The New Jewish Inscriptions from Hierapolis and the Question of Jewish Diaspora Cemeteries

Tal Ilan

The study of Jews in the western Diaspora in antiquity is based to a great extent on epigraphic material. Most inscriptions that are considered Jewish, and so belong to *the corpus* of Jewish inscriptions, are epitaphs. Some indicators of Jewishness in these inscriptions are very clear, but often Jewish epitaphs are identified as such merely because the tombstones on which they are etched were found in the vicinity of clearly Jewish epitaphs, and on the assumption that one Jewish tombstone indicates the presence of a Jewish cemetery. On this basis a canon of Jewish Diaspora cemeteries has been acknowledged: Roman catacombs, Leontopolis in Egypt, Larissa in Greece, Gamarat near Carthage and a few others. In this paper I will address this simplistic reading of the archeological and epigraphical evidence and will try to arrive at a more exact definition of what is a Jewish cemetery and what is a Jewish inscription.

A recent publication of Elena Miranda adds sixteen new Jewish inscriptions from Hierapolis in Asia to our corpus.[1] The find is unique because each and every one of the inscriptions includes the term 'Ιουδαῖος. This term, as it appears in inscriptions, has been discussed in the past and I therefore begin with a brief account of the results of previous research.[2]

In her article discussing the term 'Jew' in epigraphic material Ross Kraemer argues for the problematic nature of this designation (particularly with respect to gender analysis).[3] She rightly asserts that the designation is very rare — 'Out of approximately 1700 extant Jewish inscriptions, these terms occur in only thirty-four epitaphs and ten miscellaneous inscriptions'.[4] Unfortunately, Kraemer fails to list these 44 occurrences, and we cannot be certain which inscriptions she had in mind. Although Margaret Williams was far more precise eight years later, she was unable to improve on this figure. In her article on the meaning of the term 'Ιουδαῖος, she included an appendix of exactly 44 inscriptions.[5] In the light of this state of affairs, sixteen new epitaphs, each inscribed on a sarcophagus from the same location and containing the designation

---

1 E. Miranda, 'La comunità giudaica di Hierapolis di Frigia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 31 (1999), 109-55. The inscriptions now also appear in *IJO* 2 (see n. 6).

2 The definitive discussion of this term, as it appears in literary as well as documentary sources, is S.J.D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness* (Berkeley, 1999), 69-106. In his discussion, Cohen emphasizes that the term *Ioudaios* did not mean 'Jew', as we now understand the term, before the demise of the Hasmonean Kingdom (in the 1st century BCE). Since all the evidence discussed here post-dates this demarcation date, I feel justified in using the term 'Jew' synonymously with 'Ιουδαῖος.

3 R.S. Kraemer, 'On the Meaning of the Term "Jew" in Greco-Roman Inscriptions', *Harvard Theological Review* 82 (1989), 35-53.

4 Ibid., 37.

5 M.H. Williams, 'The Meaning and Function of *Ioudaios* in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions', *ZPE* 116 (1997), 249-62. Appendix on 258-61.

'Ιουδαῖος, are most welcome. This is an addition of over 30 percent to the catalogue and can help us understand how the ethnicon was employed, at least in one part of the world. This study takes the Hierapolis epitaphs as a starting point, in an attempt to reassess Jewish burial practices both in Hierapolis and in the Diaspora more generally.

Since much of my discussion deals with the history of research, I take as my starting point Jean-Baptist Frey's famous two-volume *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum* (henceforth *CII*). The first part of this great work, documenting Jewish inscriptions from Europe, was published in 1936, and the second part, documenting Jewish inscriptions from Asia and Egypt, was published posthumously in 1952. I have chosen to refer repeatedly to *CII*, despite the fact that this corpus (especially in regard to the Jews of the Diaspora) has now been effectively replaced by six fine systematic volumes, which illuminate much of what Frey and those who came after him had omitted.[6] The reason for this decision is my belief (which I hope to demonstrate below) that the creation of a corpus has the function of laying the foundations for the interpretation of the material it includes or excludes. Much of this paper casts doubt on the almost axiomatic adoption of *CII* as the foundation for what defines Jewish inscriptions, and consequently Jewish cemeteries as well. Like myself, all the editors of the recent, renewed publications of the Jewish inscriptions began their discussion in dialogue with *CII*, and all include a 'concordance of this edition with *CII*.'[7] As we shall see, they have not always accepted *CII*'s judgment, but they often refrained from questioning some of *CII*'s foundational concepts, which, as I hope to demonstrate, should be rejected as methodologically unsound.

Hierapolis

From a perusal of Jewish inscriptions published in *CII* 2[8] it is very difficult to learn anything about Jewish burial practices at Hierapolis. Despite the fact that all the inscriptions collected in this volume were found on sarcophagi, there is nothing uniform about their contents. One epitaph (*CII* 775=*IJO* 2, 205) was considered Jewish because it mentions the Jewish archive (ἐν τῷ ἀρχίῳ τῶν 'Ιουδαίων). The second inscription (*CII* 776=*IJO* 2, 206) was included because it mentions the Jewish people (τῷ λαῷ τῶν

---

6 **1**. W. Horbury and D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge, 1992) (henceforth *JIGRE*); **2**. D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe, vol. 1: Italy (Excluding Rome), Spain and Gaul* (Cambridge, 1993) (henceforth *JIWE* 1); **3**. D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe vol. 2: The City of Rome* (Cambridge, 1993) (henceforth *JIWE* 2); **4**. D. Noy, A. Panayotov and H. Bloedhorn, *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis I: Eastern Europe* (Tübingen, 2004) (henceforth *IJO* 1); **5**. W. Ameling, *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis II: Kleinasien* (Tübingen, 2004), 399-440, nos. 187-209 (henceforth *IJO* 2); **6**. D. Noy and H. Bloedhorn, *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis III: Syria and Cyprus* (Tübingen, 2004) (henceforth *IJO* 3).

7 For this title see *JIWE* 1, 381-3; 2, 565-70. In *JIGRE* it is designated 'concordance of the entries with *CIJ* ...', 373-6 and in *IJO* 1 and 3 it is simply designated 'Concordance', *IJO* 1, 374-5; 3, 265-6. In *IJO* 2, the only volume not edited by David Noy, the direct dialogue with *CII* is somewhat muted, and instead of a concordance we have 'Konkordanzen', recording other sources for the inscriptions published in the volume. The concordance with *CII* is on 633-4.

8 Vol. 2, 35-8.

Ἰουδαίων); the third (*CII* 777=*IJO* 2, 196) because it mentions the feast of unleavened bread (*azymon*) and Pentecost and the fifth and sixth (*CII* 779 and 780) because *CII* considered the name Maria Jewish (wrongly in my opinion).[9] Only *CII* 778 (but see now *IJO* 2, 208) contains glimpses of the designation Ἰουδαῖος. However, because the inscription fragment terminates in the middle of this word, it may actually have been the personal name Judah (also of course an indication of Jewishness,[10] but not to be confused with the unique category of the designation 'Jew'). For this reason, Ross Kraemer, in her study mentioned above, did not single out Hierapolis for discussion of this designation.

Margaret Williams, in her article eight years later, was obviously aware of Pennacchietti's publication on Hierapolis from 1967,[11] which lists three sarcophagus epitaphs that mention the term Ἰουδαῖος specifically. This addition was important for her overall conclusion that 'in later inscriptions, ... all of which come from public cemeteries, located mostly in Asia Minor, *Ioudaios* either on its own or accompanied by symbols such as a menorah, is consistently used to emphasize membership of the Jewish community, and simultaneously suggests apartness from the rest of local society ...'.[12] The sixteen additional inscriptions from sarcophagi in Hierapolis now published by Miranda, all of which clearly bear the ethnic marker Ἰουδαῖος, conclusively support this summation.

Williams rightly noted that 'to date no separate Jewish burial grounds have been identified in Asia Minor in the Graeco-Roman Period.'[13] This means that Jews frequently buried their dead in the public cemeteries of the city. The map published by Miranda, documenting the distribution of Jewish sarcophagi in the northern cemetery of Hierapolis[14] confirms Williams' claim. Jewish sarcophagi are located throughout the cemetery grounds, not isolated or concentrated in a given location.This being the case, the use of the term Ἰουδαῖος in this context, and in the context of other cemeteries in this part of the world, was a way of marking a Jewish tomb within a non-Jewish cemetery. This would probably also be true for the isolated cases of Rufina of Smyrna (*CII* 741=*IJO* 2, 43); Julia and Marcus Aurelius Sambathius of Ephesos (*CII* 745=*IJO* 2, 32; *IJO* 2, 34); Straton of Magnesia (*CII* 753=*IJO* 2, 48); Alexander of Diocleia (*CII* 764=*IJO* 2, 182) Alexander, Damnianos, Eusambatios and others of Corycos (*CII* 786=*IJO* 2, 233; *CII* 789=*IJO* 2, 235; *CII* 790=*IJO* 2, 237; *CII* 791=*IJO* 2, 238; *CII* 794=*IJO* 2, 241); Marcus Aurelius Zoilus and Marcus Aurelius Diogenes of Diocaesarea (*CII* 795=*IJO* 2, 231), Aurelia Artemis of Termessos (*IJO* 2, 216); Despena of Nevesehir (*IJO* 2, 252) and several others (e.g. *IJO* 2, 255). As in Hierapolis, the inscriptions from Corycos were also all found on sarcophagi.[15] In other locations, the designation Ἰουδαῖος was a way of distinguishing other forms of Jewish family tombs from their gentile surroundings.

---

9 And see also on this name N. Cohen, 'The Greek and Latin Transcriptions *Mariam* and *Maria*: Their Sociological Significance', *Lěšonénu* 38 (1974), 170-80 (Hebrew).

10 See below.

11 F.A. Pennacchietti, 'Nuove iscrizioni di Hierapolis Frigia', *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 101 (1966-7), 2: 287-328.

12 Williams (n. 5), 255.

13 Ibid. 256.

14 Miranda (n.1).

15 On these and other inscriptions from Corycus, see M. Williams, 'The Jewish Community of Corycus: Two More Inscriptions', *ZPE* 92 (1992), 248-52.

I go on now to inquire whether the earlier identifications of other cemeteries in the Diaspora as Jewish are justified.

Larissa

In Larissa in Thessaly, situated on the Greek mainland, a particular group of inscriptions has been identified as emanating from a Jewish cemetery. This conclusion is not based on firm archaeological foundations. No Jewish burial ground has been identified at Larissa. All the inscriptions which supposedly originate in such a cemetery were either discovered in excavations in various locations in the modern city of Larissa, usually in secondary use, or found by local citizens in its environs and acquired by the authorities (see Table below).[16] *CII*, and all subsequent scholars, considered all these inscriptions Jewish because of the formula τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν (farewell to the people) repeatedly found in them. *CII* included twelve inscriptions from Larissa (*CII* 697-708), nine of them containing this formula. *IJO* 1 counted 14 Jewish inscriptions, 11 of which contain this formula, often more than once (*IJO* 1, Ach 1-14; see Table). Another inscription from nearby Pherae also records the formula (see Table, below).

The idea that τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν is a Jewish formula is old and Frey, when editing his corpus in the 1930's, already found it well established. Robert, in his influential review of Frey's publication, found nothing wrong with this assumption. '[L]e terme ὁ λαός s'appliquant à la communauté juive', he wrote.[17] In fact, based on the same premise, he suggested adding three other inscriptions from Larissa and its environs to the corpus. In a later publication Robert formulated his conviction that inscriptions with this word are Jewish with greater clarity. He wrote: 'Le mot λαός est une très grande rareté dans les inscriptions grecques en prose; mieux, il n'y a nulle part sa place dans un texte de ce caractère — sauf dans les inscriptions juives. Λαός, c'est le peuple de Iahvé, le peuple de Dieu, c'est Israël.'[18] On this basis he suggested that an additional inscription in which this term appears, this time from Asia Minor, was also Jewish. Yet one can easily sense in the formulation of this suggestion the fact, well-known to the writer, that the term λαός is rare only in inscriptions but not in literary texts, and that in the latter it certainly is not restricted to references to the Jewish people.

In 1946 M. Schwabe finally offered a justification for considering this formula Jewish. He translated the words τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν into the well-known Jewish formula שלום על ישראל. Yet he too was aware that the translation he suggested is exegetical and not literal, for he wrote 'it is not difficult to identify in this thinly disguised (מסווה) and strange formula its Hebrew origin'.[19]

Yet the original explanation for this 'common knowledge' that we find in the works of Frey and Robert, and on the basis of Schwabe's article, is different, and goes back to Emil Schürer's fourth edition of his influential *History of the Jews*, first published in 1909. On these Larissa inscriptions he wrote that these are 'Grabschriften mit der Formel

16 This information is derived from *IJO* 1, 108-26 in the introduction to each of the inscriptions.

17 L. Robert, 'Un corpus des inscriptions juives', *Hellenica* 3 (1946), 103.

18 Idem, 'Inscriptions d'Asie Mineure au Musée de Leyde', *Hellenica* 11-12 (1960), 260.

19 M. Schwabe, '"Peace Upon Israel" in Caesarea and the Thessalian Diaspora', *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society* 12 (1945-6), 66 (Hebrew). The translation is mine.

τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν, darunter eine mit jüdischen Namen, n. 988 Μαρία Ἰούδα, hiernach sind auch die andern sicher als jüdisch anzusehen.'[20] The new English Schürer did nothing to alter this simplistic assumption other than to translate the information on Larissa literally. This cemetery, it is claimed, includes '(E)pitaphs with the formula τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν, among them one with Jewish names Maria Juda. Accordingly, the others may also safely be regarded as Jewish.'[21] The reasoning here can be traced as follows: since one inscription bearing the formula τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν is Jewish, so are the others. Since 12 inscriptions with this formula were found in Larissa and its vicinity, a Jewish cemetery must have existed at this location.

This interpretation is based on the assumption that the Greek λαός means the Jewish people. Yet that assumption is certainly not based on overwhelming inscriptional evidence. Rather, it is based on one case, indisputably Jewish, which we have already observed in Hierapolis, where the Jewish people are referred to as τῷ λαῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, and on its near absence in non-Jewish inscriptions.

It is interesting to note, however, how this assumption has influenced the inclusion of at least one more inscription in *CII* and three others in *IJO*.

1. *CII.* 720 (=*IJO* 1, Ach 54) is an inscription found at Mantinea in Greece. Aside from this inscription, there is no evidence for a Jewish community in this city.[22] The inscription itself reads: 'Aurelius Elpidus, Father of the people (πατὴρ λαοῦ) for life, donated the vestibule to the synagogue'. It is quite understandable that an inscription containing the title 'father', a donation to a synagogue and a reference to the people (λαός) could be considered Jewish. However, it need not be. Specifically in Greece, synagogues were not uniquely Jewish institutions, as demonstrated by Tessa Rajak in Appendix 2 to her article on Jewish archisynagogoi.[23] The word synagogue was a general term for a religious association, occasionally used in clear-cut pagan contexts. Although used by Jews, 'father' too is not a uniquely Jewish title.[24] To these two doubts one may add λαός as a problematic term.

2. *IJO* 2, 26 originates in Nysa in Asia Minor, where it was found in secondary use. It had been considered Jewish by Oehler,[25] but apparently not by *CII.* Schwabe, and *IJO* 2 after him, reclaimed it as Jewish based on the assumption that the term *laos* in all inscriptions refers to the Jewish people.[26] The inscription describes the dedication of a structure by Menandros son of Apollonides 'for the people (τῷ λαῷ) and the congregation (τῇ συνόδῳ) of Dositheus son of Theogenis'. One could argue that this inscription is Jewish on three grounds. 1. The names Dositheus and Theogenis are

---

20 E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*[4] (Leipzig, 1909), 56.

21 E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)* (revised and edited by G. Vermas, F. Millar, M. Goodman) (Edinburgh, 1986) vol. 3, 66.

22 Ibid.

23 T. Rajak, '*Archisynagogoi*: Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish Synagogue', in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Leiden, 2001), 428-9.

24 *JIWE* 1, 77-8.

25 J. Oehler, 'Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Judentums', *MGWJ* 53 (1909), 443.

26 Schwabe, '"Peace Upon Israel"', 67; and see also some 15 years later in: Robert, *Hellenica* 11-12 (1960), 261-2.

theophoric and neutral and were thus favored by Jews in the Diaspora.[27] 2. The unusual designation σύνοδος, although certainly not the Jewish 'synagogue', is reminiscent of the Jewish institution of the Land of Israel, the Sanhedrin. 3. The designation λαός is uniquely Jewish. Ameling, in *IJO* 2, concluded from this inscription that a Jewish synagogue and community existed in Nysa, although he conceded that '[w]eitere jüdische Inschriften aus Nysa gibt es nicht.'[28] However none of these arguments for Jewishness comes near being conclusive. The theophoric-onomastic argument does not work for the pagan name of the dedicator's father, Apollonides. The name Apollonides does not categorically rule out the Jewishness of the inscription, but it shows how shaky the opposite onomastic argument is. The term σύνοδος, while perhaps reminiscent of the Sanhedrin, is nowhere mentioned in other Jewish inscriptions. Here again, the supposedly Jewish nature of the term *laos* is hardly a strong enough reason to characterize this inscription as Jewish.

3. *IJO* 2, 44 is a tomb inscription acquired at Smyrna. It mentions Lucius Lollius Justus, a grammateus of the *laos* of Smyrna. Robert claimed it as Jewish,[29] and *IJO* 2 formulated the two grounds which justify this decision: 'sowohl der Name Justus wie die Erwähnung des ἐν Σμύρνῃ λαός sind sichere Anzeichen dafür daß es sich um eine jüdische Inschrift handelt'.[30] However, despite its relative popularity among Jews, the name Justus is certainly not Jewish as such, and the term λαός is simply not a strong enough Jewish marker.

4. *IJO* 2, 181 is a tomb inscription retrieved from the village of Karaagac, identified as related to Hellenistic Appia. This settlement could certainly boast a Jewish community in antiquity, as Jewish symbols were found on rocks and stones in its vicinity.[31] However, the inscription under discussion was in no way associated with them, and since it is fragmentary, only the mention of the λαός of ΕΥΝΚΑΙΜ suggested to the editor of *IJO* 2 that it was Jewish. The inclusion of this inscription in *IJO* 2 clearly shows how deeply rooted the concept that every inscriptional *laos* refers to the Jewish people had become.

So let us return to Larissa. The inscription of Maria daughter of Judah, which induced Schürer, and all scholars after him, to identify the formula τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν as referring to the Jewish people, is certainly Jewish. This, however cannot be concluded from the formula τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν but from the name of her father, Judah, prominently Jewish before the advent of Christianity,[32] and even more so afterwards, when in Christian circles it became identified with the traitor Judas.

At this point it is useful to remind ourselves how one usually identifies Jewish inscriptions. There are four standard criteria for such identifications, three of them almost absolute and one relative.

---

27 E.g. V.A. Tcherikover, A. Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* 1 (Cambridge MA, 1957) xix (henceforth *CPJ*).

28 *IJO* 2, 139.

29 Robert (n.26), 260.

30 *IJO* 2, 193.

31 Ibid., 386.

32 See my argument in T. Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity* Part I: *Palestine 330 BCE-200 CE* (Tübingen, 2002), 50 about its use as a name for Jewish converts in antiquity.

1. Jewish symbols. Much has been said about these, but in my experience, only the seven-branched Menorah is unquestionably Jewish.[33]
2. Inscriptions in Hebrew characters.
3. Direct reference to 'Ιουδαῖοι or 'Εβραῖοι. To this I add the name Judah in all its variants, as also being a clear indicator of Jewish ethnicity.
4. Jewish names. This is a relative indicator, as names which may appear at first sight to be Jewish turn out not to be,[34] as Christians adopted Jewish names early on, and as it is also likely that non-Jewish neighbors sometimes adopted Jewish names.[35]

In the following table, the Larissa inscriptions are examined according to these criteria:

Table 1: The Jewishness of the τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν Inscriptions from Larissa

Reference	Formula	Provenance	Jewishness?
1. *IJO* 1, Ach 1 (*CII* 699-701)	[τῷ] λ[αῷ] χαίρειν τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν	Modern Jewish cemetery	Μαρία 'Ιούδα
2. *IJO* 1, Ach 2	τῷ [λ]αῷ χαίρειν	Larissa (?)	-
3. *IJO* 1, Ach 3 (*CII* 703-5)	τῷ λαῷ χα[ί]ρειν τῷ λαῷ χαίρε[ιν]	Turkish cemetery	-
4. *IJO* 1, Ach 4	λαῷ χαίριν τῷ λαῷ χαίριν	Larissa (?)	-
5. *IJO* 1, Ach 5	-	2nd-3rd century structure	Menorah προστάτου
6. *IJO* 1, Ach 6 (*CIJ* 697)	-	Victoria Market	τῆς 'Ιουδέας
7. *IJO* 1, Ach 7	-	Larissa (?)	γυνὴ δὲ 'Ιούδα
8. *IJO* 1, Ach 8	λαῷ χαίρ[ε]ιν	Hospital	-
9. *IJO* 1, Ach 9	[χ]αίρειν	Kalyvia (60 km from Larissa)	[Λ]άζαρος Jewish name?
10. *IJO* 1, Ach 10 (*CII* 706)	τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν	Larissa (?)	-
11. *IJO* 1, Ach 11	λαῷ χαίριν	Larissa (?)	-
12. *IJO* 1, Ach 12 (*CII* 707)	λα[ῷ χαίρε]ιν	Larissa (?)	-
13. *IJO* 1, Ach 13 (*CII* 708)	τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν	Larissa (?)	-

33 And even in this case see R.S. Kraemer, 'Jewish Tuna and Christian Fish: Identifying Religious Affiliation in Epigraphic Sources', *HTR* 84 (1991), 151.

34 See e.g. the famous case of Shabtai/Sambathius in N. Cohen, 'The Name "Shabtai" in the Hellenistic-Roman Period', in A. Demski (ed.) *These are the Names: Studies in Jewish Onomastics* (Ramat Gan, 1999), 11*-28* (Hebrew).

35 T. Ilan, 'Yohana bar Makoutha and Other Pagans Bearing Jewish Names', in A. Demsky (ed.) *These are the Names: Studies in Jewish Onomastics* 3 (Ramat Gan, 2002), 109-20.

Reference	Formula	Find place	Jewishness?
14. *IJO* 1, Ach 14	τῷ λαῷ χέρειν	Larissa	-
15. *IJO* 1, Ach 25	λαῶι χαίρειν	Pherae (south east of Larissa)	-

Maria, it should be noted, was not the only Jew who was buried in Larissa. As the Table presented above shows, three other burial inscriptions originating from Larissa include one of these four features, marking them as clearly Jewish. No. 5 boasts a menorah; no. 6 mentions Jewishness specifically and no. 7 also mentions another woman whose husband's name is Judah. Interestingly, none of these clearly Jewish burial inscriptions includes the τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν formula.

Inscription no. 9 is a border case. It includes what may be considered a Jewish name, i.e. [L]azarus. However, the name as such is an emendation of the editor. It could also be read, for example, as [M]azarus, as suggested in the original publication of the inscription.[36] Furthermore, there is little doubt that, despite its Jewish origins, the name Lazarus became popular among Christians early on. In addition, the relevant formula in this inscription includes only the last word, [χ]αίρειν, without the telltale λαός, and it too is not preserved completely. Finally, as the editors note, the inscription was not found in Larissa, but rather 'in the village of Kalyvia, near the modern town of Ellassona, about 60 km from Larissa at the foot of Mt Olympus.' It is thus quite likely that it does not belong to the present corpus at all.

I would therefore claim that since the formula τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν, mentioned on Maria's tombstone, is found often in Larissa, once in Kalyvia, and nowhere else, there is no reason to consider any of the other inscriptions using it Jewish. It was, more likely, a common burial formula unique to Larissa and its environs. Rather than identify a Jewish community in Larissa with a unique burial formula, we should highlight the kind of evidence we have derived from Hierapolis. Jews buried among non-Jews (in Hierapolis and probably also in Larissa) indicate their Jewishness clearly by stressing their ethnicity (as in inscription Ach6) or using Jewish symbols (as in inscription Ach5). The Jewishness of Ach1 and Ach7 is revealed incidentally, by the indisputably Jewish name of the deceased's father or husband, but this was not intentional.

We have now to discuss other sites identified as Jewish cemeteries on slightly different grounds. These include Roman and Italian catacombs, Leontopolis or Tel el-Yehudieh in Egypt, as well as two other burial grounds in Egypt (Alexandria and Sedment el-Gebel), several sites in Cyrenaica, Gamarat near Carthage, and recently Zoar in Arabia. These cemeteries have been treated as follows: each site has been identified as a Jewish cemetery, and consequently all inscriptions found at the site or considered related to it in some way have been considered Jewish. I shall discuss this conclusion for each case separately.

36 *IJO* 1, 122.

Italian Catacombs

Four large Jewish catacombs have been identified in Italy — three in Rome and one in Venosa in southern Italy.[37] A catacomb is a constructed tomb, in which a communal effort has been invested. It makes sense that the people who buried their dead in it would have worked together toward its construction. This indeed, is a typical action for a community like the Jewish community. It is very different from the Jewish burials in Hierapolis (and other sites in Asia Minor) where inhumation in sarcophagi was the norm. The execution of even a very elaborate sarcophagus is simple and cheap compared to the construction of a catacomb. Jews in Asia Minor, therefore, placed their sarcophagi in the common burial ground of the cities. In Rome, however, things were obviously different. Here, after the discovery of numerous Jewish symbols, primarily menorahs, in several Roman catacombs, and with the realization that many of the deceased mentioned in the inscriptions were associated with synagogue institutions, scholars assumed (correctly in my opinion) that all those buried therein were Jews. Thus David Noy commented on a burial in a Rome catacomb: 'No one would presume that an epitaph reading "Aurelius Bassus had this made for Aemilia Theodora" was Jewish if it had not been found in a Jewish catacomb'.[38] Nevertheless, in this particular case, the archaeological context would make it hard to argue against her Jewish ethnicity.

Even so, this premise is not without problems. In his Appendix 3 in *CII* 1, 'inscriptions probablement païennes', Frey included 29 inscriptions found inside what he identified as Jewish catacombs but that he concluded were not Jewish.[39] I will not discuss these inscriptions individually; suffice it to say that the main impetus for his decision was what he perceived as the pagan character of the inscriptions. He argued that their presence in the catacomb could be explained as the result of a secondary use of the stones on which they were inscribed, particularly in the function of blocking burial niches. However, in re-editing these inscriptions, David Noy re-included twenty of them in *JIWE* 2, some as undoubtedly Jewish.[40] This is an example of the kind of uncertainties surrounding the inscriptions even now, and of how the scholarly pendulum swings back and forth.

Leontopolis

Can one use similar arguments for the Jewish cemetery in Leontopolis? David Noy thought so and he wrote, 'A proportion of the stones contains only Greek names with no particular Jewish connections, e.g. Hilarion daughter of Philip (no. 70). If this came from Alexandria there would be no suggestion that it was Jewish'.[41] Once again, the assumption is that all the inscriptions from a Jewish burial site are Jewish. Yet what makes the Tel el-Yehoudieh cemetery Jewish? The catacombs of Rome include

---

37 *JIWE* 1, xv-xxi; *JIWE* 2, 1-9; 173-80; 341-6.

38 D. Noy, 'Where were the Jews of the Diaspora Buried?' in Martin Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Greco-Roman World* (Oxford, 1998), 81.

39 *CII* 1, 535-42, nos. 4*-15*; 546-56, nos. 24*-42*.

40 For a list see *JIWE* 2, 570.

41 D. Noy, 'The Jewish Communities of Leontopolis and Venosa', in J.W. Van Henten and P.W. Van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (Leiden, 1994), 167.

numerous Jewish symbols and references to the Jewish institution of the synagogue. The catacomb at Venosa is similar, and it is also replete with Hebrew inscriptions.[42] None of these markers, however, is found in Leontopolis. The assumption that the cemetery is Jewish is based on three pieces of data: 1. The Arabic name of the site, Tel el-Yehoudieh (Mound of the Jews); 2. The evidence from Josephus on the foundation of a Jewish Temple and military colony on the site (*AJ* 12.388; 13.62-79); and 3. The abundance of Hebrew names in the inscriptions. One inscription further describes the site as Ὀνίου γᾶ, 'the land of Onias', presumably after the Jewish priest who founded this Jewish Temple and headed the Jewish military colony at the site.

However, is this evidence sufficient to conclude, as in Rome, that all those buried at the site are Jews? There is no doubt that there was a Jewish community at Leontopolis, and that some of those buried at the site, certainly some of those with Hebrew names, were Jews. These, however, according to my calculation, constitute only a small fraction of the deceased whom Horbury and Noy recorded in their new publication of Jewish inscriptions from Egypt (16 out of 75).[43] When I say 'my calculation' I propose a minimalist approach. It is true that variations of the name Shabtai appear in 12 of the inscriptions from Leontopolis,[44] but as has been shown by many in the past, it is doubtful whether one is justified in considering Shabtai in an Egyptian context a Jewish name. The name was certainly used by non-Jews even before the advent of Christianity.[45] This is also true for other names such as Marion and Salamis, which were probably Semitic but by no means Jewish. It is also true that some (but not too many) of the tombs include theophoric Greek names (such as Dositheus), but I think Tcherikover's assertion that this indicates Jewishness[46] is based on a circular argument, and can no longer be taken seriously within the general onomastic reality in Egypt.

It is important in this context to note the physical character of this cemetery. Noy described it as 'an area of tombs cut in the rock on the fringe of the desert. The standard form of tomb was a ... flight of three or four steps down to a doorway sealed by a stone slab, leading to an excavated chamber with a number of horizontal niches for bodies cut into the walls'.[47] This is a standard description of a family rock-cut tomb commonly found throughout the Mediterranean region. This is not a catacomb, like those of Rome and Venosa, where communal work is required for construction. Nor is it an individual burial, like a sarcophagus in Hierapolis. Obviously, if one of these tombs was built by a Jewish family we could imagine that all the deceased within were Jewish. However, there is no need to assume on the basis of this fact that the entire burial ground is Jewish and that Jews constructed all the family tombs in the cemetery.

More could have been deduced about the Jewishness of the deceased, if we had at our disposal evidence about the distribution of the inscriptions inside the rock-cut tombs where they were initially found. We would have been able to relate persons with Jewish

---

42 *JIWE* 1, nos. 42-116.

43 *JIGRE*. The Tel el-Yehoudieh inscriptions are listed on 51-182 as nos. 29-105.

44 Nos. 40, 58, 59, 60, 63, 65, 76, 86, 93, 95, 96, 98.

45 V.A. Tcherikover, A. Fuks, M. Stern, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* 3 (Cambridge MA, 1964) 43-56 and also Cohen, 'The Name "Shabtai"'.

46 *CPJ*, 1, xi.

47 Noy (n. 41), 164.

names to those with non-Jewish names buried in the same tomb and on this basis assume the latter's Jewishness. But as David Noy wrote 'Naville (who excavated the site in the 19th century) removed the stelae he found, but he did not publish an adequate plan of the necropolis or any systematic record of where in it they came from'.[48]

Since many of the inscribed stones from this cemetery ended up in private collections and in the antiquities market, inscriptions belonging to this site are identified as such because, as Noy writes, 'the ... form of stele at Leontopolis was a rectangular piece of limestone into which was carved a field for the inscription. A raised frame was left around the field, with a carved decoration in the shape of a pediment.... There was ... no other ornamentation. This type of tombstone is unique to Leontopolis but is unusual elsewhere in Egypt'.[49] It is no surprise that up to now miscellaneous inscriptions, showing up in private collections, are still identified by these criteria as originating in Leontopolis.[50] But does this make them Jewish? I think not. When describing distinctly Jewish tombstones from nearby Heliopolis, Noy wrote: 'only one of the group of inscriptions found there is in the form with the pediment favored at Tel el-Yehoudiah....'.[51] So just as the formula τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν found in Larissa, I suggest, should be considered uniquely Larissan but not necessarily Jewish, so too the pediment-form tombstone should be considered uniquely Leontopolitan, rather than uniquely Jewish.

Gideon Bohak noted a further difficulty with the Leontopolis epitaphs. He wrote: '(T)he Tel el-Yehoudieh inscriptions ... have allowed many non-Jews into our corpus, for these inscriptions, almost all of them epitaphs, count for two thirds of the Egyptian Jewish inscriptions ... but very few of them, 21 at the most, actually were found at Tel el-Yehoudieh.... 38 of the Tel el-Yehoudieh inscriptions were found, or bought, in villages around the place, 7 others in Cairo and another 11 are of unknown provenance'.[52] This comment further complicates the picture presented here. In an Appendix to this article I list all the doubtful Jewish inscriptions from Leontopolis.

Sedment el-Gebel

The same is true for a cemetery published in 1998 by Abd el-Fath and Wagner from Sedment el-Gebel in the Egyptian desert.[53] This cemetery includes two inscriptions bearing derivations from the name Shabtai, and based on these, the editors concluded that the entire cemetery was Jewish. However, as already noted, the problems with the Jewishness of the name Shabtai are numerous,[54] and there is no need to elaborate further on this question.

---

48 Ibid.

49 Ibid., 165.

50 See e.g. P.J. Sijpesteijn, 'Inscriptions from Egypt', *Chronique d'Égypte* 65 (1990), 122.

51 Horbury and Noy, *JIGRE*, 183.

52 G. Bohak, 'Good Jews, Bad Jews and Non-Jews in Greek Papyri and Inscriptions', *Akten des 21. internationalen Papyrologenkongresses Berlin, 13-19.8.1995* (Archiv für Papyrusforschung Beiheft 3, Sttutgart, 1997), 106.

53 A.G. Abd el-Ftah and G. Wagner, 'Épitaphes grecques d'époque ptolémaïque de Sedment el-Gebel (IIe/Ier siècles): une communauté juive dans la Chôra égyptienne', *Cahier de Recherches de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Égyptologie de Lille* 19 (1998), 85-96.

54 See above, n. 45.

Alexandria

The main burial site of Jews in Alexandria was identified at El-Ibrahimiya. This burial ground, like the one at Tel el-Yehoudieh, is composed of family burial caves. Horbury and Noy, following their predecessors, did not claim that this was a Jewish burial ground. They claimed that 'Jews were among the non-Greeks, including Syrians, buried in the eastern necropolis, but without a degree of segregation which would allow the description "Jewish cemetery"'.[55] In his review of their publication, however, Bohak maintained that even with these qualifications, the editors of *JIGRE* had over-interpreted the evidence in favor of Jews at the site. He claimed that both Simotera daughter of Heliodorus of Sidon[56] and a certain Psyllas[57] were wrongly identified as Jews because of their burial close to Jews. He then commented that 'what is most amusing about such identifications is that the assumption behind them — that Jews should be buried in their own cemetery, or at least in their own corner of the cemetery — is disproved by the El-Ibrahimiya finds themselves. And yet, while the total lack of regard for ethnicity in the layout of the cemetery is readily apparent, the assumption prevails that persons buried not far from Jews probably were Jews, even when one such person insists on being Sidonian, and when her father's name, Heliodorus, is known to have been popular among Phoenicians ... precisely because it was considered the Greek approximation of such theophoric names as עבד שמש (Servant of the Sun)'.[58] Nothing need be added to these comments.

Cyrenaica etc.

The most problematic publication of Jewish burials to date is that of Gerd Lüderitz and Joyce Reynolds on the Jewish presence in Cyrenaica.[59] On this publication the new Schürer commented mildly: 'The identification of epitaphs as Jewish (in it) is often very uncertain'.[60] This is a gross understatement. A cursory reading of this publication will show that the Jewishness of at least 50% of the epitaphs published therein is baseless. I give here a random sampling, and list all the doubtful cases in the Appendix.

Nos. 31-33 in the corpus are inscriptions found on the facade of chamber tombs in the western necropolis of Ptolemais.[61] No. 31 includes four inscriptions and was identified as Jewish only because of the name Sara mentioned in one of them. However, while the name Sarah was certainly Jewish, an analysis of the use of this name in Cyrenaica reveals that it was probably not the Jewish name, but an abbreviation of the Egyptian

55 *JIGRE*, xv.
56 *JIGRE*, 11-2, no. 7.
57 *JIGRE*, 12-3, no. 8.
58 Bohak (n. 52), 106.
59 G. Lüderitz, *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika* (mit einem Anhang von Joyce M. Reynolds) (Wiesbaden, 1983) (henceforth *CJZC*).
60 Schürer, *History of the Jewish People* 3, 61, n. 67.
61 *CJZC*, 48-54.

pagan name Sarapious.[62] If this name was not Jewish, obviously none of the others was either, so that the identification of the entire tomb as Jewish is completely unfounded. No. 33 includes four inscriptions, with no apparent Hebrew name. It does include the problematic name Marion (inconclusively considered Jewish)[63] and the theophoric names Theuphilus and Dosithea. There is no reason to think that any of these are Jews, much less any of the others mentioned by name in these inscriptions. Only No. 32 includes authentic Jewish names — Judion and perhaps also Johannes.[64] Of these three tombs, then, only one is probably Jewish. This is just one of numerous examples found in this corpus in which the evidence is over-interpreted in favor of a Jewish presence in Cyrenaica. The result is that Lüderitz and Reynolds were able to record some 227 Jewish epitaphs, while in Egypt, with its enormous Jewish community and excellent preservation, only 134 inscriptions were identified by Horbury and Noy as Jewish, and of these only 105 are epitaphs.

Gamarat

We are left with the cemetery of Gamarat. In Le Bohec's article from 1981, collecting all Jewish inscriptions of which he was aware from North Africa, west of Cyrenaica,[65] he counted 47, all of which he assigned to the Jewish necropolis of Gamarat, near Carthage.[66] However only 39 of these were certainly found at the site; the other eight come from various locations in the area of Carthage and are only tentatively assigned to the Jewish cemetery. Not surprisingly, five of these eight inscriptions are of a distinctively Jewish character. Four of them display menorahs[67] and three are written in Hebrew characters.[68] Another two of the eight inscriptions include the words Sabbatis and Sabba on them, but these, as we know now, are problematic Jewish indicators.[69] One of these two is almost certainly not Jewish, despite the name found on it, since it also includes the pagan formula *DMS* (*Dis Manibus Sacrum* — holy to the gods of the underworld).[70]

---

62 This is a result of my work-in-progress on Diaspora Jewish onomastics and will be published in my forthcoming *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity* Part 2: *The Western Diaspora*.

63 See e.g. *CPJ* 1, 27.

64 The name Johannes became very popular with Christians early on, and disappeared from the Jewish record around the end of the third century. See my forthcoming *Lexicon*, mentioned above, n. 63.

65 Y. Le Bohec, 'Inscriptions Juives et Judaïsantes de l'Afrique Romaine', *Antiquités Africaines* 17 (1981), 165-207.

66 Ibid., nos. 16-36 (179-89). For the source of his information see P. Monceaux, 'Enquête sur l'épigraphie chrétienne d'Afrique', *Revue Archéologique* 4/3 (1904), 361-6.

67 Ibid., nos. 16, 20, 22, 23 (179-80).

68 Ibid., nos. 18, 22, 23 (179-80.)

69 Ibid., nos. 17, 21 (179-80) and see above, n. 46.

70 Ibid., no. 17 (179). On this formula and its possible use in Jewish inscriptions see Kraemer, 'Jewish Tuna', 155-8.

The situation with the finds from the cemetery itself resembles that of the finds from Tel el-Yehudieh. The burial field is one of family tombs.[71] There is little doubt that Jews were buried in some of these family tombs, since in three burials, I assume, menorahs were found.[72] I say 'assume' because it is impossible to establish the family relationships of the interred when the archaeological provenance of the inscriptions has not been recorded, but in any case, three menorahs were found at the site. However, nothing is particularly Jewish in the other 37 inscriptions. There are no Jewish names in the inscriptions found at the site. One could argue for the Jewishness of the names Salonina or Aster,[73] but neither is distinctively Jewish. The name Anianus, which the editor attempted to identify with Hananiah,[74] is a well-known Roman name.[75] Some inscriptions include the Latin formulae *in pace* (in peace),[76] which was assumed by editors to correspond to the Hebrew בשלום, but it is also a purely Latin formula. One may also perhaps claim that tomb inscriptions in Greek,[77] at such a western location, were typical of Jews.[78] However, I would argue that until stronger indications of Jewishness are found, one could as easily assign them to other ethnic communities that used Greek in this area, and that here, as in Tel el-Yehoudieh, we can only be certain that some of the family burial caves found at the site were Jewish, but cannot make a similar conclusion about the entire cemetery. In the absence of a good map of the site or a professional archaeological report, the Jewishness of most of the inscriptions listed by Le Bohec remains suspect. The doubtful inscriptions are listed in the Appendix.

Zoar

Before concluding, let us consider a cemetery, under survey and not yet published, that can only be defined as a Diaspora Jewish graveyard according to a minimalist approach to the boundaries of the Land of Israel. I am referring to the cemetery of Zoar, south of the Dead Sea. In Roman times, this site belonged to the province of Arabia, and many of the inhabitants of Zoar were Nabateans. Yet it was also very close to the Land of Israel, and, as indicated by the Babatha archive, was also populated by Jews.[79] The Jewish character of the Zoar cemetery was already known to the editors of *CII* 2 who included two inscriptions from that location — one in Aramaic dated to 433 CE (*CII* 1208) and one in Greek dated to 389 CE (*CII* 1209). Since this publication, 23 more Jewish tombstones

---

71 A.-L. Delattre, *Gamarat ou la Nécropole juive de Carthage* (Lyons, 1895). Since it is very difficult to understand the descriptions of the physical evidence from this publication, one can do little to retrieve the evidence for the Jewishness of the site.

72 Le Bohec (n. 65), nos. 24, 50, 54 (181, 186, 187).

73 Salonina: ibid., 30, 31, 32 (182), 43, 44 (185); Aster: ibid., no. 35 (183).

74 Ibid., no. 25 (181).

75 See O. Salomies, H. Solin, *Repertorium Nominum Gentilium et Cognominum Latinorum*, (Hildesheim, Zürich, New York, 1994), 16, 293.

76 Le Bohec (n. 65), nos. 35, 36 (183), 48, 50 (186), 51 (187), 57, 58 (188).

77 Ibid., nos. 25-33 (181-3).

78 See e.g. H. Leon *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia, 1960), 75 who describes the Jews of Rome as 'predominantly a Greek-speaking community in a Latin city'.

79 See e.g. H.M. Cotton and A. Yardeni, *Aramic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever and Other Sites* (*DJD* 27, Oxford, 1997), 155-7.

from the site have been published, most of them in Aramaic, but one bilingual, in Aramaic and Greek.[80]

Can we conclude from this evidence that the cemetery in Zoar was Jewish? I think not. The inscriptions were all purchased in the antiquities market and, since the collectors and scholars who became aware of them were mainly interested in acquiring and publishing the Jewish-Aramaic ones, a distortion has occurred. This can be gleaned from a report published in 1998 by Konstantinos Politis, of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, on the salvage operation of these tombstones from the rapidly developing agricultural area of ancient Zoar. He wrote: 'The most important finds were undoubtably (*sic!*) the 300-plus funerary stelae dating from the fourth to the seventh centuries A.D., approximately 90% inscribed in Greek, the remainder in Aramaic. These are currently being studied and a catalogue will soon be published'.[81] To date, as far as I know, this has not appeared. The formulation of this sentence in Politis' article is obscure. Because of the political nature of archaeology in Israel and Jordan, the inscriptions are described precisely but inconclusively by language, as Aramaic, although they are also obviously Jewish. It is, of course, possible that all 250 other Greek inscriptions found at the site were also Jewish. But it is also likely that this was a non-Jewish cemetery where some Jews were buried. Most of the Greek inscriptions, whose dates are unknown to the scholarly world, were probably non-Jewish. This brings very close to home the situation of mixed burial sites and the question of how we identify a Jewish cemetery even in the Land of Israel. But that is not the topic of this article.

In conclusion, an adherence to the stricter principles I suggest in this paper would eliminate from the corpus of Jewish texts a large number of inscriptions. It could be argued that Jews did not necessarily carry on them ethnic markers (such as names) which would make them readily identifiable, and that a great many inscriptions known to the academic community are Jewish despite the fact that no indication of their Jewishness is available. I concur fully with this claim. However, since these Jews chose not to make their Jewish identity evident, there is no way of knowing which inscription, anywhere in the Greco-Roman world, is Jewish, unless its authors were inclined to indicate that fact. Taking a large number of doubtful epitaphs and 'proselytizing' them just because they were found in the vicinity of Jewish, or possibly Jewish, epitaphs, is, I submit, methodologically unsound.

Appendix: Inscriptions included in Jewish corpora whose Jewishness is questioned in this article, cited by number:

Larissa: *IJO* 1:
(1) Ach2; (2) Ach3; (3) Ach4; (4) Ach8; (5) Ach10; (6) Ach11; (7) Ach12; (8) Ach13; (9) Ach.14.

---

80 J. Naveh, 'Aramaic Tombstones from Zoar', *Tarbiz* 64 (1995), 477-97 (Hebrew); 'More on the Tombstones of Zoar', *Tarbiz* 68 (1999), 582-6 (Hebrew); 'Seven New Epitaphs from Zoar', *Tarbiz* 69 (2000), 619-35 (Hebrew); S. Stern, 'New Tombstones from Zoar (Moussaieff Collection)', *Tarbiz* 68 (1999), 177-85 (Hebrew); H.M. Cotton and J.J. Price, 'A Bilingual Tombstone from Zo'ar (Arabia)', *ZPE* 134 (2001), 277-82.

81 K. Politis, 'Survey and Rescue Collections in the Ghawr as-Safi', *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 42 (1998), 630-1.

Leontopilis: *JIGRE*:
(1) 30; (2) 31; (3) 32; (4) 33; (5) 35; (6) 37; (7) 38 (mentions the Land of Onias, but otherwise not Jewish); (8) 40 (Shabtai); (9) 44; (10) 45; (11) 46; (12) 47; (13) 48 (mentions the name Salamis, which could be interpreted as Jewish); (14) 49; (15) 50; (16) 51; (17) 52; (18) 53; (19) 59 (Shabtai); (20) 60 (Shabtai); (21) 61; (22) 63 (Shabtai); (23) 64; (24) 66; (25) 67; (26) 68; (27) 69; (28) 70; (29) 71; (30) 72; (31) 73; (32) 74 (Marion); (33) 75; (34) 76 (Shabtai); (35) 77; (36) 78; (37) 79; (38) 80; (39) 82; (40) 83; (41) 84 (Marion); (42) 85; (43) 86 (Shabtai); (44) 87; (45) 89; (46) 90; (47) 91; (48) 92; (49) 93 (Shabtai); (50) 94; (51) 95 (Shabtai); (52) 96 (Shabtai); (53) 97; (54) 98 (Shabtai); (55) 99; (56) 100 (Marein); (57) 101 (Maranis); (58) 103 (Marion); (59) 104; (60) 105.

Cyrenaica: *CJZC*
(1) 2 (the name [Jou]dion is an editorial supplement); (2) 3; (3) 4; (4) 5; (5) 10 (Sarra; Simon); (6) 11 (Sara, Simon); (7) 13 (Simon); (8) 14 (Simon); (9) 15; (10) 30; (11) 31 (Sara); (12) 33 (Marion); (13) 34; (14) 36 (Simon); (15) 37; (16) 38; (17) 39; (18) 41; (19) 42; (20) 43; (21) 44; (22) 46 (Sarra); (23) 48; (24) 49; (25) 51; (26) 53; (27) 56; (28) 57 (Marin); (29) 58; (30) 61 (Simon); (31) 65 (Maria); (32) 66 (Maria); (33) 67 (Simon); (34) 73; (35) Reynolds, 2; (36) Reynolds, 3 (Marin); (37) Reynolds, 4 (Sara); (38) Reynolds, 6; (39) Reynolds, 9; (40) Reynolds, 10; (41) Reynolds, 11; (42) Reynolds, 12 (Salo); (43) Reynolds, 15; (44) Reynolds, 17; (45) Reynolds, 20; (46) Reynolds, 22; (47) Reynolds, 24; (48) Reynolds, 25.

Y. Le Bohec, 'Inscriptions Juives et Judaïsantes de l'Afrique Romaine', *Antiquités Africaines* 17 (1981) 165-207.
(1) 17 (Shabtai, DMS); (2) 19; (3) 21 (Shabtai); (4) 25 (Anianus; Greek); (5) 26 (Greek); (6) 27 (Greek); (7) 28 (Greek); (8) 29 (Greek); (9) 30 (Salonina; Greek); (10) 31 (Salonina; Greek); (11) 32 (Salonina; Greek); (12) 33 (Greek); (13) 34; (14) 35 (Aster; in peace); (15) 36 (in peace); (16) 37; (17) 38; (18) 39; (19) 40; (20) 41; (21) 42; (22) 43 (Salonina); (23) 44 (Salonina); (24) 45; (25) 46; (26) 47; (27) 48 (in peace); (28) 49; (29) 51 (in peace); (30) 52; (31) 53; (32) 55; (33) 56; (34) 57 (in peace); (35) 58 (in peace); (36) 59; (37) 60; (38) 61; (39) 62; (40) 63.

Freie Universität, Berlin