum.

‘Tetrastyle’ Temple Mausoleum

The third type of temple tomb is the ‘tetrastyle’ temple mausoleum, which has a solid cella at the back that is preceded by free-standing columns and frequently topped by a roof forming a pediment. This type of tomb was popular across Tunisia, but only two of this type are evident in Tripolitania: Perhaps Gasr Ajdab (Figure 3.16a-c; >Aj001-A) in the pre-desert and Caf Tobbi (>Cr001-A) in the eastern Gebel were of this type. Gasr Ajdab, probably dating to the second or third century AD (Zenati 1997, 224-225), had tall columns discovered lying in front of its west face. No figural or ornamental decorations can be determined on these structures. A third mausoleum that was perhaps of this type was located at Ras el-Hammam in the hinterlands of Lepcis Magna (Munzi et al. 2016, 92-93), although this could have also been a multi-storey aedicula obelisk mausoleum.
Rectangular Mausolea

Only five rectangular mausolea have been noted so far, of which two were located in the pre-desert (Mm091-A; Mm123-A), and three at the coast (>Ho001-A and B; Gl001-A). They consisted of a semi-subterranean chamber topped with a plain ashlar plinth above ground and a flat roof. Notably, they lacked decorative friezes and had little in the way of architectural decoration such as mouldings and engaged pillars (Figure 3.17, see also Figure 3.3).

Figure 3.16: Possible tetrastyle mausoleum Gasr el Ajdab (AJ001-A). a) Mausoleum showing northern and eastern façade (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Column found at Gasr el Ajdab (Image: ULVS Archive); c) South side of Gasr el Ajdab showing alterations over time and top of large interior niche in north wall (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).

Figure 3.17: Rectangular mausolea: a) Gasr Legbeda, Wadi Lebda, view from the north-west (>Gl01-A; Image: Matoug 1997, Plate XCa); b) Plan of Gasr Legbeda, Wadi Lebda (Image: Matoug 1997, 212, Figure 1, drawing: Michele Cilla).
Obelisk tombs continued to develop into some rather individual forms during the third century AD. The mausoleum at the Wadi Meseuggi sported a portico on its second storey above a solid first storey and was topped by an obelisk (>Me001-A, Figure 3.18a). Aedicula obelisk tombs sometimes contained portrait statues, such as at Wadi Umm el-Agerem (>Ag002-C).

At Gasr Duierat near Leptis Magna, the tower tomb featured a circular peristyle over a square solid plinth, which was topped with a conical roof, and at least one statue was displayed in the arched niches of the circular peristyle (>Gd001-A; Figure 3.18b). The tower tomb at Bir el-Uaar in the eastern Gebel similarly had a conical roof but featured a square peristyle on a solid plinth, topped by a circular peristyle (>Ua001-A; Figure 3.18c).

The remains of a tower mausoleum at Henchir Biscema in the eastern Gebel also display circular features (>Bi001-B; SLS Archive, Brogan unpublished notes). This type of tomb was especially popular in the western Empire from the first century BC onwards as the example at St. Remy-en-Provence indicates, but it only arrived in Tripolitania in the late second or early third century AD (Kenrick 2009, 136).

Figure 3.18: Open peristyle mausolea. a) Wadi Meseuggi with open peristyle and decorations on top of the first storey and on the first tier of the obelisk (>Me001-A; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Gasr Duierat with its vivid decorations (Gd001-A; Image: Mattingly); c) Bir el-Uaar with its two open porticoes and vivid decorations (Ua001-A; Drawing: Author).
1.15 Summary

Elite burial traditions in Tripolitania changed drastically during the Roman period. The number of ashlar mausolea rose significantly, and their elaborate types and decorations show that the elite invested substantial amounts of money to build a burial marker appropriate for the representation of themselves and their families. Furthermore, the immense effort undertaken in the construction of many burials is remarkable (Stone 2016). Especially in the rural landscape, amongst smaller burials, these large mausolea emphasised the power of the family who built it relative to the much humbler graves around them (see Quinn 2013, 197 for a similar observation on pre-Roman mausolea in Numidian territories). The display of imagery became more and more significant over time, with reliefs and statues being exclusively displayed on the external façade, in highly visible positions. The heterogeneous architectural types that developed show that a certain amount of individuality in burial monument was desired, which is also reflected in the variations of themes and styles of carvings depicted on the mausolea.

Tower mausolea were the most popular form of elite burial, drawing on wider North African ancestral traditions while, at the same time, new and innovative sub-types were introduced. Temple mausolea, to some extent, also draw on ancestral traditions, but arcaded temple mausolea essentially constitute a new form of burial monument. The space on the panels above the arches and on the spandrels of the arches lent itself well to the addition of rich iconographic decorations. In their distribution, it appears that temple mausolea were most popular in the pre-desert areas, which were still prosperous in the third and fourth century AD while the prosperity at the coast and Gebel slowly started to decline during those periods.

The overall number of mausolea in the pre-desert is much higher, which is partly due to better preservation but may reflect a different social organisation in the pre-desert from that of, for instance, in the Gebel areas. Landowners in the remote pre-desert were more likely to be resident here where they had to establish and maintain (and grow) their power within their own community during the first and second century AD.

The distinct lack of Roman domestic architecture and the continuous use of the Libyan spoken language (Grahame 1998, 109), as well as Neo-Punic and Libyan inscriptions, mirror a fairly autonomous indigenous population led by elite family units. However, it appears that the altered circumstances under Roman rule led to an increased importance of the display of ancestral lineage, to legitimize social advancements of the
newly emerging elite, and manifest their power over the region. Thus, mausolea also acted as a symbolic markers, with the elites using Punic and Libyan ancestral forms of architecture and decoration to establish and strengthen their social position within society while simultaneously stressing local traditions and religion (Stone 2007a, 139-141), thereby creating a ‘landscape of identity’ (Mattingly 2004b, 15).
CHAPTER 4
MAIN ICONOGRAPHIC THEMES AND THEIR WIDER CONTEXT

1.16 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to investigate Romano-Libyan iconographic traditions in Tripolitania, to highlight the predominant themes depicted on Roman-period mausolea, to shed light on their distribution, and to explore their similarities to and differences from pan-Mediterranean as well as North African art and iconography. Based on this, Chapter 5 will then interrogate the data in the light of regional and temporal differences, compositions, themes, and artistic styles to show how different elements of pan-Mediterranean imagery was chosen, manipulated and integrated into already existing traditions to reflect regional contemporary socio-cultural concerns.

1.17 Imagery and traditions of pre-Roman Tripolitania

The sudden change in (elite) behaviour to build substantial mausolea adorned with complex funerary iconography was not an isolated phenomenon in the Roman Empire. Similar developments can be observed, for instance, in Britain or Germany (see, for example, von Hesberg 1992; Scholz 2012a; 2012b; Toynbee 1962). As in Britain, in Tripolitania there is very little evidence for funerary sculpture (or sculpture in general) before the Roman period. The near absence of sculpture is particularly striking in contrast to adjacent Cyrenaican and Carthaginian territories, which had a much longer tradition of carved images and paintings on stelai, tower mausolea, haouanets (rock-cut tombs), and hypogea (Ben Yunes 2007; Longerstay 1993; Moore 2007; Rakob 1979; Rosenbaum 1960; Stone 2007b). In Tripolitania there is, as yet, little evidence that the people had a strong tradition in expressing their culture through imagery. Indeed, scholarly works on Tripolitania ‘art’ appear to avoid this subject. This is, in part, due to the lack of evidence, because most excavations have concentrated on the Roman period in the coastal cities. Indeed, more work is needed on the pre-Roman period, which is beyond the scope of this thesis.

The assumption that Tripolitanian peoples did not have much of their own art before the Roman conquest gives the impression that ‘Libyco-Roman art is a combination, to a
greater or lesser degree, of Punic abstraction and stylisation with the harmonious naturalism of the Mediterranean tradition’ (Walda 1985, 65). This is, essentially, denying the local inhabitants the ability to create their own sculptural themes and iconography.

1.17.1 Mausoleum B at Sabratha

Mausoleum B at Sabratha is the only one of the three pre-Roman mausolea from which most of the figural decoration has survived (see Appendix 1.3.1 for more details of its architecture). A small fragment of the upper torso of a statue in the round has been found near the mausoleum Henchir Būrgū at Jerba, and a wide collar is visible around the neck (Ferichiou 2009, 123; Figure 4.1a). At Sabratha, the false door on the east side was decorated with two lions as door-handles. Above, on the wide carvetto cornice on a plinth were three seated lion statues, one at each corner (Figure 4.1c). Relief decorations were set in between the lions, depicting the god Bes as lion-tamer above the false door on the east side (Figure 4.1b), Hercules killing the Nemean lion with a sword on the north side (Figure 4.1d), and a now unidentifiable scene on the third side. The lion’s back and head supported the projecting consoles above, on which stood three upright male statues, seemingly striding forwards with one foot in front of the other (again one statue at each corner). The whole monument was covered with painted stucco (Di Vita 2010, 4-6).

The links to Alexandrian, Punic, Numidian and Hellenistic artistic styles of figural decoration has been intensely studied by Di Vita (1968; 1980-81, 1981-82; 1990; 1992; 2004; 2005). However, as Quinn demonstrates in relation to Numidian ‘royal’ architecture, much more than just external ‘influence’ was at play in such monuments. The iconography was multifaceted and adapted to suit local needs, as well as the needs of the elite who built the monument, whether they were of the Numidian royal family or of the local leading families (Quinn 2013, 197-198). The depictions of Bes and Hercules can be understood as protectors of the monument. Bes was a dwarf god and powerful demon originating in Egypt from the Middle Kingdom onwards who gained popularity beyond Egypt in the Hellenistic and the Roman periods. He was seen as a protector against evil spirits, warding off danger. He guarded the margins of human life, chaotic forces and transitional periods such as sleep and childbirth, and he guarded the journey of the departed through the underworld (Dasen 2013, 55-83). Hercules, on the other hand, was equated with the god Melquart (or Milk’ashtart in Lepcis Magna) of Phoenician origin, who was popular across North Africa, and was one of
the patron gods of Lepcis Magna. The viewers could either see a local god, Melquart, or Milk’ashtart, or the demi-god Hercules, depending on their individual background.

The figural decoration shows strong reference to Punic and Archaic traditions. On the one hand, these multiple artistic styles reflect the interconnectivity of a busy port town such as Sabratha with the wider Mediterranean world. On the other hand, these influences of Punic, Hellenistic or Alexandrian models were not only a passive borrowing of styles by the architects but were designed to ‘show off’ their knowledge of different architectural styles (Quinn 2013, 186). The monument, therefore, can be read in multiple ways depending on the audience, while it incorporated deliberate local references to existing power structures and sources of power. In this way, the commissioners sought to ‘articulate and reinforce their own power within new social and political structures in the region’ (Quinn 2013, 186).
In the middle-to-late second century BC Mausoleum B fell into disrepair, perhaps after the loss of power by the Numidian kings, and material was recycled and integrated into the fabric of the growing city of Sabratha in the first century BC (Bessi 2003, 401). Thus, the mausoleum did not serve as a direct model for the Roman-period mausolea. However, its decoration shows a high level of iconographic (and architectural) complexity already in the second century BC. This demonstrates that the mausolea were not the result of passive copying of outside influences and ‘trends’, but that they bore complex messages that could be understood differently and on multiple levels by the individual viewer.

1.17.2 Pre-Roman Statues

Nine fragments of four or five pre-Roman male statues were found in 1930 at the west side of the Neronian port in Lepcis Magna in a small room. They perhaps represented local deities or priests, since one of them held the sign of Tanit in the right hand (Figure 4.2b and e), and they both held a long, flask-like object in front of them (Figure 4.2a and b). At least two of them were of considerable height, measuring up to 4.80m (Di Vita 1968, 46-47). The sculptures were carved of local limestone, and Di Vita tentatively dated them to the second or first century BC based on their style of carving and the style of clothing (Di Vita 1968, 48).

At least six fragments of another pre-Roman sculpture were found in Sabratha in Regio IV, 8 (Figure 4.2c). This statue was carved in local sandstone and was covered in stucco (Di Vita 1968, 53). Di Vita briefly studies these sculptures, particularly in relation to their distinctly Punic style, while detecting Archaic and Hellenistic influences in the style of rendering (1968, 46-58). All of these pre-Roman statues are yet to be studied in detail and fully published. Therefore, our information on them is rather limited. The heads of the statues that survive from Lepcis Magna are particularly interesting. They bear the large almond shaped eyes, slightly downturned mouth, and very limited individual features that are so characteristic of the funerary art of the Roman period (Figure 4.2d and 4.2f). It is interesting to observe that, like Mausoleum A at Sabratha, the statue from Sabratha was covered in stucco, and Di Vita suggests that the hair on the statues of Lepcis Magna was painted on. These features would have added a lot more detail to the figures, and it is conceivable that at least some of the sculptures on Roman-period mausolea were also painted. Traces of this paint or stucco would have long disappeared since they were exposed
to the elements for a long period of time. However, a scientific study on traces of paint or stucco may reveal these.

Figure 4.2: Pre-Roman statues. a) Statue from Lepcis Magna (1.40 m height, Image: Di Vita 1968, Figure 14); b) Statue from Lepcis Magna holding symbol of Tanit in the right hand (1.52 m height, Image: Di Vita 1968, Figure 13); c) Statue from Sabratha (0.98 m height, Di Vita 1968, Figure 17); d) Head from Lepcis Magna (0.49 m height, Di Vita 1968, Figure 15); e) Detail of sign of Tanit of statue depicted in Figure b (Di Vita 1968, Figure 13); f) Head from Lepcis Magna (0.43 m height, Di Vita 1968, Figure 15).
1.17.3 Painted Hypogea

As noted in Chapter 3, hypogea were another popular mode of elite burial in Tripolitania, in particular at the coast and in the Gebel. Four of these hypogea that were excavated were decorated with wall paintings; three hypogea are from the first century AD (‘Defunto Eroizzato’, the tomb of the Gorgon at El-Balik near Sabratha, and the hypogeum of Zanzur, 15 km outside Oea) and one from the fourth century AD (Gargasesc, east of Oea). The hypogeum at Zanzur is one of the earliest examples of painted tombs in Tripolitania and was in use from the first century AD to the second or third century AD based on its grave goods such as amphorae, lamps, paterae, and glass cinerary urns (Di Vita 2010, 130; Griffith 2008, 22-34). The walls and ceiling is painted in polychrome designs (Figure 4.3). Opposite the entrance, a figure was depicted burning incense on a small altar. The lower register displayed animals hunting one another, including a lion and dogs chasing their prey. The upper register to the left showed a multiplicity of scenes from the deceased saying goodbye to his family, crossing the river (Styx) in a boat with Charon, and finally being received by two seated figures, most likely Hades and Persephone. Two further figures stood behind the seated ones. The upper register to the right showed a figure holding a dog on a chain, most likely representing the story of Hercules and Cerberus. The three figures that follow are very difficult to identify, perhaps, referring to a mystery cult such as Isis or Shadrapa (Dionysus/Liber Pater) because of the shaved head of one of the figures, or the image may represent the reunion of Persephone and Demeter. The last image shows a tall, strong man carrying a dead body, perhaps again Hercules (see Di Vita 2010; Griffith 2008 for an in depth description and discussion of the imagery). The roof was painted with winged figures, garlands and flowers.

Figure 4.3: Painted tomb of Zanzur from the first century AD (Image: Di Vita 2010, Figure 6).

Another contemporary painted hypogeum named ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ is located east of Sabratha, to the east of the amphitheatre in an area where other monumental tombs are
The tomb is divided into two chambers. The entrance chamber is plastered and painted in polychrome style, with male and female (gorgon) heads decorating the niches. A large head of a gorgon is depicted on the ceiling inside a wreath of leaves. Further leaves and scrolls decorate the walls and the ceiling, and, finally, two false doors guard the steps up to the entrance/exit (Figure 4.4b). In the second chamber, two niches hold the paintings that depict two (or three?) individuals. In the first niche, a bearded man reclined on a couch (kline), his head surrounded by a corona or crown. A larger and much more faded head is depicted to the left, surrounded by a corona. To the right of the couch stood a little three-legged table, and the figures are framed by two palm leaves. Above, a Punic inscription proclaimed: ‘the great son of Marcus and Marcius? MN / TLK Old, abhorred sin and loves gentleness’ (translated into French by Di Vita 2010, 144) (Figure 4.4c). This inscription, together with the corona, identified the owner of the tomb as a member of a mystery cult, perhaps that of Liber Pater or Dionysus (Di Vita 2010, 144). The second niche depicted a female bust, the wife of the deceased identified by a neo-Punic inscription, framed with palm leaves (Di Vita 2004, 224). Outside this frame were two triangles on top of each other, perhaps the sign of Tanit (Di Vita 2004, 224).

The style of painting of the hypogea of Zanzur and Defunto Eroizzato is rather different. The painter(s) of the tomb of Zanzur have followed a style also common in Alexandria, while the tombs at El-Balik conform to the North African preference for large, almond shaped eyes and more schematic outlines (Di Vita 1992, 112), while Di Vita also stresses the predominantly Greek and eastern influences of the kline scene at the hypogeum of ‘Defunto Eroizzato’.

What they both have in common is a close link to local customs and religions, while, at the same time, they have adapted to elements from an Empire-wide image pool, although to different degrees. The cults of Dionysus and Liber Pater had a long tradition in Tripolitania. The local god Shadrapa was associated with Liber Pater at the beginning of the Roman period, while Hercules had a longstanding association with Milk’ashtart, the patron god of Lepcis Magna. The sign of Tanit reflects the close link to the Punic goddess, who was associated with the Roman Caelestis (Mattingly 1995, 167-169). The tomb of Zanzur, instead, more clearly refers to classical myth, such as Hercules crossing the river Styx or the meeting with Hades and Persephone. As we shall see later, classical myth is a subject that will be only very occasionally met on the mausolea, where it occurs more commonly in western Tripolitania and the coast. In contrast, hunting scenes, also observed at Zanzur, are
a subject that proved to be very popular not only on mausolea but also on mosaics and domestic wall-painting.

Earlier imagery from Tripolitania already shows a complexity in iconography and styles that can be difficult to ‘assign’ to a specific culture or artistic tradition. Initially, foreign influences were added into already existing ideas of representation, and, in time, these became part of the local image pool. As we have already seen in the case of architectural styles of mausolea, new styles were introduced during certain periods of time. They may have been more popular in one region, and less in another, such as was the case with the arcaded temple tombs. Although the evidence for pre-Roman iconography in Tripolitania is slim, certain elements such as the lion, Hercules, as well as the symbol of Tanit are images that were deeply embedded within local culture, although their meaning could perhaps differ.
from region to region. Studying these images in isolation from their monuments, landscape, and historical background thus would create a false ‘reading’ of the iconography.

The section below will demonstrate the broad distribution of the main themes across Tripolitania and investigate them in their broader North African and Mediterranean context. Due to the relatively scarce evidence of pre-Roman iconography, comparisons will be made to imagery on mausolea, funerary and votive stelai of neighbouring Africa Proconsularis and other, Empire-wide imagery. This is not to say that the iconography had the same meaning across the Empire. On the contrary, it demonstrates how themes were borrowed, manipulated and adapted to suit local needs. By exploring the wider meaning of the iconography, the regional distinctiveness can be addressed more clearly in Chapter 5.

1.18 The Imagery: Main Themes, Distribution, and Iconography

Brogan and Smith (1984) and Mattingly (1999; 2003; 2010) studied the imagery of the Ghirza tombs in detail and established relevant categories. Brogan divided the depictions into three groups: 1) Symbolic Images, 2) Scenes of Daily Life and 3) Religious Scenes. Mattingly refined those categories to allow a more detailed reading of the reliefs: 1) Symbolic Sculpture; 2) Scenes of Daily Life; 3) Images of the Deceased; 4) Ceremonial Scenes; and 5) Sacrificial Scenes. While these categories were appropriate tools to study the imagery at one particular site, they need to be further refined to encompass the varied iconography of the whole of the region. The following categories are based on the main themes that emerged during this study:

1) Classical motifs
2) Representation of gods
3) Religious activity
4) Images of the deceased
5) Agricultural activity and domestic animals
6) Fertility and prosperity
7) Animals, hunting, and games
8) Economic activity
9) Martial activities
While it is necessary to establish the above categories to analyse the imagery in a systematic manner, it is important to remember that such strict groupings did not exist in the mind of the commissioner, artist or viewer. Images can hold multiple meanings as I have demonstrated above. Hercules can be perceived as a figure of classical myth or as the Libyco-Phoenician deity Melquart or Milk’ashtar, or, indeed, both at the same time. Rosettes may have simply functioned as an architectural decoration or reflected fertility or prosperity, or they may also have referred to astral symbols as Brogan and Smith suggests (1984, 215).

1.18.1 Classical Motifs and Mythological Personifications

Greek and Roman mythology were popular subjects for decorations on mausolea, sarcophagi and other forms of tomb decorations across the Empire (see, for instance, Zanker and Ewald 2004). We have already encountered mythological scenes in the small number of painted hypogea mentioned above. It may, therefore, come as a surprise that only very few scenes refer to the classical repertoire, mainly at the coast and in the western Gefara and the Gebel (Table 4.1). Strikingly, they do not feature much at all in the pre-desert or desert, and some of the representations are far from conclusive. In contrast, classical scenes, such as Erotes with downward-pointing torches, Dionysiac, or the zodiac, are common amongst relief sculpture on the mausolea of neighbouring Africa Proconsularis (Moore 2007, 86-87).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>Gefara</th>
<th>Gebel</th>
<th>Pre-Desert</th>
<th>Desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victory/Winged Figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorgon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpheus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Seasons</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zodiac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Number of relief panels that depict classical motifs mythological personifications by geographical region.

*Orpheus*: The myth of Orpheus and Euridice is depicted on two panels at el-Amrouni in the Gefara. The first shows Orpheus and Euridice just before stepping through the portal of the Underworld, Euridice in front of Orpheus. On the other side of the portal sits Cerberus and Charon is pushing the boat across the river Styx. Orpheus can be identified by his lyre
An unidentifiable figure is standing above the scene seemingly pushing a square object upwards, and a second unidentifiable figure is depicted in a roundel, curiously turned sideways (>Ea001-A-02). In a second scene (>Ea001-A-01) Orpheus is sitting under a tree taming the animals (lions, birds, monkeys, perhaps a boar). El-Amrouni is the only mausoleum that clearly has scenes of classical myth as the main subject. Despite the popularity of the tale of Orpheus on funerary iconography across the Empire, in Tripolitania this scenes is only met once.

*Winged felines:* The symbolism of the sphinxes was an ancient one already in the Roman period. Its symbolism varied, from guardian of temples and palaces in the Phoenician world to the bearer of bad luck and death-bringer in early Greek mythology whilst, at the same time, the sphinx could be a symbol of protection, and, finally, the keeper of riddles in the Oedipus myth (Rösch-von der Heyde 1999).
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Sphinxes are often associated with the funerary realm across the Greek and Roman world, guarding tombs and, in the Greek world, marking graves of men who died young (Rösch-von der Heyde 1999). Sphinxes do not appear on relief stelai or mausolea from Africa Proconsularis. Reliefs depicting a feline’s body with wings and a human face which characterise the sphinx have been found in the Gefara (Figure 4.5b-c). There is only one example surviving from the pre-desert, from Ghirza (Figure 4.5a; >Gh128-D-06). There were probably two Sphinxes in this scene which were holding an object between them, like the lion figures on three other mausolea in this cemetery (>Gh128-D-02; Gh128-G-07). The style of the Ghirza sphinx stands in stark contrast to the ones found in the Gefara, which are more akin to the artistic style of the coastal cities.

Brogan mentions two stones that each depicted a sphinx with many udders in the central Gebel at Giado (>Bg001-A-05). I could not locate an image of these two reliefs, which, according to Brogan, looked similar to the sphinx on the arch of Marcus Aurelius at Tripoli (Figure 4.5c; Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive). The sphinx at Beni Guedal (Figure 4.5b; >Gu001-B-02) and the sphinx at El-Ausaf (Figure 4.5d; >Eau001-A-04) are similar in style, carved with incised lines in profile with a seated feline body, wings, teats, and a female face. However, the Sphinx from Tigé is carved in much higher relief and with more detail.

The Four Seasons: The four seasons were a popular theme in Roman iconography, and are not unusual in Roman funerary art (especially on sarcophagi) where they symbolised the renewal of life. They became popular on funerary stelai in Africa Proconsularis in the first century AD, and by the third century AD they were one of the most popular images (Wurnig 2004, 136), associated with Saturn and the renewal of the seasons (Le Glay 1966, 227).

Despite their popularity in Africa Proconsularis, they only seem to appear twice in Tripolitania, and both cases are debatable. The three winged figures at el-Ausaf in the Gefara, which come from the same monument, could represent the four seasons. The fourth ‘season’ is missing. One figure held fruit in a shawl, perhaps representing autumn (Figure 4.6a; >Eau001-A-01). At Gasr Duierat near Lepcis Magna, three winged figures survive which are in agricultural activities (reaping, ploughing and tending the fields; Figure 4.6a; >Gd001-A-03; Gd001-A-04; Gd001-A-05). The four seasons were also particularly popular in mosaic, where they were mainly represented as female figures, such as at the villa at Silin near Lepcis Magna (Figure 4.6c). The figures at El-Ausaf near Tigé, however, appear to be male, a tendency also observed on the funerary stelai of Africa Proconsularis (Parrish 1984, 21).
Dunbabin noticed that in mosaics of North Africa the four seasons do not seem to be associated with particular cults such as Mithras or Cybele. They also do not seem to try to convey philosophical concepts (Dunbabin 1978, 160). The emphasis is as on the relief stelai, on the renewal of life, fertility, blessings and good fortune, and on ensuring that fortune will last throughout the year (Dunbabin 1978, 158). Furthermore, they point towards the prosperity of the owner (Dunbabin 1978, 160-161). Within the context of the mausoleum at El-Ausaf’s other reliefs (ploughing scene; >Eau001-A-05) and representations of ripe corn (>Eau001-A-06), this interpretation may also be true here.
4.3.2 Representation of Deities

Figural representations of deities are rare. Images of the god Saturn or Baal Hammon, the goddess Caelestis or the Capitoline triad so popular on Neo-Punic stelai of Africa Proconsularis (see for instance Moore 2000, Wurnig 2006) are completely absent from the Tripolitania monuments. There may, of course, be symbolic references which identified individual gods to the viewer. However, the figural depiction of gods on the mausolea was not common, or not deemed necessary.

What could be interpreted as symbolic images of gods/deities are present in abundance on the mausolea as, for instance, in the form or roundels, discs, crescents, rosettes, palms, vines, fish, bull, sheep, goats, pomegranates, peacocks, cockerels and other birds, flowers and livestock. Roundels, disks, crescents and rosettes may symbolise the sun, the moon and the stars, symbols for Baal-Hammon/Saturn or Tanit/Caelestis (Le Glay 1966). However, the symbol of Tanit is glaringly absent on the mausolea, despite being so popular on funerary stelai of Africa Proconsularis. Some funerary stelai from the Tripolitania coast and Gebel bear this symbol, as does a doorframe of a farm in the pre-desert in the Wadi Marsit (Di Vita 1968, Figure 1 and Figure 18; Brogan and Smith 1967, 139-141). It is not unknown in our region, but again, it seems, consciously excluded from the decorations of the mausolea.

Vines, bunches of grapes and the cantharus can be associated with fertility and life, as well as Shadrapa/Dionysus/Liber Pater, who was very popular in North Africa and was, together with Milk’ashtart, the patron god of Lepcis Magna (IRT2009, 296). Both, Dionysus and Liber Pater derive from Graeco-Roman traditions (Moore 2000, 53). Dionysus started to appear in North Africa in the fourth century BC and is predominantly known from pictorial representations, while over a hundred inscriptions were dedicated to Liber Pater across North Africa (Bruhl 1953, 224; Boussada 1992, 1048, 1051, 1064; Picard 1979, 1983). The cult of Liber Pater flourished during the second and third century AD, but essentially disappeared in the late Empire, while Dionysiac imagery remained popular (Moore 2000, 54).

Bull heads and masks may make reference to Gurzil, who was the son of the desert god Ammon and a cow. However, Gurzil is only mentioned in Corripus, and it is not clear how widespread this cult was (Iohannis, V, 22-26; Riedlberger 2010, 301). Bulls may refer to the ram-horned Ammon himself, who was very popular in Tripolitania and who shared many attributes with Baal-Hammon (Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 255-265; Le Glay 1966, 107-152;
Mattingly 1995, 168). Saturn stelai in Africa Proconsularis are decorated with scenes of farming, peacocks, pomegranates, sheep, goats, lions, date palms, cockerels, and birds (Wurnig 2006). As with Hercules, and, in fact, much of the iconography presented in this thesis, the personal background and knowledge of the viewer may have shaped how the decorations were interpreted. The depictions of these potential symbols are best investigated in more detail within their individual tomb-context (Chapter 5), and they will be discussed in this chapter in more generic terms.

Hercules/Milk’ashtart: The most recurring depiction of a (demi)god is that of Hercules. His image is difficult to interpret within its North African context because it is far from straightforward due to syncretism with the Libyco-Phoenician god Melquart, called Milk’ashtart in Lepcis Magna, where he was one of the major gods (Mattingly 1995, 167). On Punic coins, it is almost impossible to distinguish between Hercules and Melquart (Yarrow 2013, 357).

A clear reference to Hercules and classical myth is depicted on a panel of the el-Amrouni mausoleum in the Gefara: Hercules and Alcestis (>Ea001-A-03). To the left the hero is helping Alcestis off the boat in which Charon stands holding a pole after returning from the Underworld, and on the right Hercules is walking behind Alcestis holding her right shoulder, leading her back to her bereaved husband, the king Admetus. On the same monument, the myth of Orpheus and Euridice is carved in stone. Hercules may also be represented on mausoleum North D at Ghirza hunting a stag (>Gh128-D-04) and perhaps fighting a stag and a bull on Mausoleum North B (>Gh129-B-17). A more convincing representation of Hercules can be found on a mausoleum in the Wadi Ghalbun near Bani Ulid (>Ghl001-A-01), where a standing male figure has a lion cloak thrown over the right shoulder while holding a club in the left hand.

Hercules and Alcestis, as well as Orpheus and Euridice, are mythological themes that were popular across the Empire within the funerary context. Hercules is often linked with characteristic traits such as diligence, hard work and courage that the deceased possessed, while Alcestis is linked to wifely virtues and faithfulness (Zanker and Ewald 2004, 202-203). Alcestis is also firmly linked to the afterlife, or the life to come (Nagy 2016, 380). The fact that Orpheus and Euridice, as well as Hercules and Alcestis, appear together on the same mausoleum indicates that perhaps the husband and wife commemorated at el-Amrouni wanted to highlight their strong marital bond (see Zanker and Ewald 2012, 93 for this scene on sarcophagi), rather than make a direct reference to Milk’ashtart.
**Neptune/Triton:** One of the most outstanding classical scenes comes from the Gebel region, at Chormet Bu Seila. The scattered remains of the mausoleum suggest that this was once a tower tomb of substantial proportions. Amongst the relief carvings is the depiction of Neptune with four sea-horses (hippokampoi; >Ch001-A-01). This mausoleum with its scene of Neptune, Triton, and a Gorgon will be examined in more detail in section 5.4.3, and thus only briefly mentioned here. However, the depiction of these sea deities is unique within its Tripolitanian context.

**Vine/grapevine/Cantharus:** The vine and the grapevine are also popular motifs on Tripolitanian mausolea and are evident across the region. They hold a strong association with Shadrapa/Liber Pater/Dionysus, especially if they spring out of a cantharus, also a symbol of the god. The Dionysus/Liber Pater cult was very popular in Tripolitania, and he was one of the patron gods of Leptis Magna and associated with the Punic god Shadrapa (Bruhl 1953). On Neo-Punic funerary stelai, Dionysus/Liber Pater is depicted frequently, but no image of the god has survived from the mausolea of Tripolitania. The cantharus is depicted, for instance, at Ghirza (>Gh129-A-03) and in the Wadi Antar (>An001-B-01) in the pre-desert, and at Chormet el-Bousaila in the Gebel (>Ch001-A-08). The vine and the grapevine can perhaps also be interpreted as symbols of male fertility (Brogan and Smith 1984, 218).

**Rosettes, roundels, and crescents:** Rosettes and/or roundels are present on almost every decorated mausoleum of Tripolitania. In some cases, their function may have been purely decorative. Brogan noted that on the Ghirza tombs agricultural scenes frequently are decorated with rosettes. Instead of interpreting them as a simple decorative floral motive, she suggests that they may symbolise stars in reference to Saturn/Baal Hammon or Tanit/Caelestis since similar six- or eight-pointed ‘stars’ can be found on Saturn stelai and on sanctuaries of Saturn. She further argues that roundels may make reference to the sun or the moon, symbols of Caelestis and Saturn (Brogan and Smith 1984, 215-216). Given the limited evidence for the cult of Tanit and Saturn in Tripolitania, this interpretation has to be taken with caution. Some signs of Tanit are evident on early farms in the Gebel and the pre-desert as well as at Sabratha and the cult of Caelestis was practiced at Leptis Magna, Sabratha, Tarhuna and Zitha (Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 255-269; Mattingly 1995, 162, 168). However, the complete lack of the symbol for Tanit on any mausolea suggests that the cult was not strongly associated with the funerary ritual of the region. Saturn, on the other hand, is only attested in Sabratha (Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 255-269; Mattingly 1995, 168). The complete lack of Saturn stelai
in Tripolitania suggests that this cult was more popular in neighbouring Africa Proconsularis (Wilson 2005, 403).

Roundels could also represent bread. On the tomb in the Wadi Lella (>Le001-A-07) the roundels most likely represent bread, since the majority of the reliefs on this tomb depict some form of food, demonstrating that the individual context is crucial in interpreting possible symbolism (Figure 4.9c).

The crescent moon is only present on three mausolea, in the Wadi Antar in the pre-desert (>An001-B-01), and at Gasr Duierat at the coast (>Gd001-A-08) and in the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-A-03, see section 6.2.2). In the Wadi Antar, the crescent moon is depicted above a cup or cantharus that is framed by vegetal scrolls, symbols often associated with the cult of Liber Pater/Dionysus. The crescent moon at Gasr Duierat is depicted on top of one of the decorated pilasters, above scrolls of vine and grapes, perhaps also referring to Liber Pater/Dionysus rather than Saturn or Caelestis.

1.18.2 Religious Activity

Specific references to religious activities such as sacrifice or prayer are infrequent and occur in particular in the pre-desert and Gebel region (Table 4.2). Vessels that are depicted could have served as containers for offerings or for libation, though their purpose is rather more ambiguous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>Gefara</th>
<th>Gebel</th>
<th>Pre-desert</th>
<th>Desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacrifice of animals</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gesture of prayer</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offering Vessels/Libation</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Number of relief panels that depict scenes related to religious activities.

*Sacrifice:* Animal sacrifice scenes are present at Ghirza in the pre-desert on Tomb North A (>Gh129-A-02), and on South F (>Gh128-F-10), and on a relief from the Wadi al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-01). Ghirza North A and al-Binaya represent a bull sacrifice (Figure 4.7a and 4.7c) while Ghirza South F may depict the impending sacrifice of a goat. At Ghirza North A, two men hold a bull between them. The one to the right holds onto the bull’s left horn with his right hand and swings a double-headed axe above the head of the bull with his left. The figure to the left holds the bull by a rope with his right hand and by the tail with his left.
At South F a man is in the process of sacrificing a goat while an attendant stands close by holding a vessel. The shelves in the background hold a selection of human heads. From a broken stone in the Wadi al-Binaya in the pre-desert comes a bull-sacrifice scene similar to the one at Ghirza (Figure 4.7c). Bull-sacrifice scenes are known from funerary and votive stelai in Africa Proconsularis from the Roman period, but there the actual act of killing as shown at Ghirza and al-Binaya is depicted to a lesser extent (Moore 2000; Elsner 2012, 159). Three third-century AD mausolea from the area around Makthar bear scenes of bull sacrifice (Julii Mausoleum, ‘Neopunic’ Mausoleum and an unpublished mausoleum; Moore 2007 37, n.33). The Severan arch at Lepcis Magna depicts a bull-sacrifice scene, where the bull is held by the horns by one person while another is swinging a large hammer or double-headed axe to stun the bull (Figure 4.7b). However, ritual related to bulls is depicted on rock carvings in Tripolitania, dating back from before the Roman period. It appears that bulls as animals with ritual significance seem to have a long tradition unrelated to the Roman ritual of bull sacrifice (see for instance Barker 1986).

Bulls were a very expensive animal to sacrifice, and thus, such sacrifice probably did not take place very often. An inscription found near Mausoleum North A at Ghirza implicitly refers to the sacrifice of animals for a feast to celebrate the ancestors, amongst them 51 bulls and 31 goats (Brogan and Smith 1984, 135, 161-162). Bull fights are depicted on Mausoleum North B (>Gh129-B-17) and North C (>Gh129-C-14), and bull heads can be seen on South C (>Gh128-C-02), South D (>Gh128-D-02) and South G (>Gh128-G-07). The bull was the sacred animal of the Libyan God Gurzil (this will be discussed in more detail in section 5.5.3). That Ghirza was indeed a place where Gurzil was worshiped, but the presence of a large temple at Ghirza underlines the regional significance of the settlement and indicates that sacrifices of some form may have taken place.15 The presence of only Libyan inscription found at the temple on, for instance, vessels, altars, and doorways, emphasises that the cult may have been exclusively Libyan (for inscription see Brogan and Smith 1984, 250-251). It is notable that sacrificial scenes of less expensive animals such as sheep or goats are not depicted outside Ghirza. In fact, they are completely absent. Such sacrificial scenes were popular across the Empire but did not take hold in Tripolitania.

---

15 The regional significance of Ghirza, the temple and the tombs will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.
Gesture of prayer: Some stones depict a gesture of adoration, mourning or prayer. Both arms are facing upwards at a right angle and the palms of the hands turned outwards at shoulder level, as, for instance on a relief from the Wadi Merdum in the pre-desert (Figure 4.8b) (>Md001-C-02). A stone from the Wadi Migdal, also in the pre-desert (>Mg001-A-05), depicts six women (four on the front, two on the side) in this pose, the mouth turned downwards, perhaps suggesting a posture of mourning for the deceased (Figure 4.8a). At Tatahouine in the Gefara a person is depicted striking this pose, both hands raised above the head (>Tat001-B-02). Similar poses can be observed on Saturn stelai from Africa Proconsularis. The gesture of prayer or adoration is shown by raising the right arm at a right angle, palm facing outwards while the left is pointing towards the heart or abdomen (Wurnig 2006, 38-39). In Tripolitania, instead, both arms are raised most likely related to prayer or mourning. The religious significance of this pose is supported by the depiction on two small altars found in the temple of Ghirza. They show a figure standing upright, with both arms raised up (Figure 4.8c and 4.8d).
Offering vessels/libation: Some mausolea display cups or vessels, which may refer to offerings or libations as at Tatahouine in the Gefara (>Tat001-B-03); at Umm el Agerem (>Ag002-A-01) or at Ghirza (>Gh129-C-15). As mentioned in Chapter 3, some mausolea had associated offering tables or libation channels. Therefore, offerings to the dead constituted an important part of the veneration of the dead, which will be discuss more in section 6.4. A funerary feast is possibly depicted on the mausoleum in the Wadi Lella. Remarkably, these reliefs do not depict the Totenmahl that was so popular across the Empire. Instead they show
specific dishes such as a fish on a platter (>Le001-A-06), fruits such as figs (Figure 4.9a; >Le001-A-04), vegetables and fish (Figure 4.9a-c; >Le001-A-03), bread (Figure 4.9c >Le001-A-07), as well as an amphora and a wine pitcher (>Le001-A-05). It is unclear whether the commissioner of the tomb desired to forever have a funerary feast depicted on his tomb, if he wanted to stress the prosperity of the family, or if he was involved in the food trade. This mausoleum is unique within the Tripolitanian, and wider North African context, and shows that the decorations are not a mere copy of Roman ideals, but, instead, reflect very regional and personal concerns.
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Figure 4.9: Mausoleum in the Wadi Lella. a) Reliefs depicting a basket with figs, a cup and some long vegetables (>Le001-A-04; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Two fish and root vegetables (>Le001-A-03; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) fish on a tray sitting on a folding table and four loaves of round bread (>Le001-A-06; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).

### 1.18.3 Images of the Deceased

The depiction of the deceased in the form of portraits is rather common while statues are less prevalent (see section 6.2.1 for a detailed table). Overall, portraits are more widespread in the pre-desert. An overview of the portrait sculpture will be given below, but they will be discussed in more detail in section 6.2.

The majority of reliefs depict couples (Figure 4.10c). Only on four occasions in surviving examples is the couple accompanied by a third, smaller figure, perhaps a child, at
Ghirza (>Gh128-A-01; Gh128-C-01; Gh128-D-01; Figure 4.10a) and the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-A-02; Figure 4.10b). Only seven depict one single individual on a single panel (Figure 2.10d). Two females are shown together at Ghirza (>Gh129-A-05) while a portrait from the Wadi Al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-02) shows two men together. The subjects of the majority of portraits have been carved frontally, looking out towards the viewer. At Umm el-Agerem in the pre-desert a person is standing under an arch or doorway held by two columns (>Ag002-A-01). Such depictions are well known from Punic- and Roman-period Saturn stelai, but only occur once on the Tripolitanian mausolea. They may signify a temple or shrine, or the right of passage from the world of the living to the world of the dead (Moore 2000, 78; Wurnig 2006, 147-148).

Across the Empire in the third century AD, the custom of portraiture on tombs was frequently replaced by representations of the dead in the process of executing power which is something we can also see at Ghirza on the later tombs (Fontana 1997; Mattingly 2011). Tombs B (>Gh129-B-06) and C (>Gh129-C-04) of the North cemetery at Ghirza lack a specific portraiture bust but, instead, the deceased can be found sitting on a folding chair.
(Figure 4.11a). The men on both reliefs are surrounded by a group of attendants. These two men are clearly in a position of power, and most likely representing leading persons in the settlement. Such ceremonial scenes are also known from Ghadames (Figure 4.11b; >Gha001-A-03), another centre of power, as the existence of at least 10 arcaded mausolea also suggests. This scenes will be discuss in more detail in chapters 5 and 6.

Portrait statues are less prevalent; one portrait statues is known from Lepcis Magna (>Gd001-A-12), three from the Gefara (Tat001-A-02; Tat001-A-03; Gu001-B-01 three from the Gebel (Ch001-A-15 and Ch001-A-16; Ha001-A-01) and six from the pre-desert (two from Ghirza, >Gh128-A-12 and Gh128-A-13, one from the Wadi Khanafes, (>Kn005-C-01), two from the Wadi Antar (>An001-A-08; An001-B-02) and one statue was seen by Brogan in the Wadi Ghurgar, but was later lost (>Gr022-A-02). Portrait statues were a much more common form of decoration in Africa Proconsularis (Moore 2007, 83) but they appear to have been less popular in Tripolitania. Moreover, they required additional specific skills from the sculptor, and there was probably also a question of cost.
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Figure 4.11:a) So-called chiefdom scene from North C at Ghirza (Drawing: Author); b) Drawing by Duveyrier of a stone he saw at the oasis town of Ghadames (Image: Duveyrier 1864, 250, Plate X).

1.18.4 Agricultural Activity and Domestic Animals

One of the most prominent types of representation comprises agricultural scenes (Table 4.4). They can be found in every zone of Tripolitania and at Ghirza, and agriculture is one of the most commonly repeated subjects. The genre is broad and includes the depiction of ploughing, reaping, clearing and tending the fields, sowing, carrying of baskets, threshing, and winnowing, and the representation of bundles of wheat.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>Gefara</th>
<th>Gebel</th>
<th>Pre-desert</th>
<th>Desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing and tending the fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural plants/produce (dates and date palms, wheat)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Number and distribution of agricultural scenes across Tripolitania.

It is striking that these scenes are exclusively populated by male figures. No female appears to be represented on the reliefs catalogued in this work. In contrast, on mosaics or on Neo-Punic funerary stelai from Africa Proconsularis women clearly take part in agricultural activities. Women frequently hold a basket in agricultural scenes, sometimes next to a bull as an additional reference to agricultural activities while men are ploughing with horse or bulls (Wurnig 2006, 151). Sheaves of wheat also represent the importance of farming, but these, and the representation of bulls, could also signify a reference to Saturn and Caelestis (Wurnig 2006, 152). In Tripolitanian and other North African mosaic, scenes of farming were popular from the Severan period onwards, losing in popularity again in the late 3rd century AD (Dunbabin 1978, 114).

Figure 4.12: Ploughing scenes. a) Photograph taken in the 1950s of ploughing with a camel in Tripolitania (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Ploughing with a camel on a relief from the Wadi al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-03; Image: Haddad).
Clearing and tending the fields: This activity is depicted at Ghirza (>Gh128-C-05; Gh129-C-09; Gh129-C-01) and at al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-03). At Ghirza the figures are working the ground with hoes, and at al-Binaya a man is swinging his hoes in the air (Figure 4.12b).

Ploughing: The act of ploughing with horses, oxen or camels is the most frequent image: the plough was commonly driven by a person holding a stick in one hand, and the plough in the other as, for instance depicted on a relief from Tigi (Figure 4.14a) Brogan notes that ploughing with a camel and a wooden plough while lifting a stick to drive on the animal was still a scene she could observe in Tripolitania (1984, 220; Figure 4.12a). The ploughing with camels is the most common depiction, at Ghirza, Wadi al-Binaya (Figure 4.12b) the Wadi Antar, Wadi Khanafes, Tigi, Giado, and El Amrouni. Horses are used for ploughing at Ghirza and Khanafes while oxen are used at Ghirza and Tigi.

Sowing: The ploughman is often accompanied by a person carrying a basket on his shoulder (4.13b-d). He is walking behind the ploughman, most likely throwing the seeds into the freshly ploughed earth. This scene can be seen twice at Ghirza (>Gh129-C-09; Gh129-C-13), in the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-A-01) and at Tabuniyah (>Tb045-A-03) in the pre-desert, and once in the Gebel (>Bg001-A-01). A relief of a person carrying a basket is also known from Ghadames (>Gha001-A-14).

Harvesting: Slightly less common is the process of harvesting, represented by a person in the process of cutting the wheat with a sickle (Figure 4.13b; 4.14d). The reaper is sometimes accompanied by a figure carrying a basket on one shoulder (Figure 4.14b-d), and at the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-A-01) a reaper in the Wadi Antar is placing the bundles into a basket (>An001-A-13), whilst at Ghirza (>Gh129-B-12; 13; Gh129-C-08), al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-10), and Ghadames a reaper is cutting the wheat with a sickle (>Gha001-A-05).

Threshing and winnowing: The activity of threshing and winnowing is only depicted at Ghirza (>Gh129-B-14; Figure 4.13a) and at al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-10; Figure 4.13b), where to the right two men are winnowing the corn with large pitch forks, and to the left two people are threshing with the help of three or four oxen to separate the chaff from the wheat. This scene of humans and animals threshing is very similar to the Silin mosaic (Figure 4.13c).
Other agricultural activity: Other agricultural activity is represented by a figure climbing a palm tree to harvest dates at Ghirza (>Gh128-F-01) and the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-B-01) in the pre-desert, and grapes are cut with a sickle-like hook at Ghirza (>Gh128-F-12). The majority of figures that are actively involved in agriculture wear a short tunic and in some cases, a belt (Figure 4.13a and 4.13c). The ploughman at Ghirza South C (>129-C-01), and the reaper at Tabunyiah (>Tb045-A-03) both wear a longer garment which reaches down to the ankles (Figure 4.14c). The dress style in Ghadames is different to the rest of the Tripolitanian scenes (>Gha001-A-05; Gha001-A-014); the workers appear to wear a two-piece garment consisting of a tunic and a skirt-like undergarment (Figure 4.14b and 4.14d).

While the styles of carving display distinct regional differences and preferences, what they have in common is a remarkable attention to detail in the rendering of agricultural activities (Zanker 2008, 217). These specific scenes carried a multitude of important messages: they underlined the importance of agricultural activities to the owner and to the community; they displayed the wealth and achievements of the deceased (and the family) and the prosperity of the region; they carried symbolic meanings by representing the circle of life, fertility, the cycle of cultivation and good harvest (Shaw 2003, 162-165). Furthermore, country life was an extremely popular scene on mosaics (Dunbabin 1978,
and the popularity of this image in the domestic sphere was perhaps transferred onto mausolea. Amongst the North African elite landholding was the main form of wealth. Inscriptions and ancient texts from Tripolitania and Africa Proconsularis indicated that prestige and status was demonstrated by showing their involvement in rural investment, the development of land and innovation in tools and crops (Stone 1998).

However, those scenes not only celebrated the abundance and life but also celebrated death. They represented the circle of life, starting with the ploughing of the fields, and ending with cutting of stalks of ripe corn, so vividly depicted on the sequence of ploughing, sowing, harvesting and reaping on Mausoleum North B at Ghirza (Shaw 2013, 162-163). The presence of a single agricultural scene on a mausoleum, such as ploughing or reaping can be seen as an abbreviation of the full sequence (Shaw 2013, 165).

The connections between agricultural scenes and the life/death cycle were made all over the Empire, from North Africa to Gaul and Britain (Shaw 2013). However, regional differences in style of carving, dress and agricultural methods can be observed. The ploughing with camels is a local references and is not simply plucked from an Empire-wide image pool. The heat of the summer in North Africa required the reapers to wear light
garments in the form of the short tunics that are depicted on almost all of the agricultural scenes of Tripolitania.

1.18.5 Fertility and Prosperity

Images of fertility and prosperity are usually linked to faunal and floral depictions and are evident across the Empire, including Tripolitania. Thus, this imagery, in particular, is based on broader common themes in Roman art. Vines and ivy are frequently depicted on tombs as a generic decoration, or, at the same time, to symbolise abundance and fertility. Inhabited scrolls with birds, rabbits or other small animals can also be frequently observed across the region.

Grapes and Pomegranates: Grapes can represent male fertility and the male generative force. Grapes, however, were also grown for wine production, both in the Gebel and in the pre-desert (Ahmed 2010; Barker 1996; Hobson 2015, 95; Mattingly 1995). Pomegranates (also the fruit of Juno and Ceres), with their many seeds, are associated with female fertility (Brogan and Smith 1984, 218). Such associations can be made with more certainty when the fruit is depicted next to the male and female figures (>Gh129-C-16; Kn005-A-02)

Phallus: The phallus is a symbol of fertility, and, in funerary contexts, may symbolise new life, and the re-birth after death (Cumont 1949, 251). It also serves as guardian against the evil eye (Picard 1954, 157). The phallus is rare on funerary stelai of Africa Proconsularis but occurs three times on the Ghirza tombs. In fact, stones depicting a phallus appear more frequently on farm buildings or houses than within the funerary context, as for instance at Wadi Mansur (Mattingly 1996a, Mn006; see also section 6.4).

Palms/Palm fronds: Already on Punic stelai palm trees and fronds were a symbol of fertility. In Phoenician iconography, the palm tree stood for life and light and was referred to as the tree of life (Berthier–Chalier 1955, 186). Le Glay argues that this meaning was transferred to the Punic realm (1966b, 593). Palm fronds are also seen as a symbol of victory, especially when held by winged Victory figures, but may hold a different meaning when they appear by themselves (Mendleson 2003, 11). Figures who are holding a palm frond on Punic stelai could symbolise both fertility and victory over death, but, in the Roman period, seem to have
a close association with life and fertility (Moore 2006, 81). Within the context of Tripolitania, a region that is dominated by pre-desert and desert, the palm tree also needs to be considered as an iconic plant of the desert. It grows in harsh environments, provides food and shade, and forms part of the subsistence crop, especially in the desert oasis. Palms and Palm fronds appear on multiple mausolea of Tripolitania either flanking a person or held by Victories as at Ghirza North B (GH129-B-02) or in the Wadi Mimoun (MU001-A-01). They are also depicted in the Wadi Migdal (MG001-A-02). A personage standing under an arch of palm fronds can be seen on a stone in the Talha (TA001-A-01) and at Ghadames (GHA001-A-03).

1.18.6 Animals, Hunting, and Games

Wild and domestic animals were favourite subjects in North African art in general, and animals are visible in wall painting, sculpture and mosaic where they are displayed in scenes of hunts, the circus, and mythology (Dunbabin 1978, 197). The domination or control of wild animals by people is a scene long established in Greek, Eastern and Roman iconography. Dionysian iconography has a strong link to such themes of wild animals seemingly being subdued and friendly. Hercules is often depicted fighting the Nemean lion, often naked, not wearing any civilised clothes, and on the other hand clearly depicting a difference between human and animal (Harden 2014, 10). In the Greek and Roman world, animals were associated with gods or heroes. Zeus or Jupiter was symbolised by an eagle while the chariot of Cybele (Magna Mater) was drawn by lions.

Animals also feature strongly on mausolea across Tripolitania in the form of relief depictions or, in some cases, as statues. To what extent they were mimetic, reflected a narrative, had symbolic meaning or were simply decorative is difficult to discern, and depends on the context of each image and tomb. However, some broader observations can be made regarding the choice of animal and associated scenes across the region, in relation to Punic, Hellenistic, and Roman iconography. There are some broader qualities that specific animals evoke. They can give us an idea about the cultural relevance of, and cultural ideas about, animal behaviour in the given society (Harden 2014, 30).

This section will concentrate on depictions where animals are amongst the main actors of the composition. Camels, oxen/bulls, and horses feature also in other scenes such as agricultural activities, sacrificial scenes or martial scenes.
Domestic animals

Domestic animals are rarely depicted in their own right but are usually involved in a task, such as ploughing for oxen, horses, and camels, carrying goods (camels) or people (horses), pulling carts (oxen and camels) or hunting (dogs).

Horses: Horses in their own right are not depicted very frequently, but are mostly integrated into farming, martial or hunting scenes. Horses feature at Dahireat el-Hagiar (>Dh001-A-01 and Dh001-A-02), a mausoleum in the Gefara region, where all the four remaining decorated stones depict horses. In the pre-desert, a stone now at Bani Ulid shows a man holding a horse to his right hand, with a feline lying to his left (>Bu001-A-05). A running horse is shown on two stones on Mausoleum North A at Ghirza (>Gh129-A-07; Gh129-A-08) and South E (>Gh128-E-05), and a similar depiction of a running horse comes from Ghadames (>Gha001-A-04). A drawing by Richardson from Ghadames shows another stone depicting a person feeding a horse (this stone is now missing; >Gha001-A-02. Horses were prestigious and expensive commodities, used as the main mode of transport, in warfare, chariot races and ploughing. Strabo mention the interest of Libyan kings in horse breeding (*The Geography* 17.3.19) and ancient sources mention the high quality of horses that were bred in Cyrenaica and Tripolitania (*Herodotus, the histories* 4.170; Strabo, *The Geography* 17.3.21). Thus, the iconography of horses could also be associated with elite status (warfare, hunting and raiding) within broader Libyan society (*Hodos* 2006, 164; *Marshall* 2003, 57-58; Mattingly 1995, 40-41).

Camels: Camels are usually depicted in relation to agriculture as a draught animal or carrying goods. A camel and its young are depicted on a stone at Ghirza (>Gh129-B-11).

Sheep/Goats: Sheep and goats were part of the main livestock of the region, but feature only little on the mausolea. A ram and a sheep were depicted on mausolea that once stood in the vicinity of Dehibat (>Gu001-C-04; Gu001-C-07), and a goat tied to a tree(?) is depicted on a small relief at Ghirza North A (>Gh129-A-11) and a flock of goats or sheep are perhaps shown on Gh128-D-05, and a flock of sheep or goats are led towards a building on a relief from Mizda (>Mz001-A-01).
Birds

The most common bird species depicted on mausolea are peacocks, ostriches, and birds of prey. Less prevalent are cockerels, which can only be attested twice in the pre-desert, at Bir Nesma (>Sf092-A-05) and at Taghigia (>Tag001-A-03), perhaps an owl or pigeon (>Bu001-A-07; Table 4.5). Birds were a well-known and often repeated subject in Roman domestic and official art. They inhabited scrolls and garden scenes and, in general, gave an impression of abundance. What was a standard scene in Rome may have had different meaning in a desert landscape. Making land arable in the predominantly dry landscapes requires a large amount of organisation and labour. The desert can quickly reclaim lands that are not properly managed. Thus, birds (and vegetation) symbolising abundance are much more meaningful. Lush scrolls inhabited with more generic birds are a recurring scene across the region, but many birds are depicted in their own right. Peacocks, sometimes with a cup between them, and the cockerel both have a long tradition within North Africa as protectors of tombs, and can be found on Punic and Numidian tombs and stelai (Camps 1992, 48).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birds</th>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>Gefara</th>
<th>Gebel</th>
<th>Pre-Desert</th>
<th>Desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds of prey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockerels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Number and distribution of scenes depicting birds across Tripolitania.

*Birds of prey:* An eagle is depicted tearing the entrails from a hare at Meseuggi (>Me001-A-04). A similar scene can be observed at the Wadi Ghurgar, where a large bird is devouring the insides of a hare (>Gr022-A-01). Two less vivid depictions of a bird of prey eating its quarry come from the Wadi Tabuniyah (>Tb045-A-04; Tb045-A-07). Here, the birds are in the process of picking at the animal. Unfortunately, both stones are too damaged to determine the type of animal that is being devoured. Two eagles in full flight frame a hare at Ghirza, apparently in the process of catching the animal (>Gh128-G-05).

The remains of a statue of an eagle come from Chormet el-Bousaila (>Ch001-A-17). The head and feet have broken off, but the body and partly outstretched wings are still intact. The hare and the eagle appear another three times at Ghirza. Two eagles depicted frontally with outstretched wings frame the inscription of Tomb North A (>Gh129-A-01), with their heads turned towards it. In their claws, they hold a dead hare. Eagles carrying their prey are
associated not only with tombs but also with gsur. Two eagles seemingly in mid-flight are facing each other over an inscription above the main entrance at Gasr Iswai in the Wadi Migdal, the left hand bird carrying a small herbivore, and the right hand one carrying a smaller bird (Brogan 1984, 217; also see section 6.4).

The eagle is one of the most powerful symbols of the imperial strength and victory of Rome, and its association with Jupiter is well documented. In the funerary realm, it was applied as an agent of apotheosis after death, especially in association with the imperial family (Toynbee 1973, 242). On private funerary monuments in Rome, eagles are frequently depicted from the first century onwards, in some cases holding fruits or leaves in their beaks or claws (Toynbee 1973, 242). However, the eagle already appears on Punic stelae from Carthage and Sousse before the Roman period (Hours-Miedan 1951, pl. XXII a), pointing towards strong Punic traditions. The eagle is sometimes depicted with Saturn on Saturn stelae (Wurnig 2006, 139), as well as in association with Jupiter on other stelae, but is also depicted in more secular settings. Thus, there does not seem to be strict association of the bird with one single god (Moore 2000, 69), and Moore argues in relation to the la Gofra Stelae that the eagle represented power and authority, rather than a deity (Moore 2000, 70). Brogan associates the eagles of Ghirza devouring or carrying away their prey with the
depiction of the soul being carried away from the body (1984, 217). The association with Saturn in Tripolitania is questionable since he does not otherwise appear on the mausolea.

_Cockerels:_ the cockerel can only be found with certainty twice, in the Wadi Tagghigga on a fallen stone of a former obelisk tomb (>Tag001-A-03; Figure 4.15b), and in the Wadi Nesma in the spandrel of a broken monolithic arch belonging to an arcaded temple tomb (>Sf092-A-05). There may be a cockerel depicted on Mausoleum E at Ghirza, however, this stone is very weathered (>Gh129-E-02). In Africa Proconsularis, the cockerel is much more common and is strongly connected to the funerary world. It can be observed, for instance, on tomb paintings (Fantar 1970) and a statue of a cockerel once topped the pyramidal roof of the tower tomb of the Flavii at Kasserine (Longersteyn 1992, 45; Peyral 1993). Fantar argued that the bird may have acted as a spirit guide for the soul of the deceased (1970, 36-7) while others suggest that it may be apotropaic as for instance on the la Gofra stelai (Camps 1987-1989, 46-48; Peyras 1993; Moore 2000, 62). On other stelai, it can be associated with Caelestis, as also on an inscription from Koudiet es-Souda where it is named as the animal specifically chosen to be sacrificed to Caelestis while a hen is sacrificed to Venus (Moore 2000’ C. 27763). In fact, sacrificial scenes of cockerels are evident on several stelai across Africa Proconsularis, but this image is absent in Tripolitania. Clear references on mausolea to Caelestis are absent, which suggests that Caelestis may not be associated strongly with the veneration of the dead in this region. Camps points out the cockerel’s aggressive nature and strength, arguing that it was thus seen as a protector of the tomb, rather than a guide (1992, 35-48). The famous poem on the tomb of the Flavii at Kasserine refers to the bird (B13-16):

I did not tell of the trembling wings of the rooster on the top, which,  
I think, flies above the highest cloud. If nature had given a voice to the body of this rooster, it would force all the gods to wake up in the morning (translation Pillinger 2013, 30).

It is most remarkable that the rooster, in the poem, is given a voice beyond the mere symbolic meaning in the form of the statue, which underlines its iconographic importance in the funerary realm (Pillinger 2013, 199-202).16

_Peacocks:_ This type of bird is met at eight sites in Tripolitania (>Bo001-A-01; Gh128-C-04; Gh129-E-01; Gha001-A-06; Mz001-A-03; Tat001-B-07; Tb045-A-07; Figure 4.15a-e). At

16 See Pillinger 2013, 199-202 for an interesting discussion on the relationship between text and the statue of the cockerel.
Ghirza on tomb South C (>Gh128-C-04), the peacock is depicted sitting on the left side of the stone on a branch of a leafy scroll with flowers in the middle, its back towards the viewer and the head turned to the right. The decoration of the tail is indicated by vertical lines and a scale-like pattern at the bottom. To the right of the scroll is the depiction of a phallus. A peacock picking at a small rectangular shape (food container?) with two dogs running behind it towards the bird. On North tomb A, two peacocks framed a decorated cup. Two peacocks also featured on a stone of the Wadi Tabuniyah, sitting sit atop of a column framing a niche with a pitched roof (>Tb045-A-07; Figure 4.15c). At Ghadames, a peacock sat next to an unidentifiable object, perhaps a long stemmed cup, but it is unclear if another peacock was sitting on the other side. A similar image comes from Bou Guerba, where two peacocks drink out of a kantharos (>Bo001-A-01; Figure 4.15a).

In North African mosaic, the motif of peacocks was popular. They are depicted drinking out of a wine vessel, or with their tails thrown into a wheel in full glory. The peacock features strongly on Saturn stelae, especially together with Juno and the Capitoline Triad (Wurnig 2006, 138-140). Another North African example of the significance of the peacock comes from the Maison du Trident at Bulla Regia. Here, the floor is decorated with a mosaic displaying apotropaic symbols, while the peacock is depicted in a niche which was most likely for a cult statue (Dunbabin 1978, 167). A link to Dionysus may be suggested by mosaic scenes that depict peacocks facing each other across a wine vessel. Dunbabin argues that this motif is ‘related to that of the birds drinking from a kantharos, in which the concept of the drink of immortality is essentially implied’ (1978, 167). In Greek and Roman mythology, the peacock had close associations with Hera and Juno. Already in the sixth century BC the peacock was linked to Hera at the sanctuary of Hera at Samos, as evident from coinage (Toynbee 1973, 251). Also, Ovid spoke of the close relationship between the bird and the goddess. He told the story of Juno placing the 100 eyes of the giant Argus onto the tail of her peacock as jewels to commemorate her watchful giant (Ovid, Metamorphoses 1, 722f.). The shape and pattern of the birds’ tail had close links to the funerary realm and immortality. It represented the sky and stars to which the dead would rise. Peacocks decorated the tombs of, for instance, the Aelii in Rome, and Hadrian’s mausoleum was adorned with a big bronze peacock (Toynbee 1973, 252). The male peacock’s loud shriek, its territorial behaviour (similar to the cockerel), together with the association of immortality and watchfulness, makes this bird a symbol for the guardianship of a tomb (Toynbee 1973, 252).
Wild animals

Wild animals are rarely depicted by themselves, but usually are integrated into a scene (Table 4.6). Herbivores or hares are usually part of a hunting scene or are being devoured by a predator. Fish are depicted on several tombs and are listed here. In particular lions and other felines appear frequently amongst the decoration of the tombs and occur within a wide variety of themes. They are depicted either as beasts in motion posing threat to the life of other animals or humans, or as strong animals sitting or standing still, or as felines facing each other holding a bull head between them. The second and third types may have had potential heraldic significance. Below scenes will be described where feline(s) are not part of a myth (el-Amrouni) or part of the zodiac (Gasr Duierat).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wild animals</th>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>Gefara</th>
<th>Gebel</th>
<th>Pre-Desert</th>
<th>Desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felines hunting or eating their prey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs of confronted lions guarding an object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline and animal masks and hides</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions in architectural decoration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statues of lions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Number and distribution of scenes with wild animals across Tripolitania.

Lions/felines hunting or eating their prey: Scenes of felines hunting occur in several locations. Notably, the hunted animals appear to be species drawn from the wildlife of the region, especially herbivores (gazelles or antelopes) and hares, but not domesticated animals such as sheep or cattle, reflecting regional conditions in terms of prey and hunter. A stone from the Wadi Migdal shows a feline in the act of jumping onto the back of a small herbivore with antlers (>Mg001-A-07). Only one such scene is depicted at Ghirza, where a lion is hunting an herbivore (>Gh129-A-04). The lion has his head turned towards the viewer, whereas the herbivore is looking over its shoulder towards the chasing lion. At Meseuggi, a lion is in in the process of devouring his prey (>Me001-A-04). In the Gebel, at Bir el-Uaar the top of the threshold of the false door depicts a cat hunting a now undistinguishable animal, while the front of the stone shows the feline devouring its prey, set in-between two bovine skulls (>Ua001-A-06). A lion is eating its prey facing right on a damaged stone from Chormet el-Bousaila, although most of this has broken off. The head indicates the victim was a small...
bovine (>Ch001-A-10). The depiction of humans as prey is absent, although a fight between lions and humans is depicted at Ghirza (discuss below).

The association of the lion iconography with the powerful feline eating its prey as a symbol of (royal) power over others has already been mentioned. An alternative reading of this image suggests an analogy to the liberation of the soul by removing the flesh (Brogan 1984, 216; Strong 1915, 147) or a representation of the lion’s ‘ravening power of death’ (Toynbee 1973, 67).

Pairs of confronted lions guarding an object: At Ghirza three reliefs show two standing lions turned towards each other while facing outwards towards the viewer, holding a bull-head between them, one paw placed just above the ears and below the horns (>Gh128-C-02; Gh128-D-02; Gh128-G-07). A similar image can be observed on the tomb of the Wadi Taghigga (>Tag001-A-02), where two seated lions are holding a bull’s head between them. At Chormet el-Bousaila two lions face each other across a cauldron (>Ch001-A-08; Ch001-A-09). The stone is broken off towards the left of the cup, but the lion to the left can be seen lying down and placing a paw on the handle of the cup. The part broken off to the right is, most likely, a lion seated lifting its paw. The stone is broken in a manner which suggests the curve of a cup or cauldron handle. Alternatively, there may have been two scenes of the same subject, one with seated and one with crouching lions. Brogan speaks of another stone with a lion standing up and facing right, reminding her of the pose the lions struck at Ghirza, holding the bull's heads between them (Brogan notes, SLS Archive). A statue of two lions holding a bovine skull between them decorates an obelisk tomb in the Wadi Khanafes and is situated above the false door. Here, the two lions are seated confronting each other, facing outwards and holding the horns of the bovine skull with one paw (>Kn005-C-02). The left lion appears to be a female since four teats are indicated on the underside of the belly. The lion on the right has its mane indicated by chiselled lines and drilled locks on its head, and thus is male.

Lions with people: There is only one stone, now at Bani Ulid, which shows a feline and a person, seemingly at peace with each other (>Bu001-A-05). A large feline is lying down to the right of a man standing in the middle and facing outwards. To the left is a horse facing the man. The horse is held by its reins with the left hand while the right hand is slightly outstretched towards the feline.
Feline (and animal) masks and hides: These feature in particular on tombs in the pre-desert, such as at Ghirza and the Wadi Umm el-Agerem (>Ag002-A-06). There are also examples built into the Italian fort at Bani Ulid, comprising three large stones which are decorated with rosettes and feline masks (>Bu001-A-09). Feline masks (and animal masks in general) have a long tradition as symbols to protect tombs in Punic and Numidian customs (Wurnig 2006), though the function on the mausolea of Tripolitania is unclear.

Statues of lions: At Ghirza (>Gh129-B-26; Gh129-B-27) and in the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-A-04 to 07) statues of lions were found amongst the debris of the tombs. The two lions at Ghirza most likely stood to the left and right of the stairs, while the four lions from Khanafes served as roof decorations, being situated on the four corners of the roof.

In many cultures, lions are seen as powerful and majestic animals and served (and still serve) as a symbol of (royal) power. The tower mausoleum at Dougga featured a lion statue, which was perhaps originally sitting on top of the monument (Poinssot 1958, 8). Le Glay argued that even after the fall of the Numidian dynasty the image of the lion devouring its prey never quite lost its meaning of mighty power over others and as a royal and powerful symbol (1966, 142). At the same time, lions were also powerful protectors of tombs. In the Punic world, the lions were strongly associated with Baal Hammon/Saturn and Tanit/Caelestis (Picard 1954, 11-12; Le Glay 1966, 132-135). Furthermore, felines, especially lions, and cheetahs, were associated with Liber Pater/Dionysus. At Zliten, a floor mosaic depict Liber Pater/Dionysus holding a thyrus and a wine cup, while a cheetah run towards the right, looking back towards the god (see Dunbabin 1978 for further discussion of this mosaic). Similar imagery is depicted on a floor mosaic at Sabratha, where cheetah and lion-head decorate medallions. The middle medallion depicts Dionysus, Ariadne and a Victory in a cart pulled by two cheetahs and led by Pan (Toynbee, 1973, 85), and a coin minted at Lepcis Magna shows Dionysus holding a cantharus, with a cheetah sitting at his feet, looking up at him. Lion iconography already had a long-lived tradition in North Africa by the Roman period. This was not only because it held symbolic value but also because the large cats were a lived reality and were a real threat to the lives of humans and livestock. Lion hunts to protect livestock or to demonstrate one’s power and ability were dangerous, yet probably prestigious. Furthermore, ancient sources indicate that many of the felines brought to Rome for fights in the arena came from North Africa (Symmachus, Epistolae II, 76; Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Probus 19).
Fish: Curiously, fish occur mainly in the pre-desert, particularly at Ghirza and in the western Gebel. Fish were most frequently displayed as part of a more general decoration such as rosettes or within the spandrel of an arch. Two images are more unusual. One displays a larger fish catching a smaller fish by the tail (>Gh128-G-02), and another shows five fish arranged around a disk like object (flower or bread?) in the centre, with three fish filling the space on the bottom, top and right side of the stone (>Gh128-C-03). On the tower tomb in the Wadi Migdal, large fish appear on three sides of the tomb in low relief, but the decoration of the fourth side (front of tomb) is missing (>Mg001-A-03). At Meseuggi, two fish above each other and facing in opposite directions are depicted in high relief on a corner stone on the west side of the monument (>Me001-A-06). There is a visible indication of scales on the upper fish; the lower fish is badly damaged. That fish may have been eaten even in the more remote parts of the pre-desert is indicated by the depiction from the Wadi Lella of a small table holding a dish with a fish (>Le001-A-06). The symbolism of fish in Punic iconography is frequently linked to prosperity, especially when they are depicted with other images which carry similar meaning such as, for instance, the pomegranate or the palm tree. Depictions of fish are also associated with the goddess Tanit/Caelestis, but, again, direct references on mausolea to Tanit/Caelestis are otherwise rare in Tripolitania.

Hunting and Games
Hunting of herbivores and hares: Herbivores and hares are the most commonly hunted animals on reliefs. They are usually pursued by hunters on horseback carrying spears or swords, but seldom shields. The hunters usually wear short tunics and are commonly accompanied by dogs. Wild boar hunts are absent. A relief from the Wadi al-Binaya shows a unique hunting scene for a Tripolitanian mausoleum of individuals hunting with a net (>Bin001-A-05). Two people are holding the net, while the animals (herbivores) are driven into it. This way of hunting is known from mosaics of a boar hunt from Carthage and an herbivore hunt at Utica (Massion de la Chasse) dating to the third century and constitutes a method of hunting used in North Africa at the time (Dunbabin 1978, 49).
Table 4.6: Number and distribution of hunting and games across Tripolitania.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>Gefara</th>
<th>Gebel</th>
<th>Pre-Desert</th>
<th>Desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbivores/hares</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostriches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions/felines being hunted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheatre games</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chariot race</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ostriches: Ostriches are a particular favourite at Ghirza (>Gh128-D-03; Gh128-E-03; Gh128-F-04; Gh129-B-03; Gh129-B-19; Gh129-C-08; Gh129-D-07; Gh129-E-06; Gh129-E-09; Gh129-E-10), but are rare elsewhere in the region. The only other examples come from Bou Guerba (>Bo001-A-03), in western Tripolitania, Ghadames (>Gha001-A-08) and one from El-Binaya (>Bin001-A-04). In all instances, the ostriches are associated with scenes of hunting. At Ghirza, the bird is either chased by a man or men on horseback or with a camel, by dogs, or is depicted with other animals that were commonly hunted such as herbivores. The Bani Ulid stone shows an ostrich hunted by a man on horseback with a spear. At Bou Guerba, the ostrich is depicted on a corner stone that shows a hunter on horseback above and facing towards the right. Underneath are the heavily eroded ostrich and a gazelle, and a large cat at the bottom of the stone.

Lions/felines being hunted: The decorated corner stones of the Bou Guerba (>Bou001-A-03) mausoleum show a large cat beneath an herbivore and an ostrich. A person on horseback with a spear forms the top of the scene, perhaps symbolising the hunting of the animals below. The only clear indication for the hunt of large cats comes from two tombs at Ghirza, North B and C (>Gh129-B-16; Gh129-B-18), although the scenes on Gh129-B may be a representation of an amphitheatre spectacle, since the people fighting the felines are depicted naked, and are in direct combat with the animal in the manner of venatores (Figure 4.16b). This is further discussed below. The image on Gh129-C-14, however, appears to relate to a hunt. The hunter is depicted on horseback charging after a large cat and other wild animals. A palm tree in the background indicates that this scene is taking place outside, and not in an arena.

Picard noted that in Tunisia and Algeria images of hunting do not feature much in funerary iconography (Picard 1954, 218-219). As demonstrated above, this is certainly not
true for Tripolitania. Hunting scenes can be observed in painted hypogea, and, to a much greater extent, on mausolea. The hunter(s) are usually on horseback and only on one occasion is a hunter depicted with a camel (>Gh129-E-01). The hunter is frequently holding a spear while chasing a hare, a large cat or an herbivore. The reliefs suggest that hunting dogs were constant companions during hunts, since they are present on most depictions of hunting. Some reliefs simply depict dogs chasing or attacking their prey. Hunting appears to have been a favourite activity amongst the owners of the tombs, but, as Brogan pointed out, it was also an important necessity to protect crops and livestock in the hinterlands of Tripolitania (1984, 221). Thus, within the Tripolitanian setting, hunting did not only symbolise wealth and leisure but also represented the action of landowners to take care of the land and people.

As noted, hunting was a favourite subject in mosaics. A development of scenes can be observed (Dunbabin 1978, 64) which may not be dissimilar to that of the images chosen for mausolea. Dunbabin argued that due to the comparative lack of iconography related to hunting on North African tombs the hunting scene on mosaic had no real symbolic meaning. Instead, ‘the popularity of the hunting scenes, on the other hand, is certainly principally to be attributed to the desire to glorify the patron by showing his possessions and his favourite activities in a purely material way’ (1978, 64).

*Horse racing and amphitheatre scenes:* A damaged relief from a completely collapsed mausoleum from the Wadi Antar shows a chariot race in full play (>An001-A-10 An001-A-11). A figure is standing on a two-wheeled chariot, holding the reins with the right hand and a stick with the left. The figure’s head is turned outwards towards the viewer. Two horses in full gallop pull the chariot. Behind the charioteer two more horses (and perhaps the leg of a third) are visible, representing another chariot that is trying to overtake. The image itself is very vivid and dynamic, reflecting some of the intense action that was going on during those races.

A scene at Ghirza (>Gh129-B-16; Gh129-B-18), and similar scenes from the Wadi al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-12; Bin001-A-13) depict the fight with felines (Figure 4.16a and b), which may allude to circus amphitheatre, which commonly included the hunting of wild animals (venerations). On the relief, the men fighting the felines are naked and have shields, spears, daggers, and clubs as weapons. On hunting scenes, shields are usually absent. Whether this relief at Ghirza indeed shows an actual hunting or amphitheatre scene, or whether it follows a certain trend in the depiction of hunts in general is debatable. It certainly is not an 'every day' hunting scene, and may also have served to glorify the patron, by
showing exciting hunting scenes, transforming the actors into heroic figures (Dunbabin 1978, 53, 60). A connection could be made to Roman games since many of the wild animals for the amphitheatre came from Libya and this provided a lucrative trade. Shaw estimated that thousands of animals were shipped to the Italian continent to be used in the circus, making animals hunts a lucrative trade (Shaw 1981, 387; see also Sparreboom 2016). A similar scene can be observed on a mosaic from Zliten, in which naked prisoners are condemned to the beasts (Figure 4.16c).

Figure 4.16: Animal fighting. a) Naked individuals fighting felines on a relief from the Wadi al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-12; Drawing: Author); b) Naked individuals fighting felines on a relief at Ghirza (>Gh129-B-16; Drawing: Author); c) Mosaic from the villa at Zliten depicting circus games such as the wild animal hunts, animal fights, and naked individuals damned to the wild beasts. (Image: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Damnatio_ad_bestias#/media/ File:Bestiarii.jpg).

1.18.7 Economic Activity
Trade was an important part of the economy, especially in the more remote areas. Goods were moved across the vast expanses on camels and horses. Three stones from Ghirza remind us of the importance of this settlement as a centre of trade. One image shows a camel pulling a cart and arriving at a settlement, indicated by an arched gateway in the upper register of the relief. To the left, the camel is being fed or watered by a person holding a bowl standing in front and to the right of the camel. Further to the right, another person carries a large (Tripolitanian) amphora away from the cart towards the right. In the upper right hand corner, a person plays an instrument that looks like a type of lyre, perhaps to celebrate the arrival of the caravan. However, this could also be a more complex narrative that had local resonances. On the left side at the bottom of the relief, two objects in woven patterns could
represent baskets in which some of the goods are being transported (>Gh129-C-12). On two mausolea a caravan made up of three camels is shown (>Gh129-B-15; Gh129-E-04). On Gh129-B-15 the camel driver follows the caravan in the upper left hand corner, holding a stick in the left hand, and a rod in the right.

A stone found near Mizda most likely once adorned a mausoleum (>Mz001-A-01). It depicts animals and people approaching a tower-like structure, probably a gasr, which is placed towards the left edge of the stone. First arrive a group of animals, perhaps goats, followed by a group of people. Next comes a man on horseback holding a spear, followed by a camel. This stone probably depicts a small rural community reaching a large farm building or gasr (Figure 4.17a).

The fourth century mosaics from Dominus Iulius at Carthage depict similar scenes of a group of people arriving at the house to the left, a well dressed man on horseback and his servant. A hunting party is leaving the house on the right of the image (Figure 4.17b). Also from near Mizda, but almost certainly from a different mausoleum because of its stylistic differences, is an image of a camel carrying four amphorae (two on each side) (>Tu001-A-01). The camel driver is walking behind the camel, perhaps holding a rod, although the figure of the camel driver is too damaged to determine this with certainty.

Figure 4.17: a) Relief from the area around Mizda depicting a group of people arriving at a large structure (Drawing: Author); b) Mosaic depicting a group of people arriving at a villa (Image:https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/thumb/e/ec/Dominus_Julius_mosaic_in_the_Bardo_National_Museum%28212240864473%29.jpg/512pxDominus_Julius_mosaic_in_the_Bardo_National_Museum%28212240864473%29.jpg)
1.18.8 Martial Activity

Martial combat is not depicted frequently, but such scenes do occur at Ghirza and at Bir Nesma in the pre-desert (>Sf092-A-01), and on a stone from an unknown mausoleum in the Gebel Nefusa area. At Ghirza, two scenes depict the killing or execution of a man (>Gh129-A-07; Gh129-C-06). The captured man has his arms bound behind his back and is held by two men to his left and his right. The man to the left is holding the victim’s head with one hand while swinging a weapon with the other. The person to the right holds on to the victim’s right upper arm, and his head. This scene could be interpreted as a human sacrifice scene, but is, most likely, more closely related to the killing of a captured enemy, and execution or the demonstration of power. An almost identical scene could be seen on the mausoleum of the Wadi al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-14). Bir Nesma in the Wadi Soffegin, not far from Ghirza (>Sf092-A-01), has a similar depiction of a person being killed with a club, and a head that is placed on what seems to be a shelf. At Ghirza combat is depicted on the arch head of North B on which a person is about to stab the naked male figure lying on the ground (>Gh129-B-04). A clear distinction was made between the heavily armed sophisticated warrior, and the naked and defenceless ‘other’. Tomb South F has two stones depicting a fight between warriors and one person is lying on the ground about to be killed with a sword (>Gh128-F-04). On the second stone, two people holding shields are fighting each other with spears (>Gh128-F-06).

1.19 Summary

In reviewing the different iconographic themes displayed on the mausolea, and by comparing them to other North African and Empire-wide iconographic scenes, several points have become evident. Firstly, certain themes, such as mythological themes, were more popular in the Gefara, Gebel, and the coast, but appear to have been marginal in the image pool in the pre-desert and desert areas. Some themes only occur at a single site, such as Neptune at Chormet el-Bousaila, or the Hercules and the Orpheus myth at El-Amrouni. This aspect will be further explored in Chapter 5. Secondly, themes that were popular in Africa Proconsularis or elsewhere in the Empire did not necessarily gain popularity in Tripolitania. Gods are depicted frequently on the funerary and Saturn stelai in Africa Proconsularis, especially Saturn/Baal Hammon, Tanit/Caelestis or the Capitoline Triad, but, with the exception of Hercules and Neptune/Triton, deities do not explicitly appear on Tripolitanian monuments.
In contrast, Hercules and Neptune are very rare on stelai in Africa Proconsularis. Some of the funerary images that were more popular elsewhere in the Empire are glaringly absent. Perhaps the most obvious one is the funerary banquet scene or the ‘Totenmahl’ which was particularly popular in Syria, Egypt, Greece, Asia Minor, the Balkans, Britain, and Germany (see for instance Noelke 1998; Stewart 2009). The painting of the hypogeum ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ suggests that the image was not entirely unknown in Tripolitania, but it was not taken up in the image pool related to mausolea. Other themes that regularly occurred on stelai and mausolea of Africa Proconsularis which are absent in Tripolitania are Aries or dolphins. Thus the iconography is, in fact, shaped by regional preferences and tradition, and was not uncritically chosen to appear ‘Roman’. Thirdly, there appears to be an overlap in the popularity of scenes depicted on floor mosaics and wall paintings with certain images popular on mausolea, such as hunting and agricultural scenes. This aspect will be further explored in Chapter 6.

It is indeed questionable if the local population was aware of which artistic styles belonged to which culture (Stone 2007a, 138). By the time the mausolea were erected, what we know as ‘Punic art’ had been adapted and incorporated into local Libyan traditions, and would have been perceived as local art, or the art of the ancestors. To try to untangle which aspects of these reliefs belong to Punic or Libyan art is difficult, and becomes even more complex when we add Roman and Hellenistic influences to the mix. In an incredibly creative and complex process, elements of ancestral, Hellenistic and Roman iconography were chosen, adapted and manipulated to suit the local setting. They reflect local needs and traditions in a manner and style the resident viewer could understand. This style of carving had a much larger impact than standardised classical art. The style was chosen because it reflected the local needs and traditions and it was deemed appropriate for displaying the elite’s economic and political power over agriculture and water management, while, at the same time, enhancing and maintaining the ancestral claim over the land.

In order to be able to analyse the iconography of the monuments in detail, regional circumstances have to be taken into account. Some significant observations have been made about general preferences and trends across the regions, but it is important to explore the iconography in detail within its regional, socio-economic, historical and cultural context, which will be demonstrated in the following chapter (Chapter 5). What this chapter has demonstrated is that the imagery was not simply copied from pre-existing Roman, Greek or Punic models. Instead, the commissioners actively chose images and a style of carving that fitted and could be understood within the regional context.
CHAPTER 5
FUNERARY ICONOGRAPHY AND REGIONAL CONTEXT

1.20 Introduction

The previous chapter gave a comprehensive overview of the main iconographic themes that were displayed on the mausolea, and what they may signify in a wider Mediterranean and Norths African context. In this chapter, I will now investigate the imagery within its local context by concentrating on specific case studies region by region. I will explore in more detail the compositions on single mausolea and investigate how they fit into their immediate environment, looking also at differences between the previously defined sub-regions (coast, Gefara, Gebel, pre-desert, desert). Developments and changes in themes that occurred over time will be highlighted to examine how regional environments and traditions may have influenced the expression of local identities. Chapter 6 will then investigate in more detail the expression of identities through portraiture,\(^\text{17}\) the viewer’s ‘perspective’ and influence, and the role of the craftsmen and workshops and ‘trends’ in mosaic themes.

1.21 The Coast

The number of decorations that survive from the coastal zone is very low. The majority comes from one single monument, Gasr Duierat which will be examined in more detail below. The handful of sculptures from elsewhere at the coast indicates that figural decorations were less prevalent, and standard architectural and ornamental decorations were favoured. For instance, the aedicula tower mausoleum of Gasr Shaddad east of the city was only decorated with rosettes on its upper storey (>Gs001-A-01; Brogan unpublished notes, SLS Archive), a drawing by Rae of an obelisk mausoleum west of Lepcis Magna shows a frieze with rosettes on the top of the second storey (>Lp001-A-01), and the big mausoleum at al-Jumaa (>Ju001-A) appears to have no figural decorations associated with it. The reports of nineteenth of and early twentieth century travelers and archaeologists as well as more

\(^{17}\) Issues such as gender or status through dress and hairstyles, will be discussed in detail in Chapter 6. Thus, portrait sculptures will be treated with a little less detail in this chapter.
recent surveys seem to support this theory, since they predominantly mention architectural fragments (see, for instance Munzi et al. 2016, 84-93).

Despite the limited evidence, there are some indications that at least a small number of mausolea displayed some form of figural decorations. An old and grainy photograph by Romanelli taken before 1925 from the aedicula tower mausoleum of Gasr Banat near Leptis Magna shows that it was ornamented with a quadruped as well as an S-shaped figure (>Ba001-A-01). Additionally, according to Ibn at-Tayyib, an eighteenth century traveller, Gasr Banat featured female portrait heads (Romanelli 1925, 164).¹⁸

The remaining evidence that might relate to mausolea is now out of context. Therefore, it remains uncertain if these sculptural pieces adorned mausolea or came from other structures in and around of Leptis Magna. For instance, spolia fragments integrated into the Byzantine walls of the city included a Doric frieze with two elaborate rosettes and two human masks, one sticking out its tongue, and the other with a face surrounded by a lion mane or rays (Figure 5.1b; >Lp001-B-01). Another mask featured on a relief panel that Bartoccini saw in the museum of Homs (1926, 76), together with two rosettes and a winged figure (Figure 5.1c; >Lp001-B-02). A photograph taken by Brogan from Leptis Magna shows two stones; the top frieze features a mask and a shell-niche with a small face that came from the mausoleum Gasr Duierat. The stone underneath depicted a doric frieze with a mask wearing a cap and a flower rosette (Figure 5.1a; >Lp001-B-03). Despite the fact that the style of the mask is very similar to those of Gasr Duierat, this stone is likely to come from a different monument, since there is otherwise no evidence for a frieze with rosettes on Gasr Duierat.

Some statues in the round can be associated with the funerary context, but it is unclear if they come from mausolea or the substructure of hypogea or other burial monuments. A female statue from the Wadi Zennad east of the city of the ‘Grande Ercolanese’ type most likely comes from a funerary context, and a marble female statue from the Wadi er-Rasf also of the ‘Grande Ercolanese’ type may have belonged to a mausoleum (Musso 1996, 142-149; Buccino 2011). A fragment of one marble statue can be associated with the mausoleum of Gasr Duierat, and will be discussed in more detail below.

¹⁸ Gasr Banat translates to: Gasr of the girls.
1.21.1 Gasr Duierat

Gsr Duierat (Gd001-A) is the only mausoleum at the coast of which the majority of the iconographic decorations survived. The open aedicula tower mausoleum is dated to the late second century AD, on the basis of its architectural elements and the statue type (Fontana 2001, 163; Musso 1996, 144-145). It was located approximately 2 km to the south of Lepcis Magna in the Wadi Lebda near one of the roads leading in and out of the city. It was decorated with a variety of relief sculpture, predominantly referring to classical mythology and symbolism, as well as a number of portrait statues (Table 5.1; Gd001-A-01 to Gd001-A-17). The carvings were detailed with disproportionate figures, bearing large almond shaped eyes and small facial features.
### Table 5.1: Figural decorations on Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Gasr Duierat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mythological scenes and personifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winged figure holding garlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winged figures (four seasons)</td>
<td>3 (4?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorgon head</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zodiac (fish, lion, scorpion, cancer, sun, moon)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image of deceased</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait statues</td>
<td>1 (6?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural activity and domestic animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing (winged figure)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tending the fields (winged figure)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest (winged figure)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbolic elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird attacking snake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon crescent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masks</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masks with conical caps</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest with lock filled with scrolls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclear</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busts in relief</td>
<td>12 (3 on each side)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The façade of the first storey was adorned with pilasters in relief decorated with vine tendrils and leaves. The top of the corner pilaster to the right of the door to the funerary chamber featured two birds attacking a snake. The snake, in turn, appeared to be eating a small animal. The top of the pilaster to the left depicted a moon crescent. The first storey had a door on the eastern façade. Holes for hinges in the door frame indicate that this may have been the main door to the funerary chamber, instead of a false door (Kenrick 2009, 135). Set above the elaborately decorated lintel of the doorframe was the head of a Gorgon. Two small wings were depicted on top of its head, surrounded by snakes, forming an oval. The Gorgon’s head was set against the background of a scale pattern. Above the false door was an inscription (*IRT2009, 729*) indicating the names of the deceased and the dedicators:

To Caius Marius Iovinus and Caius Marius and Maria Victorina and Marsus, her son; Caius Marius Pudens Boccius Zurgem and Velia Longina Bibai, their parents had (this) made for their children and grandson.
Above the inscription was an image of a box filled with circular shapes, most likely scrolls, placed in-between two columns in relief. The keyhole was visible on the front of the box, set within a square panel. Two long poles were fed through a rings to the left and right of the box. The top of the first storey was decorated with a frieze of human masks with long coiled hair hanging down on either side of the head, and three of them wore conical caps. Alternating with the masks were shallow shell niches, in which busts in relief (head and neck) were placed. The second storey consisted of a round peristyle that featured arched niches framed by columns. The niches held marble statues, probably for the six people named on the inscription, of which fragments of only one survives (Clermont Ganneau 1903, 141). The inside of the arches in which the statues were placed were elaborately decorated with vine tendrils, leaves, and grapes, or leafy rosettes. A curved Doric frieze formed the top of this storey depicted the zodiac of which lion, fish, cancer, and scorpion survive. Personification of the sun and the moon were also originally depicted amongst this frieze, but these stones are now missing (Romanelli 1925, Figure 95, 96; Gd001-A-15 and Gd001-A-16). The wide cornice of the conical roof displayed winged figures in relief that were involved in agricultural activities: tending the fields with a hoe (Winter), ploughing (Spring?) and harvesting (Summer). The fourth winged figure is missing. Two winged figures, holding garlands probably also belong to this storey (Romanelli 1925, Figure 25a; Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive).19

The names on the inscription of Gasr Duierat demonstrate that the owners of this mausoleum were Roman citizens of Libyan descent. The family probably obtained citizenship when Leptis Magna was granted the status of *colonia* in AD 109. The parents/grandparents who commissioned the mausoleum for their children and grandchildren had a mixture of Libyan and Roman names: Marius Pudens Boccius Zurgem and Velia Longina Bibai. The cognomina Boccius Zugerem and Bibai are clear indications of their Libyan descent. Boccius is the Latin form of Bocchus a Libyan name and Zugerem perhaps referred to the grouping of the Arzurges who, according to Aethicus, lived in the area around Leptis Magna (Romanelli 1925, 166):

---

19 The mausoleum was resurrected in the courtyard of the Leptis Magna Museum in 2008. However, the reconstruction may not be strictly accurate, and the second storey may have been wider, since the statues would not have fitted into the niches of the current reconstruction (Vérité 2014). Furthermore, the depiction of the sun and the moon are not currently included in the zodiac frieze of the upper storey, where they originally belonged.
The overarching iconographic theme of Gasr Duierat draws heavily on Greco-Roman repertoires. The winged figures involved in agriculture most likely personify the four seasons and the four stages of agriculture, however, there is one ‘season’ missing from one corner cornice. The symbols of the zodiac used in conjunction with the four seasons were widespread across the Empire, especially on mosaic pavements, representing the agricultural year (Hachlili 2009, 184-197). The figural representation of the sun and the moon (Sol and Luna) draw further attention to the course of the year. They were deities indigenous to North Africa, and frequently appear on stelai from Africa Proconsularis, especially in association with Saturn, Tanit or Baal Hammon (Le Glay 1966; Wurnig 206, 129). However, within the context of the zodiac scene, they probably referred to the cycle of the year. The moon crescent on the top of the left pilaster may be another reference to a celestial symbolism. However, the evidence is too ambiguous to be able to assign these symbols to a particular god or cults, and perhaps, that was not the intention, especially since personifications of the sun and the moon do not appear on any other mausolea of Tripolitania.20 The masks depicted on the uppermost frieze of the first storey are more ambiguous and may have served an apotropaic function (Kenrick 2009, 135; on masks in general see, for instance, Napier 1986). The Gorgon had a long association as an apotropaion to ward off evil and to protect the tomb. Another apotropaic symbol was present by the snake and the birds on the right corner pilaster. The snake symbolises evil while the bird (usually an eagle) represented good, an ancient symbol that was known across the Mediterranean (Wittkower, 1939; Toynbee 1973, 223-236; 242-243). A recent article interpreted some elements of the iconography of Gasr Duierat as an expression of Mithraism, arguing that the corner pilaster depicted a snake attacking a bull, a scorpion, and a bird attacking the snake (Vérité 2014; Figure 5.2a). However, this interpretation is questionable since, in my opinion, what Vérité interpreted as the skull of the bull and the scorpion, is instead the wing of the bird, and the head of the dog is a small animal devoured by the snake (Figure 5.2b). Furthermore, Mithraism was extremely rare in Tripolitania (Daniels 1975, 269; Fowden 2005, 565). This does,

20 A mask on a frieze integrated into the Byzantine wall of Lepcis Magna may represent the sun, but it is uncertain it belonged to a mausoleum (see Figure 5.1b).
nevertheless, highlight the multiple ways in which the imagery can be perceived and interpreted depending on the expectations of the viewer.

Many of the overall themes were common in North Africa and across the Roman Empire. Figure 5.2: Gasr Duierat, corner stone (>Gd001-A-11). a) Interpretation after Vérité with bull (red), bird (blue), dog (yellow) scorpion (green); Image: Vérité 2014); b) Interpretation by author: snake (green), birds (red); small animal (blue); Image: Brogan, SLS Archive with colours added by author.

The Graeco-Roman themes the commissioner, and the sculptor drew on also appear on the small number of decorated mausolea in neighbouring Africa Proconsularis, including winged figures, garlands, the zodiac, masks and the Gorgon’s head (Ferchiou 1989, 122-123; Moore 2007, 86-87). Gorgons and winged figures were also amongst the most popular images in the painted hypogea of the ‘Gorgon’ and ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ at Sabratha, and at the painted tomb at Zanzur near Oea (see also Chapter 4). It is, therefore, the more striking that some of these elements on Gasr Duierat were highly individualised. The four seasons represented a very distinct aspect of the tomb decoration. Notably, they are not the stereotyped allegorical figures often found in sculpture and mosaic depictions across North Africa, where they appear as passive figures holding symbols associated with the different seasons they represented (Dunbabin 1978, 119). Instead, in the case of Gasr Duierat, they were actively involved in seasonal agricultural activities: tending the fields, ploughing and harvesting. This is unusual and clearly goes beyond the common stock-image (this is also an unusual image in North African mosaic, see Parrish, 1984, 25). On the one hand, the increased emphasis on agricultural activities could have served as an indicator of the family’s source of wealth.
In this context, the seasons could be understood as powerful symbol to attract desirable influences for future harvests to maintain the prosperity of the family. On the other hand, the four seasons, the zodiac, as well as representations of the agricultural year, are closely associated with the circle of life, often found on mausolea across the Empire. This scene had many different and complex layers and the way the message was received depended on the individual viewer. The family or local people from Lepcis Magna may have understood the link to agriculture and prosperity in the region, while a visitor from elsewhere in the Empire would have interpreted the scene as the circle of life and death (see Shaw 2013).

Another strong individualized aspect of the iconography are the representations of the family members, displaying their social standing, and success. Most likely six statues of the family members once stood in the niches of the second storey, (most likely the ones mentioned on the inscription; Clermont Ganneau 1903, 141; Vérité 2014). Unfortunately, only the torso of one female statue survived, the others are missing. They were made of marble, an expensive commodity in Tripolitania since it had to be imported due to the lack of marble quarries (Walda 1985, 47-48). The expense for the six marble statues alone would have been substantial. The surviving female statue of either Maria Victorina or Velia Longina Bibai is of the ‘Ceres’ type, dating to the late first or second century AD (Musso 1996, 142-249). Like the inscription, the presence of multiple statues lay emphasis on the whole family and family lineage, and not only on the individual.

A further indication of the family’s social status and education is given by the representation of a *capsa*/*serinium* above the door of the funerary chamber, an image widely used across the Empire (Figure 5.3a and b). This type of wooden container, usually cylindrical, held important papers and scrolls, indicated by the lock that is clearly visible on the relief.
1.21.2 Discussion

The mausoleum at Gasr Duierat reflects closely the complex mix of cultures that were present at the coastal cities. The monument itself is of a type that was popular across the Roman Empire. The commissioner of this tomb had chosen to draw on the iconography of the Greco-Roman world, such as the zodiac, the four seasons, the masks, the Gorgon, and the *capsa*. However, some of the decorations are highly individualised. The four seasons, drew attention to the importance of agriculture as a source of wealth and prosperity while the marble statues and the *capsa* illustrated the family lineage, their status, prestige, and education.

What makes this monument more distinctly Libyan, is the style of relief carving, more akin to the funerary art of the Tripolitanian hinterland than classical art. The figures were carved with much detail and care, but it appears that the aim was not to achieve a naturalistic ‘classical’ style. The costs of erecting a mausoleum were high and the commissioners went to vast expense, including very expensive marble statues. If a more classical style was desired by the family (and expected by the audience), a suitable sculptor could have been found amongst the many artisans at Lepcis Magna. Workshops were numerous in the city, including craftsmen from Asia Minor (Aphrodisias), Alexandria and Greece as well as workshops of local sculptors (Buccino 2011; Equini Schneider and Bianchi 1990; Portale 2012). Thus, craftsmen capable of producing classical style sculpture were widely available, yet the commissioner actively chose a style that was more akin to Punic artistic traditions. The commissioner consciously chose this style of imagery which was thought appropriate and fitting to commemorate and to reflect the social standing of the entire family. This suggests that more naturalistic Graeco-Roman sculpture did not automatically equate to ‘better quality’, at least within the funerary realm. Overall, the hybrid combination of styles and genres on this mausoleum mirrors the complexity of identity construction in the coastal cities, where Mediterranean as well as local influences shaped the way individuals wanted to represent themselves on their funerary monuments.

Gastr Duierat is only one of many mausolea that once stood around Lepcis Magna, and it is difficult to anticipate if its iconographic repertoire was unique to this tomb. Despite the small amount of evidence, some general observations can be made from the scattered sculptures that, most likely, belonged to some larger funerary structure such as the masks built into the Byzantine walls, or the statues found in the Wadi el Rasef. Apotropaic human masks, frequently displayed in a doric frieze, appear to have belonged to the more common
repertoire at Leptis Magna (Fontana 1997, 151-152) together with rosettes and scrolls. Overall, the small amount of evidence of relief sculpture from the coastal zone is striking, even if we consider the re-use of much of the material. This begs the question if mausolea around Leptis Magna simply did not bear as much figural decoration as the mausolea of the hinterland. The city itself provided ample opportunity for self-representation in the form of inscriptions, building programmes, and portrait statues for the leading elite. Furthermore, some of the affluent citizens may have preferred to be buried at their estates in the Gefara or the Gebel, where elaborate funerary monument would stand out more than in the densely built up cemeteries around the major cities.

However, the wall paintings from hypogea indicate that it was common practice at the coast to draw on iconography from the Graeco-Roman repertoire. For instance the painted hypogea in the coastal zone from the early imperial period already discussed in Chapter 4 (Defunto Eroizzato, the Tomb of the Gorgon, and the hypogeum at Zanzur) displayed a repertoire that was profoundly influenced by Mediterranean funerary iconography. Yet, in particularly in the case of the hypogeum of the ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ and the ‘Tomb of the Gorgon’ the scenes were rendered in the local artistic styles, with the customary large almond-shaped eyes and the disproportionate body.

The lack of evidence for mausolea after the Severan period brings the study of their iconography to a halt. However, evidence from painted hypogea at the coast of the late imperial period can give us some indication about the evolution of funerary iconography at the coast. The early fourth-century hypogeum at Sidret el-Balik at the outskirt of Sabratha had a funerary chapel built on top of the burial chamber. The chapel was furnished with four large sigma couches, tables and a well, providing a space for the family to gather and to hold feasts in honour of the dead. The east wall was decorated with frescos depicting the hunts of large felines by men on horseback, a variety of birds amongst vegetation, including peacocks and a cockerel, several houses, probably representing a town, and the loser register depicted wild animals amongst scrolls and vegetation. Scenes on the south side include small winged figures cutting grapes amongst birds (Di Vita 1980-81, 1981-82; 1990, 352-355; Rizzo 2015).

At Gargaresh near Oea the mid-fourth century hypogeum of Aelia Arisuth was painted with victories, two figures holding torches framing the burial niche, and portrait of a woman framed in a medallion, held by two female figures. The sitter was wearing a white turban, which, was, as we will see section 5.5, a popular headdress depicted on portraiture of the pre-desert mausolea in the mid third century. A male figure, lying on its side, head
propped up on his arm, was depicted in the neighbouring niche. Birds and peacocks were pecking amongst foliage and scrolls. Underneath the the niche of Aelia Arisuth was the depiction of a chariot race, a motive popular on sarcophagi (El Falloos 2013, 116; see also Di Vita 1978a for an in depth study of this tomb). Christian iconographic imagery comes from a fourth-century underground burial also at Gargaresh, the hypogeum of Adam and Eve. As the name suggests, it featured a depiction of Adam and Eve next to the forbidden tree and the snake. The upper floor of this hypogeum also had a funerary chapel with *stibadion*, painted walls and mosaic floors, unfortunately completely destroyed (Di Vita 1978a, 204; El Falloos 2013, 42), indicating that funerary commemoration and ritual had changed to be much more private and exclusive by the fourth century AD.

Overall, iconography linked to to the wider Graeco-Roman world prevailed, but the genre became much broader, including horse races, hunting scenes, and landscape scenes. The hypogea at Garagaresch also reflect the religious complexity that was present at least at the coast during the later period, including Christian, Classical and North African imagery (Falloos 2013, 117).

1.22 The Gefara

Mausolea in the Gefara region were mainly situated at the foot of the Gebel, where farms took advantage of the run-off that flowed down from the Gebel (Figure 5.4; Brogan 1965, Mattingly 1995). Large areas were probably also used for pasture for animals (Ferchiou 1989; Sheldrick 2017, 131). Major trade routes crossed this area, connecting the coast to the interior. This region was also defined by the *Limes Tripolitanus* that monitored the movement of peoples and commodities between the coast and the interior, as well as observing and controlling the local groupings inside and outside the frontiers (Mattingly 1995; Sheldrick 2017). The frontier developed from the mid first century BC from smaller garrisons and fortlets to more substantial forts by the third century AD (Euzennat and Trouset 1975; Mattingly 1995, 79-89; Trouset 1974). Therefore, in contrast to today’s remoteness of the Gefara, during the Roman period, this area was much better connected to both, the coastal cities and to the interior through the passing caravan trade, transhumant activity, and army movements.
Of the 21 mausolea recorded, at least ten were adorned with figural decoration. The majority of imagery comes from four sites: el-Ausaf, Beni Guedal, el-Amrouni, and Tatahouine. The small amount of photographic evidence for the mausolea of the western Gefara region is problematic, since the description of the decorated pieces in the published literature is often vague.

Overall, agricultural activities and mythological themes form the core of the decorations recorded in this region. Scenes that may relate to religious activities are evident at Tatahouine, such as the adoration pose. An altar and an offering vessel may have been depicted at Beni Guedal, but again no photograph of it exists. The most complete evidence comes from the mausolea of Henchir el-Ausaf, Beni Guedal, and el-Amrouni, and they will be explored in more detail below.

1.22.1 El-Amrouni

El-Amrouni is located approximately 1 km north-west of the fortlet of Bir Fatnassia, and about 100 km to the north-east of Beni Guedal. Sand dunes cover much of the area, and it
is difficult to determine if there were farms or villas nearby (Trouset 1974, 111). The late first or early second century AD tower tomb reached ten to sixteen metres in height and was topped by a pyramid (Trouset 1974, 111; >Ea001-A). Ferchiou (1989) studied its architectural arrangement in detail, and it appears that, similar to mausolea in Africa Proconsularis, it was squatter in comparison to the slender Tripolitanian obelisk mausolea, featuring a high podium, a single storey and a pyramidal roof. The sculptures were carved in low relief, outlined by deep grooves. The overall themes relate to Classical mythology, including Hercules, Alcestis, Orpheus and Eurydice (Table 5.2). The mausoleum bore two inscriptions, one in Latin, and one in Neo-Punic:

Dis Manibus Sac(rum)
Q(uintus) Apuleus Maxssimus
qui et Rideu vocaba
tur luzale f(ilio) lurathe n(epote)
vix(it) an(nos) LXXXXX Thanubra
coniunx et Pudens et S
everus et Maximus (filiii)
piissimi pa(tri)amantissimo sua pecunia fecerunt

The translation of the Neo-Punic inscription read:

To the Rofoim Gods of Apuleus
Maximus Rideus, son of Yubzalan
son of Yratan, the Metabian, Tanubra
his wife built (this) together with
Pudens, and Severus and Maximus, their sons.
(Translation Jongling and Kerr 2005, 14)

Both inscriptions stress Apuleus’ Latin *tria nomina*, but also underline his Libyan ancestry. His wife, father and grandfather bore Libyan or Punic names, and the Neo-Punic inscription emphasise his belonging to the grouping of the Metabians. The two sons of Apuleus and Tanubra both carry Latin names. Thus, through the inscriptions their Libyan heritage and identity is stressed, while their status within the Roman world is emphasised through the *tria nomina*. We do not know how he obtained his Roman citizenship, but is possible he was as one of the inhabitants of the coastal cities that obtained colonia status during the second century AD. Rideus appears to be the name he was locally known, not Quintus, which is
only stated on the Latin inscription. It is not clear, however, if Rideus is the Latin transliteration of a Libyan or Punic name (Kerr and Jongling 2005).

One side of the mausoleum was decorated with a life-size relief of Apuleus and his wife Thanubra. Apuleius was depicted on the right side, standing upright, wearing a long garment, perhaps a toga, and a cloak was draped over his right arm, the left hand holding on to the edge of his garment. His face was carved in detail, with large almond shaped eyes, a wide nose, thick lips, a beard and curly hair (Ferchiou 1989, 68). His beard was divided in two peaks, similar to the beard of Septimius Severus (Ferchiou 1989, 69). His wife was depicted smaller in size than her husband, and was standing on a pedestal to his left. She was wearing a long undergarment with a cloak or palla draped over the top. Her head was completely obliterated. Both were depicted with bare feet (Ferchiou 1989, 68-69).

Table 5.2: Scenes depicted on el-Amrouni.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>el-Amrouni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mythological scenes and personifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules and Alcestis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpheus and Eurydice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpheus and the animals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius amongst scrolls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysus?</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of deceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait relief of couple</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhabited scrolls / animals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining imagery showed scenes from classical mythology: Hercules returning with Alcestis from the underworld, Orpheus taming the beasts, and leading Eurydice out of the gates of the underworld with Cerberus sitting by the gate and Charon waiting in his boat. Sisyphus and Ixion are depicted on the same relief to the right, above Charon. Three panels of reliefs that probably belonged to the frieze below the roof cornice are less clear. One frieze depicted a person with a beard amongst vine tendrils and grapes, holding a double axe in one hand, while a feline was about to attack to his right. Ferchiou argues that this scene may allude to Dionysus and Lycurgus however, the evidence is not conclusive (Ferchiou 1989).

21 Lecoy de la Marche conducted a drawing of the pieces he saw (Ferchiou 1989), and a photograph of Apuleius’ head exists (Ferchiou 1989, 68 and Figure 3; Plate XVIIIb; >Ea001-A-04).
1989, 71). The second stone showed two figures amongst leaves and foliage, the first naked, turned towards the right, the second bare chested and kneeling down. The third panel depicted inhabited scrolls, with animals such as felines and deer leaping out of the centre flowers. In the middle of the scene was a torso of a person, probably a *genius*, rising out of the foliage, a popular image in the late Hellenistic and Roman Imperial art. This type of image was closely associated with the Dionysus cult and the belief in an afterlife, but they could also have had a purely decorative function (Ferchiou 1989, 71; Toynbee and Ward-Perkins 1950, 2).

Apuleius’ North African origin was emphasised through his facial features on his portrait relief, and the names on the inscriptions. Nevertheless, the choice for decorations was very much influenced by wider Graeco-Roman traditions, both in theme and style of carving, and reveals very little about local customs and traditions. El-Amrouni is one of the earliest Roman-period mausolea in the Gefara bearing figurative decoration. Some imagery might allude to Dionysus, but cannot be taken as evidence that Apuleus was part of this cult. The scenes could have been simply a part of the wider narrative of classical mythology that was being told through the relief sculpture. This mausoleum stands right at the start of the newly developing funerary iconography in Tripolitania. The use of stock images of classical mythology may, therefore, not be surprising. However, it appears that mythological narratives such as Hercules or Orpheus, so popular across the Empire, did not gain a foothold in the Tripolitanian funerary iconography more widely.

The relief were engraved with deeply incised contours, a technique not uncommon in Roman relief sculpture of the early imperial period, in particularly in southern Gaul, as for instance on the arch of Tiberius at Orange, or on the mausoleum of Glanum (Rolland 1969; Kleiner 1977). However, this style with its rigorous outlines is unusual for North Africa (Ferchiou 1989, 72-73), perhaps employed to enhance the play of light and shadow (Brogan 1965, 50). This suggests that the workshop that carved the reliefs was of foreign origin, perhaps based in the coastal cities that carried the stock images of classical mythological themes. The same technique was used again on at least three other mausolea of the mid to late second century AD in western Tripolitania: Henchir el-Ausaf (>Eau001-A), Beni Guedal (>Gu001-A), and Si Aoun (>Si001-A).
1.22.2 Henchir el-Ausaf

The mausolea of Henchir el-Ausaf (>Eau001) was situated circa 8 km north-west of the oasis of Tigi, close to one of the major routes that connected the coast with the Gebel (Sabratha to Nalut). El-Amrouni (>Ea001) was located approximately 90 km to the west. Coro mentioned several other sites around the area of el-Ausaf, including a large Roman period farm he called Kasr Saniet el-Ausaf, and a large cistern (Coro 1928, 107-109). The cemetery was placed on a small hilltop in a highly visible position (SLS Archive, Brogan unpublished notes). It held at least two mausolea built of local limestone and other minor tombs. Unfortunately, the mausolea were already completely destroyed when they were recorded and Brogan tentatively dated the first mausoleum (>Eau001-A) to the late second or early third century AD. Based on the architectural remains it is likely, they were tower mausolea, perhaps with an obelisk roof (Brogan 1965, 50-51).

The decorations were found scattered around the monument (Table 5.3; >Eau001-A-01 to Eau001-A-08). Two broken stones depicted winged male figures in a shallow niche. One of them held fruits in a shawl, suggesting that these were the personification of the four seasons Coro mentioned a third stone depicting a figure wearing a long garment, which could be the third of the four seasons (1928, 116). A seated sphinx was carved on a corner stone next to a moulded column (Figure 5.5c). It was depicted in profile with a feline body, human breasts, and a female face with long hair held in a knot in the nape of the neck. The wings extended out of the back and curled upwards. Two lions were rendered in a similar manner to the sphinx, seated on their hind legs with impressive manes. A ploughing scene was depicted on another panel, with stalks of corn on the return of the stone. A camel and an oxen each were pulling a plough, driven by men wearing short tunics. The plough furrows were indicated by long straight lines at the bottom of the stone (Figure 5.5a). Unfortunately, the inscription of the mausoleum was completely obliterated, and we have no information about the owner or commissioner of the tomb.

The majority of the sculpture was rendered in low relief in the incised contour technique. The winged figures were carved in higher relief due to their positioning in the niche, and they lack the deeply incised outline (Brogan 1965, 50). Their carving style shows strong parallels to Graeco-Roman art, with well-proportioned figures and much attention to naturalistic detail. The craftsman responsible for these works was clearly trained in producing this type of carving.
### Table 5.3: Main themes displayed on Eau001-A and Eau001-B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Eau001-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mythological scenes and personifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Winged figures (four seasons)</em></td>
<td>3 (4?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sphinx</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural activity and domestic animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ploughing with ox and camel</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eau001-B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hunting scene (horse and rider)</em>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quadruped</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second mausoleum (Eau001-B-01 to Eau001-B-02) was located to the south-west of the first, on lower ground (Brogan 1965, 50; Coro 1928, 110-112). A broken stone depicted the hind legs of a horse and the foot of the rider (see also the drawing by Coro, 1928, 110). A second panel featured the body of quadruped, perhaps a horse. Coro mentioned a panel depicting agricultural activities or hunting, and a mythological scenes featured in niches between half columns. However, Brogan could not locate these fragments when she recorded the mausoleum (Coro 1928, 111; Brogan 1965). Although only fragments remain of the second mausoleum, it is notable that the rendering of the sculpture was different to the first. What is left of the horse and rider indicates that the work was less detailed and in higher relief, more akin to the art of the pre-desert areas and it appears that different sculptors were at work here. The horse and rider scene suggests that this monument was built slightly later than Eau001-A, at some point during the mid-third to fourth century AD. By that time, the incised contour technique was no longer used, either because it was no longer desired by the commissioners, and/or the workshop that produced these images had ceased to operate in this area.

As at el-Amrouni, the main themes of Eau001-A were rather common across the Empire: lions and a sphinx guarding the tomb, the four seasons symbolising the agricultural cycle, and agricultural scenes. Any evidence for portraiture is missing, and it is unclear if the deceased was depicted on the tomb. It is noticeable that the commissioner had chosen imagery that would not have looked out of place in the coastal cities, both, in style and subject. The incised contour technique was also applied here, most likely carried out by a

22 For Coro this was the ‘primo mausoleo’ (1928, 110-112).
23 For a chronology of the development of figurative decorations see section 5.7 Discussion.
workshop based in one of the coastal cities that was familiar with Graeco-Roman art. The camel-ploughing scene stands out in that it very much reflects the regional reality of the Gefara, and Tripolitania more general, while the rest of the imagery was very generic.

1.22.3 Beni Guedal

Beni Guedal (Gu001) is located approximately 45 km south-west of el-Ausaf and 11 km north-east of Dehibat. Two cemeteries were located here, the first containing up to four mausolea and other tombs, and a second cemetery, 1 km to the south-east of the first, held at least one mausoleum. (Trousset 1974, 124-125).

The imagery of Mausoleum B (>Gu001-B-01 to Gu001-B-03) is markedly similar to the representations at el-Ausaf (>Eau001-A), including a ploughing scene with an oxen and a camel (Figure 5.5a) and a seated sphinx (Figure 5.5d). The ploughing scene is broken, and the first plough animal is missing, but Toutain stated that the missing draught animal was a camel that was already badly worn when Witz recorded it (1914, 161). As at el-Ausaf and at el-Amrouni, the reliefs were rendered in a very naturalistic Graeco-Roman manner carved in low relief, and outlined by deep grooves. The rendering and subject matter is so similar that it was probably carved by the same craftsman or workshop (Brogan 1965) drawing from the same image bank (Figure 5.5b). The last sculptural element found at this tomb was a marble statue, of which pieces scattered around the mausoleum consisted of the torso of a well rendered marble statue in a draped garment. A mutilated head was found detached from the sculpture (Toutain 1914). Unfortunately, there does not appear to be any photographic evidence of this statue, but if we trust Toutain’s judgement, then this is the only marble statue found with a mausoleum in the Tripolitanian hinterland. As already mentioned, marble was expensive. With the added cost of transporting the statue to Beni Guedal, this would have been a costly addition to the mausoleum. Fragments scattered around the tomb such as parts of the pyramid, and pieces of columns and a niche indicate that this was an obelisk tomb with an aedicula for the statue (Toutain 1914).

According to Witz, Mausoleum B was adorned with rosettes, of which a panel of three were recorded, and a relief of a vase with a long neck (Brogan 1965; Trousset 1974, 124-125). Fragments of the pyramidal roof suggests that this was an obelisk tomb. Faveris (1907, CCXLIX), who has excavated this mausoleum, recorded the relief of a goats head and

---

24 Toutain took his information directly from Witz’s notes.
a very fragmented inscription stating the name of L. Tarquitius Pudens. It is unclear if L. Tarquitius Pudens was of North African origin. Pudens was a very popular name in North Africa. We have already seen this name at Gasr Duierat (IRT2009, 729) and at el-Amrouni, and it appears several times on the inscriptions of the coastal cities (Sabratha: IRT2009, 117; Oea: IRT2009, 240, Oea; Lepcis Magna: IRT2009, 295, 647, 729, 732; Brogan 1965, 56). However, it was also attested elsewhere in the Roman world.

The third and fourth mausolea of this cemetery were very fragmented, and no decorations have been recorded (Trouset 1974, 125). One kilometre to the south-east lay another mausoleum with decorations of a frieze of triglyphs and metope (>Gu001-C-01 to Gu001-C-05). It contained a head surrounded by two intertwined snakes (Gorgon?), a vase and an altar or incense box, and a bull’s head (Trouset 1974, 125). Unfortunately, none of these decorations were photographed or drawn. Coro brought the relief of a ram’s head that he saw near this mausoleum (1927, 139), and the relief of a sheep’s head has been photographed by Brogan at Dehibat, which, most likely, belonged to this mausoleum. The rendering of these reliefs is very different from Mausoleum A in much higher relief and with less detail.
1.22.4 Tatahouine / Oued Beni Blell

At some point during the last century several sculptured stones were deposited at Tatahouine which come from mausolea in the vicinity. They were photographed by Brogan at some point in the 1950s or 1940s but had disappeared when Trousset visited Tatahouine in the 1970s (1974, 108). The majority of the sculptural pieces probably came from a single mausoleum. One option is Oued Beni Blell, 4 km to the north-east of Tatahouine (>Ob001-A). Lecoy de la Marche mentioned that a large number of reliefs from this site were brought to Tatahouine and built into the French fort, including human figures with rudimentary outlines and ostriches (1894, 394). Gaukler, instead, seemed to believe that they came from a second mausoleum at el-Amrouni (Gaukler 1901a, 290-295). Although their exact provenance cannot be established, it seems likely that Tat001-B-01 through to Tat001-B-08 come from the same monument due to their very homogeneous carving technique.

The range of themes was very varied (Table 5.4). A very weathered stone featured a ploughing scene. The draught animal may be an ox due to the long tail. The ploughman is missing. In front of the animal is a figure, probably another ploughman. The stone is broken off to the right, but the foot of another draught animal is still visible. The plough lines are carved in three fairly straight lines on the bottom of the stone. Although this stone is very weathered, its composition somewhat recalls the ploughing scenes of el-Ausaf and Beni Guedal (>Eau001-A-05; Gu001-B-03), but, although very weathered, it seems that it was carved in a less detailed manner. The draught animal had a long and thick tail that does not feature on the other two comparable reliefs, and the movements of the animals and ploughman appear less natural. It almost certain that this work has been carried out by a different workshop that had tried to re-produce the scenes from Beni Guedal and el-Ausaf.

Two reliefs depicted peacocks drinking out of a cup and another featured a lion in profile, head turned towards the viewer. One stone contained the rudimentary outlines of six human figures, the bodies carved in a roughly triangular shapes with oval heads. The eyes, mouth, and nose, were roughly indicated by chiselled lines. A small figure with both arms raised above the head could be seen on a corner stone, next to a large flower or pine cone carved on the pilaster. Other relief sculptures included a cup with undistinguishable content (leaves? incense burner?), a branch with fruit, either olives or figs, and two quadrupeds displayed above each other.
Table 5.4: Themes on displaced stones that were collected at Tatahouine.

Brogan also recorded the fragments of two sculptures-in-the-round made of limestone, but it is not clear if they belong to the same mausoleum (Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive). Of on statue only the upper torso survived. The second sculpture, is broken in two pieces of the upper and lower part of the torso. The heads and feet are missing. Both individuals wore garments that were wrapped around the body and drawn over the left shoulder, most likely representing a toga. Tat001-A-02 held on to a thick fold of the garment with the left hand, a standard pose of the *togatus*. Brogan also photographed a very well-carved capital featuring Atlas(?) of unknown provenance (>Tat001-A-01).

Notably, the majority of the reliefs from Tatahouine were rendered in the incised contour technique, but in their execution they are much more rudimentary than the pieces from el-Ausaf or Beni Guedal. It is apparent that the craftsman that fashioned these carvings was not as well adept in producing this type of classical art. However, the apparent similarities of the ploughing scene to the ones at Beni Guedal and el-Ausaf suggest that an attempt has been made to copy at least some of the iconography and the style of carving. Yet, it is notable that the themes chosen for Tat001-B are much broader, including birds
drinking out of a cup, wild animals, a cup, the adoration pose, and a pine cone. Scenes of classical mythology so prevalent on el Ausaf (>Ea001-A) and Beni Guedal (>Gu001-B) are missing, and instead the commissioner has chosen themes that evolved from Punic artistic traditions. This, suggests that that this mausoleum was built later than el-Ausaf and Beni Guedal when the funerary iconography of Tripolitania had evolved to include a much broader range of themes. Iconographically, these sculptures fit in much better with a group of mausolea that stood circa 80 km further to the north-west in the Gebel (see Section 5.3 Bou Guerba), but stylistically, the craftsman clearly tried to reproduce something like the pieces at el-Ausaf or Beni Guedal.

1.22.5 Discussion

The commissioners of the mausolea at el-Amrouni, Beni Guedal and el-Ausaf drew from the Greco-Roman repertoire of funerary iconography such as sphinxes, the four seasons, Orpheus and Hercules. Subtle local references were made in the ploughing scenes, where camels are depicted as drought animals. However, in style, and theme, the majority of the imagery of the late first and mid second-century mausolea would not have looked out of place in Italy. The choice of the incised contour technique is an interesting one since its use is rare elsewhere in North Africa. This technique was particularly useful for craftsmen since it could be employed to copy the outline of more complex images onto the stones with a drill or a chisel (Kleiner 1977, 686).

This particular style of relief carving appears only on one other mausoleum in Tripolitania, at Si Aoun in the Gebel, circa 45 km south-west of Beni Guedal. It was one of the southernmost fortlets / praesidium on the Limes Tripolitanus on the track to Ghadames, dating to the early third century (Trouset 1974, 120; Mattingly 1995, 102) indicated by a military inscription mentioning Quintus Anicius Faustus who was appointed consul in AD 198 (I.L.Af. 9 = I.L.S. 9177). The mausolea where situated 300 m from the fortlet, and can perhaps be associated with it. However, there is no inscription to verify this. The imagery that survived showed two winged figures holding a garland above an arch and a mask wearing a cape with a hood featuring two ears, again, a very standard decoration of funerary monuments in the wider Roman world. Within the Tripolitanian context, however, the decorations stand out rather than represent the norm, and it appears that this type of relief accounts for a very regional preference. Given the similarities of the reliefs of el-Ausaf and
Beni Guedal, it is conceivable that those mausolea were built by the same workshop that operated in a 50 km radius and worked with a range of pattern and outlines catering towards the specific demands of the local elites. The pieces at Tatahouine illustrate that this particular style was still desired much later. However, by that time the workshop may have ceased to operate in this area, but, nevertheless, attempts were made to reproduce the incised contour technique in a style much more akin to Punic artistic traditions.

However, the pieces from Tatahouine (>Tat001-A and Tat001-B) and the fragments of the later mausolea of el-Ausaf (>Ea001-B) and Beni Guedal (>Gu001-C) illustrate the preference of themes clearly changed over time from more generic classical mythology, to iconography imagery that was laden with local religious and symbolic significance. Birds facing each other over a cup, hunting, wild animals and figures with their arms raised for prayer or mourning also start to occur in particularly in the western Gebel in the mid-third century AD, which will be illustrated below.

### 1.23 The Gebel

Just as parts of the Gefara, the western part of the Gebel was defined by the limes zone. The fort of Remada was probably one of the earliest larger forts in the region built at some point during the Hadrianic period while the majority of larger forts were established in the early third century AD (Euzennat and Trousset 1975; Mattingly 1995, 80; Trousset 1974). Several important trade routes crossed the Gebel and nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes were moving across the region. Thus, like the Gefara, the Gebel consisted of a complex mix of different peoples that would have encountered, and viewed the mausolea. As already stressed in previous chapters, the primary source of wealth in the Gebel was agricultural production, especially olives for olive oil. Due to the intense exploitation, settlements were frequent, located near cultivable land along the wadis, where most of the good soil was located, and run-off water could be caught and kept. Intensive surveys on the Gebel Tarhuna show that the settlement pattern was a dispersed one, consisting of large-scale farms, fortified farms, and oilaries, as well as small-scale farms (Ahmed 2010). This pattern also seems true for the rest of the eastern Gebel region. More detailed survey work in the western Gebel is needed,

25 The agricultural scene at Rogeban (>Ro001-A-02) is very similar to the ones at el-Ausaf and Beni Guedal, and was perhaps also carved by this workshop. However, there is no evidence of the incised contour technique.
but Trousset’s work has shown that farming was also practiced there, although the extent of it is difficult to estimate (Trousset 1974).

It has long been argued that in contrast to the coastal villas, villas in this region were mainly utilitarian structures which were firmly linked to the agricultural activities in the region (Mattingly 1995; Percival 1976). However, the intensive survey by Ahmed shows that ‘11 out of 33 oilery/large olive farm sites (within the area of Wadis Turgut and Doga) have produced surface evidence for luxury elements such as columns, mosaics, wall-paintings and bath buildings and in total, 12 villas with luxury evidence were identified’ (2010, 98, 106). Goodchild excavated the luxury villa at Ain Scerciara, which featured mosaics and porticoes (Goodchild 1951). Thus, some people who lived in the Gebel area may have possess a level of wealth which allowed them to build villas with luxury elements, as well as substantial mausolea. Nevertheless, much of the agricultural land was owned by the city elite, some of who may have erected large luxury villas on their estates together with the mausolea (Figure 5.6).

Figure 5.6: Location of mausolea in the Gebel. Names of mausolea discussed in more detail in this chapter are indicated on map.
1.23.1 Bir El-Uaar

The mausoleum at Bir el-Uaar (Ua001-A) is architecturally similar to Gasr Duierat at the coast, but much larger, 4.64 m x 4.64 m and about 20 m in original height. It consisted of three storeys, including a circular aedicula on the third storey and a conical roof. The second storey had a square aedicula with a free-standing colonnade. This mausoleum has been dated to no later than the third century AD on the basis of its architectural elements (Abdussaid 1998, 154). The architecture of this mausoleum is studied in more detail by Abdussaid (1998) and Brogan (1978), but its figural decorations have not yet been analysed. While architecturally, there may be some similarities to Gasr Duierat at the coast, its decorations are substantially different (Ua001-A-01 to Ua001-A-07).

The panel for the inscription above the door was not inscribed. It may be that there was a painted inscription, but the lettering has now disappeared. The iconographic repertoire depicted on this grand mausoleum is rather limited. Two portrait heads in relief featured on the first storey left and right of the false door, each set in a medallion, displaying some very individual features. In the right medallion was a male head with short hair and a beard. The relief is rather weathered, but it appears that two long objects were crossed over underneath the chin. The medallion to the left depicted a female figure with long hair or a vail hanging down in a straight line left and right of the head. The women was wearing a very elaborate headdress decorated with what may be small rosettes at the front, or tight curls, held up by two triangular pieces on the side of the head above the temples. This type of headdress is very distinct, and there are no parallels found elsewhere in Tripolitania. The details of the individual portrait reliefs will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, but this headdress appears to be a very personal, or perhaps local style, indicating the high status of the woman depicted.

On top of the first storey, female busts in high relief were placed between shallow shell niches on all sides of the mausoleum (two on each side). The female figures wore pleated garments with the folds running over the right shoulder across the body to left. The hair hung down loose behind the shoulder. The first storey of the monument held the false door (facing south-east), which has long disappeared. A feline was carved in relief running, hunting a small animal, carved on the moulding beneath the opening for the false door. On the front side of the same stone, another feline was depicted between two vessels, devouring its prey. Unfortunately, the stone is very weathered, and the species of the prey can no longer be distinguished. This scene can also be found at mausolea in the pre-desert, and was also
an image popular across the Empire. A Doric frieze with individual rosettes in panels are depicted running all the way around the monuments. The decoration of the second storey is unclear, but the third storey sported female figures in high relief in front of the eight columns, wearing loose tunics on top of long undergarments. Their arms were held in front of their chest holding an object, perhaps an offering vessel. Apart from the portrait sculptures, the decoration on this mausoleum are rather generic. However, the mausoleum would have stood out because of its sheer size, rather than the decorations associated with it. It was clearly important to the commissioner to add some individual features to the portrait reliefs.

A large gasr stood about 2 km to the south, but it is unclear if this is related to the Bir el-Uaar mausoleum. Brogan suggests that the mausoleum belonged to a member of the elite at Oea due to the absence of a large enough dwelling nearby (Brogan 1978, 235). It may, of course, be that the dwelling associated with the mausoleum has long since disappeared. However, given the large dimensions and the elaborate architectural decorations, it is plausible that this very expensive monument belonged to a member of the city elite.

1.23.2 Bou Guerba

The mausoleum at Bou Guerba was already completely destroyed at the beginning of the 20th century (>Bo001-A-01 to Bo001-A-06; Saladin 1902, 406). The small number of surviving blocks and corner pilasters are rather large, indicating that it was probably a substantial mausoleum of the tower or obelisk type. It is the westernmost example of which some photographic evidence was available to me. A cistern was located 500 m to the northeast, and 500 m to the north was a dam, probably related to floodwater farming. About 1 km towards the Wadi Macera were ruins of a farm with an olive press (Saladin 1902, 408-11; Trouset 1974, 83). A large number of smaller circular tombs surrounded the monument (Saladin 1902, 408-11; Trouset 1974, 83). It is, therefore, plausible that the families who lived in this area were involved in agricultural activities rather than in the caravan trade (Trouset 1974, 157). Five fragments of three inscriptions were found, of which only one was legible:

\[ \text{D(is) [M(anibus) s(acrum)]} \]
\[ \ldots \text{T(itus) Domitius (N...,} \]
\[ \ldots \text{us vi[xi]t ann[i]s...} \]
\[ \ldots \]
Unfortunately, the name does not reveal much about the origins of the owner of the tomb, but it may be that the family was granted citizenship under the Flavian emperors. Above the panel for the inscription was the relief of two birds with long necks (peacocks?) drinking out of a kantharos, set in a wreath, outside of which two more birds were depicted, one on each side (>Bo001-A-01; Gaukler 1901b, CLXV; Saladin 1902, 408).

The arrangement of the remaining decorations is unique to Tripolitania, carved on long vertical slabs which would have run up the length of an entire storey (Figure 7.7.2). Brogan’s photographs confirm the accuracy of most drawings, but no pictures representing drawings number four and five could be found. However, it is safe to assume that they are quite accurate. The only doubt is placed on the drawing of the tortoise (Figure 5.7.8).

Figure 5.7: Drawings provided by Saladin sketching out the decorations and a proposed reconstruction of the mausoleum at Bou Guerba (Saladin 1902, Plate XLVII).

Apparently the stone was already very mutilated when it was recorded by Pontbriand (Saladin 1902, 406), and the photographic evidence suggests that, instead, it featured small rosettes and scrolls. The main iconographic theme refers to hunting activities: two hunters on horseback; wild animals, including felines, antelopes, a fox, a hare and perhaps a hunting dog. One slab depicted two figures, standing both arms raised in the posture of prayer or adoration. On the same stone is a camel, a fish, and a wild ass or gazelle were displayed. An
offering table displayed carved offerings of two fish in one bowl, and a fish, perhaps a bird and a third object in a second bowl. Two smaller bowls were left empty, probably to hold actual offerings (Figure 5.7.1). The style of carving is summary and disproportioned, with only little attention to detail, somewhat similar to some of the pieces now at Tatahouine (Tat001-B).

Some of the animals were more unusual, such as the fox or the donkey, and they were perhaps directly requested by the commissioner. The fish, the offering table, and the two figures with raised arms most likely refer to the ritual that was practiced to honour the dead. Offering tables are attested across North Africa (Hitchner 1990, 144; Mattingly with Edwards 2003; Mattingly 2007b) and are also evident in Tripolitania (Mattingly with Dore 1996, 144; Figure 5.8e-f) where they are very seldom decorated with carved offering, such as Tabuniyah (Figure 5.8d). However, I did not come across any other offering tables with sculptured offerings during my archival survey of the cemeteries and mausolea of Tripolitania. Offering tables similar to the one at Bou Guerba were, however, present at Timgad, modern day Algeria. (Figure 5.8a-c). At Bou Guerba, such an offering table highlights the concern of the deceased to perform appropriate rituals around the tomb.

Figure 5.8: Offering tables. a-c) Offering tables from the cemeteries at Timgad, Algeria (Images: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Offering table with carved offerings (fish in centre, dates in upper right bowl) from Tabuniyah, found near mausoleum Tb045-A (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); e) Offering table from Wadi el-Amud near the mausoleum Lm001-A (Image: ULVS, SLS Archive); f) Offering table from Wadi Umm-el Agerem with libation channel found near Ag002-A (Image: Daniels, SLS Archive).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Henchir Bou Guerba (Bo001-A)</th>
<th>Henchir Krebita (Hk001-A)</th>
<th>Henchir Oum el Abbes (Oa001-A)</th>
<th>Henchir Bel Aid (Ha001-A)</th>
<th>Sidi bel Abbas (Ab001-A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture of prayer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of deceased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait male (bearded)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue (seated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural activity and domestic animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds left and right of cup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels/cup and pinecone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadruped</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope / Gazelle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizard or snake</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting dog</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare hunt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbivore hunt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich hunt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline hunt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting on horseback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull hunt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genie or dancer?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosettes / tendrils?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: Imagery depicted on mausolea in the western Gefara.

The story of this mausoleum becomes particularly interesting when we place it within its regional context. Four mausolea were located in the vicinity, three at Henchir Krebita (>Hk001-A) approximately 6 km to the south-east, and one at Henchir Oum el Abbes (>Oa001-A) about 5 km to the south. Two inscriptions at Oum el Abbes mention the name Domitius: (L(ucius) Domitius Aumura, I.L.T., 52; L Domiti[us] Macul[us], I.L.T., 54). At
Henchir Krebita, the inscription refers to L(ucio) Domitio Telluli (I.L.T., 51). The name ‘Domitius’ appears on all three inscriptions, which suggests that the local elite of the area was formed by the family of the Domitii, including Titus Domitius N[… of Bou Guerba (>Bo001). Thus, this family probably owned a considerable amount of land in this area, which they controlled. Unfortunately, it is not possible to establish the exact relations or a chronology from these inscriptions.

Interestingly, the iconographic themes chosen for the mausoleum of Henchir Krebita are very similar to Bou Guerba, comprising hunting scenes, animals, (including a donkey like at Bou Guerba), and birds next to a cup. The mausoleum at Henchir Oum el Abbes (>OA001-A) stands out due to the absence of hunting scenes, and the presence of rosettes and scrolls. It is possible this was one of the earlier mausolea in this area, but without any photographic evidence, this is difficult to determine. However, a lamp found at the mausoleum can be dated to the second or third century AD, which perhaps indicates an earlier date for this mausoleum (Trouset 1974, 84-85). The mausolea displaying hunting scenes can be more securely placed in the mid to late third to fourth century AD, when these scenes became popular on mausolea in Tripolitania (see Chapter 6). If we look slightly further afield to Henchir Bel Aid (>HA001-A: circa 20 km to the north east of Bou Guerba Bo001-A), and Sidi Bel Abbas (>AB001-A; circa 35 km south-east of Bou Guerba), again, similar themes can be observed (Table 5.5). No inscriptions survive from these mausolea, and we cannot determine if they also belonged to members of the Domitii family. However, judging from the descriptions from earlier sources was a degree of homogeneity in themes which were especially popular amongst the local elite. Furthermore, the style of carving, for all of these mausolea is similar. Trouset describes as ‘d’art beaucoup plus fruste, dont la facture suggère une origine autochtone libyco-berbère (1974, 157), a style chosen in this region of Tripolitania.

1.23.3 Chormet el-Bousaila

Chormet el-Bousaila was located on a hill south-west of the ancient settlement of Tazzoli, on the western edge of the Tarhuna paleau. (Figure 5.9; Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive, Brogan and Kenrick, unpublished report, SLS Archive). The mausoleum was completely destroyed, probably during an earthquake, but judging by its large building blocks, it once was a substantial aedicula tower mausoleum, perhaps with a pyramidal top
(base 3.10 m x 3.10 m; Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive). It was surrounded by an enclosure wall 11 m x 11 m, a very unusual feature otherwise not associated with inland Tripolitanian mausolea.

Figure 5.9: Unpublished location map of Chormet el-Bousaila drawn by Kenrick in 1971 (Image: Kenrick, SLS Archive)

There were at least three inscriptions found around the mausoleum, most of them too damaged to be readable. However, an inscription which Brogan had not translated or mentioned in her notes, but of which a photograph exists in the SLS Archive, names C Valerius Vibianus.

Diis manibu(s) [...]
C Valerius V[... ]n(v?)s
Lep.*...anvs vale [...] n
fusc(?) [...] vixit a n

The Valerii were an influential family in Lepcis Magna from the second century onwards (Tantillo and Bigi 2010, 372-374). A late third century fragmented inscription from the Old
Forum at Lepcis Magna may refer to a Valerius Vibianus (IRT2009, 274; Tantillo and Bigi 2010, 442-445) and a statue dedication in the Severan Forum at Lepcis Magna named C. Valerius Vibianus as governor of Tripolitania at the beginning of the fourth century AD (IRT2009, 577; Tantillo and Bigi 2010, 372-374; Lenaghan 2016, 267). Brogan had dated the mausoleum to the third century AD, however, the acanthus leaves on the capitals are clearly reminiscent of the prickly acanthus introduced during the Tetrarchic period, datable from the late third century AD to the first half of the fourth century AD (Figure 5.10; Harrazi 1982a, 85; for comparisons see Harrazi 1982a, 85-90; Harrazi 1984b, Plate 96-105; Pensabene 1996, 401-406, nos. 407-431, plates 50-52). If this was indeed the governor’s mausoleum or the mausoleum of one of his family members is not certain. However, the size the decorations and statues speak of a family of high rank. The inscription also emphasises a close relationship to Lepcis Magna, supporting the theory that some of the rich citizens of the city may have wanted their mausoleum on their family estate.

Figure 5.10: Capitals from Chormet el-Bousaila with ‘prickly Acanthus’ (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).

This mausoleum was richly decorated with relief sculpture and statues, which can be divided into three sets of imagery (>Ch001-A-01 to Ch001-A-17). The first set of relief sculptures can be linked to the ocean and sea deities. The Dioscuri, otherwise absent on Tripolitanian tombs, were depicted as two nude men with a mantel around their shoulders, holding a spear with one hand, and leading a horse with the other. Both were wearing a Phrygian cap. Similar

---

26 I would like to thank Dr Niccolo Mugnai for helping me with the dating of these capitals, and for pointing me towards the relevant bibliography.
images of the Dioscuri have been found on stelai from Africa Proconsularis where they accompany Saturn as the personification of the two hemispheres, underlining the importance of Saturn as a cosmic deity (Le Glay 1966, 299; Wurnig 2006, 128). However, no reference to Saturn is made on this mausoleum (or, in fact, many other mausolea). Instead, this mausoleum drew particular reference to mythologies and deities relating to the ocean, such as a sea deity wearing a seaweed crown and holding sea horses at a reign (Neptune? Figure 5.11c) or a human mask with crap-claws on its head (Triton?; Figure 5.11d). The Dioscuri were connected with the protection of seafarers, an association which, within the context of iconography of this mausoleum, is plausible. The immortal horses of the Dioscuri, Kyllaros, and Xanthos, were gifted to them by Hera and who, in turn, had received them from Neptune (Alcman, Fragment 25).

Image - No Copyright

Figure 5.11: a) Mosaic from Chebba, Tunisia, second century AD, of Neptune and his sea horses, Triton with his crab-claws to the left, and Aphos to the right. Image source: http://www.theoi.com/Gallery/Z2.4.html; b) Chormet el-Bousaila, head of a gorgon, perhaps Medusa (>Ch001-A-06; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) Chormet el-Bousaila, Neptune, with four sea horses behind him, holding a triton and wearing a crown of seaweed (>Ch001-A-01; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Chormet el-Bousaila, bearded male with crab-claws to the left and right of his head Image: Brogan, SLS Archive.

The image of the Gorgon was depicted on the same tomb; perhaps Medusa drew another connection to ocean deities (Figure 5.11b). The myth of Medusa was strongly linked to Lake Tritonis, to Neptune, and the sea in general. According to Pausanias, 'she reigned over those
living around Lake Tritonis, going out hunting and leading the Libyans to battle’ (Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 2. 21. 5 – 2.21. 6). Neptune violated Medusa at the temple of Athena near the lake Tritonis, and Medusa, when Perseus beheaded her, gave birth to the winged horse Pegasus and the hero Chrysaor (Hesiod, *Theogony* 179-286; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4, 270ff). Medusa was the daughter of Keto, who was associated with the dangers of the sea, and Phorkys, a sea god which is linked, in particular, to the dangers of the deep sea. Medusa was also associated with sea-faring and dangerous reefs, which were created when Perseus touched the seaweeds with Medusa’s head, which turned into stone (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 4. 740 ff). The image of Poseidon and Triton was also popular in mosaic depiction, such as at Chebba (Figure 5.11a; Dunbabin 1978, 149-154).

A second set of reliefs featured wild animals: a lion eating its prey, a dog hunting a feline, lions holding a cantharus between them, a hare nibbling on some grass. A large eagle statue carved in the round was also placed somewhere on the monument. Two statues of a *togatus* perhaps featured the deceased and other family members, heads now missing.

In many ways, this mausoleum stands out from all the other mausolea of the region. It combines some standard Tripolitanian imagery such as lion’s eating their prey or guarding an object between them, with themes that are otherwise absent in Tripolitania, such as the depictions of the personified deities. While fish appear on a number of mausolea, there they seem to symbolize offerings to the dead, but direct references to the sea and its deities are otherwise absent. It appears that the imagery relating to the ocean were a very personal request from the commissioner to the sculpture. The rendering of Neptune suggests that this scene did not belong to the standard repertoire of the craftsman, and his inexperience probably accounts for the more summary workmanship of this scene, especially when compared to the relief of the Dioscuri. Neptune’s body is out of proportion, with a large head, long body, short legs and thin arms, awkwardly stretched out to the sides. His feet do not touch the ground and are carved in profile, even though the rest of his body is facing outwards.

In contrast, the statue of the eagle and the portrait statues were well proportioned and carved in detail. The eagle statue represents something of a peculiarity, since it is the only one of its kind in Tripolitania, perhaps as a symbol to protect the tomb, or as a reference to Rome, especially if the individual indeed held a high office in the Roman administration.
1.23.4 Discussion

It is difficult to determine wider trends in this area, because of the dispersed and fragmented condition of many of the decorations. However, the three mausolea discussed above indicate some broader regional preferences, while also pointing out some very individual features that appear to have been specifically chosen by the client. Bir el-Uaar stands out because of its sheer size, but its decoration was rather generic. The architecture and size of the monument perhaps already sufficiently highlighting the status and wealth of the deceased and the family. Care has been taken, however, to individualize the portraits that were depicted left and right of the false door through grooming and hairstyle.

The mausolea in the western Gebel stand in stark contrast to Bir el-Uaar in that they were much more liberally decorated. Here, clear regional preferences can be detected in hunting scenes, animals and symbolic iconography such as the birds drinking out of a cup. This scene was popular across Tripolitania, but was particularly favoured in this specific area at some point during the third century AD.

Chormet el-Bousaila is one of the most unusual of all Tripolitanian mausolea. The inscription indicates that it was built for an inhabitant of Leptis Magna of an influential family and who may have been directly involved in the administration of the province. The iconography that was chosen for this mausoleum suggest a much wider involvement with the Roman world.

1.24 The Pre-Desert

The pre-desert area was intensely settled from the late first century AD onward as demonstrated by the ULVS (Barker 1996; Mattingly 1996c), including farmsteads and larger courtyard farms. Fortified farms (gsur) started to appear from the third century AD onwards (Mattingly with Flower 1996, 168). The farms were established along certain wadis with some of them becoming very densely settled (see for instance Sheldrick 2017). The presence of presses in this remote area shows that olive trees and vines were cultivated, together with other crops such as barley and wheat, also demonstrated by environmental analysis (van der Veen and Grand 1996). The pattern of settlement in this area suggests that it was divided into independent farms and estates which held a considerable amount of land, to which the mausolea can be linked (Figure 5.11; Mattingly 1996a, 178; 1996b). In contrast to the Gebel,
they were not controlled by the elite dwelling in the coastal cities, but by the Libyan elite, demonstrated by the large number of inscriptions stating Libyan names in Libyan, neo-Punic, but rarely in Latin (Mattingly 1996c, 321-324).

Figure 5.12: Location of mausolea in the pre-desert. Names of mausolea discussed in more detail in this chapter are indicated on map.

The iconographic imagery on mausolea in the pre-desert area developed into an incredibly rich repertoire from the late first century AD onwards. As we will see below, the choice of scenes was influenced by the need to establish and maintain ancestral roots, by concerns about maintaining local traditions and by the regional and wider social and political environment.

The case studies for this chapter (Figure 5.12) were carefully chosen from the large body of data that was generated from this area, that best represent the general trends in the developments in iconography, as well as demonstrate some of the regional peculiarities. As far as possible, they are arranged in chronological order of construction.
1.24.1 Wadi Umm el-Agerem

The monumental cemetery in the Wadi Umm el-Agerem was situated in an area that contained many farms of all sizes as well as small settlements. The cemetery held a large number of smaller burials and at least six monumental tombs in a highly visible position on a hill, close to a large farm complex located to the west of it (Mattingly 1996a, 20). The mausolea were arranged in a line running north to south. The majority of them are completely collapsed, and only a small number of the sculptured stones survived.

Ag002-A, an obelisk mausoleum with open peristyle, still stands up to its first storey today. Ag002-B was another obelisk tomb while Ag002 C through to Ag002-E were most likely temple mausolea due to fragments of roof acroteria and column bases found amongst the debris of these tombs. (Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive). A broken portrait relief from the temple mausoleum Ag002-C-01 showed the outlines of a bust with its face weathered away, wearing a mantle or shawl crossed over at the front in the manner that also occurs on the portrait reliefs at Ghirza (>Gh128-C-01, Gh128-D-01 and Gh128-E-01) which tentatively places this mausoleum in the late third to early fourth century AD, indicating a long continuity of this particular cemetery over centuries. Two Latino-Punic inscription were found in this cemetery containing Libyan and Punic names and stressing the family relations amongst the deceased in this cemetery (Reynolds 1955, IRT Suppl. 28; Appendix 1.2.3; Figure 5.13). The inscriptions tell us that Annobal was the builder of two mausolea (>AG002-A and Ag002-B). He had contributed 1,000 denarii to the construction of Ag002-A, which may indicate that Masauchan was Annobal’s father, but the wording of the inscription suggests that Thanubda was perhaps not his mother (Mattingly 1995, 165).

Iyllul (Iylul?) Imiltho (builder)

Ysysan Masauchan = Thanubda

Annobal (builder) Nasif

Figure 5.13: Partial family tree from the Wadi Umm el-Agerem cemetery, second/third century AD (after Mattingly 1995, 164).
Ag002-B appears to be the earliest of all six mausolea. It was built for Iyllul, father of Masauchan, who was buried in the Ag002-A mausoleum. The little decoration that survives from AG002-B shows that it was decorated with scrolls and rosettes, but no figural relief, a common pattern for the earlier mausolea of the pre-desert (see for instance >Md001-A; Md001-B; Md023-A).

The early to mid-third century mausoleum AG002-A displayed some figural decoration amongst panels showing elaborately carved rosettes and roundels (>Ag002-A-01 to Ag002-A-06). A feline mask with forelegs hanging below was amongst the fallen stones of the first storey. The commissioners Thanubda and Nasif were particularly concerned with the representation of family members. A portrait bust in relief of the deceased under an arch was shown on the frieze of the first storey above the false door. The arch probably indicated his deceased (but perhaps elevated) status. He was wearing a cap on his head with a row of tight curls peeking out from under it, and was clean shaven. In the panel next to him stood a full-length figure holding a bowl, dressed in a similar cap to the deceased, but without the tight locks. Perhaps, this was meant to represent Nasif holding an offering bowl for the veneration of his dead father. Thanubra was probably depicted on the North side of the mausoleum in a single panel, identifiable by her elaborate hairstyle. A fourth individual was represented on the west side, but the stone is too weathered to identify individual features. The iconographic repertoire was mainly concerned with portraiture and self-representation of the individuals. Family connections were stressed through this imagery, and further emphasised by the inscription.

1.24.2 Wadi Antar

The two mausolea An001-A and An001-B were located in substantial cemetery that contained a large number of minor burials (at least 203 individual features were recorded by the ULVS team, Mattingly 1996a, 33-39). An001-A was placed on top of the hill in the centre of the cemetery. An001-B was located approximately 120 m to the south-west of Mausoleum A. Both were, most likely obelisk tombs with aedicula. An001-B was the earliest mausoleum of the cemetery, dating, to the late first or early second century AD based on the lettering of its Latin inscription and the tria nomina that indicated that citizenship was received under the Flavian emperors (Brogan and Reynolds 1985, 20.
To the gods below Titus Flavius Ninus son of Achu(l?)
Uuzal grandson(?) of Masthan. He lived for 29 years. This
monument was built by his children[ ]Athob and
Ime[...]nis (and) Thaneci Bab and his mother(?) Sanmilc
of the Lepcinians (?). The cost 25000 denarii).
(This translation is based on Brogan and Reynolds 1985).

As we have already encountered on the contemporary mausoleum of el-Amrouni in the
Gefara, the inscription stresses, the family lineage, including the names of the grandfather
and father, and the names of the children, that are all of Libyan or Punic origin. The mother
(or the father?) had some connection to Lepcis Magna, perhaps indicating that (part) of the
family once lived in the city, where they may have received their citizenship (Brogan and
Reynolds 1985, 19). The disputes with the Garamantes from the interior were settled under
the Flavian emperors, allowing for safe and eventually prosperous settlement in the remote
areas of the pre-desert, such as at Antar (Barker and Jones 1982, 7). A Titus Flavius was also
mentioned on a building inscription of a nearby temple (Tininai) dating to the late second or
early third century AD, probably a descendant of the same family (IRT2009, 888; Brogan

The mausoleum was already completely collapsed when it was recorded, and its
stones lie scattered around the ground. However, from what could be documented by
Brogan and the ULVS it appears that it was predominantly decorated with vegetal scrolls
and other standard architectural decorations. Amongst the rubble a seated limestone
sculpture was discovered. The man was wrapped in a long mantle, but unfortunately, the
head is missing (>An001-B-01). The other remaining iconography of this tomb includes a
cantharus with tendrils tumbling out of it. A moon crescent was depicted above the
cantharus (>An001-B-02). Unfortunately, no further figural decorations survive for this
tomb. The statue from this tomb is the earliest example of statuary in the pre-desert so far
known to the author. Other late first or early second century AD mausolea, instead, bear
very little or no decorations. A statue in the round would have most certainly stood out in
an environment where statues were otherwise absent. However, if we accept that at least
part of the family had some connection to Lepcis Magna, or even lived in the city, they would
have been familiar with this kind of self-representation. This also suggests that they were
newcomers to the region and the statue acted as a powerful tool to establish and symbolize
the ancestry of this elite family in their new environment.

In contrast to An001-B, the iconography on An001-A is remarkably varied (Table
5.6), and appears to represent a cross-over from the portraiture heavy third-century mausolea
of Umm el-Agerem, Ghirza (>Gh128-A, see below), and Meseuggi (>Me001-A, see Chapter 6) including more dynamic scenes, such as agricultural activities and a chariot race. Unfortunately, no inscription survives from this tomb. This suggests that this mausoleum was built later than An001-B, probably in the third century AD.

The decorations on Mausoleum A (>An001-A-01 to An001-A-13) were placed on the pilasters and probably on the friezes of the first and second storey. A female statue was placed in an aedicula under an arch on the second storey. The pilasters of the first storey were decorated with small rosettes, roundels, fish, vine tendrils, grapes, a bull’s head and two human figures. The headdress of the individuals on the pilasters match the headdress displayed on the portrait relief and statue, indicating that these are representations of the deceased or the family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wadi Antar An001-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mythological scenes and personifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winged figure (Victory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of deceased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person holding cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person holding long object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural activity and domestic animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates / Date palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapes / vines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmented roundels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll with flower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull’s head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting/Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chariot race</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Main themes and decoration for An001-A.

The remaining reliefs, described below, probably belonged to the second and third storey of the monument. The agricultural scenes include reaping and ploughing. One side of the tomb sported a chariot race. The two surviving stones depict three charioteers in their chariots. The best preserved part shows the charioteer with the head turned towards the viewer. His chariot was pulled by at least two horses in full flight. Behind him the heads of three
additional horses are visible that pulled the chariot behind him, now missing. The return of this stone depicts another, much damaged, charioteer the horses are missing. A second stone, unfortunately, much damaged, also shows a chariot race, with the back of the horse and the charioteer still partly visible. The figure of a victory, with its wing much damaged, is holding a palm branch wearing an elaborate dress of a long pleated tunic under a mantle which was held together at the waist with a belt or cord most likely also belongs to this storey. The top of the mantle was decorated in a coiled pattern. The second storey would have also held the female statue which was placed under an elaborately decorated arch.

An001-A is certainly one the most complex in its iconography. There was still a distinct focus on portraiture such as at Umm el-Agerem (Ag001-A) and Ghirza (Gh128-A). At the same time, new themes appeared on this mausoleum that included highly symbolic imagery the bulls head for the protection of the tomb, or the victory, perhaps as a symbol of the defeat of death, as well as agricultural scenes and the chariot race. The manner of self-representation was clearly changing, displaying new concerns and ideas of self-representation.

1.24.3 Ghirza

The richly decorated mausolea of the two monumental cemeteries at Ghirza are the most intensely studied mortuary monuments of Tripolitania and are often used as the prime example of the funerary art of the hinterland. However, to what extent does Ghirza reflect common trends and themes, and to what extend are the depictions on mausolea unique to the people of this settlement?

The settlement of Ghirza was the largest nucleated settlement in the pre-desert area, measuring approximately 500 m (north-east) x 300 m (south-west; Brogan and Smith 1984, 47). It consisted of 40 substantial buildings, of which six are gasr, two of them very large in size (Building 31 and Building 34, see Brogan and Smith 1984, 62-68; Mattingly 1996a, 118-119). These two large structures may point towards two existing leading families at Ghirza, or two branches of one family. The presence of two monumental cemeteries supports this hypothesis (Mattingly 2011, 253). A large temple is situated at the south-eastern edge of the settlement, but it is unclear to which deity/ies the structure was venerated. The finds within

27 Groupings in Libya were usually family based, including the extended family units (Brett and Fentress 1996, 200-270; Fontana 1997, 150; Mattingly 1995, 17-24; 2011, 253).
the temple suggest a very active cult, with offering tables, bowls, small altars, parts of a stone statue and stone heads (Brogan and Smith 1984, 80-92). The inscriptions on the altars are all in the Libyan alphabet, and not yet deciphered. Libations and food offerings were clearly a large part of the cult, which draws parallels to the tombs and mausolea of Ghirza, which also have libation channels and offering tables associated with them. The heyday of the settlement was most likely in the third and fourth centuries AD when most structures (including the majority of the mausolea) were erected. However, evidence such as coins and pottery shows that the settlement was established much earlier, most likely in the first century AD (Brogan and Smith 1984).

Ghirza did not exist in isolation, with a large number of substantial open farms and gasr scattered along the wadi to the north and to the south of the settlement (Figure 5.14). Wadi Ghirza is a southern tributary of the Wadi Zemzem, characterised by a steeply incised wadi-bed and pronounced escarpments (Brogan and Smith 1984, 45; Mattingly 1996a, 106).

![Figure 5.14: Settlement distribution in the Wadi Ghirza of open farms and gasr.](image)

When Smythe visited the area in in the nineteenth century, he noted that the Wadi Ghirza was a ‘fine but neglected valley to the south-eastward, in which were great numbers of wild antelopes and ostriches’ (Smythe 1854, 482-484). Floodwater walls crossed the wadi to regulate the water from flash floods and to channel it into cisterns. Environmental samples
taken by the ULVS show the presence of a variety of crops, such as olive trees, barley, wheat, grapes and figs were cultivated at Ghirza (van der Veen 1995; van der Veen and Grant 1996).

The two monumental cemeteries, lie to the south of the settlement. The so-called North Cemetery was located very close to Ghirza, approximately 350 m from the nearest building, whereas the South cemetery was situated 2.5 km to the south (Brogan and Smith 1984, 121). Each cemetery held at least seven monuments. Although both cemeteries belong to the same settlement, they differ from each other in layout and in the preference of imagery displayed. The southern cemetery featured the only obelisk mausoleum, which was situated at the western edge of the cemetery (128-A). It was also the first mausoleum to be built at Ghirza, probably dating to the early to mid-third century AD based on the capitals (Brogan and Smith 1984, 210). The mausoleum is located close to the earliest minor tombs identified at Ghirza, dating to the first and early second century AD (Brogan and Smith 1984, 107, 114). The obelisk mausoleum was probably placed here to form a connection to the earlier burials of the settlements (Brogan and Smith 1984, 107, 114; Audley-Miller 2012, 101), but also perhaps also to mark out the extent of the territory that belonged to the families of Ghirza (Buck et al. 1983, 53; Mattingly with Dore 1996, 144; see also Chapter 3 for other examples). The arcaded temple mausolea are located approximately 35 m north-east of the obelisk mausoleum, forming two lines. Gh128-E was built at some point during the second half of the third century, followed by Gh128-D and 128-C, while the second line formed by 128-G and 128-F was probably constructed somewhat later in the fourth century AD (Brogan and Smith 1984, 185, 212). The space between the obelisk and the temple tombs created a separation between them. 128-B the rectangular two-roomed structure or tomb which lay mid-way between the obelisk and the temple mausolea may have created a link between the older part of the cemetery and the newer mausolea. This structure is very different from the other mausolea. It bears no evidence of columns or any other decoration and the masonry is of much smaller stones rather than ashlar masonry. A similar building is also evident in the Northern cemetery (129-G; Brogan and Smith 1984, 177-179).

The mausolea in the northern cemetery were arranged in a roughly linear pattern. The peripteral temple mausoleum 129-A was the largest, and most likely the first temple mausoleum to be built at Ghirza, dating to the mid-third century AD (Brogan and Smith 1984, 125). Five arcaded temple mausolea lie to the south of 129-A, of which 129-B and

28 The individual decorations have been described in much detail previously (Brogan and Smith 1984). Thus, this section will focus in particular on Ghirza’s regional similarities and differences below by comparing the two cemeteries to each other, and by putting them into their wider pre-desert context.
129-C are the largest and together with 129-D were built in the fourth century based on the lettering of the inscriptions and typological criteria. 129-E and 129-F probably date to the fifth century AD (Brogan and Smith 1984, 185) Building 129-G lies slightly to the east of the linear arrangement and like 128-B was a two roomed burial structure quite different to the temple mausolea. The arcaded temple mausolea at the northern cemetery were larger and account for a slightly higher number of reliefs and statues in this cemetery, 90 pieces in total, whereas Gh128 had 65 decorated elements.

First, I will discuss the main themes on each tomb in the southern and northern cemetery in chronological order to demonstrate the development of imagery and the individuality of imagery on the mausolea. Then I will compare the similarities and differences of themes between the two cemeteries, to show that the two family groups had different priorities on what they wanted to have displayed on their tombs.

Ghirza Cemetery South:
The obelisk mausoleum is the only mausoleum of its kind at Ghirza. It was not only unique in its architectural style, but also in its iconography (see >Gh128-A-01 to Gh128-A-16). The focus was primarily on the deceased; portrait sculptures of various kinds dominated, including reliefs depicting a male and female busts, male and female standing figures, two sculptures in the round (one male, one female) and figured capitals that were carved with individual features that corresponded with the portraits. The top of the first storey, above the false door, held portrait busts in relief of a bearded man and a women wearing a turban, presumably husband and wife, and placed above the false door. A third personage was seated(?) between them, much smaller in scale, with a short fringe or, perhaps, a headdress, wearing a long garment and a necklace tightly round the neck. Because of the much smaller scale of this figure, it likely represented the child of the couple, or perhaps a servant. The remaining portrait sculpture looked very similar in appearance, which led Audley-Miller to suggest that the same subjects were repeatedly depicted on this tomb (2012, 101). However, other contemporary mausolea such as in the Wadi Meseuggi (>Me001-A), the Wadi Antar (>An001-A) or, the Wadi Umm el-Agerem (>Ag002-A) that also show multiple portraits appear to feature several individuals instead of the same subjects multiple times. Thus, it might be suggested that more than two family members were displayed on the Ghirza obelisk tomb. Individual features were expressed through the style of clothing and personal adornments. Females were depicted six times, wearing a turban-style headdress and a shawl
or mantle draped around the shoulder. The female statue in the round was dressed in a long
tunic of many folds, the shawl draped over her right shoulder, hanging down at the
front. Three of the female portraits were wearing necklace. Males were depicted three times,
on the portrait relief above the false door, in a figured capital and a statue in the round.
Unfortunately, the head of the male statue is missing. On the remaining sculpture, he can be
identified by his tight curls and his fairly long beard. He was depicted wearing a long tunic
with a mantle wrapped across it over the right shoulder, a thick fold running down the centre.

The remaining imagery related to ritual and symbolism. The arch head above the
niche for the statues was decorated with a phallus, a scorpion, and rosettes, symbols of
protection for the tomb, the statues and perhaps the family of the deceased. On the frieze
of the first storey next to the turbaned female, a standing figure wrapped in a mantle over a
long tunic was holding a round bowl in the right hand. The small figure between the portraits
of the couple was holding an identical bowl. They are probably related to offerings that were
placed in the mausoleum. A libation duct led into the burial chamber of the mausoleum,
giving us a glimpse into the ritual that had taken place at the tomb. A female figure wearing
a long flowing garment, seemingly floating upwards is depicted on the east side. The head is
slightly protruding out of the stone as if the figure was floating out of the monument. She
was holding a laurel wreath in the outstretched right hand, and a long object, perhaps a scroll,
in the left. This scene was separated off from the portrait sculpture to its right by a garland,
perhaps symbolising the rise of the soul out of the grave (Brogan and Smith 1984).

The imagery of this tomb was very concerned with depicting the deceased, and
perhaps other members of the family. Status and gender were expressed through local dress
and jewellery, which will be discuss in more detail in Chapter 6. Ritual practices that were
held at the mausoleum were represented by the figures holding offering bowls.

In comparison to the obelisk mausoleum, the imagery displayed on the arcaded
temple mausolea of the southern cemetery was much more varied. Portrait busts in reliefs
still appear on most of the mausolea in the form of couples or family groups of three, but
there is a clear shift away from the main focus on the self on portraiture, towards other
subjects such as hunting scenes, agricultural scenes and symbolic imagery. The most striking
feature of this cemetery is the individuality of genres on each mausoleum, where the
combinations of imagery chosen by the commissioner is unique to each tomb.

128-E is the earliest arcaded temple tombs of Ghirza, probably built in the early
fourth century AD (Brogan and Smith 1984, 197 based on the capitals; see >Gh128-E-01 to
GH128-E-11). When the imagery of this tomb was chosen by the commissioner, some
inspiration was taken from the peripteral temple mausoleum in the Northern cemetery (129-A) which was built at some point during the mid-third century, rather than from the obelisk tomb (Brogan and Smith 1984, 125). The eagle with outstretched wings carrying a hare in its claws (Figure 5.15d), the lion (Figure 5.15b), recall the eagles (Figure 5.15c) and the lion (Figure 5.15a) depicted in the Northern cemetery 129-A. As on 129-A, the deceased were represented in the form of portrait busts in relief. A bearded male was placed to the left and a female to the right, perhaps wearing a veil, their mouths are downturned. The dress is similar to the portraits on 128-A, with a mantle drawn across the body, and corresponds with the dress style on the obelisk tomb. However, they are not exactly copies and were clearly rendered by a different craftsman.

The theme that featured strongest on this mausoleum was that of hunting. The hunter was exclusively depicted in the nude. One stone depicted a naked hunter facing outwards, holding a spear in the left hand and a club in the other, both arms outstretched. To his left was a

Figure 5.15: Comparisons between 128-E and 129-A. a) Lion hunting prey 129-A (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Lion on 128-E (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c) Eagle and hare 129-A (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Eagle and hare from 128-E (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).
palm tree with dates, and to his right, a dog jumped up at him or ran up the stone (Figure 5.16a). A similar man is depicted on a more damaged stone, but the left side is missing. A third naked hunter was situated to the right of the tall lion probably inspired by the lion on 129-A (Northern cemetery). The hunter held a spear in his right hand. The strength of the hunter was emphasised by his bulky body. The nude hunting scenes most likely had symbolic meaning, rather than depicting realistic hunts. Nude hero-hunters are known from third-century mosaics from North Africa. For example at the Villa of the Nile at Lepcis Magna, a semi-nude Meleager was facing the Caledonian boar (Dunbabin 1978, 52). The near absence of any other mythological narratives, similar to those at el-Amrouni, on the mausolea of Ghirza and indeed the entirety of Tripolitania, suggests that stock images of the heroic hunter were adapted to suit local needs. The image of the large lion and the nude hunter could perhaps evoke another stock image, of Hercules and the Nemean lion, but it does not display the usual Herculean attributes such the club. Instead, the hunter held a weapon (spear).

A nude hunter re-appears on neighbouring Mausoleum D (>Gh128-D-04), which is located approximately five meter to the north-west of 128-E. He was holding a club in the left hand, and the antlers of a stag in the right (Figure 5.16b). A hunting dog was attacking the stack from the front. This type of image, again, may belong to the stock image depicting Hercules or Melquart, but was adapted by the commissioner and sculpture to fit the local environment. The naked hunter has a beard, but no moustache, a rather distinctive feature. The portrait relief on the same mausoleum also depicted a male with a beard but no moustache. Thus, it is likely that the nude hunter represents the person on the portrait.

The second hunting scene on Gh128-D is very different and more realistic. It showed a man dressed in a tunic on horseback chasing an ostrich with the help of two hunting dogs (Figure 5.16c). The ostrich is disproportionately large. Ostriches can become extremely aggressive and dangerous when attacked and cornered. They are also extremely fast runners, and thus probably represented a prestigious animal to hunt, as also noted by Pliny (Natural History, 5.1) and Aelian (Characteristics of Animals, 4.37; Sparreboom 2016, 90-91). This is the first depiction of a more realistic hunting scene, where the hunter is fully dressed, charging after the victim on horseback. Two felines holding a bull’s head between them, mouth open and teeth showing, feature on a different stone. This scene appears twice more in the southern cemetery (>Gh128-C, and Gh128-G), and is the most common image next to portraiture and hunting. A similar image was represented by a standing sphinx with feline body depicted in profile, wings protruding out of the back and a human face, turned
towards the viewer. One front paws was raised in a similar manner to the two felines holding the bulls head. Unfortunately, the left part of this stone is missing. This is the only representation of a sphinx at Ghirza (and indeed in the pre-desert) and was probably adapted to display an image meaningful within the context of Ghirza. References to pastoralism were made in a unique scene, most likely showing a goat-herder with his dog and his flock, with a tree with a thick trunk (olive or acacia?) in its centre, under which several animals, perhaps goats, were depicted. To the right was a standing figure wearing a short pleated tunic and a dog, chasing one of the animals. On the left side of the stone two larger male animals (perhaps also goats) are standing on their hind legs, noses touching. Underneath is a small male figure at right-angles to the remaining scene, seemingly walking up the relief towards the two larger animals. The animals look similar to the sheep or goats depicted on a stone from Mizda (>Mz001-A-01), where a group of people with their flock is approaching a gasr.

![Image - No Copyright](image_no_copyright)

Figure 5.16: Evolution of hunting scenes on the mausolea of the southern cemetery of Ghirza. a) The nude hunter with his hunting dog and spear, Gh128-C (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Nude hunter with fighting a stag (portrait?) Gh128-C (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive; c) Hunter on horseback perusing an ostrich with his two hunting dogs, Gh129-C (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).

Mausoleum Gh-128-G (>Gh128-G-01 to Gh128-G-11) and Gh128-F (>Gh128-F-01 to Gh128-F-15) is formed the second row of tombs. These are the only mausolea bearing arches decorated with figural relief, a feature common in the North cemetery. The arches of 128-G depict a palm tree, fish, a hunting scene, a camel feeding out of a trough, two birds attacking a hare, a horse and a vine with grapes. A small figure is cutting a large bunch of grapes with a sickle. Rosettes of various sizes and designs also decorate the arches. Grapes
and vines are depicted on two further stones, one also featuring a wine jug. Two lions were holding a bovine skull between them, one clearly male with a big mane, and one female with many teats. A portrait relief of two individuals holding an object, perhaps a scroll, was on the north frieze. In the panel to the left, a man wearing a long garment and a pointed cap holds a spear in the right hand, framed by rosettes.

The arches of 128-F marks a shift in how the elite wanted to represent themselves, from predominantly portraiture and hunting scenes, to images that are particularly related to the expression of the individual’s and the family’s power in the region (see Mattingly 2003a and 2011). 128-F is the first mausoleum at Ghirza that does not feature portrait busts in relief but instead displays interactive portraits, where the deceased was clearly actively involved in the narrative of the scene. A tall bearded man in a tunic with a cloak draped over his left shoulder is standing upright, facing outwards. He is holding a cup in the outstretched right hand, and a long object in the outstretched left. The stone is broken off to the right, and a hand offering a jug is just about visible. To the left a smaller figure is carrying an object on the shoulder, perhaps an incense burner, and two long objects in the other. Three further fragments of stones depict a figure holding objects. This scene is very similar to 128-B (Brogan and Smith 1984, 223-224). Another, rather damaged stone depicted three figures. The one to the right is completely obliterated but, according to Brogan, had a beard. The face of the person in the centre is missing and was wearing a long mantle draped over the right shoulder. The left hand is extended, and an object with two tassels was draped over it. The figure to the left is wearing a long tunic bound at the waist, and has a short curly fringe, wearing a conical hat. The right arm is raised, and the left held a spear. Two martial scenes depict men fighting with spears or swords and shields. The tallest figures is resting his hand on top of the shoulder of a warrior. He is wearing the same garment as the man in the interactive scene, with a mantle draped over the left shoulder across a long tunic, perhaps, again depicting the deceased. The arches of the tomb depicted a bird in full flight, a dog hunting an ostrich, vines, and grapes a palm trees with dates and a figure climbing up, fish, palm and olive branches amongst rosettes and roundels.

The focus of the themes in the southern cemetery is primarily on portraiture, hunting, grapes, and vines as well as the symbolic imagery of lions guarding a bovine skull. The obelisk tomb is particularly rich in portraiture, depicting the bust of a bearded male figure and two females wearing a turban. The other four portraits in the cemetery consisted of busts in reliefs. The portraits are very summary and were clearly not intended to bear the real likeness of the deceased. However, the contrast between the imagery on the obelisk
mausoleum and the other mausolea is striking, and demonstrates how the iconography steadily changed from self-representation through portraiture, to a much broader iconographic repertoire that was becoming more and more concerned with power-related imagery. It is striking that no inscriptions come from this cemetery, while several inscriptions are associated with the Northern cemetery.

**Ghirza Cemetery North**

The peripteral temple mausoleum of Ghirza (Gh129-A) is the only one of its kind at Ghirza. It was built in the mid to late third century AD and was the first mausoleum of this cemetery. A Latin inscription was placed above the false door to the upper chamber, reading:

> Of M(archius) Nasif and M(archia) Mathlich, mother; the Marchii Nimira and Fydel, their sons, had this built for their dear parents.  
> *(IRT2009, 899; translation Bodard and Roueché 2009).*

The inscription reveals that the owners of this tomb were a Libyan family, the father, the mother and their two sons. Two statues of felines (one male, one female) were found with this tomb, probably guarding the steps that led up to the platform and portico. The sculptural decorations were limited to four relief panels on the other cella wall (portrait, eagles carrying hares, lion hunting herbivore and bull sacrifice; (Gh129-A-01 to Gh129-A-12), and three figural reliefs integrated on the Doric frieze amongst rosettes and roundels (a goat, birds drinking out of cup and a human mask functioning as a water spout29). The portrait depicts two female busts wearing garments that were crossed over at the chest, similar to the portraits on Gh128 C, D and E, but carved in much more detail. This is the only occasion where two women were depicted together on the same stone. However, this is somewhat curious since only one female was mentioned in the inscription (the mother) who had two sons. It may be that the son's paid for the mausoleum, and are thus mentioned on the inscription, while a sister was only represented through the portrait sculpture. In general, across the Tripolitanian funerary inscriptions, the male line was stressed more often, which indicates that it was from the male line that ancestry was predominantly traced down from.

---

29 A human mask as a water spout was also noted at the peripteral temple mausoleum of Gasr Banat (a tomb that has a very similar plan to Gh129-A; Nf038-A; Di Vita 1964, 140). This is a rather unusual features for Tripolitanian tombs, and perhaps indicates the tombs were built by the same workshop.
The bull sacrifice depicted on this tomb is particularly interesting especially when considering a second inscription associated with 129-A, that was cut into a column, framed by an ansata. The inscription referred to the *parentalia*, for which 51 bulls and 38 goats were killed (Brogan and Smith 1984, 262). It is doubtful that the festivities of the *parentalia* were the same as in the festival with this name on the Italian peninsula since, as Mattingly points out, these were usually conducted by close family members in smaller groups (2011, 265). An enormous amount of meat would have been processed, amounting to 8670 kg of bull meat, and 950 kg of goat’s meat (Fontana 1997, 185). With such a vast amount of meat, it is likely that several thousand people took part in commemorating the dead at a certain time in the year, arguably far more than the whole community normally living at Ghirza (Mattingly 2013, 265). Even if the numbers of animals to be slaughtered were slightly inflated to enhance the importance and wealth of the family, it still marks the *parentalia* out as one of the major events of the region, perhaps bringing together the immediate and more extended clans, who may have lived further away. Furthermore, the likely presence of a temple to the god Gurzil at Ghirza may have been also linked to the bull-sacrifices. As Mattingly (2011, 265) points out, ‘the scale of the sacrifice matches the impressive funerary architecture and iconography produced to honour and appease those ancestors’ (Diggle and Goodyear 1970; Mattingly 1983; Mattingly 2011, 265-267). If 129-A was indeed the first mausoleum of the northern cemetery, the celebration of a big *parentalia* also aided in establishing the cemetery as a new centre for cult and ritual much closer to the Ghirza settlement.

129-B was the first arcaded temple tomb of the northern cemetery, dated to the early fourth century on the basis of its capitals and inscription, and, together with 129C, the largest (Brogan and Smith 1984, 210). As with the peripteral temple mausoleum, steps led up to the podium in front of the false door. However, the iconographic composition of 129-B marks a shift in how the elite represented themselves (>Gh129-B-01 to Gh129-B-29). Perhaps inspired by the imagery on 128-F, the commissioner of this mausoleum had chosen depictions that particularly related to the family’s power in the area. On the inscription, we meet again Marchius Fydel, most likely the son of M(archius) Nasif and M(archia) Mathlich mentioned on the inscription of 129-A. The reference to a sum *in follos* to pay for the tomb firmly places this monument into the fourth century AD.
Marchius Fydel and Flavia Thesylgum, father and mother of Marchius Metusan who had this memorial made for them, and have reckoned that there was spent on this, in coin [··· ? ···] thousand folles, and in addition the food for the workmen. May my sons and grandsons read (this) in good fortune and build others like it;

(IRT2009, 900; translation Bodard and Roueché 2009.)

The iconography of this mausoleum is incredibly rich. Four main themes dominate: agricultural imagery, hunting, martial activities, and interactive scenes relating to the expression of power and ritual. This is the only mausoleum at Ghirza (and the pre-desert) that displays the full agricultural cycle in remarkable detail, from ploughing, sowing and tending the fields, to reaping, threshing and winnowing. The hunting scenes include nude individuals in direct combat with wild animals, recalling mosaic scenes of combats in the arena. The image of a human fighting a stag and bull may have been taken from the stock images of the Hercules myth, but in the context of the other two animal-combat scenes of naked figures fighting several felines, it is more likely that they were referring to fights in the arena, also indicated by some of the figures holding shields. Shields are usually not depicted on hunting scenes, but appear on mosaic depicting fights with wild beasts in the arena. A hunter on horseback with two hunting dogs appears to sport a beard, perhaps an indication that this is Fydel out on a hunt. Notably, no other bearded figures feature other than the hunter and the deceased seated on the cross-legged chair. This scene shows the deceased holding a cup or small staff and receiving gifts (small and large vessels, a long object) from people wearing a variety of costume and headdresses, perhaps indicating the different regions they were coming from. The seated figure is disproportionally large, indicating that this is indeed a portrait of the owner of the tomb, further indicated by the presence of a beard. To the right of the same stone, a person is being punished or executed by two figures to the right and left of him. Another combat scene shows an armed man with a spear, with carefully curled hair overpowering a nude figure with much longer and straight hair, clearly showing the distinction between the civilised people of Ghirza, and the uncivilised ‘barbaric’ other. Victories round up this powerful iconography, depicted on an arch holding palm branches, and as roof statues, placed on all four corners of mausoleum.

The imagery of Gh129-C is remarkably similar to Gh-129-B, including hunting, agricultural scenes, execution or punishment, the presentation of gifts to the deceased and the arrival of a caravan (>Gh129-C-01 to Gh129-C-17). Some of the reliefs are carved in the horror vacui style, with multiple horizons filling the frame. The inscription from this tomb does
not indicate any direct relationship to the family on Gh129-B. However, the name Marchius and the Marchii points towards some form of relationship.

(Marchius Chullam and Varnychsin, father and mother of the Marchii Nimmira and [?]accurasan, who had this memorial built for them. We paid out in reckoning for these things, in coin on salaries a total of forty-five thousand six hundred folles, in addition to the food for the workmen. May their sons and grandsons visit it happily. (IRT2009, 898; translation Bodard and Roueché 2009).

The interactive scene depicted Marchius Chullam with a beard but no moustache, sitting on a cross legged chair surrounded by figures presenting vessels, a long staff, and a quiver. As on Gh129-B, status was indicated by the height of the figures. A second scene shows the deceased standing up and facing outwards. His distinct curly hair and beard are still just about visible, and he is the tallest figure of this relief. To the right and left of him are two smaller figure raising their arms in the pose of prayer or mourning. To the right stands another tall figure wearing a long tunic decorated with vertical and horizontal stripes wearing a cornical cap. The arms are slightly extended to the right, towards another smaller figure. This perhaps could be Varnychsin, the wife of Marchius. A relief from the Bir Secdua (ULVS Bs072) shows a women wearing a similar conical cap. To the right next to the head is a pomegranate, a symbol frequently associated with female fertility while to the right of the male figure is a bunch a grapes, linked to male fertility. To the left of this scene, a group of horsemen are approaching in full gallop. On the return of this stone was a standing figure holding a bowl in one hand, while reaching into it with the other. He is sporting the same style of beard as the other portraits on the tomb, with no moustache and the tight locks of hair on his head. Sirens were placed as roof statues on all four corners of the roof.

In contrast to 129-B and C, the iconography of the rest of the mausolea seems rather subdued, and more akin to some of the imagery in the southern cemetery such as the harvest of dates, ostrich hunts, fish, grapes and vines on Gh129-D (>Gh129-D-01 to Gh129-D-08), and tree panels depicting ostrich, herbivore and hare hunts on Gh129-E (>Gh129-E-01 to Gh129-E-04). Interestingly, here the hunter appears with a camel on foot, and not on horseback. The stones are carved in a different manner to the rest of the mausolea, with two registers above each other, each depicting a separate scene. Next to no decoration survived from Gh129-F except some architectural fragments and a relief with two roundels.
Comparisons: Ghirza North and Ghirza South

The comparison of the two cemeteries reveals some rather distinct differences in how the people of the Southern and the Northern cemetery wanted to represent themselves. The most obvious difference is the absence of portraiture busts on the arcaded temple mausolea of Gh129, and, in turn, the complete absence of inscriptions in the southern cemetery. Why this is the case is puzzling, but it appears to be such an obvious division, that suggests that the absence portrait busts on the later Northern cemetery was perhaps deliberate, perhaps to distinguish themselves from the families in the southern cemetery. Explaining the absence of inscriptions in the southern cemetery because of the unavailability of a skilled workmen who could carve Latin letters seems unlikely given the fairly large amount of inscriptions across the pre-desert. Audley-Miller suggested that the mere presence of the portrait bust was perhaps a strong enough vehicle to recognize, and remember the ancestors without the need for an inscription (2010, 193).

Another, more striking difference is the complete absence of two felines holding a bulls head in the northern cemetery, a subject so dominant in the southern cemetery. These images may
have religious connotations, perhaps referring to the bull-headed god Gurzil, or may have protected the tomb. Perhaps this was also an image with which the family in the southern cemetery identified itself, and was thus rejected in the northern cemetery. These scenes can be observed on two additional mausolea of the pre-desert but not elsewhere in Tripolitania, which suggests that it held a significance particular to this region (Figure 5.17).

Ghirza is frequently mentioned in scholarship because of its vivid agricultural scenes. Ploughing and reaping and the control over agricultural production is much more frequently presented on 129-B and C, but only once in the southern cemetery. Here, images of grapes and grape harvest are most common, certainly a prestigious crop to grow in these rather unforgiving climatic conditions.

![Figure 5.18: The fasces indicated in red on two reliefs at Ghirza. a) Gh129-C-04 (Image: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 78); b) Gh129-C-16 (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).](image)
The difference between the two cemeteries furthermore suggests that there was a change in how status was defined, and expressed on funerary reliefs of the late third and fourth century. Such changes can be observed across the Empire, as the Roman Empire weakened. The withdrawal of the troops from Bu Njem and Gheriat left this region more exposed to threats from the south. Some of the regional power was handed back to the local leaders who maintained a close relationship with Rome via treaty. The safekeeping of this area would have fallen to the local leaders, who, in turn, probably sought relations with other local leaders in the area. Ghirza was thus, not only a major centre for trade, but also a key location for the safekeeping of the region and consequently, the elite’s power would have risen considerably. 128-F probably reflects the beginning of the rising power and self-government of the Ghirza elite over the region. The depictions of combat and gift giving underlines the new status, and responsibility of the family to keep the communities safe. The smiting scenes suggest that they had the status of magistrates which gave them judicial power. This is further underlined by the folding chair the deceased was portrayed sitting on, perhaps a *sella curulis* (Figure 5.18; Fontana 1997, 156), an insigne that embodied magisterial power (Schäfer 1989, 19). In this context, what had previously been identified as a quiver on Gh128-F, Gh129-B and Gh129-C could indeed be interpreted as *fasces*, an insigne which consisted of bundles of reed tied together to demonstrate magisterial or religious power (Schäfer 1989, 196). The sceptre, which both seated figures held, are a further symbol of the Roman magistrate (Salmonson 1956, 96; Schäfer 1989, 184-190). These symbols were frequently depicted on coins, and were probably well known in the hinterlands of Tripolitania.

### 1.24.4 Wadi al-Binaya

A number of reliefs now housed in the Bani Ulid museum come from mausolea that once stood in the Wadi al-Binaya, a minor wadi between the Wadi Migelal and the Wadi Ghurgar, approximately 100 km north-east from Ghirza (>Bin001-A-01 to Bin001-A-14). Unfortunately, nothing is known to the author about their context, what type of tombs they belonged to, and if they all came from a single tomb or from several (Table 5.7).

The carving style is very similar across the recovered pieces, with faces with pronounced pointy chins, long noses, and large eyes. It can be assumed that they were carved by the same craftsman or workshop, and perhaps even from the same tomb. The range of
imagery depicted is very varied, ranging from agricultural scenes, hunting scenes, smiting scenes, bull sacrifice and fighting scenes to portrait sculpture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Wadi al-Binaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice bull</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person holding long object</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural activity and domestic animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing with horse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing with camel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing and Tending the fields</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundles of wheat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbolic elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting dog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbivore hunt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich hunt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting on horseback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting with net</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stag hunt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martial Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed men</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiting scene</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed fight with lions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Themes from the Wadi al-Binaya

What is immediately striking is the close resemblance to scenes on mausolea 129-A and 129-B of the Northern cemetery of Ghirza (see Figures 4.12a and b; 4.15a and b). The commissioner and/or sculptor at al-Binaya were clearly drawing on the iconography of Ghirza or another common source. The bull sacrifice scene and the portrait sculpture have very close resemblance to similar scenes on Gh129-A while the rest of the imagery drew on scenes from 129-B. This is especially evident on the threshing scene, the smiting scene and the ‘circus’ scene where the composition are strikingly similar. The only image that is unique
to the Wadi al-Binaya is a hunting scene, where a hunter on horseback is driving herbivores into a net, held by stakes and two individuals. Such hunting methods were common across the ancient world and were frequently depicted in mosaics. It is plausible that some sort of connection existed between the elite at Ghirza and the elite in the Wadi al-Binaya. The commissioner may have seen the Ghirza tombs Gh129-A and Gh129-B and wanted a similar tomb for himself. At the same time, the craftsman could have been inspired by having seen the mausolea at Ghirza and included the scenes in his image bank.

1.24.5 Discussion
In the pre-desert the iconography that was displayed on the mausolea was closely linked to regional and wider socio-cultural circumstances. Fontana argues that the ‘profound evolution’ of iconography in the mid and late imperial period in the pre-desert was closely linked to local realities (Fontana 1997, 150). However, this evolution started much earlier, in the first century AD and developed over time, reflecting constant shifts in how the elite wanted to represent themselves and their community.

From the data collected it emerges that the ornamental and figural decorations underwent four major phases: (1) the depiction of predominantly ornamental and vegetal decorations (if any) on mausolea from the early Romano-Libyan period; (2) a predominance in portraiture and symbolic and apotropaic imagery to protect the mausoleum, and a preference of images placed in a Doric frieze in the mid-Romano-Libyan period; (3) more complex imagery involving agricultural activities, hunting, and a wider array of symbols on panels and a reduced use of the Doric frieze from the mid-to late Romano Libyan period; and finally (4) an increasing tendency to power-related imagery such as ceremonial, religious and martial scenes in the late Roman-Libyan period. This also brought with it stylistic changes, from figures placed onto a neutral background, to scenes populated with figures on different levels which created a horror vacui, the filling of the entire stone with figures (Di Vita 1964, 73-38) that created ‘some unusual and distinctly un-Roman compositions’ (Mattingly 2013, 251), as also visible in North African mosaic (Fantar 1999; Mattingly 2013, 252).

The patrons of mausolea of the early Roman-Libyan were particularly concerned with representing themselves, as well as emphasising their ancestral lineage, stressing their Libyan and Punic names on the inscription. At the same time, they also emphasised their status within the Roman Empire by advertising their tria nomina, demonstrating that both, a ‘Roman’ and a ‘Libyan’ identity could be displayed at the same time. Many inscriptions
stressed family lineage by mentioning the father of the deceased, as well as their offspring to demonstrate the continuity of the family line. Family trees can be established from groups of mausolea at the Wadi el-Amud, Ghirza and the Wadi Umm el-Agerem (Mattingly 1995, 162-168; Reynolds 1955), demonstrating that cemeteries with several mausolea encompass a single elite family for several generations.

The lands of the pre-desert were intensely settled during the first century AD, and although some of the leading families may have already resided in this area before, many would have been newcomers from the coast, the Gefara or the Gebel, who, consequently, needed to establish their power over their land. Thus, for the commissioner and their families, the focus was on strengthening their presence and influence in the region as (new) landlords by displaying themselves and their family members on the mausolea. In an area where there was next to no imagery and statuary and indeed very little monumentality, mausolea provided the ideal canvas to emphasise their elite identity and reinforce and increase the family’s status in a progressively growing society. The large number of substantial *opus africanum* farms together with the growing number of mausolea also indicates that the number of leading families drastically increased in the pre-desert, leading to a degree of competition amongst them. The mausolea provided one of the few opportunities to stand out and to emphasise status and success. For the communities, they provided a new focal point for long-established rituals and traditions across Tripolitania of venerating the dead and the ancestors, a tradition with which the growing population could identify. Notably, mausolea rarely stand in isolation but are surrounded by, often substantial, cemeteries formed of the people that belonged to the particular social group that lived on the landlords land.

In the mid Romano-Libyan period, the iconography grew more complex and varied and came to reflect a wider spectrum of the social and ritual life of the region. The representation of the individual family members became less important, and the focus shifted to other imagery. The change in iconography of the region indicates that several generations after the first intense settlement of the area, the family territories were established, and the need for self-representation in the form of portraiture and imagery no longer as important. The new imagery that emerged focused on agricultural activities and hunting, scenes that were not out of place in a society that accumulated their wealth through these activities. The majority of wild animals depicted, antelopes, gazelles, and hares were present in the pre-desert and hunted to protect the crop and for their meat. Ghirza and al-Binaya represent something of an exception by also depicting lion and bull hunts as well as
direct combat with lions and other wild animals. These animals were more dangerous to hunt and threatened crop and livestock. Some of these fighting scenes recall arena scenes in a form reminiscent to mosaic depictions. However, this does not prove that such entertainment went on at Ghirza (or al-Binaya). Instead, these scenes may refer to the wild animal trade to supply the Roman Empire with exotic animals. The large settlement of Ghirza was most likely a brimming centre of trade, and it is conceivable that animals of the ‘wild beast zone’ came from, or were traded via Ghirza.

By the late Romano-Libyan period, Rome’s dwindling power resulted in the withdrawal of official troops stationed in the pre-desert, and the local elite grew increasingly powerful (Mattingly 1995, 205ff; Fontana 1997, 150). This power shift is, in particular, reflected in the iconography of mausolea at Ghirza, with an increase of martial scenes, men garbed in military dress and ceremonial scenes. This type of scenes was most common at Ghirza, indicating that the large settlement was one of the main centres of power in the region by the fourth century AD. Scenes of executions were also depicted at Nesma near Mizda and at al-Binaya perhaps also alluding to the execution of regional power and the safekeeping of the former frontier zone. Despite the change in iconography, the veneration of the dead remained important during the late imperial period, indicated by the continuous presence of libation channels.

1.25 Ghadames

The existence of Roman-period temple mausolea with complex iconographical imagery at Ghadames is remarkable due to its peripheral location. The oasis is situated approximately 450 km south of Oea in the Saharan desert, which equates to a journey of nine days by caravan (Richardson 1848, 91-92). Pliny mentions the name of Cydamus together with two other urban centres of the Phazania region, in which Ghadames was located (Natural History, 5.26-5.35). Balbus appears to have subjugated Ghadames during his campaign of 20 BC. During his triumphal procession in 19 BC in Rome, Cydamus together with Garama was amongst the most valuable achievements of the expedition, indicating that the oasis was already an important centre, most likely in relation to the caravan trade (Pliny Natural History, 5.35-5.37; Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 18; Merrills 2016). It is probable that Ghadames successfully entered some sort of client relationship with Rome and Mattingly and Sterry (2010, 18) suggest that the connection to Rome was close from this point onwards. A
garrison was installed in the early third century AD, which remained until at least AD 235 since the *Legio III Augusta* is mentioned on an inscription (Mattingly 1995; Reynolds 1958; *IRT2009*, 907; 908). Ghadames perhaps returned to its autonomous status after the withdrawal of the garrison at some point in the mid third century AD, but maintained close trade links with Rome and later the Byzantine Empire (Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 18).

The *Asnam* cemetery of the oasis town of Ghadames held some of the largest temple mausolea in Tripolitania, most likely of the arcaded type, similar to the ones at Ghirza, but much bigger (Rebuffat 1975, 498-99; 1977, 90-91; Brogan and Smith 1984, 212; Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 76). There were at least seven, but perhaps even more (Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 9; 63). Due to their architectural similarity, the mausolea of Ghadames have been tentatively dated to the late third to the fifth century AD (Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 76). Richardson reports that some of the *Asnam* were blown up with gunpowder by one of the sons of the late Karamanli ruler of Tripoli (Richardson 1848, 356-358) and that Largeau excavated some of the large mounds of rubble, which turned out to be additional mausolea (Largeau 1881, 237). Unfortunately, all of the remaining tombs are completely stripped off their decorations. They were probably faced with ashlar masonry or plaster. There may also have been an obelisk mausoleum at Ghadames, suggested by a curious stelae featured an obelisk tomb with a tree rowing out of the top of the roof (Figure 5.18).

Many of the figural and architectural decorations are now lost, but the numerous structural elements integrated into the Islamic city bear testimony to the once richly decorated monuments. Unfortunately, none of the reliefs from Ghadames can be securely linked to a particular monument (>Gha001-A-01 to Gha001-A-14). Funerary inscriptions that were found across Ghadames were conducted in Latin or Latino-Punic and including Latin and Libyan names such as Rosauarugarage, a ‘good woman’ from Ghadames inscribed in Latin (*IRT2009*, 912 = C.I.L., 8: 22659) Julianus from a neo-Punic inscription (*IRT2009*, 911) or Macarcum Varivara from a Latin inscription (Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 111).

The mausolea were surrounded by a large cemetery which extended up to 25 hectares. The physical burials pay testimony to the unique character of

![Figure 5.19: Stelae depicting obelisk mausoleum found at Ghadames, now in the Ghadames museum (Image: Author).](image)
the ancient peoples of Ghadames, with multiple burials in the mausolea that were distinct to the oasis and markedly different to those recorded by the ULVS in the eastern pre-desert (Barker 1996; Mattingly 1996a), or those excavated during the Desert Migration Project in the Fezzan (Mattingly 2003b; 2006; 2007a; Mattingly and Sterry 2010, 9).

A total of 14 reliefs was recorded, of which two are known only through sketches by Duveyrier (1864) and Richardson (1848; Table 5.8). Stylistically, the sculptures are very similar to the funerary art of the Tripolitanian hinterland. The figures are stylized rather than in the naturalistic tradition, with disproportionately small bodies and large heads. The overall themes are agricultural activities (reaping, a person holding a basket, a pitch fork). Agricultural produce was shown on a broken panel that also depicted a bird next to the tail of a fish in a medallion. The bird might be a cockerel, indicated by its comb and wattle. To the right of the medallion a pomegranate, and what may be dates, seeds or nuts are shown as well as two large roundels with cross incisions (bread?) and two bunches of grapes. The tail of a potential second fish is showing on the edge of the break. Recalling the offering table with the carved offerings at Bou Guerba, this stone indicates that offerings were also made to the dead as in the rest of Tripolitania. Offering tables were also found in the Asnam cemetery (Mattingly and Sterry 2010).

Horses and hunting are another popular image. Richardson’s sketch showed a person feeding a horse and four panels may refer to hunting. Two dogs with collars were attacking an herbivore, and two reliefs featured a horse and a rider holding a spear. Hunters were commonly depicted without shields as was the case on the stones from Ghadames. A large eagle and a hunter featured on a very weathered stone, closely recalling the hunting reliefs from Tarhuna, and the hunting scene at Gasr Iswai (see Chapter 6 for a more detailed discussion on those scenes). A third group of three reliefs appear to show ceremonial scenes. What is immediately striking about the Ghadames reliefs is their distinct reference to regional hair and dress styles, reflecting social ideals and local traditions that differed from the rest of Tripolitania. Dress was a powerful tool to express social, religious, and group identity, even on more formulaic and idealised funerary iconography (Harlow 2012, 1). The workers on the agricultural scene wore a different style of garment to the short tunic with belt that was frequently depicted in the rest of Tripolitania. They were dressed in a loose long-sleeved tunic that reached to the upper thigh, and a skirt-like garment underneath reaching below the knees. Folds were indicated by straight vertical lines. A longer version of this type of dress is visible on a stone depicting several figures, with a skirt describing an A-line. Two depictions show a personage in a wrapped dress reaching down to the ankles, and wrapped
across the upper body of the left shoulder. Tunics worn with a belt are shown twice, these were long sleeved garments reaching down below the knee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Ghadames</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image of deceased</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive portrait</td>
<td>1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural activity and domestic animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person carrying basket</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitchfork</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbolic elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird fish and dates in medallion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomegranate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figs, dates, nuts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundels (bread?)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunting/games</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting dog pursuing herbivore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting on horseback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclear</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial scene</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8: Scenes from Ghadames

The most striking feature about the local costume was undoubtedly the hairstyle. Three stones depicted a personage of undistinguishable gender with hair arranged in thick braids high on the head, with the ends hanging down to the shoulder in a long, thick ponytail (Figure 5.19a). A headdress with long braids is part of the traditional wedding dress for women at Ghadames today, which somewhat recalls the hairdo on the relief (Figure 5.19b). On the reliefs from Ghadames, it appears that this hairdo was depicted exclusively on ceremonial scenes. Duveyrier’s drawing shows a seated figure holding a palm leaf above an arch decorated with a zig-zag pattern, in which a person is seated holding a staff. Unfortunately, the stone was broke off at the centre and only the arm holding the staff was still visible. Behind the seated person stood a second, smaller figure. Both wore the distinctive Ghadamese hairstyle. The person sitting in the centre clearly had some social significance, perhaps depicting the deceased or a deity.

A very similar scene featured on a broken and very weathered relief which is now in the Ghadames museum. Two figures with the distinct hairstyle are standing next to what
presumably is an arch. The first person was depicted much taller than the second. A rosette was placed above the smaller figure, and the whole scene is set within an arched frame. On a third relief, a procession of four people was shown, one wearing the distinctive hairstyle. They walked towards the right behind each other. The last person in the line was a man with short hair, dressed in a tunic with a thick belt, similar to the dress of Richardson’s drawing. He held onto the wrist of the man in front of him with one hand, and holding a small object, perhaps a bowl, in his other. The second man was wearing a long tunic with long sleeves, and a mantle folded over it. He was also holding an object in one hand. The personage with the distinct hairstyle is holding an object in one hand, perhaps a cup or a vessel and a smaller object in the other, now obliterated. This person was wearing a long A-line skirt or tunic with a shorter loose tunic on top. The cup is offered to a fourth person who appears to be facing outwards and is slightly larger. Unfortunately, the stone is broken off here and only part of this larger figure is showing.

A broken and very weathered stone features a similar scene of people holding on to each other, walking in a line. On these scenes, the size of the figure seems to determine status and hierarchy, rather than age, as indicated by the large figures in the centre of scenes. Some of

Figure 5.20: Ghadamese headdress a) close up of ceremonial scene showing that the headdress was arranged of small plates (>Gha001-A-10; Image: Author); b) traditional bridal dress at Ghadames, still used today. A wig of small braids is placed on the head, together with a distinctive ponytail-style arrangement that is placed on top of the head somewhat recalling the headpiece shown on the relief (Image: Author).
the overall compositions do recall the ceremonial scene on the interactive portrait relief from Ghirza, where cups, vessels and gifts were presented to the deceased. Ghadames, like Ghirza, was centre of trade, and it is likely that they also constituted major centres of power in their respective region.

1.26 Discussion and Summary

This chapter demonstrates that the iconography Tripolitanian mausolea was much more varied and complex than previously recognized. The scenes that were chosen by the commissioner were closely bound to local traditions, as well as regional socio-economic and historical circumstances. By looking at the iconographic repertoire of individual tombs, it becomes apparent that the images were not simple copies from pattern books that were uncritically repeated time and time again. Instead, each mausoleum was decorated with a set of images that was carefully chosen to represent him or herself and the family to the immediate and wider community.

The imagery became more and more varied over time as funerary iconography in Tripolitania developed into a complex set of images. Classical mythology and representations popular in the Graeco-Roman world were particularly popular on the at the coast, and the earlier mausolea of the Gefara and the Gebel. However, as the funerary iconography developed, representations of mythological narratives such as Hercules and Alcestis or Orpheus and Eurydice failed to spread more widely. Instead, new themes started to appear that were fit to reflect local concerns and realities that were important to the commissioner and the surrounding communities.

When comparing the imagery from the coast and to some extent, the Gefara and the Gebel with the pre-desert areas and Ghadames, it becomes immediately clear that the people at the coast had a different engagement with the funerary iconography of the Roman World. The inhabitants of the coastal regions had a long-standing relationship with other Mediterranean cultures. Lepcis Magna, for instance, was a hot-pot of different cultures, including Roman and Greek inhabitants as evident from inscriptions. The city was a centre for artistic production until the third century crisis, including a range of local and foreign workshops from, for instance Alexandria, Italy or Aphrodisias (Baratte 2005, 243). Thus, the population was very familiar with the art and symbolism of the Graeco-Roman world.
However, also on mausolea where classical mythology prevails, the expression of local aspects of identity can be observed from the beginning, may it be through agricultural scenes featuring camels, distinct North African facial features, or the inclusion of North African artistic styles particularly associated with the funerary realm. Thus, from the beginning, it appears that the commissioners were highly selective in their choice of scene and artistic style. In fact, the evidence suggests that, over time, North African artistic styles that stemmed from Punic art were seen as the most appropriate decorative style to adorn the mausolea. The funerary monuments decorated with motives in the incised contour technique present somewhat of an exception. Perhaps inspired by the earlier monument of el-Amrouni, the commissioners clearly sought out this style, but chose a different set of imagery. Here, we might have the rare evidence of one workshop operating in that part of the Gefara for a certain amount of time that provided an artistic style desired by the local elite in this particular area. The incised contour technique that can be observed again on a later monument of this area, curiously, is carved very much the North African artistic tradition and very regional iconographic imagery, such as the figure with raised arms and the peacocks drinking out of a cup. Whether this was simply a matter of lack of skill from the craftsman, or a deliberate merging of the two styles is unclear, but is was evidently seen as appropriate to decorate the mausoleum. The case study from the western Gefara of the area around Bou Guerba shows that classical scenes ceased to be popular in the third and fourth century in this particular area. Instead, distinct preference of hunting scenes, symbolic imagery, such as birds drinking out of a cup and fish, most likely to represent offerings can be observed.

The pre-desert and desert areas are particularly rich in their iconography. In an area which only had very limited artistic traditions before the Roman period, the iconography could develop more freely, and was less influenced by the classical traditions of the wider Mediterranean world. Although some sites in the pre-desert were, as the crow flies, much closer to the coastal cities than some sites on the central Gebel or the Gefara, direct access to the coast was much more difficult, almost cutting the region off from the coastal areas. The many rugged and deep wadis dictate the channel of movement, making it a much longer and cumbersome journey.

The establishment and maintenance of ancestral cults and traditions were clearly at the heart of the pre-desert iconography. Self-representation was important not only to

30 For instance, Bou Guerba is approximately 170 km west of Sabratha, and the Wadi Messeuggi is located approximately 120 km south from Lepeis Magna as the crow flies.
express the status and wealth when alive, but also to ensure the transformation into the ancestral realm. Furthermore, the opportunity for self-representation was much more limited in the Tripolitanian hinterland. The big cities provided ample opportunity for the upper strata of society to represent themselves, and to compete with their peers. However, as stressed before, the hinterland was almost void of sculpture apart from the funerary monuments. Sculptural decorations, in particularly figurative ones, appear to be reserved for structures with religious significance, such as mausolea and temples (this will be further explored in section 6.4).

As demonstrated above, the evolution of the iconography was closely bound to regional, social, economic, and political circumstances. It developed from concerns over self-representation and the establishment of ancestral lineages to expressions of power over the control of the agricultural land and hunting to presentations of political and judicial power in a time when the Roman Empire was in decline. While the coastal regions struggled under the third century crisis and the number of workshops dwindled to the extent that first and second century portrait sculptures were frequently re-worked to create new portraits (Caputo and Traversari 1976, 14-16), the pre-desert and desert areas flourished (Bianchi 2005) and, as the iconography and inscriptions of the Ghirza mausolea suggests, the veneration of the dead was very much a communal affair (Mattingly 2013). In contrast, the two fourth-century hypogeum of Oea and the painted feasting chamber above the hypogeum at Sabratha suggest that funerary rituals at the coast went more private, reserved for the immediate members of the family. This is also suggested by the fourth century mausoleum of Chormet el-Bousaila that was enclosed by substantial wall.

The next chapter will look at the factors which influenced and shaped these expressions of local identities by examining in more detail ways of self-representation through portrait sculptures, the relationship between commissioner and viewer, the significance of the mausolea to the community as places of ritual, and the role of the craftsmen in terms of skill and wider trends in mosaic and wall painting that may have influenced the popularity of certain scenes chosen for the funerary structures.
CHAPTER 6
THE COMMISSIONER, THE CRAFTSMEN AND THE VIEWER

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter has demonstrated that the expression of self- and group identities through funerary iconography developed over time into a complex system of meanings, influenced by regional and wider socio-historical circumstances. This chapter will now explore in more detail the various expressions of identities by concentrating on the different actors that shaped and engaged with a monument’s iconography: Commissioner, Craftsmen, and Viewer. At first glance, it appears that a ‘chaîne opératoire’ was in place, an operational sequence that was formed by the commissioner who instructed the craftsmen. The craftsmen, in turn, executed the commission which was, subsequently, seen by the local audience – the viewer (for the original concept of chaîne opératoire see, for instance, Lemonnier 1986). In what is to follow I will examine the different actors that were involved in this operational sequence (first the commissioner, then the craftsmen, and finally the viewer) in more detail by exploring the iconography from their perspective. By doing so, this chapter will demonstrate that the interaction between the different actors was more complex than simply an operational sequence. The choice in iconography was ultimately not formed by a ‘chain of operators’ but by a network of operators who were closely connected and influenced each other.

The majority of the funerary sculpture was rendered in a rather non-realistic style and, as I have suggested in Chapter 5, was perfectly acceptable – if not desirable – for decorating the mausolea. Nevertheless, it is undeniable that the way the sculptures were carved does bear some striking resemblance to provincial sculptures elsewhere in the Empire, in places such as Roman Britain or Syria where, like in Tripolitania, figural art was not widely produced. Johns points out that:

‘the wealth of sophisticated architectural and sculptural material from the Libyan site of Ghirza includes pieces that display elements of naïve work that, had they been found in Britain, would have been readily described as ‘Celtic’. This fact clearly demonstrates that simple, childlike or naïve depictions are not necessarily connected with any local or cultural preference’ (Johns 2003, 35-36).
Johns’ rather sweeping statement is justified to some degree, in that there are indeed stylistic similarities in the manner in which the reliefs were carved in areas where sculpture had not previously been common. However, the Tripolitanian way of rendering imagery undoubtedly had a long tradition in North Africa and, as I have argued in the previous chapter, this style was consciously chosen to create a connection to the past. Some scholars have seen the production of such imagery as deliberate resistance to or rejection of romanitas (see, for instance, Alderhouse-Green 2003), but the combined and close study of both artistic style and iconography suggests that the choice of decoration is more complicated than that. Style of carving and iconography together create a complex mix of Roman and North African influences that reflect more than a simply acceptance or resistance. Instead, the decorations reveal a complex negotiation between local, Mediterranean, and more specifically Roman influences that change over time depending on socio-political developments in local, wider North African and Empire-wide circumstances. Over time, certain Mediterranean styles and iconographies merge with local ones, making them inseparable from regional tradition. Therefore, in this chapter, I will argue that it is the combination of style and iconography that is important and that they are interlinked. Both were chosen not primarily to openly (if perhaps at times subtly) oppose Rome, but to create and maintain the connection to the past through ancestral artistic and architectural styles and new forms of iconography.

Unfortunately, we do not have much written evidence for the people who commissioned, built, or viewed the mausolea. Funerary inscriptions are often rather short and formulaic, and little is known about the ritual practices that took place, or how the monument was perceived by the different people who encountered it. To get some more insight into these matters, let us examine a tower mausoleum constructed 150 km west of Tripolitania at Kasserine, in modern Tunisia. Two lengthy poems were inscribed on the tower mausoleum of the Flavii family, built around AD 150. Although this monument lies outside my study area, the poems can give some indication of the significance of building such a substantial funerary monument in North Africa. They reveal that the commissioners were aware of the impact that the messages and decorations had on the viewer and that they were ‘dependent upon their reception by a specific audience at a specific time or place’. Furthermore, the poems convey an understanding of the changing nature of the monument over time (Pillinger 2013, 188, 205-208).
The mausoleum at Kasserine was erected for Titus Flavius Secundus and his family by his son who was also named Titus Flavius Secundus. The deceased was probably of local origin and had a successful career in the military until he retired to his large estates near the township of Cillium where he died around AD 150 (Thomas 2007, 197). The aedicula-tower mausoleum had three storeys and most likely a pyramid roof, and stood over 14 m in height (Figure 6.1a). The poem suggests that a statue of a cockerel was perched on top of the pyramid. The third storey held an aedicula which held the now missing statue of the father, Titus Flavius Secundus. The aedicula was surrounded by twelve columns forming a peristyle. The two poems were inscribed on the first storey in three columns on the side that faced the road (Pillinger 2013, 172; Figure 6.1b). A separate funerary inscription at second-storey level reveals the names and ages of the family members who were buried in the mausoleum, including the commissioner and son that both bore the same name, Titus Flavius Secundus (See Appendix 1.4.4 for the inscription).

Many members of the family were buried in this tomb over time and thus created a ‘clear statement of a family united in death’ (Thomas 2007, 198; see also Groupe de

Figure 6.1: The mausoleum of the Flavii at Kasserine. a) Reconstruction showing the position of the statue amongst the columns of the third-storey aedicula (drawing: Holtzinger 1906, 23, Figure 16); b) The side of the inscription on the second storey, and the poems on the first storey above the door to the funerary chamber (Image: Andrew Wilson from Pillinger 2013, Figure 2).
Recherches sur l’Afrique Antique, 1993 for a detailed study of the mausoleum). Even long after Secundus’ death, he, as the builder of the mausoleum, and his father remained the main focus, and all family members defined themselves in relation to Secundus the builder and son (Thomas 2007, 198). The two Flavii Secundii are also the main focus of the poems.

Before I examine certain aspects the poems in more detail, it is important to keep in mind the nature of the poems. They were created by a writer and not by Flavius Secundus the deceased, or his son, the commissioner. The poet used some standard phrases, formulas, and hexameter to construct his work (see Thomas 2007, 197-200). Nevertheless, the poem does give us an idea about the worthiness of erecting a mausoleum for both the departed and his family, and it highlights the importance of the funerary structure as a sacred monument in which the ancestors were housed permanently (for the entire poems see Appendix 1.4.5).

Poem I

…This is a more praiseworthy use of wealth; in this way, expenditure creates a permanent resting place, in this way money discovers how to establish enduring traditions, when it is firm and invested well in an eternal product…

…Your father ought now to be considered immortal — look! — and to have deserted the grim home of abandoned Dis, now that he prefers to inhabit this monument for the rest of time and to live forever in the inscribed names…

…Now I do not doubt that among the silent shades of Acheron, if consciousness remains after death, your father often rejoices, Secundus, and spurns the other ranks of the dead, because he knows that here such a remarkable form of a tomb exists for him, one of permanent novelty, and he knows that a shining construction of stones stands thus, that the levels have grown upwards from the base ever more impressively thus, so it is that every single edge is defined thus, as if by a thread through softened wax. The cheerful sculpture is renewed by mobile markings, and the wandering crowd can admire these decorations uninterruptedly and marvel at the gleaming columns evenly poised above. Indeed you have offered up to the gods not just the inscription of his military service but even your father himself, watching so often as he does these delights which once he himself granted to the place, when he established the many products of Bacchus and decided to lay out the first vines and furnished the grove with a more regular water supply (Translation Pillinger 2013, 179-181).
Poem II

Piety, turn your venerable mind this way again, and tend to my songs in the way you know so well. Look! Secundus is here again, who out of the devotion of his heart has given his father not a monument, but a new temple. To what end are you now forcing me, Calliope, on a twin route, to go once again down roads I have already traveled? Surely I made a description of the great work, and I mentioned the stones polished in their fitted spots, the surrounding groves, the waters rushing peacefully and the bees regularly bringing back honey. This, however, this alone I think was missing from our art (in which you descend into many jokes, my tipsy Muse): I did not tell of the trembling wings of the rooster on the top, which, I think, flies above the highest cloud. If nature had given a voice to the body of this rooster, it would force all the gods to wake up in the morning.

Now the façade is marked with firmly-fixed words, and a life trusting in the inscriptions can be observed. I hope, Secundus, that you live happily for many years, and that you read the monument that you yourself made (Translation Pillinger 2013, 181).

The two poems, spread over 110 lines, correlating to the age of the deceased father, were thus most likely inscribed together at the same time (Pillinger 2013, 196). However, while the first column mainly focuses on the father, the second seems to speak to the son more directly, and particularly highlights the close relationship between the powerful monument and the viewer, in this case Secundus, the son. Several aspects become apparent from the poem that also have relevance to the mausolea of Tripolitania. As on some of the inscriptions of my study area, the substantial cost of the monument is stressed, specifically regarding the creation of an eternal resting place, and the creation of a long-lasting memorial for the family. In Secundus' poems, the importance of ‘monumentality’ and the close links between the monument and the decorations are stressed, while the statue and the monument itself are seen as symbols of Secundus’ immortality. In fact, the statue is described as being ‘cheerful’, alive and in motion (Thomas 2007, 199). This, of course, could be a poetic play of words, but that cult statues were believed to hold certain powers is attested in Corippus. He tells us that the Laguatan, a people from eastern Tripolitania, carried the idol of their god Gurzil into battle (Jabau., 2.109; 2.404-408).

Within the funerary context, the impact of the sculptures was greatly enhanced because they were placed on large, elaborate monuments which, in themselves, bore significant religious and ritual significance, and were even referred to as a temple. Together they created an enormous impact on the viewer, a fact of which the commissioner was evidently aware.
Although the poems of Secundus are from outside my study area, they still hold noteworthy relevance to this thesis. They provide a glimpse at how the commissioner and the viewer may have perceived the monument, how they engaged with it, and what significance the sculpture held. By considering some of the aspects of the poem, this chapter will look in more detail at the complex factors that may have shaped the selection of the imagery, and what forms of identities were expressed, in particular through portraiture. Next, the role of the viewer will be examined, especially the relationship between the audience and the mausolea with their imagery as sacred structure. To get a better understanding how certain images and trends spread across Tripolitania, the last section focuses on the people who built the monuments and created the sculptural decoration.

6.2 The Commissioner and the Deceased: Depicting the Self, the Family, and the Ancestor

The portrait of the deceased is one of the main mechanism with which the individual negotiated his or her identity (Birke 2013, 44). The visual expression of the self or family members in the form of portrait reliefs and statues represented a new way of commemoration in Tripolitania from the early first century AD onwards. Portraits depicted the deceased, and frequently also members of the family, emphasising the importance and continuation of the family group. They served as a very powerful form of non-verbal communication with the viewer through which certain aspects of identity were expressed. Specifically, dress, adornments, and personal grooming reveal how those aspects of identity such as gender, age or status were defined and displayed and how they changed over time (Hope 1997, 114). The appearance of the portrait was a personal and yet very significant choice to make, since one of the main functions of the portrait was eternal commemoration, to create an image that aided future generations to remember the deceased and to honour the ancestor. The commissioner had to decide consciously how he or she wanted the deceased to be eternally represented to the family and the community.

Essentially, Tripolitanian funerary portraiture developed out of both Graeco-Roman and Punic funerary reliefs. Funerary portraits were exceedingly rare before the Roman period, but, just like in other parts of the Empire (Stewart 2008, 78-79), their numbers increased drastically from the first century AD onwards. The portrait bust in relief was the most popular form of self-representation in Tripolitania. It was a particularly Roman form
of self-representation, which perhaps rose to popularity across the Roman Empire because of its focus on the face (Zanker 1990, 343). The use of frontal perspective was not new to traditional Punic art, and the majority of the Tripolitania examples maintained the traditions of the Punic world. In essence, they did not endeavour to display a true likeness of the sitter but were rendered in a schematic manner with exaggerated features, rigidly looking out at the viewer. As a result, the distinctions between cultural, sub-cultural and individual values, gender divisions and status were not depicted through naturalistic facial features, but through details in dress, hairstyles, and personal adornment. The way the Tripolitania elite had actively chosen to represent themselves after death reflected and asserted the norms and values that were followed in the region. The main purpose was to create a memory of the departed family member or the self. From the inscriptions, we can understand that the majority of mausolea were commissioned by a close member of the family, not the deceased him or herself. Whether the monument was commissioned before or after death is unclear, although it is likely that work, in some cases, began before death occurred. However, it is important to keep in mind that we may not be looking at how the deceased wanted to be depicted, but rather at how the family wanted the departed person to be represented.

Crucially, portraits were not only about depicting aspects of identity that were held during the sitter’s lifetime, but they were also concerned with the expression of a new form of identity: that of the ancestor. Essentially, death represents a transition from being a leading figure in living society, to joining the realms of the powerful ancestors. Self-representation was, therefore, also about being remembered in this ‘new’ and permanent role. There was an obvious concern about being forgotten and about the continuity of the maintenance of ritual at the tomb as evident from the inscriptions, offering channels, offering tables, and the depictions of offerings and figures holding offering bowls on the imagery of the mausolea. In this context, portraiture provides us with an extraordinary glimpse into some very complex aspects of expressing identities held during life, and from beyond the grave. Because of this ‘eternal’ notion of self-and-family representation, the way the individuals were represented on their mausolea was a very deliberate and self-conscious choice, resulting in an idealised image of the deceased. Consequently, dress, hairstyle and personal adornments displayed were perhaps not what the deceased wore in everyday life, but they were carefully chosen from a range of options to emphasise certain aspects of the deceased’s identity. How did the individual want to be depicted for future visitors to see? What aspects were deemed to be important to display, and what social ‘codes’ were expressed that were understood by
the local community that viewed the monument? How did those aspects change over time and place?

The earliest example of portraiture within the funerary context comes from the early first century AD hypogaeum of the ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ at Sabratha, where the deceased was depicted lying on a couch, his head surrounded by a corona, emphasising his status (Di Vita 2004, 223). As already pointed out in Chapter 4, the ‘Totenmahl’ composition was not taken up into the image pool of the region and does not appear again in Tripolitanian funerary art. His wife Ala was depicted as a portrait bust in the neighbouring niche, wearing a tunic with two parallel stripes running down the front, her long locks hanging down either side of her face. Her arms were not depicted. As we will see below, this type of portrait bust occurred again and again in the pre-desert area, where it developed to be one of the standard forms of self-representation (Figure 6.2).
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Figure 6.2: Comparison of early first century AD and fourth century AD portrait busts. a) Wall painting of a woman from the early first century AD Hypogaeum at Sabratha ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ (Image: Di Vita 1984, Table CXLVI.4); b) Portrait relief from Ghirza (>Gh128-E-01; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).

As we shall see below, the elite at the coast, and to some extent in the Gefara and Gebel, were influenced by the Graeco-Roman style of honorific portrait statues in the cities. However, in the pre-desert, the realistic and natural rendering of the subject was not desired in most instances. Here, the majority of portraits were conceptual representations of the departed or family members.
### 6.2.1 Types of Portraiture

The distribution of portrait sculpture is rather uneven, chiefly because of the continuously settled coast, and the intensely farmed Gebel. By far the largest number of extant portrait sculpture come from the pre-desert, but no clear example survives from Ghadames (Table 6.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Coast</th>
<th>Gefara</th>
<th>Gebel</th>
<th>Pre-desert</th>
<th>Desert</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relief bust couple (male/female)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief bust two females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief bust family (male/female/child)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief bust male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief bust female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief full figure male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief full figure female</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief full figure couple</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief full figure family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bust in the round male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive scenes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Types and distribution of portrait sculpture in Tripolitania.

The different types of portraiture have already been outlined in Chapter 4, and I will, therefore, only briefly outline them here. Five broad types can be distinguished: 1) portrait busts in relief; 2) portrait busts in the round; 3) full figures in relief; 4) interactive scenes; 5) statues in the round.

1) **Portrait busts in relief**: Most of the portrait busts come from the pre-desert and only three from the Gebel. The individuals are usually depicted frontally, looking directly at the viewer. Only on a single mausoleum in the Wadi Migdal is a couple shown in profile (twice), facing each other (>Mg001-A-01 and Mg001-A-02). The compositions consist of couples (man and woman), families of three (man, woman, and child), two women, or one single individual. The busts were depicted without arms and hands, except for one relief from the Wadi al-
Binaya, where the male deceased holds a scroll in the right hand, while the left hand is raised, palm facing outwards (>Bin001-A-02).

2) Portrait busts in the round: One portrait bust of a bearded male was found during the restoration of the tower mausoleum in the Wadi N’fd (>Nf030-A-04), near the south-eastern corner of the mausoleum (Abdussaid 1996, 74). No other examples are known from Tripolitania. The mausoleum was re-constructed by the Department of Antiquities in the 1990s, but it is not clear where the bust would have fitted. Many mausolea had niches inside the burial chamber, in which urns were placed. It is possible that the bust was originally placed in such a niche, although there is no evidence for such a practice in mausolea chambers elsewhere in the region. However, burial chambers are often looted or not excavated. Some hypogea appear to have had busts inside the burial chamber as for instance at Gargaresc (El Falloos 2013, Figures Gh1.60-1.62).

3) Full figures in relief: As with the portrait busts in relief, full-length figures are depicted frontally looking out towards the viewer. In the pre-desert examples, they are frequently holding a cup, or are offered a cup, but did not actively take part in any action. In contrast to the interactive scene, the focus is on the individual, and not on his or her involvement in any action. Thus, they form somewhat of a grey area between portrait busts and interactive scenes. The deceased can probably be identified by the height of the figure. The full-figured portrait relief of Apuleius and Thanubra in the Gefara is unique since it depicted them almost life-size across one side of the mausoleum (>Ea001-A-04).

4) Interactive scenes: Interactive portraits show the deceased directly involved in an activity. The only instances of such a scene come from Ghirza (>Gh129-C-04; Gh129-B-06), where the departed is the largest figure on the relief, rendered in profile and seated on a chair receiving various goods from figures that were approaching from the front and from behind.

5) Statues in the round: Only two of the extant statues in the round are rendered in marble, one at Gasr Duierat at the coast, and the other at Bon Guerba at the Gebel. The majority of statues were made of local limestone (eleven in total) in the Gefara, the Gebel, and the pre-desert. Three male statues are seated (>An001-B-02; Ha001-A-01; Ha001-A-02) and the others are depicted standing upright (>An001-A- Ch001-A-15; Ch001-A-16; Gh128-A-12; Gh128-A-13; Kn005-C-01; Tat001-A-02; Tat001-A-03). Marble statues, in particular, were
often re-used or recycled in lime-kilns and portrait sculpture often fell victim to vandalism and looting over the centuries, and have now disappeared. Considering that the mausoleum at Gasr Duierat outside Leptis Magna likely held up to six marble statues alone, it is conceivable that many other mausolea in the coastal regions also contained statuary (>Gd001-A-12).

6.2.2 Pose, Symbols, and Facial Expressions

Before I engage in more detail in the expression of identity through dress and hairstyles, I will explore the various poses and related gestures that were commonly assumed, frequently accompanied by objects and symbols. Portrait busts usually did not depict arms or hands, and thus the depictions of hand-gestures are limited. That there was a certain awareness of symbolism embedded in poses is demonstrated by the depiction of figures that were raising both arms above their head in a posture of prayer or adoration. Notably, this is the only gesticulation that regularly occurred across Tripolitania. This universal pose was (and still is) assumed in many cultures as a sign of grief or veneration and does not constitute a region-specific gesture (Demisch 1984). On the reliefs, this gesture was usually not assumed by the deceased him- or herself, but by separate figures, most probably to express the veneration and mourning of the dead. An exception may be the figured capitals on the Ghirza obelisk tomb where the bearded man and the female with a turban on top of the capital bear a striking resemblance to the individuals on the portraits.

At Ghirza and in the Wadi Khanafes, a more ambiguous gesture was displayed. The upper arms were held close to the body, while the lower arms were bent at a 45-degree angle towards the right (>Gh129-C-16) or the left (>Kn005-B-01). On both reliefs a person was standing next to the main figure, suggesting that this was perhaps a signal of welcome or acceptance. The only other gesture noticed amongst the Tripolitanian portraits comes from the Wadi al-Binaya (>Bin001-A-02). Here, a male figure has his right hand raised in front of his body, palm facing outwards, while holding a scroll in his left hand. This pose is common on Punic and Roman period stelae from Carthage and is frequently accompanied by the sign of Tanit (Wurnig 2009, 48-49). Yet, within the context of the mausoleum from the Wadi al-Binaya, where the Tanit sign is absent, this may represent an alternative symbol for prayer.

In general, it appears that gestures were not used to communicate and negotiate local or Roman social values or status. The Roman world was full of gestures that symbolised
status, family relationships or gender (see, for instance, Brilliant 1963; Aldrete 1999; George 2005 for the complex variety of gestures in Roman society, or Heyn 2010 for gestures on funerary portraiture of Palmyra). However, it appears that this form of communication was used predominantly for religious purposes on funerary reliefs in Tripolitania.

Overall, poses were not very varied. When not depicted in bust form, figures were usually standing, or seated. Individuals lying on a couch or bed are notably absent. If the full figure was visible, the deceased was either portrayed standing or seated. On the other occasions where the whole figure was depicted, the deceased can be distinguished by the larger size or, in the case of men, the presence of a beard (see 6.2.3 below). In the Wadi Khanafes in the pre-desert, the whole family was standing upright, and they appeared to be holding an object in front of them, perhaps a vessel (>Kn005-A-02). Vessels were also held by two individuals at Ghirza (>Gh128-A-16; Gh129-C-15), while at Khanafes (>Kn005-B-01) and Ghirza (>Gh129-C-16) the standing figures were being offered a vessel. On three occasions, an individual was placed under an arch formed by palm leaves (>Ta001-A-01; Gha001-A; Gha001-A-03) or columns (>Ag002-A-01), perhaps, as already discussed in Chapter 5, to denote the new ancestral status of the deceased.

From the interactive reliefs of Ghirza, we can gather that the seated position was seen as dignified. At least one statue in the round was rendered in this manner in the pre-desert (>An001-B-02), and Donau recorded two seated statues in the western Gebel (>Ha001-A-01; Ha001-A-02). Seated statues were particularly popular in North Africa in the second century AD (Zanker 1983, 35). Across the Mediterranean world, this type of statue was frequently used to depict the ancestors but increasingly was also associated with the representation of deities and the emperor in temple and sanctuaries (Krausz and Coulon 2010; Ney 2015, 14). For instance, a seated Hadrian was depicted as Jupiter at Lepcis Magna (rendered by North African masons), denoting his rank and status, and, after death, divine powers (Zanker 1983, 31-35; Plate 94-95).31

Instead of a wide variety of poses and gestures, it appears that some portrait reliefs applied symbolic elements as a form of communication. Interestingly,Procopius mentions an ancient custom in which ‘tribal’ leaders received certain symbols of office, including a staff, a cap and a cloak, of which some bear a resemblance to tokens of power depicted on the reliefs of Tripolitania (see Appendix 1.1.6 for Procopius’ passage).

31 Other seated statues of emperors come from Bulla Regia and Dougga (Zanker 1983, 35; Plate 18, 2 and 19, 1-2).
The most obvious symbol of power visible on the mausolea is the staff. A groove down the left knee of the seated statue in the Wadi Antar indicates that the sitter held something in his hand, most likely a staff or sceptre (>An001-B-02). At Ghirza 129-C-04, the person behind the seated figure was holding a long staff, while the seated figure was holding a shorter staff. A cornerstone from a mausoleum in the Wadi Khanafes depicted an individual holding a staff that was topped by a crescent (>Kn005-A-03). This could perhaps be a reference to Saturn. Due to the lack of reference to Saturn elsewhere in the area, the crescent staff could also refer to the Tlegentii, an organisation of people who hired venerators for the amphitheatre, looked after the animals, served as intermediaries to supply the animals and also functioned as funerary societies in North Africa, especially in the pre-desert, an area which played an important role in the supply of animals for the circus (Dunbabin 1979, 82-83; Blanchard-Lemée et al. 1996; Sparreboom 2016, 73; 94, 95, 124-127).

Other symbols of power, such as the fasces and the sella curulis, have already been discussed in Chapter 5 (5.5.3). A person holding a scroll only appears once with certainty (>Kn005-C-01) and perhaps also in the Wadi al-Binaya, although this item could have also been a short staff (>Bin001-A-02). Other symbols may have determined gender. Bunches of grapes were sometimes depicted next to men and pomegranates were associated with females both symbols of fertility (see Chapter 4). A laurel wreath was placed between a couple at Ghirza (>Gh128-E-01).

Standing figures on the reliefs in the pre-desert frequently held a cup or a bowl, alluding to the ritual offerings that were made at the tomb. Although gestures and poses were not very varied, contemporary elements linked to ritual, power, and memory to venerate the dead were regularly included, be it in the form of gestures of prayer, holding offering vessels, or a variety of symbols. The communication of rituals carried out at the tombs was evidently of the highest importance, emphasising that the ancestors held a significant status within Tripolitanian society.

Some of the facial expressions on the reliefs are particularly intriguing (where they are still recognizable). The schematic rendering of the portraits does not allow for very distinct individual facial features. The faces are often ageless, neither young nor old, which leads to a certain ‘sameness’ of the figures. Some indication of a more advanced age is given on the portrait bust from the Wadi N’f’d, where grooves on the forehead indicate wrinkles (>Nf030-A-04). On some reliefs the mouth was traced as a straight line, and rather expressionless, neither smiling nor expressing sadness. It is only on the relief from the Wadi Binaya that the portrayed figures were smiling (>Bin001-A-02). Interestingly, on five
sculptures, all from the pre-desert, the individuals were depicted with the corners of their mouth downturned (>Gh128-A-13; Gh128-E-01; Gh129-C-15 An001-A-08; An001-A-09) leading to the most obvious assumption that they might express sadness. However, this facial expression might also mark out the person as the deceased, in contrast to the family members depicted on the tomb that were still alive. Interestingly, the pre-Roman statue of a deity from Lepcis Magna also has his mouth downturned at the corners (see Figure 4.2).

Despite the more abstract rendering of the faces, it is notable that some personal features were sometimes carved onto the face by the craftsmen, such as particularly high cheekbones or a cleft chin. However, age is particularly difficult to discern. The bust in the round from the Wadi N’f’d appears to have wrinkles on the forehead and pronounced nasolabial folds.

6.2.3 Dress and Headdress

The portrait reliefs differ from one another, notably because of distinct characteristics in grooming, hairstyles, headdresses, jewellery, or clothing that were added to individualise each portrait. Dress, grooming, and adornments have not yet been subject to detailed study. The sculptures at Ghirza have received the most attention since they are well published, and important work has been conducted that stresses the use of clothes to identify status or social role in Ghirza’s society (Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1999; 2003; 2011; Zanker 2008). Audley-Miller investigated in more detail the development of dress styles on portraiture of the Northern and Southern cemetery, showing that fashions and styles of dress and hair changed over time. Status was expressed within the local setting by consciously choosing elements of indigenous and Roman dress (Audley-Miller 2012).

Clothes, hairstyles, jewellery, and types of headdress are non-verbal media to communicate certain aspects of identity. Through dress and grooming we present and represent ourselves to society, and through this, we try to influence the impressions others have of us (Goffman 1956, 1-9). Without speaking a single word, aspects of meaning and identity can be transmitted through certain codes that can only be understood within the given socio-cultural context. For instance, wearing black does not signify mourning in all societies (Sommer 2012, 257; Davis 1992, 5; Enninger 1983). Clothes, hairstyles, and adornments can also be used to categorise the social environment in which we operate, and manifest these categories in visible expressions (Sommer 2012, 259). Thus, to some extent,
dress can be seen as a ‘communicator of identities’ denoting, for instance, the belonging (or not belonging) to a particular religion, distinct cultural and/or kinship group, social status and rank, legal status, and gender (Roach-Higgins and Eicher 1992, 5-6). Crucially, all these aspects can be expressed at once (Rothe 2009, 3). From this, it becomes clear that clothes and adornments are not passive or static reflections but, instead, can be read as dynamic and ever-changing ‘cultural products that can be actively manipulated and used in the non-verbal dialogue with a person’s surroundings’ (Rothe 2009, 5; see also Stone 1962; Roach and Eicher 1965; Kuper 1973).

In the Roman world, dress and grooming depicted very complex aspects of identity such as age, gender, or social status (Lovén 2014, 266). In fact, Romans were particularly preoccupied with dress and dress codes (Rothe 2009, 9; Starbatty 2010). The toga was used to denote citizenship and office, while the stola was integral to the matrona’s costume (Olsen 2008). At the same time, in the Roman provinces, the degree of adoption of the Roman dress styles was not uniform. The many detailed studies that have been carried out in the Germanic, Gallic, and Syrian provinces show that a deliberate choice was made in what type of dress to wear, or crucially, on funerary monuments, what kind of dress and hairstyles were appropriate to the individual depicted (Carroll and Wild 2013; Freigang 1997; Harlow 2012; Olsen 2008; Rothe 2009; Stauffer 2013). Therefore, the differences in dress and hairstyle on Tripolitanian mausolea can tell us something about how the elite defined themselves through those attributes, how they negotiated between local dress and Roman influences, and how trends in clothing and hairstyles changed over time. The way men and women chose to be depicted or to portray their close kin, also provides us with an idea about gender distinctions expressed through dress, hairstyles, headdresses and personal grooming.

**Male Dress**

The toga, denoting citizenship and status in the Roman world, does not feature strongly on Tripolitanian funerary portraits and is only recorded once with absolute certainty. De la Marche describes Apuleus at el-Amrouni as having worn a toga (>Ea001-A-04, cited in Ferchiou 1989, 68), perhaps advertising his new status as a Roman citizen in the early second century AD. The two fragmented statues at Tatahouine appear to have worn a toga, draped over the left shoulder, but due to their fragmented state, this is not entirely certain (>Tat001-A-02 and Tat001-A-03). The only securely recorded depiction of a toga comes from a statue at Chormet el-Bousaila (>Ch001-A-15 and Ch001-A-16). This is perhaps unsurprising since
the family of the Valerii of Lepcis Magna, to whom this monument belonged, was amongst the highest ranking in the city.

The range of dress on portrait reliefs in the pre-desert in general is rather small. In most cases, a mantle or cloak was drawn across the body in an x-shaped manner such as at Ag002-C-01. The collar was decorated with a zig-zag pattern at Ghirza (>Gh128-D-01). The toga seems to be completely absent in the pre-desert and desert areas, and male dress was dominated by long tunics and cloaks. The bearded man depicted on the mausoleum at Meseuggi wore a mantle drawn over both shoulders. It was fastened across the chest with two disk brooches, one either side, which were connected with a chain. The beardless figure next to him, probably his son, showed some pleated or zig-zag decoration around the neck of his tunic (>Me001-A-01). On the obelisk mausoleum at Ghirza, the male bust had his cloak drawn across the left shoulder, in a similar fashion to the statue from the same tomb (>Gh129-A-01). The male statue from Ghirza was dressed in a long tunic that reached down to his lower thighs. A mantle was wrapped tightly over his left shoulder and was arranged in thick folds around his body. A thick fold of fabric hung down the centre of his body (Brogan and Smith 1984, 185). No sandals are visible on his feet, but they could have been painted on (Audley-Miller 2012, 103). The seated statue from the Wadi Antar wore a mantle with many folds. The top of the mantle was draped over his left shoulder. His feet were in a pair of sandals with very high soles, perhaps rendered this way so the feet touched the ground rather than swinging off the chair (>An001-B-02). The male statue from the Wadi Khanafes was dressed in a long plain tunic, reaching down below the knees to the calves. A loose mantle with many folds was drawn over both shoulders, its seam at the bottom running up at an angle. A tassel decorated the edge of the top fold of the mantle. On his feet he wore a pair of sandals made of two thin straps, perhaps tied at the top with a small knot. A mantle was also worn by the man on the family relief of the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-A-02), hanging loosely down from the shoulders.

A much more elaborate dress style was shown on Gh129-C-04 at Ghirza. The deceased was depicted seated in profile, receiving objects that were handed to him. A mantle decorated with an intricate pattern was wrapped around his body. Notably, the individuals surrounding him also wore clothes decorated around the hem or collar. One of the figures was perhaps female because of the conical cap and the necklace around the neck (see below, female dress). On Gh129-C-16 the portrait shows the deceased standing upright, wearing a short tunic and a long cloak that reaches down to his ankle. Aside from the decorated dress on the mausolea North B and C of Ghirza there is relatively little evidence for patterns on
clothes. However, more intricate decorations on clothes that now appear rather plain could have been achieved with the addition of plaster and/or paint, which would have enhanced the impact of the scenes even further, and may have set the leading figure apart through specific combinations of colour and patterns.

Audley-Miller (2012, 106-111) suggests that the cloak seen on the reliefs at Ghirza may be a chlamys, a mantle originally worn in the military and later by a whole range of office holders such as governors and praetorian prefects. In the late fourth century AD the military cloak rose to be a symbol of prestige and status amongst elites across the Roman Empire (Harlow 2004, 60-61, 66-68). Smith found that the chlamys statues, of which none can be dated before the late fourth century AD, are all situated in the eastern Empire (Smith 2016, 16-17). Mosaic depictions in the West, as for instance in Spain, North Africa, or Sicily show that the chlamys was also worn here (Grabar 1996). However, given the inherently local costume on the reliefs in Tripolitania, it is more likely that the individuals wore a different form of decorated cloak, which, nevertheless, reflected status and prestige. We recall Procopius quoted above, who mentions a white cloak gathered with a golden brooch on the shoulder as an ancient symbol of power (Vandal Wars III, xxv 7-15). Interestingly, the male portrayed on the mausoleum in the Wadi Meseuggi wears a mantle held with a brooch (>Me001-A-01). Military might instead was expressed through the presence of armed horsemen at Ghirza and the depictions of dressed and armoured men fighting and overwhelming naked opponents.

**Male Grooming**
Men were most commonly depicted with a beard and short hair on portraiture. The beard was often well groomed in small and tight curls, and, on some occasions, was without a moustache. The hair was frequently rendered in a similar style, showing well groomed, tight locks and curls. Beardless figures on portraits are rare, and only occur on the late second/early third century AD mausolea of Umm el-Agerem (>Ag002-A-01) and the Wadi N’Fd (>Nf031-A-01). Before the Antonine period, Roman male fashion was dictated by a clean shaven face. It was only during the reign of Hadrian that beards started to come back into fashion, and during the Severan periods, beards were the standard amongst men (Bartman 2001, 3). The male figures on Ag002-A-01 also wore a cap, the only occasion where a headdress is worn by a male portrait figure.
Interestingly, beards and carefully styled short locks are almost exclusively depicted on portrait reliefs. The vast majority of people involved in other activities such as hunting or agriculture appear to be beardless with very nondescript hair. In some exceptional cases, a bearded man is depicted amongst more general scenes, in particular at Ghirza. For instance, the nude stag-hunter of the southern cemetery (>Gh128-D-04) sported a beard and hair very similar to the man depicted in the portrait of that tomb. The rider on 129-C-16 may have also had a beard. A notable feature is that the dress of the rider was decorated with a zig-zag pattern similar to that of the dress of the individual sitting on the chair, again, perhaps an indication that the same person was depicted. On the same tomb a bearded male with the corners of his mouth downturned, is holding a vessel, most likely again representing the departed (>Gh129-C-15). Grooming of hair and beard was clearly used as a tool to set the deceased apart from the remaining figures on the tomb, denoting his high status through the grooming of beard and hair. On family portraits where the son is depicted, the presence or absence of a beard seems to distinguish boys from men (>Me001-A-01). Therefore, the wearing of the beard may represent a certain maturity, power, and social status.

The manner of the depiction of personal grooming and dress clearly set the images of the deceased apart from the rest of the figures of the tomb. The male individuals working the fields, for instance, wore the very generic everyday dress of a short tunic, and sometimes a belt. On rural scenes, the status of the foreman may be indicated by his wearing of a longer tunic (as, for instance, visible on the relief at Ghirza (>129-C-01; Zanker 2008, 217-219, see Figure 4.13), or the ploughing scene of the Wadi Tabuniyah (> Tb045-A-03). However, the combination of beards and more elaborate dress and/or cloaks seemed to be reserved to denote male status.

**Female Dress**

Depictions of female dress were even more limited in range than the attire of their male counterparts. The three portrait statues associated with a funerary context at the coast are in the style of the large Herculaneum woman, the *Pudicitia*, and the *Ceres* type. For these types, the dress style and the shape of the body were standardised and this does not tell us much about local costumes. Due to the compact shape of the body, with arms positioned close to the torso, these statues were easy to transport and were frequently imported already carved, while the head was added later (Trimble 2011, 164). For instance, the body of a statue of the large Herculaneum Woman type from Cyrenaica was carved in Asia Minor, but the head was
carved in Cyrene (Trimble 2011, 162-163; Figure 4.3). The same is probably true for the examples of Lepcis Magna, where marble had to be imported. These types of statues were popular with the imperial family and can be found across the Roman world as public and funerary statues (Davies 2013). The rich drapery emphasises the high status of the woman depicted and a sense of the individual was achieved through facial features and hairstyles, which will be discussed in more detail below.

The women’s dress in the pre-desert consisted mainly of local styles and fashions. At Ghirza, the female statue from the obelisk tomb was clad in a long garment of many thick folds that reached down to the ankles. A scarf was draped over her right shoulder. A comparable garment was worn by the second female bust, with a scarf or folds hanging down on the left shoulder. A similar scarf draped over the left shoulder was also depicted on the female portrait above the false door at Meseuggi (>Me001-A-01). The second female on this tomb wore a shawl or mantle crossed in front on top of the tunic. The third was dressed in a tunic with vertical folds over which a very elaborate piece of fabric was draped, arranged in many folds and with an intricate edging of semi-circular pieces of fabric or jewellery (>Me001-A-08). On the relief in the Wadi Khanafes, the female was wearing a long mantle draped over the body and reaching down to the ankles, a garment slightly longer than that of the male. The statue from the Wadi Antar is much damaged, but the female here seems to have worn a tunic with long sleeves and a pleated skirt that reached just over the knees.

**Female Grooming**

Several female figures were adorned with a plain necklace very close to the neck, some beads being rendered clearly. The statue from the Wadi Antar appears to have had a very bulky necklace, somewhat recalling the collar necklaces of Egypt (>An001-A-08). Earrings were also worn by several women. At Meseuggi two of the females wore earrings in the shape of long triangles or droplets (>Me001-A-01 and Me001-A-08). Similar earings were worn by the female statue of the Wadi Antar (>An001-A-08). Big loop earrings adorned the ears of one of the women depicted on the peripteral temple tomb at Ghirza (>Gh129-A-05), and slightly smaller loops are visible on a bust from the Wadi Mimoun (>Mm079-A-01).

Female hairstyles and headdresses were much more varied than those of their male counterparts, and appear to have changed over time. On the late second/early third century mausoleum of the Wadi Umm el-Agerem, the sitter sported a very distinct hairstyle. The hair was parted in the centre and piled up on top of the head, perhaps in braids (>Ag002-A-04).
This style is very similar to the hairstyle of Faustina the Elder that was popular in Rome in the late Flavian and early Antonine period. A statue sporting this hairstyle existed at Oea (Fittschen and Zanker 1983, Beilagen 13c). Ten funerary busts from Cyrene had the same hairstyle (Rosenbaum 1960, 115-118, Plates XCIII-XCV).

Associated with mausolea from the late second to mid-third century AD are portraits of women wearing a coiffure or turban, sometimes with a veil (>Gh128-A-01; see Brogan and Smith 1984, 184-185 and Audley Miller 2012 for Ghirza). The portraits from Ghirza (>Gh128-A-01; Gh128-A-03; Gh128-A-13) have already been discussed in more detail in chapter 5. A very similar headdress to that of Ghirza was depicted on the mausoleum in the Wadi Meseuggi, where two women wore a turban and a veil (>Me001-A-01; Me001-A-08). This tomb is roughly contemporary with the Ghirza obelisk according to the style of its capitals (Brogan, unpublished notes, SLS Archive). The female statue from the Wadi Antar also wore a turban with a veil (>An001-A-08), again similar to the statue from Ghirza. On Gh128-A, a figure carved on the first storey pilasters was, similarly, dressed in a turban.

Interestingly, such a headdress can perhaps also be seen on a stone from Mizda that depicted people arriving at a tower or gasr (>Mz001-A-01; Fontana 1997, 153). The date of this relief is not known, but it is an indication that this type of headdress was worn by women in everyday life. Turbans were arranged in two or three tiers of folded cloth, by which the hair was completely covered. Two comparative funerary busts of women wearing a turban come from Cyrene, both dated to the Antonine era (Rosenbaum 1960, 119-120; Plate XCVI 3 and 4). It should be noted that the turban as a prestigious headdress does not reappear on later Ghirza mausolea (Audley-Miller 2012, 102), a pattern also observable in the rest of the pre-desert mausolea. This absence does not mean that turbans were no longer worn. For instance, a high status woman dressed in a turban is depicted in the fourth century AD hypogeum of Gargarsesh (Di Vita 2004), showing that this kind of headdress has a long history in the region of Tripolitania.

A type of headdress that was previously associated with men is the pointed cap (Brogan unpublished notes, SLS Archive). Interestingly, on a number of reliefs from Ghirza (>Gh129-C-16), the Wadi Khanafes (>Kn005-A-02), and the Bir Sceuda Basin (>Bs072-A-01) pointed caps appear to be worn by females. For instance, the figure wearing a pointed hat on the relief at Ghirza is beardless, the attribute depicted next to it is a pomegranate, the dress is reaching down to the ankles and it is slightly smaller in size than the male figure (although still taller than the remaining figures). Another portrait on the same tomb shows the deceased man seated on a folded chair placed on a pedestal (>Gh129-C-04). The
beardless person standing right behind him was previously identified as male (Brogan and Smith 1984, 153). The figure is holding a long staff is wearing a pearl necklace with two strings of pearls, a long tunic with a mantle wrapped around it, and a decorated conical cap on the head. The long tunic and mantle teamed with a necklace and the pointed cap begs the question whether this person is female, and if this is the same person that appeared standing next to the deceased on Gh129-C-16. Instead of interpreting this figure as a male attendant, it could indeed be the wife of the deceased that is shown. Consequently, the two smaller figures standing on pedestals and holding vessels behind the seated man and the standing woman could be the children. A conical cap was also worn by the beardless figure holding a short staff who was again dressed in a long tunic decorated with two vertical stripes and wearing, perhaps, a necklace. This figure was placed behind the seated male on 129-B-04. Interestingly, a similar pointed cap was worn by two armed figures holding a spear and perhaps shields (>Gh129-C-10). Thus, pointed caps may have been an item of apparel that crossed over gender, and perhaps denoted status.

Particularly elaborate hairstyles and headdresses were featured in the Wadi Antar and at Bir el-Uaar (>An001-A-09; Ua001-A-01). The portrait from the Wadi Antar depicts two women. The one to the left has long flowing hair, covered by an elaborate veil, which appears to have been embroidered along the edges and featured curly tassels at the ends. The woman to the right wore a hairnet which was heavily decorated at the edges, on top of tightly coiled curls that reached down to just below the ear. There are no parallels to this kind of hairstyle and headdress elsewhere in Tripolitania, but hairnets were worn widely across the Mediterranean world throughout the Roman period. The relief busts bear very little indication of dress. The thick edge of a garment may be indicated around the neck of the figure on the left, but this could also be a necklace. It is, of course, probable that the decorations on the dress were painted on rather than sculptured, but it appears that main focus was on the hair. At Bir el-Uaar, the female depicted in a medallion either had her hair piled up on the top of the head in curls, or was wearing a diadem. The hair or veil was reaching down to her shoulders. Again, no dress was indicated here, but the focus was on the hair.

Two females were depicted on the mausoleum at Ghirza (>Gh129-A-05), both sporting yet another hairstyle. The hair was parted at the centre, and falling to the sides in neatly arranged waves, drawn back to the nape of the neck. This style was most likely inspired by wider Roman fashions at the imperial court, perhaps by Julia Mamaea (late second/early third century AD; Brogan and Smith 1984, 123), or Otacilia Severa (mid-third century AD;
Audley-Miller 2012, 102; See Fittschen and Zanker 1983, 34-35, no. 37). The women to the viewer's right perhaps wore a veil. A similar hair style can perhaps also be seen on the mausoleum of the Wadi Meseuggi (>Me001-A-02).

The distinction of status amongst the women depicted is difficult to unravel. It may be that the presence or absence of a veil or turban or the wearing of specific jewellery such as earrings denoted age or marital status, but this is not entirely clear from the images we have to hand. This is exacerbated by the fact that women depicted in sculptural form were not always mentioned in the inscriptions that were present. However, although difficult to determine now, it does appear that female dress and attire held subtle messages that were to be understood by the local viewer, about their social status, gender and perhaps age.

6.2.4 Discussion: Defining Identity - Power, Status, and Gender

The portrait sculpture that has survived until today shows that the local elite engaged with local as well as Roman dress styles, actively choosing certain elements of both cultures to define their status, their gender and their power in local society. The evidence from the coast shows a strong engagement with wider Mediterranean modes of self-representation in the form of imported portrait statues. The portraiture of the hinterlands, however, shows a much more nuanced and subtle engagement with wider Mediterranean influences. The portrait reliefs reflect the complexity of identity construction within a colonial context. Despite the Roman hegemony, the social potency of the Tripolitanian portraits in the local community was not based solely on their similarity to the Roman portraits (Heyn, 2010, 643 for a similar argument on the portraits of Palmyra). The discovery of patterns that draw attention to such aspects as gender and family ties sheds much light on the ways in which new styles of (Roman) funerary art could be used to communicate the multifaceted identities of the social elite in a post-conquest world (Heyn 2010, 644).

Crucially, in particular, in the hinterlands, the funerary monument was the only opportunity for the individual to be commemorated with a likeness (however abstract). Honorary statues or portrait busts like in the big coastal cities, which were focal points and symbols of social and political power (Smith 2016, 3), did not exist, and thus the mausolea provided the perfect canvas to commemorate and honour the individuals and the whole family unit. In the coastal cities, and in particular at Lepcis Magna, the dedication of statues played a primary role in defining social status and the relationship between leading families.
(Bigi and Tantillo 2016, 215). Interestingly, at Lepcis Magna a local custom developed during the second and third century AD. This custom required heirs to honour the dead patron with a statue *ex testamento* before they could receive their heritage (Bigi and Tantillo 2016, 215; see also Jacques 1986, 554, 774). Thus, there was clearly a close connection between the dead and the importance of their commemoration in the form of statues. Due to the lack of big urban centres in the Tripolitanian hinterlands, the mausolea probably fulfilled these functions, and they were often set up by a family member to pay homage to the leading family member(s) and the powerful elite. The way the elite represented themselves on reliefs changed over time from the focus on the individual and the family’s status in society to images that denote power and control over agricultural activities and trade as well as military and judicial powers, particularly at Ghirza (see also Chapter 5).

On many of the bust-reliefs, both men and women wore a garment that was diagonally wrapped across the body and crossed over in the front. There does not appear to be a gender distinction in this kind of dress, and Mattingly suggests that this may not represent an everyday garment, but a funerary shroud (Mattingly 2003, 165; 2013, 261). Audley Miller instead argues that this was the dress of the living, which would be more in line with the remaining imagery of the mausolea, where figures were depicted in everyday dress (2012, 104). Unfortunately, we do not have any archaeological evidence for how the body was treated after death in this region, but in Fazzan to the south, for instance, bodies were indeed wrapped in funerary shrouds (Cole 2010, 101-102). Arms and hands are usually not indicated on this type of portrait relief. If this was indeed a shroud, they would have been wrapped up in the fabric. Interestingly, the facial expression of individuals wearing this type of garment frequently displays the downturned corners of the mouth. Facial features can be particularly evocative, especially when viewed together with dress, posture and other symbols. This combination can tell the viewer about the individual’s status and identity (Hope 1997, 114), and in the case of Tripolitania perhaps distinguished the dead from the living.

Hairstyles in portraiture especially appear to have functioned as a cultural marker (Walker, 1997, 2), negotiating between Roman fashions and local influences. Due to the great focus on headdress and hair, it is reasonable to assume that hairstyle was a particularly strong marker of status and gender. At Ghadames, the braided hair on top of the head may also have ceremonial significance, as pointed out in Chapter 5. The variety of female hairstyles and personal adornments such as jewellery is noticeable, especially when considering that dress, in general, is depicted as having been quite plain without any indication of decoration,
apart from the elaborate shawl at Meseuggi. Some of the hairstyles were clearly influenced by wider trends in the Empire, which were set by the women of the court at Rome, while dress, where visible, appears to be much more influenced by local styles. Jewellery was worn exclusively by women in the form of necklaces and earrings. More subtle differences such as veils or jewellery denoting marital status are difficult to detect since the faces are rendered in a rather ageless manner. However, it is notable that most women wore some form of head cover.

The portrait scenes on mausolea 129-B and 129-C at Ghirza stand out in Tripolitanian iconography since they are the only examples of interactive or ceremonial scenes that are known in the region. The changing power relations in the frontier zones of the late Roman Empire were also reflected in a change in dress style, at least on the reliefs of Ghirza. The gradual loss of control by Rome over its borderlands was already felt in the abandonment of the forts of Bu Njem and Ghadames. The power of the landlords slowly changed to be not only over the agricultural production, but also over the safekeeping of the local communities and the maintenance of the limes zone. Thus their role progressively extended to defending the region and maintaining stability. The rise of fortified farms (gsur) in Tripolitania, and a gradual change of settlement patterns from more dispersed (if often substantial) farms to settlements often clustered around gsur is visible across the region from the third century onwards (Sheldrick 2017, 233), reflecting the increasing instability of the limes. By the fifth century AD, the frontier zone was, in essence, controlled by independent landlords who, at least officially, were still Roman appointees (Liebeschuetz 2015, 67).

The increasingly elaborate dress on the late Ghirza tombs and the change from portrait busts to elites exercising their power over others reflect the increasing political influence the leading families had in the region. The careful analysis of the dress, adornments and other attributes and gestures of Gh129-B and Gh129-C suggests that the reliefs depict a family paying homage to the former head of the household who was being transferred into the realm of the ancestors. The attributes of authority depicted on the tombs such as the sella curulis, the fasces, the military dress, and the staff held by some individuals emphasise the significant symbolic meaning and do not only highlight the power of the individual but also stress the power of the whole family.
6.3 The Commissioner and the Artist: Workshops, Genres, and Trends

As demonstrated in the previous chapters, the range of imagery that was displayed on the mausolea developed and grew in complexity over time. Judging from the large number of mausolea that have survived until today, it is very likely that specialised workshops established themselves in the region to decorate the monuments. Whether or not these workshops were also involved in the construction of farms, and later gsur is unclear, but it is plausible. We have no knowledge about how these workshops functioned, but they were, in all probability, mobile, and workmen travelled from one commission to the next (on migrant carvers elsewhere see for instance Kleiner 1977; Trimble 2011; Russell 2013). Initially, they were probably trained in the workshops of the coastal cities and, over time, they started to move further inland. Fontana suggests that dedicated workshops operated in the pre-desert and that these carried out the works for mausolea. We do not know how those workshops were assembled, and it is possible that workmen and skilled craftsmen were hired according to demand (Birke 2012, 33; Russell 2013, 329-336). Thus, it would not always be the same craftsmen working in the same workshops, which may account for the diversity in carving styles across the region.

For the Gebel Tarhuna, Ahmed suggests the establishment of workshops that supplied the local community with stones needed for the construction of farms and olive presses (2010, 139). A similar arrangement in stone supply is also plausible for the mausolea since they were built of stones that were locally available, with essentially the same material being quarried for ashlar elements of farm buildings as for the mausolea (Figure 6.3). Thus, the construction and the rendering of the decorations depended on the local material that was available. The use of marble outside the coastal cities was rare, and it was probably too costly to acquire and transport over considerable distances. For instance, marble funerary inscriptions were primarily evident at the coastal cities (e.g. IRT2009, 108; 109; 110; 114; 154; 159; 166; 662; 705; 712; 719; 733; 763). In contrast, not a single funerary inscription, or indeed any other element of funerary structure, made of marble has been found in the pre-desert or desert. In other areas of Tripolitania, a marble inscription with Libyan text has been found near Cussabat in the eastern Gebel (IRT2009, 879), and only one marble cult statue is known from the eastern Gebel at Ras el-Haddagia (Goodchild 1951) and one from the Gefara (>Gu001-B-01; Trousset 1974, 124-126).
We do not know what radius the workshops operated over. This almost certainly depended on the demand for their skills in certain areas. The workshop that specialised in the incised contour technique seemed to operate over a radius of about 50 km in the Gefara and the Gebel but, of course, they could also have had commissions in the coastal cities or further afield, of which all traces are now lost. The similarities in themes and style of rendering suggest that the reliefs of Ghirza 128-C and the mausoleum at the Wadi al-Binaya were rendered by the same workshop or even the same craftsman. They were located about 100 km west of Ghirza as the crow flies. The inscription from Gh128-A indicates that the craftsmen were indeed mobile since it lists the feeding and housing of the craftsmen during construction as a separate cost. The inscription from the Wadi Umm el Agerem named Annobal and Imiltho as the builders of the mausoleum, and in the Wadi el-Amud the builders were named as Bodastart and Arisam. Although these tomb builders bore Punic names, this does not necessarily preclude them from being Libyan, especially since Annobal appears to be the son of a man with a distinctly Libyan name and Annobal was thus of Libyan descent (Mattingly 1995; see Chapter 5 for discussion of the family tree).

Several different skills were needed to erect and decorate the mausolea, from cutting stones in the quarries, shaping them, carving capitals and other architectural decorations, to the carving of the reliefs, statues, and inscriptions. One person could, of course, acquire more than one of those skills, but it is likely that a substantial workforce was needed to
complete the monuments in a reasonable amount of time, and that at least some of the
workers had very specific skills.

It is likely that the builders and carvers brought their tools with them, possibly as
well as some elements of the scaffolding to erect the monument, since substantial trees were
rare in the remote areas of the pre-desert and desert, although the trunks of palm trees were
perhaps also used. Tool marks on some stones suggest that the tooth chisel was used to
rough out the image, and to create the flat surface for the background of the relief (Wooton
et al. 2013a, 4; Figure 6.4a-b). The use of a drill is evident on, for instance, the female statue
at Ghirza, where the folds of the neckline, the headdress and probably the eyes were worked
with this tool (Wooton et al. 2013a, 7-8; Figure 6.4c-d). The drapery folds of the female statue
at Ghirza also seem to be rendered with a drill. Perhaps a rasp was used to smoothen the
surface of the reliefs after carving them with a chisel. Some of the figural reliefs were perhaps
cut on the ground before they were placed on the monument, since, in many cases, the relief
panels held self-contained scenes that did not spread over several panels (Wooton et al.
2013b, 15). However, in the Wadi Antar, the chariot race (An001-A-10) appears to be carved
across two panels, which suggest that this scene was carved on scaffolding while the stones
were already placed on the monument.

Figure 6.4 Tool marks on Tripolitnian funerary sculpture. a-b) Relief from an unknown mausoleum
in the pre-desert showing tooth chisel tool marks (>Bu001-A-07; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); c-
d) Deep grooves probably produced by a drill around the necklace and neckline and the deep folds
of the headdress, Ghirza (>Gh128-A-13; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).
Tool marks are frequently still visible on the reliefs (Figure 6.5). This begs the question of whether they were covered with a layer of stucco or paint, which would eliminate the need to smooth the surface. The sculpture on the pre-Roman mausoleum at Sabratha, and the pre-Roman statue from Leptis Magna show traces of stucco (Di Vita 1968), indicating that this technique was known and used at least in the coastal cities already before the Roman period. The use of colour on the tombs would not be surprising, but no detailed studies have yet been conducted to prove this. More tangible evidence to support the theory that the mausolea decorations were painted is provided by stucco and plaster which has been found at Ghirza on scrolls in relief that decorated the temple, together with evidence for paint (Brogan and Smith 1985, 244-246). Paint, plaster, and stucco would simply not survive for millennia exposed to the harsh climate of Tripolitania, but the plastered and stuccoed decorations from Ghirza that survive sheltered inside structures strongly suggest that the mausolea could have also been painted. Painting sculpture was a common practice in the Roman world, and the impact of the reliefs would have been rather dramatic, especially in the more desert-like landscape. The use of plaster, stucco, and paint would have also allowed additional detail that would have smoothed over some of the sometimes more crudely carved reliefs. The absence of carved dress on some of the portraits (>An001-A-09; Mm079-A-01; Md001-C-01) and the seemingly floating figures on some of the reliefs at Ghirza (>Gh129-C-12) support the theory that plaster and paint were used to further enhance the sculpture of the mausolea.

Figure 6.5: Ploughing scene from el-Ausaf in the Gefara which shows the carved and corrected outline of ploughman’s face (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).
It is unclear how the commissioner chose certain scenes, or how the motif was transferred onto the stone (see for instance Birke 2012; Russell 2013 for a similar question on the rendering of sarcophagi). For architectural decorations and geometric patterns the use of pattern books is likely. For instance, scrolls, rosettes and other patterns are often executed very well, succeeding in producing patterns that are well arranged, well-spaced and well executed. The measurements for these patterns could be transferred onto the stone without much need for change or adaptation.

An indication of the use of pattern books for figurative motifs is given by the similarities between certain compositions in the different regions of Tripolitania. This suggests that pattern books helped the commissioner to choose, and the artist to render the scene (Allison 1991; Andreae 1973; Carucci 2007, 103; Koortbojian 1995, 71 argues against the use of pattern books). The corrected outline from the relief at el-Ausaf shows that the figures were first sketched onto the stone (Figure 6.5), but it is unclear how the motif was transferred from the pattern book onto the stone. It is notable that many of the scenes were freely adapted to suit the requirements of the commissioner, which led to a wide variety of versions of similar subject matter. There are, nevertheless, enough similarities and close replications between certain figures on mausolea, a considerable distance away from each other, to strongly suggest the use of pattern books (for similar arguments for wall painting, mosaic and sarcophagi scenes see Ling 1990, 217-218; Birke 2012, 22).

The use of pattern books may also explain the similarities of motifs in mosaic and wall paintings to some of the scenes on the mausolea, such as the hunting scenes, arena motifs or the agricultural scenes. In previous chapters, I have, on numerous occasions, referred to North African mosaics that were strikingly similar in theme to the iconography on the mausolea. In fact, when comparing the development of certain subject matter within domestic mosaic art with the evolution of the funerary sculpture, it appears that there was a close relationship between the two. Certain trends that first appeared in mosaic art soon appeared on the iconography of mausolea, agricultural scenes, and hunting scenes in particular. This section will give a brief overview of the developments of themes in mosaic in relation to funerary iconography, based on Dunbabin’s detailed study on the Roman mosaics of North Africa. Like the decorations on mausolea, mosaic pavements developed from the first century onwards from generic patterns to more complex figural compositions (Dunbabin 1979, 34).
The earliest figural mosaics were limited to a repertoire that was, in style and composition, rather common across the Classical world, such as patterns of fish, birds or still-life subjects included in *emblemata*. The genre of mythological scenes was limited to subjects that were amongst the most common across the Empire, such as the Rape of Ganymede at Sousse and El-Djem or Perseus and Andromeda from Bulla Regia (Dunbabin 1979, 38-39). Dunbabin noted that the episodes ‘do not suggest a deep familiarity with the subject matter, and have none of the literary tinges which characterise some of the mosaics found, for instance, in Antioch’ (1979, 38). In fact, the range of mythological subjects always remained relatively limited in North Africa, especially in comparison with the extensive repertoire on Roman wall painting (such as that at Pompeii), Roman sarcophagi or the domestic mosaics of the East (Carucci 2007, 96). This strikes a particular chord with the development of scenes on mausolea, where mythological scenes are very rare, and highlights the distinct regional preferences of commissioners not only within the funerary realm, but also within domestic art.

In the early third century AD, there was a sudden rise in mosaics depicting hunting scenes, which increased in popularity until the fourth century AD. This period also marked a departure from the *emblemata* panels to more freely arranged scenes until they became more and more cluttered and eventually developed into the *horror vacui*, where every available space was filled (Dunbabin 1979, 34). The earliest hunting mosaics included the heroic hunt, where nude heroes of the mythological world were involved in the hunt. This scene was soon replaced by more realistic hunts, where the patron was depicted in contemporary clothes carrying out his favourite activity. The hunting parties were frequently accompanied by hunting dogs. Animals hunted included hares, boars, foxes, and herbivores. By the mid-third century, the heroic hunt had almost disappeared from mosaic art and by the late third century AD, the prey consisted mainly of big and dangerous animals such as lions or tigers, moving away from more realistic ‘everyday’ depictions of hunting and focused instead on the maximum action and excitement. By now, hunting scenes were no longer displayed as a continuative narrative, but several self-contained scenes would occupy one mosaic. These would include scenes of hunting as well as of *venatores* in an amphitheatre and chariot races in the circus, which also became a very popular subject across North Africa (Dunbabin 1979, 54).

The sudden increase in hunting mosaics was probably caused by the demand of patrons who wanted their favourite activity displayed on their floors. The mosaics depicted mainly ‘real’ hunts and probably had little symbolic function (Dunbabin 1979, 52). Hunts
were popular not only in mosaic art but also in wall painting, as for instance displayed in the hunting bath outside the Oea gate of Lepcis Magna at some point in the second century AD (Musso with Matoug 2012, 35).

Hunting scenes start appearing on mausolea at some point during the mid-third century AD, correlating with their rise in popularity in mosaic depictions. On the mausolea, they predominantly consist of real hunts, and the mythological hunt only perhaps appears at Ghirza, where a naked hunter is depicted with a lion on Gh128-E-06. The hunt with the net that was depicted in the Wadi al-Binaya is unique within the funerary iconography of Tripolitania (>Bin001-A-05). However, this method of hunting appears frequently in mosaic art across North Africa (Dunbabin 1978, 69 Plate 54; Poinssot and Quoniam 1952, 157-165) and it is plausible that this scene was inspired by a pattern originally designed for other media such as mosaic. That this type of hunting was practised in Tripolitania is very plausible. For instance in the Wadi Khanafes walls that appear to have been designed to funnel animals into a smaller space, perhaps so that they could be caught in nets, are visible on satellite imagery (Figure 6.7). 

Figure 6.6: Walls for hunting with a net(?) indicated in red in the Wadi Khanafes. The topography on higher ground suggests that these walls were not for water management, but for another purpose, such as funnelling animals into a smaller space, (Image: Google Earth).

Thanks to Nichole Sheldrick for pointing this feature out to me.
The *horror vacui* that was popular in mosaic art by the late third century AD is also detectable on the panels of the fourth century AD mausolea at Ghirza (Mattingly 2011, 251>Gh129-C), further highlighting the possibility that there was some connection between domestic mosaic art and the reliefs on mausolea. The potential arena scenes at Ghirza (>Gh129-B) thus may have also been inspired by a pattern book which held motifs popular in mosaic art, as may the chariot race from the Wadi Antar (>An001-A). However, it is clear that these motifs were not chosen at random, but appear to have some real connection to the commissioner and the lived reality of the area. Libya, in particular, was one of the main sources for wild beasts for the arena (Sparreboom 2016, 67-98).

It is possible that some of the patrons saw popular motifs during a visit to the coast and, therefore, desired a similar image on the tomb. More likely, though, is that at least some of the images were prompted by motives contained in pattern books, carried by the artists. Such images thus gained popularity in funerary art. This is not to say that the imagery on the mausolea lost all its symbolic meaning and was merely chosen because of trends. However, the choice was certainly influenced by wider preferences, and hunting scenes in particular, held some significance and appeal to the elite over other themes in the pattern books. As already stressed in the previous chapters, hunting was a lived reality in the hinterlands of Tripolitania, and not only served as a favoured leisure activity of the elite but also was important to protect crop, livestock, and people. Combined with its possible symbolic function of safeguarding the tomb and fighting evil, it was a powerful image that went beyond the mere decorative function.

### 6.4 The Commissioner and the Viewer - Intention, Perception, and the Impact of Monumentality

Crucially, tomb monuments were addressed to the local community, which had specific customs and ideas about the veneration of the dead. I have argued throughout the thesis that the choice of figures was not governed by matters of ‘inspiration’ or creativity as such, but was closely linked to the intentions of the patron and the craftsman (see for instance Livingston 2005 on ‘art and intention’ more generally). Because of their durability, the meaning associated with the monuments inevitably changes over time, though physically they may stay the same (Thomas 2007, 4; Meyers 2012, 13). Many of the ancient Tripolitania mausolea are called *senaïm* in Arabic, a word linked to ancient religious structures, and the
Mausolea were associated with powerful spirits, Jjins, that resided in them (Richardson 1848, 355-356; Mattingly and Sterry 2011, 21, 67, 73). The custom of visiting ancient tombs and making offerings to the dead is still celebrated today across Libya and North Africa (Mattingly with Edwards 2003; Figure 6.8a-b).

What gives true meaning to a monument are the activities that are performed in and around the structure. This is a two-way process: first, the architecture of the building can constrain or deliberately shape these activities (access or restricted access to the funerary chamber, surrounding walls, location of libation channels and offering tables, false doors, placement of figural decorations); second, the people themselves shape the space by performing rituals around it, by the way they actively interact with the monument and the way they assign meaning to it (Hillier and Hanson 1984). Thus, as pointed out in Chapter 1, we assign agency to monuments, but they themselves also apply their agency to us, depending on, and influenced by, our beliefs, thoughts, and actions (Hoskins 2006; Osborne 2014, 3-4). The sheer size and embellishment of the mausolea had several functions: it created a division between the more powerful elite families and their subordinates (for similar ideas see Pollock 1999, 175); it asserted boundaries and property rights; and, perhaps most importantly, it created a social relationship – a social memory – through the acts of mourning, ritual, and remembrance that took place at the tomb between the people who engaged with the monument and the deceased (Assmann 2011, 149; Osbourne 2014, 10, 13; Wendrich 2014, 412). Through this, the monuments became part of the communal or collective memory and social identity of the group that engaged with them.

Figure 6.7: Modern examples of the veneration of the dead in Libya, a) Islamic tomb (marabout) with incense burners at Germa (Image: Mattingly and Edwards 2003, Figure 6.5); b) offering vessels on graves at Guddwa (Image: Mattingly and Edwards 2003, Figure 6.47).
However, who is this ‘viewer’ or the ‘audience’? Can we indeed get an idea about the often very personal interpretation of the imagery? Fowler was certainly right when he stated that: ‘nothing is more changeable than the meaning of a monument’ (Fowler 2000, 206), which is also true of its iconography. After all, how the iconography is interpreted depends on the viewer’s identities and experiences, such as gender, status, education or origin, and is, therefore, highly subjective (Clark 2003, especially 1-13; Freedberg 1989, especially xix-xxi; Stewart 2008, 123-124). We cannot reconstruct the reactions or emotions that the ancient viewer had when faced with the monument, which would have altered depending on the historical and personal circumstances. What we can do is to analyse carefully the evidence we have available for the different actors that engaged and (physically) shaped the monuments to get perhaps a glimpse at the agency that was given to the monument and its sculptures, and how it may have impacted the viewer and vice versa. Furthermore, in seeking to study perceptions of the iconography by ancient viewers we need to recognize that we know too much and too little. It is questionable whether the local viewer (or indeed the commissioner) knew about the detailed Punic, Hellenistic, Roman or Alexandrian origin of certain architectural features or types of imagery, or the wider patterns of preference for certain themes and monument types in other regions. What mattered was local relevance, a memorial with which the local community could identify, and imagery that was fitting and appropriate for the ancient viewer at the time and place of construction.

Apart from the poem of the Flavii mausoleum, we have next to no contemporary literary sources that deal with the perception of the viewer, but, nevertheless, some more general observations can be made (Zanker 1997, 179). What we can gain is an idea about ‘communal patterns of response’, which addresses the general expectations and characteristics common amongst the community of the viewer in the particular region (Stewart 2003, 15). In this context, there needs to be a degree of common ground between what the patron intended the monument and imagery for and what the audience expected of it (see Hölscher 1984 on the ‘Übereinstimmungen’ between political representations and the viewer’s expectations).

Funerary monuments had a very specific function: first and foremost, they were monuments to commemorate the dead, places to mourn and to hold rituals to the ancestors. They were also vehicles to create and promote individual and group identity. In contrast to public dedications which had a broad range of viewer, funerary iconography operated on a more local level, and the imagery was predominantly aimed at the local community. The commissioner and the viewer were aware of these primary functions of mausolea. Thus,
there appears to have been a consensus between the commissioner’s intention and the viewer’s expectation. As Stewart points out, the artist and the commissioner were also viewers (2003, 15) and they should not be treated in isolation. The poem of the Flavii mausoleum of Kasserine suggests this, since the son of the deceased, who, at the same time, was the commissioner, was also buried in the mausoleum, and the second poem seems to be addressed to him:

Now the façade is marked with firmly-fixed words, and a life trusting in the inscriptions can be observed. I hope, Secundus, that you live happily for many years, and that you read the monument that you yourself made (Translation Pillinger 2013, 181).

That people directly interacted with the funerary monument is evident through the offering tables and libation channels that were present. The inscriptions at Ghirza also support this, where the wish is expressed that the sons and grandsons visit the mausoleum (IRT2009 898), and celebrations in honour of the ancestors are highlighted (IRT2009, 994). What kind of ritual took place around the tomb is difficult to reconstruct with the archaeological evidence we have at hand. Nonetheless, it appears that the mausolea were continuously visited, and offerings of food and liquid were being made, a custom still observable in some parts of Libya today, as pointed out above. Herodotus and Mela tell us about a practice carried out by the Augilae, who lived in the oasis of Augila, in north-eastern Cyrenaica, and slept outside burials to communicate with the powerful ancestors in dreams (Herodotus, the Histories, 4.172; Mela, de situ orbis libri III, I.46; Appendix 1.1.7 and 1.1.8):

It is important to keep in mind that Mela, who wrote four centuries later, drew heavily on Herodotus (Romer 1998, 70) and there is a clear similarity between the two above passages. Some credibility about the long existence of this custom is given by the fact that similar practices were observed much later, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, carried out by the Berber and Tuareg of the Maghreb and the Sahara (Duveyrier 1868, 415; Foucauld 1918, 115; Foureau 1902, 66; Camps 1986, 163). Women who wanted to know about the well-being of their absent husband would sleep on top of Pre-Islamic tombs (Camps 1986, 163), and people would sleep in shrines (kouba) or caves where holy men were buried to receive revealing or premonitory dreams (Doutté 1909, 412; Basset 1920, 61). El Bekri mentions tombs at Gurza that were still used for worship in the 10th century (El Bekri 1913, 31; Mattingly 1995, 212-213; Mattingly 2011, 267). The poem of the Flavii at Kasserine also states the divine qualities of the deceased and the mausoleum, to which the poet refers
to as a temple (see above), and to the importance of the funerary monument as a place where the ancestors resided.

In this context, it is important to note that outside the big coastal cities, temples and sanctuaries have rarely been identified (Figure 6.9). They are often relatively small in size (Brogan and Smith 1984, 80–92; Rebuffat 1990; Brouquier-Reddé 1992; Mattingly and Dore 1996, 141-142), and it is very difficult to associate them with particular farm buildings (Sheldrick 2017, 237). An exception might be military forts, which frequently had small sanctuaries or temples associated with them where syncretised cults were worshipped, thus indicating that their behaviour was very different to that of the rural community (Mattingly 2011, 245). For instance, outside the fort of Bu Njem small temples were dedicated to Mars Canapphar, Vanammon, Jupiter Hammon and other, unknown deities (Rebuffat 1990; Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 148–160) and a number of portable shrines and temples were recorded at Gheriat el-Garbia (Goodchild 1954b, 60–66; Jones and Barker 1983, 64–67; Mattingly 1996, 98–105; Mackensen 2012, 53–54; Sheldrick 2017, 94). The rural communities, instead, venerated gods that were predominantly of non-syncretised, Libyan origin such as Ammon or Gurzil (Mattingly 2011, 243-245).

Within the civilian context, the evidence is less tangible. There is, of course, the possibility of natural shrines that were frequented, such as trees or caves. Still, more survey work is needed to identify sites with religious and ritual significance in the Tripolitanian hinterland.

![Figure 6.8: Map of temples and sanctuaries in Tripolitania, (Data: Brouquier-Reddé 1992).](image)
with more certainty. The near absence of temples is striking, and one has to wonder about the relationship of the temple-like mausolea with local cults. Notably, a small temple at Tinina in the pre-desert has long been identified as a mausoleum due to their architectural similarities, until an inscription was found that indicated that this was in fact small temple (IRT2009, 888; Gentilucci 1933, 187; Goodchild 1949; 1951)

The largest temple outside the coastal cities was located at Ghirza, in which a now unknown deity was venerated. It was in use from the second century AD, and continuously enlarged and altered up to the seventh century AD, when it was eventually destroyed by a fire (Brogan and Smith 1984, 80-92). Offering tables identical to the ones outside tombs and also similar in style to the offering tables in the cemeteries of Ghirza were found in this temple (cemeteries 2, 3, and 4, see Brogan and Smith 1984, 87-88). Also found within the temple were 26 altars, of which some resemble buildings or recall the architecture of the mausolea (Figure 6.10a-b; see Brogan and Smith 1984, 243-245 for a description of the altars). Another noteworthy link between the temple and the mausolea can be made in the sculpture that was found in both, and in other burials. Sculpted heads have been found associated with both the temple (Figure 6.10c) and the cemeteries, where they functioned as headstones (Figure 6.910-e). On the relief from Mausoleum F in the southern cemetery (>Gh128-F-10), similar heads were lined up on a shelf above a man who was holding a bowl (Figure 6.10f). A goat was tied up behind him. This scene has been interpreted as a person making preparations for offerings in the temple (Brogan and Smith 1984, 88). A head on a shelf also seems to be depicted on a relief from a temple tomb at Nesma in the Wadi Sofeggin (>Sf092-A-01), although this scene is a little bit more ambiguous (Figure 6.10g). At Ghirza there appears to be a close connection between the ritual that was celebrated in the temple, and the ritual that was carried out at tombs and mausolea, suggesting that the latter had a religious function as well as serving as memorials and markers of status. They functioned as shrines to the ancestors, and, as we have seen in the previous chapter (Chapter 5) that discussed the festivities surrounding mausolea at Ghirza, large festivals took place at the burials to venerate the dead.

I will here only briefly address the presence of Christian churches in Tripolitania. Christianity, for a long time, did not have a stronghold in the Tripolitanian hinterlands, and fewer than ten churches have been recorded so far dating from the late fourth century AD onwards, most of them in the Gebel. The number of Christian inscriptions is also very low and, again, they mainly concentrate on the area of the Gebel and the coastal cities (Ward-Perkins and Goodchild 1953, 35-56; Mattingly 1995, 209-213; 1996c: 337–338; Dossey 2010;
Leone 2013). The architectural decoration of the churches is very similar in style to that of the mausolea, and it would be worth exploring this in more detail in a future study, but it does not fit within the scope of this Ph.D. What is crucial here is that paganism survived until the sixth century AD in the Tripolitanian countryside (Conant 2012, 267-268; for ancient authors, see Corippus Iohannis 2.109-11; 3.81-85; 5.494-502; 6.145-90; 8.300-17). Christianity does not seem to have had a major impact, especially in the Tripolitanian hinterlands, until the 6th century AD, and, instead, paganism remained predominant in this region before Islam (Mattingly 1995, 212-213).

The sacred or protective status certain imagery held in Tripolitania can perhaps be best demonstrated by the relatively small and selective number of figurative decorations on domestic buildings throughout the regions (Appendix 1.5). In fact, heavily decorated farm buildings are rare, even with more standard architectural decorations. Luxury elements such as mosaics, columns, porticoes and bath houses were particularly rare in the pre-desert (seven structures in total), but more common in the Gefara and the Gebel (64 structures in total; Sheldrick 2017, 148). Figural relief decorations displayed on farms were also unusual in the Gefara and the Desert in particular and completely absent at the coast (Table 6.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2: Types and numbers of figural decorations displayed on domestic buildings in Tripolitania.</th>
<th>Gefara</th>
<th>Gebel</th>
<th>Pre-desert</th>
<th>Desert</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phallus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man with large phallus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle with prey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle/lion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting scene</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting scene/eagle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winged figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornucopia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian symbol</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm tree/figure holding palm leaf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wreath</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.9: a) and b) Altars found in the temple of Ghirza (Building 32; Image: Brogan and Smith 1984, 21a; 22a); c) Stone head found in the temple of Ghirza (Image: Smith, SLS Archive); d-e) Stone heads from the cemeteries at Ghirza (Image: Smith, SLS Archive); f) Relief from 128-F at Ghirza showing the preparation for an offering, perhaps in a temple (Image: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 125a); g) Relief depicting a head on a shelf from the Nesma in the Wadi Sofeggin (Image: Brogan, SLS Archive).
Figure 6.10: Decorations from gsur. a) Gasr Azziz in the Wadi Merdum (ULVS Md28; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); b) Displaced relief, Tarhuna from a mausoleum or gasr (>Gar001-A-03; Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive); c) Gasr Isawi (ULVS Nf037; Image: Brogan, SLS Archive); d) Relief from Gasr or mausoleum, Tarhuna (>Gar001-A-01; Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive; e) Phallus from gasr, Wadi Mansur (UVLS Mn006; Image: ULVS Archive); f) Eagle, Ghadames, from gasr or mausoleum (Image: Author; image enhanced with brown overlay); g) Wadi Musa, stone from Gasr or mausoleum (Image: ULVS Archive); h) Relief from gasr or mausoleum, Tarhuna (>Gar001-A-02; Image: Ward-Perkins, SLS Archive).
Notably, the majority of sculpture associated with domestic structures was found near, or still integrated into, doorways and main entrances/exits, possibly to protect the building and its inhabitants. Phalli were particularly popular, probably due to their protective symbolism to avert the evil eye (Picard 1954, 157). Interestingly, despite their strong symbolism, they have been found only rarely on mausolea (three times in total) and appear to be symbols particularly reserved for domestic buildings. Hunting also had a safeguarding function but, as argued above, it had a very real and everyday reality in Tripolitania. Yet, combined with the eagle, it, again, bears some strong protective symbolism (see also Chapter 4). This particular combination of the hunter and the eagle is absent on the mausolea.

Some of the pieces recorded near farm buildings were out of context, and it is not clear if they derived from the farm building, or if they were part of a destroyed mausoleum. For instance, at Ghadames a very weathered stone depicted a large eagle and a horse and rider (>Gha001-A-11). Two displaced reliefs from Tarhuna display a very similar scene, and they could come from either a mausoleum or a domestic structure (>Gar001-A-01 and Gar001-A-03). Interestingly, it appears that some of the reliefs that originally came from mausolea were later integrated into farm buildings since their size is different to the surrounding masonry. On a few occasions, it is clear that the decorations were specifically designed for the building, since they fit well into the surrounding masonry and appear to be custom made to fit the particular space. Overall, the limited figural decoration on domestic structures above or near doorways suggests that the reliefs had a very specific protective function, and were seen as powerful imagery to safeguard the building and its inhabitants. The choice of scene was rather specific and suggests that mausolea and domestic structures had different sets of imagery associated with them, a subtlety recognizable to the commissioner and the viewer. Sculptured stones that originally came from a mausoleum, perhaps collapsed by the time the domestic structure was built, may have been a particularly potent protection.

The above suggests that the viewer of the mausolea was aware of the religious function of the buildings as a shrine to venerate the ancestors. The audience engaged actively with the monument, while the monument’s agency as a sacred structure, perhaps even a temple as the poem of the mausoleum of the Flavii suggests, influenced how the viewer interacted with the mausoleum. There was a clear distinction between imagery that was appropriate to decorate and safeguard the structures of the living, such as phalli and hunting scenes, and imagery that was fit to guard the structures of the dead. Overall, it appears that
all imagery had some protective or religious connotation, which was understood and differentiated by the local audience. Within Tripolitania, this perception of the divine nature of the mausolea appears to be very long lasting. The continuous practice of offerings at tombs until today has already been stressed above. Furthermore, the Arab geographer El-Bekri of the 10th century tells of a stone idol named ‘Gurza’ (Ghirza?) in the pre-desert that was still worshipped by his contemporaries (El Bekri 1913; Brogan and Smith 1984, 36). Traveller accounts from the eighteenth and nineteenth century indicate that the mausolea at Ghirza and their figural decorations were perceived by the locals as ancient inhabitants that were turned into stone by divine powers (Brogan and Smith 1984, 36).

6.5 Summary

This chapter highlights the complex messages the mortuary imagery contained and the many different actors that shaped the perception of the mausolea over time and place. Portraiture is particularly effective since it expresses a myriad of identities, such as gender, power relations, status, and family relations. Subtle gestures and objects were depicted to communicate with the local community. The mausoleum, certainly impressive within itself, served to commemorate the deceased and the family, and, together with the imagery, was a forceful monument that also had a religious function to venerate the ancestors. From the inscriptions, such as those from Ghirza, it appears that the mausolea were regularly visited and that the audience engaged with the monument in certain ways, as a religious structure, as a tomb of the collective ancestors, or as a resting place for the family. The close relationship between trends in mosaic scenes and trends in the art of mausolea indicate that pattern books were used by the local sculptors, but only scenes that held some significance to the commissioner and the local audience were selected. This chapter demonstrates that the mausolea, and their sculpture, are much more than simply an expression of acceptance or resistance to the Roman Empire, or the result of poor craftsmanship. Their appearance was shaped by numerous interlinked factors and influences with the primary aim to honour and to remember the dead in a way that was suitable for the local community.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

7.1 Conclusions

This Ph.D. has, for the first time, collected, analysed, and compared a large number of funerary sculptures that decorated the mausolea of Roman-period Tripolitania. The aim was to investigate the imagery and its iconography to enhance our understanding on how the local elite expressed aspects of their identity through North African and Roman imagery and symbolism in an area where sculpture was previously rare. Previous work focused primarily at a single site or monument, and frequently emphasised particularly Roman, Hellenistic or Punic elements that had influenced the style of the decorations. Instead, I have focused on the regional diversity that existed, and on how the Libyan elite utilised foreign and local pictorial elements and styles to express their very own agendas.

Tripolitania was unique within its North African context, being much more substantially Saharan in both climate and geography than to its neighbours Cyrenaica and Tunisia (Africa Proconsularis). The area did not have a large influx of Roman settlers, and the land largely stayed in the hands of the Libyan elite, which is discussed in Chapter 2. Chapter 2 also laid the foundation for understanding the diverse historical and economic development of the regions of Tripolitania, which, furthermore, enhanced social diversity across the region. The distribution of the mausolea was closely linked to the rise in prosperity of the local elite through agricultural activities and trade, as described in Chapter 3. Many individual families accumulated considerable wealth, which is reflected in the large number of mausolea that dotted the landscapes. The number of ashlar mausolea rose sharply from the first century AD onwards. This rise in large, highly visible and costly burial monuments reflects a change in Tripolitanian elite society in the Roman period. Rome’s need for agricultural produce such as olive oil and wine from the Gefara, the Gebel, and the pre-desert, as well as the demand for wild animals, slaves and precious stones from the interior, enhanced the prosperity of a number of individuals. The Roman Empire’s demand for goods appears to have been almost unquenchable, leading to the development of agricultural estates in remote regions that required a considerable amount of water management to function successfully and to yield surplus produce (Hobson 2015). Despite these difficulties, the pre-desert area flourished to an unprecedented extent, and the archaeological evidence of farms
and houses attests to the large number of people that lived in these now very remote areas. Thus, in the pre-desert the mausolea were not placed in what now appears to be an almost empty landscape, but the mortuary monuments were seen by many. Within the rural context, where we have the most evidence of mausolea, they may also have functioned as boundary markers, and probably also marked out water rights. In their architectural forms, the mausolea developed into a wide variety of sub-styles, expressing the commissioner’s desire to build an eternal resting place for the family that stood out from its surroundings and impressed the local communities and passers-by. The vivid figural decorations that were placed on the mausolea enhanced this effect.

No other province in Roman North Africa produced such a variety of funerary iconography. Chapter 4 introduced the wide variety of themes evident across Tripolitania that developed in an area that appears to have had limited traditions of expressing itself through visual imagery. In particular, the pre-Roman statues from Sabratha and Lepcis Magna and the early-Roman hypogeum ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ are rendered in a distinctly North African manner, with large almond shaped eyes, rather indistinct facial features and disproportionate body, a style that was later frequently implemented on Roman-period funerary art. By placing the rich Roman-period iconography into distinct categories, and by comparing the latter with wider pan-Mediterranean funerary sculpture and iconography in Chapter 4, it became evident that certain themes that were popular across the Empire, such as mythological ones, were rare in Tripolitania. Themes that were popular in neighbouring Africa Proconsularis did not necessarily gain popularity in Tripolitania. Gods were frequently depicted on the funerary and Saturn stelai in Africa Proconsularis, especially Saturn/Baal Hammon, Tanit/Caelstis or the Capitoline Triad, but, except for Hercules and Neptune/Triton, deities do not explicitly appear on Tripolitanian monuments. In contrast, Hercules and Neptune are very rare on stelai in Africa Proconsularis. Some of the funerary images that were more popular elsewhere in the Empire are glaringly absent. Perhaps the most obvious one is the funerary banquet scene or the ‘Totenmahl’ which was particularly popular in Syria, Egypt, Greece, Asia Minor, the Balkans, Britain, and Germany (see for instance Noelke 1998; Stewart 2009). The painting of the hypogeum ‘Defunto Eroizzato’ suggests that the image was not entirely unknown in Tripolitania, but it was not taken up in the image pool related to mausolea. Thus the iconography is, in fact, shaped by regional preferences and tradition, and was not uncritically chosen to appear ‘Roman’ or ‘Punic’. It reflected a myriad of messages primarily directed at the local community, rather than at a ‘Roman’ audience.
Chapter 5 drew attention to the importance of studying the sculpture and its iconography within the regional context. It revealed that, especially at the coast and in the eastern Gefara, the repertoire remained more limited, and the commissioners looked towards the art of the coastal cities and thus were influenced by wider Mediterranean traditions such as sphinxes, victories or the zodiac. Classical themes appear to have been especially marginal in the image pool in the pre-desert and desert areas. Some only occur at a single site, such as Neptune at Chormet el-Bousaila, or the Hercules and the Orpheus myth at el-Amrouni. In contrast, in the western Gefara, the Gebel and the pre-desert the iconography developed into a rich array of symbolic sculpture. What the different regions do have in common is a general concern to display ancestral connections through the imagery in the form of portraiture, and on the funerary inscriptions through the mentioning of parents and grandparents. The iconography of the mausolea reflects the concern with the ancestors, especially on the monuments up to the third century AD. Often several members of the family were depicted with portrait busts in relief, and the inscriptions lay emphasis in particular on the male family line. The ancient style and decorations of the mausolea further create a sense of ancestral entitlement to the land, and to the social position the family occupied. Over time, the conspicuous display of iconographic imagery became more and more important. Especially in the pre-desert, it appears that when the power of the families strengthened and grew well established in the third century AD, the focus shifted away from family portraiture to other matters, such as the depiction of hunting scenes, horse races, and symbolic imagery. By the time the arcaded temple mausolea at Ghirza were erected, the elite families were already well established. The choice of a new burial monument reflects this since there was no more need to emphasise ancestral connections to the land through the architecture of the tomb. By the beginning of the fourth century AD portrait busts in reliefs were abandoned completely at Ghirza, and instead, the power the individual families exercised was stressed through the imagery. What started to emerge during Chapter 5 is not only that the imagery was regionally diverse, but that the iconography also points towards a focus on ancestral commemoration, emphasising family lineage, social relationships and a distinctly local expression of social identities. A further major contribution of this study is the regional analysis of the decorations beyond the well-published site of Ghirza. While the latter site is undoubtedly significant, I have shown that it does not represent the norm in either the iconographic repertoire or the architectural type of funerary structure.

Finally, Chapter 6 explored different levels of identities that were expressed through the imagery, in particular portraiture, gestures, and poses, based on the theory discussed in
Chapter 1. The example of the poem inscribed on the mausoleum at Kasserine suggested that the monumentality of the mausoleum and the impact of the imagery on the viewer were most likely apparent to the commissioner. The commissioner carefully chose the different aspects of identity he or she wanted to be displayed, such as gender, power, family relations or status. By also focusing on the craftsmen and the viewer this Ph.D. shows that not only the commissioner took part in the shaping of the monument and its iconography, but also the viewer and the craftsmen. It highlights the importance of the monuments as places of gathering, mourning, and ancestral worship for the families and the local community.

The craftsmen most likely carried with them pattern books, from which the commissioner could choose certain scenes that were deemed appropriate. Trends in mosaic and wall painting were probably reflected in these pattern books, and some scenes, such as scenes of hunting, were integrated more widely into the range of funerary iconography. Furthermore, it appears that the abstract style in which the majority of sculptures were carved was a deliberate choice rather than a mere lack of available craftsmen or skill. An artistic style developed that was seen as particularly appropriate to adorn funerary structures. It drew heavily on Punic artistic traditions but also integrated Roman imagery. Whether the majority of the commissioners or the viewers were particularly aware of the ‘Punic’ style or the precise ‘Roman’ aspects is questionable. In fact, as demonstrated in the preceding chapters, it is inherently difficult for us to disentangle these different influences that, over time, merged into an inherently Tripolitanian set of iconographic images. To separate the different elements would have been all the more difficult for the ancient viewer, who did not have all the knowledge at hand we have today.

7.2 Future Research

This Ph.D. has started to reveal the complex aspects Tripolitanian funerary iconography encompasses. Limitations have been present since the majority of the monuments are still severely under-studied and not widely published. While this study is starting to fill this gap in research, it only scratches the surface of what the mausolea can tell us about the complex and fascinating society that was responsible for building them. Major obstacles are presented by the current political situation in Libya. Not only are the remaining mausolea under constant threat of damage and looting, but it is also not possible to study the monuments in situ. A full architectural study of the mausolea would reveal more about how they were built,
and would greatly enhance our understanding of their dating. Small scale excavations around
the monuments would further increase our knowledge about rituals that may have taken
place, and how the ancient viewer interacted with the mausolea. Furthermore, the mausolea
were usually not placed in isolation but were surrounded by smaller burials such as cairns
and cists. Studying the organisation of cemeteries and the wider Tripolitanian funerary
landscape could reveal much about social relationships within those complex communities
over a long period.

One of the most glaring gaps in the study of Tripolitanian art is the lack of
publications about the pre-Roman and Roman sculpture of the region. In particular, pre-
Roman sculpture, including rock art, lacks detailed study. For instance, the late first century
BC sculptures from Sabratha and Lepcis Magna, discussed in Chapter 6 and briefly studied
by Di Vita (1968), have never been published in detail. There may not have been many
sculptures in pre-Roman Tripolitania, but we know almost nothing about the ones that
existed. Tripolitanian rock art may be another fruitful avenue to explore in order to deepen
our understanding of the significance of imagery before the arrival of Rome. Rock carvings
contain the most diverse and rich pre-Roman imagery across Tripolitania, including scenes
of hunting, anthropomorphic imagery, wild and domestic animals, and symbols, but they are
notoriously difficult to date. Furthermore, very little work has been conducted on this
subject. In the Tripolitanian pre-desert the ULVS team recorded several rock carvings.
Barker 1986, 73-75; Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 130a).

Some sculpture that was created under the Roman Empire in Tripolitania has been
studied in more detail, especially the sculptures from the big coastal cities. Here, however,
as with the funerary art, the focus has been predominantly on the Roman aspects and stylistic
traditions. The creation of a detailed catalogue of Tripolitanian sculpture, including pieces
from the Tripolitanian hinterlands, would draw attention to the rich variety of sculpture
created by local, wider North African and foreign workshops and sculptors. It would greatly
enhance our understanding of sculptural workshops and how they operated, and what artistic
styles were favoured in a particular region. Much work is still to be done on the mausolea of
Tripolitania in particular, and sculpture more generally, and this Ph.D. represents one of the
first steps towards learning more about the complex funerary art and iconography of
Tripolitania.
APPENDIX 1.1:
THE GEOGRAPHICAL ZONES OF TRIPOLITANIA:

1.1.1 The Coast
The coastal zone is formed by a band of oases that runs along the coast (of which Tripoli is the largest). It receives an annual rainfall of about 300 mm, which is suitable for agriculture (Mattingly 1995, 6-8) and strong economic production (Barker 1996, 4). The most fertile part of the coastal region is to the east close to Lepcis Magna (Willamott 1960, cited in Barker 1996, 4). To the west, the soil is generally of lower quality and rather thin, supporting steppe vegetation (Barker 1996, 4). This area was, and still is, the most urbanised and populated part of Tripolitania. During the Roman period, four cities had the status of colonia: Sabratha, Oea, Lepcis Magna and Tacapae. Six towns were municipia, among them Gigthis (Bou Ghara), Turris Tamallenii (Telmine), Zitha (Zuab) and Thubactis (at or near Misurata?). Another nine or ten towns may have ranked as civitates (Mattingly 1995, 116-137).

1.1.2: The Gefara
The Gefara extends behind the thin belt of the coastal oasis, stretching for 350 km from west to east. Its geographical limits form an arch that runs along the bottom of the Gebel escarpment, measuring about 150 km at its widest stretch. Areas immediately north of the Gebel and parts of the eastern and western Gefara are suitable for dry-farming without the need of irrigation (Barker 1996, 4). Most of the central areas, however, are essentially desert-like with moving sand dunes (Mattingly 1995, 6). Not much archaeological work has been conducted in this region, but it appears that most Roman-period sites are located at the southern edge of the Gefara, immediately below the Gebel, to make use of run-off waters from the escarpment (Brogan 1965, 47).

1.1.3: The Gebel
The Gebel zone consists of a limestone escarpment that rises steeply from the Gefara to about 500 m above sea level. It is divided into continuous hill groups created by erosion. The eastern Gebel is formed by a band of hills that rises sharply up from the Gefara and is divided into the Gebel Nefusa, the Gebel Garian, the Gebel Tarhuna and the Gebel
Mesellata. The western Gebel (now Tunisia) is formed of the Gebel Tebaga and the Gebel Matmata. In some regions access to the top of the plateau is limited, such as from Nalut to Garian (Mattingly 1995, 6). Towards the south the Gebel slopes away gently into pre-desert and desert, essentially matching the arch of the Gebel escarpment, leaving a strip of agricultural land which is, in places, up to 25 km wide. The area is suitable for agricultural due to the relatively high amount of annual rainfall, which is approximately 200-300 mm (Mattingly 1995, 8). Additionally, many freshwater springs and wells feed the region. Basins and depressions are filled with the so-called terra rossa, a rich soil which allows olive trees and cereals to grow (Barker 1996, 4). During the Roman period, most agricultural sites were located in the areas where this soil is present. Complex water-management systems were in place to sustain the high agricultural production of the Gebel area (Ahmad 2010, 290).

1.3.4 The Pre-desert

The pre-desert landscape is very different from the Gebel zone, with spare vegetation on a large limestone and basalt plateau. It is intersected by wadi channels (ancient river beds), of which the largest are the Wadi ZemZem, the Wadi Sofeggin, and Bei el-Kabir. Rainfall varies from about 25 to 150 mm a year and cultivation is only possible in wet years in pockets of soil in depressions in the landscape (Barker 1996, 5-13). Additionally, the region suffers from very hot summers with an average of 32°C and cold winters with an average of 4.4°C and frost at night. A strong hot wind blows from the desert in spring and autumn, the ghibli, which carries much sand and can cause damage to crops and trees (Mattingly 1995, 8-9). The wadi channels are also affected by severe flash floods caused by torrential downpours (Barker 1996, 5-13). During the Roman period, intense water management in the form of irrigation walls and cisterns was used to make agriculture a possible and fruitful venture in this region.

1.3.5 The Syrtica

The Syrtic basin stretches from Misurata to Ras el-Aâli at the coast, with a pre-desert steppe hinterland including the oasis of Giofra and Zella, covering 600,000 m² (LeQuesne et al. 2010, 9). Geologically formed fault lines run north to west. Amongst them is the Hun-Waddan graben that runs from Bei el-Kebir to Giofra, and is one of the most important routes from the coast to Fazzan. Today this area (especially the coast) is predominantly defined by pastoralism and some agricultural cultivation, but numerous archaeological remains such as
farms and olive presses suggest that this region was exploited more extensively during the Roman period. Settlement was particularly concentrated on the outlying fringes of the Gebel, where run-off waters could be used for farming (Mattingly 1995, 16; LeQuesne et al. 2010, 10).

1.3.6 The Desert

(6) The south of Tripolitania is covered by the Sahara desert, which consists of either a dry rocky landscape or big sand seas. It is formed of the stone plateau of the Hamada el-Hamra, the Sirtica, and the Dahar as well as the sand seas of the Great Erg and the Murzuk Sand Sea. It is dotted with oases of varying sizes: Ghadames, Derj, and Sinawen between the great Erg and the Hamada; the Mizda, Giofra, Zella, and the Augila oases to the east of the Hamada; and the Nefzaoua oases which define the key strategic position outlining the western/north-western limits of Tripolitania. In the desert areas, the local foodstuffs are dates, cereals and vegetable crops (Mattingly 1995, 7-9).
APPENDIX 1.2: 
INSCRIPTIONS

1.2.1: IRT2009, 854: Boundary stone from the Lecis Magna territory:

‘[On] the authority of the son of deified Vespasian, emperor Domitian (name erased) Augustus Germanicus, chief priest, holding tribunician power for the sixth time, acclaimed victor fourteen times, consul for the thirteenth time, perpetual censor, father of the country, by the command of Suellius Flaccus, legate of Augustus with praetorian powers, the boundary stone(s) were set up between the tribe of the Muduciuiui and that of the Zamucii, in accordance with the agreement of both tribes’ (Translated by Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952).

1.2.2: Inscription from the boundary stone near Gasr Doga

C(aio) Mario Iouino et C(aio) Mario et 
Mariae Victorinae et Marso f(ilio) eius 
C(aius) Marius Pudens Boccius Zurgem et Velia 
Longina Bibai parentes f[lilj]is et nepotí fectorunt 
(Di Vita-Evrard 1979: 78-79).

1.2.3: IRT Supplement 25. Inscription Wadi Umm el-Agerem:

The Latino-Punic inscription of AG 002-A) read (translation):

Thanubda and her son have made this monument to Masauchan, son of Iylul, with 2,100 dinarii to which were added by the builder Annobal 1,000…(Translation, Reynolds 1955,)

The Latin inscription of Ag002-B read (translation):

Masaucan and Yysyan have made this tomb for their father Iylul…the builder were Imiltho and Annobal son of Masauchan Chaross (Translation, Mattingly 1995, 165).
Appendix 1.2.4: CIL 8.2II. The funerary Inscription from the mausoleum at Kasserine

Titus Flavius Secundus, son, built this for Titus Flavius Secundus, devoted father: he served as soldier for 33 years and lived for 110 years: here he lies. And for Flavia Urbana, devoted mother: she lived for 105 years: here she lies. And of Flavia Secunda, devoted sister: she lived for 20 years: here she lies. And for Titus Flavius Martialis, devoted brother: he served as soldier for 12 years and lived for 35 years: here he lies. And for Flavia Sperata, devoted sister: she lived for 36 years: here she lies. And for Aemilia Pacata, daughter of Sextus, devoted wife, priestess of the imperial cult in perpetuity: she lived for 53 years: here she lies. Titus Flavius Secundus, son of Titus, of the Roman tribe Papiroia, himself, priest of the imperial cult in perpetuity: here he lies. For Flavia Pactata, daughter of Titus, priestess of the imperial cult in perpetuity for the colony of Theveste, devoted daughter, Flavis Libera, mother, placed a statue: she lived for 15 years and 10 months: here she lies. For Flavia Libera, devoted wife of Titus Flavius Secundus, lived for 88 years: here she lies (translation Thomas 2007, 197-198).

Appendix 1.2.5: Poems from the mausoleum at Kasserine

Poem A

Although the timespan of a brief life is fleeting, and the short hour of stolen days passes quickly and jealous Lachesis relentlessly drags mortal bodies down into the Elysian fields by cutting the thread of life, now, however, a representation of charming reason has been found, by means of which a more lasting commemoration may embrace men and prolong their timespan and preserve many details in the process, with the years destined to last more strongly through the inscriptions. Look! An act of piety, bound to please everyone, which deserves a huge amount of fame and praise, one now full of new style, which Flavius Secundus, working within the ancient tradition, has marked out with the honour due to his father. Who could ever be in its presence without the noble qualities of his mind fully supportive; who would not marvel at this work and, in seeing the riches poured into it, stand astonished to observe such expense, by means of which the monument rears up through the heavenly breezes? This is a more praiseworthy use of wealth; in this way expenditure creates a permanent resting place, in this way money discovers how to establish enduring traditions,
when it is firm and invested well in an eternal product. Let the madness that is incited by too much gold see this, madness that is invoked by the gleam of silver bought with blood; and let the reckless pride in extravagance poured out on empty desires see it too, pride which has learned to seek out foreign clothes and jewels whose appeal lies in their great shine or possessions coming from the Red Sea, pride which foreign societies exacerbate through their diverse rivalry in the supply of material goods: Greece with its slave boys, Spain with its produce of Pallas, the lands of Libya with their hunting, the lands of the East with their perfume, Egypt with the frivolities of the Pharos, Gaul always boasting in the arts it has achieved, Campania rich in wine. These quickly lose their attraction and bring a short reward of pleasure, condemned by their own transience, but if anyone were to review all the hazards of life and make the effort to measure a man in all the shortness of his existence, then he will learn to understand that nothing better is achieved than that which is able to last long with the strength of great age, and with the gods’ approval. Now I do not doubt that among the silent shades of Acheron, if consciousness remains after death, your father often rejoices, Secundus, and spurns the other ranks of the dead, because he knows that here such a remarkable form of a tomb exists for him, one of permanent novelty, and he knows that a shining construction of stones stands thus, that the levels have grown upwards from the base ever more impressively thus, so it is that every single edge is defined thus, as if by a thread through softened wax. The cheerful sculpture is renewed by mobile markings, and the wandering crowd can admire these decorations uninterruptedly and marvel at the gleaming columns evenly poised above. Indeed you have offered up to the gods not just the inscription of his military service but even your father himself, watching so often as he does these delights which once he himself granted to the place, when he established the many products of Bacchus and decided to lay out the first vines and furnished the grove with a more regular water supply. May the Fates and the Stygian ruler of dreadful night permit me to say: your father ought now to be considered immortal—look!—and to have deserted the grim home of abandoned Dis, now that he prefers to inhabit this monument for the rest of time and to live forever in the inscribed names, to settle in the well-known woods, and from here to contemplate the family house peacefully and without interruption, and always to have nearby the home he granted to his children. Perhaps many, commenting on these things in empty chatter, may say that when someone builds a monument for the future while he is still alive, it is a harbinger of a more imminent death. I do not hold such an opinion, but I think that those people can be at ease, those who have chosen to prepare an eternal resting place and to set the foundations of walls that will never collapse, according to the firm principles by
which they live. The road of the Fates is firmly set and Atropos does not waver among the threads of life: once she has begun to spin the first strand, believe me, Secundus, you will travel through the allotted years. But you will be at ease, you will be rich deep in your heart, now that you cannot be a burden for anyone and do not make wills filled with obligations, now that your heir does not fear that he must build something similar. Now, rather, whatever you leave, all of it will go wherever your wishes want it to go. But attention to the work and its lofty beauties call me back. It stands as a towering glory and strikes the nearby clouds and measures the route of the sun. If by chance your eyes should wish to survey the mountains, the summits are conquered, one by one; if you should look to the plain, the ground lies hidden below. It is said that the Colossus does not soar above the hills of Romulus in such a way, nor does the obelisk in the Circus rise into the winds, and the Pharos does not reveal the twists and turns of the rattle-bearing Nile quite like this, when it illuminates its water with all-seeing fire. What does learned piety not achieve? Look! The stone, with many skylights cut into it, encourages charming bees to rush inside and to build waxy nests so that this house, sweet with thyme-flavored nectar, may always waft out floral scented perfumes while they produce fresh honey (translated by Pillinger 2013, 179-181).

Poem B

Piety, turn your venerable mind this way again, and tend to my songs in the way you know so well. Look! Secundus is here again, who out of the devotion of his heart has given his father not a monument, but a new temple. To what end are you now forcing me, Calliope, on a twin route, to go once again down roads I have already traveled? Surely I made a description of the great work, and I mentioned the stones polished in their fitted spots, the surrounding groves, the waters rushing peacefully and the bees regularly bringing back honey. This, however, this alone I think was missing from our art (in which you descend into many jokes, my tipsy Muse): I did not tell of the trembling wings of the rooster on the top, which, I think, flies above the highest cloud. If nature had given a voice to the body of this rooster, it would force all the gods to wake up in the morning. Now the façade is marked with firmly-fixed words, and a life trusting in the inscriptions can be observed. I hope, Secundus, that you live happily for many years, and that you read the monument that you yourself made (translated by Pillinger 2013, 179-181).
Appendix 1.2.6: Procopius, *Vandal Wars III*, xxv 7-15

‘There were some also who even furnished their children as hostages and requested that the symbols of office be sent them from him according to the ancient custom. For it was a law among the Moors that no one should be a ruler over them, even if he was hostile to the Romans, until the emperor of the Romans should give him the tokens of the office. And though they had already received them from the Vandals, they did not consider that the Vandals held the office securely. Now these symbols are a staff of silver covered with gold, and a silver cap,—not covering the whole head, but like a crown and held in place on all sides by bands of silver,—a kind of white cloak gathered by a golden brooch on the right shoulder in the form of a Thessalian cape, and a white tunic with embroidery, and a gilded boot. And Belisarius sent these things to them, and presented each one of them with much money’.

Appendix 1.2.7: Herodotus, *the histories*, 4.172

‘As for their manner of swearing and divination, they lay their hands on the graves of the men reputed to have been the most just and good among them, and by these men they swear; their practice of divination is to go to the tombs of their ancestors, where after making prayers they lie down to sleep and take for oracles whatever dreams come to them. They give and receive pledges by each drinking from the hand of the other party; and if they have nothing liquid, they take the dust of the earth and lick it up’.

Appendix 1.1.8: Mela, *de situ orbis libri* III, 1.46

Mela: ‘The Augilae think only the Manes are gods. They swear by them; they consult them as oracles. They pray to the Manes for what they want, and after they have thrown themselves on burial mounds, the Manes bring dreams as oracular responses’.
APPENDIX 1.3: ARCHITECTURAL TYPES OF MAUSOLEA

1.3.1: The architecture of Pre-Roman Mausolea-an overview
The evidence for pre-Roman mausolea in Tripolitania is very scarce, with the remains of only three pre-Roman examples surviving: two at Sabratha from the second century BC, Mausoleum A and Mausoleum B (Figure 1.1; Di Vita 2010), and Henchir Bürgü on the island of Jerba (Ferichiou 2009).

At Sabratha, only the base of Mausoleum A survives, a few metres south-west of Mausoleum B, which was similar in plan. Mausoleum B reached a height of almost 24 m and has been intensely studied and reconstructed in situ by Di Vita (1976; 1978b; 1984; 2004; 2010). Mausolea A and B were hexagonal in form with concave sides in a triangular configuration, similar to Henchir Bürgü on Jerba (Ferichiou 2009, 107-113), and Beni Rhenane near Siga.
in western Algeria (Rakob 1979). Mausoleum B at Sabratha sat on a high stepped podium and the three sides of the first storey were supported by semi-columns with Ionic capitals. A false door was located on the east side. The second storey was characterised by three statues of lions that sat on top of a heavy cornice, topped by brackets on which three statues of striding male figures (kouroi) were placed. In the centre rose a long triangular tower which was crowned by a slender pyramid above the second cornice. Above the false door, a relief of the Egyptian god Bes was visible, and Hercules was depicted on the north side killing the Nemean lion. The relief on the third side was too badly damaged to be identified. The whole monument was covered with stucco and painted (Figure 1.1b).

Some of the architectural decoration was influenced by Alexandrian traditions, such as the architrave above the door which can also be found on Alexandrian funerary monuments. Hellenistic influences can also be detected in the style of the columns and capitals (Di Vita 2004, 221). All three Tripolitanian pre-Roman mausolea are part of the so-called ‘Numidian Royal Architecture’, a term coined by Friedrich Rakob (1979). Whether or not these monuments were indeed erected by, or for, members of a royal dynasty is still debated (see for instance Coarelli and Thébert 1988; Moore 2007; Quinn 2013; Rakob 1979).

Elsewhere in North Africa, mausolea became an established feature of elite burial before the Roman period, some dating as far back as the late fourth century BC. For instance, radiocarbon dates indicate that the mausoleum at Medracen, Algeria, dates to around 320 BC (Camps 1973). At least some of these mausolea were, most likely, commissioned by rich North African individuals rather than royal families, that adapted Hellenistic, Egyptian and Near Eastern architectural styles to local materials and tastes (Moore 2007, 78, Quinn 2013), which led to the development of distinct regional styles across North Africa. Many of the pre-Roman tower tombs were built next to expanding cities, such as at Dougga, Beni Rhénane overlooking Siga or Sabratha, pointing a growing and prospering urban elite (Quinn 2013, 199). The most common form of mausoleum was the tower tomb, a type which originated in the Near East in the sixth century BC and spread westwards to Egypt, North Africa and the whole of the Mediterranean (Coarelli and Thébert 1988, 777; Stone 2007b, 64). In Cyrenaica tower tombs with up to three storeys developed from the late third century BC onwards. They were predominantly square in plan and sometimes topped by a pyramid (Figure 1.2a; Stucchi 1987). Tunisian and Algerian tower mausolea similarly reached up to three stories high and were topped by a pyramid (Figure 1.2b and 1.2c; Bentivogli 2007-2008, 47-77; Ferichiu 1995; Horn and Rüger 1979; Poinssot and Salomonson 1963; Rakob 1979; Stucchi 1987). Some of these mausolea were decorated with a small number of free-
standing sculpture and reliefs, such as the mausoleum of Dougga (mid-second century BC). This monument was decorated with the relief of a *quadrigae*, four free standing sculptures of horsemen, lions, and winged females (Moore 2007, 78). Elsewhere in North Africa, monumental circular mausolea were also constructed. However, there is no evidence in Tripolitania for the existence of this type in either the pre-Roman or the Roman period.

Figure 1.2: Pre-Roman mausolea in North Africa: a) Tomb of Ptolemais, Cyrenaica (Image: Stucchi 1987, Figure 76), b) El-Kourb, Algeria (Image: Stucchi 1987, Figure 70; c) Dougga, Tunisia (Image: Giraud Patrick).
1.3.2: Main type of Mausolea

Architectural types of mausolea: 51 tower mausolea, 30 temple mausolea, 5 rectangular mausolea, 30 possible tower mausolea, 10 possible temple mausolea, 2 possible rectangular mausolea, 75 collapsed/unclear mausolea.

Appendix 1.3.3: Architectural Sub-Types of Obelisk Mausolea

Sub-types of tower mausolea: 14 obelisk mausolea, 9 multi-storey aedicula mausolea, 3 open peristyle mausolea, 23 possible obelisk mausolea, 9 possible multi-storey aedicula mausolea, 2 possible open-peristyle mausoleum.
3.3.4: Architectural Sub-Types of Temple Mausolea

Sub-types of temple mausolea: 4 peripteral temple mausolea, 13 arcaded temple mausolea, 2 tetrastyle mausolea, 2 possible peripteral temple mausoleum, 10 possible arcaded temple mausolea, 1 possible tetrastyle mausoleum.
APPENDIX 1.4:
THEMES DEPICTED ON MAUSOLEA BY REGION

1.4.1: Principal Themes in the Gebel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eastern Gebel</th>
<th>Western Gebel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mythological scenes and personifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Victory/Winged Figure</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dioscuri</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sphinx</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gorgon</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation of deities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hercules/Melquart/Milk’ashtart</em></td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poseidon/Neptune/Triton</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious activity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture of prayer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person holding vessel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image of deceased</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue in the round</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural activity and domestic animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing with camel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundles of wheat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapes/vines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbolic elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomegranate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds left and right of cup</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup and pine cone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of bull</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mask</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels/cup</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosettes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette in laurel wreath</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrolls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadruped</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions/felines hunting or eating their prey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs of confronted lions guarding a vessel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cock and feline fight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion head</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle statue in the round</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird of prey carrying away prey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting dog</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbivore hunt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline hunt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull hunt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich hunt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting on horseback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting on foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camel Caravan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martial Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct combat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosette?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizard / snake?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genie or dancer?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female busts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male figure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figured capital (female)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender ambiguous figures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1.4.2: Principal Themes at Ghirza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mythological scenes and personifications</th>
<th>Ghirza South (Gh128)</th>
<th>Ghirza North (Gh129)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victory/Winged Figure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (4?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory/Winged Figure (statue)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (4?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representation of deities
- Hercules/Melquart/Milk’ashtart: 1? / 1?

### Religious activity
- Sacrifice bull: - / 1
- Sacrifice goat/sheep: 1 / -
- Gesture of prayer: 1 / 2
- Heads on shelf: 1 / -

### Image of deceased
- Portrait: 7 / 1
- Interactive scene: 2? / 3
- Statues: 2 / 2
- Person holding cup: 3 / 2
- Person holding object: 1 / -
- Person holding long object: 1 / 2

### Agricultural activity and domestic animals
- Ploughing with horse: 1 / 3
- Ploughing with camel: 1 / 3
- Harvest: 1 / 2
- Sowing: 1 / 2
- Threshing: - / 1
- Ox pulling cart: - / 1
- Clearing and Tending the fields: 1 / 2
- Date harvest: 1 / -
- Grapes harvest: 2 / -
- Dates/Date palms: 2 / 4
- Grapes/vines: 7 / 2
- Olives or figs: 1 / -

### Symbolic elements
- Pomegranate: - / 3
- Phallus: 2 / -
- Scorpion: 1 / -
- Birds left and right of cup: - / 1
- Roundels integrated in figural scene: 9 / 21
- Segmented roundels: 2 / 6
- Vine/grapevine/Cantharus: - / 1
### Animals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions/felines hunting or eating their prey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs of confronted lions guarding a bulls head/object</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions with person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feline</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statues of lions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird of prey with hare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockerels</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacocks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbivore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hunting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hunting Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting dog</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare hunt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbivore hunt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich hunt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting on horseback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting on camelback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stag hunt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camel caravan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camel and amphora</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camel pulling cart</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Martial Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct combat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiting scene</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed fight with bull</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed fight with lions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight with stag</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.4.3: Principal Themes in the Pre-desert and Comparison to Ghirza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mythological scenes and personifications</th>
<th>Ghirza North and South</th>
<th>Other pre-desert mausolea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victory/Winged Figure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory/Winged Figure (statue)</td>
<td>2 (4?)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siren / Winged figure</td>
<td>2 (4?)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphinx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation of deities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hercules/Melquart/Milk’ashtar</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious activity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice bull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice goat/sheep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture of prayer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads on shelf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image of deceased</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait under arch</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive scene</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bust in the round</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person holding cup</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person holding object</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person holding long object</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural activity and domestic animals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing with horse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing with camel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox pulling cart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing and Tending the fields</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundles of wheat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapes harvest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates/Date palms</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapes/vines</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olives or figs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root vegetable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbolic elements</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pomegranate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phallus</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scorpion</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds left and right of cup</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head of bull</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mask</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vessels/cup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palm leaf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rosettes and Roundels integrated in figural scene</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segmented roundels</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vine/grapevine/Cantharus</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Animals**

| **Horses**     | 5  | 1 |
| **Camel**      | 3  |   |
| **Bull**       |   | 1 |
| **Lions/felines hunting or eating their prey** | 1  | 4 |
| **Pairs of confronted lions guarding a bulls head/object** | 2  | - |
| **Pairs of confronted lions guarding a bulls head** | -  | 1 |
| **Lions with person** | 1  | 1 |
| **Feline**     | 1  | 2 |
| **Statues of lions** | 2  | 4 |
| **Lion with person** | 1  | 1 |
| **Bird**       | 1  | 3 |
| **Bird of prey with hare** | 4  | 1 |
| **Bird of prey devouring pray** | -  | 3 |
| **Cockerels**  | 1  | 2 |
| **Peacocks**   | 2  |   |
| **Ostrich**    | 3  |   |
| **Fish**       | 6  | 8 |
| **Herbivore**  | 2  | 0 |
| **Hare**       | 1  |   |
| **Fox**        |   | 3 |
| **Snake**      |   | 2 |

**Hunting**

| **Hunting dog**       | 13 | 2 |
| **Hare hunt**         | 1  | 0 |
| **Herbivore hunt**    | 2  | 2 |
| **Ostrich hunt**      | 7  | 1 |
| **Hunting on horseback** | 7  | 4 |
| **Hunting on camelback** | 1  | - |
| **Stag hunt**         | 1  | - |

**Economic Activity**

<p>| <strong>Camel caravan</strong> | 2  | - |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camel and amphora</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camel pulling cart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martial Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct combat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiting scene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed fight with bull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed fight with lions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight with stag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX 1.5:**

**DECORATION ON GASFACROSS TRIPOLITANIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Location</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Building type</th>
<th>Sculpture</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben001-f</td>
<td>Gefara</td>
<td>Unfortified</td>
<td>Phallus</td>
<td>Sandstone block with relief of a phallus</td>
<td>Fontana, Munzi, &amp; Ricci 1996, Sito 1; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben11-f</td>
<td>Gefara</td>
<td>Unfortified?</td>
<td>Winged figure</td>
<td>Sandstone block with winged figure with two faces</td>
<td>Fontana, Munzi, &amp; Ricci 1996, Sito 11; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Berresaf</td>
<td>Gefara</td>
<td>Fortified?</td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>A fierza showing a fish walled into one of three gasur located on the confluence of the Wadi Beresaf and the Wadi Bighighila.</td>
<td>Coro 1928, 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senam el-Ruani Gebel</td>
<td>Unfortified</td>
<td>Phallus</td>
<td>Possible relief of a phallus</td>
<td>Cowper 1897; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henchir Guedah el Baguel</td>
<td>Gebel</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>Monolithic lintel with rosettes found amongst debris</td>
<td>Trouset 1974; Toutain 1903, 314–315; Donau 1904, 476; Guéry 1986, 602; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turris Maniliorum/Arelliorum/Henchir el Gueciret</td>
<td>Gebel</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Five figures, two winged victories carrying crowns, man with large phallus and palm, two horses.</td>
<td>Trouset 1974; Pericaud &amp; Gauckler 1905; Cagnat 1913, 565–568; Shaw 1984, 170–171; CNSA168, 168.099; Mattingly 1995, 167, 200; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henchir Ras el Oued Gordab</td>
<td>Gebel</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Three phalli</td>
<td>Relief of two phalli found near entrance and a third relief of a</td>
<td>Trouset 1974; Moreau 1904, 370, Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Fortification Type</td>
<td>Artistic Feature</td>
<td>Artistic Description</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksar Chouline/Djeycha</td>
<td>Gebel Fortified</td>
<td>Relief carving</td>
<td>Keystones with relief carving found amongst debris.</td>
<td>Trousset 1974; Blanchet 1899, 142; Tribalet 1901, 288, n. 2; Moreau 1904, 474; Mattingly 1995, 106; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henchir el Asnam</td>
<td>Gebel Fortified</td>
<td>Statues and inscription</td>
<td>Statues and inscription</td>
<td>Trousset 1974; Lecoy de la Marche 1894, 408; Toussaint 1906, 236; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Majen/Oum el Mouajen</td>
<td>Gebel Fortified</td>
<td>Four-pointed stars</td>
<td>Cornice with four-pointed stars</td>
<td>Trousset 1974; Donau &amp; Pervinquièr 1912, 469–471; Mattingly 1995, 106; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henshir Maagel</td>
<td>Gebel Fortified</td>
<td>Phallus with legs</td>
<td>Phallus with two legs and possible tabula ansata</td>
<td>Cowper 1897; Goodchild 1951c, 76, Site 8; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasr Zuguseh, Kasr Ferjana, Oates74</td>
<td>Gebel Fortified</td>
<td>Phalli</td>
<td>Multiple carvings including phalli</td>
<td>Cowper 1897; Oates 1954, Site 74; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henscir Uheda</td>
<td>Gebel Fortified</td>
<td>Statue</td>
<td>Fragments of a marble statue</td>
<td>Goodchild 1951, 50, 76, Site 26; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henscir el-Aftah</td>
<td>Gebel Fortified</td>
<td>Relief of lion and eagle</td>
<td>Inscription framed by lion and eagle</td>
<td>Oates 1954, 109–110; Caputo 1942, 151–152; Goodchild 1951c, 74; Ward- Perkins &amp; Goodchild 1953, 44–47; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Meauia</td>
<td>Gebel Fortified</td>
<td>Floral emblem, cornucopia, symbol of Tanit</td>
<td>Moulded doorframe, with relief of floral emblem and possible cornucopia. Another block with</td>
<td>Oates 1953, 103–104; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Hayb</td>
<td>Gebel</td>
<td>Three phalli</td>
<td>Stone with triple phallus relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahmed 2010; Oates 1954, 106, Site 82; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasr Laussàggia</td>
<td>Gebel</td>
<td>Lion sitting on a shelf?</td>
<td>Integrated into Gasr/medieval structure 138-139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gebel</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Relief depicting a phallus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phallus</td>
<td>Oates 1953; 1954, 96–99; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gebel</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Relief of Chi-Rho monogram with raised hand and the words ‘Dom Benedixit’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Rho monogram</td>
<td>Oates 1954, 106; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Umm el-Agerem Ag001</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Probable lintel block (from main entrance?) with incised Chi-Rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Antar (An013)</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Possible carving of horse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phallus</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Barker &amp; Jones 1981, 38; Jones 1985, 281; Mattingly, Barker, &amp; Jones 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni Musa</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Hunting scene</td>
<td>Keystone above entranceway featuring possible phallus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brogan O. and Reynolds, J. 1964, Inscriptions from the Tripolitianan hinterland. Libya Antiqua 1 43-46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beni Ulid North (Bun006)</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>Arched entrance with rosette</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souk el-Lhoti/el-Oti/al-Awty, Wadi Burza (Bz028)</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>Inscription with tabula ansata and rosette</td>
<td>Barker et al. 1991, 52–56; Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasr' Ezzhafa, Wadi Ghirza Gh001</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Unfortified</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>Rosette in relief in North corner of farm</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Ghirza, Gh080</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Unfortified</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>Relief of a bull carved on a stone block</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Ghirza, Gh083</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Relief carving</td>
<td>Block with relief carving</td>
<td>Barker &amp; Jones 1981, 35; Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghirza, Wadi Ghirza, Gh127, Building 33</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>Possible rosette carved on keystone</td>
<td>Brogan &amp; Smith 1984, 65–67, Building 33; Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghirza, Wadi Ghirza, Gh127, Building 34</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Phallus</td>
<td>Keystone of internal doorway carved with phallus</td>
<td>Brogan &amp; Smith 1984, 67–68, Building 34; Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Kanafes, Kn003</td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Winged phallus</td>
<td>Winged phallus relief with inscription &quot;MERCURI&quot; noted among ruins</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location Details</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wadi el Amud, Lm004</strong></td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Inscription, two eagles clutching hares</td>
<td>Inscription framed by two eagles attacking a hare above entrance of Gasr, closely resemble eagles of Ghirza Gh129-A</td>
<td>Brogan 1964, 52, Site 10; Barker &amp; Jones 1984, 2–3, 43; Dore &amp; van der Veen, 65–67; Jones 1985, 274, 279; Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gars al Jafiliyah, Wadi Merdum</strong></td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Doric frieze with rosettes and triglyphs</td>
<td>Fragment of Doric frieze with triglyphs and rosette amongst rubble</td>
<td>Brogan 1977, 112, Maymun Darragh Site 5; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faschiet el Habs, Wadi Merdum Md011</strong></td>
<td>Unfortified</td>
<td>Phallus with legs</td>
<td>Phallus with legs found in entranceway</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Barker &amp; Jones 1981, 38; 1982, 6; Jones 1985, 272–274; Brogan 1977, 107–108; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gars el Azziz/Azaiz Md028</strong></td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Palm and eagle, hunting scene</td>
<td>External doorframe decorated with palmettes; inscription within tabella ansata, flanked by reliefs of figure holding a palm and eagle, hunting scene with ostriches</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Brogan 1977, 108–109; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gars Elisawi Wadi Migdal, Mg006</strong></td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Inscription with two eagles and animals</td>
<td>Inscription within tabella ansata, flanked by eagles holding two small animals in their claws and spiral decorations</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wadi Mimoun</strong></td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>entrance-way keystone carved with a rosette</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Brogan 1977, 102–103, Maymun Site 19; Sheldrick 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Decoration</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ggasr Lamalma, Wadi Mansur, Mn001</strong></td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>Lintel in entranceway carved with rosette</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wadi Mansur, Mn006</strong></td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Unfortified</td>
<td>Four phalli, some with legs and wings</td>
<td>Four orthostats carved with a phallus with legs and wings found at the entrance in the north-east angle of the farm.</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Jones 1985, 273–274; Hunt et al. 1986, 8, 16–20; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wadi Meseuggi, Ms002</strong></td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Eagle and hare</td>
<td>Relief in entranceway of an eagle with a hare in talons(?) above</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ggasr Nagazza, Wadi Sofeggin, Sf11</strong></td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Rosette and dolphins</td>
<td>Entrance-way arch carved with rosette and cable pattern; dolphin relief amongst debris</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Gentilucci 1933, 178–180; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wadi Sofeggin, Sf116</strong></td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Wreath</td>
<td>Wreath carved above entrance archway</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wadi Tinina</strong></td>
<td>Pre-desert</td>
<td>Fortified</td>
<td>Rosette</td>
<td>Rosette in arched entranceway decorated with double cable pattern</td>
<td>Mattingly 1996; Sheldrick 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1.6: MAPS OF THE LOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF MAUSOLEA – COAST, GEFARA AND GEBEL

- Towns/Settlement
- 1-3 undecorated mausolea
- 1-3 decorated mausolea
- 4-8 undecorated mausolea
- 4-8 decorated mausolea
- misplaced sculpture
APPENDIX 1.7:
MAPS OF THE LOCATION AND NUMBER OF MAUSOLEA IN THE PRE-DESER
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APPENDIX TWO

Catalogue of Sites, Mausolea and Iconography

This catalogue contains information about the sites, mausolea (decorated and undecorated) as well as their iconography. Images have been removed because of copyright. The exact location of the sites and monuments has not been included because they are currently under server danger of looting and destruction.
Site ID: Ab001

Location  Sidi bel Abbas

Landscape:  Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID  Ab001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Scattered, well-cut blocks of a collapsed mausoleum. The fallen stones of two different types suggest, according to Trousset, a monument with two storeys, perhaps crowned by a pinecone.

References:
Trousset 1974, 79-80.

Image source:  No Image
Site ID: Ag002

Location  Wadi Umm el-Agerem

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID   Ag002-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible tower mausleum open perystile

Period:
Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Cemetery with at least six mausolea, of which four are still partly upstanding, two are fully collapsed. A group of predominantly rectangular minor tombs surrounds the mausolea. Only two inscriptions have been found. A cemetery of minor tombs (ULVS:Ag003) is next to Ag002 and a large gasr (ULVS: Ag001) with olive presses is close by to the west. Numerous smaller farms and gasr are in the vicinity. A Roman-period cistern is located at the bottom of the cemetery (ULVS: Ag004). Ag002-A was perhaps a obelisk tomb with open peristyle as its second storey. This is suggested by eight column bases and four column shafts that were lying amongst the debris. A capital and pinecone was recorded that would have crowned the top of the pyramidal roof.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Ag002

**Location**: Wadi Umm el-Agerem

**Landscape**: Pre-Desert

**Monument ID**: Ag002-B

**Monument Name**: Mausoleum B

**Architectural Type**: Possible temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type**: Collapsed, Unclear

**Period**: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

**Short Description of Site**:

Cemetery with at least six mausolea, of which four are still partly upstanding, two are fully collapsed. A group of predominantly rectangular minor tombs surrounds the mausolea. Only two inscriptions have been found. A cemetery of minor tombs (ULVS:Ag003) is next to Ag002 and a large gasr (ULVS: Ag001) with olive presses is close by to the west. Numerous smaller farms and gasr are in the vicinity. A Roman-period cistern is located at the bottom of the cemetery (ULVS: Ag004). Ag002-A was perhaps a obelisk tomb with open peristyle as its second storey. This is suggested by eight column bases and four column shafts that were lying amongst the debris. A capital and pinecone was recorded that would have crowned the top of the pyramidal roof.

**References**:

Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image source**: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Ag002

Location  Wadi Umm el-Agerem

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Ag002-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C (Brogan Tomb C)

Architectural Type:
Possible temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Cemetery with at least six mausolea, of which four are still partly upstanding, two are fully collapsed. A group of predominantly rectangular minor tombs surrounds the mausolea. Only two inscriptions have been found. A cemetery of minor tombs (ULVS:Ag003) is next to Ag002 and a large gasr (ULVS: Ag001) with olive presses is close by to the west. Numerous smaller farms and gasr are in the vicinity. A Roman-period cistern is located at the bottom of the cemetery (ULVS: Ag004). Ag002-A was perhaps a obelisk tomb with open peristyle as its second storey. This is suggested by eight column bases and four column shafts that were lying amongst the debris. A capital and pinecone was recorded that would have crowned the top of the pyramidal roof.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; , Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Ag002

Location: Wadi Umm el-Agerem

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Ag002-D

Monument Name:
Mausoleum D (Brogan tomb E)

Architectural Type:
Possible temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Cemetery with at least six mausolea, of which four are still partly upstanding, two are fully collapsed. A group of predominantly rectangular minor tombs surrounds the mausolea. Only two inscriptions have been found. A cemetery of minor tombs (ULVS:Ag003) is next to Ag002 and a large gasr (ULVS: Ag001) with olive presses is close by to the west. Numerous smaller farms and gasr are in the vicinity. A Roman-period cistern is located at the bottom of the cemetery (ULVS: Ag004). Ag002-A was perhaps a obelisk tomb with open peristyle as its second storey. This is suggested by eight column bases and four column shafts that were lying amongst the debris. A capital and pinecone was recorded that would have crowned the top of the pyramidal roof.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; , Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
**Site ID:** Ag002  
**Location**  Wadi Umm el-Agerem  
**Landscape:** Pre-Desert  

**Monument ID**  Ag002-E  
**Monument Name:**  Mausoleum E  
**Architectural Type:**  Possible tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum  

**Period:**  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)  

**Short Description of Site:**  
Cemetery with at least six mausolea, of which four are still partly upstanding, two are fully collapsed. A group of predominantly rectangular minor tombs surrounds the mausolea. Only two inscriptions have been found. A cemetery of minor tombs (ULVS:Ag003) is next to Ag002 and a large gasr (ULVS: Ag001) with olive presses is close by to the west. Numerous smaller farms and gasr are in the vicinity. A Roman-period cistern is located at the bottom of the cemetery (ULVS: Ag004). Ag002-A was perhaps a obelisk tomb with open peristyle as its second storey. This is suggested by eight column bases and four column shafts that were lying amongst the debris. A capital and pinecone was recorded that would have crowned the top of the pyramidal roof.  

**References:**  
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; , Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.  

**Image source:**  No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID:</th>
<th>Ag002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Wadi Umm el-Agerem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monument ID** Ag002-F  

**Monument Name:** Mausoleum F  

**Architectural Type:** Possible temple mausoleum  

**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Unclear  

**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  

**Short Description of Site:**  
Cemetery with at least six mausolea, of which four are still partly upstanding, two are fully collapsed. A group of predominantly rectangular minor tombs surrounds the mausolea. Only two inscriptions have been found. A cemetery of minor tombs (ULVS:Ag003) is next to Ag002 and a large gasr (ULVS: Ag001) with olive presses is close by to the west. Numerous smaller farms and gasr are in the vicinity. A Roman-period cistern is located at the bottom of the cemetery (ULVS: Ag004). Ag002-A was perhaps a obelisk tomb with open peristyle as its second storey. This is suggested by eight column bases and four column shafts that were lying amongst the debris. A capital and pinecone was recorded that would have crowned the top of the pyramidal roof.  

**References:**  
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.  

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Ag027

Location: Wadi Umm el-Agerem

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Ag027-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A (Brogan Notes Tomb B

Architectural Type:
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Small structure of circa three metre square and small circular structure three m to the north of the first, both made of slabs of architectural fragments most likely from mausoleum that stood in the vicinity.

References:

Image source: No Image
**Site ID:** Ag074

**Location:** Wadi Umm el-Agerem

**Landscape:** Pre-Desert

**Monument ID** Ag074-A

**Monument Name:**
Possible Mausoleum

**Architectural Type:**
Reused stones

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Unclear

**Period:**
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
Modern huts built of re-used material which probably come from a mausoleum that once stood there. Half of a possible libation table and many cut stones were found. Some stones bear masons marks. The mausolea of Ag002 are circa one and a half kilometre towards the wadi to the north-west. On the opposite side of the wadi are two gasr (Ag043 & Ag045) and the Roman period farmstead (Ag041). Ag045 produced a range of early pottery amongst it early terra sigillata TS1 and African red slip wear.

**References:**
Mattingly, D.J. 1996, 28; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Ag076

Location: Wadi Umm el-Agerem

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Ag076-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A cemetery with circular and rectangular tombs, graves and cists on an approximate north/east south/west alignment following the edge of scarp for 100 m. Fragments of column drum may indicate the former presence of a mausoleum.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Aj001

Location: Gasr el-Gebab, Wadi Ajdab

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Aj001-A

Monument Name:
Gasr Adjab, Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Possible temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible peripteral temple mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Large mausoleum or temple located on a watershed between the Wadi Adjab and the Migrad al Kafir wadi systems dominating the landscape for many miles. There are a number of associated buildings nearby: a gasr, a barrel vaulted tomb and a gasr type farm. Some of these structures, as for instance the gasr type farm, reuse blocks from mausoleum/temple.

References:

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: An001

Location  Wadi Antar

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  An001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A large cemetery which was visible for miles. This cemetery had two monumental tombs of which one is completely destroyed. It consisted of a particularly wide range of funerary styles, including mausolea, cist burials, circular cairns, burial platforms, rectangular platforms and graves.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: An001

Location Wadi Antar

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID An001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A large cemetery which was visible for miles. This cemetery had two monumental tombs of which one is completely destroyed. It consisted of a particularly wide range of funerary styles, including mausolea, cist burials, circular cairns, burial platforms, rectangular platforms and graves.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: ULVS Archive


**Site ID:** As001

**Location**  Asaba, Sinan

**Landscape:**  Eastern Gebel, Gebel

**Monument ID**  As001-A

**Monument Name:**  Mausoleum A

**Architectural Type:**  Collapsed/Unclear, Possible tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**  Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum, Unclear

**Period:**  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**  
A mausoleum situated in the village of Sinan on the Asaba plain. It was destroyed during recent land clearance work. It was built of large limestone blocks. Amongst the rubble lay some sections of moulding, and column bases.

**References:**  
Zenati 1997, 224.

**Image source:**  No Image
Site ID: At001

Location  Argub Tifran (?)

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  At001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Brogan recorded the remains of two lower courses of a large mausoleum, between Es Senam and Bir Gan on the south side of the road. No decoration had been recorded.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Au001

Location  Ain el Auenia, Gebel Nefusa

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Au001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Roman period cemetery which is located between Yefren and Rogeban. A sculptured block was found amongst the ruins, as well as seven inscribed tombstones indicating that a station of the Limes Tripolitanus was once placed here. It is likely that the sculptured stone comes from mausoleum that stood in this cemetery. Only a few sculptured blocks were found amongst the Roman period cemetery. A reconstruction of the mausoleum that may have once stood here is not possible.

References:
Borga, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Oates 1953.

Image source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID:</th>
<th>Ba001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Lepcis Magna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape:</strong></td>
<td>Coastal Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument ID</th>
<th>Ba001-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument Name:</strong></td>
<td>Mausoleum A, Gasr el-Banat; KHM 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Period:**

Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**

Mausoleum that once stood south of Lepcis Magna. Mentioned by Cowper and Romanelli and identified by the Universita Roma Tre survey team. Romanelli assumed that the mausoleum was originally three stories high. The first storey was of plain ashlar masonry while the second storey was decorated with pilasters. Only a small corner of presumably the back of the cella facing west remains. The door to the burial chamber opened toward the east. The chamber had a vaulted roof and three quadrangular niches.

**References:**

Cowper 1897b, 214, Number 2; Romanelli 1925, 164, 165, Figure 97; Munzi et al. 2016, 91.

**Image source:** Romanelli 1925, Figure 97.
Site ID: Bd001

Location: Bdarna, Wadi Garsof

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Bd001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Group of at least three mausolea that appear to have been built of cement and rubble. The cemetery was located on top of a hill. Other, smaller tombs appear to have surrounded the monuments. It is located in the vicinity of the ancient gasr Garsof.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 67-69.

Image source: Coro 1928, 67
Site ID: Bd001

**Location**  Bdarna, Wadi Garsof

**Landscape:** Gefara

**Monument ID**  Bd001-B

**Monument Name:**
Mausoleum B

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:**
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
Group of at least three mausolea that appear to have been built of cement and rubble. The cemetery was located on top of a hill. Other, smaller tombs appear to have surrounded the monuments. It is located in the vicinity of the ancient gasr Garsof.

**References:**
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 67-69.

**Image source:** Coro 1928, 68
Site ID: Bd001

Location  Bdarna, Wadi Garsof

Landscape:  Gefara

Monument ID  Bd001-C

Monument Name:  Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:  Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:  Group of at least three mausolea that appear to have been built of cement and rubble. The cemetery was located on top of a hill. Other, smaller tombs appear to have surrounded the monuments. It is located in the vicinity of the ancient gasr Garsof.

References:  Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 67-69.

Image source:  Coro 1928, 68
Site ID: Bd001

Location: Bdanra, Wadi Garsof

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Bd001-D

Monument Name:
Mausoleum D

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Group of at least three mausolea that appear to have been built of cement and rubble. The cemetery was located on top of a hill. Other, smaller tombs appear to have surrounded the monuments. It is located in the vicinity of the ancient gasr Garsof.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 67-69.

Image source: Coro 1928, 68
Site ID: Be001

Location  Bir Ayyad

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Be001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Brogan recorded two mounds, about 50 m apart of which one was probably a mausoleum. The south-east side still showed some evidence of a base of dressed stone, ca. 5m long. One of the stones is very large, measuring 2.20 m x 0.92 m x 0.20 m. They were located in the vicinity of Gasr el-Hag and Bir Ayyad on the wide flat expanse within the watershed of the Gebel.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Bg001

Location  Buchar, Giado

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID  Bg001-A

Monument Name:
Mezgura, Mosque

Architectural Type:
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Mosque that was built with re-used stones. Sculptures stones were placed to the left and right of the doorway into the mosque which, most likely, come from a Roman-period mausoleum that, most likely, stood in the vicinity. The sculptured stones were transported to Giado in the 1930s and assembled to create a decorative monument in the piazza, which was subsequently destroyed in 1953. The two stones from Buchar are now in Tripoli Castle. Further dressed stones probably from the Roman period were recycled in the mosque, especially in the eastern wall. They may also come from other structures such as farms and dwellings.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Bgc001

Location: Beni Guedah Ceder

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Bgc001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Donau observed the remains of a mausoleum and fragments of a lamp. This site is located near the fort of Beni Guedah Ceder, a the clausura de Gebel Tebaga. Only a few scattered fragments had survived of the monument when it was recorded by Donau.

References:
Donau 1904,465-472; Trouset 1974, 67-68.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Bh001

Location: Lepcis Magna

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Bh001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A, Gasr Sidi Bu Hadi

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Only little information has been found about this site. The mausoleum was located between Gasr Shaddad (to the south) and Gasr er-Riyahi (to the east).

References:
Romanelli 1925, 163.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Bi001

Location  Biscema

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Bi001-A

Monument Name:  
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:  
Collapsed/Unclear, Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:  
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:  
Only little information has been found about this site. The mausoleum was located south of the road near the Zintan to Biscema and was recorded by Brogan.

References:  
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Bi001

Location: Biscema

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Bi001-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum, Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Only little information has been found about this site. The mausoleum was located south of the road near the Zintan to Biscema and was recorded by Brogan.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Bi001

Location  Biscema

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Bi001-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Only little information has been found about this site. The mausoleum was located south of the road near the Zintan to Biscema and was recorded by Brogan.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Bin001

Location: Wadi al-Binaya

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Bin001-A

Monument Name: Displaced reliefs

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Nothing is known about these mausolea. Many sculptured reliefs come from the Wadi al-Binaya, which are now held in the Bani Ulid Museum.

References:
-

Image source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site ID:</strong> Bm001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Beni (Sidi) Musa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape:</strong> Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monument ID** Bm001-A

**Monument Name:**
Mausoleum A

**Architectural Type:**
Collapsed/Unclear

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:**
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
Some scattered fragments of a mausoleum. No additional information has been recorded from this site.

**References:**
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Bn001

Location: Lepcis Magna

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID Bn001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; KHM 35

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This mausoleum is located three and a half kilometre west of Lepcis Magna. There may have been an inscription associated with this mausoleum (IRT 783).

References:
Clermont-Ganneau 1903, 344-345; Cowper 1897, 215, Number 5; Munzi et al. 2016, 88-89.

Image source: Munzi et al. 2016, 90, Figure 28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID: Bo001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location Henseir Bou Guerba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument ID</th>
<th>Bo001-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument Name:</td>
<td>Mausoleum A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Possible tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Description of Site:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Located in the hills of Matmata are the remains of a large decorated mausoleum. The remains were reported by Saladin in 1902, and most of the stones where lying in a circular arrangement when Brogan visited in 1959. Only scattered stones survive of this mausoleum, and it is difficult to determine its type. Trouset suggests that the monument may have been trapezoidal. It was built of irregular stones with lime mortar. However, long slender pilasters lie amongst the remains, which could indicate that this was an obelisk tomb. The vault, destroyed when Brogan visited, had three loculi shaped niches on three sides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brogan Unpublished Notes; Gauckler 1901, CLXV; Saladin 1902, 405-407; Toutain, 1903, 378, 383, 389-390; Trouset 1974, 82-83 Site 83.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Image source: | SLS Archive, Brogan Collection |
Site ID: Bs011

Location  Bir Scedua Basin, Wadi Dreder

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  BS011-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A-C

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Cemetery associated with mausoleum Bs012, numerous individual graves with rectangular and with circular cist. The remains of three mausolea have been recorded. Two large Gasr (ULVS Bs001 and Bs002) are located approximately 800 m to the south of the cemetery. A cistern is located about 200 m to the east.

References:

Image source: ULVS Archive
**Site ID:** Bs012  

**Location:** Bir Scedua Basin  

**Landscape:** Pre-Desert  

**Monument ID:** Bs012-A  

**Monument Name:**  
Mausoleum A  

**Architectural Type:**  
Collapsed/Unclear  

**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Collapsed, Unclear  

**Period:**  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  

**Short Description of Site:**  
Mass of collapsed and badly eroded ashlar blocks and architectural fragments, that probably belonged to mausolea. Two large Gasr (ULVS Bs001 and Bs002) are located approximately 800 m to the south of the cemetery. A cistern is located about 200 m to the east.  

**References:**  

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Bs022

Location: Bir Scedua Basin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Bs022-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This cemetery holds approximately 25 graves mostly circular but a few rectangular. All have large stone blocks around the outer edge, some roughly squared with smaller stones forming the cairns. Libation table, column fragments, base and capital were noted. It is situated 200 m from Bs021. The remains of a mausoleum has been noted by the ULVS in this cemetery in 1981. Some architectural fragments were lying around such as column fragments, bases and capitals. However, the type of mausoleum can not be determined. There was no mention of any relief decoration that may have adorned the monument.

References:
Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 50.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Bs072

Location: Bir Scedua Basin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Bs072-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Possible temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This cemetery held at least two mausolea and stepped column tombs. There were also at least 18 rectangular chambered tombs which were approximately 3 m wide and 1 m high. Only scattered fragments remain of these mausolea. Architectural fragments include three-quarter columns, Ionic capitals and part of the cornice (Bs001-B), as well as a square base (Bs001-A). Two farms are nearby (Bs069 and Bs070), as well as a cistern approximately 100m to the south (Bs062).

References:
Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 55.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Bs072

Location  Bir Scedua Basin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Bs072-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This cemetery held at least two mausolea and stepped column tombs. There were also at least 18 rectangular chambered tombs which were approximately 3 m wide and 1 m high. Only scattered fragments remain of these mausolea. Architectural fragments include three-quarter columns, Ionic capitals and part of the cornice (Bs001-B), as well as a square base (Bs001-A). Two farms are nearby (Bs069 and Bs070), as well as a cistern approximately 100m to the south (Bs062).

References:
Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 55.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Bu001

Location  Beni Ulid

Landscape: Pre-Desert, Wadi

Monument ID  Bu001-A

Monument Name: 
Mausoleum fragments A

Architectural Type: 
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: 
Unclear

Period: 
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: 
Bani Ulid Museum: sculptures that were integrated into the Italian fort at Bani Ulid and sculptures of unknown provenance collected in the museum of Bani Ulid. A number of sculptured stones from Roman-period sites in the area around Beni Ulid were taken by Italian officers to decorate official buildings under the Italian regime. The sites from which the stones originated were frequently not recorded.

References: 
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Bu001

Location  Beni Ulid

Landscape:  Pre-Desert, Wadi

Monument ID  Bu001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum Fragments B

Architectural Type:
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Bani Ulid Museum: sculptures that were integrated into the Italian fort at Bani Ulid and sculptures of unknown provenance collected in the museum of Bani Ulid. A number of sculptured stones from Roman-period sites in the area around Beni Ulid were taken by Italian officers to decorate official buildings under the Italian regime. The sites from which the stones originated were frequently not recorded.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image source:  No Image
Site ID: Bun007

Location: Beni Ulid (North), Wadi Dinar

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Bun007-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A mausoleum or a temple, integrated into a Opus Africanum farm Grarat Awlad Salem (or Grarat Dnar Salem). Within an enclosure stood either a small temple or a mausoleum very close to the farmstead, about 250 m to the north-east. Fragments of capitals, decorated stones and a platform were recorded.

References:

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Ch001

Location: Chormet Bu Sella

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Not much is known about this site. It is located on a small hill and the monument would have been visible from afar. A collapsed mausoleum with a square or rectangular base. The corner columns found suggest that this may have been a tower or obelisk tomb. An enclosure wall can be associated with this monument, on the north, south and west side, measuring 11 m x 11 m.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Cha001

Location  Wadi Chadrun

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID  Cha001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; KHM136

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Scarce remains of a mausoleum on a hill slope facing Wadi Chadrun.

References:
Munzi et al. 2016, 93.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ct001

Location: Caf Tobbi

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Ct001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Possible temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A big mausoleum which stood on a hill on the west side of the Tripoli-Garian road. It was still standing up to seven courses when Brogan visited it. There may have been another mausoleum on the other side of the road.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ct001

Location Caf Tobbi

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID Ct001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A big mausoleum which stood on a hill on the west side of the Tripoli-Garian road. It was still standing up to seven courses when Brogan visited it. There may have been another mausoleum on the other side of the road.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Da001

Location  Wadi Dalif

Landscape:  Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Da001-A

Monument Name:  Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Obelisk mausoleum

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Brogan, in her notes, refers to a collapsed mausoleum in a minor wadi between wadis Migdal and Meseuggi which joins the lower valley of Migdal-Ghurgar. On the right bank of this wadi, about midway along its course, she came upon a collapsed obelisk-tomb. No more detail has been recorded.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source:  No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID: De001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location      Dehibat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape:    Gefara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monument ID** De001-A

**Monument Name:**
Mausoleum A

**Architectural Type:**
Possible tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:**
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
Dehibat is located directly north of the Gebel on the bottom of the escarpment. Coro gives the drawing of five sculptures, and Lieut. Witz and Faveris excavated two mausolea. Brogan mentions several people who visited the site: 1959 C. Vita Finzi and R.W. Hey saw column fragments. 1964 Messrs. Norman Hammond, P. Bellwood and T. Frost observed that the building which had the sheep and sphinx built into it, was now torn down and the stones were lying on the ground. The decorated stones, most likely, come from mausolea nearby.

**References:**
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Picard 1959-60; Coro 1929, 107-118; Toutain 1914.

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Dh001
Location  Dahireat el Hagiar
Landscape:  Gefara, Plateau

Monument ID  Dh001-A
Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible tower mausleum open perystile

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Very scattered remains of a mausoleum of which only very few stones remain. It is located on a flat plain which suggests that it was visible from quite a distance. A collapsed and scattered mausoleum with round elements which suggest that it could be similar to Bir el Uaar or Gasr Duierat.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source:  No Image
Site ID: Dog001

Location  Doga (Gastr)

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Dog001-A

Monument Name:
Gastr Doga, Dughah

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This is one of the largest mausolea in Tripolitania. On top of a stepped podium stands the first storey which is decorated with corner pilasters. Above a projecting cornice follows the second storey that was similarly decorated with corner pilasters. The third storey consisted of a colonnade of around 30 Corinthian columns. They probably enclosed a cella. The vaulted burial chamber is entered on ground level through a corridor of the flanking peers. Inside are two benches along the rear wall and small niches on the opposite wall may have held lamps. Minutilli says that the Roman tomb at Gasr Doga (Doga) was in later centuries enlarged by the Arabs to make it into a fortress, in the vicinity there are 6 large and deep wells."

References:
Ahmed 2010, 126; Aurigemma 1954; Barth 1857, 79; Bigi et al. 2009, 25-46; Caputo 1942, 151ff; Cowper 1897, 53; Di Vita Evrard 1979; Goodchild 1951; Minutili 1912, 201; Kenrick 2009, 161; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Dou001

Location Douirat

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID Dou001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Lecoy de la March mentions a Roman mausoleum in the countryside, 12 km north west from Duierat, of which only the foundation survived. 1 km to the north he noted the ruins of a building.

References:
Lecoy de la Marche 1894, 402; Trouset 1974, 102.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Dt001

Location  Djebel Tafechna

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID  Dt001-A

Monument Name:
Henchir Tafechna

Architectural Type:
Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Donau mentioned to Cagnat a small mausoleum near the small fortlet of Djebel Tafechna.

References:
Cagnat 1919, CCXVIX, Trouset 1974, 81-2.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ea001

Location  El-Amrouni, Tatahouine

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Ea001-A

Monument Name:
El Amrouni, Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausolea are situated in the zone of the Limes Tripolitanus in the region of el-Amrouni, approximately forty kilometres south of Tatahouine. Sand dunes are in close proximity, the monuments were partly covered by sand between 1917 and 1970. The mausolea and the fortlet of Bir Fatnassia are located half way between the forts of Remada and Medeina (Tkebelami?) The relief sculpture of these mausolea was transported to Tataahuine after the first World War.

References:
Trouset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ea001

Location  El-Amrouni, Tatahouine

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Ea001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausolea are situated in the zone of the Limes Tripolitanus in the region of el-Amrouni, approximately forty kilometres south of Tatahouine. Sand dunes are in close proximity, the monuments were partly covered by sand between 1917 and 1970. The mausolea and the fortlet of Bir Fatnassia are located half way between the forts of Remada and Medeina (Tkebelami?) The relief sculpture of these mausolea was transported to Tatahuine after the first World War.

References:
Trouset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Eau001

Location: Hencir el-Ausaf, Tigi

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Eau001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A, Hencir el Ausaf

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Tigi is a small oasis located at the foot of the Gebel Nefusa. The mausoleum lies approximately 10 km North-West of Tigi on a small hill. There may have been a second mausoleum to the South-West of Hencir el-Ausaf. Brogan suggests that the settlement that can be associated with the mausolea can still be seen, approx. one kilometre south-east of the large mausoleum (Gasr Saniet el-Ausaf). Here, a piece of second century terra sigillata chiara was found.

References:
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Eau001

Location  Henseir el-Ausaf, Tigi

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Eau001-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Tigi is a small oasis located at the foot of the Gebel Nefusa. The mausoleum lies approximately 10 km North-West of Tigi on a small hill. There may have been a second mausoleum to the South-West of Henchir el-Ausaf. Brogan suggests that the settlement that can be associated with the mausolea can still be seen, approx. one kilometre south-east of the large mausoleum (Gasr Saniet el-Ausaf). Here, a piece of second century terra sigillata chiara was found.

References:
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ec001

Location: El-Cherba

Landscape: Gebel

Monument ID: Ec001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Re-used stones in a mosque possibly from a mausoleum.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Eh001

Location  Gasr el-Hag

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Eh001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Scattered stones of a mausoleum on a hill north-west of Gasr el-Hag. Fourteen kilometre to the west are the ruins of a village in which Brogan found Roman pottery, a site that was locally known as el Medina er-Ragda. Only some sculptured stones remain of this mausoleum. They are rounded, which suggests that elements of this mausolea were circular.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Elk001

Location: El-Khadra, Gebel Tarhunah

Landscape: Eastern Gebel

Monument ID: Elk001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Stones from a collapsed mausoleum, one of which as Arab dot markings.

References:
Cowper 1897b, 256.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Es001

Location: Bir Ayyad

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Es001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The tombs are located north of Bir el-Beda on an open plain. The base of two possible mausolea were located by Brogan, and a third structure seems to be a smaller tomb. Possible tomb built of cement and rubble. A fallen fragment of concrete lies on its south side. It is located approximately 12m west of Mausoleum Es001-B. Mausoleum Es001-B was built of cement and rubble.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Es001

Location: Bir Ayyad

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Es001-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The tombs are located north of Bir el-Beda on an open plain. The base of two possible mausolea were located by Brogan, and a third structure seems to be a smaller tomb. Possible tomb built of cement and rubble. A fallen fragment of concrete lies on its south side. It is located approximately 12m west of Mausoleum Es001-B. Mausoleum Es001-B was built of cement and rubble.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Fa001

Location: Lepcis Magna, Wadi al-Fani

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Fa001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear, Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This mausoleum was located west of modern Homs above a middle-imperial period farm. Later a gasr was built next to the mausoleum.

References:
Ben Rabha and Masturzo 1997, 216.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Fe001

Location: Fergian

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Fe001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausoleum is located at Fergian on the Gebel Tarhuna, among the farms of Zituna. The structure of the mausoleum is badly damaged. Only the foundations and parts of the second course with simple moulding remained when Oates recorded the site. Several large stones and corner pilasters with Corinthian capitals are scattered around the site and built into a nearby hut.

References:
Oates 1953, 85, 104.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ga001

Location: El-Gseba, Gebel Garian, Wadi Gan

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Ga001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible tetra style temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Two mausolea overlooking the wide wadi. It is unclear if a cemetery is associated with the mausoleum.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ga001

Location: El-Gseba, Gebel Garian, Wadi Gan

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Ga001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Two mausolea overlooking the wide wadi. It is unclear if a cemetery is associated with the mausoleum.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gar001

Location Gebel Tarhunah

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID Gar001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Relief from an unknown mausoleum on the Gebel Tarhuna.


Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gb001

Location  Cabao, Gasr el Berber

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Gb001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A, Gasr el Berber

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This mausoleum was located somewhere in the vicinity of Cabao and had almost entirely collapsed when Brogan visited it in the 1960s. It had a square base and a moulded plinth. The North and West facing sides of the first storey mausoleum were still preserved up to three metres height when Coro visited in the 1920s, and later Brogan in the 1960s. This tomb must have been of substantial height judging from the amount of debris that is lying around the tomb. It must have been richly decorated, since Coro recorded 10 stones carved in relief alone.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.

Image source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID: Gd001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape: Coastal Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monument ID: Gd001-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument Name: Mausoleum A; Gasr Duierat; Gasr ed-Dueirat; KHM 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Sub-Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Description of Site:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This tomb is located in close vicinity to Lepcis Magna, yet it holds many similarities with tombs from the pre-desert, especially its decorations. It was located on the left bank of the Wadi Lebda, about 2 km south west above Lepcis Magna before it was reconstructed in front of the museum at Lepcis Magna by the French Archaeological mission under Andre Laronde.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia Nikolaus, Private Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site ID: Gd002

Location: Gasr Duierat, Lepcis Magna, Wadi Lebdah

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Gd002-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Seen in 1895 beside the remains of a mausoleum 20 minutes south of Gasr Duierat (Gd001). Not seen again. According to Clermont-Ganneau the mausoleum was similar to Gasr Duierat (Gd001).

References:
Clermont-Ganneau 1903, 342; Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, VIII: 22675; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ged001

Location Lepcis Magna

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID Ged001-A

Monument Name:
Gasr Gelda; El Geledah; KHM 103

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausoleum is located one kilometre away from the fort Monticelli and Gasr el-Geledah. According to Romanelli this mausoleum that was destroyed during the Italian war pre-1925. Romanelli mentions some architectural decorations associated with this monument, such as acroteria in the form of spirals and palmettes and part of a Doric frieze. Romanelli also noticed an inscription (IRT 745).

References:

Image source: Romanelli 1925, Figure 97
Site ID: Ger001

Location: Lepcis Magna

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Ger001-A

Monument Name: Gasr er-Riyahi

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Romanelli mentions the remains of a mausoleum located south-east of Gasr Shaddad on the left side of the es-Sahel road in a large enclosure, 42 x 30m, and perhaps the remains of two or three further mausolea.

References:
Romanelli 1925, 163.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gez001

Location: Guedah el Doukara, Henchir Guedah ez Zehamla

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID: Gez001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Remains of a mausoleum 50 m to the north east of a structure measuring 10 m x 21 m.

References: Trousset 1974, 69; Toussaint 1905, 69.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gh002

Location  Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh002-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A mausoleum which is set at the edge of Hamada.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 106; Sjöström, 206 ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gh006

**Location**: Wadi Ghirza

**Landscape**: Pre-Desert

**Monument ID**: Gh006-A

**Monument Name**: Mausoleum A

**Architectural Type**: Collapsed/Unclear

**Architectural Sub-Type**: Collapsed, Unclear

**Period**: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site**: Single dressed block, probably from mausoleum.

**References**: Mattingly 1996, 106; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image source**: No Image
Site ID: Gh029

Location  Wadi Ghirza
Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh029-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Mound of rubble, dressed blocks, some with rosettes. Possibly other tomb 5 m away, situated a short distance from the edge of the Hamada.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 109; Sjöström 1993, 207; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gh062

Location  Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh062-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A scatter

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Some circular cairns (up to 4.7m in diameter) reuse some dressed and decorated blocks from Roman-period mausolea, and others lie around the site.

References: Mattingly1996, 112; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gh067

**Location**  Wadi Ghirza

**Landscape:** Pre-Desert

**Monument ID**  Gh067-A

**Monument Name:**  Mausoleum A

**Architectural Type:**  Possible rectangular mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**  Collapsed, Possible rectangular mausoleum

**Period:**  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
This is a small cemetery with mausoleum south of Gh066 with two rectangular/square large tombs or mausolea. Column base lies immediately adjacent, and modern graves with cists are situated to the west.

**References:**
Mattingly 1996,112; Sjöström 1993, 208; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

**Image source:**  No Image
Site ID: Gh124

Location: Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Plateau, Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh124-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Lime stone plateau half a kilometre from Wadi Ghirza, south of Gh119. Cemetery area contains a variety of forms of graves and least two possible ashlar mausolea.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 118; Sjöström 1993, 219; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gh124

Location  Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Plateau, Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh124-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Lime stone plateau half a kilometre from Wadi Ghirza, south of Gh119. Cemetery area contains a variety of forms of graves and least two possible ashlar mausolea.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 118; Sjöström 1993, 219; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gh128

Location: Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh128-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so-called Ghirza South cemetery is situated approximately three kilometre to the south of the settlement of Ghirza. A cemetery of minor burials is situated next to the monumental tombs.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Gh128

Location  Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh128-B

Monument Name: 
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: 
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: 
Unclear

Period: 
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: 
The so-called Ghirza South cemetery is situated approximately three kilometre to the south of the settlement of Ghirza. A cemetery of minor burials is situated next to the monumental tombs.

References: 
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Gh128

Location  Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh128-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum North C

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so-called Ghirza South cemetery is situated approximately three kilometre to the south of the settlement of Ghirza. A cemetery of minor burials is situated next to the monumental tombs.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 105b
Site ID: Gh128

Location  Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh128-D

Monument Name:
Mausoleum D

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so-called Ghirza South cemetery is situated approximately three kilometre to the south of the settlement of Ghirza. A cemetery of minor burials is situated next to the monumental tombs.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source: Brogan and Smith 1984, 194, Fig.62
Site ID: Gh128

Location: Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh128-E

Monument Name: Mausoleum E

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so-called Ghirza South cemetery is situated approximately three kilometre to the south of the settlement of Ghirza. A cemetery of minor burials is situated next to the monumental tombs.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source: Brogan and Smith 1984, 198, Fig.64
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site ID:</strong> Gh128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape:</strong> Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monument ID</strong> Gh128-F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument Name:</strong> Mausoleum F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong> Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong> Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong> Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description of Site:**
The so-called Ghirza South cemetery is situated approximately three kilometre to the south of the settlement of Ghirza. A cemetery of minor burials is situated next to the monumental tombs.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

**Image source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Gh128

Location: Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh128-G

Monument Name:
Mausoleum G

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so-called Ghirza South cemetery is situated approximately three kilometres to the south of the settlement of Ghirza. A cemetery of minor burials is situated next to the monumental tombs.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh129-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so called Ghirza North cemetery is situated approx. 350 m West from the Ghirza settlement. A cemetery of smaller burials is situated behind the mausoleum cemetery.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Gh129

Location  North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Landscape:  Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh129-B

Monument Name:  Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:  Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so called Ghirza North cemetery is situated approx. 350 m West from the Ghirza settlement. A cemetery of smaller burials is situated behind the mausoleum cemetery.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source:  Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh129-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so called Ghirza North cemetery is situated approx. 350 m West from the Ghirza settlement. A cemetery of smaller burials is situated behind the mausoleum cemetery.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Gh129

Location  North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Gh129-D

Monument Name:
Mausoleum D

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so called Ghirza North cemetery is situated approx. 350 m West from the Ghirza settlement. A cemetery of smaller burials is situated behind the mausoleum cemetery.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh129-E

Monument Name:
Mausoleum E

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so called Ghirza North cemetery is situated approx. 350 m West from the Ghirza settlement. A cemetery of smaller burials is situated behind the mausoleum cemetery.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh129-F

Monument Name:
Mausoleum F

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Short Description of Site:
The so called Ghirza North cemetery is situated approx. 350 m West from the Ghirza settlement. A cemetery of smaller burials is situated behind the mausoleum cemetery.

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gh129-G

Monument Name:
Mausoleum G

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The so called Ghirza North cemetery is situated approx. 350 m West from the Ghirza settlement. A cemetery of smaller burials is situated behind the mausoleum cemetery.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID: Gha001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoelum A

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Site ID:** Gha001  
**Location:** Ghadames  
**Landscape:** Desert, Oasis

**Monument ID**  Gha001-B  
**Monument Name:**  
Mausoleum B  
**Architectural Type:**  
Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum  

**Period:**  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)  

**Short Description of Site:**  
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.  

**References:**  
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.  

**Image source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID: Gha001-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID: Gha001-D

Monument Name:
Mausoleum D

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: Mattingly, Private Image
Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID: Gha001-E

Monument Name:
Mausoleum E

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Gha001

Location Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID Gha001-F

Monument Name: Mausoleum F

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: Mattingly, Private Image
Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID: Gha001-G

Monument Name:
Mausoleum G

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID: Gha001-H

Monument Name:
Mausoleum H

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID: Gha001-I

Monument Name:
Mausoleum I

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Gha001

Location  Ghadames

Landscape: Desert, Oasis

Monument ID  Gha001-J

Monument Name:
Mausoleum J

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The Asnam cemetery of Ghadames (ancient Cidamus) stands outside the medieval town of Ghadames towards the south-west, and is slowly incorporated into the modern town.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ghl001
   Ghl001

**Location** Wadi Ghalbun

**Landscape**: Pre-Desert

**Monument ID** Ghl001-A

**Monument Name:**
Mausoleum A

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Possible obelisk mausoleum

**Period:**
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
A mausoleum from the Wadi Ghalboun, which is now partly re-constructed inside the Bani Ulid museum.

**References:**
Kenrick 2009 175.

**Image source:** Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Gi001

Location: Giosc el Seghir

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Gi001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Three displaced sculpted stones from mausolea that were piled up in the centre of the piazza at Giosc.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gi001

Location: Giosc el Seghir

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Gi001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Three displaced sculptured stones from mausolea that were piled up in the centre of the piazza at Giosc.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site ID:</strong> Gi001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Giosk el Seghir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape:</strong> Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong> Gi001-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument Name:</strong> Mausoleum C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong> Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong> Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong> General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description of Site:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three displaced scultured stones from mausolea that were pileded up in the centre of the piazza at Giosk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong> Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image source:</strong> No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site ID: Giu001

Location: El-Haraba

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Giu001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The base of three mausolea have been observed by Coro and Brogan.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 40.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Giu001

Location: El-Haraba

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Giu001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The base of three mausolea have been observed by Coro and Brogan.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 40.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Giu001

Location: El-Haraba

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Giu001-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The base of three mausolea have been observed by Coro and Brogan.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 40.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gl001

Location  Lepcis Magna

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID  Gl001-A

Monument Name:
Gasm Legbeba; KHM 104

Architectural Type:
Rectangular mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Rectangular mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausoleum is situated approx. five and half kilometre south-west of Lepcis Magna. A wall of
small stones is situated south of the mausoleum as well as traces of a water basin. The mausoleum that
still stood to some height when Cowper visited it towards the end of the nineteenth century. Cowper
mentions an inscription on a marble block nearby.

References:
Cowper 1897, 214; Matoug 1997, 211-214; Romanelli 1925, 164; Munzi et al. 2016, 91-92.

Image source: Munzi et al. 2016, 91, Figure 31
Site ID: Go001

Location Rhoumrassen

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID Go001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear, Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The now destroyed mausoleum stood on the foot of a natural quarry one kilometre to the north of the castellum at Henchir Ras el Oued Gordab.

References:
Gauckler 1904, 376; Tribalet 1901, 289; Trousset 1974, 105.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gr022

Location: Wadi Ghurgar

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Gr022-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This site has not been recorded by the ULVS but Brogan visited it at some point in the late 1950s or 1960s. It is nine kilometre from the great cisterns of the wadi Tininai, on the left bank of the wadi. There seems to have been five monumental tombs, but only two can still give any indication their nature, possibly obelisk tombs. There is a number of stone piles in the vicinity which might be graves. A destroyed gasr is to the east of the cemetery.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gr022

Location Wadi Ghurgar

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID Gr022-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This site has not been recorded by the ULVS but Brogan visited it at some point in the late 1950s or 1960s. It is nine kilometre from the great cisterns of the wadi Tininai, on the left bank of the wadi. There seems to have been five monumental tombs, but only two can still give any indication their nature, possibly obelisk tombs. There is a number of stone piles in the vicinity which might be graves. A destroyed gasr is to the east of the cemetery.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gs001

Location: Lepcis Magna, Wadi Lebdah

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Gs001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; Gasr Shaddad;

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Several mausolea were located east of Lepcis Magna, east of the Wadi Lebda near the Eastern bath and theatre. Only the remains of Gasr Shaddad survive, however, Romanelli indicates that more mausolea once stood here.

References:
Cowper 1897, 213; Kenrick 2009; Romanelli 1925.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Gse001

Location  Wadi Gsea

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Gse001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Possible temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This mausoleum is situated just over one kilometre north-west of Ras el-Msid on a small hill overlooking the Gsea valley, Gebel Tarhuna.

References:
Oates 1953, 104-105.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gu001

Location  Beni Guedal

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Gu001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Beni Guedal is approximately eleven kilometre north east of Dehibat. Previous excavations by Lieut. Witz and Lieut Faveris located two mausolea, and Trouset during a survey located an additional two.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Gu001

Location: Beni Guedal

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Gu001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Beni Guedal is approximately eleven kilometre north east of Dehibat. Previous excavations by Lieut. Witz and Lieut Faveris located two mausolea, and Trousset during a survey located an additional two.

References:

Image source: No Image
**Site ID:** Gu001  

**Location:** Beni Guedal  

**Landscape:** Gefara  

**Monument ID** Gu001-C  

**Monument Name:**  
Mausoleum C  

**Architectural Type:**  
Collapsed/Unclear  

**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Collapsed, Unclear  

**Period:**  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  

**Short Description of Site:**  
Beni Guedal is approximately eleven kilometre north east of Dehibat. Previous excavations by Lieut. Witz and Lieut Faveris located two mausolea, and Trousset during a survey located an additional two.  

**References:**  

**Image source:** No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gz001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Gasr ez-Zlasei, Gebel Tarhunah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape:</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monument ID</strong></th>
<th>Gz001-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument Name:</strong></td>
<td>Mausoleum A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description of Site:</strong></td>
<td>Fragments of a mausoleum on spur two kilometres south of Gasr ez-Zlasei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Oates 1953, 104-105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site ID: Ha001

Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID: Ha001-A

Monument Name: Henshir bel Aid

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausoleum is situated outside a small fortlet of Henshir bel Aid, approximately 200m to the north-west. There may have been a second mausoleum, but the evidence is not conclusive. There was a second tomb 900 m towards the west, but if this was also a mausoleum is not clear.

References:
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.

Image source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site ID:</strong></th>
<th>Haj078</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Gasr Dehmesh, Gebel Tarhunah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape:</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Haj078-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument Name:</strong></td>
<td>Mausoleum A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description of Site:</strong></td>
<td>Remains of a small mausoleum in the area of Hjaj, a tributary of the Wadi Doga, about 150 m on the opposite side of the wadi of Gasr Dhemeshn near a small village. All surface traces were bulldozed and looted. What remains is a small subterranean funerary room, lined by fine ashlar blocks. Early Italian sigillata (Conspectus Form 4) and Eastern sigillata A sherds (form type 43= Hayes 1991, Figure 4, number 30) were collected at this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site ID: Hk001

Location: Henchir Krebita

Landscape: Gebel, On hilltop, Western Gebel

Monument ID: Hk001-A

Monument Name: Henchir Krebita

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: A ruined mausoleum four and a half kilometre south-west of Techine on a small hill.

References: Cagnat, 1928, 249-253; Toussaint 1908, 403; Trouset 1974, 83-84.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Hm001

Location  Guedah el Doukara, Henchir Mguitla

Landscape:  Gebel, On prominent spur, Western Gebel

Monument ID  Hm001-A

Monument Name:  Henshir Mguitla

Architectural Type:  Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:  Fragments of a larger structure were noted 700 m to the east of Henchir Mguitla (small fortlet) which probably belonged to a mausoleum.

References:  Donau 1904, 475; Trouset 1974, 62.

Image source:  No Image
Site ID: Hs001

Location Gebel Nefusa, Henscir Suffit, Yefren

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID Hs001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; Suffit Mausoleum

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
‘Tetrastyle’ temple mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausoleum is situated on a hill overlooking the countryside. Henchir Suffit, the nearby farm, is located 250 m North-East. It has been excavated in 1926 by Bartoccini.

References:

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Hu001

Location: Al-Khums, Lepcis Magna

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Hu001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Rectangular mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Rectangular mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A cemetery at the southern outskirts of Lepcis Magna (Al-Khums) with a group of rectangular mausolea. This site is now destroyed and built over.

References:
Matoug 1997.

Image source: Matoug 1997, Plate XCb
Site ID: Hu001

Location: Al-Khums, Lepcis Magna

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Hu001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Rectangular mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Rectangular mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A cemetery at the southern outskirts of Lepcis Magna (Al-Khums) with a group of rectangular mausolea. This site is now destroyed and built over.

References:
Matoug 1997.

Image source: Matoug 1997, Plate XCb
Site ID: Jo001

Location: Josh (Giosc)

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Jo001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear, Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Fifteen kilometre west-north-west of Josh near Wadi Jerboa and an area called Scgera. A group of ruins, cement and pieces of wall indicate the presence of a house, and the columns might belong to a mausoleum. The marabout tomb on the road just outside the village contains many dressed stones.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ju001

Location: Wadi Caam

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Ju001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; Al Jumaa; El Giuma

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This mausoleum is situated 5 km East of the Wadi Caam on the modern main coastal road. This very big rectangular mausoleum was restored in 1927.

References:
Kenrick 2009,149.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Kh9511

Location: Wadi Umm el Kharab

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Kh9514-A

Monument Name:
Unfinished mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Large cemetery comprising Kh9511-Kh9515. Kh 9514 is an unfinished mausoleum.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Kha001

Location: Wadi Khalbun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Kha001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The wadi Khalbun is located in the vicinity of Bani Ulid. The remains of the tower mausoleum are now in the Bani Ulid museum. Its exact original location is unknown.

References:
Kenrick 2009, 175.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Kn005

Location  Wadi Khanafes

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Kn005-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A (North)

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery is located on the south side of the wadi Khanafes. It is situated on top of the scarp overlooking the wadi bed, approximately 20 m from the Hamada edge. Two large cella mausolea and 30 mausolea-like tombs are represented by mounds of rubble and 6 mausolea-like tombs of squared masonry. The mausolea are approximately 10 m apart from each other. The north mausoleum (Kn005-A) is better preserved. The cemetery is not far from the gasr Khanafes which dominates the important passage between the wadi Soffegin and Zemzem.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Kn005

Location  Wadi Khanafes

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Kn005-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B (South)

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery is located on the south side of the wadi Khanafes. It is situated on top of the scarp overlooking the wadi bed, approximately 20 m from the Hamada edge. Two large cella mausolea and 30 mausolea-like tombs are represented by mounds of rubble and 6 mausolea-like tombs of squared masonry. The mausolea are approximately 10 m apart from each other. The north mausoleum (Kn005-A) is better preserved. The cemetery is not far from the gasr Khanafes which dominates the important passage between the wadi Soffegin and Zemzem.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Kn005

Location: Wadi Khanafes

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Kn005-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery is located on the south side of the wadi Khanafes. It is situated on top of the scarp overlooking the wadi bed, approximately 20 m from the Hamada edge. Two large cella mausolea and 30 mausolea-like tombs are represented by mounds of rubble and 6 mausolea-like tombs of squared masonry. The mausolea are approximately 10 m apart from each other. The north mausoleum (Kn005-A) is better preserved. The cemetery is not far from the gasr Khanafes which dominates the important passage between the wadi Soffegin and Zemzem.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
**Site ID:** Kn079

**Location:** Wadi Khanafes

**Landscape:** Pre-Desert

**Monument ID** Kn079-A

**Monument Name:**
Mausoleum A

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Obelisk mausoleum

**Period:**
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
North side west Wadi Khanafes on neck of promontory above Wadi. Circa nine tombs, all approximately rectangular and very ruinous. Small architectural fragments noted, such as a cornice or pediment, a spiral decoration and a possible column part.

**References:**
Mattingly 1996, 159; Sjöström 1993, 223; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

**Image source:** ULVS Archive
Site ID: Kn079

Location: Wadi Khanafes

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Kn079-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
North side west Wadi Khanafes on neck of promontory above Wadi. Circa nine tombs, all approximately rectangular and very ruinous. Small architectural fragments noted, such as a cornice or pediment, a spiral decoration and a possible column part.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 159; Sjöström 1993, 223; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Lb001

Location: Lepcis Magna, Wadi Lebdah

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Lb001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Marble tomb relief with tabella ansata, possibly from a mausoleum, found in the Wadi Lebda.

References:
Reynolds and Ward-Perkins, 1952.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Le001

Location: Wadi Lella

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Le001-A

Monument Name: Gusbat Lella

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This mausoleum is located about three kilometre west of the Garian-Mizda road on a small rounded knoll in the south-west side of the Wadi Lella.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Gentilucci 1933, 172-187.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Lm001

Location: Wadi el-Amud

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Lm001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery is situated on the west side of wadi el-Amud on a low stony terrace. It has at least two temple mausolea with an aedicula. One mausoleum is standing, the other ruined. A third mausoleum was recorded by Brogan (Site 3) but was not visible when that ULVS surveyed the site. Brogan notes that a destroyed building on a low terrace on the east side, the other a site with an olive press a little above the tombs.

References:
Barker and Jones 1982, 18; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 267; Brogan 1964, 48-50; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 165; Sjöström 1993, 182; M:163-64.

Image source: Mattingly, Private Image
Site ID: Lm001

Location  Wadi el-Amud

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Lm001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery is situated on the west side of wadi el-Amud on a low stony terrace. It has at least two temple mausolea with an aedicula. One mausoleum is standing, the other ruined. A third mausoleum was recorded by Brogan (Site 3) but was not visible when that ULVS surveyed the site. Brogan notes that a destroyed building on a low terrace on the east side, the other a site with an olive press a little above the tombs.

References:
Barker and Jones 1982, 18; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 267; Brogan 1964, 48-50; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 165; Sjöström 1993, 182; M:163-64.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Lm001

Location  Wadi el-Amud

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Lm001-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery is situated on the west side of wadi el-Amud on a low stony terrace. It has at least two temple mausolea with an aedicula. One mausoleum is standing, the other ruined. A third mausoleum was recorded by Brogan (Site 3) but was not visible when that ULVS surveyed the site. Brogan notes that a destroyed building on a low terrace on the east side, the other a site with an olive press a little above the tombs.

References:
Barker and Jones 1982, 18; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 267; Brogan 1964, 48-50; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 165; Sjöström 1993, 182; M:163-64.

Image source: No Image
**Site ID:** Lm001  
**Location**  Wadi el-Amud  
**Landscape:**  Pre-Desert  

**Monument ID**  Lm001-D  
**Monument Name:**  Mausoleum D  

**Architectural Type:**  Reused stones  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  Collapsed, Unclear  

**Period:**  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  

**Short Description of Site:**  
The cemetery is situated on the west side of wadi el-Amud on a low stony terrace. It has at least two temple mausolea with an aedicula. One mausoleum is standing, the other ruined. A third mausoleum was recorded by Brogan (Site 3) but was not visible when that ULVS surveyed the site. Brogan notes that a destroyed building on a low terrace on the east side, the other a site with an olive press a little above the tombs.  

**References:**  
Barker and Jones 1982, 18; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 267; Brogan 1964, 48-50; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 165; Sjöström 1993, 182; M:163-64.  

**Image source:**  No Image
Site ID: Lp001

Location Lepcis Magna

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID Lp001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Romanelli assumes that several mausolea once stood to the west of Lepcis Magna, but only little traces of them survive until today. One mausoleum survived until the 19th century and has been drawn by Rae, Delaporte mentions other graves around the monument, while Rohlfs provides a sketch of the tomb.

References:
Delaporte 1836, 30-31; Romanelli, 1925, 163-164; Rohlfs 1871, 108; Rae 1877, image between page 34 and 35.

Image source: Rae 1877
Site ID: Md001

Location  Mselleten, Wadi Merdum

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Md001-A

Monument Name:
Mselleten Mausoleum A; Msallatin

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery of Mselletin (the two needles in Arabic) is situated on the left bank of the wadi Merdum where the old road from Beni Ulid to Misurata crosses. 33 Cairns surround the mausolea which makes them the central point of the cemetery. A third mausoleum (Md001-C) stood to the west of Md001-A and B, but has now fully collapsed. Brogan commented in her notes that some of the reliefs walled into the fort at Beni Ulid probably belong to this monument. Mehier de Mathuisieulx, Nouvelles Archives des Missions XII (1904) illustrated a large fallen capital beside the third collapsed monument of the group, carved with a lion and a bull. The capital was later removed to Beni Ulid, where it was identified and photographed. It was later taken to Tripoli museum.

References:
Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Matttingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
**Site ID: Md001**

**Location** Mselleten, Wadi Merdum

**Landscape:** Pre-Desert

**Monument ID** Md001-B

**Monument Name:**
Mselleten Mausoleum B; Msallatin

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Obelisk mausoleum

**Period:**
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
The cemetery of Mselletin (the two needles in Arabic) is situated on the left bank of the wadi Merdum where the old road from Beni Ulid to Misurata crosses. 33 Cairns surround the mausolea which makes them the central point of the cemetery. A third mausoleum (Md001-C) stood to the west of Md001-A and B, but has now fully collapsed. Brogan commented in her notes that some of the reliefs walled into the fort at Beni Ulid probably belong to this monument. Mehier de Mathuisieulx, Nouvelles Archives des Missions XII (1904) illustrated a large fallen capital beside the third collapsed monument of the group, carved with a lion and a bull. The capital was later removed to Beni Ulid, where it was identified and photographed. It was later taken to Tripoli museum.

**References:**
Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Mattingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image source:** Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Md001

Location: Mselleten, Wadi Merdum

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Md001-C

Monument Name:
Mselleten Mausoleum C; Msallatin

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery of Mselletin (the two needles in Arabic) is situated on the left bank of the wadi Merdum where the old road from Beni Ulid to Misurata crosses. 33 Cairns surround the mausolea which makes them the central point of the cemetery. A third mausoleum (Md001-C) stood to the west of Md001-A and B, but has now fully collapsed. Brogan commented in her notes that some of the reliefs walled into the fort at Beni Ulid probably belong to this monument. Mehier de Mathuisieulx, Nouvelles Archives des Missions XII (1904) illustrated a large fallen capital beside the third collapsed monument of the group, carved with a lion and a bull. The capital was later removed to Beni Ulid, where it was identified and photographed. It was later taken to Tripoli museum.

References:
Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Mattingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Md019

Location: Wadi Merdum

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Md019-A

Monument Name: Mausleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
On the north side of Wadi Merdum as it approaches Sofeggin, is a wide flat plain. The mausolea are located on the bluff 30 m above Md018 (Snemat Opus Africanum farm with two upright olive presses and two cisterns). There are at least two mausolea, now almost completely demolished. Blocks are scattered over hillside and hilltop, some re-used in circular huts.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 181; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: Mattingly 1996a, Figure 26.17
Site ID: Md019

Location: Wadi Merdum

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Md019-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
On the north side of Wadi Merdum as it approaches Sofeggin, is a wide flat plain. The mausolea are located on the bluff 30 m above Md018 (Snemat Opus Africanum farm with two upright olive presses and two cisterns). There are at least two mausolea, now almost completely demolished. Blocks are scattered over hillside and hilltop, some re-used in circular huts.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 181; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Md023

Location  Bir Gebira, Wadi Merdum

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Md023-A

Monument Name:  
Bir Gebira Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:  
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Short Description of Site:  
This obelisk tomb stands on the right bank of the wadi, opposite the well which is on the left bank. It is associated with Md022, an early Opus Africanum farm which has produced early sigillata.

References:  
Bauer 1935, 75; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 109; Mattingly 1996, 183.

Image source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Md027

Location: Wadi Merdum

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Md027-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Cemetery with cairns and one mausoleum. One carved stone noted.

References: Mattingly 1996, 183; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Me001

Location: Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Me001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This mausoleum is located far up the Wadi Meseuggi, and was not visited by the ULVS team.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Mg001

Location  Wadi Migdal

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Mg001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Mausoleum near the lower end of the Wadi, just before it turns east. The tomb is standing high above the left bank, half way up the hillside, where there is a break making a bay in the wall or high ground along the wadi. It is a tower with an aedicula on the second storey. Brogan suggest that they may have been a couple of statues in the aedicula, of which no traces remain.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 200.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Mg009

Location  Wadi Migdal

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Mg009-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Two obelisk tombs 200 m apart and similar to each other, are located on a shallow gravel terrace. Other graves are in this cemetery.

References:

Image source: Mattingly 1996a, Figure 27.7
Site ID: Mg009

Location: Wadi Migdal

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mg009-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Two obelisk tombs 200 m apart and similar to each other, are located on a shallow gravel terrace. Other graves are in this cemetery.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mg011

Location: Wadi Migdal

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mg011-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Possible mauosulem in a rectangular courtyard with small rectangular structure 3 m x 2 m in one corner constructed of small dressed blocks, with some architectural fragments.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mg038

Location  Wadi Migdal

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Mg038-A

Monument Name: N/A

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Block of sculpture was found lying by side of track, most likely out of context. Opus Africanus fames nearby (Mg36). Mausoleum Mg001 is on the opposite side of the wadi, circa 600 m away. Rectangular block with relief of human figure in arched panel. Possible reuse as water tray.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 205.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mgu001

Location Henchir Mguitla

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID Mgu001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Ruins of a mausoleum 700 m to the east of Henchir Mguitla south-east, which is a dwelling of some sort.

References:
Trousset 1974, 62; Donau 1904, 475.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mm003

Location  Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Mm003-A

Monument Name:  
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:  
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  
Unclear

Period:  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:  
Moulded base of mausoleum, with cornice, above colonnade, 4 x 3 m with shafts that were 1.73 m long. Two rectangular coursed rubble graves were close by. Also three pieces of column shaft and eight bases as well as 6 very eroded capitals found at Mm002 which were not in situ, and could belong to this mausoleum.

References:  

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mm004

Location: Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mm004-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Three mausolea and three small graves of coursed rubble. No bigger settlement in immediate vicinity.


Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Mm004

Location: Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mm004-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Three mausolea and three small graves of coursed rubble. No bigger settlement in immediate vicinity.

References:

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Mm004

Location: Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mm004-C

Monument Name: Mausoleum C

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Three mausolea and three small graves of coursed rubble. No bigger settlement in immediate vicinity.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mm079

Location: Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mm079-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Ornate mausoleum partly collapsed on the north side of the Wadi Mimoun. Mausoleum was probably once of the obelisk type but there are no traces of the obelisk blocks that would have formed the roof, but much of the stone was robbed.

References:

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Mm091

Location  Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Mm091-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Rectangular mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Rectangular mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Small mausoleum located circa 100 m from the Wadi edge on the Hamada. The tomb chamber is roofed with five originally plastered blocks. A moulded cornice also recorded here. Visible from mausoleum Mm079 ca. 100m from wadi edge on Hamada.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 220; Sjöström 1993, 257; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Mm123

Location: Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mm123-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum

Architectural Type: Rectangular mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Rectangular mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Well preserved cemetery, including a rectangular mausoleum, oblong cairns and circular cairns.

References:
Barker 1996, 144, Figure 5.32; Mattingly 1996, 223; Sjöström 1993, 258 ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Short Description of Site:
A major cemetery with three small mausolea located on the south side of the wadi Mimoun, directly opposite Mm010. Other individual graves and circular tombs in vicinity.

References:

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Mm209

Location  Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Mm209-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A major cemetery with three small mausolea located on the south side of the wadi Mimoun, directly opposite Mm010. Other individual graves and circular tombs in vicinity.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mm209

Location  Wadi Mimoun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Mm209-C

Monument Name: Mausoleum C

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A major cemetery with three small mausolea located on the south side of the wadi Mimoun, directly opposite Mm010. Other individual graves and circular tombs in vicinity.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mn014

Location: Wadi Mansur

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mn014-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This possible mausoleum is located 27 km up Wadi Mansur to the west of a large gsur (ULVS Mn14). The mausoleum has a rectangular cella (almost square) with moulded pediments and cornices with two courses of fine ashlar blocks intervening. Stands to a height of circa 1.40 m but with cornice in place would have been much taller.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 238; Sjöström 1993, 229; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mu001

Location: Bir Dufan, Wadi Mimun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mu001-A

Monument Name: Scattered fragments

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
During the Italian occupation, some of the Italian officers collected an number of stones from an unspecified tomb sites an set up at the crossroads in front t of the Italian fort which bear traces of sculpture.

References:
Brogan 1977, 112.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mu001

**Location**  Bir Dufan, Wadi Mimun

**Landscape:** Pre-Desert

**Monument ID**  Mu001-B

**Monument Name:**
Mausoleum B

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Possible peripteral temple mausoleum

**Period:**
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
During the Italian occupation, some of the Italian officers collected an number of stones from an unspecified tomb sites an set up at the crossroads in front t of the Italian fort which bear traces of sculpture.

**References:**
Brogan 1977, 112.

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Mu001

Location  Bir Dufán, Wadi Mimun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Mu001-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible tower mausoleum open perystile

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
During the Italian occupation, some of the Italian officers collected an number of stones from an unspecified tomb sites an set up at the crossroads in front t of the Italian fort which bear traces of sculpture.

References:
Brogan 1977, 112.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mu001

Location: Bir Dufan, Wadi Mimun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mu001-D

Monument Name: Mausoleum D

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
During the Italian occupation, some of the Italian officers collected an number of stones from an unspecified tomb sites an set up at the crossroads in front t of the Italian fort which bear traces of sculpture.

References:
Brogan 1977, 112.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mu001

**Location**  Bir Dufan, Wadi Mimun

**Landscape:**  Pre-Desert

**Monument ID**  Mu001-E

**Monument Name:**  Mausoleum E

**Architectural Type:**  Possible temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**  Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:**  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**  
During the Italian occupation, some of the Italian officers collected an number of stones from an unspecified tomb sites an set up at the crossroads in front t of the Italian fort which bear traces of sculpture.

**References:**  
Brogan 1977, 112.

**Image source:**  No Image
Site ID: Mu001

Location: Bir Dufan, Wadi Mimun

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Mu001-F

Monument Name: Mausoleum F

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
During the Italian occupation, some of the Italian officers collected an number of stones from an unspecified tomb sites an set up at the crossroads in front of the Italian fort which bear traces of sculpture.

References:
Brogan 1977, 112.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Mz001

Location: Wadi Mizda

Landscape: Oasis, Pre-Desert, Wadi

Monument ID: Mz001-A

Monument Name: Mizda collection

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Italian officers collected sculptured stones from the surrounding countryside in Mizda during the Italian occupation. There are no records about where the stones came from. Most of the Mizda stones have been taken to Tripoli castle by Dr Verfara Caffarelli in 1960.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Site ID: Nf030**

**Location**  Shapet el Gasr, Wadi N'f'd

**Landscape:** Pre-Desert

**Monument ID**  Nf030-A

**Monument Name:**
Shapet el Gasr Mausolum A (North tomb)

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Obelisk mausoleum

**Period:**
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
Collapsed obelisk tomb at time of the ULVS survey in 1980. Now reconstructed in situ by the department of Antiquities. It is situated on the north bank of the Wadi N'f'd, due north across the wadi from the visible upstanding Southern mausoleum (Nf031).

**References:**
Abdussaid 1996, 73-78; Barker and Jones 1981, 25-26; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996a, 261; Sjöström 1993, 264-65.; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image source:** Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Nf031

Location  Shapet el-Amud, Wadi N'f'd

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Nf031-A

Monument Name:
Shapet el-Amud Mausoleum A (South tomb)

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Well preserved obelisk tomb. Smaller tombs are surrounding the monument, including burial mounds.

References:
Abdussaid 1996, 73-78; Barker and Jones 1981, 25-26; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996a, 261; Sjöström 1993, 264-65.; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Nf038

Location  Wadi N'f'd

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Nf038-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Gars Banat is situated on the left bank of the Wadi N'f'd, approximately fifteen kilometre south from where it connects to the Wadi Sofeggin. The cemetery consists of at least 2 mausolea. One is still standing (Nf038-A).

References:
Bauer 1935, 72-73, Figures 24-25; Brogan and Smith 1984, 264-264; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996a, 263; Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 4, 6 ; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 264-73; Di Vita 1964, 89; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Oa001

**Location**  Henchir Oum el Abbes

**Landscape:** Gebel, Western Gebel

**Monument ID** Oa001-A

**Monument Name:**
Henchir Oum el Abbes

**Architectural Type:**
Collapsed/Unclear

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Unclear

**Period:**
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
The mausoleum of Henchir Oum el Abbes is located on the northern slope between Djebel Umm el-Abbes and Djebel Oum el Bebbouch.

**References:**
Cagnat, R. 1928, 253-256; Toussaint, 1908, 403; Trouset, 1974, 84.

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Oa001

Location: Henchir Oum el Abbes

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID: Oa001-B

Monument Name: Monument B

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausoleum of Henchir Oum el Abbes is located on the northern slope between Djebel Umm el-Abbes and Djebel Oum el Bebbouch.

References:
Cagnat, R. 1928, 253-256; Toussaint, 1908, 403; Trouset, 1974, 84.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Oa001

Location  Henchir Oum el Abbes

Landscape:  Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID  Oa001-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausoleum of Henchir Oum el Abbes is located on the northern slope between Djebel Umm el-Abbes and Djebel Oum el Bebbouch.

References:
Cagnat, R. 1928, 253-256; Toussaint, 1908, 403; Trouset, 1974, 84.

Image source:  No Image
Site ID: Ob001

Location  Oued Beni Blell, Tatahouine

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Ob001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The ruins of a mausoleum were recorded by De la Marche four kilometre to the North of Tatahouine, but are now lost. Not much is known about the architecture of this mausoleum. According to Lecoy del la Marche it had a rectangular base. The decorated fragments were taken to Tatahouine by Lecoy de la Marche. They are, most likely, the fragments photographed by Brogan, now lost.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Lecoy de la Marche 1864, 394; Tribalet 1901, 289; Trousset 1974, 108.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Om001

Location  Dehibat, Oued Morteba

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Om001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Donau mentions the remains of a single mausoleum amidst other tumuli around seventeen kilometre from Dehibat, past Bir el Gaa. A Libyan inscription engraved on a column amongst the ruins of a mausoleum were noted, which was transported to Tatahouine. Trouset did not see it when he visited Tatahouine, probably lost.

References:
Donau 1909, 40; Donau 1915, CXX-CXXI, Trouset 1974, 122.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Re001

Location: Gebel Nefusa, Remada

Landscape: Gebel, Western Gebel

Monument ID Re001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Remada was a military post twenty miles south of Tatahouine. In the gateway of the fort and within the courtyard were sculptured stones, which Brogan recorded. The stones found at Remada that belong to a mausoleum are probably coming from somewhere in the vicinity.

References:
Brogan 1965, 53; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Euzennat and Trousset 1978; Goodchild and Ward-Perkins 1949, 95; Lecoy de la Marche, H. 1894, 405-306; Trousset 1974, 114-118.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Rh001

Location: Lepcis Magna, Ras el-Hammam

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Rh001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; KHM 106

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Two mausolea stood in this area, Rh001-A was photographed by Ward Perkins between 1940 and 1950 on the foot of Ras El Hammam. Rh001-B stood about 70m to the east of Rh001-A.

References:

Image source: Munzi et al. 2016, 92, Figure 32
Site ID: Rh001

Location: Lepcis Magna, Ras el-Hammam

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Rh001-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B; KHM 104

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Two mausolea stood in this area, Rh001-A was photographed by Ward Perkins between 1940 and 1950 on the foot of Ras El Hammam. Rh001-B stood about 70m to the east of Rh001-A.


Image source: Munzi et al. 2016, 92, Figure 33
Site ID: Rm009

Location  Wadi Umm el-Ramel

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Rm009-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The site close to a courtyard farm contains at least one tomb and a mausoleum. Modern track runs through site and destroyed a number of walls.

References:
Mattingly 1996a, 272.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Rme001

Location Ras el-Mergheb

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID Rme001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; KHM 2

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
At least two mausolea stood in the wadi Ras el Mergheb, the Beechey brothers mention several tombs here.

References:
Beechey 1828, 50; Munzi et al. 2016, 89-91.

Image source: Cowper 1897, Figure 61, Munzi et al. 2016, 90, Figure 29
Site ID: Rme001

Location  Ras el-Mergheb

Landscape:  Coastal Zone

Monument ID  Rme001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B; KHM 10

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
At least two mausolea stood in the wadi Ras el Mergheb, the Beechey brothers mention several tombs here.

References:
Beechey 1828, 50; Munzi et al. 2016, 89-91.

Image source:  No Image
Site ID: Ro001

Location Rogeban

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID Ro001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A single mausoleum was discovered in the inhabited area of Rogeban. Potsherds of local ceramic and human bones were found during excavation. Two skeletons (confronted) were buried in a large amphora (2.80m tall), and a skeleton in foetal position was also discovered.

References:

Image source: Zenati 1995, Plate LXXIIa
Site ID: Rr001

Location  Bir Ghnem, Yefren

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Rr001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Mausoleum located about four and a half kilometre east of the road between Bir Ghnem and Yefren, km 105 from Tripoli. Three courses of masonry were preserved when Brogan visited the site. The internal chamber is accessible from the east side.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sc001

Location  Bir Ayyad

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Sc001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; Henscir Schiugaff

Architectural Type:
Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A single mausoleum with a concrete core located six kilometre north of the Bir-Aiad to Gasr el-Hag road, from a point two kilometre west of Bir-Aiad. Some dressed stones on a knoll 300 m to the west of the mausoleum were noted by Brogan, perhaps belonging to this monument.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sci001

Location: El-Haraba

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Sci001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A' Henscir Giuemaat

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Remains of mausoleum Brogan visited in 1952 and it was already very damaged when Coro visited it. According to Coro, the crypt was hexagonal in shape, but the shape of the above monument could not be determined.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 42-44.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Se001

Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Se001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; Gber el Faed; Coro: Primo Mausoleo

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The site is located at km stone 295 from Tripoli, one kilometre to the North. When Brogan visited in 1952 not much was left of the eight mausolea Coro recorded in 1922.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Se001

Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Se001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B; Henchir del Arn; Coro: Secondo Mausoleo

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The site is located at km stone 295 from Tripoli, one kilometre to the North. When Brogan visited in 1952 not much was left of the eight mausolea Coro recorded in 1922.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Se001

Location  Cabao, Sia en Nachla

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Se001-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C; Terzo Mausoleo for Coro

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The site is located at km stone 295 from Tripoli, one kilometre to the North. When Brogan visited in 1952 not much was left of the eight mausolea Coro recorded in 1922.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Se001

Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Se001-D

Monument Name: Mausoleum D; Quinto Mausoleo for Coro

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The site is located at km stone 295 from Tripoli, one kilometre to the North. When Brogan visited in 1952 not much was left of the eight mausolea Coro recorded in 1922.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Se001

Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Se001-E

Monument Name:
Mausoleum E; Quinto Mausoleo for Coro

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The site is located at km stone 295 from Tripoli, one kilometre to the North. When Brogan visited in 1952 not much was left of the eight mausolea Coro recorded in 1922.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image source: No Image
**Site ID:** Se001

**Location:** Cabao, Sia en Nachla

**Landscape:** Eastern Gebel, Gebel

**Monument ID** Se001-F

**Monument Name:**
Mausoleum F

**Architectural Type:**
Possible tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum, Unclear

**Period:**
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Short Description of Site:**
The site is located at km stone 295 from Tripoli, one kilometre to the North. When Brogan visited in 1952 not much was left of the eight mausolea Coro recorded in 1922.

**References:**
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Se001

Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Se001-G

Monument Name:
Mausoleum G; Settimo Mausoleo for Coro

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The site is located at km stone 295 from Tripoli, one kilometre to the North. When Brogan visited in 1952 not much was left of the eight mausolea Coro recorded in 1922.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Se001

Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Se001-H

Monument Name:
Mausoleum H; Ottavo Mausoleo for Coro

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The site is located at km stone 295 from Tripoli, one kilometre to the North. When Brogan visited in 1952 not much was left of the eight mausolea Coro recorded in 1922.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sen001

Location: El-Haraba

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Sen001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Remains of mausoleum visited by Brogan in 1952.

References: Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sf003

Location  Kser Banat, Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Sf003-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Possible temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible peripteral temple mausoleum, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
"Mausoleum at Kser Banat , also called Gasr al-Mekeznat (small warehouse) is located on the lower course of the wadi Soffegin on a small summit. Traces of rectangular settlement can be found behind the monument. The mausoleum is rectangular in plan. The quarry for the limestone is located a few dozen metres to the north of the mausoleum."

References:

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Sf023

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf023-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Remains of mausolea cemetery of which one was probably an obelisk tomb. Some masonry reused in two nearby huts and some in wadi wall at foot of slope. Also traces of three similar mausolea. One fragment of early lamp.

References:
Mattingly 1996a, 283; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sf023

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf023-B

Monument Name: Mausolea B, C, D

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Remains of mausolea cemetery of which one was probably an obelisk tomb. Some masonry reused in two nearby huts and some in wadi wall at foot of slope. Also traces of three similar mausolea. One fragment of early lamp.

References:
Mattingly 1996a, 283; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sf023

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf023-C

Monument Name:
Mausoleum C

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Remains of mausolea cemetery of which one was probably an obelisk tomb. Some masonry reused in two nearby huts and some in wadi wall at foot of slope. Also traces of three similar mausolea. One fragment of early lamp.

References:
Mattingly 1996a, 283; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sf023

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf023-D

Monument Name: Mausoleum D

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Remains of mausolea cemetery of which one was probably an obelisk tomb. Some masonry reused in two nearby huts and some in wadi wall at foot of slope. Also traces of three similar mausolea. One fragment of early lamp.

References:
Mattingly 1996a, 283; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sf023

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf023-E

Monument Name: DELETE!!!

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Remains of mausolea cemetery of which one was probably an obelisk tomb. Some masonry reused in two nearby huts and some in wadi wall at foot of slope. Also traces of three similar mausolea. One fragment of early lamp.

References:
Mattingly 1996a, 283; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sf025

Location  Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Sf025-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Possibly more mausolea in this area but very fragmentary. It is located on the north side of Sofeggin to the east of a gully on the ledge 12 m above the wadi.

References:
Mattingly 1996a, 283; Sjöström 1993, 275; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sf092

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf092-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Cemetery North of the village of Bir Nesma (Nezma). The mausolea are visible from main track.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Sf092

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf092-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Cemetery North of the village of Bir Nesma (Nezma). The mausolea are visible from main track.

References: Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Sf092

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf092-C

Monument Name: Mausoleum C

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear, Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Cemetery North of the village of Bir Nesma (Nezma). The mausolea are visible from main track.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Sf092

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf092-D

Monument Name:
Mausoleum D

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Cemetery North of the village of Bir Nesma (Nezma). The mausolea are visible from main track.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sf092

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID: Sf092-E

Monument Name: Mausoleum E

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Cemetery North of the village of Bir Nesma (Nezma). The mausolea are visible from main track.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Si001

Location  Si Aoun, Tatahouine

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Si001-A

Monument Name: Mauoleum A

Architectural Type: Possible hexagonal mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: A mausoleum with a small fort nearby, approximately thrityfive kilometre south of Remada.

References: Donau 1909, 40-43; Toutain 1903, 396; Trouset 1974, 118.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sil001

Location: Silin

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Sil001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Single mausoleum near a nearly obliterated coastal villa which once stood on a high promontory above the sea. The mausoleum is located on a small hill close to the villa. A block with an insert panel and moulding (cyma recta) has been discovered near the mausoleum.

References:
Masturzo 1997; Munzi et al. 2004, Site 16 and Site 48.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sil001

Location: Silin

Landscape: Coastal Zone

Monument ID: Sil001-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Single mausoleum near a nearly obliterated coastal villa which once stood on a high promontory above the sea. The mausoleum is located on a small hill close to the villa. A block with an insert panel and moulding (cyma recta) has been discovered near the mausoleum.

References:
Masturzo 1997; Munzi et al.2004, Site 16 and Site 48.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sn001

Location  Bir Remtsa

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID  Sn001-A

Monument Name: 
Mausoleum A; Henchir Snem

Architectural Type: 
Collapsed/Unclear, Possible rectangular mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: 
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: 
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: 
The cemetery is located seven kilometre south-southeast of Bir Temtsa, near a modern cistern. The three mausolea are rectangular in plan of ochre limestone blocks. One of them was excavated by Lecoy de la Marche, who recognized three mausolea with vaulted chambers underneath. It is, however, unclear which mausoleum he excavated. Trouset states that they still stood to a height of 2 m when he visited the site but no ancient settlement can be associated with them. More recent tombs are to the east of the mausolea.

References: 

Image source: ULVS Archive
Site ID: Sn001

Location: Bir Remtsa

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Sn001-B

Monument Name:
Mausoleum B, Henchir Snem

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery is located seven kilometre south-southeast of Bir Temtsa, near a modern cistern. The three mausolea are rectangular in plan of ochre limestone blocks. One of them was excavated by Lecoy de la Marche, who recognized three mausolea with vaulted chambers underneath. It is, however, unclear which mausoleum he excavated. Trousset states that they still stood to a height of 2 m when he visited the site but no ancient settlement can be associated with them. More recent tombs are to the east of the mausolea.

References:
Lecoy de la Marche 1894, 406; Toussaint, 1906, 236; Trousset 1974, 109.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Sn001

Location: Bir Remtsa

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Sn001-C

Monument Name: Mauoleum C, Henchir Snem

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The cemetery is located seven kilometre south-southeast of Bir Temtsa, near a modern cistern. The three mausolea are rectangular in plan of ochre limestone blocks. One of them was excavated by Lecoy de la Marche, who recognized three mausolea with vaulted chambers underneath. It is, however, unclear which mausoleum he excavated. Trousset states that they still stood to a height of 2 m when he visited the site but no ancient settlement can be associated with them. More recent tombs are to the east of the mausolea.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: So001

Location: Ain Scersciara, Gebel Tarhunah

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: So001-A

Monument Name:
as-Sonama; TEL.92

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The mausoleum is located four and a half kilometre north of Ain Scersciara and seven kilometre north-west of Gasr Doga in the vicinity of a small farm (TEL 95, Ahmed 2010, 127). It had angle pilasters surmounted by a good Corinthian capitals and frieze at each corner.

References:

Image source: No Image
Site ID: So002

Location: Ain Scersciara, Gebel Tarhunah

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: So002-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Mausoleum recorded by Ahmed and Goodchild. Goodchild mentions a stone relief, but does not describe it further.

References:
Ahmed 2010, Site TEL92; Goodchild 1951, Site 24.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ta001

Location  Wadi Talah

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Ta001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
A single mausoleum that was sketched by Barth in 1850. It is situated south-south-east of Mizda on a high ground overlooking the Wadi.

References:
Barth in 1857, 52; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009, 205.

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Tag001

Location Wadi Taghiggia

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID Tag001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Located on the north side of the Wadi Taghiggia, 3 km of the Mizda Gheriat Road in 1958 when Brogan visited the site. By then the site was utterly destroyed, but the tombs still stood when Barth visited it in 1850. According to the locals it had fallen down about 50 years before 1958. A little of the hard concrete base remained when Brogan visited in 1958.

References:
Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Tat001

Location: Tatahouine

Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Tat001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Sculptures from mausolea that stood in the vicinity were brought to Tatahouine such as the sculptures from El-Amrouni (Ea001) and perhaps Oued Beni Blell (Ob001).

References:
Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trouset 1974, 106-7.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Tat001
Location: Tatahouine
Landscape: Gefara

Monument ID: Tat001-B
Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Sculptures from mausolea that stood in the vicinity were brought to Tatahouine such as the sculptures from El-Amrouni (Ea001) and perhaps Oued Beni Blell (Ob001).

References:
Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trouset 1974, 106-7.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Tb045

Location  Wadi Tabuniyah

Landscape: Pre-Desert

Monument ID  Tb045-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A (B for Brogan)

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The blocks of the mausolea are re-used in huts. Possibly two smaller and simpler mausolea and eight or nine chambered tombs with sunken burials are nearby. In 1958 Brogan found the bases of two, or perhaps three, large tombs, and various other remains. On the high ground south of the wadi and a little to the west the Italians had built a small monument with about 24 dressed Roman stones cemented together. One of these blocks has a relief of a double scroll with ivy leaves.

References:
Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Site ID:** Tb045  

**Location:** Wadi Tabuniyah  

**Landscape:** Pre-Desert  

**Monument ID** Tb045-B  

**Monument Name:**  
Mausoleum B (A for Brogan)  

**Architectural Type:**  
Collapsed/Unclear  

**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Collapsed, Unclear  

**Period:**  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  

**Short Description of Site:**  
The blocks of the mausolea are re-used in huts. Possibly two smaller and simpler mausolea and eight or nine chambered tombs with sunken burials are nearby. In 1958 Brogan found the bases of two, or perhaps three, large tombs, and various other remains. On the high ground south of the wadi and a little to the west the Italians had built a small monument with about 24 dressed Roman stones cemented together. One of these blocks has a relief of a double scroll with ivy leaves.  

**References:**  
Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.  

**Image source:** No Image
Site ID: Te001

Location Gebel Garian, Tebedut

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID Te001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan? (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
The remains of a substantial tomb stood to the west of the Garian-Mizda road, five kilometre south of Bu Zeian, on a narrow tongue of hilly land between the road and the Asbaa plain.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Tm001

Location: Taglissi Msufin

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Tm001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan? (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Goodchild investigated a gasr here and found the base of a small mausoleum, now completely destroyed. Near Garian.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Tu001

Location: Gebel Tarhunah, Tuil el Cherm

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Tu001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Ruins of two mausolea that lie side by side on hill east of Garian-Mizda road, north of a small track which leaves road immediately opposite a ruined 'Casa Cantoniera', twentyfour kilometre from Bu Zeian. There are traces of other, smaller tombs.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Site ID: Tu001

Location: Gebel Tarhunah, Tuil el Cherm

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Tu001-B

Monument Name: Mausoleum B

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
Ruins of two mausolea that lie side by side on hill east of Garian-Mizda road, north of a small track which leaves road immediately opposite a ruined 'Casa Cantoniera', twentyfour kilometre from Bu Zeian. There are traces of other, smaller tombs.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Ua001

Location  Bir el Uaar

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID  Ua001-A

Monument Name:
Mausleum A; Al Urban; es Senama; Bir al Waar

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This mausoleum is located in the Al-Urbaan area on flat ground. An ancient building is located on the opposite side of the wadi, about 2km to the east. The mausoleum was restored in the 1990s up to its second storey. (around 2/3rd of the full monument height). Large and richly ornamented and inscribed limestone block was found nearby.

References:

Image source: Kenrick, Private Image
Site ID: Ye001

Location: Gebel Garian, Yefren

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Ye001-A

Monument Name: Mausoleum A

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site: Relief from unknown site near Yefren.

References:
BSR Ward-Perkins archive number wplib-48.XXIII.15

Image source: No Image
Site ID: Za001

Location: Cabao, Wadi Zarizera

Landscape: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Monument ID: Za001-A

Monument Name:
Mausoleum A; Hencir Zarzera for Brogan,
Mausoleo dell’Aquila for Coro.

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Short Description of Site:
This tomb is located km to the east of Cabao. Coro suggest that there was a farm nearby.

References:
Coro 1928, 33-35; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image source: No Image
Deco ID:  Ab001-A-01
Monument ID: Ab001-A
Site ID:  Ab001
Location:
Sidi bel Abbas
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Carved stone depicting quadrupeds, but the type of animal is not specified. Trousset states that the carvings are similar to neo-Punic art such as the decoration of Henchir bel Aid, Bou Guerba and Tatahouine.
References:
Trousset 1974, 79-80.
Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID:  Ab001-A-02
Monument ID: Ab001-A
Site ID:  Ab001
Location:
Sidi bel Abbas
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Carved stone depicting a fish. According to Trouset, the carvings are similar to neo-Punic art such as the decoration of Henchir bel Aid, Bou Guerba and Tatahouine.

References:

Image Source:  No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Ab001-A-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ab001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ab001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Sidi bel Abbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gebel, Western Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Carved stone depicting pine cones and a cup framed by a circle. According to Trousset, the carvings are similar to neo-Punic art such as the decoration of Henchir bel Aid, Bou Guerba and Tatahouine.

**References:**
Trousset 1974, 79-80.

**Image Source:** No Image
### Deco ID: Ag002-A-01

### Monument ID: Ag002-A

### Site ID: Ag002

### Location:
Wadi Umm el-Agerem

### Region:
Pre-Desert

### Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

### Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible tower mausoleum open perystile

### Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

### Size: -

### Short Description:
Corner stone with two square panels and plain borders. The left panel depicts the head and torso of a figure standing under an arch, flanked by two columns. The facial features are defined by large almond-shaped eyes, a small mouth and nose. The hair is carved in small circles, covered by a cap. The face is slightly damaged, featuring a hole in the left cheek. The panel to the right depicts a person standing upright holding an object in front of the belly. The figure is wearing a tunic with folds gathered at the neckline. The face has large almond-shaped eyes, a small straight nose, a small mouth and pronounced cheekbones. The head is covered by a cap, indicated by two chiselled lines.

### References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

### Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Ag002-A-02
Monument ID: Ag002-A
Site ID: Ag002
Location: Wadi Umm el-Agerem
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible tower mausoleum open perystile
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, (return of Ag002-A-01). Three square panels with plain borders and a bead-and-real band above. The left panel shows a roundel divided into eight segments each with a single puncture, with smaller circle in middle. The centre is hollow. The second panel depicts a rosette with eight petals, four in the foreground and four in the background. A thin chiselled groove outlines the inside of each petal. The third panel shows a multi-petalled rosette (sixteen petals), eight in the foreground, eight in the background, outlined by a thin line on each petal. A smaller rosette is placed in the centre in the centre with eight small petals, four in the foreground, and four in the background, also outlined, with a chiselled groove.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
**Deco ID:** Ag002-A-03  
**Monument ID:** Ag002-A  
**Site ID:** Ag002  
**Location:** Wadi Umm el-Agerem  
**Region:** Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:** Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Possible tower mausoleum open perystile  
**Period:** Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)  
**Size:** -  

**Short Description:**  
Square stone showing a plain frame and decorative bead-and-real band is carved along the top frame. The plain frame is damaged on top and at the bottom, where it has weathered away. A rosette of sixteen petals, eight in the foreground, eight in the background. Each of the foreground-petals is outlined by a thin line. A round disk marks the centre of the rosette.

**References:**  
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Ag002-A-04
Monument ID: Ag002-A
Site ID: Ag002
Location: Wadi Umm el-Agerem
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible tower mausoleum open perystile
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone divided into two plain panels with plane frames, underneath a bead-and-real band. The right panel shows a rosette with four acanthus leaves arranged in a cross pattern, and four plain petals in the background. A round disk forms the centre. The left panel depicts a woman. The face is weathered, part of the nose and mouth are obliterated. The eyes are large and almond-shaped, outlined with deep grooves. The hair is parted in the middle and piled up in three rows on top of the head (or headdress?). Tight locks of hair are indicated by small circles carved along the forehead. A wide band either a necklace or the neckline of the dress, is running closely around the neck.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Ag002-A-05
Monument ID: Ag002-A
Site ID: Ag002
Location: Wadi Umm el-Agerem
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible tower mausleum open perystile
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone divided into three square panels with plain borders and a cable pattern running along the top. The left and right panels are completely weathered away. The central panel shows a human face and torso with a long neck, small nose, a mouth indicated by a straight line and almond shaped eyes. The hair is indicated by small vertical carved lines. It appears that the central panel has been restored recently with some sort of plaster, and therefore the facial features may not be accurate. The plain frame on the right side of the stone has broken away and is missing.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID:  Ag002-A-06
Monument ID:  Ag002-A
Site ID:  Ag002
Location:  Wadi Umm el-Agerem
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Possible tower mausoleum open perystile
Period:  Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone divided up into two panels, with cable pattern running along the top of the panels. The left panel shows a weathered carving of a feline mask or hide with its forelegs hanging down underneath the head. The face features comprise two large almond eyes, two small ears and an open mouth. The paws are rendered in detail with long grooves. The right panel shows a multi-petalled rosette with 16 petals, eight in the foreground outlined by a thin line and eight plain petals in the background. The top and bottom corner on the right hand side is broken off and the borders of the panel are missing.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Ag002-B-01
Monument ID:  Ag002-B
Site ID:  Ag002
Location:  Wadi Umm el-Agerem
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Possible temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size:  W: 0.38 m

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, broken off on the right hand side. The frieze depicts a double stemmed scroll, one ivy and one wine leaf and a 6-petalled flower in the centre of the scroll. Three sets of three small and straight leafs are growing out of the scroll. Carving marks of a tooth chisel can be seen on the bottom of the plain border.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; , Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Ag002-B-02
Monument ID: Ag002-B
Site ID: Ag002
Location:
Wadi Umm el-Agerem
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Possible temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone with an inscription framed by two twelve-petalled star-rosettes in high relief. The inscription is set in a tabella ansata, a rectangular frame with two trapezoidal shapes to the left and right, with the inscription inside the frame. Two rosettes are placed left and right of the ansata. Six petals are in the foreground, and six plain petals are in the background. Two grooves are inside each petal in the foreground, and one in the centre of the petal in the background. The inscription is very weathered, and the bottom right petal of the right rosette is damaged.

References:
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
**Deco ID:** Ag002-C-01

**Monument ID:** Ag002-C

**Site ID:** Ag002

**Location:**
Wadi Umm el-Agerem

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Possible temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** H: 0.40 m

**Short Description:**
A rectangular stone, broken in half. The left side is missing. It depicts a very weathered portrait of a person wearing a garment that crosses-over at the front. The folds are well-defined with carved parallel lines. The facial features are now weathered away. The traces of a necklace are visible around the upper part of the neck.

**References:**
Brogan 1971; Brogan Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 286; Mattingly 1995, 164-65; Mattingly 1996, 20, 126; Barker and Jones 1982, 13, 6; IRT2009; Reynolds and Ward-Perkins 1952; Reynolds 1955, 141-2; Sjöström 1993, 290-91; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: An001-A-01
Monument ID: An001-A
Site ID: An001
Location: Wadi Antar
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
The pilaster to the north side of the false door depicts vine stem, leaves, scrolls and grapes that seemingly grow up the pilaster. The same carving is repeated on the other side of this corner pilaster (An001-A-02).

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID:  An001-A-02
Monument ID: An001-A
Site ID:  An001

Location:
Wadi Antar

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:  Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
Damaged corner pilaster on the east corner of the north facing side of the mausoleum. Vines, grapes and vine leaves are seemingly growing up the pilaster. This is the same motive as on the other side of this corner pilaster (An001-A-01).

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  ULVS Archive
Deco ID: An001-A-03
Monument ID: An001-A
Site ID: An001

Location:
Wadi Antar

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
What remains of this corner pilaster is decorated with four finely carved multi-petalled rosettes. The lowest one is the smallest and they gradually increase in size as they progress higher up the pillar.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID:  An001-A-04  
Monument ID: An001-A  
Site ID:  An001  
Location:  Wadi Antar  
Region:  Pre-Desert  
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum  
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum  
Period:  Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)  
Size:  -  

Short Description:  What remains of this very weathered pilaster is a bull head with ears, two horns and prominent eyes, two rosettes are situated above the bull's head.  

References:  Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.  

Image Source:  ULVS Archive
Deco ID: An001-A-05
Monument ID: An001-A
Site ID: An001
Location: Wadi Antar
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This pilaster has an unidentified object at the bottom, possibly grapes and vine. Above is a thick stem with a scale pattern, which could represent a tree trunk. To the right and left of the thick stem are objects, possibly dates or fruit from the tree. The upper part of the carving may represent the top of the tree with two scroll like swirls projecting out from the top, with two thick leaves to the right and left.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>An001-A-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>An001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>An001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Wadi Antar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
The carvings on this pilaster are very weathered. They show two standing figures. The lower person has a big head and the hair is curling down left and right of the head. The facial features are weathered away. The long neck may have been adorned by a necklace or the neckline of the dress was rather high. The garment is long and flowing. The arms are in front of the body, with the hand presumably meeting in front of the belly. They could have been holding an object like at Ag002-A-01. The shape of the figure, the potential necklace, and the longer hair could indicate that this is representing a female.

**References:**
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** ULVS Archive
Deco ID: An001-A-07
Monument ID: An001-A
Site ID: An001
Location: Wadi Antar
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: Rectangular stone depicting two double rosettes. The rosette to the right has pointed leaves, and a smaller rosette with five petals in the middle. The rosette to the left has twelve pointed petals and a small rosette with 5 petals in the centre. A crack runs horizontally along the centre of the stone.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: An001-A-08
Monument ID: An001-A
Site ID: An001
Location: Wadi Antar
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Fragmented statue of a woman. The head and part of the lower torso survive. The head is broken away from the torso at the lower part of the neck. A turban sits on top of the head, with a veil or hair is hanging down the sides and back of the long neck. The top of the turban is slightly damaged. The eyes are closely set together similar to the woman on An001-A-09. The nose is missing, and the mouth is downturned at its corners. Large teardrop-shaped earrings are hanging down from her ears. The lower part of the body (broken at hip-level) shows a skirt with straight folds reaching below the knee. The folds may be the result of restoration work by the Bani Ulid museum.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID: An001-A-09
Monument ID: An001-A
Site ID: An001
Location: Wadi Antar
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size:
Short Description:
Rectangular stone depicting two females. Left: woman with long hair flowing down to the shoulders, wearing an elaborate headdress. The headdress covers the top of the head and is richly decorated. The face is oval, with a long nose, almond shaped eyes and downturned mouth. A necklace or the neckline of the dress is visible around the neck. Right: woman wearing an elaborate headdress. This figure is slightly taller. The headdress is shaped in a criss-cross pattern like a net, with elaborate decoration along its sides. The hair is hanging down to the cheeks in ringlets. The face is oval, with two almond shaped eyes, a long nose and a downturned mouth. The return of this stone shows (a now very damaged) chariot race.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.
Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>An001-A-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>An001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>An001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Antar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>0.74 m x 0.44 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Rectangular stone showing a chariot race. This relief is very damaged, the top of the charioteer’s head is chipped away, as well as the head of the horse pulling the chariot. In the centre one wheel of the chariot is visible, with the charioteer atop. The chariot is pulled by two horses in full gallop, their heads are chipped away. The head of the driver is partly damaged, a small mouth, nose and the bottom of a large, almond-shaped eye, are still visible. Behind the first chariot two or possibly three horses in full gallop. The left side of the stone is broken off, and only the head and torso of the horses are visible.

**References:**
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** ULVS Archive
**Deco ID:** An001-A-11

**Monument ID:** An001-A

**Site ID:** An001

**Location:**
Wadi Antar

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

**Period:** Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
This very damaged stone depicts a figure to the left on a chariot which is pulled by a horse. The tail of the horse, its hind legs and back are still visible. This relief is part of a larger chariot race scene (An001-A-05).

**References:**
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** Al-Haddad Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>An001-A-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>An001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>An001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Antar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>0.89 m x 0.57 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Damaged and weathered rectangular stone depicting a reaping scene. A person is grasping finely rendered barley stalks with both hands on the left hand of the stone, wearing a short tunic and a thick belt. The head is rather large and has been chipped away. The arms are unnaturally long. There is a second bushel of barley on the right, placed in a basket which also contains carefully bundled up barley stalks. A sickle to cut the barley is depicted on the bottom of scene between the reaper and the basket.

**References:**
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** ULVS Archive
Deco ID: An001-A-13

Monument ID: An001-A

Site ID: An001

Location:
Wadi Antar

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: 1.10 m x 0.55 m x 0.28 m

Short Description:
This rectangular stone showing a ploughing scene is much damaged, broken off at the right and no traces of carvings remain on the right hand side where the draught animal would have been. At the left end of the stone is a (male?) figure guiding a plough, wearing a short tunic reaching down to the knees with some folds still showing around the neck. The face has been chipped away. Despite the damaged state of the relief, it is apparent that the figure has been carved with some care. The fingers of the right hand are showing. The left arm was most likely stretched out toward the animal. The plough has a long upper part which divides into a triangle with the plough at the bottom. There are rosettes on the return of the stone on the left end.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Location: Wadi Antar
Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: 0.54 m x 0.57 m

Short Description:
Rectangular stone showing a Cantharus on the right out of which flow two thick, rounded tendrils, one on either side. Above the Cantharus is a crescent that springs from the base or stalk. The right side of the stone is missing. The left tendril curves around a floral rosette with many small petals. Three leafs spring from either side of the Cantharus base. There are more leafs on the left of the scroll.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: An001-B-02

Monument ID: An001-B

Site ID: An001

Location: Wadi Antar

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: 0.86 m; base 0.10 m; backing stone 0.10 m;

Short Description:
Statue of a seated man, the head and hands missing. He is wearing a long flowing gown with thick folds and sandals. He possibly was holding a (staff like?) object his right hand, suggested by a groove that runs down the right knee. The base of the statue as well as the back are very thick.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 287; Jones and Barker 1983, 39-40; Mattingly 1996, 33; Sjöström 1993, 153; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID:  Au001-A-01
Monument ID: Au001-A
Site ID:  Au001

Location:
Ain el Auenia, Gebel Nefusa

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
A square stone with a very weathered relief of striding figure (Hercules?), wearing a garment draped over right shoulder (Lion skin?) The head is chipped away. Behind the figure to the right is a tree. Unfortunately, this relief has now disappeared. The right hand is slightly extended outwards, holding a long object (club?).

References:
Borgan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Oates 1953.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  
Monument ID: Bg001-A

Site ID:  
Buchar, Giado

Region:  
Gebel, Western Gebel

Architectural Type:  
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:  
Unclear

Period:  
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size:  
0.77m x 0.52m

Short Description:  
Rectangular stone depicting a ploughing scene with a camel. From left to right: a figure, in profile, walking towards the right while holding on to a plough with the right hand. The left-hand is raised upwards. The ploughman is wearing a short tunic hanging down loosely in vertical folds. The head is weathered away. The reins of the plough are attached to the camel’s neck and head. The camel walks in front of the ploughman towards the right. It’s head is turned, looking back at the ploughman. Underneath the camel are eight diagonal lines which indicate the furrows created by the plough. Where the lines end towards the right stands another figure facing outwards. The face is weathered away. This person is wearing a short tunic gathered with a belt. Both arms are stretched out to the sides. The left hand is holding a long stick, the right is held out towards the furrow.

References:  

Image Source:  
Romanelli 1930 Figure 17
Deco ID: Bg001-A-02
Monument ID: Bg001-A
Site ID: Bg001
Location: Buchar, Giado
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone. From right to left: a ploughman is facing towards the left, walking behind the plough holding it with the left hand, while the right hand is raised holding a thin stick. He is wearing a long-sleeved tunic with lines indicating the folds on the garment. The face is weathered away. The large plough appears to have three plough ends and is pulled by a camel. The reins are attached to its head and neck. Underneath the camel eight diagonal lines indicate the plough furrows. At the right end of the stone is a tree with four branches sticking out, two to the right, one to the left and one at the top. The branches bear many leafs depicted in detail.

References:

Image Source: Romanelli 1930 Figure 17
Deco ID:  Bg001-A-03
Monument ID: Bg001-A
Site ID:  Bg001
Location:
Buchar, Giado
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  0.66 m x 0.52 m x 0.20 m

Short Description:
Rectangular stone showing an armed horseman, and armed people on foot fighting two naked figures. This relief is very weathered and damaged, and parts of the left and right side are missing. From left to right: in the bottom left corner a naked figure is laying on the ground. The legs are on the floor, while the upper body is raised upwards. Above is the front of a horse in full gallop, its head and neck, chest, and front legs showing. In the centre is another horse walking towards the right. The fastenings of the reins on its head are visible. The rider, almost entirely weathered away, is holding a circular shield with his right hand. The rider has been almost entirely weathered away. Below is another figure holding a shield. In front of the rider and horse towards the right is a (naked?) figure holding round shield. The right leg is lifted ready to fight the horsemen. Above is another (naked?) figure turning away from the rider, head turned towards him.

References:

Image Source:  Romanelli 1930 Figure 17
Deco ID:  Bg001-A-04
Monument ID: Bg001-A
Site ID:  Bg001
Location:
Buchar, Giado
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
Rectangular weathered stone. Left and right often and uninscribed inscription is the depiction of two male figures with wings. The arms are raised left and right of the body, one hand is touching the edge of the tabella ansata. All facial details are weathered away.

References:

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bg001-A-05
Monument ID: Bg001-A
Site ID: Bg001
Location: Buchar, Giado
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel

Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: 1.14 m x 0.58 m x 0.30 m

Short Description:
Two stones depict two female sphinxes with many udders. Brogan suggests that they look similar to the sphinx on the arch of Marcus Aurelius at Tripoli.

References:

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID:  Bi001-C-01
Monument ID: Bi001-C
Site ID:  Bi001
Location:
Biscema
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
Part of a round architectural element of the mausoleum decorated with a Doric frieze in three panels. The panel to the left shows a square shape, the panel in the middle depicts a laurel wreath with a small flower in the centre, and the right hand panel depicts a pomegranate.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Bi001-C-02

Monument ID: Bi001-C

Site ID:  Bi001

Location:  Biscema

Region:  Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:  Part of a round architectural element of the mausoleum decorated with a Doric frieze in three panels with rosettes.

References:  Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Bi001-C-03
Monument ID: Bi001-C
Site ID:  Bi001
Location:
Biscema
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Lattice decoration and linear decorations on rectangular stone.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bi001-C-04
Monument ID: Bi001-C
Site ID: Bi001
Location:
Biscema
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Two leaf scrolls with a small flower in the middle of each scroll.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bi001-C-05
Monument ID: Bi001-C
Site ID: Bi001
Location: Biscema
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: Wide cornice with a lion head in high relief on its upper part. The mouth is open and tongue seems to be sticking out.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bi001-C-06
Monument ID: Bi001-C
Site ID: Bi001

Location:
Biscema

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Part of a wide cornice with a lion head in high relief, mouth open.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bi001-C-07
Monument ID: Bi001-C
Site ID: Bi001
Location: Biscema
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Three leaf scrolls with rosettes in the centre.
References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bin001-A-01

Monument ID: Bin001-A

Site ID: Bin001

Location: Wadi al-Binaya

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour. A line of dentil (tooth) band runs across the top of the panel. This weathered stone depicts the scene of a bull sacrifice. A man is standing upright on the left side of the stone, feet astride, holding the bull on its horns with the left hand. In the right hand he is holding a weapon, perhaps an axe. He is wearing a short tunic, which is decorated with a wide collar around the neck. The eyes are large and almond shaped, and the chin (or beard?) is very pointy. The Bull is depicted in profile, facing left towards the person, tail raised, striding forward with the left leg.

References:
-

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID:  Bin001-A-02
Monument ID: Bin001-A
Site ID:  Bin001
Location:
Wadi al-Binaya
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour depicting the portrait of a man and woman, very weathered. The man is depicted to the right, the female on the left. The man has wavy hair and a pointy beard but no moustache. The long nose and small mouth are still visible. He appears to be smiling. The right hand is raised, and he is holding a long object in the left hand. A mantle is wrapped around his body, crossing over at the front.
The woman on the left has her hair is small curls, carved in small circles. Her features are almost entirely weathered away. A necklace is placed around her neck. The upper body is badly weathered and broken away in places.

References:
-

Image Source:  Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bin001-A-03
Monument ID: Bin001-A
Site ID: Bin001

Location:
Wadi al-Binaya

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan?
(4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour depicting an agricultural scene of ploughing and reaping. A line of dentil (tooth) band runs across the top of the panel. From left to right: ploughman in profile facing right, holding the plough with the left hand, and a whip raised up above his head in the right hand. He is wearing a short tunic with short sleeves and belt. His hair is short. Next comes the plough, which is attached with a beam and ropes to the camel’s hump. The camel is pulling the plough facing to the left. The harness is attached to the camels head. Three furrows are underneath the ploughing scene. Next come four stalks of wheat. To the far right a person is in the process of hacking the ground with a hoe. This person is depicted in profile facing left is wearing a short tunic and has short hair, locks indicated by small, straight incisions.

References:
-

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID: Bin001-A-04

Monument ID: Bin001-A

Site ID: Bin001

Location: Wadi al-Binaya

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour. A hunter on horseback is pursuing an ostrich on the left side of the stone. The upper body of the hunter has almost entirely weathered away. The horse is depicted in full gallop, both front legs extended into the air. The ostrich is very large in comparison to horse and rider. It is running away from its perpetrator facing right, wings spread. The feathers are carved as parallel lines. The head is turned looking back towards the hunter.

References:
-

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bin001-A-05
Monument ID: Bin001-A
Site ID: Bin001
Location: Wadi al-Binaya
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour. A dentil (tooth) band is running along the top. The stone depicts two hunters (horizontally) on the top and bottom of the stone, holding on to a net. The hunter at the bottom has almost weathered away. The hunter on top has a long face with a pointy chin. He appears to be wearing a pointed hat. Both are wearing a short tunic. The net is held in place by four sticks. Two herbivores are in the process of running into the net from the left. A third herbivore is standing outside the net to the right with its head turned back towards the hunting scene.

References: -

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Bin001-A-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Bin001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Bin001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Wadi al-Binaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
Rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour. A line of dentil (tooth) band runs across the top of the panel. This hunting scene probably goes together with Bin001-A-05. To the left of the stone is a man on horseback (depicted in profile facing right) in full gallop hunting three herbivores that are running in front of him. He is holding a spear in the right hand, ready to be thrown. The hunter is wearing a short tunic and a pointed hat. The three herbivores (depicted in profile facing right) in front of him are badly weathered. The hunter on horseback appears to chaise the herbivores into the net, ready to be caught.

**References:**
-

**Image Source:** Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bin001-A-07

Monument ID: Bin001-A

Site ID: Bin001

Location: Wadi al-Binaya

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Rectangular stone of yellowish colour depicting a hunting scene. A hunter on horseback on the left side of the stone is holding a spear in the right hand. He has large almond-shaped eyes, and is wearing a cap or helmet. In front of him a large hunting dog is attacking an herbivore that is running towards the right. The dog is attacking its victim at the neck. A dentil band is running along the top and bottom of the stone. The stone is rather weathered and parts of the dentil decoration have broken off, especially along the bottom.

References: -

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Bin001-A-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Bin001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Bin001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi al-Binaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>Rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour. This very broken and weathered stone shows three men on horseback in full gallop riding towards the right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>Al-Haddad, Private Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Bin001-A-09

Monument ID: Bin001-A

Site ID: Bin001

Location: Wadi al-Binaya

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour. A line of dentil (tooth) band runs across the top of the panel. This stone depicts a ploughing scene. From left to right: A figure, depicted frontally, is holding a basket close to the chest. The right hand is raised. The face has weathered away. Carved lines indicate the weaving pattern of the basket. The person has short hair and wears a short tunic. Towards the right is a horse pulling a plough, facing left. The ploughman is walking behind the horse, slightly bend over, holding on the reins and the plough. He is wearing a short tunic. There seems to be a carving mistake in the face, since two mouth and two noses are visible, perhaps the outlines of the first, rough carving have never been removed.

References:

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bin001-A-10
Monument ID: Bin001-A
Site ID: Bin001
Location: Wadi al-Binaya
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone of reddish-yellowish colour depicting an agricultural scene, the reaping of corn on the left side of the stone, and threshing on the right side of the relief. From left to right: a reaper, facing right, wearing a short tunic, is holding a bundle of corn in one hand and the sickle in the other to cut the stalks. The next figure is facing left, bending over the corn to cut it, wearing a short tunic. The third figure is carrying a basked on the right shoulder, walking towards the right. Next comes a man wearing a conical hat. He appears to control three bovines are trampling over the wheat that is spread on the floor in front of them. To the far right is a person winnowing the threshed wheat with a three-pitched fork.

References:
-

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID:  Bin001-A-11
Monument ID: Bin001-A
Site ID:  Bin001
Location:
Wadi al-Binaya
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone in reddish-yellowish colour. A dentil (tooth) band is running along the top. The dentil band is chopped off at the top left corner, and in the centre. It depicts a large plant similar to an artichoke, with two thick leafs and three stalks of fruit growing out of its centre, and two artichoke or pine cone shaped fruits growing out to the left and right of the main stalk.

References:
-

Image Source:  Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bin001-A-12
Monument ID: Bin001-A
Site ID: Bin001
Location: Wadi al-Binaya
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Deco ID: Bin001-A-12

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This rectangular weathered stone in a yellowish reddish colour depicts four individuals fighting animals. The right corner is chipped off. Along the bottom and top runs a dentil (tooth) band. The figure on the left is holding a spear and shield, about to stab an animal. The second figure is lying on the floor with legs and arms raised upwards, being trampled by the animal. The third figure is holding a long object in his right hand and is being attacked by an animal from behind. The fourth person is in close combat with a feline, holding up a long stick or whip above the head, while the other arm is wrapped around the neck of the animal. All figures appear to be naked. This scene is very similar to Bin001-A-13 and Gh129-B-16; Gh129-B-18 at Ghirza.

References: -

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bin001-A-13

Monument ID: Bin001-A

Site ID: Bin001

Location:
Wadi al-Binaya

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This is a very damaged and weathered stone, rectangular in shape of reddish yellowish colour. The left side of it is completely obliterated, and the thin frame on the top and bottom is almost entirely chipped off. The scene shows two naked figures, one is holding club on the top of the stone, seemingly floating horizontally. The second person appears to be running towards the right, or jumping over a bull depicted on just below the figure. Either the bull or the person is depicted upside down, depending on how the stone would have fitted on the monument. This appears to be a fighting scene similar to the one at Ghirza Gh129-B-16, Gh129-B-18 and at Bin001-A-12.

References:
-

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Bin001-A-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Bin001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Bin001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Wadi al-Binaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
This rectangular stone, yellowish reddish in colour, is very weathered. A dentil band is running across the top. It depicts three figures, of which all are nearly completely obliterated. The person to the left is wearing a short tunic and a belt and has the right arm raised up above the head, perhaps holding a weapon. The person in the middle is held by the head and left hand by the person standing to the right. This scene is very similar to the execution scene at Ghirza (Gh129-A-07 and Gh129-C-06).

**References:**
- 

**Image Source:** Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bm001-A-01

Monument ID: Bm001-A

Site ID: Bm001

Location: Beni (Sidi) Musa

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: A weathered broken stone, the right side is missing, depicting a hunter on horseback, the back of a Gazelle or Antelope and a hunting dog. The stone is surrounded by a simple frame. From right to left: A rider and horse are charging towards the left and are depicted in profile. This stone may come from a mausoleum or from a gasr.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID:       Bo001-A-01
Monument ID:  Bo001-A
Site ID:       Bo001

Location:     Henscir Bou Guerba

Region:       Gebel, Western Gebel

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period:       General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size:         -

Short Description: This stone includes an inscription and a figural relief carving. The relief shows two birds sitting left and right of a vessel (cantharus). The beaks are touching the top of the vessel. The birds and vessel are framed by a medallion of leaves or laurel, outside of which, on either side, two further birds are depicted, possibly sitting on a branch or tree. The inscription is located underneath the birds in the centre in an inset frame. The stone is very weathered, and broken off to right corner, as well as at the bottom, cutting off some of the inscription.

References:   Brogan Unpublished Notes; Gauckler 1901, CLXV; Saladin 1902, 405-407; Toutain, 1903, 378, 383, 389-390; Trouset 1974, 82-83 Site 83.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bo001-A-02
Monument ID: Bo001-A
Site ID: Bo001

Location:
Henscir Bou Guerba

Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: 2.20m height

Short Description:
This stone is a large corner stone. The reliefs are carved vertically, not horizontally. It shows a camel at the top with very long legs. In the middle are two standing figures, the smaller one has a very large head, the head of the larger one is missing. The carving is rather eroded and no facial features can be detected. Underneath the two people is a fish, followed by another animal, Brogan suggests perhaps a wild ass.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes; Gauckler 1901, CLXV; Saladin 1902, 405-407; Toutain, 1903, 378, 383, 389-390; Trouset 1974, 82-83 Site 83.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Bo001-A-03
Monument ID: Bo001-A
Site ID:  Bo001
Location:
Henscir Bou Guerba
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period:
General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size:  h: 2.20 m
Short Description:
Part of a large rectangular corner pilaster showing three images above of each other. On top of the stone, is horseman on a horse in profile, facing left. The image in the middle shows a small ostrich, partly eroded, to the right, and a gazelle to the left, both in profile. The bottom carving depicts a large cat with a long tail in profile, either a lion, lioness or a panther.
References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes; Gauckler 1901, CLXV; Saladin 1902, 405-407; Toutain, 1903, 378, 383, 389-390; Trouset 1974, 82-83 Site 83.
Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Bo001-A-04

**Monument ID:** Bo001-A

**Site ID:** Bo001

**Location:**
Henscir Bou Guerba

**Region:**
Gebel, Western Gebel

**Architectural Type:**
Possible tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

**Size:** h: 2.20

**Short Description:**
This long and rectangular corner stone has relief carvings on three sides. The image shows left side of a corner stone, which depicts three animals above of each other. On top is a camel, then a fox with a long tail and at the bottom is an antelope.

**References:**
Brogan Unpublished Notes; Gauckler 1901, CLXV; Saladin 1902, 405-407; Toutain, 1903, 378, 383, 389-390; Trousset 1974, 82-83 Site 83.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Bo001-A-05
Monument ID: Bo001-A
Site ID:  Bo001

Location:  Henscir Bou Guerba
Region:  Gebel, Western Gebel

Architectural Type:  Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:  A stone with an unknown object, possibly a staff with two round shapes on the top (Mercury?). The stone is rather weathered and it is not clear if there is a figure standing next to the staff.

References:  Brogan Unpublished Notes; Gauckler 1901, CLXV; Saladin 1902, 405-407; Toutain, 1903, 378, 383, 389-390; Trousset 1974, 82-83 Site 83.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bo001-A-06
Monument ID: Bo001-A
Site ID: Bo001
Location: Henscir Bou Guerba
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A scroll and a small rosette were caved on the return of the stone Bo001-A-01.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes; Gauckler 1901, CLXV; Saladin 1902, 405-407; Toutain, 1903, 378, 383, 389-390; Trouset 1974, 82-83 Site 83.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Bs012-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Bs012-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>BS012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Bir Scedua Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Rectangular stone, broken off across the top and on the left hand side. It depicts three faces set into a Doric frieze. The top of the heads and the upper frame of the frieze has broken off. The panels are divided by triglyphs, while the masks fill the space between them. The masks are very similar to each other in appearance. They have round faces, big almond shaped eyes and small noses. The long hair is hanging down either side of the face in three strands, similar to the 'mourners' at Wadi Migdal (Mg001). The first and second mask from the left are of similar size and both have their mouth wide open, corners curved up. The third appears a bit smaller and the mouth is shut.

**References:**

**Image Source:** ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Bs072-A-01
Monument ID: Bs072-A
Site ID: Bs072
Location: Bir Scedua Basin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Possible temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone depicting the portrait of a man and a woman. The man (left) has a finely carved beard; hair is curled into small locks. There may have been a parting in the middle. His eyes are small and almond shaped. The nose has weathered away. The corners of the small mouth are slightly turned downwards. Ears are visible on either side of the head. The garment has short sleeves and is crossed over in the front, gathered together above the belly. The folds of the garment are carved in detail. The female (right) is wearing a pointed cap, under which her hair is visible. The eyes are large and almond shaped, small nose mouth that is slightly curved downwards. Her garment is crossed over in the front and gathered above the belly forming short sleeves similar to the man's dress. She is either wearing a necklace, or some sort of undergarment under her folded dress. The frame is decorated with a small garland at the bottom, and the larger garland at the top.

References:
Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 55.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Bs072-A-02
Monument ID: Bs072-A
Site ID:  Bs072
Location:  Bir Scedua Basin
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Possible temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
Small figure wearing a tunic which is bound at the waist. Facial features are completely weathered away. The tunic is carved with much detail. The arms to the left and right are missing.

References:
Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 55.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bs072-A-03
Monument ID: Bs072-A
Site ID: Bs072
Location: Bir Scedua Basin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Possible temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This is a much damaged relief. A figure is standing to the right with a branch to the left. The relief is too damaged to describe this image in more detail.

References:
Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 55.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Bs072-A-04
Monument ID: Bs072-A
Site ID: Bs072
Location: Bir Scuedua Basin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Possible temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: A much damaged stone with three small rosettes on the right side, and an object which might be a shell. The left part of the stone has broken away.
References: Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 55.
Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Bs072-A-05
Monument ID: Bs072-A
Site ID: Bs072
Location: Bir Sciedua Basin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Possible temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone depicting a ploughing scene, very weathered. The right bottom corner is broken off, including the feet of the ploughman. The left bottom corner is also damaged, as is the top of the stone. From left to right: two horses behind each other are pulling a plough. Only the head and the legs of the second horse can be seen, creating some sense of dimension. A much-weathered figure is standing behind the plough, facing outwards, while holding the handle of the plough with the right hand. The left arm is raised up in a right angle, holding a long thin stick to drive the horses along. Two or three small rosettes are depicted below the horses, rendered in high relief.

References:
Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 55.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
**Deco ID:** Bs072-A-06  
**Monument ID:** Bs072-A  
**Site ID:** Bs072  
**Location:** Bir Scedua Basin  
**Region:** Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:** Possible temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Unclear  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:** Rectangular stone which is part of a Doric frieze with three square panels. The left panel depicts a rosette with three tiers of petals. The central panel shows a bird that appears to hold something in its beak. The panel to the right shows another rosette with three tiers, and finely carved petals. The plane frame of the right rosette is chipped off on the bottom right.  
**References:** Jones and Barker 1983, 45-51; Mattingly 1996, 55.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bu001-A-01
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Corner stone or statue of a female figure with wings wearing a flowing pleated two tiered dress. The head is missing. The figure was incorporated into the walls of the fort at Bani Ulid. Its provenance is unknown, and it is unclear if this was originally a corner stone or if this was part of a statue or roof ornament. This stone is now missing.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bu001-A-02
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone yellowish/reddish in colour. Three flower rosettes are arranged along the centre, surrounded by leafy scrolls. The upper left hand corner has broken off.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID: Bu001-A-03
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone depicting a detailed ivy scroll with a flower rosette at its centre. The scroll and flower rosette are very finely carved. The flower rosette has six petals and has a three-dimensional quality, hollowed out underneath each petal perhaps with a drill and/or channeling tools. This stone was integrated into the walls of the fort at Bani Ulid, now missing. The original provenance of this stone is unclear, but it is, most likely from a mausoleum that stood in the vicinity of Bani Ulid.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Bu001-A-04
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID:  Bu001
Location:
Beni Ulid
Region:
Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type:
Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  34cm x 40 cm

Short Description:
Small square stone depicting two palm trees, roughly carved, with two bunches of ripe dates to the left and right of each palm tree. A deeply incised line indicates the centre of each palm leave. Dentils are carved along the upper and lower edge of the stone. A rosette with four petals with deeply incised lines is situated between the two stems of the palm. The original provenance of this stone is unclear, but it is, most likely from a mausoleum that stood in the vicinity of Bani Ulid.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bu001-A-05
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This sculptured stone depicts a feline and a horse facing each other. A man standing between them. In his right hand he holds a whip, his left arm is extended, holding the reigns of the horse in his hand. He is wearing a Tunic that reaches down to his knees, and a mantle draped over his shoulders. The feline is crouched down, its long tail folded around its body. Its small head is facing outwards, and appears to have had a long pointed muzzle or beard. The horse is stepping forward with right foreleg raised. The mane is detailed by parallel grooves, and a ridge along the neck. The lower part of the head has gone, but the deeply scored eye and bridle still show. There is a decorated collar round the neck. The stone has a deep flange at the top and a lesser flange at the bottom.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bu001-A-06
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A stone with three square panels show a very weathered female head with hair hanging down either side is between two well carved multi-pedalled rosettes.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: Mattingly Private Image, SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bu001-A-07

Monument ID: Bu001-A

Site ID: Bu001

Location: Beni Ulid

Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone shows a bird perching on a tree branch. The tree has well defined branches and pointy leaves (perhaps an olive tree?). Chiselled lines indicate the feathers on the wing of the bird. The head of the bird is damaged; its large eyes and small beak are still faintly visible. The claws of bird’s feet are curled around the branch. The stone is broken on the right hand side, and part of the top has been chipped off.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Bu001-A-08
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A rectangular corner stone with four square panels on the right side, and three square panels on the return (left side) of the stone. The borders are plain. From left to right-first panel: multi-peddled rosette with fine leafs and a smaller rosette in middle. Second panel: vessel or urn with lid and two large handles. Third panel: rosette with larger petals and a smaller rosette in centre. Fourth panel: Face/mask of a canine (fox/dog/wolf) depicted frontally, with a long snout, pointy ears and eyes closely set together, outlined with grooves. Return of stone- first panel: round male face/mask with downturned mouth, moustache and beard, a wrinkled brow and a wreath across the forehead. Second panel: multi peddled rosette with fine leafs and a smaller rosette in middle. Third panel: canine or feline face/mask, with a long nose, small pointed ears and close-set eyes outlined by grooves. The corners of the mouth are turned up like a smile.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: BSR Archive, Ward-Perkins Collection
Deco ID: Bu001-A-09
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone, yellowish in colour, depicting a fish facing left in a plane, inset frame. The mouth of the fish is open, and a round eye is visible. Two sub-circular incisions indicate the partition between the head and the body. Scales are carved along the body and a spikey fin is visible along the back. A rosette is depicted on the return of the stone. The original location of this stone is unclear.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Bu001-A-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Bu001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Bu001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Beni Ulid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert, Wadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Reused stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
A corner stone depicting a fish with small scales on one side, and two rosettes on the return of the stone. It is unclear from which mausoleum this stone comes from.

**References:**
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

**Image Source:** Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID: Bu001-A-11
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi

Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: 

Short Description:
Rectangular corner stone, yellowish in colour, depicting a fish facing left, set in a frame with three inset tiers on the left side of the stone. The head of the fish is missing and the right side of the stone has been repaired more recently, the frame re-constructed. A multi-petalled flower rosette with pointy petals is on the return (right side) of the stone.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID: Bu001-A-12

Monument ID: Bu001-A

Site ID: Bu001

Location: Beni Ulid

Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Rectangular stone of yellowish reddish colour with three panels in plane frames. The left panel has a rosette formed of four acanthus leafs in its centre, the central panel shows a face or mask. Long hair is hanging down to the right and left of the head in two strands. A pointed cap is placed on top on the head. The right panel shows a three-petalled rosette.

References: Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: Mattingly Private Image
Deco ID: Bu001-A-13
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001
Location: Beni Ulid
Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: Rectangular stone, yellowish in colour, which probably part of a cornice depicting a small fish in a diamond-shaped frame. The fish is facing towards the right, a small straight line indicates the mouth, a small round eye can be seen and a small fin in the centre of the fish. A straight line indicates the tail fin. It is unclear where this stone came from.

References: Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bu001-A-14
Monument ID: Bu001-A
Site ID: Bu001

Location:
Beni Ulid

Region:
Pre-Desert, Wadi

Architectural Type:
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Part of a very damaged corner stone, yellowish in colour, with a three-quarter column to the right. The relief depicts a quadruped, probably a bull, with a spear sticking out of its back. The stone is broken at the left-hand bottom corner. The front legs and snout of the animal are broken off. This scene is carved in high relief.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID: Bu001-A-15

Monument ID: Bu001-A

Site ID: Bu001

Location: Beni Ulid

Region: Pre-Desert, Wadi

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Rectangular stone, yellowish in colour, broken off to the left divided into three panels (Doric frieze) with plain borders, and a dentil (tooth) pattern running along the top. The right panel depicts a coiled-up snake, perhaps with two heads. The central panel shows a flower rosette with four (clover-like) petals, the third panel depicts a rosette, broken off towards the left, only two petals are visible.

References: Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009.

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Bun007-A-01

Monument ID: Bun007-

Site ID: Bun007

Location:
Beni Ulid (North), Wadi Dinar

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A multi-pedalled rosette is carved in the centre of a scroll with leaves.

References:

Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Ch001-A-01
Monument ID: Ch001-A
Site ID: Ch001
Location:
Chormet Bu Seila
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.80 m x 0.36 m

Short Description:
This rectangular relief depicts a naked male figure standing in front of four sea horses. He is wearing a spikey crown on his head and holding a downturned triton in his right hand. Both Arms are stretched outwards. The four seahorses are depicted above each other. They have long, eel-like bodies and two legs towards the front of the body. They are wearing horse harnesses. This is most likely a depiction of a sea god, perhaps Neptune.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Ch001-A-02

**Monument ID:** Ch001-A

**Site ID:** Ch001

**Location:**
Chormet Bu Seila

**Region:**
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** 0.50 m x 0.55 m

**Short Description:**
Square stone, broken off on the top and right hand side. This was probably part of a Doric frieze, indicated by triglyph on the left side of the stone. Two quadrupeds, probably a feline and a dog, are running. They are depicted above each other, the one on the bottom (dog?) running towards the right, the other on top (feline?) towards the left.

**References:**
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Ch001-A-03  
**Monument ID:** Ch001-A  
**Site ID:** Ch001  
**Location:** Chormet Bu Seila  
**Region:** Eastern Gebel, Gebel  
**Architectural Type:** Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** 1.00 m x 0.35m  

**Short Description:**  
An niche head in shell design decorated with scrolls which probably formed a niche in which one of the statues once stood. According to Brogan, the top of the arch depicted the head of a deity, but this is not visible on the photographs.  

**References:**  
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.  

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Ch001-A-04  
**Monument ID:** Ch001-A  
**Site ID:** Ch001  
**Location:** Chormet Bu Seila  
**Region:** Eastern Gebel, Gebel  
**Architectural Type:** Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** 1.20 m x 0.40m  
**Short Description:** Arch head depicting a dog in full run hunting another animal, of which only the tail and the hind leg survive. The hunted animal could perhaps a feline due to the shape of the tail and the claws indicated on the feet.  
**References:** Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-05
Monument ID: Ch001-A
Site ID: Ch001
Location: Chormet Bu Seila
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This rectangular stone shows the bearded head of a male set within a Doric frieze with two triglyphs. Two claws are protruding out of his head. A hole is visible above the right claw, probably weather damage. The face is rather weathered, but he appears to have two large eyes, a wide nose and a mouth carved as a straight line. This could be interpreted as Triton with crab claws on his head. The tail of a fish is visible in the right panel.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-06
Monument ID: Ch001-A
Site ID: Ch001
Location: Chormet Bu Seila
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.60 m x 0.35 m

Short Description:
This relief depicts the head of a gorgon. The hair is formed of the body and heads of snakes. Two snake bodies are wrapped around her head and from a knot under the chin. The face shows strong eyebrows, small eyes, nose and mouth. The mouth is slightly downturned. The left hand corner is chipped off, and a small hole is visible in the left side of the gorgon’s head.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-07

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Site ID: Ch001

Location: Chormet Bu Seila

Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.56 m x 0.42 m

Short Description: Rectangular stone depicting a hare in profile facing to the right nibbling on some greenery on a panel that was part of a frieze. The hare is crouched down, head bend down towards the plant, long ears sticking up from its head. The short tail is visible.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Ch001-A-08

**Monument ID:** Ch001-A

**Site ID:** Ch001

**Location:** Chormet Bu Seila

**Region:** Eastern Gebel, Gebel

**Architectural Type:** Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** 0.87 m x 0.55 m

**Short Description:** Rectangular stone, broken off to the right. It shows a feline in profile facing right, crouching down next to a vessel with a handle on the right side (cantharus). The paw and the mouth of the feline are nearly touching the vessel. There probably was a similar lion guarding the cantharus on the other side, most likely Ch001-A-09, as also Brogan suggest in her notes (SLS Archive).

**References:** Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-09

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Site ID: Ch001

Location:
Chormet Bu Seila

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.63 m x 0.55m

Short Description:
This rectangular stone, probably the right hand side of Ch001-A-08. A seated feline is depicted in profile, facing towards the left, mouth slightly open, tail curled around its hind leg. The right paw is reaching upwards.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-10

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Site ID: Ch001

Location:
Chormet Bu Seila

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone depicting a male lion with a very curly mane is depicted in profile, facing right, its head turned facing out towards the viewer. He is in the process of eating a small animal, perhaps a small calf or bull, since two horns appear to protrude out from the head of the victim.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-11

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Site ID: Ch001

Location: Chormet Bu Seila

Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.10 m x 0.35m

Short Description: This rectangular broken stone depicts a Doric frieze with two panels with a rosette to the right, and a bunch of wheat and perhaps some other fruit in the left.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Ch001-A-12

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Site ID:  Ch001

Location:  Chormet Bu Seila

Region:  Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:  Part of a Doric frieze with triglyphs depicting a fish in profile facing left. The fish has two large spiny fins on the back and a wide tail.

References:  Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-13
Monument ID: Ch001-A
Site ID: Ch001
Location: Chormet Bu Seila
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description:
This rectangular stone depicts part of a decorated pilaster with leaves on the left side. To the right of the pilaster is a naked man, depicted frontally, leading a male horse in profile towards the left. The man is naked apart from a shawl draped around his shoulders. He is holding a spear in the right hand and the left foot is slightly bent. Two almond shaped eyes are still visible, but the rest of the face has weathered away. The horse is carved in much detail with a bridle and a decorated chain across its neck. It is in the process of setting the right foot in front of the left. This may depict one of the Dioscuri, the second is depicted on Ch001-A-14.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Ch001-A-14  
**Monument ID:** Ch001-A  
**Site ID:** Ch001  
**Location:** Chormet Bu Seila  
**Region:** Eastern Gebel, Gebel  
**Architectural Type:** Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** 1.27 m x 0.65 m  

**Short Description:**  
This rectangular stone depicts part of a decorated pilaster with leaves on the right hand side. To the left of the pilaster is a naked man, depicted frontally, leading a male horse in profile towards the right. The man is naked apart from a shawl or mantle draped around his shoulders. He is holding a spear in the left hand. The face is weathered away. The horse is carved in much detail with a finely caved mane and tail. It is in the process of setting the left foot in front of the right. This may depict one of the Dioscuri, the second is depicted on Ch001-A-13.  

**References:**  
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.  

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-15

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Site ID: Ch001

Location: Chormet Bu Seila

Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.61 m x 0.50 m

Short Description: Statue of limestone of a man wearing a toga, which is wrapped around the body, covering his arms and hands completely. The feet are showing. The toga is rendered to depict the complex folds of the garment. The head is missing. The back of the statue was rounded to fit into the niche.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-16

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Site ID: Ch001

Location:
Chormet Bu Seila

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.65 m x 0.55m

Short Description:
According to Brogan this was a statue of a man broken into two pieces found amongst the debris of the tomb on the eastern side. The head is missing. A piece of a shell head that probably formed the niches in which the statues were placed was found nearby. The statue wore a toga similar to Ch001-A-15 with many complex folds. The back of the statue was rounded to fit into the niche.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ch001-A-17

Monument ID: Ch001-A

Site ID: Ch001

Location:
Chormet Bu Seila

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.42 m x 0.45 m

Short Description:
A statue of a bird, probably an eagle, with both wings outstretched. The head is missing. The wing and tail feathers are indicated by parallel incised lines, and the breast feathers are carved as small curved lines. A rectangular extension is visible at the tail end of the bird, which probably keyed the statue into the masonry of the mausoleum structure.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Dh001-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Dh001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Dh001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Dahiret el Hagiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gefara, Plateau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible tower mausoleum open perystile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>Brogan describes a sculptured stone that depicted a horse facing right in low relief but carefully moulded. The body was very well shaped but the legs were summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID:   Dh001-A-02
Monument ID: Dh001-A
Site ID:   Dh001
Location:
Dahireat el Hagiar
Region:
Gefara, Plateau
Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible tower mausoleum open perystile
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:
Brogan describes a sculptured stone that depicted a horse facing right in low relief but carefully moulded. The body was very well shaped but the legs were summary.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID: Dh001-A-03
Monument ID: Dh001-A
Site ID: Dh001

Location:
Dahireat el Hagiar

Region:
Gefara, Plateau

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible tower mausoleum open perystile

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Brogan describes a sculptured stone that depicted a bull facing right in low relief but carefully moulded. The body was very well shaped but the legs were summary.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Dh001-A-04
Monument ID: Dh001-A
Site ID: Dh001
Location: Dahireat el Hagiar
Region: Gefara, Plateau

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible tower mausoleum open perystile

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Brogan describes a sculptured stone that depicted a bull facing right in low relief but carefully moulded. The body was very well shaped but the legs were summary.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Ea001-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ea001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ea001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>El-Amrouni, Tatahouine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
This panel shows Orpheus charming the animals. The centre of the composition is occupied by Orpheus looking towards the right while sitting under a tree playing his lyre. Behind him are several wild animals: a lioness sitting down, a wolf or a jackal, and a raptor. In front of Orpheus is a lion, a wild boar, a bear, and a monkey and a bird a little smaller than the bird behind Orpheus.

**References:**
Trousset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ea001-A-02
Monument ID: Ea001-A
Site ID: Ea001
Location:
El-Amrouni, Tatahouine
Region:
Gefara
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone showing Orpheus and Eurydice in the Underworld. From left to right: Orpheus is standing on the left hand side of the stone, holding a lyre in one hand and a cylindrical object believed to be a plectrum. Eurydice is in front of him her back turned towards Orpheus, and moving towards an arch probably representing the doors of Hades. Cerberus with his three heads is sitting on the other side. Behind the dog, Charon is standing in his boat. Above Cerberus is a depiction of a man pushing up a stone, perhaps Sisyphus pushing his rock. Next to Sisyphus is a man tied to a wheel, perhaps Ixion.

References:
Trousset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;

Image Source: Ferchiou 1989, Plate XXIIIc, SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Ea001-A-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Ea001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Ea001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>El-Amrouni, Tatahouine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Rectangular stone, broken off on all sides depicting Hercules and Alcestis. Charon is depicted on the left, facing outwards, holding his sickle to push the boat across the Styx. Alcestis appears to be sitting in the boat. Hercules is in the process of taking her by the hand to lead her to the other side of the portal of Hades, of which only a thin pilaster is visible on the right. Hercules is wearing his lion skin over the left shoulder, and is holding his club in the left hand. Alcestis is wearing a cloak, pulled over her head. On the right half of panel (broken off) Hercules is depicted leading Alcestis along a path, his hand placed on her shoulder. The body and head of Hercules are missing.

**References:**
Trouset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Ea001-A-04
Monument ID: Ea001-A
Site ID:  Ea001
Location:
El-Amrouni, Tatahouine
Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
Only a very old photograph of Apuleus' face survives from the full-length portrait sculpture of Thanubra and Apuleus at El-Amrouni. According to Lecoy La Marche Apuleus stood to the right, right arm folded on the chest, while holding a fold of his garment in his left hand. He wore a short-sleeved tunic, over which a cloak, mantle or a toga was draped. On the left stood Thanubra that was depicted smaller than her husband. She was standing on a pedestal. She was wearing a long tunic with shawl or a palla thrown over it. Both were depicted bare foot. Apuleus' face was carved which much attention to detail to bring out some more individual features, such as the pronounced eyebrows, the small nose and the wide lips.

References:
Trousset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;

Image Source:  Ferchiou 1989, Plate XVIIIb
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Ea001-A-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ea001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ea001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>El-Amrouni, Tatahouine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Troussset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>Ferchiou 1989, Plate XXIIIc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Large rectangular panel depicting the torso of a naked figure rising up from foliage. Both arms are extended at an angle from the elbow towards two animals that appear to leap out of the centre of two flowers. The animal to the left appears to be a deer, and the animal to the right might be a feline. There are scrolls and foliage around the person in the centre, and a lion is leaping out of the centre of flowers on the far left of the stone. Another animal is leaping out of a flower on the right side of the stone.
Deco ID: Ea001-A-06
Monument ID: Ea001-A
Site ID: Ea001
Location: El-Amrouni, Tatahouine
Region: Gefara
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Broken stone with floral scroll.
References: Trousset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ea001-A-07

Monument ID: Ea001-A

Site ID: Ea001

Location:
El-Amrouni, Tatahouine

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This panel depicts two male figures striding towards the right amongst branches of trees (perhaps olive trees). They are both almost naked. The first person on the left hand side right arm forwards. His cloak is floating behind him, retained in the hollow of the left elbow. The second figure behind the first has a bare torso, while the lower body is covered with draped fabric. Tendrils with leaves can be seen in the background and the left and right of the stone.

References:
Trousset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;

Image Source: Ferchiou 1989, Plate XXIa
Deco ID: Ea001-A-08
Monument ID: Ea001-A
Site ID: Ea001
Location:
El-Amrouni, Tatahouine
Region:
Gefara
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This rectangular panel depicts vine scrolls full of grapes and vine leaves. Amongst the scrolls kneels a naked male figure with a beard. The body is facing to the left, and the head is turned over the shoulder to the right, towards a feline that is about to pounce on the man. He is holding a double axe in both hands, perhaps about to swing it at the feline. The top left corner has broken off.

References:
Trouset 1974, 110; Brogan 1965; Berger 1895;

Image Source: Ferchiou 1989, Plate XXIIIa
Deco ID:   Eau001-A-01
Monument ID: Eau001-
Site ID:   Eau001

Location:
Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: 1.05 m x 0.58 m

Short Description:
This rectangular stone is badly damaged, the top part is missing. It shows a winged figure in a shallow and round niche, holding fruit in front of the torso in a long cloth, the ends are hanging down either side. The upper body is naked, the lower body is covered by a long flowing garment with light drapery. The right wing and the head are missing. The left wing is still visible just above the shoulder with a scale-like pattern indicating the feathers of the wing.

References:
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquire 1912.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Eau001-A-02
Monument ID: Eau001-
Site ID: Eau001
Location: Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi
Region: Gefara
Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: 0.40 m x 0.56 m
Short Description: This rectangular stone shows the upper part of a winged figure in a shallow niche. The head, most of the wings and the arms are missing. The neck and shoulders are bare, and the left arm is bent outwards from the elbow. Four feathers of the wing are still visible above the left shoulder, two above the right.
References: Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Eau001-A-03

**Monument ID:** Eau001-

**Site ID:** Eau001

**Location:**
Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi

**Region:**
Gefara

**Architectural Type:**
Possible tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

**Period:** Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
This relief has been drawn by Coro when he visited the site. It shows a figure dressed in a flowing garment with many folds draped over the left shoulder.

**References:**
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.

**Image Source:** Coro 1928, 116
Deco ID: Eau001-A-04

Monument ID: Eau001-

Site ID: Eau001

Location:
Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: 0.98 m x 0.49 m

Short Description:
This is a rectangular corner stone with a column in relief on the left hand side. A sphinx (feline body, wings and human face) is facing towards the right, its tail is curved upwards and the wings are stretched out from the back. There is a slight curl at the end of the wing. The feathers are indicated with incised lines. The hair rendered in waves and appears to be loose.

References:
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Eau001-A-05

Monument ID: Eau001

Site ID: Eau001

Location:
Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: 1.49 m x 0.49 m x 0.42 m

Short Description:
This partly damaged rectangular stone (left and right lower corner missing) shows a ploughing scene with two ploughmen, two oxen and a camel in profile. From left to right: A ploughman is walking behind the plough, wearing a short pleated tunic, and hair that seems to reach down to his shoulders. In front of him are two oxen with broad chests, large heads and horns. Their heads are slightly turned towards the viewer. The harness around their necks to pull the plough is just about visible. In front of the oxen is a second ploughman with a short (long sleeved?) tunic and short hair, walking behind a camel. The ropes of the plough are attached to the shoulders of the camel. The plough groves are carved as straight lines along the bottom of the relief.

References:
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Eau001-A-06

Monument ID: Eau001

Site ID: Eau001

Location: Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi

Region: Gefara

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: 0.42 x 0.49 m

Short Description: The return of the ploughing scene, left hand side (Eau001-A-04) is decorated with eight stalks of wheat, set in a plain frame. Each corn of the ear is carved in detail. The lower left hand corner and the bottom of the stone is missing, and the frame is damaged on the left and on the top.

References: Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Eau001-A-07
Monument ID: Eau001-
Site ID: Eau001
Location: Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi
Region: Gefara
Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: 0.75 m x 0.50 m x 0.34 m
Short Description: A seated lion is depicted in profile looking towards the right. The mane is carved with care, and the tail is long and curves upwards. This stone was drawn by Coro, but is now missing.
References: Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.
Image Source: Coro 1928, 116
Location: Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi
Region: Gefara

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: 0.74 m x 0.49 m x 0.23 m

Short Description: This stone is much damaged. It depicted a seated lion looking towards the right, similar to Eau001-A-06.

References: Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquire 1912.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Eau001-B-01

Monument ID: Eau001-

Site ID: Eau001

Location:
Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This very damaged stone shows the body of a quadruped with long legs and a long tail, perhaps a horse. The head is missing.

References:
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquiere 1912.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Eau001-B-02

Monument ID: Eau001-

Site ID: Eau001

Location:
Henscir el-Ausaf, Tigi

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: 0.80 m x 0.60 m x 0.25m

Short Description:
This stone is broken off on the left, and at the top and bottom. It is depicting the hind legs of a quadruped (horse?) and part of a tail. The lower part of a human leg is visible on the right hand of the stone, presumably the leg of the rider.

References:
Brogan 1965, 47-56; Coro 1929, 107-118; Donau and Pervinquire 1912.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ec001-A-01
Monument ID: Ec001-A
Site ID: Ec001
Location: El-Cherba
Region: Gebel
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: 0.55 m x 0.60 m

Short Description:
This stone is broken in the upper left hand corner. It depicts a human figure holding a long object in the right hand (spear?) and an oval object in the left (shield?). The stone is broken at the top left corner, and the head is missing. The figure appears to be naked, stepping forwards with the right foot, which is bent at the knee and lifted up. A long and thin object is visible behind the right arm.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ec001-A-02
Monument ID: Ec001-A
Site ID: Ec001
Location: El-Cherba
Region: Gebel

Architectural Type: Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: 0.60 m x 0.45 m

Short Description:
This stone depicts two vegetal scrolls with a small rosette in the centre.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ec001-A-03
Monument ID: Ec001-A
Site ID: Ec001
Location: El-Cherba
Region: Gebel
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Fragment of a vegetal scroll with a small rosette in the centre.
References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Eh001-A-01
Monument ID: Eh001-A
Site ID: Eh001
Location: Gasr el-Hag
Region: Gefara

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
According to Brogan, this carefully moulded stone displaying a horse. The legs are rather summery, while the body is well shaped. The horse is facing right.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Eh001-A-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Eh001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Eh001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Gasr el-Hag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>According to Brogan, this carefully moulded stone displaying a horse. The legs are rather summery, while the body is well shaped. The horse is facing right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID:  Eh001-A-03
Monument ID: Eh001-A
Site ID:  Eh001
Location:
Gastr el-Hag
Region:  Gefara
Architectural Type: .Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: .Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  Carefully moulded stone displaying a bull. The legs are rather summery, while the body is well shaped. The bull if facing right.
References:  Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID: Eh001-A-04

Monument ID: Eh001-A

Site ID: Eh001

Location: Gasr el-Hag

Region: Gefara

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Carefully moulded stone displaying a bull. The legs are rather summery, while the body is well shaped. The bull is facing right.

References: Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Eh001-A-05
Monument ID: Eh001-A
Site ID: Eh001
Location: Gasr el-Hag
Region: Gefara

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: The Schech of Schechsciuch told Brogan in 1953 that there also used to be a relief of a camel.

References: Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gar001-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gar001-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gar001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Gebel Tarhunah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Reused stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
This rectangular stone shows a relief of a hunting scene on the left side of the stone and a large eagle on the right. A man is sitting on horseback facing to the left. He is holding a sword or dagger in his left hand. He is in the process of stabbing a herbivore with a spear with his right hand, which is lifted up above the head. He wears a short tunic with a belt. Beneath the horse is a hunting dog running towards the left. The right of the stone is dominated by a large eagle depicted frontally with outstretched wings, head facing left towards the left. The feathers on the body are indicated by small triangular incisions, and the feathers of the wings and tails by parallel straight lines. The eagle is proportionally large, exceeding the size of the horse and rider. This stone appears to be now missing.

**References:**
BSR website Ward-Perkins

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Ward-Perkins Collection
Deco ID:  Gar001-A-02
Monument ID: Gar001-
Site ID:  Gar001
Location:  Gebel Tarhunah
Region:  Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:  Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
On this square stone, a large bird in profile is depicted in full flight, facing towards the right. It has a long neck, tail and small wings. The bird is carrying away its prey in its claws, perhaps a smaller bird with long tail and legs. The stone is slightly damaged by two holes underneath the neck of the bird, and one above its tail.

References:
BSR website Ward-Perkins

Image Source:  BSR Archive, Ward-Perkins Collection
Deco ID: Gar001-A-03
Monument ID: Gar001
Site ID: Gar001
Location: Gebel Tarhunah
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This rectangular stone has a plane bordor, and shows a large eagle with long claws on the right side of the stone. The body is depicted frontally, and the head is turned to the left. Both wings are outstretched. The feathers are indicated by triangular incisions and straight parallel lines. To the left is a person on a horse wilding a sword and a spear. A dog is visible at the bottom of the stone. The stone is broken off on the left hand side, and on the upper right hand corner.

References:
BSR website Ward-Perkins

Image Source: SLS Archive, Ward-Perkins Collection
Deco ID: Gb001-A-01
Monument ID: Gb001-A
Site ID: Gb001
Location: Cabao, Gasr el Berber
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This figured capital shows the torso and head of a nude woman. The breasts are carved in two small circles. The face and hair has weathered away. This is the only incident of a nude woman amongst the Tripolitanian relief sculpture recorded in this catalogue.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gb001-A-02
Monument ID: Gb001-A
Site ID: Gb001
Location: Cabao, Gasr el Berber
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A relief depicting scrolls of vine and grapes on the right hand side, and three (naked?) figures on the left standing in a row. The figure in the centres has its arms extended outwards towards the left and right. This could be a depiction of the three graces who are commonly depicted in this manner across the Empire.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.

Image Source: Coro 1928, Figure 1
Deco ID: Gb001-A-03
Monument ID: Gb001-A
Site ID: Gb001
Location:
Cabao, Gasr el Berber
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:
Short Description:
Only a drawing by Coro survives from of this stone. Amongst vegetal scrolls a feline with spots is walking towards the right followed by a winged figure whit a long flowing garment.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.
Image Source: Coro 1928, 12
Deco ID: Gb001-A-04
Monument ID: Gb001-A
Site ID: Gb001
Location:
Cabao, Gasr el Berber
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:
Short Description:
Amongst vegetal scrolls a lion is following an herbivore. Behind the lion is a winged figure wearing a long garment. All figures are facing towards the left. Only a drawing by Coro survives from of this stone.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.
Image Source: Coro 1928, 12
Deco ID: Gb001-A-05
Monument ID: Gb001-A
Site ID: Gb001

Location:
Cabao, Gasr el Berber

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A small hare is depicted in profile, facing right, amongst vegetal scrolls, a small rosette and a bunch of grapes. Only a drawing by Coro survives from of this stone.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.

Image Source: Coro 1928, 12
Deco ID:   Gb001-A-06
Monument ID: Gb001-A
Site ID:    Gb001
Location:
Cabao, Gasr el Berber
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period:   General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  
Short Description:
A relief depicting three rosettes, each in the centre of a vegetal scroll. Only a drawing by Coro survives of this stone.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.
Image Source:  Coro 1928, 13
Deco ID: Gb001-A-07

Monument ID: Gb001-A

Site ID: Gb001

Location:
Cabao, Gasr el Berber

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size:

Short Description:
Three vegetative scrolls with fruit in their centre, perhaps olives. Only a drawing by Coro survives from of this stone.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.

Image Source: Coro 1928, 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gb001-A-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gb001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gb001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Cabao, Gasr el Berber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>Three vegetative scrolls with a bunch of grapes and three pomegranates. Only a drawing by Coro survives from of this stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>Coro 1928, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Gb001-A-09
Monument ID: Gb001-A
Site ID: Gb001
Location: Cabao, Gasr el Berber
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Two fragments of a relief showing an unidentifiable fruit, leaves and a rosette. Only a drawing by Coro survives from of this stone.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.

Image Source: Coro 1928, 14
Deco ID: Gb001-A-10
Monument ID: Gb001-A
Site ID: Gb001
Location: Cabao, Gasr el Berber
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: A large vessel with a thin stem and large handles is depicted on this stone. Some plants or fruit seem to be placed in the vessel. Only a drawing by Coro survives from of this stone.
References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro, 1928, 7-8.
Image Source: Coro 1928, 15
Deco ID: Gd001-A-01

Monument ID: Gd001-A

Site ID: Gd001

Location:
Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah

Region:
Coastal Zone

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Corner pilasters located on each corner of the monuments. Each pilaster is decorated with scrolls of vine in relief, winding up the pilaster.

References:

Image Source: Nikolaus, Private Image
Deco ID: Gd001-A-02
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID: Gd001
Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region: Coastal Zone
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone was originally placed above the door of the monument. It depicts very weathered head of a gorgon. The face is nearly obliterated. Two snakes are winding around the head of the gorogn and two small wings are visible on the top of the head. The gorgon's head is set in front of a snake-scale pattern, in between the architectural decoration of the door frame.

References:

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Gd001-A-03
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID:  Gd001
Location:  
Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region:  
Coastal Zone
Architectural Type:  
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  
Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:  
A fragment the roof cornice depicts a figure with large wings holding a sickle in the left hand, arm held close to the body. The right hand is holding stalks of wheat, about to be cut with the sickle. The head is missing. The person is wearing a short tunic with a belt. This is probably one of the four seasons, most likely representing summer, the time of harvest in this is region.

References:  

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gd001-A-04
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID: Gd001
Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region: Coastal Zone

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A fragment of the roof cornice showing a figure with large wings holding a plough in the left hand. The right arm is bend upwards towards the face, close to the body. The figure is wearing a short tunic with long sleeves and a belt. Plough lines may be indicated by curved lines at the bottom of the stone. The facial features are weathered away, but the figure appears to have long hair or is wearing a cap. This is one of the four seasons that decorated the roof cornice of the monument, perhaps spring.

References:

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gd001-A-05
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID: Gd001
Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region: Coastal Zone

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Part of the broken roof cornice showing a figure holding a hoe with both hands close to the body. The face is weathered, but two eyes and a mouth carved in a straight line are still visible. The clothes consist of long trousers and a loose tunic. Behind the figure are long grooves that are either part of the wings or plough lines. This is one of the four season depicted on this mausoleum, perhaps winter.

References:

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Gd001-A-06
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID:  Gd001
Location:  Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region:  Coastal Zone
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:
This stone formed part of the frieze that run below the roof cornice. It shows a lion set in-between triglyphs and metope. The lion is depicted in profile with a large head, small eye and a mane indicated by carved wavy lines.
References:
Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gd001-A-07

Monument ID: Gd001-A

Site ID: Gd001

Location:
Gastr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah

Region:
Coastal Zone

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone was located above the inscription of the monument and set in-between two columns in relief. It depicts a box with a lock in which six round shapes are held. Two rings are shown to the right and left hand side of the box, through which two sticks are fed. This is most likely the depiction of a caps, which held pressures items such as scrolls.

References:

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gd001-A-08
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID: Gd001
Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region: Coastal Zone
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A moon crescent is carved on the top of the corner pilaster to the left of the door and inscription. An unidentifiable object appears to be depicted on top of the crescent.

References:

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gd001-A-09

Monument ID: Gd001-A

Site ID: Gd001

Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah

Region: Coastal Zone

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: A scorpion set in a triglyphs and metope frieze as part of the zodiac. The scorpion has eight legs and two claws at the top of the head. The tail is not visible.


Image Source: Nikolaus, Private Image
Deco ID: Gd001-A-10
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID: Gd001
Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region: Coastal Zone
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A fish depicted in profile set in a triglyphs and metope frieze below the roof cornice as part of the zodiac.

References:

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID:  Gd001-A-11
Monument ID:  Gd001-A
Site ID:  Gd001
Location:  Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region:  Coastal Zone
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
A snake and two birds are depicted on top of the corner pilaster to the right of the door. The snake is winding its way up the wine scroll. Scales are clearly carved on its body. The head of the snake is bend towards a small quadruped, about to devour it. Two birds are attacking the snake, one in full flight on the head, and the other is pecking at the snake’s body.

References:

Image Source:  Verite 2014, Figure 16
Deco ID: Gd001-A-12

Monument ID: Gd001-A

Site ID: Gd001

Location:
Gasar Duierat, Wadi Lebdah

Region:
Coastal Zone

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Marble portrait statue of the Ceres type that stood in one of the niches of the mausoleum on the second storey. The head is missing. The right arm is bend across the chest, and the upper body, including the arm, is draped in a stola with many delicate folds. Underneath the stola is a long garment that reaches all the way to the bottom, the feet are not visible. This garment is also arranged in many delicate folds. The back of the statue is flat, presumably to fit into.

References:

Image Source: Musso 1995, Plate LXIIIb
Deco ID:  Gd001-A-13
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID:  Gd001
Location:  Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region:  Coastal Zone
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  Arch heads decorated in relief with vines, scrolls, rosettes and acanthus leaves. The statues were placed in these niches.
Image Source:  Nikolaus, Private Image
Deco ID:  Gd001-A-14
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID:  Gd001
Location:  Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region:  Coastal Zone
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
A drawing by Romanelli shows that reliefs of winged figures and garlands were probably placed along the roof cornice of Gasr Duierat. A photograph by Brogan of very poor quality confirms that such winged figures were present at Gasr Duierat.

References:

Image Source:  Romanelli 1925, Figure 25a
Deco ID: Gd001-A-15

Monument ID: Gd001-A

Site ID: Gd001

Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah

Region: Coastal Zone

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Romanelli photographed this relief which, as he states, belongs to Gasr Duierat. It was, most likely part of the zodiac frieze that run below the roof cornice. The figure has a very long neck and a round face with small features and short hair. Behind the head a moon crescent is depicted.


Image Source: Romanelli 1925, Figure 95
Deco ID: Gd001-A-16
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID: Gd001
Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region: Coastal Zone
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Romanelli photographed this relief which, as he states, belongs to Gasr Duierat. It was, most likely part of the Zodiac frieze that run below the roof cornice. The figure has a very long neck and a round face with small features and short hair. Behind the head the rays of the sun are depicted.

References:

Image Source: Romanelli 1925, Figure 96
Deco ID: Gd001-A-17
Monument ID: Gd001-A
Site ID: Gd001
Location: Gasr Duierat, Wadi Lebdah
Region: Coastal Zone
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A frieze with human masks was running along the top of the first storey. Masks in shell niches are placed between masks with long hair hanging down left and right of the face. Some of these mask are depicted wearing a pointed hat. The mask in the shell niches are much smaller and only show a head with short hair and small facial features.

References:

Image Source: Nikolaus, Private Image
Deco ID:  Gh029-A-01
Monument ID: Gh029-A
Site ID:  Gh029
Location:  Wadi Ghirza
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  Some blocks of this mausoleum were decorated with rosettes.
References:  Mattingly 1996, 109; Sjöström 1993, 207; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.
Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID: Gh062-A-01
Monument ID: Gh062-A
Site ID: Gh062
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Some decorated fragments with incised circles were noted the ULVS in 1979.

References: Mattingly1996, 112; ULVS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh128-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
This scene is situated above the false door of the tomb. From left to right: A (female?) bust with large almond shaped eyes, a long nose and a small mouth. The headdress is turban like, with folds of cloth wrapped around the head. There seems to be a band reaching under the chin to keep the headdress in place. The visible part of the garment shows horizontal folds across the chest which gather on the left shoulder. From there, the garment hangs down in multiple vertical folds. Next comes a small male figure which is either standing upright with the legs slightly offset to the right, or is seated, the chair might have been drawn on. He has short hair and a fringe and a short curly beard, large almond shaped eyes, a large nose and small mouth. He is wearing a long garment with vertical folds. Both hands are hanging down the side, and he seems to be holding what Brogan describes as a basket or purse in the right hand, and a bent staff in the left. The third figure is the bust of a man with a beard and very elaborate short locks. The eyes are large and almond shaped, and the nose is long, and the mouth small. The folds of his garment gather on his left shoulder. Divided off by a wide frame with a scale-like pattern comes the last figure of this relief. A person is diagonally placed on the stone, seemingly floating in mid-air upwards, from left to right. The head is at the far right, beardless, with short hair, almond shaped eyes and a small nose and mouth. The right hand is extended out holding a round object, possibly a wreath. The right left hand is at an angle holding a long object or shaft. The legs are stretched out towards the left. This figure is wearing a long wrapped garment with multiple folds. The head sticks out beyond the edge of the relief on the right hand side.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

**Image Source:** Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Gh128-A-02
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This is the return of Gh128-A-01. The back of the head of the floating figure is visible on the left hand side. A standing figure is wearing a long garment with multiple folds which is draped over the left shoulder. Large almond shaped eyes, a small mouth and nose make up the face. The hair is short with small tight locks. Both arms are hanging down at the side, holding a larger object in the right hand, possibly a basket or bag, and a curved object in the left, perhaps a sickle, as Brogan suggests.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh128-A-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
The top of this stone is decorated by leafy scrolls. From left to right: a female bust is wearing a turban-like headdress similar to Gh128-A-01, which is fastened around the chin, the straps can be seen along the side of the face. She may be wearing a necklace or a garment with a very high neck (similar to Gh129-A-05). She has large almond shaped eyes, a long nose and small mouth. The cheeks are very prominent. The garment has numerous folds which fall horizontally. To the right are two rosettes that are caved with much detail in high relief.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Gh128-A-04
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Three rosettes that are caved with much detail in high relief, including detailed under-cutting are depicted underneath four stepped arches that run along the top of the stone.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-A-05
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
The stones depict two large rosettes with two layers of petals in high relief carved in much detail. A band of a leaf scroll is running along the top of the stone.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
On the left side of this stone is a roundel divided into eight segments, each bearing one drilled-hole. The bottom right segment has a loop in relief carved into it, with the two ends of the loops pointing upwards. The rosette to the right is carved in three layers with an eight petalled rosette in the centre, a moulded ring as the second layer, and a 16 petalled rosette as the background layer.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deeco ID: Gh128-A-07
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Three rosettes are placed under 4 projecting four-tiered arches carved in relief. Half of an arch is visible on the corner stone above the first rosette on the left.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-A-08

Monument ID: Gh128-A

Site ID: Gh128

Location: Wadi Ghirza

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is the return of the long relief on the east side showing a rosette under an arch. The arch has a cable pattern on it. The rosettes is in high relief.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
**Deco ID:** Gh128-A-09  
**Monument ID:** Gh128-A  
**Site ID:** Gh128  
**Location:** Wadi Ghirza  
**Region:** Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:** Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum  
**Period:** Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:** This stone is depicting a scorpion and a phallus. The scorpion has 6 legs, three on either side of the body. The sheers are sticking out left and right of the head, and the tail is under the phallus.  
**References:** Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Daniels Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-A-10
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is rather damaged. It has three carvings on it, first on the left is a roundel with leaves, a figure or animal in the middle and a floral rosette with 6 petals to the right.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1884, Plate 102
Deco ID: Gh128-A-11
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Two big rosettes are on the left side of the arch. On the right side is a simple floral rosette with six petals. Underneath the rosette are two very small rosettes underneath each other.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gh128-A-12
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Very damaged statue of a man, broken in the middle and head is missing. The garment is reaching below the knees. An over-garment is draped in thick folds around the body and over the right shoulder. A long object or a big fold of thick fabric is hanging down the front. The feet appear to be bare.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-A-13
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128
Location:
Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Damaged statue of a female wearing a long draped dress and turban-like head dress on her large head. The eyes are large and almond shaped and are sunken into the head. The nose and mouth are small. She is wearing a draped tunic gathered at the waste and a shawl around her shoulders. The folds are carved rather thickly similar to the other statue of Gh128-A-12.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-A-14

Monument ID: Gh128-A

Site ID: Gh128

Location: Wadi Ghirza

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A figured capital depicts a woman, frontally, with both arms raised in a right angle left and right of the head. She is wearing a long-sleeved garment. The face is rather damaged, but the two large almond-shapes eyes are still visible. She is wearing a turban or, alternatively, the hair could be piled up high on the head.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh128-A-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
The head and torso of a man are depicted in this figured capital. The man has a long and curly beard, two almond shaped eyes, and a small mouth and nose. The hair is curly, indicated by small carved circles on top of the head.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984
Deco ID: Gh128-A-16
Monument ID: Gh128-A
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A corner stone depicts a standing figure, facing outwards. Small breasts might be indicated on the chest. The garment is long, reaching down to the ankles, covered by a shawl that is drawn across the body over the left shoulder. A round shape, most likely a bowl, is held in the right hand. The face is defined by two very large almond shaped eyes, a small nose and mouth. The hair appears to be curly.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Gh128-C-01
Monument ID: Gh128-C
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.95 m x 0.14 m x 0.06 m

Short Description:
This stone shows three busts with a figure in the centre framed by a smaller figure to the right and an even smaller personage to the left. All three are wearing the same garment with a plain undergarment over which the fabric is draped crossing over at the front, left to right. From left to right: the first figure to the left is the smallest of the group. The face is very round, with large ears, bulging round eyes and a large nose. The mouth has worn away. The hair is short and carved in small circles. A tight necklace in two rows is carved around the neck. In the middle is a male figure with a curly beard carved in small circles, starting smaller around the small mouth and getting bigger around the cheeks. The hair is carved in the same manner as the beard but in much larger circles. The eyes are large and bulging and the ears are sticking out rather. Most of the nose has been chipped off. The third figure is also wearing a necklace with two rows around the neck. The hair is rendered in circles to indicate curls and s either held together at the top of the head or it is covered by a headdress which is sitting on top of the head.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-C-02

Monument ID: Gh128-C

Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.19 m x 0.50 m x 0.18 m

Short Description:
On this relief two lions are facing each other looking outwards. Between them they are holding a bulls head or mask with one front paw. The lion on the left has a long mane falling down in three layers of waves over the chest and the front part of the body. The mane is also indicated on the lion's forehead with curved lines starting from the nose and fanning out over the forehead. The face is round, the eyes are big and bulging with drill holes to indicate pupils, a small nose and pointy ears. The mouth is open with four pointy teeth showing. The tail is curled at the side of the body. The bull’s head in the middle has the long horns, big ears pointing downwards, and large eyes indicated by simple caved lines. The nose is indicated by two simple drill holes as nostrils. The lion on the right hand side is almost identical to the one on the left hand, except that it has a much shorter mane in rather straight diagonal lines only reaching around the neck.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-C-03

Monument ID: Gh128-C

Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Eight fish and a roundel are depicted on this stone. Five fish are gathered around the roundel in the middle, which they are nibbling on, or about to nibble. On the left and right of the stone two fish are swimming upwards and one fish swims along the top of the stone. The fish have small round or oval eyes, with an open or clothed mouth. The edge of the head is indicated by a semi-circular line. A small fin is carved at the side of the body next to the semi-circular line.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-C-04
Monument ID: Gh128-C
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.56 m x 0.52 m x 0.13 m

Short Description:
This stones depicts a floral scroll, a peacock and the phallus. On the top right of the stone is the phallus carved in detail. In the centre of the stone are two spiral scrolls with a rosette in the centre of each. The peacock is situated at the bottom of the stone facing scroll. The feathers of the bird are carved in much detail. It has a small head, a small beak and eye.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Gh128-C-05

Monument ID: Gh128-C

Site ID:  Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size:  1.37 m x 0.53m x 0.18m

Short Description:
An agricultural scene with multiple horizons. From left to right: on the top is a figure wearing a short pleated tunic which is holding a basket. Underneath a person is ploughing with a camel. The left-hand is held up, possibly holding a stick, while the right hand is holding on to the plough. The person is facing outwards, wearing a short pleated tunic. The face has weathered away. The reins of the plough are attached to the mouth of the camel as well as the hump. The camel is facing towards the right, its head has weathered away. Next comes another ploughman with a camel. He is wearing a short tunic and he is holding onto the plough with the right hand, while holding a stick up with his left. He is facing outwards, with short hair large almond shaped eyes a small nose and mouth. The plough is attached to the camel by its hump and possibly the head. The neck and face has been chipped off. The camel is facing towards the right. Underneath is another ploughing scene depicting a person facing outwards wearing a long tunic which is gathered at the waist with a belt. The plough is held with the right hand while the left arm is raised upwards. The head and left-hand has broken off. It is unclear if that person was holding an object in the left-hand. The plough is pulled by either a horse or a donkey facing towards the left. The reins are attached around the neck as well as the head. The ears of the animal are rather large and it has long thin tail. On the top of the stone at the far right is a horse or donkey with a plough. Underneath, is a figure wearing a long tunic which is gathered at the waist. The figure is bending over holding an unidentifiable object in both hands while bending over heaps of cut wheat, possibly threshing it. The figure is facing towards the left but looking outwards, having short hair large eyes and a small mouth and nose.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
DeCo ID: Gh128-C-06
Monument ID: Gh128-C
Site ID: Gh128
Location:
Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 1.52m x 0.52m x 0.15 m

Short Description:
This relief depicts a caravan scene. From left to right: on the top left a person is walking towards the right while turning the head outwards, wearing a short tunic. The head is round but rather whether. The eyes and mouth are reduced to holes. A spear is held in the left hand. The rein of a camel is held in the right hand that is depicted underneath. Three camels are depicted behind each other facing right, tied together on their humps with a long rope. The leading camel is on the far right and is wearing a harness on its head. Above this camel caravan is a much smaller camel towards the left which is held by a rope by a small person with a short pleated tunic. The figure is facing outwards, holding the rope in its right-hand and a long spear in its left. Next comes an animal, perhaps an antelope or gazelle running away towards the right, while looking back at the person behind. This may depict a hunting scene.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-C-07
Monument ID: Gh128-C
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
The roof was decorated with palmettes at the corner and two double spirals on between. A short leaf was projecting from the top of each spiral. There were four twists on each site.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gh128-D-01

Monument ID: Gh128-D

Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.05 m x 0.52 m x 0.18 m

Short Description:
The busts of a man and a woman as well as a small standing figure and horse are depicted on this stone. The female figure is on the left side. Her head has been chipped away. A (beaded?) necklace is placed around her rather thick neck. She is wearing a plain undergarment with long fabric being draped around the shoulder and the upper body crossing at the centre over the chest. The top layer is reaching from the left side across the upper body over the right shoulder. Next to the woman, in the middle of the stones, is a small standing figure wearing a short tunic with long vertical folds which is decorated with chip carving around the neck and shoulders. The head is missing. He or she is holding a long stick in there left-hand pointing downwards. Behind this figure stands a horse in profile facing towards the left. The head is missing, and only the four legs, the back and the long tail are visible. On the right side of the frieze is the bust of a male figure. Here only the top of the head is missing. The triangular shaped face has large almond shaped eyes, with drill holes indicating the pupils. He has a small flat nose and a small mouth with full lips and a beard with little curls indicated by small circular incisions. It appears that the hair on the head was rendered in the same manner. Two ears are sticking out on the side of his head. He is wearing a similar garment then the female bust, with a simple undergarment and she layers of fabric draped around him, which cross over in the centre of the chest. While the neckline of the woman’s garment is plain, the male’s neckline is embellished by some kind of ruffles around the neck. There is a small simple roundel with three concentric circles to the left side of the woman and a small rosette to the right side of the man.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-D-02
Monument ID: Gh128-D
Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.34 m x 0.54 m x 0.20 m

Short Description:
On this relief two lions are facing each other looking outwards. Between them they are holding a bulls head with one front paw like at Gh128-C-02. The lion on the right has a long mane falling down in three layers of waves over the chest and the front part of the body. The mane is also indicated on the lion’s forehead with curved lines starting from the nose and fanning out over the forehead. The face is round, the eyes are big and bulging with drill holes to indicate pupils. It has a small nose and pointy ears. The mouth is open with four pointy teeth showing. The tail is curled up. The bull’s head in the middle has the long horns, big ears pointing downwards, and large eyes indicated by simple caved lines. The bull’s fur on the forehead is indicated by thin chiselled lines. The nose is indicated by two simple drill holes as nostrils. The lion on the left hand side is almost identical to the one on the right hand except that it has a much shorter mane in rather straight diagonal lines only reaching around the neck.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Mattingly, Private Image
Deco ID: Gh128-D-03

Monument ID: Gh128-D

Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.18 m x 0.53 m x 0.10 m

Short Description:
This very weathered relief depicts a hunting scene. From left to right: a figure wearing a pleated tunic is riding a horse which is moving towards the right. The horse is depicted in full gallop. The rider is holding onto the reins of the horse with the left-hand while holding up a long stick with the right. In front and above the horse are two dogs running towards the right chasing an ostrich which is depicted on the left side of the panel. It has a round head with an eye in the middle and a small beak, a thin neck and a round body and long straight legs. The feathers are indicated by curved lines running along the body and the tail feathers are curving downwards. The ostrich is disproportionately large in comparison to the horse and hunter.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-D-04
Monument ID: Gh128-D
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.63 m x 0.53 m x 0.10 m

Short Description:
This relief depicts a stag hunt. From left to right: a nude man is depicted frontally, his belly button showing clearly. His head is round with two almond shaped slightly bulging eyes, a small nose and mouth. He has a short fringe, and he may be wearing a headdress with two animal ears. In his right hand he is holding a club, with his arm outstretched and bent up ready to strike the stag he is holding onto by the right antler with his left hand. The stag is facing towards the right and is lying on its front legs while the rear legs are still standing up. Most of the stags face is missing. In front of it is a hunting dog facing the stag.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009;190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Gh128-D-05
Monument ID: Gh128-D
Site ID:  Gh128
Location:  Wadi Ghirza
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  0.72 m x 0.53 m x 0.19 m

Short Description:
This stone is depicting a variety of scenes. From left to right: a figure is standing up facing towards the right wearing a short tunic, with a pointy nose and an almond shaped eye. Underneath is a hunting dog facing right about to jump onto another animal in front of it, possibly a goat. Next comes a tree with a thick trunk that is splitting up into two thick branches out of which several smaller branches are growing with pointed leaves (olive tree or an acacia tree?). To the right of the tree trunk is an unidentified animal which seems to be facing towards the left and holding the front legs up in the air, possibly to nibble on the tree. Two further unidentifiable animals are placed further to the right. On top towards the far right of the stone two animals are standing on their hind legs facing each other with their noses nearly touching. On the bottom right-hand corner stands a figure which is situated at a right angle to the rest of the scene, seemingly walking up the relief, wearing a short tunic. This personage is holding up its right arm, while the left arm is cross across the belly.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-D-06
Monument ID: Gh128-D
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Part of this stone has broken off on the right hand side. It depicts a quadruped with a female feline body, a wing on its back and a human face (sphinx?). It is depicted in profile facing towards the right. Around the neck two row of parallel curved lines imitate fur. Only part of the face survives, with one almond shaped eye, a broad nose and small mouth. An ear is visible on the right side of the head. The wing appears to be cut off or not fully carved, perhaps because it would not have fitted onto the stone. Ten teats are visible along the belly of the sphinx. One front leg is being held up at a right angle, perhaps to hold an object that was carved on the now broken-off part of the stone, which is now missing.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-E-01
Monument ID: Gh128-E
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Relief of a man and a woman depicted frontally. The woman is on the left of the stone, and the man on the right. Both have large almond shaped eyes, small nose and a mouth that is turned down at the corners. A wreath is placed between them. The woman has curly hair, indicated by small circles. Her hair, or a vail, is sticking out left and right of her head. She is wearing a mantle with many folds carved in straight parallel lines. The mantle is crossed over from left to right, with an undergarment visible at the neckline. The man has a beard and curly hear, again indicated by circular incisions. His dress is similar to the female dress. The folds are wider and the mantle crosses over from right to left.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-E-02
Monument ID: Gh128-E
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A large bird of prey, most likely an eagle, is depicted frontally, with its head turned towards the right. It has a small unidentifiable animal in its claws. The large wings are stretched out left and right of the body. The feathers are indicated by incised straight parallel lines.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-E-03

Monument ID: Gh128-E

Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Two ostriches depicted in profile running from left to right. The ostrich in the background is much larger than the ostrich in the foreground. The ostrich in the background has its head turned, looking back towards left. Wings and tail feathers are indicated by curved parallel lines.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-E-04
Monument ID: Gh128-E
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A nude person with its legs depicted in profile, while the upper torso is depicted frontally. The right leg is placed in front of the left leg, taking one large step. The arms are extended outwards and upwards, bent at the elbows. A long thin object, probably a spear, is held in the left hand. The upper part of the stone has broken off, and only half of the face is visible. The facial features have weathered away.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-E-05
Monument ID: Gh128-E
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A stallion is shown in profile facing towards the left. The front legs are in the air, indicating a running movement. Part of the middle of this stone is missing.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 117
Deco ID: Gh128-E-06

Monument ID: Gh128-E

Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This damaged stone shows a large lion next to a smaller nude male figure with an erected phallus. The man is depicted in profile on the left side of the stone, facing the lion. A spear is directed at the lion who's body is depicted in profile, while the head is turned, looking out towards the viewer. The man’s features are weathered away. The upper part of the lion's face is damaged. He has two large almond shaped eyes and a small nose. The lion's mouth is open showing a row of sharp teeth. The lion's mane is carved around the head and incised by straight parallel lines. The tale is raised upwards and curled towards the body.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-E-07
Monument ID: Gh128-E
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A nude male is depicted standing upright with the legs in profile, and the upper body twisted looking out towards the viewer. The arms are spread out wide, slightly bent upwards at the elbows. He is holding a club in his right hand, and a spear in his left. A dog is standing on its hind legs on the right, seemingly jumping up towards the club. The face of the man is very weathered. A palm tree is depicted to the left of the hunter with bunches of dates hanging of it on either side. The man is proportionally large in comparison to the palm tree.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh128-E-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
A nude male figure with an erected phallus. The man is depicted in profile on the left side of the stone, holding a long object, probably a spear, in his right hand. The left hand is placed on the chest. This stone is much damaged, and the figure that was depicted on the right is missing, perhaps another lion similar to Gh128-E-06.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 118
Deco ID: Gh128-E-09
Monument ID: Gh128-E
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A fish and a rosette are depicted on the left side of the stone, and another fish and a roundel is depicted on the right. Both fish have their mouth open.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-E-10
Monument ID: Gh128-E
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 
Short Description:
A corner stone on which two rosettes, a roundel and bunches of grapes were carved. A zig-zag line is running along the top of the stone. A small rosette or mask was carved in between the rosette and the roundel, which is now much damaged.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-E-11
Monument ID: Gh128-E
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
An arch head with two roundels, a rosette and a human mask in the centre of the arch. The mask has large eyes, a small mouth and nose, and short hair.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 113
Deco ID: Gh128-F-01
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128
Location:
Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 

Short Description:
A decorated arch head with vines and grapes growing up the left spandrel. A rosette is placed in the centre. A bird is depicted in profile, flying towards the right, wings outstretched. On the right side of this arch a palm tree is shown which has two bunches of dates hanging of it left and right of the palm trunk. A person is climbing up the palm tree, probably to harvest the dates.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-F-02
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
An arch head showing a rosette in the right spandrel, and a roundel divided into eight section in the left spandrel. A fish facing left, is depicted in the centre of the arch. Two leafy plants are springing out from the bottom of the arch.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-F-03
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This arch head shows a dog running upwards towards an ostrich. The ostrich is running away towards the right, both wings stretched out. In the centre of the arch is a small rosette. To the left a bunch of grapes and vines are shown, seemingly growing up the arch.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 122
Deco ID: Gh128-F-04
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128
Location:
Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This very weathered stone shows four armed figures of which two appear to be fighting on the left hand side of the relief. The figure to the far left is holding a sword or dagger, pointed towards the second figure, which appears to be lying on the floor, spear in hand. A shield and spear are depicted above the fallen figure. The third figure is standing upright, holding a spear in the right hand, and a round shield in the left. A larger figure to the right has placed the right hand on top of the armed man's shoulder. All the faces are weathered or broken away.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh128-F-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Two human figures are depicted frontally on this very weathered stone. A third figure may have stood to the far left, but is almost entirely weathered away. The person in the centre is wearing a mantle that was wrapped diagonally over the right shoulder. The arm and head are missing. To the right stand another figure that appears to be wearing a pointed cap. This person is wearing a long tunic and a belt, and perhaps a spear in the left hand.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984
Deco ID: Gh128-F-06
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Two figures are facing each other on this relief, engaged in a fight. The figure to the left is wearing a short tunic and is holding a spear in the right hand, and a shield in the left. The person to the right seems to be running towards the other fighter, spear raised in one hand, and the shield held in front of his body.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-F-07
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
The torso and head of a figure are depicted on this stone. The person is wearing a mantle that is draped over the left shoulder. The mouth is carved in a long line, and the nose and eyes are small. A cap is placed on his head, above which a vessel is placed that has vines and bunches of grapes springing out of it. The vessel is decorated with parallel diagonal lines.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-F-08
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A man on horseback is shown in profile, riding towards the left. In front of him is a small quadruped.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Gh128-F-09  
**Monument ID:** Gh128-F  
**Site ID:** Gh128  
**Location:** Wadi Ghirza  
**Region:** Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:** Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Arcaded temple mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:** This relief depicts two vegetal scrolls. In the centre are twicks of fruit bearing trees, perhaps olives or figs.  
**References:** Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-F-10

Monument ID: Gh128-F

Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone depicts a person in profile, facing right, holding a bowl in both hands and wearing a short tunic with a belt. Behind this figure is a goat or sheep, bound by a rope to a shelf that is above the person. On top of this shelf are three human heads sitting next to each other. Below the shelf is a small object with legs, perhaps a table or brazier. A vessel is visible in front of the person, seemingly floating in mid-air. The stone is broken off here, and it is conceivable that another person was in the process of handing the vessel over, perhaps the figure of the broken stone from Gh128-A-13. This scene may depict the sacrifice of a small animal in the temple.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 125
**Deco ID:** Gh128-F-11  
**Monument ID:** Gh128-F  
**Site ID:** Gh128  
**Location:**  
Wadi Ghirza  
**Region:**  
Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:**  
Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Arcaded temple mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:**  
This broken stone depicts a person wearing a short tunic, and holding a vessel in one hand. The upper part of the body is missing.  
**References:**  
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.  
**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 125
Deco ID: Gh128-F-12

Monument ID: Gh128-F

Site ID: Gh128

Location: Wadi Ghirza

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A piece of a broken relief depicting a person facing towards the left with large almond shaped eyes and curly hair. A long object is held in the left hand.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 125
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh128-F-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
The lower body of a human figure is depicted on this broken stone, facing towards the left and wearing a short tunic and belt.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984
Deco ID: Gh128-F-14
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is broken off on left side. A large figure is standing on the left hand side, facing out towards the viewer. The facial features are very weathered but a beard and lips can still be detected. He is wearing a tunic over which a mantle is draped across the body and the left shoulder. The right arm is outstretched, holding a cup in this hand. The left arm is also outstretched, holding a long object. On the floor next to the bearded man is another object, perhaps a quiver or fasces? A smaller person is depicted to the right in profile, holding a cup in one hand, and two long objects in the other. Towards the left of the stone, a hand and vessel are visible, the rest of the figure is broken off.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-F-15
Monument ID: Gh128-F
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is broken off to the left. A person is standing on the right, holding a sickle in the right hand, and a vessel in the left. In front of him is a vine with a large bunch of grapes. The person is wearing a mantle that reaches down to the knee where it falls slightly open.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 124
Deco ID: Gh128-G-01

Monument ID: Gh128-G

Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size:

Short Description:
Arch head featuring a camel in the left spandrel that is eating out of a trough. In the right spandrel a hunter on horseback is riding towards the left. In front of him is a hunting dog, about to attack an herbivore. A rosette is depicted in the bottom of the left arch, and a roundel is depicted in the bottom of the right arch.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Gh128-G-02  
**Monument ID:** Gh128-G  
**Site ID:** Gh128  
**Location:** Wadi Ghirza  
**Region:** Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:** Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Arcaded temple mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:** Arch head depicting a palm tree in the left hand corner that is heavy with two bunches of dates. Next comes a rosette and two fish in profile facing towards the right. The larger fish appears to be holding the tail of the smaller fish in its mouth. Two further rosettes decorate the right spandrel of the arch.  
**References:**  
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-G-03
Monument ID: Gh128-G
Site ID: Gh128

Location:
Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
The upper torso of two people is depicted on this relief. The facial features are much damaged. They are wearing tunics that appear to flair out around the waist, or the figures are depicted seated. Both figures have their right arm at a right angle pointing towards the left.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
| **Deco ID:** | Gh128-G-04 |
| **Monument ID:** | Gh128-G |
| **Site ID:** | Gh128 |
| **Location:** | Wadi Ghirza |
| **Region:** | Pre-Desert |
| **Architectural Type:** | Temple mausoleum |
| **Architectural Sub-Type:** | Arcaded temple mausoleum |
| **Period:** | Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD) |
| **Size:** | - |

**Short Description:**
In-between two large rosettes a figure is depicted frontally, wearing a conical hat and a long tunic. A spear is held in the right hand.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 127
Deco ID: Gh128-G-05
Monument ID: Gh128-G
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This arch head depicts two birds with a hare between them. The birds are facing the hare, seemingly in the process of attacking it. Two rosettes are placed at the bottom left and right of the arch.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-G-06
Monument ID: Gh128-G
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This arch head is decorated with two large elaborate rosettes in the left spandrel. A horse is depicted on top of the arch next to a rosette. The left spandrel shows a big vine stem with three bunches of grapes. A small figure is in the process of cutting disproportionally large bunch of grapes with a sickle.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 128
Deco ID: Gh128-G-07
Monument ID: Gh128-G
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A male and a female lion are holding a bovine head between them. The lion on the left is female, showing a row of teats along the belly. The male lion sports a mane around his face. Both have their mouth open. They are holding on to the bull's head with a front paw, grabbing it by its ears.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 128
Deco ID:  Gh128-G-08
Monument ID: Gh128-G
Site ID:  Gh128
Location:  Wadi Ghirza
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size:

Short Description:  Grapes and vines are displayed in-between two rosettes.

References:  Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh128-G-09
Monument ID: Gh128-G
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Two vine stems with three bunches of grapes are depicted next to a small jug, probably a vessel for wine.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Gh128-G-10

**Monument ID:** Gh128-G

**Site ID:** Gh128

**Location:**
Wadi Ghirza

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Arcaded temple mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
Large rosette is depicted on a corner stone, next to the lions and bull scene (Gh128-A-07).

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 128
Deco ID: Gh128-G-11
Monument ID: Gh128-G
Site ID: Gh128
Location: Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: A small rosette or laurel wreath is depicted on this corner stone.
References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Gh129-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Gh129-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Gh129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>North tombs, Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Peripteral temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
The inscription in a tabella ansata is framed by two eagles, each clutching a hare in their claws. Their wings are spread and the feathers are finely carved. The bodies of the eagles are caved in frontal view, however, each eagle is turning its head towards the inscription.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 51
Deco ID: Gh129-A-02

Monument ID: Gh129-A

Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: h: 0.45 m

Short Description:
This relief is weathered and depicts two figures holding a bull. The figure on the right is holding the bull by its horns with his left hand, while swinging double bitted axe above his head with is right hand. The double bitted axe looks similar to the Greek Labrys. He is wearing a short garment and possibly trousers. The face is weathered away. To the left is a person holding the bull on his tail with his left hand and a robe attached to the horns of the bull in the right hand. He is wearing a short overgarment or tunic. The face is rather weathered. Both figures face outwards, the bull is carved in profile except for the head, which is facing outwards.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-A-03
Monument ID: Gh129-A
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Peripteral temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: This cantharus is carved with only little detail in comparison to the rest of the frieze. It has two curved handles on either side and tendrils are rising out of the top spreading to the left and right.

References: Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 52
Deco ID: Gh129-A-04
Monument ID: Gh129-A
Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A lion, in profile to the left, is hunting an unidentifiable herbivore (to the right). The lion's face is facing outwards. Although the outlines of the animals themselves is caved simply, the detail of the curls on the lion's mane is remarkable. The eyes are prominent, probably rendered with a drill. The mouth is open and the teeth are showing.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 52
Deco ID: Gh129-A-05
Monument ID: Gh129-A
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This portrait of two females is the only one in the northern cemetery. The woman to the left has her long hair falling in waves down over her shoulders, parted in the middle. The hair is tucked behind the ears and ringlets fall from her ears to her shoulders. The face is rather weathered, but it shows a round face with big eyes, prominent cheeks and a small mouth. She is wearing a garment which crosses over at the front and is draped over the left shoulder in big folds. The person to the right has long hair held together by a head-band or veil. The eyes are very large with a small nose and mouth. She is wearing rather large round earrings. The garment is crossed over at the front and draped over the left shoulder. She is either wearing a big necklace or an undergarment that is gathered high up around the neck.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-A-06

Monument ID: Gh129-A

Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This crude carving, roughly outlining two figures fighting, is tugged away under the soffit of the portico and was, as Brogan argues, a piece of work carved for the amusement of the craftsmen, or it is a unfinished/discarded piece of the frieze. The person to the right has its body in a frontal position while the head is depicted in profile. Both hand are lifted upwards at an angle. In the left hand is an axe or pointy hammer held upwards, the right seems to be pushing the shoulder of the person on the left. The figure to the left strikes a similar pose with the body in a frontal position the head in profile as well as legs and the arms raised at an angle. It is not clear whether or not this person is holding an object in its right hand, since it disappears under the edging of the portico. The left hand is on top of the head of the figure on the right. Both have their mouth open, probably to mimic shouting.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 55
Deco ID: Gh129-A-07
Monument ID: Gh129-A
Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A roughly incised horse is depicted on the upper east wall of the inside chamber. It is upside down, suggesting that this is a discarded outline of a horse. Tool marks are still visible on the stone (tooth chisel).

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 55
Deco ID: Gh129-A-08
Monument ID: Gh129-A
Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Peripteral temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A running horse in profile is carved on this stone with only little attention to detail. The mane has some incisions. This relief was unfinished since it stone surrounding the relief has not been cut away completely.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Gh129-A-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Gh129-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Gh129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>North tombs, Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Peripteral temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**

vertical lines (on occasion two or four lines). Within the metope are rosettes and roundels alternating. The roundels are plainer, however, no two flowery rosettes are the same, showing variety in number of petals and rendering. One of the rosettes shares its panel with a crudely carved goat (Gh129-A-11) and an unidentifiable wavy object. On the north side is a metope with two birds and a cup (Gh129-A-12) and a drainage gargoyle also on the north side (Gh129-A-10).

**References:**

Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Kenrick, Private Image
**Deco ID:** Gh129-A-10

**Monument ID:** Gh129-A

**Site ID:** Gh129

**Location:**
North tombs, Wadi Ghorza

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Peripteral temple mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
The Doric frieze which is running around the roof is divided by triglyphs with mostly three vertical lines (on occasion two or four lines). Within the metope are rosettes and roundels alternating. The roundels are plainer, however, no two flowery rosettes are the same, showing variety in number of petals and rendering. One of the rosettes shares its panel with a crudely carved goat (Gh129-A-11) and an unidentifiable wavy object. On the north side is a metope with two birds and a cup (Gh129-A-12) and a drainage gargoyle also on the north side (Gh129-A-10).

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-A-11
Monument ID: Gh129-A
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Peripteral temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Panel with a Doric frieze depicts a rosette with 8 petals. To the left is a crudely carved goat standing on its hind legs, and to the right is a wavy object which is not identifiable.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 54
Deco ID:  Gh129-A-12
Monument ID: Gh129-A
Site ID:  Gh129
Location:  North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Peripteral temple mausoleum
Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Short Description:  Two birds are drinking out of a cup which is placed in the middle between them. The birds are depicted in profile and their feathers are carved with detail.
References:  Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.
Image Source:  Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Gh129-B-01
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Fourteen arch heads of this tomb have no figural decoration on them but a rosette in each spandrel of the arch, all different in rendering and size. The arch still standing on the north side has a roundel rather than a rosette.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gh129-B-02
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size:

Short Description:
This damaged arch-head depicts a victory in each spandrel. Both victories seem to be flying, and are holding a palm branch in one hand, arm stretched out for the palm branches to touch above the centre of the arch. Each victory is holding a laurel reef in the other hand. The head of the left victory is missing. She is wearing either a long garment which is held together around the waste with a belt with long folds draped over it, or a tunic like top and a skirt. One wing is showing, the feathers are caved in detail. The victory to the right look very similar to the one on the left. Here, the face is preserved showing features indicating eyes and long nose and a small mouth. The face is depicted in profile with short hair worn in a bob and possibly a fringe. This victory is also wearing a flowing garment in the manner of the left hand counterpart, however, the legs and a part of the wing are missing. The laurel reef of the right-hand victory is double the size than the one held by the victory on the left hand side.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-B-03
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
The left side of this highly damaged archhead shows an ostrich being chased by a dog. The right spandrel depicts a man on horseback raising his right hand. The carving is very weathered.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 62
Deco ID: Gh129-B-04
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This arch-head is broken and only the left side remains. It depicts two men fighting, the victor leaning over the defeated, in the process of stabbing the person at the bottom with a spear through the abdomen. The victor of the fight is holding a round shield in his right hand and a spear in his left. His face is damaged, but the hair appears to be short and set in tight locks. His victim has fallen backwards on the ground, with one leg bent underneath him. The torso is facing outwards, while the rest of the body is rendered in profile. He has longer hair and appears to be naked. He is also holding a spear in his right hand, which he is holding up, while apparently trying to catch his fall with the left hand.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 61
| **Deco ID:**  | Gh129-B-05  |
| **Monument ID:** | Gh129-B |
| **Site ID:** | Gh129 |
| **Location:** | North tombs, Wadi Ghirza |
| **Region:** | Pre-Desert |
| **Architectural Type:** | Temple mausoleum |
| **Architectural Sub-Type:** | Arcaded temple mausoleum |
| **Period:** | Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD) |
| **Size:** | - |

**Short Description:**
This is a highly damaged stone. In the left spandrel a dog is jumping up to bite an antelope which is jumping above him. To the right is a palm tree with ripe dates hanging from it.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 62
Deco ID: Gh129-B-06
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 1.15 m x 0.51 m x 0.24 m

Short Description:
This rather long and weathered relief panel depicts a man sitting on a cross-legged chair surrounded by several other figures. (From left to right), the first figure, facing right, is wearing a long dress held together in the middle with a belt. He/she is holding a large cup or basket in both hands. The head is damaged, but Brogan suggests that he may be wearing a tall cap. The second, also facing right, seems to be wearing a long dress with a cape over it, while holding a long slim object in one hand (sceptre?). This figure has tight curls and may be wearing a conical cap. The third person is slightly bigger than the rest of the group, sitting on a cross legged chair with a high back, facing right. The bolt of the crossed legs can be seen. His hair is set in tight locks, and he may be wearing a cap. His head is rather large. It is unclear whether or not he is having a beard. He is wearing a long wrapped garment, the folds clearly visible around his arms. He is holding an unidentifiable slim object in front of him with both hands, possibly a sceptre, scroll or weapon. Next comes a person facing right, extending the arms as if to present an object. Unfortunately, the relief is broken here, so it is unclear what kind of object this person was holding. The legs are also missing, but he seemed to have been wearing a short tunic.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-B-07
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.97 m  0.51 m x 0.23 m

Short Description:
This relief, now broken off, probably belonged to Gh129-B-06. It depicts four figures standing in a line. From right to left: The first persons head and upper body seems to be facing out, but the legs are in profile facing left. The head is damaged. The figure is wearing a short tunic and is holding the handle of a large (wine?) vessel with the one hand. The stone is broken off here. It appears that the person is in the process of carrying the vessel towards the left. The second person to the right has its upper torso facing outwards, but the rest of the body is turned to the right. The head is much damaged. He is wearing a short tunic held together with a belt. He is holding a long object, presumably some sort of weapon, up above his head to the left with his right hand, ready to smite the person to his right. He is holding his victim by the head with is left hand. This position reminds of the Egyptian pharaonic smiting position often seen on reliefs and wall paintings. The victim in the middle may have his hands bound. In the front (or back?). His body is facing outwards but his head is turned to the right. He is wearing a short tunic. To his right is another person, also holding the victims head with the right hand, and possibly his arm with the left hand. Next to the last person to the left is a small rosette.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-B-08
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 1.18 m x 0.51 m x 0.28 m

Short Description:
Damaged and weathered relief of a ploughing scene. To the left a bovine is depicted in profile facing left, pulling a plough. The plough has a triangular frame, with the pole sticking out at the top end. Behind the plough is the figure driving the plough which is much damaged. The harness and reins are showing, leading to the bovine’s head and harness. Of the ploughman only two legs in profile and the top of the head remains. The outline suggests that he was wearing a short toga. A small rosette is carved above the horse and plough. The next figure to the right depicts a person in a short tunic held together in the middle with a belt. The right arm is raised, holding a stick or whip in the hand, while driving the plough with the left. The plough is pulled by a horse. Above the horse is a rosette.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-B-09

Monument ID: Gh129-B

Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.82 m x 0.50 m x 0.09 m

Short Description:
Part of the right side of this relief is missing. Along the bottom of the frieze two carved lines indicate plough furrows. From left to right: A person is driving a plough facing towards the right, wearing a short tunic (and maybe trousers?). The head is missing. A stick is held in the left hand, and the plough is guided with the right. A camel is pulling the plough, with the reins attached to its head. While the drivers feed are on the ground at the bottom of the relief, the camel seems to be floating mid air by being positioned in the middle of the panel. Right next to the camel is another ploughman, also wearing a short tunic. He is holding what looks like a hammer or axe, chopping down a small tree or stump in front of him.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 64
**Deco ID:** Gh129-B-10

**Monument ID:** Gh129-B

**Site ID:** Gh129

**Location:**
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Arcaded temple mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
This stone is broken on the left and weathered. From left to right: A figure walking towards the left stepping down with his right leg while lifting the left up behind him. The face and hands are broken off. He is wearing a short tunic with a belt. With his right hand he is holding what probably is the handle of a plough. Towards the right is a man facing right. His features are still visible, with large eyes, small nose and mouth and a pointy chin. He has short hair and a very long neck. He is wearing a short tunic. In his left hand he is holding a plate or bowl, his left hand is raised up behind him, probably about to throw the seeds for sewing behind the plough.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh129-B-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh129-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>North tombs, Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>0.380 m x 0.47 m x 0.08 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>This stone is very damaged and broken. A mother camel to the right is suckling her baby camel to the left. The mother camel may be wearing a harness for ploughing. To the right there might be the hand and stick of the ploughman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID:   Gh129-B-12
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID:   Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:   Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 1.11 m x 0.51 m x 0.30m

Short Description:
A broke stone shows two reapers and a man carrying a basket. From left to right: After a small rosette, a reapers is bent down over stalks of barley or wheat. He is holding two stalks in his left hand, while in his right hand he is holding a sickle. He is wearing a shot tunic. The head is partly damaged, but his pointy chin can be seen. The barley is growing on a small mound, and the stalks and ears are finely carved. To the right is more finely carved barley, which is being cut by a person who is grasping the barley with the right hand, while holding the sickle in the left. This person is also wearing a very short tunic and has a pointy chin and short hair. The figure to the right is carrying a basket on the right shoulder, being held with both hands that are reaching up to support the basket. The weave of the basket is indicated. This person is depicted facing outward, however, the face itself is very weathered. He is wearing a short tunic.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source:  Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 66
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh129-B-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh129-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>North tombs, Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Damaged and broken stone showing two reapers cutting wheat or barley. From left to right: A heap of cut stalks is lying on the floor. Next to it a reapers is cutting stalks by holding one stalk with his left hand, while cutting with a sickle with his right. He is wearing a short tunic with a belt. His head is much damaged, but some of the short hair can be still seen. The barley is growing on a small heap of soil. One stalk is lying on the ground. Next is another heap of soil with barley growing on top of it. To the right is a figure in a short tunic and belt cutting the stalks with the left hand with a sickle, while holding the stalk with the right hand. The head is missing. A small rosette is depicted above the barley stalks.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 66
Deco ID: Gh129-B-14
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 1.13 m x 0.51 m x 0.22 m

Short Description:
This part of the relief is a corner stone (rosette on the return of the stone). Particularly the left side of the relief is very weathered. From left to right: On the left hand side a man is holding a stick up in the air, driving the animals around the threshing floor on which ears of grain lie. Most of the animals are unrecognizable, but there may be horses and cattle. To the right of this scene stands a figure with a large head. He is wearing a pointy cap but doesn't seem to be wearing any other clothes. He is depicted in profile facing the threshing scene. Behind him to the right at the level of his head are two objects, possibly sacks of grain. Next, two are men winning a pile of barley or wheat with forks. Both are depicted in profile facing each other with the grain lying between them. They also seem to be nude.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 67
Deco ID: Gh129-B-15
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.89 m x 0.51 m x 0.23 m

Short Description:
Very weathered stone depicting a camel caravan. From left to right: A figure in a short tunic depicted in profile is facing right walking behind a camel which is placed in the middle of the panel, not on the 'ground'. The camel is carrying a something on its back. The saddle pad is still clearly visible. The load seems to be distributed on both sides of the camel. The relief is too weathered to determine the nature of the load. Next comes a much smaller figure wearing a short tunic driving along the camel in front with a stick or club that is held above the head with the left hand. The camel is also carrying some goods which are unidentifiable. Here, the camel and driver are both placed firmly at the bottom of the relief. Both figures seem to be holding the camel in front of them at the tail with one hand. To the right at the end of the panel is a third, very badly damaged figure. It seems to be facing the caravan, holding the reins of the camel closest to him.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 67
Deco ID: Gh129-B-16

Monument ID: Gh129-B

Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.15 m x 0.51 m x 0.24 m

Short Description: This is a rather weathered corner stone (rosette on other side) depicts a scene of three figures fighting three lions. From left to right: A naked figure with long wavy hair is laying on the ground face down. The left arm is raised and the right arm seems to try to protect the head from the attacking lion to the right. The face of the lion is mutilated, but the wavy mane is clearly visible. Above this scene is a Lion charging towards a man in a short tunic holding a shield. This figure seems to be running towards the charging lion. The head is much damaged. To the right is a tall (? naked?) man about to strike a lion which is attacking him standing on its hind legs. The figure is holding a weapon, possibly a club, in its right hand above his head, ready to strike the lion. The lion is facing away from the man. Its mane is carved in detail.

References: Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-B-17
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 1.30 m 0.50 m x 0.23 m

Short Description:
Broken and weathered relief depicting a figure fighting a stag and another figure fighting a bull. From left to right: After a small rosette a naked man is kneeling on the back of a stag, holding on to the antlers. The man has short tight locks on a pointy chin. The stag is rather weathered. After another small rosette comes a man with short hair and pointy chin wearing a short tunic. He is holding a spear with both hands, knees bent, stabbing the bull to his right. The figure is facing the bull. The bull is stabbed in his chest facing his killer. Above the bull is another well caved rosette.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 68
Deco ID: Gh129-B-18

Monument ID: Gh129-B

Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.48 m x 0.51 m x 0.29 m

Short Description:
Broken and weathered carving which shows three (naked?) figures fighting with three large cats. The cats have incised carvings probably indicating spots on leopards or cheetahs. From left to right: a large cat is attacking a man which lying on the ground, tearing out the intestines of the man. He is holding a long object in his left hand which curls at the end, maybe a whip? Next comes a small rosette, then a (naked?) man with pointy chin and curly hair fighting with another large cat. The man is facing to the right, holding a shield in his left hand and a spear in his right ready to throw it at the cat. The cat is standing on its hind legs and has its back to him but its head is turned towards the man. The stone is partly broken here and there was most likely another rosette. The third fighting scene shows a man possibly holding a spear in his right hand and a shield in his left. The large cat is in the process of jumping up at him. The figure is walking away from the cat, but the upper body and face is twisted towards it ready to stab the animal. Above the cat is another rosette.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 68
Deco ID: Gh129-B-19
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 1.02 m x 0.49 m x 0.08 m

Short Description:
Two ostriches and a gazelle or antelope are depicted on this relief. The left part of the relief is broken off. From left to right: an ostrich is carved in profile facing left, with its head towards the ground. The second ostrich is walking along to the left, with its long neck locking backwards and outwards. The feathers of both ostriches are carved with detail and they are well proportioned.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 69
Deco ID: Gh129-B-20
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.62 m x 0.49 m x 0.08 m

Short Description:
A broken stone where two figures are riding on horseback towards the right. From left to right: after a small rosette at the top is a highly weathered horse on which rides a person with a short tunic or skirt in two layers. Head and torso are very weathered. In between the first and the second rider is a rosette. More detail of the second horse is preserved, the bridle and rein as well as the mane can still be seen. The rider is wearing a short tunic or skirt with many folds. The carving shows that he may be wearing a breastplate of some sort. The head is highly damaged. However, the outline of it is rather large and he could have been wearing a helmet.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 69
Deco ID: Gh129-B-21
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size:

Short Description:
Broken stone of a stone which shows a huntsman charging after his prey on horseback. From left to right: according to Brogan there is a hare, but it can not be seen on the photograph. A dog is running after the hare. Close behind follows the hunter, who is wearing a short tunic, perhaps with sleeves. He has short hair and perhaps a beard. He is holding a stick or weapon in his left hand. The horse is in full gallop. The face, mane and tail are carefully carved. After the huntsman is a big multi-pedalled rosette.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-B-22
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.40 m x 0.52 m

Short Description:
A broken stone which is decorated with two palm trees and a rosette. The trees are standing close together, palm branches touching. Each palm tree has one bunch of dates hanging from the stem to the left and right. The dates are roughly indicated by carved incisions. Both trees have two small mounds around their stem, possibly indicating a small mound of soil around the stems. In-between the trees is a small floral rosette with four petals, roughly incised.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-B-23
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.38 m x 0.87 m x 0.32 m

Short Description:
This is a statue of a heavily damaged winged statue, broken at the waist. The arms, the lower part of the wings, as well as the face has broken off. The wings are incised with lines to indicate feathers. The figure is wearing a long dress, its skirt flowing downwards and arranged in multiple folds. The left leg of the statue is placed before the right.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-B-24
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: h: 0.88 m

Short Description:
This is a statue of a heavily damaged winged figure. The arms, head and part of the wings are missing and it is broken in two parts around the waist. The wings are raising at the shoulders, spreading, outwards and upwards. The feather are indicated on the wings, the upper part showing smaller individual feathers, whereas the lower part of the wings is incised with long feathers. The figure is wearing a long floating dress with multiple folds. The lower part of the legs is showing and they are carved in high relief around the base. The feet are missing.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Mattingly, Private Image
Deco ID: Gh129-B-25
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: h: 0.90 m

Short Description:
A much weathered statue of which only the leg is visible from the knee down. Brogan notes that the leg seems to be sticking out amongst the folds of the garment. There is no image of this statue.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gh129-B-26

Monument ID: Gh129-B

Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.72 m x 0.35 m x 0.25 m

Short Description:
This statue of a lion is weathered and broken. Its four legs are missing. The face is rather flat, with small roughly incised eyes and nose. The mouth is open as if to roar or attack. The mane is roughly incised by wavy chisel marks on the shoulders, neck, down the front and on the head where it takes on a chevron like pattern. It is not clear if the lion was standing or sitting, however, the forelegs seem to have been extended forward. A square-cut tail is running down the back. Brogan suggests that the lions (also Gh129-B-27) may have been placed on a small plinth placed on either side of the platform on top of the flight of stairs.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 72
Deco ID: Gh129-B-27
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.61 m x 0.30m x 0.21 m

Short Description:
This statue of a lioness is weathered and broken. All four legs are missing. The face is rather flat, with incised eyes and nose. The mouth is open as if to roar or attack. The mane is incised with wavy chisel marks on the shoulders, neck, down the front and on the head where it takes on a chevron like pattern. It is not clear if the lioness was standing or sitting. A square-cut tail is running down the back, some of it broken off. What differentiates it from the lion (Gh129-B-26) is a row of teats along the side of the belly. Brogan suggests that the lions (also Gh129-B-26) may have been placed on a small plinth placed on either side of the platform on top of the flight of stairs. The lioness may have stood on the left hand side, since the teats are only carved on right side (North side facing east).

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 72
Deco ID:  Gh129-B-29
Monument ID: Gh129-B
Site ID:  Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  0.25 m x 0.51 m x 0.24 m

Short Description:
A large elaborate rosette with a flower in its centre and multiple petals around it. Brogan suggests that these stones were used for filling gaps on the tomb.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-C-01
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.83 m x 0.54 m x 0.18 m

Short Description:
This is a very weathered stone, left and right side missing and broken through in the middle. It depicts a horse and camel ploughing accompanied by two ploughmen. From left to right: a horse pulling a plough. Only the backside and the two back legs and the thin tale of the horse is still visible. The horse is walking towards the right. The reins of the horse are visible, attached to the plough and held by the ploughman. The ploughman is very weathered, and the head had been chipped off. He is wearing a short pleated tunic. In the right hand he is holding a stick which is lifted up in the air. On the upper part of the stone above the neck of the camel is a small rosette. The camel has a long neck, four legs and a short tail (facing left) drawing the plough. Two long reins of the plough are still visible, fastened on the harness around the head of the camel. Behind the camel walks the ploughman wearing a short pleated tunic, holding a stick up in the right hand and the reins in the left. The face is very weathered and the plough is completely obliterated. On the upper part of the relief, between the back of the camel and above the stick of the ploughman, is a very weathered figure probably chopping down a bush by holding an L-shaped tool up ready to strike.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 77
Deco ID:  Gh129-C-02
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID:  Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size:  0.26 m x 0.53 m x 0.18 m

Short Description:
A small broken corner stone which has the word ISIGUAR inscribed on it. The person is facing right with a large head, large nose and small eyes. He is wearing a short tunic, the upper part is decorated with chip carving, the lower part is arranged in multiple folds. The left hand is raised up, holding a basket on the left shoulder. The basket weave is indicated by incised lines. The right hand is also held up in the same angle, fingers appear to be clenched intp a fist.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source:  Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 77
Deco ID: Gh129-C-03
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.26 m x 0.53 m

Short Description:
This is the return relief of Gh129-C-02. It is rather weathered, mainly the outlines of the figures are still visible, and only very little detail. At the bottom, above each other, are two dogs running to the right, the lower one having the ribcage indicated by chisel marks. The horse and rider are the top figures heading towards the right. The very weathered rider is holding a long object, most likely a spear, in its right hand.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 83
**Deco ID:** Gh129-C-04

**Monument ID:** Gh129-C

**Site ID:** Gh129

**Location:**
North tombs, Wadi Gharza

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Arcaded temple mausoleum

**Period:**
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** 0.85 m x 0.49 m x 0.08 m

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 78
Deco ID: Gh129-C-05
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Three well carved rosettes decorate this stone that is still in situ. They all have eight petals.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-C-06
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This corner stone is still in situ and depicts two men holding a third man between them, while the left is about to strike the person in the middle with a long object. From left to right: A person, facing right is standing up, legs apart, holding the person in the middle by the head with the right hand. The left hand is extended towards the left ready to strike. This figure is wearing a short tunic with a belt, possibly decorated with vertical stripes at the top. The face is rather weathered, but there seem to be large eyes and short hair. Above is a plain roundel. Next, in the middle, is a smaller person who seems to have both hand crossed on his back and bound. The (naked?) body is facing out showing the back, the head is turned towards the right. Facial features include a large pointy nose and a large eye. The person to the right is holding the victims left hand with the left, and his head with the right hand. He is wearing a short plain tunic with a belt. He also has a large eye and a large pointy nose. A floral rosette with six petals is placed above this figure.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-C-07
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.38 m x 0.29 m x 0.08 m

Short Description:
This very weathered relief, broken off to the left, depicts two figures facing towards the left. They are both wearing short tunics and a belt. The faces are too weathered to distinguish. Before them walks an animal. Only the tail is visible of either a very large cat or a bull. This stone is now in Istanbul.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 79
Deco ID: Gh129-C-08
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This is a large relief depicting multiple scenes of hunting and agricultural activities. From left to right: At the bottom, after a small but elaborate rosette are four long stalks of barley or other wheat. The reaper facing left is standing behind the wheat, holding a curved sickle in the right hand, while grasping a stalk with the left. Above this scene are two figures with a small bush or tree between them. To the right of this group is a person in a short tunic carrying a basket on the left shoulder, supporting the basket with both hands. The woven pattern of the basket is indicated. A smaller rosette at the top, and a slightly larger one at the bottom divide this scene from the hunting scene that follows. At the bottom, an antelope with long horns is running away from a dog. Above is a larger herbivore facing left, but looking back at the two dogs that chaise it. Behind this herbivore is a small tree. Further to the right are two ostriches. The feathers are indicated by small chisel-marks. The ostrich at the bottom is facing to the left, and the one above is also facing left, but is looking back at the horse and rider that follows. The rider at the bottom sits on a horse that seemingly is in full gallop. He seems to be holding a spear. The rider on top is also sitting on a horse in full gallop, holding a long thin object up with the left hand. Both people seem to wear short tunics. Two more rosettes are placed amongst the animals.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Gh129-C-09
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID:  Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:  Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  0.74 m x 0.58 m x 0.21 m

Short Description:
This stone is rather weathered and broken off to the left. It depicts an agricultural scene, including clearing the field, ploughing, sowing and reaping. From left to right: At the bottom a plough and a very weathered person can be seen. The person is holding on to a plough which is drawn by a camel (facing right). Above this scene is a person wearing a short pleated tunic either harvesting the wheat, holding a bunch of wheat in the left hand, and the sickle in the right, or, alternatively chopping down a bush to clear the field. Next to this at the top is a person carrying a basket on the left shoulder holding on to the basket with one hand, while the other arm is extended backwards perhaps to indicate the sowing of seeds. The short pleated tunic is gathered at the waist with a belt, and the top half is decorated with chip carving. At the bottom to the right is a camel drawing a plough facing towards the left. Hence, the two camels at the bottom of this relief are facing each other. The two reins are still very visible, being attached to the head and the neck of the animal. Behind the camel is the plough together with a person holding on to the plough with one hand, while raising the other hand up holding a stick or whip. The body is in profile, but the very weathered face is facing outwards. Above is a horse drawing a plough. Here, the reins seem to be attached to the horse’s neck and mouth. The ploughman is depicted in profile facing towards the left, wearing a short pleated tunic while holding on to the plough with the right hand, raising a stick or whip with the right.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-C-10
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.65 m x 0.53 m

Short Description:
This stone, broken off at the right, is in Istanbul, and Brogan assigns it to Gh129-C since the flanged border is characteristic to this tomb as well as the style of carving. Two men are depicted frontally, both wearing a long folded tunic or mantle, reaching down over his knees as well as a conical cap. Short tight curls can be seen sticking out from under the cap. The faces are very weathered, however, the right figure seems to have had large almond shaped eyes and a long nose. The left arm is crossed over the body, the right extending out towards the right in a similar angle to the left arm. The right hands are either obscured by two rosettes, or they are holding a shields. A simple roundel with a cross in the middle is placed at head height between the two figures. To the right is another roundel or very simple rosette.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 80
Deco ID: Gh129-C-11
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Two rosettes above each other with an object between them depicted horizontally.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: No Image
Decco ID: Gh129-C-12
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Rectangular stone showing a caravan arriving. From left to right: On the top are two pomegranates, below that a very elaborate rosette. Below the rosette is a round object with a criss-cross pattern, possibly imitating flat baskets? Next to that object a similar semi-circular object with the same pattern. Next, towards the top is a person wearing a short tunic sitting down playing a musical instrument with strings with both hands. The person is floating in mid-air (chair was painted on?). The face is rather weathered, a large pointy nose can still be seen. The instrument is a string instrument, and probably some kind of a lyre. Next, under a small rosette is a figure carrying a large (Tripolitanian?) amphora with both hands. This person is wearing a short cloak or tunic. On top of the relief is a (double?) archway. Below the archway is a person with short hair, pointy nose and chin wearing a short tunic feeding a camel. He seems to be holding a small bowl in the left hand, which is outstretched towards the camel and a long thing object in the right hand. The camel has its head lowered to eat or drink out of the bowl. It has two large amphora strapped to its back, and it is pulling a cart or a chariot behind it which is indicated by one single wheel and the shaft of the cart. Above the wheel is a simple roundel.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
**Deco ID:** Gh129-C-13  
**Monument ID:** Gh129-C  
**Site ID:** Gh129  
**Location:**  
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza  
**Region:**  
Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:**  
Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Arcaded temple mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  

**Short Description:**  
This stone is still in situ. From left to right: A figure, facing left, is bend down either sowing, or Brogan suggests chopping down a bush or hoeing. He is holding both hands cloth together similar to picking up seeds from the palm of the other hand. The figure is too weathered to distinguish any clothing. Behind this scene are two oxen drawing a two-wheeled cart. All eight legs can be seen but only one wheel and the shaft of the cart. The bovine’s body is depicted in profile, while the heads are turned to look outwards. No facial features remain. Above the bovines are two rosettes, and behind them a palm tree full of dates.

**References:**  
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Gh129-C-14
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone depicts a hunting scene. From left to right: After a palm tree with bundles of dates hanging on each side comes a rosette at the top. At the bottom, a large cat is running towards the left, the face facing out showing a wavy long mane (lion?). Above the cat is a smaller cat attacking a person lying on the floor. This person has short hair and is wearing a short tunic which seems to be decorated at the top. Underneath the fallen figure is an animal which is in the process of being stabbed by the person standing to the right of it. This rather large figure is facing left and is holding the spear with both hands while stabbing the animal in front. The hunter has short hair, large almond shaped eyes and is wearing a short tunic. On the bottom of the relief under the stabbed animal is a hare. Next comes a smaller animal at the bottom, possibly a fox. Above is a bull which is being stabbed by the hunter to its right. The bull is depicted in profile with the head facing out. Above the bull are another two animals, possibly large cats. The hunter to the far right looks very similar to the one in the middle. He has short hair, almond shape eyes, wearing a short tunic and is just in the process of stabbing a bull.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
**Deco ID:** Gh129-C-15  
**Monument ID:** Gh129-C  
**Site ID:** Gh129  
**Location:**  
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza  
**Region:**  
Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:**  
Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Arcaded temple mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** 0.27 m x 0.58 m  
**Short Description:**  
Return of Gh128-C-16. A standing male figure wearing a long folded dress or mantle. His hair is short and kept in tight locks or waves. He has large almond shaped eyes, a small nose and a small downturned mouth. The lower part of the face is bearded. He appears to be holding an object in front of him with both hands. This could be a bowl, supported at the bottom by the right hand, while the left one is reaching into it.  
**References:**  
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.  
**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984, Plate 83
Deco ID: Gh129-C-16
Monument ID: Gh129-C
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 1.60 m x 0.58 m x 0.27 m

Short Description:
This stone is broken into two parts and rather weathered. From left to right: a small figure is facing right, wearing a long pleated tunic with a wide belt or a separate top. This person has short hair, a small nose and large eyes. It is possible that he/she is holding something in both hands. The individual is looking up to the much taller person that is standing next to him/her. Above is a small rosette and a large pomegranate or apple. The second larger figure is depicted facing outwards wearing a conical cap and a long tunic. Small tight locks can be seen under the cap. The face is rather weathered but he had large almond shaped eyes and possibly a beard. The tunic is falling down in vertical folds, while the top part by the shoulders and the bottom part by the legs are decorated with horizontal stripes. The bottom may have been fringed or it is the continuous folds from above. The right arm is extended outwards at a 45 degree angle towards the right, and the left arm is reaching across the body in the same manner, similar to Gh129-C-15. He or she may have been holding something in the right hand. The third person from the left is again much smaller, facing the taller person with the conical hat. The backside of body is facing outwards, and both hands are raised up, arms bent at a 45 degree angle, very similar to the pose observed at Nesma or Beni Ulid. The figure is slightly leaning towards the personage with the cap. The right hand is touching the grape that is depicted above. This personage is wearing a short tunicfastened at the waist. The face and hair are very weathered, however, the hair seems to be short. Next comes the tallest figure of the relief which appears to be wearing a short plain garment. No traces of a tunic or similar garment can be seen. The hairstyle is in short tight locks or waves, similar to Gh129-C-15. The eyes are large and almond-shaped and rather deep set, making the cheeks appear rather large and round. The nose and mouth are damaged. The right hand seems to be hanging down the side, while the left appears to be resting on the hip. A small rosette is situated near the neck. The fifth individual to the right is again depicted rather small and is wearing a short tunic. Very similar to the smaller person no.3, he or she has got both hands raised, arms at a 45 degree angle. It is not clear which way he or she is facing since the head has gone. The face is too weathered to distinguish. The right or left hand seems to be supporting the bow and arrow case above. Towards the right, three riders on horseback are approaching wearing short tunics. The first rider is on its own, the second and third rider are above each other. There were two, now very damaged small rosettes above the first horse and rider. The pleats of the short tunic of the first and second rider can still be seen. The last figure of this relief is small, standing above a small rosette. He or she is wearing a short pleated tunic with a belt, the backside of the body facing outwards while the head is facing towards the left. Small round holes indicate curls. The posture again is similar to the smaller figures three and four, both arms lifted up at a 45-degree angle.
**Deco ID:** Gh129-C-17

**Monument ID:** Gh129-C

**Site ID:** Gh129

**Location:**
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Arcaded temple mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:**
- Width across wings: 0.54 m, present
- Height: 0.54 m

**Short Description:**
This is a winged naked female statue which is heavily damaged has been found north of the tomb amongst the debris. Brogan suggests that there were four of them decorating the corners of the roof. The head, lower wings and the legs are missing. The breasts are carved similar to two roundels. The hands are resting on the thighs, indicating that this figure could have been crouching. The large wings are spread out at the back, the feathers very roughly indicated by long carved deep lines.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Gh129-C-18

**Monument ID:** Gh129-C

**Site ID:** Gh129

**Location:**
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Arcaded temple mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** h: 0.42 m

**Short Description:**
This frieze is placed under the cornice of the podium and is running all around the monument. The frieze is decorated with scrolls which are mainly square cut with grooves, on some of the blocks are rounded. From the stem spring stylised leaves and fruit (grapes, pomegranates, pears). A figure of a horse is carved on the west side, fifth scroll from the right.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

**Image Source:** Kenrick, Private Image
**Deco ID:** Gh129-D-01  
**Monument ID:** Gh129-D  
**Site ID:** Gh129  
**Location:**  
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza  
**Region:**  
Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:**  
Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Arcaded temple mausoleum  
**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** 1.48 m x 0.58 m x 0.22 m  
**Short Description:**  
This large arch has a rosette at its centre and is framed by a narrow fillet. In the left spandrel is a palm tree with seven leaves (three each side, one sticking up in the centre) and bundles of ripe dates are hanging down to the left and right. The lower part of this carving has gone. The right spandrel also bears a very similar palm tree, here, the stem is incised with a criss-cross pattern. A person is climbing up the tree trunk on the left hand side, holding on with both hands and both legs are pressed against the tree trunk. This is the largest of the four arch heads and probably went across the east side.  
**References:**  
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-D-02
Monument ID: Gh129-D
Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 1.23 m x 0.53 m

Short Description:
The two spandrels of this arch have been decorated with one simple roundel each. There are broad bands carved down the side, and fillets decorate the top of the arch head and around the arch.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984
**Deco ID:** Gh129-D-03

**Monument ID:** Gh129-D

**Site ID:** Gh129

**Location:**
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Arcaded temple mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** 1.02m x 0.58m

**Short Description:**
This arch-head has a roundel in each spandrel, fillets on top of the arch-head and around the arch and a band around the sides. Brogan suggests that this arch head belonged on the west side due to its size.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** Brogan and Smith 1984
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gh129-D-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh129-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gh129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>North tombs, Wadi Ghirza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>A piece of a fourth arch-head has been found, but it was not described by Brogan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Gh129-D-05
Monument ID: Gh129-D
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.90 m x 0.48 m x 0.18 m

Short Description:
This stone is badly defaced. It depicts a vine-stalk in a zig-zag pattern with three bunches of grapes and perhaps the bottom of a vase or basket at the centre of the stone. The return of this stone shows a rosette.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-D-06

Monument ID: Gh129-D

Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.67 m x 0.48 m x 0.18 m

Short Description:
This heavily damaged stone shows a vine in the centre with bunches of grapes growing out from both sides.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984
Deco ID: Gh129-D-07

Monument ID: Gh129-D

Site ID: Gh129

Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.78 m x 0.48 m x 0.21 m

Short Description:
This heavily defaced stone shows a horse and rider to the left charging towards the right. Two ostriches are running in front of the rider away from him. Both ostriches are having their head turned to the left, as if watching their pursuer. According to Brogan, there is a rosette on the right hand side.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Smith Collection
**Deco ID:** Gh129-D-08

**Monument ID:** Gh129-D

**Site ID:** Gh129

**Location:**
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Arcaded temple mausoleum

**Period:** Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** 0.32 m x 0.48 m x 0.18 m

**Short Description:**
This relief is most likely from tomb D, but it is not certain. Two fish are depicted on top of each other, one swimming towards the left, and the other towards the right. The eyes, mouth and headline are incised in a simple manner, but no incisions for the scales are visible. The stone has a moulding around its edges.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Smith Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-E-01
Monument ID: Gh129-E
Site ID: Gh129
Location:
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.64m x 0.48 m x 0.24 m

Short Description:
This stone is divided into two panels which are on top of each other. From left to right: the top panel shows a peacock in profile facing left. The crown and long feathers are indicated. Next to the beak is a square shape, possibly a trove to feed the bird? Behind the peacock are two running haunts depicted above each other. The second panel below the first shows a large ostrich facing left with two short outstretched wings, long neck, short legs and fat belly. Next comes the hunter facing towards the left. He has no hair and a large almond shape eye. He is wearing a short tunic with multiple folds and a decorated top, indicated by chip carving. In his right hand he is holding two spears, and with his left he is leading the camel that follows behind him. The camel seems to have a saddle or bag strapped to its hump.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Gh129-E-02
Monument ID: Gh129-E
Site ID:  Gh129
Location:  
North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region:  
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:  
Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  0.19 m x 0.48 m x 0.19 m

Short Description:
This corner stone has two panels on top of each other. The top panel is occupied by a bird, possibly a cockerel or a peacock facing right. It has a long neck, small face, long legs and long tail feathers. Below is a figure facing outwards. Both hands are raised up into the air and an object was held in the right hand, now no longer visible. The persons seems to have wore a short tunic with folds and a belt.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37 ; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-E-03

Monument ID: Gh129-E

Site ID: Gh129

Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.80 m x 0.48 m x 0.16 m

Short Description: This stone is broken and a large piece of the lower panel is missing. It is divided into two panels which are placed on top of each other. On the top row are five animals, of which the second could be a herbivore, and the fourth and fifth could be ostriches with long necks, legs and short wings. On the bottom panel a hare is depicted jumping on the top left corner, an unidentifiable animal is depicted below and an unidentifiable quadruped can be seen on the right hand side of the stone.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009, 190.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gh129-E-04
Monument ID: Gh129-E
Site ID: Gh129
Location: North tombs, Wadi Ghirza
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: Late Romano-Libyan (4th-5th century AD)
Size: 0.54 m x 0.48 m x 0.14 m

Short Description:
A very weathered stone with two panels on top of each other. The top panel is occupied by an unidentified large herbivore, behind which is bigger and a smaller camel. The bigger camel seems to be carrying a bag or saddle. The lower panel shows a hunting scene. A large quadruped, possibly a dog, is attacking a large bird, perhaps an ostrich. The horse and rider are almost weathered away. The rider seems to raise both hands in the air.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Mattingly 1996, 120; Barker and Jones 1981, 37; Barker and Jones 1982, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 263; Sjöström 1993, 205; Smith 1985; Kenrick 2009,190.

Image Source: Brogan and Smith 1984
Deco ID: Gha001-A-01

Monument ID: Gha001-

Site ID: Gha001

Location:
Ghadames

Region:
Desert, Oasis

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Decorated arch head perhaps from one of the arcaded mausolea from the Asnam cemetery.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image Source: No Image, SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Gha001-A-02
Monument ID: Gha001-
Site ID:  Gha001
Location:  Ghadames
Region:  Desert, Oasis
Architectural Type:  Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  Man holding or feeding a horse. Found by Richardson in 1845 in a garden and taken to his house where he made a sketch of it. Now missing.
References:  Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.
Image Source:  Richardson 1848
Deco ID:  Gha001-A-03

Monument ID: Gha001-

Site ID:  Gha001

Location:
Ghadames

Region:
Desert, Oasis

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone depicts a seated figure in profile on a cross legged stool, feet on a footstool, wearing an elaborate headdress. The headdress has a long feather or fabric hanging down the back. Alternatively, the hair could be braided and held together in a high ponytail. The seated figure is holding an object, described as a palm leave by Duveyrier, in its hand. A smaller, standing figure is situated on the left hand side of the seated person, wearing a similar headdress. On the right hand side, in front of the seated figure, is an arch, with the arm and hand of another figure showing that is holding a long object.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image Source:  Duveyrier 1864, 250, Plate X
**Deco ID:**  Gha001-A-04  
**Monument ID:** Gha001-  
**Site ID:**  Gha001  
**Location:**  Ghadames  
**Region:**  Desert, Oasis  
**Architectural Type:**  Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum  
**Period:**  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:**  0.35 m x 0.39 m x 0.18 m  
**Short Description:**  This rectangular stone depicts a horse and rider. The horse has an elongated body and long tail. The rider is leaning backwards, one hand is holding on the rein, the other is extended backwards, probably about to throw a spear, which is still very faintly visible. The bridle and rein as well as the horse’s mane are carved in detail.  
**References:**  Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.  
**Image Source:**  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gha001-A-05

Monument ID: Gha001-

Site ID: Gha001

Location:
Ghadames

Region:
Desert, Oasis

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This rectangular stone depicts a reaper to the right cutting wheat or barley with right hand. The person standing in front of the reaper to the left is holding an object in its left hand, Brogan suggests a flail. There may be something sitting on the person’s right arm, perhaps a basket? This person is wearing the long tunic and skirt which seems customary to Ghadames.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Gha001-A-06

Monument ID: Gha001-

Site ID:  Gha001

Location:  
Ghadames

Region:  
Desert, Oasis

Architectural Type:  
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:  
Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:  
This rectangular stone depicts different kinds of food or offerings. From left to right: two bunches of grapes, the one at the top hanging down, the bottom one pointing upwards. Two roundels with four sections each with a hole in the middle. Then, at the bottom, seven nuts, dates or seeds, on the top is a pomegranate. Next comes a circular medallion (or plate?) in which one bird can be seen to the left with a date or nut at the bottom. In the centre of the medallion or plate is a long object, perhaps a fish or a cup. Another object is on the right hand side, now mostly broken off.

References:  
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gha001-A-07

Monument ID: Gha001-

Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Region: Desert, Oasis

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Damaged stone showing a horse and rider. Of the rider only the legs are visible. The rider might be holding a spear in his right hand. The spear projects upwards over the horse’s neck. The horse is large and slightly elongated similar to Gha001-A-04. The rein is just about visible on the horses head. Although the relief is much damaged now, it seems that this is finer craftsmanship than Gha 001-A-04.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image Source: Nikolaus, Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gha001-A-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gha001-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gha001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Ghadames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Desert, Oasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>This hunting scene depicts a herbivore that is being attacked a dog (facing right). The dog is depicted above herbivore, about to bite its neck. A smaller quadruped is running towards the right at the bottom of the stone, underneath the herbivore, perhaps another dog or herbivore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>Nikolaus, Private Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Gha001-A-09

Monument ID: Gha001-

Site ID: Gha001

Location: Ghadames

Region: Desert, Oasis

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This small stone depicts a pitchfork. This relief could be part of a mausoleum or a stele.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image Source: Nikolaus, Private Image
**Deco ID:** Gha001-A-10  
**Monument ID:** Gha001-  
**Site ID:** Gha001  
**Location:** Ghadames  
**Region:** Desert, Oasis  
**Architectural Type:** Temple mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  

**Short Description:**  
This weathered rectangular stone depicts four figures. The stone is broken by the fourth figure on the right hand side, and only half of the fourth person is still visible. From left to right: a person wearing a tunic reaching down to the knees is holding the second person by its arm. The other hand is held upwards, palms facing up. The second person in wearing a long garment that reaches down to the ankles. A shawl or mantle crosses over the upper body and over the right shoulder. This second figure is holding on to the shoulder of the third person with his hand. The third figure is wearing a long skirt and a tunic on top. A small amphora is perhaps held under the right arm. A cup is being offered to the fourth person. The third person is wearing the distinct Ghadamese hairstyle or headdress, with the hair gathered on top of the head in braids. The fourth person appears to be depicted frontally and seems to be larger than the surrounding figures.

**References:**  
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.  

**Image Source:** Nikolaus, Private Image
Deco ID: Gha001-A-11
Monument ID: Gha001-
Site ID: Gha001

Location:
Ghadames

Region:
Desert, Oasis

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is very damaged and weathered, showing three figures. The person to the right is rather small. The figure in the middle is an eagle with in wings spread out and there is a person standing on the right hand side.

References:
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image Source: Mattingly, Private Image
Deco ID: Gha001-A-12  
Monument ID: Gha001-  
Site ID: Gha001  
Location: Ghadames  
Region: Desert, Oasis  
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum  
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum  
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)  
Size: -  

Short Description:  
This rectangular stone is of pinkish limestone is very weathered and broken off at the bottom. It is showing two figures in a medallion or under an arch. The person to the right is wearing a wrapped dress with precise folds, draped over the right shoulder. Both figures are wearing the headdress much observed on the other stones of Ghadames. Two or three rosettes are above the figures inside the curved frame. Some symmetric pattern can be seen on the edge of the stone.

References:  
Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972, 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

Image Source: Nikolaus, Private Image
Deco ID: Gha001-A-13
Monument ID: Gha001-
Site ID: Gha001
Location: Ghadames
Region: Desert, Oasis
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: This stone or stele depicts an obelisk mausoleum with a podium, two storeys, engaged columns and a pyramid roof. A little tree seems to be growing out of the top of the roof.
References: Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.
Image Source: Nikolaus, Private Image
**Deco ID:**  Gha001-A-14

**Monument ID:**  Gha001-

**Site ID:**  Gha001

**Location:**  Ghadames

**Region:**  Desert, Oasis

**Architectural Type:**  Temple mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**  Arcaded temple mausoleum, Possible arcaded temple mausoleum

**Period:**  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:**  -

**Short Description:**  Damaged relief of a carefully carved figure holding a large woven basket on its left shoulder. The left hand is supporting the basket at the bottom. A long handle or rope is reaching over the head which has large eyes, a small nose and mouth and a pointy chin. The person is wearing a long tunic with folds and long sleeves, a skirt with many folds and possibly boots.

**References:**  Bovill 1964, 137, 263-64; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive, Coro 1956; Duveyrier 1864, 351; Largeau 1881, 237-243; Mattingly and Sterry 2010; Mercier 1953, 17-47; Pavoni 1913, 311-13; Pervinquière 1912, 128-131; Piccioli 1931, 495-96; Rebuffat 1972; 1975; Richardson 1884, 355-358.

**Image Source:**  Nikolaus, Private Image
Deco ID:  Ghl001-A-01
Monument ID: Ghl001-
Site ID:  Ghl001
Location:
Wadi Ghalbun
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
A small relief of a man is placed below the inscription. The figure is nude except of a lion skin that is draped over the left shoulder. The man is holding a club in the right hand. The face has weathered away. The lion skin and the club indicate that this could be Hercules or Milk'ashtar.

References:
Kenrick 2009 175.

Image Source:  Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Ghl001-A-02
Monument ID: Ghl001-
Site ID: Ghl001
Location: Wadi Ghalbun
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: This relief shows a cart with big wheels that is pulled by two bovines, walking next to each other. A person is standing in front of the bovines, pulling them along with both hands with a long rope. Most of the person is weathered away.

References: Kenrick 2009 175.

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID: Ghl001-A-03
Monument ID: Ghl001-
Site ID: Ghl001

Location:
Wadi Ghalbun

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This relief depicts a feline in profile running towards a herbivore. The herbivore is standing still, with its head turned towards the feline.

References:
Kenrick 2009 175.

Image Source: Al-Haddad Private Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Ghl001-A-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monumnt ID:</td>
<td>Ghl001-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Ghl001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Wadi Ghalbun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Possible obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description:</td>
<td>This rectangular stone depicts a small figure depicted above the inscription of the mausoleum wearing a long garment and standing on a small podium. The stone is broken off to the right and it is very weathered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References:</td>
<td>Kenrick 2009 175.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source:</td>
<td>Al-Haddad Private Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deco ID:** Glh001-A-05
**Monument ID:** Ghl001-
**Site ID:** Ghl001
**Location:** Wadi Ghalbun
**Region:** Pre-Desert
**Architectural Type:** Tower mausoleum
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Possible obelisk mausoleum
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
This relief depicts a feline in profile running towards a herbivore. The herbivore is standing still, but has its head turned towards the feline.

**References:**
Kenrick 2009 175.

**Image Source:** Al-Haddad Private Image
Deco ID: Go001-A-01

Monument ID: Go001-A

Site ID: Go001

Location:
Rhoumrassen

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear, Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
According to Trouset, a relief of a fish and rosette was integrated into a more recent structure that came from the mausoleum that once stood here.

References:
Gauckler 1904, 376; Tribalet 1901, 289; Trouset 1974, 105.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Go001-A-02
Monument ID: Go001-A
Site ID: Go001

Location:
Rhoumrassen

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear, Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
According to Trousset, a relief depicting men in a boat was integrated into a more recent structure. This, most likely, came from a mausoleum.

References:
Gauckler 1904, 376; Tribalet 1901, 289; Trousset 1974, 105.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gr022-A-01
Monument ID: Gr022-A
Site ID: Gr022
Location: Wadi Ghurgar
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A bird of prey, depicted in profile, is sitting on top of a hare, tearing out its entrails. The head is lifted up high while the break holding some of the entrails. The stone is rather weathered, but the straight parallel lines indicating the feathers of the wing are still visible. The feathers of the body are indicated by a wavy pattern. The hare, with long ears, is lying on its back with its stomach torn open by the bird.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Gr022-A-02
Monument ID: Gr022-A
Site ID: Gr022
Location: Wadi Ghurgar
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Brogan recorded a fragment of a stone which depicts a bust or statue with drapery.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Gr022-B-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Gr022-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Gr022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Wadi Ghurgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Possible obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description:</td>
<td>Amongst the debris of the tomb lie some stones which have rosettes carved on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References:</td>
<td>Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source:</td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Location: Wadi Ghurgar

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A stone with a six-segmented plain roundels is lying amongst the rubble of the tomb.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gs001-A-01
Monument ID: Gs001-A
Site ID: Gs001
Location:
Lepcis Magna, Wadi Lebdah
Region:
Coastal Zone
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Romanelli mentions rosettes and a Doric frieze which is now missing.
References:
Cowper 1897, 213; Kenrick 2009; Romanelli 1925.
Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gu001-B-01
Monument ID: Gu001-B
Site ID: Gu001
Location:
Beni Guedal
Region:
Gefara
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A life-size marble statue has been seen by Lieut. Witz which was wearing a draped garment. This statue is now lost.

References:

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gu001-B-02
Monument ID: Gu001-B
Site ID: Gu001
Location: Beni Guedal
Region: Gefara
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: 0.75 m x 0.60 m

Short Description:
This rectangular stone depicts a seated sphinx in profile, facing towards the right, its tail is curving upwards and the wings stretched out at the back. The hair is held in a loose bunch in the nape of the neck. The feathers of the wings are carved in detail.

References:

Image Source: Trouset 1974, Figure 33b
Deco ID: Gu001-B-03

Monument ID: Gu001-B

Site ID: Gu001

Location:
Beni Guedal

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: 0.80 m x 0.45 m

Short Description:
This stone is rather damaged. It depicts a ploughing scene with two (or three?) oxen pulling the plough. The ploughman is depicted on the far right of the stone, holding on to the plough. The stone is broken off here, and only the weathered head and one leg of the ploughman can be seen. The cattle have thick necks with reins around them to pull the plough. In front of the cattle is another person wearing a short tunic walking towards the right, presumably driving another plough. The stone is broken off here, and the animals pulling the plough cannot be determined, however, Lieut. Witz states that the stone depicted oxen and camels ploughing. The furrows of the plough are indicated by 6 straight lines on the bottom of the scene.

References:

Image Source: Toutain 1914
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Gu001-C-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gu001-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Gu001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Beni Guedal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>h: 0.50 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>According to Witz this stone depicted a head surrounded by two intertwined snakes, perhaps a gorgon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Brogan 1964, 51-53; Toutain 1914, 157-164; Trouset 1974, 123-126.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Gu001-C-02
Monument ID: Gu001-C
Site ID: Gu001
Location: Beni Guedal
Region: Gefara
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: According to Witz, this stone depicted a vase and an altar or incense box.


Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gu001-C-03
Monument ID: Gu001-C
Site ID: Gu001
Location: Beni Guedal
Region: Gefara

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: According to Witz this stone depicted a bull's head between triglyphs.

References:

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Gu001-C-04
Monument ID: Gu001-C
Site ID: Gu001
Location: Beni Guedal
Region: Gefara
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: 0.47 m x 0.50 m x 0.23 m

Short Description:
On this broken corner stone with a pilaster in relief a sheep is depicted in profile facing left. The sheep is rather weathered and no distinctive features can be noted.

References:

Image Source: Trouset, Private Image
Deco ID:  Gu001-C-05
Monument ID: Gu001-B
Site ID:    Gu001
Location:
Beni Guedal
Region:
Gefara
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period:    General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:      -

Short Description:
A ram's head was depicted on this stone according to Witz, which is probably the one drawn by Coro.

References:

Image Source: Trousset, Private Image
Deco ID: Gu001-C-06
Monument ID: Gu001-C
Site ID: Gu001
Location: Beni Guedal
Region: Gefara
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A ram's head was depicted on this stone according to Witz, which is probably the one drawn by Coro.

References:

Image Source: Coro 1928, 116
Deco ID: Ha001-A-01  
Monument ID: Ha001-A  
Site ID: Ha001  
Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine  
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel  
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear  
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear  
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
Size: -  

Short Description:  
Seen by Donau (1906, 117). Seated statue but no image.  

References:  
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trousset 1974, 80-81.  

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-02
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location:
Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Seated statue recorded by Donau (1906, 117). No image.
References:
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.
Image Source: No Image
**Deco ID:**  Ha001-A-03

**Monument ID:** Ha001-A

**Site ID:**  Ha001

**Location:**
Henchir bel Aid, Serarine

**Region:**
Gebel, Western Gebel

**Architectural Type:**
Collapsed/Unclear

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Size:** 0.50 m x 0.68 m

**Short Description:**
Two birds are drinking out of a cup, facing each other, the cup is between them.

**References:**
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.

**Image Source:** No Image
Deco ID:  Ha001-A-04
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID:  Ha001
Location:
Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A stone depicting a turreted buildings. The outlines are scratched into the stone, and are more likely to be a graffiti, and do not belong to the original decoration of the mausoleum.

References:
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.

Image Source:  No Image
**Deco ID:** Ha001-A-05

**Monument ID:** Ha001-A

**Site ID:** Ha001

**Location:**
Henchir bel Aid, Serarine

**Region:**
Gebel, Western Gebel

**Architectural Type:**
Collapsed/Unclear

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
A stone depicts a bull with a hump, a person is behind him, holding a long stick spurring on the bull.

**References:**
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.

**Image Source:** No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-06
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Two donkeys are depicted on this stone, one rearing the front legs.
Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-07
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone depicts two sheep are facing each other.

References:
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trousset 1974, 80-81.

Image Source: No Image
**Deco ID:** Ha001-A-08  
**Monument ID:** Ha001-A  
**Site ID:** Ha001  
**Location:**  
Henchir bel Aid, Serarine  
**Region:**  
Gebel, Western Gebel  
**Architectural Type:**  
Collapsed/Unclear  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Collapsed, Unclear  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:**  
This stone shows a man standing.  
**References:**  
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.  
**Image Source:** No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-09
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: This stone depicts a lion and a hunter.
References: Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trousset 1974, 80-81.
Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-10
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: This stone depicts a man riding a camel.


Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-11
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: This stone depicts a man riding on horse
References: Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trousset 1974, 80-81.
Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-12

Monument ID: Ha001-A

Site ID: Ha001

Location:
Henchir bel Aid, Serarine

Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone depicts two quadrupeds, of which one could be a Waddan.

References:
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-13
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: This stone depicted an ostrich
Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-14
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location: Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone depicted a dancing? female figure.

References:
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trousset 1974, 80-81.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Ha001-A-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ha001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ha001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Henchir bel Aid, Serarine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gebel, Western Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Arch head surmounted by pointed gable, and solid stone in place of the arch. The spandrels are decorated with a winged figure (victories?) on each side, holding a wreath between them. Stone was transported to Remada.

**References:**
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.

**Image Source:** No Image
Deco ID: Ha001-A-16
Monument ID: Ha001-A
Site ID: Ha001
Location:
Henchir bel Aid, Serarine
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Arch head similar to Ha001-A-15 was noted by Trousset in front of the courtyard of the officer at Remada.

References:
Toutain 1903, 304, 330-31; Donau, 1906, 114-117; Trouset 1974, 80-81.

Image Source: No Image
**Deco ID:** Hk001-A-01

**Monument ID:** Hk001-A

**Site ID:** Hk001

**Location:**
Henchir Krebita

**Region:**
Gebel, On hilltop, Western Gebel

**Architectural Type:**
Possible tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Unclear

**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

**Size:** 0.30 m x 0.44 m x 0.44 m

**Short Description:**
Stone depicting a female head, (0.45m high). The woman is wearing very distinct earrings, triangular in shape.

**References:**
Cagnat, 1928, 249-253; Toussaint 1908, 403; Trouset 1974, 83-84.

**Image Source:** No Image
Deco ID: Hk001-A-02
Monument ID: Hk001-A
Site ID: Hk001
Location: Henchir Krebita
Region: Gebel, On hilltop, Western Gebel

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: 0.39 m x 0.50 m x 0.44 m

Short Description: Stone depicting a bearded male figure carved in relief. The upper and lower part of the relief was already broken in the early 20th century, when Cagnat saw the stone.

References: Cagnat, 1928, 249-253; Toussaint 1908, 403; Trousset 1974, 83-84.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Hk001-A-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Hk001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Hk001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Henchir Krebita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gebel, On hilltop, Western Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>0.84 m x 0.50 m x 0.40 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>A stone depicting a dog hunting a rabbit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Cagnat, 1928, 249-253; Toussaint 1908, 403; Trouset 1974, 83-84.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Hk001-A-04
Monument ID: Hk001-A
Site ID: Hk001
Location: Henchir Krebita
Region: Gebel, On hilltop, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: 0.49 m x 0.47 m x 0.52 m
Short Description: This stone depicted the outline of a donkey in relief.
References: Cagnat, 1928, 249-253; Toussaint 1908, 403; Trousset 1974, 83-84.
Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Hk001-A-05
Monument ID: Hk001-A
Site ID: Hk001
Location: Henchir Krebita
Region: Gebel, On hilltop, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: 0.62 m x 0.50 m x 0.50 m

Short Description:
This stone depicted the outline of an antelope or gazelle, according to Cagnat recognizable by its horns, its tail and its straight thighs. The return of the stone (left) depicted an incised lines, forming a diamond pattern.

References:
Cagnat, 1928, 249-253; Toussaint 1908, 403; Trousset 1974, 83-84.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Hk001-A-06
Monument ID: Hk001-A
Site ID: Hk001
Location: Henchir Krebita
Region: Gebel, On hilltop, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: 0.80 m x 0.47 m x 0.35 m

Short Description:
This stone depicted two peacocks facing each other, drinking out of a cup which is placed between them.

References:
Cagnat, 1928, 249-253; Toussaint 1908, 403; Trouset 1974, 83-84.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID:  Hk001-A-07
Monument ID: Hk001-A
Site ID:  Hk001
Location:  Henchir Krebita
Region:  Gebel, On hilltop, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:  Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  0.67 m x 0.47 m x 0.38 m

Short Description:  This relief depicted a fish with a large head. Cagnat describes it as either a mallet from the Mediterranean sea or a type of catfish which can be found in the neighbouring wadi Djir.

References:  Cagnat, 1928, 249-253; Toussaint 1908, 403; Trouset 1974, 83-84.

Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID: Hs001-A-01
Monument ID: Hs001-A
Site ID: Hs001
Location: Gebel Nefusa, Henscir Suffit, Yefren
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: ‘Tetrastyle’ temple mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Vegetal scroll underneath projecting cornice of first storey.
Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Kn005-A-01

Monument ID: Kn005-A

Site ID: Kn005

Location: Wadi Khanafes

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is much damaged and broken to on the top right. It is carved in high relief with multiple horizons, one figures and two camels (or one horse and one camel) are in the foreground, two figures and one camel in the background above seemingly of the same height. The figure on the top left does not have a camel and plough and instead is holing a bowl or basket in the left hand, while reaching into it with the right. All figures wear short tunics.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Kn005-A-02

Monument ID: Kn005-A

Site ID: Kn005

Location:
Wadi Khanafes

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This is a detailed relief of three figures. From left to right: Small standing figure wearing a tunic and skirt with folds. The hairstyle is the same as the woman's next to it. This figure is holding an object in its hands in front of the belly. There is another object between the small figure and the person to the right in the shape of a beaker. The next figure shows a woman's, head, torso and the upper part of the legs. The hair is parted in the middle and held in a loose bun in the neck. She is wearing a long tunic with folds. Her hands are in front of her body. To the far right is a man with beard and a wrapped short dress. His upper legs are showing. He possibly also holds his hands in front of his body. Grapes and vine are growing between the man and the women.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Kn005-A-03
Monument ID: Kn005-A
Site ID: Kn005
Location:
Wadi Khanafes
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size:

Short Description:
This corner stone shows a person in a wrapped dress with elaborate folds holding a long object in its right hand that is topped by a crescent. The head is missing. On the revers of the stone is a smaller figure, wearing a tunic and dress much like the smaller figure in Kn005-A-02, holding a bunch of grapes in its right hand. The head is missing.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Daniels Collection
Deco ID:  Kn005-A-04
Monument ID: Kn005-A
Site ID:  Kn005

Location:
Wadi Khanafes

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
This is a statue of a lion which belongs to a group of four lion statues. The head is missing. The mane is rendered in much detail falling in waves down the lions back and front. Also the wave of the fur is indicated. It is sitting down, with its tail curved round the left side. This is likely to be a corner roof ornament similar to Ghirza.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Kn005-A-05
Monument ID: Kn005-A
Site ID: Kn005
Location: Wadi Khanafes
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This is a statue of a lion belonging to a group of four lion statues. The head is missing. The statue is rather weathered, and it can no longer be seen if the lion had a mane, or if the statue was carved as a lioness. It is sitting down, with its tail curved round the left side. This is likely to be a corner roof ornament similar to Ghirza.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Kn005-A-06
Monument ID: Kn005-A
Site ID: Kn005
Location: Wadi Khanafes
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This is a statue of a lion or lioness which belongs to a group of four lion statues. The head and the upper part of the body is missing. It is sitting down, with its tail curved round the left side. This is likely to be a corner roof ornament similar to Ghirza.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Kn005-A-07
Monument ID: Kn005-A
Site ID: Kn005
Location: Wadi Khanafes
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Short Description:
This is a statue of a lion, belonging to a group of four similar lion statues. The head is missing. The mane is carved in long scales at the front and side, but has weathered away on the back. It is sitting down, with its tail curved round the left side. This is likely to be a corner roof ornament similar to Ghirza.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Kn005-B-01

Monument ID: Kn005-B

Site ID: Kn005

Location:
Wadi Khanafes

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This is a very busy relief incorporating three themes in one, hunting, harvesting and portraiture each divided by an elaborate zig-zag line. From left to right: underneath a palm branch is a person on a horse, right hand reaching back. He is following an animal which is being hunted. The head is missing but it could be a stag or gazelle. On top of the prey is a running dog, running towards it and a rosette above in the corner. In the next square to the right is a bearded man standing up. He is facing outwards, but his hands are indicating towards the palm tree to the right. He is wearing a short tunic with fold ending above his keens. There is a rosette in the left hand upper corner. To his right is a palm tree with dates with two smaller figures to the left and right of the tree trunk. The left one is facing outwards and the right figure is just about to climb the tree, probably to harvest dates. Between the large figure and the tree is a triangular object, similar to the one between the small figure and woman in Kn005-A-02.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
**Deco ID:** Kn005-C-01  
**Monument ID:** Kn005-C  
**Site ID:** Kn005  
**Location:** Wadi Khanafes  
**Region:** Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:** Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Obelisk mausoleum  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  

**Short Description:**  
A statue of a male with a curly beard and hair. His face was rather weathered when it was found, and the current facial features are mainly re-constructed by the team at the Bani Ulid museum. The man is wrapped in a mantle that hangs down his shoulders in many folds. The bottom seam runs diagonally across his lower body, ending in a tassel. A plain garment with no folds is depicted underneath the mantle. The right arm is held across the body and a scroll is held in this hand. The left arm is hanging down, and he is holding a bowl in the left hand.

**References:**  
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Kn005-C-02
Monument ID: Kn005-C
Site ID: Kn005
Location:
Wadi Khanafes
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This is a group of statues carved in the round. Two felines are guarding a bull's head that is placed in the centre between them. The lion to the left is female, her teats are visible. The face is turned towards the viewer. The mouth is wide open showing a row of teeth. With her left paw the lioness was holding onto the horns of the bull. To the right the male lion similarly is looking out towards the viewer with his mouth wide open. The mane is falling in thick waves down his shoulders. The bull's head in the centre is facing outwards.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 152-3; Sjöström, 220-21; UVLS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Lb001-A-01
Monument ID: Lb001-A
Site ID: Lb001
Location: Lepcis Magna, Wadi Lebdah
Region: Coastal Zone
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: This stone depicts half-length figures of, most likely, a man and a woman. The faces are cut off. They appear to be holding hands.


Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Le001-A-01
Monument ID: Le001-A
Site ID: Le001
Location: Wadi Lella
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
From left to right: panel with a straight narrow object, a root vegetable similar to a carrot or turnip pointing upwards, a cup filled with fruits, and another root vegetable pointing up again.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Gentilucci 1933, 172-187.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Le001-A-02
Monument ID: Le001-A
Site ID: Le001

Location:
Wadi Lella

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone depicts two big fish on top of each other, one facing to the east, the other facing to the west. Only the outline of the fish has been carved, no incisions indicate eyes or scales.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Gentilucci 1933, 172-187.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Le001-A-03
Monument ID: Le001-A
Site ID:  Le001
Location:  Wadi Lella
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  Four cucumber shaped vegetables held together at the top with a ring or string.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Gentilucci 1933, 172-187.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Le001-A-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Le001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Le001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Wadi Lella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description:</td>
<td>From left to right: a basket with 10 fruits, probably figs. The basked it incised with fine lines to indicate the basket weave. Next to the basket is a cup or goblet with a low stem and a thin rim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References:</td>
<td>Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Gentilucci 1933, 172-187.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source:</td>
<td>SLS Archive, Brogan Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID:   Le001-A-05
Monument ID: Le001-A
Site ID:   Le001
Location:  Wadi Lella
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  

Short Description:  The image is very hard to see from the photographs. It appears to be a flagon of some sort, with a large body and small neck and a small handle on the left. To the right is a long object which has a bend, narrow end.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Gentilucci 1933, 172-187.

Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID: Le001-A-06
Monument ID: Le001-A
Site ID: Le001
Location: Wadi Lella
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
On a cross legged table stands a serving dish with a large fish inside.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Gentilucci 1933, 172-187.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Le001-A-07
Monument ID: Le001-A
Site ID: Le001
Location: Wadi Lella
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Four roundels, three with eight incisions, one with two visible incisions and a small circular incision in the middle.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Gentilucci 1933, 172-187.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Lp001-A-01
Monument ID: Lp001-A
Site ID: Lp001
Location: Lepcis Magna
Region: Coastal Zone
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A relief seen and photographed by Romanelli depicting a frieze with four panels. The left panel shows a winged figure with long hair. The second panel depicts a rosette, and the third shows a human mask, with the hair hanging down either side of the face, mouth wide open. A second rosette is in the fourth panel.

References:
Delaporte 1836, 30-31; Romanelli, 1925, 163-164; Rohlf's 1871, 108; Rae 1877, image between page 34 and 35.

Image Source:
Short Description:
This rectangular stone is part of a Doric frieze that was later integrated into the Byzantine wall of Lepcis Magna. Between two rosettes a human mask is wearing a cap. The mouth is wide open and the tongue is sticking out. In a second panel a head surrounded by a lion mane or by the rays of the sun is depicted.

References:
Delaporte 1836, 30-31; Romanelli, 1925, 163-164; Rohlf 1871, 108; Rae 1877, image between page 34 and 35.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Lp001-A-03
Monument ID: Lp001-A
Site ID: Lp001
Location: Lepcis Magna
Region: Coastal Zone
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: This stone shows two rosettes on one face and another on the return of the stone.

References: Delaporte 1836, 30-31; Romanelli, 1925, 163-164; Rohlfs 1871, 108; Rae 1877, image between page 34 and 35.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Md001-A-01
Monument ID: Md001-A
Site ID:  Md001
Location:  Mselleten, Wadi Merdum
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Obelisk mausoleum
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
Above the capitals of the second story runs a frieze with scrolls that are decorated with flowers in the centre.

References:
Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Mattingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Md001-C-01
Monument ID: Md001-C
Site ID: Md001
Location: Mselleten, Wadi Merdum
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: 1.00 m x 0.50 m
Short Description: This stone depicts the portrait of two people. The heart shaped busts are rendered in high relief. Both heads are damaged. The left figure shows traces of a square neck garment. On the back of the head of the left figure there may still be the carving of curls recognizable and possibly some sort of head-dress.
References: Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Matttingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Md001-C-02
Monument ID: Md001-C
Site ID: Md001
Location:
Mselleten, Wadi Merdum
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: 0.50 m x 0.44 m x 0.52 m

Short Description:
Carving in high relief of head and torso of a man with the arms bent up at the elbow. The hands are raised, palms facing outwards at shoulder level. The man sports a long beard, reaching down to his chest. What remains of the waves of the beard indicates that the carving was rather detailed.

References:
Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Mattingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Md001-C-03
Monument ID: Md001-C
Site ID: Md001
Location: Mselleten, Wadi Merdum
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: 0.90 m x 0.42 m x 0.52 m
Short Description: Head and torso of figure in high relief with raised arms from the elbows, hands at shoulder level similar to Md001-C-02. This stone had been broken to the right and shows the hind legs of an animal.
References: Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Matttingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Md001-C-04
Monument ID: Md001-C
Site ID: Md001
Location: Mselleten, Wadi Merdum
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Part of a sculpture decorated with a wavy pattern. Perhaps a lion?
References: Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Matttingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Md001-C-05
Monument ID: Md001-C
Site ID: Md001
Location: Mselleten, Wadi Merdum
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: 0.80 m x 0.52 m
Short Description:
This stone depicts a small figure standing on a base wearing a long flowing garment. The left arm is raised from the elbow and may have been holding an object in front of the chest or holding the garment on shoulder?
References:
Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Matttingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Md001-C-06

Monument ID: Md001-C

Site ID: Md001

Location: Mselleten, Wadi Merdum

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Eight petalled rosette with vegetal scroll.

References:
Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 267; Buck and Matttingly 1995, 266-67; Brogan 1971, 121-128; Brogan 1977, 106; Mattingly 1996, 173; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Me001-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Me001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Me001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>0.50 m height</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
Rectangular stone displaying the portrait of two men, a woman. From left to right: Rosette at the left hand corner of the stone. Next to the rosette is a female head wearing a headdress (veil or turban) similar to Ag002-A or Gh128-A. A necklace is placed around her neck and a scarf is placed over her left shoulder. Tear-drop shaped earring are hanging from her ears. She has large almond shaped eyes and her mouth is slightly down-turned at the corners. Next comes another rosette in high relief. A figure with short curly hair is depicted next to the rosette. The eyes are large and almond shaped, the nose is weathered away, the mouth is small and no beard is visible. The neckline of the tunic is decorated with a simple pattern, and a mantle seems to be thrown over the shoulders. The man on the right hand side is the largest figure if the three. He has carefully curled hair, a beard and large almond shaped eyes. He is wearing a mantle draped across the shoulder, which is held together with a disk brooch and chain.

**References:**
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Me001-A-02
Monument ID: Me001-A
Site ID: Me001
Location: Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada
Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: 0.50 m height

Short Description:
This reliefs shows the portrait of a woman. The face is weathered away. Her hair appears to be parted in the middle and hanging down either side of her head. She appears to be wearing a garment that is crossed over in the front.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Me001-A-03  
**Monument ID:** Me001-A  
**Site ID:** Me001  
**Location:**  
Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada  
**Region:**  
Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:**  
Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum  
**Period:** Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)  
**Size:** 0.50 m height  
**Short Description:**  
This stone depicts a leopard on the left side of the stone, with raised tail and drill marks to indicate its spots, is attacking another feline in the centre. To the right a lion with a full mane jumping onto the back of the feline in the centre, mouth open and ready to bite.  
**References:**  
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Me001-A-04
Monument ID: Me001-A
Site ID: Me001
Location:
Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: 0.50 m height

Short Description:
This relief shows a bird of prey that is tearing out the entrails of a hare. The bird is standing next to the hare and has its head bend over its prey. The feathers are indicated by carved lines. A small rosette is depicted to the left of this scene.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Me001-A-05
Monument ID: Me001-A
Site ID: Me001
Location: Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: 0.50 m height

Short Description: This corner stone is the return of Me001-A-03. It depicts a human mask with an elaborately curled beard, curly hair and almond shaped eyes.

References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Me001-A-06
Monument ID: Me001-A
Site ID: Me001
Location: Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: 0.50 m height

Short Description:
Two unidentifiable animals are depicted above each other, perhaps two fish.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Me001-A-07
Monument ID: Me001-A
Site ID: Me001

Location:
Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: 0.50 m height

Short Description:
Two masks are carved next to each other amongst decorative scrolls with a cable pattern that is merging into a bead and-real-pattern. The mask to the left has slightly longer hair. The mask to the right has shorter, curly hair and a very thin and long face with a pointed beard. It is wearing a crown of palm leaves and flowers. Between the scrolls is a small bovine mask, a small rosette and a small stem with two scrolls to the left and right.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Me001-A-08
Monument ID: Me001-A
Site ID: Me001
Location: Wadi Meseuggi/Mrefada
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size:
Short Description: This stone is the return of Me001-A-01. It depicts the portrait of a woman is carved in high relief. The lower part of her face is rather damaged. She has large almond shaped eyes, the nose and mouth are damaged. She is wearing a turban-like headdress and a vail. Large tear-drop shaped earing are attached to her ears. Around the neck she is wearing a very elaborate scarf or necklace.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Mg001-A-01
Monument ID: Mg001-A
Site ID: Mg001
Location: Wadi Migdal
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Male and female are facing each other. The man has a square beard. Between them is an object, a vessel with a long neck.
References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 200.
Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID:  Mg001-A-02

Monument ID: Mg001-A

Site ID:  Mg001

Location:
Wadi Migdal

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:  Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
Male and female are facing each other. The man has a pointy beard and the woman’s hair is flowing down her neck. Between them is an object (pomegranate?), behind the man is a palm branch.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 200.

Image Source:  ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Mg001-A-03
Monument ID: Mg001-A
Site ID: Mg001
Location: Wadi Migdal
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: A large fish with small fins. Incised lines indicate the head, eye and fin.
References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 200.
Image Source: Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID:  Mg001-A-04
Monument ID: Mg001-A
Site ID:  Mg001
Location: Wadi Migdal
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: A large fish with small fins. Incised lines indicate the head, eye and fin.
References: Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 200.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Mg001-A-05

**Monument ID:** Mg001-A

**Site ID:** Mg001

**Location:**
Wadi Migdal

**Region:**
Pre-Desert

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

**Period:**
Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

**Size:** 0.68 m x 0.45 m x 0.42 m

**Short Description:**
This corner stone shows six women (two on one side, and four on the other) facing outwards. They are all striking the same pose, holding their hands above their heads. Their hair is at shoulder length (braided?) and parted in the middle. The corner of their mouth is turned downward. They are wearing long dresses with folds gathered at the waist, their feet are showing.

**References:**
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 200.

**Image Source:** Mattingly, Private Image, ULVS Archive
Deco ID:  Mg001-A-06
Monument ID: Mg001-A
Site ID:  Mg001
Location:  Wadi Migdal
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  A relief of a fish very similar to Mg001-A 04 and 05.
References:  Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 200.
Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID:  Mg001-A-07
Monument ID: Mg001-A
Site ID:  Mg001
Location:  Wadi Migdal
Region:  Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period:  Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size:  0.80 m x 0.42 m

Short Description:  This rectangular and very weathered relief depicting a feline chasing a stag.

References:  Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996, 200.

Image Source:  Al-Haddad, Private Image
Deco ID: Mg009-A-01
Monument ID: Mg009-A
Site ID: Mg009

Location:
Wadi Migdal

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Relief of an eagle eating a small animal.

References:

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Mg038-A-01
Monument ID: Mg038-A
Site ID: Mg038
Location: Wadi Migdal
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Single carved stone out of context, depicting a human figure in an arched panel.
References: Mattingly 1996, 205.
Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Mm003-A-01
Monument ID: Mm003-
Site ID: Mm003

Location:
Wadi Mimoun

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This relief depicts two figures, nearly obliterated, in short tunics holding a stick and possibly a plough to the left.

References:

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Mm003-A-02
Monument ID: Mm003-
Site ID: Mm003
Location: Wadi Mimoun
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Floral rosette with twelve petals.

References:

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Mm003-A-03
Monument ID: Mm003
Site ID: Mm003
Location:
Wadi Mimoun
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Floral rosette with twelve petals.
References:
Image Source:
Deco ID: Mm003-A-04
Monument ID: Mm003-
Site ID: Mm003
Location:
Wadi Mimoun
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Floral rosette with twelve petals
References:
Image Source: No Image, ULVS Archive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Mm003-A-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Mm003-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Mm003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Mimoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>Floral rosette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Mm003-A-06
Monument ID: Mm003-
Site ID: Mm003
Location:
Wadi Mimoun
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Brart of a relief, showing a quatruped.
References:
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Mm004-C-01

Monument ID: Mm004-

Site ID:  Mm004

Location:
Wadi Mimoun

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
Incised tree as centre piece or corner piece of roof decoration.

References:

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Mm079-A-01
Monument ID: Mm079-
Site ID:  Mm079
Location:  Wadi Mimoun
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:  This stone shows a portrait bust in high relief of a woman wearing loop earrings. Her eyes are almond shaped, and her nose is wide and flat. Her lips are think and she has a distinctive cleft on her chin. Her hair and dress are not rendered in detail, perhaps this detail was painted on.


Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Mn014-A-01
Monument ID: Mn014-A
Site ID: Mn014
Location: Wadi Mansur
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone shows a portrait bust in high relief of a woman wearing loop earrings. Her eyes are almond shaped, and her nose is wide and flat. Her lips are thick and she has a distinctive cleft on her chin. Her hair and dress are not rendered in detail, perhaps this detail was painted on.

References:
Mattingly 1996, 238; Sjöström 1993, 229; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
Deco ID: Mu001-A-01
Monument ID: Mu001-A
Site ID: Mu001
Location: Bir Dufan, Wadi Mimun
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: This relief shows a wreath with figures (victories) on either side holding palm branches. In the centre is a bust with curly hair and a very long neck.

References: Brogan 1977, 112.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:   Mz001-A-01
Monument ID: Mz001-A
Site ID:   Mz001
Location:
Wadi Mizda
Region:
Oasis, Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type:
Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
From Mizda but now in Tripoli museum. There is an upper band with a line of obolo, below which is a fillet resting on dentils. Under this comes the sculptured scene. From left to right: an object which looks like a tower rising in three steps (gasr? town? mausoleum?). The building has carved doors, not unlike a false door on a mausoleum. To the right of the building is a flock of animals (3), probably sheep or goat approaching the building. Right behind them are 4 people closely huddled together. The first seems to wear a veil or turban, the second seems to have a beard. All wear long cloaks that reach down to their knees. Further to the right is a horse and rider. The rider may wear a helmet or pointed cap. Behind him is a large animal, probably a camel, much damaged. It is possible that this stone belonged to one of the mausolea at Bir Nesma (Sf092-A) like to the other stones that were brought to Mizda.
References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source:
Deco ID: Mz001-A-02
Monument ID: Mz001-A
Site ID: Mz001
Location:
Wadi Mizda
Region:
Oasis, Pre-Desert, Wadi
Architectural Type:
Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: 0.66m x0.47 m x0.18 m

Short Description:
Much of this relief on this stone has been obliterated. At the bottom left are two rectangular objects, highly decorated at the top. According to Brogan they look like tables or stools, similar to the stool form Ghirza North C or the chieftdom stone at Ghadames. It is possible that this stone belonged to one of the mausolea at Bir Nesma (Sf092-A) like to the other stones that were brought to Mizda.

References:
Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source:
Location: Shapet el Gasr, Wadi N'f'd
Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: The four pilasters of the first story are decorated with leafy scrolls. At the bottom of each pilaster is a broad acanthus leaf, and above a pomegranate.


Image Source:
Deco ID:  Nf030-A-02
Monument ID: Nf030-A
Site ID:  Nf030

Location:
Shapet el Gasr, Wadi N’f’d

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)

Size:  

Short Description:
The metope and triglyphs frieze on top of the first storey depict rosettes all the way around.

References:
Abdussaid 1996, 73-78; Barker and Jones 1981, 25-26; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996a, 261; Sjöström 1993, 264-65.; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source:
Monument ID: Nf030-A
Site ID: Nf030
Location: Shapet el Gasr, Wadi N'f'd
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
The relief that is running around the top of the second storey and is delicately carved. It is decorated with inhabited scrolls (birds, herbivores, large cats) and flowers.

References:
Abdussaid 1996, 73-78; Barker and Jones 1981, 25-26; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996a, 261; Sjöström 1993, 264-65.; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Nf030-A-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Nf030-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Nf030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Shapet el Gasr, Wadi N'f'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
A portrait bust has been found during the reconstruction of the tomb in 1991. The right side of the face is damaged but the left side is still in good condition. The bust shows a man with a carefully curled beard, and full hair. He has large eyes, and a full mouth that is slightly curved downwards. His head is sitting on a long neck.

**References:**
Abdussaid 1996, 73-78; Barker and Jones 1981, 25-26; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996a, 261; Sjöström 1993, 264-65.; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:**
Location: Shapet el-Amud, Wadi N'f'd

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum

Period: Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: A Doric frieze with four panels. The two central panels showed two rosettes. The panel on the right hand side shows the head and the torso of a person wearing a conical cap. The left hand panel shows a similar bust with a round head. The faces are too weathered to distinguish any facial features.

References:
Abdussaid 1996, 73-78; Barker and Jones 1981, 25-26; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996a, 261; Sjöström 1993, 264-65.; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.

Image Source: ULVS Archive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Nf031-A-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Nf031-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Nf031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Shapet el-Amud, Wadi N'i'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description:</td>
<td>A frieze with decorative scrolls and rosettes run along the top of the second storey of this mausoleum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source:</td>
<td>SLS Archive, Brogan Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Nf038-A-01
Monument ID: Nf038-A
Site ID: Nf038
Location: Wadi N'f'd
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Peripteral temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: In 1963 Di Vita found a gargoyle amongst the rubble of the tomb. It was rendered to depict a human mask with the gaping mouth. A possibly similar gargoyle can also be found at tomb North A at Ghirza.
References: Bauer 1935, 72-73, Figures 24-25; Brogan and Smith 1984, 264-264; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Mattingly 1996a, 263; Barker and Jones 1981, 38; Barker and Jones 1982, 4, 6; Buck and Mattingly 1985, 264-73; Di Vita 1964, 89; ULVS Record Sheets, SLS Archive.
Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Oa001-B-001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Oa001-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Oa001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location:**
Henchir Oum el Abbes

**Region:**
Gebel, Western Gebel

**Architectural Type:**
Collapsed/Unclear

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
A fragmented stone of yellow limestone that depicts a medallion, and an animal with raised tail to the right of it, Cagnat suggests a lizard.

**References:**
Cagnat, R. 1928, 253-256; Toussaint, 1908, 403; Trouset, 1974, 84.

**Image Source:** No Image
**Deco ID:**  Oa001-B-002

**Monument ID:** Oa001-B

**Site ID:**  Oa001

**Location:**
Henchir Oum el Abbes

**Region:**
Gebel, Western Gebel

**Architectural Type:**
Collapsed/Unclear

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Collapsed, Unclear

**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
Yellowish limestone block with a small rosette in one corner.

**References:**
Cagnat, R. 1928, 253-256; Toussaint,1908, 403; Trouset, 1974, 84.

**Image Source:**  No Image
Deco ID:  Oa001-B-003
Monument ID: Oa001-B
Site ID:  Oa001
Location:  Henchir Oum el Abbes
Region:  Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:  Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  Small bunch of grapes on a rather damaged stone.
References:  Cagnat, R. 1928, 253-256; Toussaint,1908, 403; Trouset, 1974, 84.
Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID: Ro001-A-01
Monument ID: Ro001-A
Site ID: Ro001
Location: Rogeban
Region: Gefara

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Architectural fragment of metope and triglyphs showing a rosette with eight petals and a smaller rosette with five petals in the centre.


Image Source: Zenati 1995, Plate LXXa
Deco ID:  Ro001-A-02
Monument ID: Ro001-A
Site ID:  Ro001

Location:
Rogeban

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Possible tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period:  Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
A relief showing two individuals engaged in agricultural activities. The person to the right is in the process of bending down to the corn that is depicted on the bottom of the stone. The person to the right is also depicted in a crouched position, about to touch the stalks of wheat. Both individuals are dressed in short tunics with long sleeves. The person to the left seems to wear a short mantle which is depicted flattering in the wind.

References:

Image Source:  Zenati 1995, Plate LXXb
Deco ID: Ro001-A-03
Monument ID: Ro001-A
Site ID: Ro001
Location: Rogeban
Region: Gefara

Architectural Type: Possible tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: This rectangular stone depicts a human face or mask with large almond shaped eyes and small nose. The mouth is damaged. The hair is falling down left and right of the face, and tight locks or braids are indicated by circular incisions in an almost scale like pattern. A necklace appears to be around the neck.


Image Source: Zenati 1995, Plate LXXIa
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Ro001-A-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ro001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ro001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Rogeban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Possible obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan? (1st-2nd century AD), General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan? (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>According to Zenati a branch of a pomegranate was depicted on a relief from this mausoleum. Unfortunately, no picture of this stone was published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Zenati 1995,157.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID:  Se001-A-01
Monument ID: Se001-A
Site ID:  Se001
Location:
Cabao, Sia en Nachla
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible obelisk mausoleum, Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
Only a drawing by Coro survives of this scene. A feline with spots is depicted in profile running, chasing a gazelle.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image Source:  Coro 1928, 25
Deco ID:  Se001-B-01
Monument ID: Se001-B
Site ID:  Se001
Location:  Cabao, Sia en Nachla
Region:  Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:  Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:  Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:  Only a drawing by Coro survives of this scene of three panels with two rosettes and a hare. The hare is placed in the centre panel.

References:  Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image Source:  Coro 1928, 26
Deco ID: Se001-B-02

Monument ID: Se001-B

Site ID: Se001

Location:
Cabao, Sia en Nachla

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Only a drawing by Coro survives of this scene of a cockerel and a large cat fighting.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image Source: Coro 1928, 27
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID</th>
<th>Se001-B-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID</td>
<td>Se001-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Se001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Cabao, Sia en Nachla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type</td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type</td>
<td>Collapsed, Possible multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description</td>
<td>Only a drawing by Coro survives of this stone depicting the upper torso of a figure, wearing a tunic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source</td>
<td>Coro 1928, 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Se001-D-01
Monument ID: Se001-D
Site ID: Se001
Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Only a drawing by Coro survives of this scene of an ostrich walking towards the left.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image Source: Coro 1928, 30
Deco ID: Se001-D-02
Monument ID: Se001-D
Site ID: Se001
Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
Only a drawing by Coro survives of this scene of a person with a bow and arrow.
References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.
Image Source: Coro 1928, 30
Deco ID: Se001-D-03
Monument ID: Se001-D
Site ID: Se001
Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: Only a drawing by Coro survives of this stone of a lion in profile running from right to left.

References: Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image Source: Coro 1928, 30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Se001-D-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Se001-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Se001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Cabao, Sia en Nachla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
The torso of a human figure wearing a garment with many folds was depicted on this stone. Only a drawing by Coro survives of this scene.

**References:**
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

**Image Source:** Coro 1928, 30
Deco ID: Se001-H-01
Monument ID: Se001-H
Site ID: Se001
Location: Cabao, Sia en Nachla
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Lower part of a human figure wrapped in a garment with many folds. Only a drawing by Coro survives of this scene.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Coro 1928, 25-32.

Image Source: Coro 1928, 32
Deco ID: Sf092-A-01
Monument ID: Sf092-A
Site ID: Sf092
Location: Wadi Sofeggin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This relief is showing a female head to the left which appears to be placed on a shelf. The head has large eyes, the pupils drilled with deep holes, and a small nose and mouth. The long wavy hair is hanging down to the shoulders left and right of the head. Next to the head on the right is a smaller man in profile with longer wavy hair, beard, large eyes and nose and a small mouth. His left arm raised holding a long, club like object walking towards a figure to the right ready to strike. He is holding his victim's head with his left hand. The victim's figure is facing outwards. He or she has long wavy hair falling down to the shoulders, large eyes and a small nose and mouth. The left arm is held up at a right angle, palms facing outwards, as if to greet, pray or admit defeat. The right hand is pointing downwards at an angle possibly resting on the hip. The lower part of this relief is very weathered, but the victim seems to be wearing a tunic reaching to the knees.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Sf092-A-02
Monument ID: Sf092-A
Site ID: Sf092
Location: Wadi Sofeggin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This broken and weathered arch head depicts two heads, and possibly a third one to the left of the right spandrel. Here, the arch is broken off and only the top of the potential third head is visible. From left to right: Only the top of this carving survives, possibly representing a hairdo. To the right is a head positioned very close to the upper frame of the arch. The hair is curly, either standing up from the head or wearing an elaborate headdress. The face is weathered away. This person is either having a long beard along his chin, or is wearing an elaborate collar. The bust on the right had side has thick wavy hair reaching down to the chin on both sides. The face is weathered away, and the outline of the torso is just about visible.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Sf092-A-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Sf092-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Sf092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Sofeggin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Size:** -

**Short Description:**
This arch is broken off to the left and only the decoration of the right spandrel is visible. A very elaborate large and finely caved rosette decorates the whole span of the spandrel. The round and finely incised pistil in the middle is surrounded by four thick pedals and four finely caved acanthus-type leaves. This stone was photographed by Gentilucci (1933, 180-83) at Sf092-A, and later by Brogan at Mizda, after the stones have been transported there at some point between 1933 and 1950's.

**References:**
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Sf092-A-04
Monument ID:  Sf092-A
Site ID:  Sf092
Location:  Wadi Sofeggin
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This is the left side of a broken arch head, the right side is missing. A cockerel is depicted in the spandrel in profile. Its face is carved in detail complete with beak, wattles, comb, earlobe and the small eye. The feathers around the neck are roughly indicated, but the sickles are carved with more detail. The legs are thin and it has three claws on each foot. Image: Gentilucci 1933, 180-83.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Sf092-A-05
Monument ID: Sf092-A
Site ID:  Sf092
Location:  Wadi Sofeggin
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:
The left spandrel of this broken arch depicts a man facing to the right, his upper body and feet facing out. He has short hair, large eyes and nose, similar to Sf092-A-01. He is wearing a tunic with multiple folds which reaching to his knees. His left hand is hanging down the side, while his right hand is holding a spear. He may have a bow and arrows on his back sticking out behind his shoulders but this is hard to distinguish on the image. Image: Gentilucci 1933, 180-83.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Sf092-A-06
Monument ID: Sf092-A
Site ID: Sf092
Location: Wadi Sofeggin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This arch head is highly damaged and it is difficult to determine what is depicted on it. Only the right side of the arch survives. In its spandrel is, what could be a naked figure, the head is broken off. The person is facing outwards, the left arm is raised up at an angle, the right has broken off. Next to the right shoulder is an unidentifiable object, possibly a spear?

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Sf092-A-07
Monument ID: Sf092-A
Site ID: Sf092
Location: Wadi Sofeggin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
The image of this carving is too poor to be able to distinguish exactly what is carved in the spandrel of this broken arch head. It may be the peacock Gentilucci mentioned in his short account about he Nesma tomb (Gentilucci 1933, 180-83).

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Sf092-A-08

Monument ID: Sf092-A

Site ID: Sf092

Location: Wadi Sofeggin

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)

Size: 0.56 mx 0.43 m x0.10 m

Short Description:
Arch head depicting the relief of a peacock sitting on a column and drinking out of a shallow bowl. A roundel with triangular patterns is depicted in the spandrel of the arch, and vines are growing out of the centre of the arch head. This stone was found at Mizda and most likely belongs to one of the mausolea at Bir Nesma.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Sf092-A-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Sf092-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Sf092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Wadi Sofeggin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Arcaded temple mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description:</td>
<td>Piece of arch-head with rosettes. This stone was later brought to Mizda, where it was photographed by Brogan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References:</td>
<td>Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Sf092-A-10
Monument ID: Sf092-A
Site ID: Sf092
Location: Wadi Sofeggin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is part of an arch head showing a cantharus and scrolls with leaves. This stone was later brought to Mizda, where it was photographed by Brogan.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source:
**Deco ID:** Sf092-A-11  
**Monument ID:** Mz001-A  
**Site ID:** Mz001  
**Location:** Wadi Mizda  
**Region:** Oasis, Pre-Desert, Wadi  
**Architectural Type:** Reused stones  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Unclear  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:** This stone is part of an arch head decorated with vines and large bunches of grapes.  
**References:** Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.  
**Image Source:**
Deco ID: Sf092-A-12
Monument ID: Sf092-A
Site ID: Sf092
Location: Wadi Sofeggin
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Temple mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Arcaded temple mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This corner stone depicts the head of a bull on one side and a rosette on the other side. This stone was later brought to Mizda, where it was photographed by Brogan.

References:
Brogan and Smith 1984; Gentilucci 1933, 180-83; Mattingly 1996a, 287; UVLS Record Sheet, SLS Archive.

Image Source:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Si001-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Re001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Re001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Gebel Nefusa, Remada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gebel, Western Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Reused stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
A large statue, head missing. The figure wears a long folded garment which is warped around its body with a fold in front similar to a toga. Feet are showing but are much destroyed.

**References:**
Brogan 1965, 53; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Euzennat and Trousset 1978; Goodchild and Ward-Perkins 1949, 95; Lecoy de la Marche, H. 1894, 405-306; Trousset 1974, 114-118.

**Image Source:** No Image
Deco ID:  Si001-A-02
Monument ID:  Re001-A
Site ID:  Re001
Location:  Gebel Nefusa, Remada
Region:  Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:  Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:  Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -

Short Description:  This stone depicts a mask incorporated in a Doric freeze. The face is very round, and the hood with (feline) ears seems to be tied under the chin.

References:  Brogan 1965, 53; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Euzennat and Trouset 1978; Goodchild and Ward-Perkins 1949, 95; Lecoy de la Marche, H. 1894, 405-306; Trouset 1974, 114-118.

Image Source:  Trouset 1974, Figure 33b
Deco ID: Si001-A-03
Monument ID: Re001-A
Site ID: Re001
Location: Gebel Nefusa, Remada
Region: Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: This stone depicted a man standing between two lions.
References: Brogan 1965, 53; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Euzennat and Trousset 1978; Goodchild and Ward-Perkins 1949, 95; Lecoy de la Marche, H. 1894, 405-306; Trousset 1974, 114-118.
Image Source: No Image
Deco ID:  Si001-A-04
Monument ID:  Re001-A
Site ID:  Re001
Location:
Gebel Nefusa, Remada
Region:
Gebel, Western Gebel
Architectural Type:
Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:
Unclear
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:
This stone depicted a man leading a long-tailed horse.
References:
Brogan 1965, 53; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Euzennat and Trousset 1978; Goodchild and Ward-Perkins 1949, 95; Lecoy de la Marche, H. 1894, 405-306; Trousset 1974, 114-118.
Image Source:  No Image
Deco ID:  Ta001-A-01
Monument ID: Ta001-A
Site ID:  Ta001
Location:
Wadi Talah
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Possible obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone shows an arch formed of palm-branches joined at the top and, below the branches, a figure with, on the right, an object which may be a bird according to Brogan. On the lower left is an object, possibly a rosette.

References:
Barth in 1857, 52; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009, 205.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Ta001-A-02
Monument ID: Ta001-A
Site ID: Ta001
Location: Wadi Talah
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Possible obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: 0.60m x 0.40 m

Short Description:
Rectangular corner stone with three quarter column on the right, showing two small figures. The one on the left is striding towards the one standing to the right. The striding person may be carrying something on its shoulder.

References:
Barth in 1857, 52; Brogan, Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive; Kenrick 2009, 205.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tag001-A-01
Monument ID: Tag001-
Site ID: Tag001
Location: Wadi Taghigga
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Elaborately carved vine scroll with double stem, leaves of various sorts, including ivy leaves, and decorated with small bunches of grapes and animals nibbling them.

References:
Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tag001-A-02

Monument ID: Tag001-

Site ID: Tag001

Location:
Wadi Taghigga

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: 1.07 m x 0.43 m x 0.28 m

Short Description:
Two felines, perhaps lions, holding a bulls head, between them. The lion on the left still has its heavy lion's mane; the one to the right shows its teeth. The vessel between them was decorated with curves and zigzags. At the end of the stone is a piece of pilaster shown by Barth as an angle column.

References:
Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Tag001-A-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Tag001-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Tag001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Wadi Taghigga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description:</td>
<td>Square corner stone with a cockerel, and below it, to the left, a bunch of grapes. On the return is a rosette with punched circles as background decoration. The frame on both faces are alternative vine leafs and bunches of grapes. Stone now in Tripoli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References:</td>
<td>Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source:</td>
<td>SLS Archive, Brogan Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID:  Tag001-A-04
Monument ID: Tag001-
Site ID:  Tag001
Location:  Wadi Taghigga
Region:  Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  Stone from frieze, with the same upper register of leaves and bunches of grapes as Tag001-A-02. The relief is split up into two squares which the left contains a bull and above it an unidentifiable object. In the second square is a stag and perhaps a leaf to the right of it.
References:  Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.
Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Tag001-A-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Tag001-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Tag001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Taghigga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>Stone from a frieze: squares with rosettes, and drilled circles and holes in the background. Above is a bunch of vine tendrils bearing leaves and grapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>SLS Archive, Brogan Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Tag001-A-06
Monument ID: Tag001-
Site ID: Tag001

Location: Wadi Taghigga

Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Stone with hunting scene, much damaged. Two animals are depicted running. This could be the scene Barth has illustrated as being on the east side of the tomb, on the upper part of the first storey above the portrait of the woman.

References:
Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Tag001-A-07  
**Monument ID:** Tag001-  
**Site ID:** Tag001  
**Location:**  
Wadi Taghigga  
**Region:**  
Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:**  
Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:**  
This stone depicts a female figure. It lay upside-down when Brogan visited and was heavily damaged. Barth drawing indicates that this was a female with a bare upper torso and long hair with a parted in the middle. Image: Barth, 1857.  
**References:**  
Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.  
**Image Source:**
Deco ID: Tag001-A-08
Monument ID: Tag001-
Site ID: Tag001
Location: Wadi Taghigga
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Bust of a couple, male and female, in a niche which, appear to have a bare upper torso according to the drawing by Barth Image: Barth 1857.

References:
Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source:
**Deco ID:** Tag001-A-09  
**Monument ID:** Tag001-  
**Site ID:** Tag001  
**Location:**  
Wadi Taghigga  
**Region:**  
Pre-Desert  
**Architectural Type:**  
Tower mausoleum  
**Architectural Sub-Type:**  
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:**  
Only documented through Barth drawing, Brogan does not mention it in her notes. Two winged figures flying and dressed in wide floating wrapped dresses are holding an object in the middle, which Barth describes as a coronal. Image: Bath 1857.  
**References:**  
Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.  
**Image Source:**
Deco ID: Tag001-A-10
Monument ID: Tag001-
Site ID: Tag001
Location: Wadi Taghigga
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Barth mentions another bust of an older female on the north side of the tomb which he has not illustrated. He states: 'but on the north side an elderly woman occupies a niche with her bust, probably in her character as proprietress of the single sepulchral niche of the tomb below.

References:
Barth 1857, 53-55; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Tat001-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Tat001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Tat001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Tatahouine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Reused stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>A bearded man is depicted bare chested with his arms raised above the head. This carefully carved piece probably depicts an Atlantes, which would have appeared to hold up part of the monument with its arms and torso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trouset 1974, 106-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>SLS Archive, Brogan Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Tat001-A-02

Monument ID: Tat001-A

Site ID: Tat001

Location:
Tatahouine

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan?
(4th-5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
Broken part of a statue wearinng a a cloack wraped around the body.

References:
Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trouset 1974, 106-7.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tat001-A-03
Monument ID: Tat001-A
Site ID: Tat001
Location: Tatahouine
Region: Gefara
Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD), Late Romano-Libyan? (4th-5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Damaged statue of a figure wearing an undergarment and a mantle above.
References: Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la Marche 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Troussot 1974, 106-7.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:  Tat001-B-01

Monument ID: Tat001-B

Site ID:  Tat001

Location:
Tatahouine

Region:
Gefara

Architectural Type:
Reused stones

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period:  General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size:  -

Short Description:
Six roughly carved human figures are depicted in a row next to each other. The heads are oval in shape with no indication of hair, and the bodies are trapeze-shaped. The eyes and mouth were roughly indicated by carved lines, but the clothes seem unadorned.

References:
Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trouset 1974, 106-7.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID:   Tat001-B-02
Monument ID: Tat001-B
Site ID:   Tat001
Location:
Tatahouine
Region:
Gefara
Architectural Type:
Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period:   General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is part of a corner pilaster. On the pilaster a type of plant is depicted, perhaps a flower or a pine cone. Next to the plant stands a small naked (?) human figure. The head is round and the nose is quite pronounced. No hair is indicated. The arms are raised left and right to the head.

References:
Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trousset 1974, 106-7.

Image Source:  SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tat001-B-03
Monument ID: Tat001-B
Site ID: Tat001
Location:
Tatahouine
Region:
Gefara
Architectural Type:
Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description:
This stone depicts a cup or incense burner. Inside the cup is a plant with the leaves sticking out the top, perhaps an offering?
References:
Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la Marche 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trouxset 1974, 106-7.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID</th>
<th>Tat001-B-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID</td>
<td>Tat001-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>Tat001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Tatahouine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Gefara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type</td>
<td>Reused stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type</td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description:</td>
<td>This stone is part of a corner pilaster. It depicts two quadrupeds, one above the other. The stone is to weathered to determine the type of animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References:</td>
<td>Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trousset 1974, 106-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source:</td>
<td>SLS Archive, Brogan Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Tat001-B-05
Monument ID: Tat001-B
Site ID: Tat001
Location: Tatahouine
Region: Gefara

Architectural Type: Reused stones
Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: A feline is depicted on this stone, the body is carved in profile, while the large head is turned outwards towards the viewer. The right front and back paws are lifted up slightly, perhaps to give the impression of the lion walking. The mane is indicated by some scale-like incisions.

References:
Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trousset 1974, 106-7.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Tat001-B-06  
**Monument ID:** Tat001-B  
**Site ID:** Tat001  
**Location:** Tatahouine  
**Region:** Gefara  
**Architectural Type:** Reused stones  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Unclear  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:** This very weathered and damaged stone depicts a camel on the left side. A person is standing on the right hand side.  
**References:** Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la Marche 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trousset 1974, 106-7.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Tat001-B-07  
**Monument ID:** Tat001-B  
**Site ID:** Tat001  
**Location:** Tatahouine  
**Region:** Gefara  
**Architectural Type:** Reused stones  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Unclear  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:** Two birds with long tails, probably peacocks, are depicted in profile left and right of a cup, both peering into it. The wings and tail feathers are indicated by chiselled lines.  
**References:** Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trousset 1974, 106-7.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
**Deco ID:** Tat001-B-08  
**Monument ID:** Tat001-B  
**Site ID:** Tat001  
**Location:** Tatahouine  
**Region:** Gefara  
**Architectural Type:** Reused stones  
**Architectural Sub-Type:** Collapsed, Unclear  
**Period:** General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)  
**Size:** -  
**Short Description:** This stone depicts the relief carving of a tree, perhaps olives or figs.  
**References:** Berger 1895, 71-83; 1901, 296-298; Brogan 1965, 54-56; Gaukler 1901a, 290-295; Lecoy de la March 1894, 403-405; Toussaint 1906, 235-236; Trouset 1974, 106-7.  
**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tb045-A-01
Monument ID: Tb045-A
Site ID: Tb045
Location: Wadi Tabuniyah
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is broken off to the left. It shows thin stalk of wheat and perhaps other plants with thick leaves.

References:
Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Tb045-A-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Tb045-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Tb045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Wadi Tabuniyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Pre-Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Obelisk mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>Barth the relief of a nude couple placed on the second storey of the monument. There may have been a portrait of the deceased, but since nude busts are rare, the accuracy of this drawing is questionable. Image: Barth 1856.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Tb045-A-03
Monument ID: Tb045-A
Site ID: Tb045

Location:
Wadi Tabuniyah

Region:
Pre-Desert

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is broken into two pieces. On the left is a heap of barley (?) already cut. The figure standing in the middle is missing its head and neck and was perhaps carrying a basket. The person wears a short wrapped dress. The figure to the right is bend over presumably to cut the wheat, wearing a long shirt and skirt similar to the dress style in Ghadames. The broken piece of the stone is the right hand end and shows a barley plant with waving ears.

References:
Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tb045-A-04
Monument ID: Tb045-A
Site ID: Tb045
Location: Wadi Tabuniyah
Region: Pre-Desert

Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description: Bird of prey picking on a mammal which is lying on its back. The bird is perched on top of it, picking at its neck. This scene is carved on a stone between two pieces of rounded pilaster columns.

References: Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tb045-A-05
Monument ID: Tb045-A
Site ID: Tb045
Location: Wadi Tabuniyah
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description: Rather damaged relief of lion eating its prey. The lion is perched on top of a mammal which is lying on its side. The lion is attacking the mammal's throat. This scene is part of a corner stone with a three-quarter column.

References: Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tb045-A-06
Monument ID: Tb045-A
Site ID: Tb045
Location: Wadi Tabuniyah
Region: Pre-Desert
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Frieze decorated with three squares. Rosettes are placed in the square to the left and right, while a galloping horse is placed in the centre square.
References: Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.
Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tb045-A-07
Monument ID: Tb045-A
Site ID: Tb045
Location:
Wadi Tabuniyah
Region:
Pre-Desert
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Obelisk mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Two birds (peacocks or cockerels?) are standing on top of a column left and right of a niche. The birds are facing each other over the pitched roof that is carved around the niche. Drill holes serve as a decorative pattern.

References:
Barth 1857; Brogan Unpublished Notes, Mattingly 1996a, 302.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
Deco ID: Tm001-A-01
Monument ID: Tm001-A
Site ID: Tm001
Location:
Taglissi Msufiin
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear
Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear
Period: General Romano-Libyan? (1st to 5th century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
A camel of which no image was found by author, but apparently is now in Tripoli museum according to Brogan's notes.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
Deco ID: Tm001-A-02
Monument ID: Tm001-A
Site ID: Tm001

Location:
Taglissi Msufiin

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan? (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
A relief of a simply carved lion, now lost. Recorded by Goodchild and mentioned in Brogan's notes.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: No Image
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Tm001-A-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Tm001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Tm001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Taglissi Msufiin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan? (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Description:</td>
<td>Simply carved olive tree, now lost. Seen by Goodchild and mentioned in Brogan's notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References:</td>
<td>Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Source:</td>
<td>No Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID:  Tu001-A-01
Monument ID: Tu001-A
Site ID:  Tu001

Location:
Gebel Tarhunah, Tuil el Cherm

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type:
Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: 0.79 m x 0.53 m x 0.40 m

Short Description:
A damaged relief shows a camel with short legs, a round, almost bug-shaped body and a long thing neck. The camel is carrying two pointed amphora on its right side. The person behind the camel is much damaged, the head has been completely chipped off.

References:
Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: SLS Archive, Brogan Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Deco ID:</strong></th>
<th>Ua001-A-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ua001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID:</strong></td>
<td>Ua001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Bir el Uaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Sub-Type:</strong></td>
<td>Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period:</strong></td>
<td>Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Description:</strong></td>
<td>Female head with long hair on either side of head. She is wearing an elaborate headdress, with very detailed carving. The portrait is in a medallion to the left of the false door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>References:</strong></td>
<td>Abdussaid, 1996; 1998; Brogan 1978, 233; Ward-Perkins and Goodchild 1953, 50; Kenrick 2009,159.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image Source:</strong></td>
<td>Kenrick, Private Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deco ID: Ua001-A-02
Monument ID: Ua001-A
Site ID: Ua001
Location: Bir el Uaar
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
The panel shows a male head. His hair is styled in very tight locks and he may have a beard. The portrait is in a medallion to the right of the false door similar to Ua001-A-01. Two long thin objects, crossed over, are below the face.

References:

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Ua001-A-03
Monument ID: Ua001-A
Site ID: Ua001
Location: Bir el Uaar
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
Female? busts in in very high relief run all around the first storey of the monument, intermitted by shells. The busts have long hair tight in a loose knot at the back, and wear a wrapped dress, with the right side wrapped over the left. There seem to be eight in total, two on each side, which all look the same.

References:

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID: Ua001-A-04
Monument ID: Ua001-A
Site ID: Ua001
Location: Bir el Uaar
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -
Short Description: Panelled frieze running along the top of the first story. Each panel displayed an individual rosette.
Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
**Deco ID:** Ua001-A-05

**Monument ID:** Ua001-A

**Site ID:** Ua001

**Location:**
Bir el Uaar

**Region:**
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

**Architectural Type:**
Tower mausoleum

**Architectural Sub-Type:**
Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle

**Period:** Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)

**Size:**
-

**Short Description:**
Corner stone with curved stems on both sides and the ends meet at the corner.

**References:**

**Image Source:** SLS Archive, Daniels Collection
Deco ID: Ua001-A-06
Monument ID: Ua001-A
Site ID: Ua001
Location:
Bir el Uaar
Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:
Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period: Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size: -

Short Description:
This stone is situated in the cornice of the first floor, directly underneath the false door. The top of the cornice depicts a feline hunting its prey, the prey is much damaged and can no longer be identified. On the front part of the threshold is another feline eating its prey but again, the prey is much damaged. Two indistinguishable objects, perhaps vessels or bull heads, are situated left and right of this scene.

References:

Image Source: Kenrick, Private Image
Deco ID:  Ua001-A-07
Monument ID: Ua001-A
Site ID:  Ua001
Location:  Bir el Uaar
Region:  Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type:  Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type:  Tower mausoleum with integrated open peristyle
Period:  Early Romano-Libyan (1st-2nd century AD), Middle Romano-Libyan (3rd century AD)
Size:  -
Short Description:  Very well carved floral rosettes with five petals that are placed on a curved stone which was probably placed on top of the second or third storey. Thick garlands are surrounding the rosettes, fixed between each rosette and hanging down to the bottom half of the stone, going back up between the rosettes.
Image Source:  SLS Archive, Daniels Collection
Deco ID: Ye001-A-01
Monument ID: Ye001-A
Site ID: Ye001

Location:
Gebel Garian, Yefren

Region:
Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type:
Tower mausoleum

Architectural Sub-Type:
Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: 0.30 m x 40 m

Short Description:
The damaged relief of a bull in profile has been recorded by Ward-Perkins, now missing. The bull is carved in very high relief. The left front leg is sculptured in the round. Below the bull are bushels of vegetation.

References:
BSR Ward-Perkins archive number wplib-48.XXIII.15

Image Source: BSR Archive, Ward-Perkins
Collection wplib-48.XXIII.15
Deco ID: Ye001-A-02
Monument ID: Ye001-A
Site ID: Ye001
Location: Gebel Garian, Yefren
Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel
Architectural Type: Tower mausoleum
Architectural Sub-Type: Multi-storey aedicula mausoleum
Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This stone depicts a very weathered mask surrounded by tendrils. The upper part of the head has completely weathered away. The outlines of the eyes and nose are still visible. Two coils of curls are hanging down left and right from the face.

References:
BSR Ward-Perkins archive number wplib-48.XXIII.15

Image Source: BSR Archive, Ward-Perkins Collection
Deco ID: Za001-A-01

Monument ID: Za001-A

Site ID: Za001

Location: Cabao, Wadi Zarizera

Region: Eastern Gebel, Gebel

Architectural Type: Collapsed/Unclear

Architectural Sub-Type: Collapsed, Unclear

Period: General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)

Size: -

Short Description:
This relief set in a frame shows an eagle, depicted frontally, with its wings stretched out to the side. The head is turned towards the left. Coro’s drawing is the only evidence for this relief.

References:
Coro 1928, 33-35; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

Image Source: Coro 1928, 35
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deco ID:</th>
<th>Za001-A-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monument ID:</td>
<td>Za001-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site ID:</td>
<td>Za001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Cabao, Wadi Zarizera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region:</td>
<td>Eastern Gebel, Gebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed/Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Sub-Type:</td>
<td>Collapsed, Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td>General Romano-Libyan (1st to 5th century AD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short Description:**
A stone with a corner pilaster on the left hand side. The legs and the lower part of a garment with many folds have been recorded by Coro, but no other evidence exists for this stone.

**References:**
Coro 1928, 33-35; Brogan Unpublished Notes, SLS Archive.

**Image Source:** Coro 1928, 35