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BABATHA’S PATRIA: MAḤOZA, MAḤOZ ‘EGLATAIN AND ĖO’AR*

Partial citations in various publications of the as-yet unpublished Nabataean and Aramaic documents from the Babatha archive¹ have led people to assume that Babatha’s village — Maḥoza, מַחְזָה — belonged under Nabataean rule to the larger unit of Maḥoz ‘Eglatain. The word maḥoz in this phrase was taken to mean “district”, as it does in modern Hebrew,² and the phrase as a whole was understood to mean “the administrative district of ‘Eglatain”. In the Semitic documents, which begin in 59-69 CE, both names Maḥoz ‘Eglatain³ and Maḥoza⁴ occur, whereas in the Greek part of the Babatha archive⁵ the name Maḥoz ‘Eglatain never turns up, only the name Maḥoza (Mawza), which belongs here to the larger unit of Zo’ar.⁶ Since the Greek documents begin after the annexation of the Nabataean kingdom (the first one is dated to 110, P.Yadin 5a and 5b), it seemed very natural to assume that Zo’ar replaced Maḥoz ‘Eglatain as the administrative district to which Maḥoza belonged.

The argument was first put in these terms by Yadin: “It is interesting to note that this term [i.e. Maḥoz ‘Eglatain] which does not appear in the Greek documents, possesses a parallel in the words ἐν Μαωζα περὶ Ζῶαραν, hence it is to be concluded

---

² This is not insignificant, as will be seen below.
³ For Maḥoz ‘Eglatain see P.Yadin 36 = J. Starcky, ‘Un contrat Nabatéen sur papyrus’, Revue Bibliq 61, 1954, 163-5 (59-69 CE), Frag. A, l. 2: ‘lṣq’ (ṣṣw) bmtḥwz ʾgltyn; Frag. C, l. 5: dy ḫswk mḥwz ʾgltn. Dr. Ada Yardeni kindly showed me her reconstruction of the text, where these are now ll. 8 and 35 respectively (another contract from 43 CE is mentioned in the papyrus). Maḥoz ‘Eglatain occurs also in the following unpublished papyri: P.Yadin 2 (99 CE), ll. 2-3 = ll. 20 + 22; P.Yadin 3 (99 CE), ll. 22-24; P.Yadin 6 (119 CE), l. 4; P.Yadin 7 (120 CE), l. 2 = l. 32; XHev/Se Nab. 2 (c. 100? CE), ll. 4-5.
⁴ Maḥoza occurs only once in the Semitic documents — in P.Yadin 7, l. 3 = l. 33, see below.
⁵ N. Lewis, The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters. Greek Papyri, 1989; henceforth ‘Lewis’.
⁶ E.g. P.Yadin 5, ll. 4-5: ἐν Μαωζα ξεν ἐν περὶ Ζῶαραν.
that [Maḥoz ‘Eglatain] is the Nabataean and perhaps also the ancient Moabite administrative term — later thus modified after the Roman conquest’.7

Bowersock, in his review article of Lewis (n. 5),8 simply makes Yadin’s equation of Zo’ar with Maḥoz ‘Eglatain more explicit: “Babatha’s village of Maoza appears as Mahoz in the Semitic documents. The district to which it belongs is the well-known Zoar in Greek, but — as we knew from the Starcky text as long ago as 1954 — it was called ‘Egaltein in Aramaic’. The nickname “Eglas” in the name of Joseph Eglas, father of one of the guardians of Babatha’s son “is transparently a local hypocoristic of a man from Zoar–Egaltein”.9 The “moschantic estate of our Lord the Emperor” in P.Yadin 16, l. 24—μοσχαντικὴ κυρίον Καὶσαρος — “is simply an imperial estate in ‘Egaltein, which is Zoar south of the Dead Sea”, since the μοςχ element translates the element ‘Egl (she-calf — ἐγλα) in the place-name ‘Eglatain.

As early as 1970 Y. Kutscher disputed the interpretation given by Yadin on purely linguistic grounds, but his protest seems to have remained unheeded; he proves beyond doubt that the original meaning of maḥoz in Aramaic is “port” or “city” or “market” — “district” is an altogether later accretion.10 The meaning “district” so prominent in the modern Hebrew word maḥoz seems to have imposed the anachronistic translation of Maḥoz ‘Eglatain as “the district of ‘Eglatain”. It may still be maintained, however, that the construct state Maḥoz ‘Eglatain could mean “the port (in the district) of ‘Eglatain”: “The name Mahóza or ‘port’ reflects the area of the district in which the village was located. ... The determinative word ‘Eglatain most probably is a regional name referring to the northern part of the peninsula.”11

7 Phoenix. 17, 1963 (n. 1), 231; cf. idem, IEJ 12, 1962 (n. 1), 251: “in ‘The Greek Documents’ ... as already noted, Mahoza (in the Nabataean and Aramaic documents part of ‘the coastal district of ‘Agaltain’[sic]) is included in the region of Zoar”.
9 Note though that it is Ἰωάνης Ἰωάνητος τοῦ Ἐγλα “Yohanes son of Joseph Egla” only in P.Yadin 14, l. 23 and 15, ll. 3-4 = l. 18 whereas elsewhere the nickname replaces the name completely: Ἰωάνης Ἐγλα, “Yohanes son of Eglas”, P.Yadin 12, l. 8; 13, ll. 21-22; 27, l. 6, as well as in the Aramaic subscription of P.Yadin 15, l. 33: γῆρας μύρας ἐπὶ Σφατίν “my colleague, Yohanna son of Egla”. See now Bork.. Ἀγλα ἐπὶ τρόπου in XHev/Se Gr. 2, l. 4 in H. Cotton, ‘A Cancelled Marriage Contract from the Judaean Desert (XHev/Se Gr. 2)’, JRS 84, 1994, p. 69.
Now that the Greek part of the archive has been published, and more is known about the Semitic documents, it is possible to prove what Kutscher merely stated, namely that Mahoza and Mahoz ‘Eglatain are one and the same locality and that there was no region called ‘Eglatain, just a village variously called Mahoza and Mahoz ‘Eglatain. The element ‘Eglatain in the construct state Mahoz ‘Eglatain is no longer a partitive genitive which describes the whole of which Mahoz is part, i.e. “Mahoz in the district of ‘Eglatain”; rather ‘Eglatain here determines the word Mahoz, i.e. it has become part of the name, as forum is in Forum Clodii and Forum Sempronii, and be’er (i.e. “well”) in Be’er-Sheva and ‘ein (i.e. “spring”) in ‘Ein-gedi. Mahoz ‘Eglatain, “the Port (or City) of ‘Eglatain”, is sometimes abbreviated to Mahoza, i.e. “the Port” or “the City” (the suffix aleph → ο — at the end of a word stands for the definite article in Aramaic) by a process of antonomasia, as for example in urbs Roma becoming Urbs; Glil Goyim becoming HaGalil (Galilee), Portus Traiani becoming Portus.

In the Greek documents the definite article “the” (i.e. the Aramaic suffix, aleph → ο — after Mahoz → zwjm) has become part of the name, and is no longer felt to be the definite article. Hence Μαωζα rather than Ὁ Μαωζα. In other words, the Greek transliterates the Aramaic rather than translates it.

The identity of Mahoza and Mahoz ‘Eglatain is established by (1) the text of the Aramaic P.Yadin 7 and (2) simple logic:

1) P.Yadin 7, a deed of gift by Babatha’s father to her mother, is the only document in which both Mahoz ‘Eglatain and Mahoza occur. Here, therefore, we must look for the clue: the context itself must tell us whether or not these are two different locations or one and the same. First, however, it should be pointed out that although we are already in 120 CE, that is to say fourteen years after the annexation of the Nabataean kingdom, the name Mahoz ‘Eglatain still occurs, and Zo’ar — which had already appeared in the first Greek document 20 — is not mentioned here at all.

---

13 Ibid. (n. 10), 8-9; 11.
14 That it was a village we know from P.Yadin 12, l. 7: καὶ ἱσσαύων Ἰουδαίων ὠς ἱσσαύων κωμῆς Μαωζα Ἀβδοβδάς Ἱλούξα καὶ Ἰωάνης Ἑγλα.
15 The distinction is well illustrated in English by the difference between “the City of Oxford” (i.e. the city that is Oxford) as against “the City of David” (i.e. the city that David built).
16 Cf. “port” in Port-Sa’id, “cape” in Capetown and “mouth” in Portsmouth.
17 See J.-L. Maier, L’épiscopat de l’Afrique Romaine, Vandale et Byzantine, 1973, 102ff. for other examples of antonomasia, e.g. Aquae (125ff.), Castellum (153ff.), Horrea (240ff.).
18 In the Greek documents Μαωζα, as pointed out by Lewis (p. 20), is usually “treated as a feminine singular”, apart from P.Yadin 5 and 16 where “it is treated as a neuter plural”.
19 See on Bagalgala in Lewis, p. 70 and below, n. 24.
20 P.Yadin 5a, ll. 4-5: ἐν Μαωζαίας τὰ ἡπεῖ Ἰοαϊραν.
The papyrus begins with the date and place: “In the consulship of Lucius Catilius Severus for the second time and of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, in the third year of the Imperator (Autokrator) Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, and according to the era of the province on the twenty-fourth of Tammuz year fifteen in Maḥoza ‘Eglatain” (ll. 1-2 = ll. 30-32),\(^{21}\) immediately followed by: ‘I, Simeon son of Menahem who lives in Maḥoza (Maḥoza) gives you Miriam my wife, daughter of Joseph, son of Menashe, all that I own in Maḥoza” (l. 3 = l. 33).\(^{22}\)

The run of the sentences and the context both show clearly that in the transition from line 2 (=32) to line 3 (=33) Maḥoza i.e. “The Maḥoz” replaces Maḥoz ‘Eglatain i.e. Maḥoz of ‘Eglatain. In other words the definite article aleph (א) at the end of Maḥoz (Maḥoza) has replaced the determinative ‘Eglatain; Maḥoza becomes Maḥoza, “The Port” or “The City” and there is no longer any need to use ‘Eglatain.

2) In the Nabataean document *P.Yadin* 3 of 99 CE a date grove bought by Babatha’s father is said to be situated in Galgala which in turn is located in Maḥoz ‘Eglatain: “a date grove which belongs to ‘Abi’adan called Gh... in the Galgala in Maḥoz ‘Eglatain”, (ll. 2-3 = ll. 23-24).\(^{23}\) Among the date groves which Babatha declared in the census of 127 CE, there was one said to be located in Galgala — this time said to be in Maḥoza: κήπον φοινικών ἐν οἷς Μαωζών λεγόμενον Βεσταλγαλάκα (P.Yadin 16, ll. 24-25). There is no reason to deny that the Galgala of *P.Yadin* 2 and 3 is the same as the Galgala of *P.Yadin* 16; consequently Maḥoz ‘Eglatain must be identical with Maḥoza. If so, why should Maḥoz ‘Eglatain and Maḥoza stand for two different places in *P.Yadin* 7?

\(^{21}\) ‘l ḥpptl lyqys Ḫwlyys swrs ṭynqy wmrqṣ ‘wrlys nṭwnys šnt llt l’wṭḥṭw qr ṛyns ḥdṛyns sbštš w’l mnyn ḫṛkḥy d’ b’ṣryn w’rḥ btmwz šnt ‘sr ḥwntš bmvḥwz ‘gltyn’ And again in ll. 12-13 = l. 48: Simeon adds: “and also —[inner text: another gift] — all my dates and trees scattered in Maḥoza ... and also — another gift — my courtyards and houses in Maḥoza”.

\(^{22}\) ‘n’ šnt yn br mnḥm dy ‘mr bmvḥw z’ lky ’nty mnrmn ’nty btr wyyf br mnšt yt kl mh dy ’yty ly bmvḥw z’. The outer text, l. 33, does not have “all that I own in Maḥoza”.

\(^{23}\) gnt ṭmr ḥy l’by’dn d’ dy mtqṛḥ gh... dy bglgl’ dy bmvḥwz ‘gltyn; see also P.Yadin 2 (Nabataean), l. 3 = l. 22, of the same year: “a date grove in the Galgala in Maḥoz ‘Eglatain”.

This same grove, now part of Babatha’s property, reappears in the Greek *P.Yadin* 16 of 127. There is no doubt that we are dealing here with the same date grove since it is abutted by the same properties. It is one of the first two groves mentioned there: (1) κήπον φοινικών ἐν οἷς Μαωζών λεγόμενον Αλγιόμαμα ... γείτονες όδος καὶ θάλακκα, (2) κήπον φοινικών ἐν οἷς Μαωζών λεγόμενον Λέγιομαμα ... γείτονες μοχατοτική κυρίου Καίσαρα καὶ θάλακκα. See in detail H. M. Cotton and J.C. Greenfield, ‘Babatha’s Property and the Law of Succession in the Babatha Archive’, ZPE 104, 1994, 211-224.

\(^{24}\) Bagalgala — ḥɔ̀lwa — means literally “in the Galgala”: the preposition “in” (beth — ב), as well as the definite article “the” (the suffix aleph — א) have become part of the name in Greek, see Lewis, p. 70. *P.Yadin* 6 (Nabataean), l. 4 reads “which you have in Galgala in ...” (dy lk bglgl’ dy ...), but Dr. Ada Yardeni tells us that there is no room for Maḥoz ‘Eglatain in the gap which follows.
Given that Maḥoza and Maḥoz ‘Eglatain are one and the same in the documents, and given also that Maḥoza is a village (κωμή P.Yadin 12, l. 7), we face the problem that the village of Maḥoza/Maḥoz ‘Eglatain seems to contain several units within it. Galgala is not the only unit located there. In one of Bar Kokhba’s Hebrew contracts two men who now reside in ‘En-gedi are said to come originally from the Luhit in Maḥoz ‘Eglatain: “Teḥinnah son of Simeon and Alma son of Judah both of the Luhit in Maḥoz ‘Eglatain now resident in ‘En-gedi”. What kind of village is Maḥoza/Maḥoz ‘Eglatain which contains both Galgala and Luhit, and perhaps other units as well?

It could be suggested that Maḥoza/Maḥoz ‘Eglatain was an important regional centre, or an agglomeration of once independent villages. But this explanation is somewhat hard to reconcile with Maḥoza/Maḥoz ‘Eglatain’s obvious inferiority vis-à-vis Zo’ar in whose territory it is subsumed. In fact everything about the phrasing suggests that Maḥoza/Maḥoz ‘Eglatain was subordinate to Zo’ar in much the same way as a village in Judaea was subordinate to the capital village which gave its name to the toparchy to which it belonged. Even if the term toparchia never appears in the Babatha archive or in the province of Arabia, one cannot help noticing the striking resemblance between en Maωξα peri Zoορων of P.Yadin 14. 1. 20 for example and the locutions describing the hierarchical relationship between a capital village and a subordinate one in Judaea: en Βαιτοβαίςσας ... τοπαρχεῖας Ἡρωδείου ... ἀπὸ κόμης Γαλωθὸς τῆς περὶ Ἀκραβατῶν ἀικῶν ἐν κοιμηθεὶς Βαιτοβαίςσας τῆς περὶ Γοφνίας of DJD II, no. 115, ll. 2-3; and in the Babatha archive itself: κόμης Ἕγγαδδὼν περὶ Ἴρειχόταν of P.Yadin 16, l. 16; and in the so-called P.Se’elim: εν Ἀριστοβουλία τῆς Ζεφηνῆς ... τῶν ἀπὸ κόμης Ἰακείμον τῆς Ζεφηνῆς of (XHev/Se Gr. 2, ll. 3-5). We cannot be sure of what is implied by the subordination

25 This difficulty, too, had been pointed out by Kutscher (n. 10), 11-13, but his solution does not seem convincing to us.
26 Yadin IEJ 12, 1962, pp. 251-2, no. 44 (134 CE): τῆς ἐν Σμυρναὶ ὅπως ἐγγύνη γεννήματος Σμυρναί. Yadin suggests cautiously that Teḥinnah son of Simeon could be Ζεφηνῆς Ζεφηνῆς of the Greek part of the Babatha archive, who no doubt resided in Maḥoza, for he is the scribe of many of the documents written there: P.Yadin 5 (110); 15 (125); 17 (128); 18 (128).
27 I suspect that Βηθφαφαράα — Bethpharaaia — of P.Yadin 16, l. 30 may be another one.
28 Above n. 6, and see also P.Yadin 14, l. 20; 15, l. 3 =16-17; 17, ll. 2-3 = 19-20; 18, l. 3 = 32: ἐν Μαωξα περὶ Ζοαραν; P.Yadin 25, l. 28 = 64: ἐν Μαωξα περὶ Ζοαραν; P.Yadin 19, ll. 10-11: ἐν Μαωξα τῆς περὶ Ζοαραν; P.Yadin 20, ll. 22-23; 21, ll. 5-6; 22, ll. 5-6; 26, l. 18; 27, ll. 3-4: ἐν Μαωξα περὶ Ζοαραν; XHev/Se Gr. 1, l. 3 in H. Cotton, ‘The Archive of Salome Komaïse Daughter of Levi: Another Archive from the ‘Cave of Letters’‘, ZPE 105, 1995, 183, l. 3: ἐν Μαωξα τῆς περὶ Ζοαραν.
30 “at Bethbassit in the toparchy of Herodion ... from the village of Galoda of Akrabatta, but is an inhabitant of Batharda of Gopha”.
31 “in Aristoboulas of the Zephene ... from the village of Yaqim [of the Zephene]”, see Cotton (n. 9), 67, and discussion there, 73-77.
of villages to each other (or to a city), nor do we know the functions performed by central villages such as Zo’ar, Gophna, Akrabatta, Herodion, Jericho and Zif vis-à-vis their subordinate villages, Maḥoza, Bethbassi, Galoda, Batharda, Yaqim and Aristoboulia respectively, but there can be no doubt that something more than a merely geographical relationship is intended.

Conclusion:
We have thus eliminated the non-existent district of ‘Eglatain, and the assumption that it was re-named Zo’ar under Roman rule. However, we cannot be sure that the inclusion of villages — like Maḥoza/Maḥoz ‘Eglatain — in the district of other villages — like Zo’ar — originated only with the Roman re-organization of the new province: although the subordination of Maḥoza to Zo’ar is recorded for the first time after the annexation of Arabia (P. Yadin 5, 110 CE), it does not appear in the Aramaic P. Yadin 7, written in 120 CE. It may be argued that the convention of attributing a village to the district is tied up with the language of the document — Semitic or Greek.

The exact location of Maḥoza also remains a puzzle. Whether maḥoz means “a port” or “a city”, Maḥoza/Maḥoz ‘Eglatain lay by the sea shore. The proof is in the documents themselves which mention two date groves in Maḥoza named Algiphiamma, which is a Greek transliteration of Aramaic ‘l gif ym’ “on the sea shore”: κῆπον φοινικώνος ἐν ὀρίοις Μασῶζων λεγόμενον Ἀλγιφιάμμα ... γείτονες ὀδὸς καὶ θάλασσα, κῆπον φοινικώνος ἐν ὀρίοις Μασῶζων λεγόμενον Ἀλγιφιάμμα ... γείτονες μοσχαντική κυρίου Καίσαρος καὶ θάλασσα (P. Yadin 16, II. 17-24).

32 Petra is mentioned three times as the centre to which both Zo’ar and its subordinate village, Maḥoza, belonged. See P. Yadin 16, I. 13-14: Βαβθα ... Μασωζη της Ζωρημης περιμετρου Πετρας; P. Yadin 37, II. 2-3: εν Μασωζη της Ζωρημης της περιμετρου Πετρας; cf. N. Lewis, ‘A Jewish Landowner from the Province of Arabia’, Scripta Classica Israelica 8-9, 1985/88, 134, I. 12: Γειτονες Μασωζη της Ζωρημης περιμετρου Πετρας.


34 Thus an identification with Kh. Galgul (cf. A. Musil, Arabia Petraea: I Noah, 1907, 365 and 381, n. 1) or with Kh. el-Gillime (cf. F.-M. Abel, Géographie de la Palestine II, 1938, 310, s.v. Eglaïm) is impossible since both are located inland. See the illuminating discussion of biblical ‘Eglat ( Isaiah 15:5; Jeremiah 48:5) in A. Schalit, ‘Die Eroberungen des Alexander Jamnäus in Moab’, Theokratia. Jahrbuch des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschiannum I, 1967-69 (1970), 12ff. (an earlier version of this article appeared in Hebrew in Eretz Israel I, 1951, 104-121).

35 Since Luḥit is explicitly said to be in Maḥoza/Maḥoz ‘Eglatain, it should be located by the sea shore. Any attempt to identify it with one or another of its namesakes must start from this fact. Biblical “ascent of Luḥit” (Isaiah 15:5 and Jeremiah 48:5) is identified by Eusebius as a village lying between Areopolis and Zo’ar: και ἐστι μεταξὺ Ἀρεωπόλεως καὶ Ζωρημω κυρίη νῦν καλουθεῖτη Δουβάθα (Onomasticon 122, 28, Klostermann). A commander of an army camp in Luḥtw ( rb müsta dy ḫlytw) is mentioned in a Nabataean inscription from 37 CE (of which two identical copies were found: CIS II.1, no. 196 = RES no. 674). See R. Savignac and J. Starcky, ‘Une Inscription nabatéenne provenant du Djôf’, RB 64, 1957, 200-203; W. Schottroff, ‘Horonaim, Nimrim, Luḥith und der Westrand des “Landes Ataroth”’ ZDPV 82, 1966, 196ff.; A. Schalit (n. 34), 40-41 and n. 4 there; Mittmann (n. 11).
And indeed the sea, or rather the sea shore, is said here to be one of the abutters of these date groves. Another clue to the location of Maḥoza/Mahoz ‘Eglatain is that dates constitute the main, if not the only, product of the area: they are mentioned in census declarations, deeds of gift and tax receipts. Hence we must look for a place with climatic and water conditions similar to those prevailing in Zo‘ar and ‘Ein-gedi. The Ghor al-Šafi, south of the Dead Sea, with Wadi al-Ḥasa nearby, would fit Maḥoza/Mahoz ‘Eglatain admirably.

The Hebrew University Hannah M. Cotton Jerusalem Jonas C. Greenfield

---

36 In the Nabataean P. Yadin 3, where one of these two groves is mentioned, the word used israqq’ (l. 5 = l. 27), i.e. “shoals”, a word used elsewhere for the shallow water near the shore of a lake or sea, cf. bShabbat 100b; b’Erubim 43a.

37 P. Yadin 16 and Lewis, SCI 8-9, 1985/88, 134, l. 12.

38 P. Yadin 7 and XHev/Še Gr. 1 (n. 28).


40 Zo‘ar is “the city of palms”, see Mishnah, Yeḥamot, 16:7; see M. Broshi, ‘Agriculture and Economy in Roman Palestine: Seven Notes on the Babatha Archive’, IEJ 42, 1992, 233: “The heat, the extreme low humidity and the abundant water are prerequisites for cultivating the date palm. The salinity ... is no hindrance”, cf. ibid. 231-2. Note that in the two biblical passages mentioned above (n. 34) ‘Eglat is mentioned together with Zo‘ar.

41 See map. The “big river” — nhr’ ṭb’ — mentioned in P. Yadin 7, l. 8 = l. 42 and the “water from the Wadi” — my wdy’ — mentioned in l. 43 may point to Wadi al-Ḥasa. Note also the “desert” — mḏbr’ — as one of the abutters in l. 5. Cf. Nelson Glueck’s first impression of the Ghor al-Šafi area: “...We pushed on to Ghfar eš-Šāfī, near the south-eastern end of the Dead Sea. The waters of the Seil el-Qurāḥi, as the lower end of the Wāḏi el-Ḥesā is called, irrigate an extensive area, part of which is in a swampy state [cf. above, n. 36, the “shoals” — raqq’]... The large green fields of eš-Šāfī were a welcome relief after the waste stretches traversed from the time we left the plantations of the el-Mezra‘ah”, Explorations in Eastern Palestine II (AASOR 15, 1935), 7.
END NOTE:
Even if *maḥoz* does mean “district”, the identification of Maḥoza and Maḥoz ‘Eglatain remains unaffected; even then the word *maḥoz* in Maḥoz ‘Eglatain cannot mean “district” literally. My colleague Simon Hopkins kindly supplied a similar example: the town Siirt in Southern Turkey is the capital of Siirt Province (*vilayet* in Turkish = Arabic *wilāya(t)*), but in the local Arabic *ṣl-walāye*, i.e. “the province” is used for the town Siirt itself, not “the province”; see O. Jastrow, *Die mesopotamisch-arabischen qṣltu-Dialekte* I, 1978, 16; II, 1981, 217; 220, n. 16; 274, n. 20. A good example is II, 226 § 1 ḍavaṣ ṣl-walāye which means literally “the district of the province”, i.e. “the district of Siirt”.

Concordance of the papyri mentioned in this article (with the exception of those published by Lewis, n. 5) with H. Cotton, W. Cockle and F. Millar, ‘The Papyrology of the Roman Near East: A Survey’, *JRS* 85, 1995:

- *P.Yadin* 2 = no. 182.
- *P.Yadin* 3 = no. 183
- *P.Yadin* 6 = no. 186
- *P.Yadin* 7 = no. 187
- *P.Yadin* 12 - no. 175.
- *P.Yadin* 36 = no. 180.
- Yadin *IEJ* 12, 1962, pp. 251-2, no. 44 (n. 26) = no. 303.

- *XHev/Še Gr.* 1 = no. 204.
- *XHev/Še Gr.* 2 = no. 292.
- *XHev/Še Gr.* 5 = no. 191.
- *XHev/Še* 12 = no. 205. 42


---

42 The Greek and Aramaic papyri said to come from Nahal Še’elim and designated *XHev/Še* will be published in a final form by H. Cotton and A. Yardeni, *Aramaic and Greek Texts from Nahal Ḥever (The Seiyal Collection II), Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXVII*, 1996.
Map: The Locations mentioned in the article
(Reproduced with some additions from N. Lewis, *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters. Greek Papyri*, 1989 by permission of the publishers)