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THE MEANING AND FUNCTION OF IOUDAIOS IN GRAECO-ROMAN INSCRIPTIONS*

Out of the many hundreds of Jewish inscriptions surviving from the Graeco-Roman world about forty, mostly epitaphs dated to the late 2nd century CE or later, contain the words Ioudaios/Ioudaia or their Latin counterparts, Iudaeus/Iudaea. Their meaning and function have been the subject of much debate in recent years. For Tomson, Ioudaios simply means ‘Jew’. Arguing that Jews used it only when viewing themselves from “a non-Jewish perspective” in “largely non-Jewish surroundings”, he concludes that, in contrast to the “inside” name Israel, it invariably functioned as a term of “outside identity”. Kraemer, in the first of her two influential articles on ambiguity in Jewish epigraphy, sees Ioudaios quite differently: “A careful look at the occurrence of these terms in Greek and Latin Jewish inscriptions suggests that rather than sustain only one uniform translation, Ioudaia/Ioudaios may have a range of connotations.” In addition to functioning as a geographic indicator (i.e. pointing up the Judaean origin of people who may not necessarily even have been Jews), Ioudaia/os, she claims, may also be a sign of pagan adherence to Judaism. In still other cases, the masculine and feminine singular may represent a proper name, and where that is the case, it may provide further evidence for pagan attraction to Judaism. For Kraemer’s novel contention is that Ioudaia/os may well have been used like the name Sambathion, which, so Tcherikover argued, many non-Jewish Egyptians gave their children out of admiration for, and possibly attachment to, Jewish customs, most notably the sabbath. The views of Ioudaios taken by both Tomson and Kraemer will be challenged in the first part of this paper. Close examination of the physical context in which this word occurs shows that it does not function only as a term of “outside identity”, as Tomson has argued. And from onomastic, linguistic and chronological analysis of all the surviving inscriptions we can see that it does not have as many meanings or perform quite the same functions as those proposed by Kraemer. First, it will be argued that in all but a tiny number of very early inscriptions, where it clearly is a personal name, Ioudaios, like its Byzantine successor Hebraios, simply means ‘Jew’. Secondly, it will be shown that it performs significantly different functions, depending upon whether its context is Jewish or predominantly non-Jewish and, if the latter, whether the evidence dates from the Hellenistic or the Roman period. Finally, we shall apply

---

* This paper was originally presented at a seminar held by the Open University’s Classics Department on October 25th, 1996. I would like to thank those present for their helpful comments and also Professor J. A. Crook of St John’s College, Cambridge, for subsequently reading the full text. The views expressed are my own.

The following abbreviations are used throughout this paper:

HN = W. Horbury and D. Noy, Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt, Cambridge 1992;

1 In this paper, Ioudaios tends to be used as a generic term for all these variants.
4 Kraemer, 1989, 35.
6 Kraemer, 1989, 49.
7 CPJ III Section XIII.
the principles established in this analysis to some texts whose dates and provenance, though not certain, are very probable, and suggest their likely interpretation.

For this study, all the inscriptions in which Ioudaios appears – other than those where Ioudaioi is part of an official community title, such as syncagogue ton Ioudaion\(^8\) – have been collected and re-translated. They have been categorised according to function and provenance in an appendix (Appendix 1). References in the paper itself in the form (no. 1) . . . (no. 43) are to the documents listed in this appendix. One particular inscription, the epitaph of Aurelia Artemeis Ioudea (sic) from Termessos (TAM III 448), is discussed in detail in Appendix 2.

(i) The meaning of Ioudaios

(a) Ioudaios as a personal name

No one would dispute that on occasion Ioudaios does function as a variant of Judas\(^9\) and thus as a personal name. There are two unambiguous\(^10\) instances of this – in no. 1, a Delphic manumission document dating from 162 BCE, the Jewish slave receiving his freedom has the name Ioudaios and in no. 2, a similar document of a slightly later date (119 BCE), it is the manumitter himself, Ioudaios, son of Pindaros, who bears that name. In both these instances what we clearly have is a Hellenised version of the common Hebrew word Yehudah, which functioned sometimes as a geographical term (as in the Land of Judah) and at others as a personal name (i.e. Judah). In the first case above we may suspect a geographical derivation for Ioudaios: it was a common practice among the Greeks and Romans to name their slaves after their country of origin. An analogous Jewish case is probably to be found in CIJ I* 77*, the votive dedication to the Iunones of the Brescian freedwoman, Annia Iuda.

But are nos. 1 and 2 the only inscriptions in which Ioudaios is used as somebody’s personal name? Kraemer has suggested that we should see Ioudaios as part of a personal name in a whole range of texts – in each of the seven North African epitaphs in which Iudaea/Iudaeus appear (nos. 13 and 27–32), for instance, as well as several inscriptions from Rome, Greece and the Balkans\(^11\). In all these cases the word has traditionally been taken as an epithet meaning Jew/ess. Is there any reason to suppose that that view is mistaken? Not unless we assume that the normal onomastic practices of Greek and Roman society are not operating. But such an assumption is unjustified: it has long been recognised and can easily be demonstrated that the onomastic practices of Diasporan Jews were not significantly different from those of their gentile neighbours\(^12\). That being so, it is highly unlikely that in epitaphs, such as those of Iulius An[ia]nus Iudeus (no. 27), Iulia Victoria [Iu]dea (no. 29) and Septim(i)a Maria Iudaea (no. 38), Iudae/a Iudaeus can be part of the personal name of the deceased. What we have in each of these cases is (for the period and the place – i.e. late 2nd/early 3rd century CE Africa) a standard Roman name consisting of the family name (gentilicium) followed by the personal name (cognomen), followed by the word Iudaeus/us. (The omission of the praenomen in funerary inscriptions was at this time

---

\(^8\) For this, see, inter alia, TAM IV 1.376 (Nikomedea in Bithynia), DF 100 = CJZC 72 (Berenice in Cyrenaica) and the Bulletin of Judaico-Greek Studies 13, 1993, 27 (Phanagoria in the Bosporan kingdom). Cf. CIJ II 718 for a syncagogue Hebraion at Corinth.


\(^10\) Somewhat ambiguous is the Iudaeus whose medicinal preparations Celsus refers to twice in his De Medicina. At V.22.4, Iudaeus appears to be a personal name but at V.19.11 only an epithet qualifying the noun auctor. For discussion, see Stern, ibid.

\(^11\) Kraemer, 1989, 48, n. 38, citing our nos. 6, 34, 38–40. Our nos. 3 and 36 are also deemed possible candidates. See Kraemer, 1989, 50 and 45.

\(^12\) For a succinct analysis of the naming practices of the Roman Diaspora, see now L. V. Rutgers, The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora, Leiden 1995, 158–163.
common practice\(^\text{13}\). The only problematical aspect of inscriptions such as these is the precise meaning of the epithet *Iudaeus/a*. Does it merely denote a Judaean origin and, if so, perhaps not Jewishness at all?

(b) *Ioudaios* as a geographical indicator?

In one of the inscriptions under consideration in this paper *Ioudaios* cannot be a geographical indicator. The Laodicean Jewess, Ammias Ioudea, who ended up in the Monteverde catacomb at Rome (see no. 6), cannot have been a native of Judaea, as no city bearing the name Laodicea ever existed there\(^\text{14}\). And in those texts in Appendix 1 which are dated to the second half of the 2nd century or later *Ioudaios* is unlikely to indicate a Judaean origin: by that time the name Judaea had been replaced by that of Syria Palestina\(^\text{15}\). Cases such as these aside, are there any inscriptions where *Ioudaios* may be functioning as a geographic indicator? Kraemer proposes that as a possibility for, among others, all the *Ioudaios* inscriptions from Asia Minor\(^\text{16}\). Specific evidence, however, to back these claims is nowhere given. Instead there is repeated reference to “Kraabel’s interpretation”\(^\text{17}\), by which is meant that scholar’s novel explanation of the unique phrase, *hoi pote Ioudaioi*, found in a pagan donor inscription from Smyrna of Hadrianic date\(^\text{18}\) and usually understood as “people who were formerly Jews” – i.e. apostates\(^\text{19}\). Kraabel, however, preferred to take the words to mean “people formerly of Judaea” and thus was able, at a stroke, to dispose of the apostates and replace them with immigrants from Judaea who need not even have been Jewish\(^\text{20}\). Although this interpretation has commanded wide acceptance\(^\text{21}\), it is no more than an opinion, not a shred of evidence having been offered in its support. How likely is it to be right? The argument, sometimes adduced on Kraabel’s behalf, that no Jew would go out of his way to advertise his apostasy in the manner alleged of these Smyrnaean donors, is weak. Conspicuous apostasy, though exceedingly rare among Diasporan Jews, did occur\(^\text{22}\). One need only think how the Antiochene apostate Antiochus behaved at the beginning of the Jewish War: he publicly sacrificed “in the Greek manner” precisely to demonstrate to the local Greeks the genuineness of his conversion (*metabole*)\(^\text{23}\). Also against Kraabel a number of powerful historical and linguistic arguments can be brought to bear. After the imposition of the Jewish tax in 70 CE\(^\text{24}\), *Ioudaios* can hardly have been, if it ever was, a term of self-definition that non-Jews would eagerly seek to use, and by the time of the Smyrnaean donor list (i.e. the period following the Diasporan revolts of Trajan’s reign) it is surely one

\(^{13}\) Rutgers (n. 12) 159.

\(^{14}\) Noy II 183 speculates that she may have come from either Syrian Laodicea or Laodicea Combusta in Phrygia.


\(^{16}\) Kraemer, 1989, 43, by which are meant our nos. 12; 19–23; 33; 36 and 37. Not all the inscriptions cited by Kraemer actually contain the epithet *Ioudaios*. In CJ II 750 and 793 *Hebraios* is found instead.

\(^{17}\) Kraemer, 1989, 35, 43, 52.

\(^{18}\) IGRR IV 1431, line 29 = CJ II 742.

\(^{19}\) As, for example, by W. H. C. Frend, Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church, Oxford 1965, 148, n. 47 and Smallwood 507.


\(^{23}\) Josephus BJ 7.47.

\(^{24}\) Josephus BJ 7.218; Cassius Dio 66.7.2.
they would have avoided\footnote{Especially if it belonged to the period of the Bar Kochba revolt (132–5 CE) or the closing years of Hadrian’s reign. However, although this document is definitely Hadrianic, it cannot be dated any more precisely than that. See Smallwood 507, n. 3.} Even more seriously, there seems to be no linguistic support for Kraabel’s interpretation. In inscriptions from Smyrna and other Anatolian cities, foreign residents are never described as “formerly of such and such a region”. The place of origin tends to be given in one of three forms: an ethnikon in the nominative (this is the most common\footnote{See, for instance, the Smyrnaean inscriptions, IGRR 1446 (Beithynos Nikaius – from Nikaia in Bithynia) and 1460 (Beithynieus kai Neikomedes – a Bithynian and a Nikomedean) and IK Smyrna 689 (multiple examples from all over the eastern Mediterranean).}, the preposition apo followed by the city-name or the city-name on its own in the genitive\footnote{See, for instance, MAMA III 442 (Ephesios); 176 (apo Ephesos); 742 (Ephesos).}. Jews moving around the Mediterranean followed Graeco-Roman conventions in this matter. Judaean metics (usually assumed to be Jewish) at Iasos and Rhodes, for instance, are described/describe themselves as Jerusalemites\footnote{Cf. Appendix 1 no. 34.}. Settlers from Galilee routinely describe themselves as Tiberieus\footnote{CIJ II 749; IG XII.i.11.} or Sephorenos\footnote{Le Bohec 28 – epitaph found in the necropolis of Gamart at Carthage. Cf. Appendix 1 no. 34.} (i.e. from Tiberias or Sepphoris) and at Rome, among the many immigrants from other parts of the Jewish world, we find Jews “from Aquileia”\footnote{CIJ II 362 = Noy II 60.} and “from Laodicea” (no. 6). So far, in the epigraphic evidence, I have been unable to find a single instance of pote being used in the manner Kraabel proposes. If IGRR IV 1431, as interpreted by Kraabel, offers so little support for the thesis that Ioudaios frequently operates as a geographic indicator, is there any other inscriptive evidence that may be invoked instead? Solin suggested\footnote{H. Solin, Juden und Syrer im westlichen Teil der römischen Welt, ANRW II.29.2, 1983, 649.} that CIL XIV 4624 and CIJ I² 643 provided further examples of the usage. However, in the most recent edition of CIL XIV 4624, a text regarded by Solin himself as a bit doubtful, the epithet no longer figures, Iuda[eus] having been replaced by the name Iuda\footnote{Noy I 15.}. With regard to the second (no. 24), which runs L(uclius) Aiaccius P(ublii) libertus Dama Iudaeus por tor v. s. f., Solin’s argument that Iudaeus here must have a “rein geographische Funktion” because “v. s. f. weist auf heidnische Dedication hin”\footnote{Solin, ibid.} is unsound. Even if v. s. f. had to be interpreted as votum solvit feliciter (which it does not\footnote{Noy I 7 reads here vivus sibi fecit.}), there is no reason why a Jew should not have made such a dedication, as our discussion below of no. 9, a Jewish inscription from the shrine of Amphiarao at Oropos, will show. Thus we are left with no hard epigraphic examples of Ioudaios meaning ‘person (not necessarily Jewish) from Judaea’\footnote{For other criticisms of Kraemer on this point, see P. W. van der Horst, Ancient Jewish Epitaphs, Kampen 1991, 69–70.}. So what does Ioudaios signify?

\begin{itemize}
\item[(c)] Ioudaios as an indicator of status within the Jewish community
\end{itemize}

Josephus almost invariably uses the term Ioudaios to designate post-exilic Jews, whether those of Judaea itself or those domiciled in Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean world\footnote{Josephus AJ 11.169–73. For discussion, see Tomson (n. 2) 123–124.}. He also applies it to proselytes, as his account of the conversion of the Adiabenian king, Izates, for instance, shows: with circumcision, the latter “genuinely” became “Ioudaios”\footnote{AJ 20.38ff. cf. AJ 13.258, for the use of similar language in regard to the conversion of the Idumaeans.}. In the Roman History of Cassius Dio, a work dating roughly from the same period as many of the Ioudaios inscriptions under consideration here (i.e. 2nd-3rd century CE), the usage is the same: “They (sc. the Jews) have also another name that they have...”
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acquired (sc. besides Palestine). The country has been named Judaea (Ioudaia) and the people themselves Jews (Ioudaioi). I do not know how this title came to be given them but it applies also to others, although of a different race (alloethneis), who zealously adhere to their customs. This people (genos) is found even among the Romans and, although many times repressed, has increased mightily and won the right of freedom in its observances.39 Is the epigraphic use of the term any different from that found in these (and other) literary sources?40 Kraemer argues that it may also have been adopted by pagans merely sympathetic to Judaism. Her principal reason for making this claim is the presence in two of the epitaphs alluded to above, namely those of Iulia Victoria Iudaea from Cirta in Numidia (no. 29) and Septim(i)a Maria Iudaea of Pannonia (no. 38), of the “heathen” formula D(is) M(anibus) – to the Divine Spirits (of the departed). This, she suggests, indicates, at the very least, broad sympathy towards Judaism on the part of pagan persons, either the deceased themselves or the parents who gave them “the name Judea”41. Kraemer’s hypothesis here is both implausible and unnecessary: Iudaea, as was demonstrated above, is unlikely to be a name in either of these inscriptions. Further, there is no reason to suppose that the Dis Manibus formula cannot have been used by Jews: although predominantly a pagan usage, it has also been found not only on several Christian tombstones42 but also occasionally in Jewish contexts43. While many of these cases are simply pagan tombstones in secondary use (several of those found in the Jewish catacombs at Rome, for instance, demonstrably were used for helping to seal up burial cavities44), there is one from Segermes in Africa Proconsularis45 and another from the Monteverde catacomb at Rome46 that cannot easily be explained away.

What then are we to conclude about the meaning of Ioudaios in inscriptions? I myself can see no reason for not assuming that, nos. 1 and 2 apart, it is the same as in other types of contemporary source material – i.e. it refers mostly to people who had been born as Jews whether in Judaea/Palestine or elsewhere and in a few cases those who had converted outright to Judaism. Hebreos, the word which largely superseded Ioudaios in Byzantine times, the latter having acquired pejorative overtones, largely confirms this. It never denotes mere sympathisers. Nor is it somebody’s personal name. It simply refers to Jews wherever found and whatever their geographical origin47.

(ii) The function of Ioudaios

(a) Ioudaios in a Jewish context

Instances of Ioudaios in a wholly Jewish context are, unsurprisingly, rare. In Judaea/Palestine there is only one and in the synagogal inscriptions of Diasporan Jewry, the official use of Ioudaioi in

39 Cassius Dio 37.16.5–17.1. Usually interpreted as referring to proselytism. See, for instance, M. Stern, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism II, Jerusalem 1980, no. 406, comm. on 37.17.1 and, more recently, M. Goodman, Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity, JRS 79, 1989, 43.
40 In papyrological sources from Egypt too, Ioudaios normally functions as a status indicator. See, for instance, CPJ I 30; 38; 43; 46 etc.
41 Kraemer, 1989, 49.
42 Some from the same region as the Iulia Victoria Iudaea epitaph – i.e. Cirta. See P. Monceaux, Enquête sur l’épigraphie chrétienne d’Afrique, Revue Archéologique 1, 1904, 359.
43 See van der Horst 43.
44 Rutgers (n. 12) 269–272.
45 Le Bohec 12.
46 CIJ I2 464 = Noy II 608 (listed with “possibly Jewish” inscriptions). Noy concedes, however, that this epitaph ends with a formula “which has usually been regarded as almost exclusively Jewish.”
47 In inscriptions and papyri at any rate. Compare, for instance, CPJ 512 an Arsinoite Hebrew with CIJ I2 370 = Noy II 112, a Palestinian one at Rome. To claim that it refers only to Palestinian or Aramaic-speaking Jews is to go beyond the evidence. So, correctly, N. de Lange, Origen and the Jews, Cambridge 1976, 30. For the altogether more nuanced uses of Hebræos/Ioudaios in literary sources, especially those of 4th century Christian writers, see the perceptive remarks of D. T. Runia, The Studia Philonica Annual 6, 1994, 14–20.
community titles apart\(^{48}\), none at all. Given the absence of any need for a Jew to define him or herself as Jewish when among Jews, where the word does occur in a Jewish context, there must be a special reason for it. In the Jewish catacombs of Rome, *Ioudaios*/*a* is securely attested five times (nos. 3–7). In all but one of these cases (no. 7) the people so described were in some sense on the margin of the Roman Jewish community. For they were of either proselyte or (no. 6 only) immigrant status. That the term is being used in these cases to stress group-membership comes out particularly clearly in the epitaph of the three-year-old proselyte, Irene, from the Lower Nomentana catacomb (no. 4). However we choose to interpret this peculiar, much discussed text (I follow Frey in CIJ), there can be no doubt that the people who were responsible for its composition\(^{49}\) were determined to emphasise Irene’s Jewish credentials. Hence (to the bafflement of Tomson) their simultaneous description of her as both a Jew and an Israeliite (*Ioudea Israelites*)\(^{50}\).

But what does *Ioudaios*/*a* mean when the person so described apparently is neither a proselyte nor an immigrant? There are only two certain\(^{51}\) instances of this usage, both funerary, one of them from Rome (no. 7) and the other from Beth She’arim in Galilee (no. 8). In the first, a text decorated with the menorah and other ritual objects, the deceased is described as *bona Iudea* and in the second as *Ioudea hosia*. Does *Ioudea* here have the same clear laudatory function as the adjacent epithets, *bona* and *hosia*? Avigad thought so, as his commentary on the Beth She’arim text (the epitaph of Sara, wife of Bariose) makes clear: “the purpose . . . is . . . to praise her in idiomatic terms in use even today, for example, ‘a wise Jew’, ‘a good Jew’, etc.”\(^{52}\). This interpretation seems the right one: *Jewishness*, in the sense of living an upright life in accordance with Jewish values, is a quality singled out for celebration in contemporary inscriptions. Sometimes, as in the *laudatio* of Regina, the Roman Jewess, the handling of this topic is very elaborate\(^{53}\). Closest to the economical treatment of it in our two inscriptions (supposing that the *Ioudaia* in each case is laudatory) is the phrase *kalos biosasa en to ioudaismo* in CIJ I\(^{2}\) 537 (Noy II 584)\(^{54}\). It is pertinent in this context to note that *Hebraios* too sometimes functions in a laudatory manner, as, for instance, in CIJ I\(^{3}\) 551 (Noy II no. 108), where the deceased, a young boy, is described as *Hebraios kai glukus*.

\[(b) \textit{Ioudaios} in a non-Jewish context\]

Rather more numerous, unsurprisingly, are the instances of *Ioudaios* in non-Jewish contexts. Examples have been found all over the Graeco-Roman world from periods as far apart as the 3rd century BCE and the 5th century CE and at sites as diverse as the Temple of Pan near Edfu in Egypt, the pagan necropolis at Termessos in Pisidia and the mainly Christian cemetery at Korykos in Cilicia\(^{55}\). Despite this

\[\text{---}\]

\(^{48}\)See n. 8 above.

\(^{49}\)Quite possibly they were Irene’s proselyte parents. So, attractively, G. Horsley as cited by van der Horst 111, n. 39.

\(^{50}\)Tomson, 131, n. 31 – “this clumsy emphasis remains enigmatic”. Simon interpreted it, correctly in my opinion, as an attempt to reinforce Irene’s proselyte status. See M. Simon, Verus Israel: a study of the relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (AD 135–425), trans. by H. McKeating, Oxford 1986, 485, n. 65.

\(^{51}\)Another may be Μαρια Ἱο[u]δαι[α] from the Lower Nomentana catacomb at Rome. See CIJ I\(^{2}\) 41, followed by H. J. Leon, The Jews of Ancient Rome, Philadelphia 1960, 270 and Appendix 1 no. 43 below. J. M. Reynolds has suggested reading here “Mara the daughter of Judas”. See CR 13, 1963, 332 (review of Leon). Though that is possible, there are no parallels among the other epitaphs in the catacomb for citing the patronymic in this way. Generally a fuller style, Χθυγατερ/Χυιος, is employed. See, for instance, CIJ I\(^{2}\) 30 and 67 = Noy II 454 and 452 (θυγατερ) and CIJ I\(^{2}\) 27; 31; 55 and 56 = Noy II 453, 457, 463 and 475 (χυιος).

\(^{52}\)N. Avigad, Beth She’arim III – Catacombs 12–23, New Brunswick, N. J. 1976, 31. For her husband, see BS II no. 161.

\(^{53}\)CIJ I\(^{2}\) 476 = Noy II 103. For translation and discussion, see van der Horst, 112.

\(^{54}\)Cf. politeusamenos pasan poleiteian kata ton ioudaismon in the famous donor inscription from Stobi in Macedonia (CIJ I\(^{2}\) 694).

\(^{55}\)Also of note is the ‘Ioudaios’ inscription, dated 42 CE, from the façade of one of the mainly pagan rock-cut tombs at Egra (Medain Saleh) in the northern Hedjaz. (For these, F. Millar, The Roman Near East 31 BC – AD 337, Cambridge,
diversity, the basic function of *Ioudaios* is always the same – to draw an explicit distinction between Jews and non-Jews. But what exactly was the epithet meant to convey?

In the three earliest texts, one certainly dating from the Hellenistic period (no. 9) and the other two (nos. 10–11) very probably so, it is hard to believe that the epithet, in each case used self-definitively, is doing any more than reflecting an awareness of ethnic difference. Traditional Jewish *Frömmigkeit* is certainly not in evidence nor “much communal Jewish feeling”\(^{57}\). In two of them, graffiti produced by Jewish devotees at the temple of Pan at Edfu (nos. 10 and 11), the deity is praised in language so ambiguous that to this day the identity of the god towards whom they were directing their devotion and thanks is disputed, some claiming it was the Jewish God and others Pan himself. From the third text (no. 9), a long inscription from the shrine of Amphiarao at Oropos in central Greece, we can deduce that the slave, Moschos, son of Moschion *Ioudaios*, had been engaging in what were (from a Jewish viewpoint) decidedly impious practices. For he had been sacrificing a ram to the resident deity, incubating in his sanctuary\(^{58}\) and then, “as a result of a dream”, setting up a stele near the altar “at the command of the god Amphiarao and Hygeia”.

In the later inscriptions, however, all of which come from public cemeteries, located mostly in Asia Minor, *Ioudaios*, either on its own or accompanied by symbols such as the menorah, is consistently used to emphasise membership of the Jewish community and simultaneously suggest apartness from the rest of local society, whether predominately pagan or Christian.

In 3rd century Hierapolis, for instance, where there was a *katoikia/laos Ioudaion* with roots going back to the Seleucid period\(^{59}\), it would appear that the function of the term *Ioudaios* primarily was to stress involvement in the life of this ancient community. This we can deduce from clues on each of the three ‘*Ioudaios*’ tombs: on one, we find a depiction of the *shofar*, *lulab* and *menorah* (no. 17), on another, the *menorah* alone (no. 18) and, on the third, an elaborate statement of ownership in which the *laos Ioudaion* is made the sole guarantor of the tomb’s inviability (no. 16). (In the pagan epitaphs of Hierapolis, by contrast, fines for violating the tomb generally are payable to the local *gerousia* and/or ‘the most holy treasury’\(^{60}\).)

At 3rd century Termessos, this same desire to emphasise social and religious differences can also be observed. Here the evidence occurs on a tomb specially set up by a pagan father for a Jewish (possibly proselyte) daughter (see Appendix 2 below) – a phenomenon nowhere else attested in the Graeco-Roman world. Aurelia Artemeis’ desire to be treated differently from the rest of her family can be seen first of all in her burial apart from them (its solitariness is stressed in her epitaph). Her different religious values can be deduced from the unusual character of the arrangements for the protection of her tomb: the customary (for Termessos) reference to Zeus Solymeis, an example of which is to be found on the adjacent tomb of her uncle, Markos Aurelios Moles\(^{61}\), is omitted. The description of Aurelia Artemeis as *Ioudea* was not casual: hers was an expensive tomb, the long epitaph is carefully inscribed and the fact that she was a Jewess the one piece of information we are given about her. The desire to make clear to the passer-by in this overwhelmingly pagan necropolis the distinctive character of her religiosity and piety is patent.

---

\(^{56}\) All modern scholars regard them as Ptolemaic, W. Schwartz (1806) alone suggesting a possible Roman date. See P. M. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria II, Oxford 1972, 302, n. 353.


\(^{58}\) On the well-attested rituals at the Amphiarion, see “Oropus” in OCD and Lewis (previous note), 265.


\(^{60}\) For a comprehensive list, see C. Humann, C. Cichorius, W. Judeich and F. Winter, *Altertümer von Hierapolis*, Berlin 1898, 184.

\(^{61}\) TAM III no. 612. For other examples, see TAM III p. 354.
In early Byzantine Korykos too we see the epithet being used to advertise communal and religious differences (nos. 21–23). In this largely Christian necropolis characterisation of the deceased as Ioudaios (and later Hebraios) was but one of several devices used to distinguish the graves of members of the Jewish community from those of the town’s Christian majority. On the tomb of Damianos (no. 21), it occurs on its own. (cf. nos. 19 and 20) In nos. 22 and 23 it is given added force by being accompanied by depictions of the menorah.

(iii) The interpretation of Ioudaios on some stones whose original context is unknown

In all the cases so far analysed, the general physical context has been the prime factor in determining the broad function of Ioudaios. With inscriptions from non-Jewish contexts, chronology, too, has emerged as being important: Ioudaios in inscriptions from the Hellenistic period clearly lacks the religious and communal character that it consistently has in texts from the early Roman imperial and Byzantine eras. Given this pattern in the evidence, it becomes feasible to try and identify the likely function of Ioudaios in inscriptions whose date and context can be established with a fair degree, only, of probability.

Take, for instance, the north African inscriptions from Cirta, Sitifis and Auzia (nos. 27–32), whose original context is unknown. All, as we have seen, have been the subject of much speculation by Kraemer. On palaeographic and onomastic grounds, these epitaphs are generally dated to the 2nd–3rd centuries CE. In all probability they came from communal city-cemeteries: while Iudaeus has never been securely attested in north Africa in a wholly Jewish context, it is found in a non-Jewish one – namely the Roman necropolis of Sala (Rabat) in Mauretania. Given this, the balance of probability must be that in each of these texts Iudaeus is functioning as a term of social and religious differentiation.

The four Ioudaios inscriptions from Asia Minor (nos. 26, 33, 36 and 37), none of which has ever been dated earlier than the 2nd–3rd centuries CE, must be similarly interpreted, for in their case it is even more likely that they emanated from communal city cemeteries. To date, no separate Jewish burial grounds have been identified in Asia Minor in the Graeco-Roman period. There is, however, indisputable evidence for the burial of Jews in a number of urban necropoleis there, most notably those of Hierapolis and Korykos. Thus in the case of that great Smyrnaean lady, Rufina Ioudaia
archisynagogos (no. 36), there is no need to suppose that she was a Judaean immigrant or named Rufina Ioudaia. Most likely she is using Ioudaia in the same way as her (broad) contemporaries at Hierapolis, Termessos and elsewhere – i.e. she is publicising, in her case in an official notice, her pride in her membership of the local Jewish community – ho en Smyrne laos, as it is called in another inscription. Several features of the text combine to confirm this interpretation: e.g. the prominence she gives to the word Ioudaia (it occupies virtually half of the first line of the inscription) and the mention she makes of her high status within the community – she was archisynagogos.

Not all the inscriptions of uncertain provenance, however, are so readily susceptible of interpretation. Where date and ancient context are wholly unknown, as, for instance, with the stone from the museum of Larisa in Thessaly mentioning Pontiana, the Jewess (no. 40), it is generally best avoided. In this text, the epitaph of her son, Boukolion, son of Hermias, we have the epigraphic equivalent of Timothy’s family in the Acts of the Apostles 16.1–2 – Boukolion, like Timothy, had a Greek father and a Jewish mother. But how to interpret Ioudaia in this case is not clear, for we do not know whether Pontiana was a Jewess by birth and thus possibly using the epithet in an ethnic sense or through conversion and thus using it in a religious one.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to challenge Tomson’s and Kraemer’s views of the meaning and significance of Ioudaios and to make some contribution to the ongoing debate about the problems of interpreting Jewish epigraphic material from the Graeco-Roman world. Both of these scholars are to a certain degree correct in their analyses of the evidence but both overstate their case. Although, as Tomson’s massive bi-partite study shows, Ioudaios very frequently does function as a term of “outside identity”, there are times when it does not. Besides the epigraphic exceptions noted above, there is numismatic and papyrological evidence that does not fit into his schema. Equally, Kraemer is correct in observing that many of the words, phrases and symbols often taken as unquestionably Jewish are ambiguous. But, while there are indeed huge grey areas in the epigraphic field (of many inscriptions it is impossible to know if they are Jewish, pagan or Christian), the Ioudaios inscriptions do not constitute one of them. Both the meaning and the function of the epithet seem to me to be remarkably clear: used with pride by both those born as Jews and those converted to Judaism, it might, depending on place and time, serve either to stress similarities or to emphasise differences.

Korykos (i.e. whether in Zone A, B or C of the necropolis), see details at, for instance, MAMA III 222; 237; 262; 295; 344; 440; 607; 679. Also from communal cemeteries are the two Cilician inscriptions – CIJ II 784 (Seleukeia on the Kalykadnos) and 795. On the exact findspot of the latter, see E. L. Hicks, JHS 12, 1891, 269. It came from Diokaisarea, not Olba, as stated by Frey in CIJ. So correctly H. Bloedhorn, JSS 35, 1990, 68.

71 “un avis au public”. So S. Reinach, REJ 7 (1883) 166.
72 IK Smyrna I 296.
74 E.g. the coins of Alexander Jannaeus which bear the legend: Hever ha-Yehudim (Society of the Jews) and the letter of Bar Kokhba’s commanders about the kitreiahelen Ioudaion (citron-celebration of the Jews). Tomson’s attempts (129–130) to explain these away are not convincing.
75 Amply demonstrated in Kraemer, 1991 (n. 3).
Appendix 1

(i) **Ioudaios** as a personal name

1. [ἕρχοντος Ἐμμενίδα τοῦ] Καλλία [μ]ηνὸς Ἀπελλαίου, ἐπὶ το[ῖς] ἄπεδοτο Κλέων Κλευδάμου, συνεπανευώνσεις Ξενοφανείας τάς [μ]ητρὸς Κλευδάμου, τοί Ἀπόλλων τοῦ Πυθίων σώμα ἄνδρειον ὡς ὄνομα Ἰουδαῖος τὸ γένος Ἰουδαίων, τιμᾶς ἄργυριον μὴν τεσσάρων . . . (CIJ I2 710 – Delphi; 162 BCE) = In the archonship of Emmenidas, the son of Kallias, in the month of Apellaios, Kleon, son of Kleudamos, with the consent of Xenophaneia, the mother of Kleudamos, has sold to Apollo Pythios a male person, by name Ioudaios, a Jew by race, for the sum of four silver minas on these conditions . . .

2. ἄρχοντος Ἡρακλείδα, μη[ν]ὸς Ποιτροπίου, ἄπεδοτο Ἡρακλείδας, ἀνευδοκήσα τοῦ γιοῦ Πινδάρου, τοί Ἀπολλων[ι]νι σώμα ἄνδρειον, ὡς ὄνομα Ἀμφιάραος . . . (CIJ I2 711 – Delphi; 119 BCE) = During the archonship of Herakleidas, in the month of Poitropios, Ioudaios, son of Pindaros, has, with the agreement of his son Pindaros, sold to Apollo a male slave, Amyntas by name . . .

(iii) **Ioudaios** in a Jewish context

3. *Cresce(n)s Sinicerius Iudeus proselitus vixit ann(is) XXXV dormitione(m) accepit. mat(er) dul(cisimo) fil(io) suo fec(it) qu(o)d ips(e) mihi deb(it) facere. VIII K(a)l(endas) Ian(uarias) (CIJ I2 68 = Noy II 491 – Rome, 3rd–4th cent. C.E.) = Cresce(n)s Sinicerius, a Jew (and) a proselyte, (who) lived for 35 years, has fallen asleep. His mother has done for her sweet son what he should have done for me. 8 days before the Kalends of January (i.e. 25th December).

4. *Εἰρήνη τρεξτῆ προσήλυτος πατρός καὶ μητρὸς Εἰούδα ίσιδραλήτης ἔξησεν ἤτ(η) γʹ μ(ήνας) ζʹ ἡμ(ήρον) αʹ* (CIJ I2 21 = Noy II 489 – Rome, 3rd–4th cent. CE (?)) = Eirene, a foster-child, a convert to Judaism through her father and mother, a Jewess (and) an Israelite, has lived for 3 years and 1 day.


6. Ἐπὶ κτίτε Ἡρμιὰ Ἰουδαία ἀπὸ Λαοδίκαιας ἦττες ἔξησεν ἑπὶ πε’ τε’ τοῦ Ἐδεσίου MENORAH (CIJ I2 296 = Noy II 183 – Rome, 3rd–4th cent. CE (?)) = Here lies Ammias, a Jewess from Laodicea, who lived for 85 years. Peace.


8. ὁδὲ κτίτε Σάρα Ἰουδαία ὁσία (BS II 158 – Beth She’arim, 3rd cent. CE) = Here lies Sara, a pious Jewess.

(iii) **Ioudaios** in a non-Jewish context

9. Μόσχος Μοσχίων Ἰουδαίος ἐνύπνιον ἱδὼν προστάξαντος τοῦ θεοῦ Ἀμφιαράου καὶ τῆς Ὡγείας, καθά συνετέξει ὁ Ἀμφιαράους καὶ ἡ Ὡγεία ἐν στήλη γράφαντα ἀναθείην πρὸς τοῦ βωμοῦ (CIJ I2 711b, lines 10–14 – shrine of Amphiaras at Oropos, circa 300–250 BCE) = Moschos, son of Moschion, a Jew, as a result of a dream (has set up this stele) at the command of the god Amphiaras and Hygeia, in accordance with the orders of Amphiaras and Hygeia to write these things on a stele and set (it) up by the altar.

11. εὐλαγητὸς τὸν θεόν. Πτολεμαῖος Διονυσίος Ἰουδαῖος (CIJ II 1538 = HN 122 – same provenance and date as the previous entry) = Praise God! Ptolemy, son of Dionysios, a Jew.


13. Μαρείνος Πτολεμαῖος Ἰουδαῖος (Le Bohec 78 = AE 1949, 142 – Sala (Rabat) in Mauretania Tingitana, late 2nd cent. CE (?!)) = Mareinos Ptolemaios, a Jew.

14. τοῦτο τὸ ἱερὸν Ἡς(λ)εύκου Ἡζ(τ)λου καὶ Ἰαμίας Ἀ[... καὶ] Σαμουηλου Γορί[τ]η[ν]] Ἰουδαίου (CIJ II 1417 – Edessa, early 3rd cent. CE, according to Schürer, revised by Vermes, Millar, Goodman III 9) = This is the tomb of Seleukos, son of Izates and Iamias, son of A[... ] and Samouelos, son of Gordianos (?), Jews.

15. For the text and translation of the 3rd cent. epitaph of Aur(elia) Artemeis Ioudea (sic) from Termessos in Pisidia, see Appendix 2 below.

16. ἡ σορὸς καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ αὐτῆς τῆς στέρεως σὺν τῷ βαθρικῷ καὶ τῷ τόπῳ Ἀυράηλλας Γλυκωνήδος Ἀρμανου καὶ τοῦ ἄνδρος αὐτῆς Ἄρηκου Ἀυράηλ(ίου) Ἀλεξάνδρου Θεοφίλου ἑπίκλαι[. . .]. [sic]. ἣν Ἱουδαίου ἐν Ἡ ἡ ἱεροτατοστοι[α]ν αὐτοῦ ἐτέρῳ δὲ οὐδενὶ ἱέστηκεν κηδεύειν εἰς αὐτῆς τινα; [sic] δὲ μὴ ἀποτείςει τὸ λαών τῇ Ἰουδαία[ν] προστεί[μ]ου ὁ νόμος διναρίας χείλειας. τῶν τῆς ἑπιγραφῆς ἀπόλου ἥν ἤμετρον ἐπέθεξε εἰς τὰς ἀρχιά (CIJ II 776, as emended by Robert, Hellenica 11–12, 1960, 261, n. 1 – Hierapolis, 3rd cent. CE = Judeich p. 96, no. 69) = This tomb and the base on which it rests [and] the site (belong to) Aurelia Glykones, daughter of Ammianos, and her husband, M(arkos) Aur(elios) Alexander, son of Theophilos, also called [. . .]ph. [. .]os, Jews. It is for their burial. No one else shall be allowed to bury anyone else in it. Otherwise, he shall pay to the community of the Jews by way of a fine one thousand denarii. A copy of this inscription has been deposited in the record office.

17. ἡ σορὸς καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς καθ’ οὗ ἐπείκειται Μάρκου Ἀυράηλίου Φιλομενίου Στρυνεύνως Ἰουδαίῳ MENORAH SHOFAR LULAB (BE 84, 1971, 645 – Hierapolis, “époque impériale”) = The tomb and the altar on which it stands (belong to) Mar(kos) Aur(elios) Philoumenes, son of Streneion, a Jew.


19. ἐνθάδε κεῖται Ἀλεξάνδρος Ανεμουρίους Ἰουδαῖος σὺν τῇ συνβίῳ αὐτοῦ, ἐὰν ὁν τις παρενοχληθῇ ἡμεῖς, δῶσε τῷ ἱεροτάτῳ τωμαίῳ ἰδινάρια, βφ’ (CIJ II 786 = MAMA III 222 – Korykos, 3rd cent. CE (?!)) = Here lies Alexander, citizen of Anemurion, a Jew, together with his wife. If anyone disturbs us, he shall pay to the most sacred treasury 2,500 denarii.

20. ἐνθάδε κεῖτε Ἰουδᾶς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρας Νισαιῶν [ὑπὲ]ρ Ἰουδαίων. ἐὰν οὖν τις παρενοχλήσῃ ἡμεῖς, δῶσε τῷ ἱεροτάτῳ τωμαίῳ ἰδινάρια, βφ’ (CIJ II 791 = MAMA III 440 – Korykos, 3rd cent. CE (?!)) = Here lie Ioudas and Alexas, sons of Nisaios, Jews. If anyone disturbs us, he shall pay to the most sacred treasury 2,500 denarii.

21. ἡ τήκη Δαμιανοῦ Ἰουδαίου (CIJ II 789 = MAMA III 295 - Korykos, 4th cent. CE or later) = [Tomb of] Damia(n)os, a Jew.

22. ἡ τήκη Δαμιανοῦ Ἰουδαίου πρεσβύτερον μυρεψῆν 2 MENOROT (CIJ II 790 = MAMA III 344 – Korykos, 4th–5th cent. CE) = Tomb of Eusambatios, a Jew, an Elder, a perfumer.

23. ἡ τήκη Δαμιανοῦ Ἰουδαίου MENORAH (CIJ II 794 = MAMA III 679 - Korykos, 4th–5th cent. CE (?!)) = (Tomb of) Samoes, Kopas and Auxentios, Jews.
(iv) Ioudaios where the original context is unknown

24. L. Aiacius P. l(ibertus) Dama Iudaeus portor (ivus) s(ibi) f(ecit) (CIJ I 643 = Noy I 7 – Aquileia, 1st cent. BCE (?) = L.(ucius) Aiacius Dama, freedman of Publius, a Jew (and) a customs official (?) has erected (this tomb) during his lifetime or has willingly fulfilled his vow.

25. Alucius Roscius C(ai) l(ibertus) h(ic) s(itus) e(st) Iudaeus . . . (rest of text unintelligible). (Noy I 188 – vicinity of Mérida, Spain; 1st–3rd cent. (?)) = Alucius (?) Roscius, freedman of Caius, a Jew, lies here

26. [τοÚtò tÒ Ïmtì]- τοÚtò tÒ Ïmtì- [μòrì Ïm tÌ]ν [μòrì Ïm Ïììn] [ . . . ] [ . . . ] ΄Εφε- 'Ιούδα 'Εφ[εσίον] [σίου Ιούδά] πο [Ιούδείου] (Final fragmentary line omitted) (SEG 39, 1989, 1222 – Ephesus, 2nd-3rd cents. CE) = (Left part of marble plaque) – [This half of the tomb] belongs to . . . ios, son of . . . , an Ephesian (and) a Jew. (Right part) – This half of the tomb belongs to Aur(elios) Sam[bathios], son of Ioudas, an Ephesian (and) a Jew.

27. Iulius Anianus Iudeus filius patri suo karissimo posuit; v(ixit) an(nis) (septuaginta quinque) (Le Bohec 69 = CIL VIII.I 7150 – Cirta in Numidia, no earlier than 2nd–3rd cents. CE) = Iulius Anianus, a Jew, son, has set up (this monument) for his dearest father, (who) lived for 75 years.

28. Pompeius Restutus Judeus Pompeia Cara patri rarissimo fecit (Le Bohec 70 – CIL VIII.I 7155 – Cirta, same location and date as previous entry) = To Pompeius Restutus (sic), a Jew. Pompeia Cara has set (this monument) up for her most remarkable father.


30. Caelia Thalassa Iudaea vixit ann(is) (viginti) m(ensibus) (quattuor); M(arcus) Avilius Ianuarius coniugi karissimae (Le Bohec 73 = CIL VIII.2 8423 – near Sitifis in Mauretania, 2nd–3rd cents. CE) = Caelia Thalassa, a Jewess, has lived for 20 years (and) 4 months. M(arcus) Avilius Ianuarius (has set this up) for his dearest wife.


32. Furfanius Honoratus Iudeus vix(it) pl(us) m(inus) ?? (incomprehensible sign) ant(nis) (quadraginta quinque) . . . Cl(audia) Honorata [mat]er fecit (Le Bohec 76 = CIL VIII Supp. III–IV 20759 – Auzia in Mauretania Caesariensis; 2nd–3rd cents. CE) = Furfanius Honoratus, a Jew, has lived for forty-five years more or less. His mother, Claudia Honorata, has set (this) up.

33. Άτονς τμῆ'. Άυ[ρι]δου(ο) 'Αλέξανδρος 'Ιουδάιος ζ[ίων] κατεσκεύασε τὸ μνημεῖον (CIJ II 764 – Diokleia in Phrygia, not Ammonia, as stated in CIJ; 257/8 CE) = Year 342. Aur(elios) Alexander, a Jew, has built this tomb during his lifetime.

34. Αύρη(λί)νας Διονυσίστας 'Ιουδάτος Τιβέρ(ί)ν(ῆ)σιν(ῶν) ἀν(νάρων) XXXXX φι(λί)άρων τρίουν πάτερ (CIL III 10055 = CIL I 680 – Senia in Dalmatia, 3rd cent. CE (?) = Aurelius Dionysius, a Jew from Tiberias, aged 50, father of three children – i.e. possessor of ius trium liberorum.

35. [Άννα?] nia Sal[omono]ni? Iula portor (no) I mensibus) III die I ludaeae (CIJ F 665 = Noy I 179 – Abdera in Spain, 3rd cent. CE (?) = Anna (? Salomonula (or perhaps Saloninula), 1 year, 4 months (and) 1 day. A Jewess.

The Meaning and Function of Ioudaios

From the document:

37. Στράτων Τυρράννου Ἰουδαίου ζῶν τὸ μνημεῖον κατασκεύασε ἠτῶσι καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις (CIJ II 753 = IK Magnesia am Sipylos 27 – Magnesia, undated) = Straton, son of Tyrannus, a Jew, has erected this tomb during his lifetime for himself and his wife and his children.


39. Βουκολίων τοῦ ζῶν τὸν Ἰουδαίον (IG IX.2 834 = CIJ I 2 697 – Larisa, undated) = Boukolion, son of Hermias and of Pontiana, the Jewess.

Uncertain instances of Ioudaios

41. ἡ Σορᾶ καὶ ὁ τόπος Ἁὔρηλίου Ἀννίου Εἰνόνιος Ἰουδεῖου (?=) ἐν ἑαυτῷ κηδευθήσεται αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Λύρη(λία) Μεν(ανδρίς) Παπίου, κηδευθεῖσον δὲ καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν ἑτέρῳ δὲ ὁμώς ἐν ἑαυτῷ κηδευθεῖσον. ἐν δὲ τῷ παρὰ τὴν ἐπίγραφὴν ἐπεναλθησείν, ἀπότισε τῷ εἰεροτάτῳ τοιῷ δηνάρια πεντεκόσια. τοὺς τῆς ἐπίγραφῆς τὸ ἀντίγραφον κεῖται ἐν τῷ ἀρχικῷ (Judeich p. 97, no. 72 = CIJ II 778 – Hierapolis, 3rd cent. CE) = The tomb and the site are the property of Aurelios Annios Einon (= Simon?), a Jew (?), in which he will be buried and his wife Aurelia Menandris, daughter of Papios, and their children will be buried. No one else shall be buried (in it). If anyone acts against this inscription, he shall pay to the most sacred treasury five hundred denarii. A copy of this inscription is to be found in the archive office.

Appendix 2 – Aurelia Artemeis Ioudea (sic) of Termessos

Kraemer’s welcome attempt to give Aurelia Artemeis of Termessos a sharper profile unfortunately is marred by her complete mistranslation of one of the two inscriptions relating to her – namely the epitaph of her uncle, Markos Aurelios Moles, in TAM III 612. This has led to not only the misrepresentation of relationships within her family but even the invention of a non-existent person76. To clarify the situation, I present here (a) the two relevant inscriptions accompanied by translations, (b) a stemma and (c) a brief discussion of the likely meaning of Aurelia’s epithet, Ioudea.

(a) The evidence for Aurelia Artemeis and her family

(i) Μ(ᾶρκος) Ἀὐρ(ήλιος) Ἑρμαῖος(ζ) δίς Κευν τὴν σωματοθήκην τῇ θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἀὐρ(ηλία) Ἀρτεμείς Ἰουδαίας μονήν ἄλλω δὲ μὴ δεν ἐξον εἴναι ἐπειθάνει τινά, ἐπὶ ὑ πειράσας ἐκτίσ[ei]

76 Kraemer, 1989, 44.
M. H. Williams

τὸ ἱερωτάτῳ ταμίῳ ἀρκόν Κόλπα καὶ ἠνοχοῖς ἠτταὶ ὑκλήματι [τυμβωροχίας] (TAM III 448 – from area E 10 of the necropolis of Termessos in Pisidia – 3rd cent. CE) = M(arkos) A(urelios) H(ermaios) son of Hermaios, son of Keues, (has set up) the sarcophagus for his daughter Aur(elia) Artemeis, a Jewess, alone. No one else has the right to bury anyone else (in it). He who attempts (to do so) shall pay 10,000 denarii to the most sacred treasury and be liable to a charge of [tomb-violation].

(ii) M(arkos) A(urelios) M(oles, son of Hermaios, son of Keues, (has set up) the sarcophagus for himself and for his wife, Aur(elia) Artemeis, also called Korkaina. No one else has the right to bury (anyone else in it). He who attempts (to do so) shall pay to Zeus Solymeis 1,500 denarii and to the most sacred treasury 2,000 denarii.

(b) Stemma of the family of Aurelia Artemeis

Keues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hermaios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


∞

Aurelia Artemeis

also called Korkaina

(c) The meaning of Ioudea in TAM III 448

It will have been observed that the wife and the niece of Markos Aurelios Moles both had the same name – an extremely common one at Termessos (Heberdey, in the index of TAM III, lists over fifty women called Aurelia Artemeis!). It was doubtless for this reason that Moles’ wife bore an additional identifier, namely the signum Korkaina77. But what is the significance of the epithet borne by his niece? Heberdey suggested that the younger Aurelia Artemeis was called Ioudea simply because her mother was Jewish78. While that cannot be ruled out, Aurelia Artemeis’ pronounced fastidiousness with regard to paganism, revealed by both the separateness of her burial79, as well as the omission from her epitaph of the customary reference to Zeus Solymeis, points more strongly towards her having been a proselyte80. If I am right in this, then Aurelia Artemeis joins the very select band of upper class Graeco-Roman women who, instead of flirting with Judaism, fully embraced its tenets81.

Edinburgh Margaret H. Williams

77 Another nine of the women called Artemeis listed by Heberdey, also resorted to this onomastic device. See TAM III, p. 317.
78 See TAM III 448, comm ad loc.
79 On this point, see L. Robert, Hellenica 11–12, 1960, 386.
80 Although Kraemer, ibid., notes this as a possibility, she falls to pursue the point, becoming diverted instead by speculation about the possible reasons (e.g. death, divorce) for the absence of any mention of Aurelia Artemeis’ mother in TAM III 448.
81 E.g. Fulvia, wife of Saturninus (Josephus AJ 18.82); Beturia Paulla (CIJ I 2 523 = Noy II 577).