Dedicatory Inscriptions by Women at Carthage[*]

Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo
("Sapienza" Università di Roma)

Abstract

The present study is devoted to a collection and partial analysis of the dedications offered by women in Carthage's *tophet* and edited in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* (*pars prima*). A group of these dedications had been analysed in an article appeared in 1988, which is presented again here translated into English, with slight corrections. A study of the lacking inscribed material has now been carried on. The results of both studies show that a proportion of more than 10% of the Carthaginian dedications were offered by women of different social classes. The purpose of these offerings is not clear, due to the standardised formularies of the dedications. It seems however that their purpose was not obligatory tied to the desire of an offshoot.

1. Purpose and first analysis

Emphasis has often been placed on the uniform nature of direct written sources regarding Carthage: the thousands of inscriptions from the *tophet*[1], the formula of which is highly standardised, only provide us with personal names, a few titles of functions and professions and some grammatical indications. The banal nature of the texts, combined with the lack of an index of the *CIS*, renders any study or classification of the inscriptions from Carthage a particularly unrewarding pursuit that has never seemed to serve any useful purpose. It is, however, only by means of applying such a classification that the documents in question can be of use. On the one hand, we can thus obtain grammatical, morphological and orthographic indications and, on the other, a series of pieces of information of a fundamentally sociological nature. In the field of proper names, we must study, for example, the date and spread of papponymy[2], the use, within the same family, of similar proper names and the eventual reasons underpinning "characteristic" names.

---

[*] This article is a translated version of Amadasi Guzzo 1988, with some slight corrections, an updated bibliography, and a final addition.

[1] Most of the over 6,000 Punic inscriptions from Carthage, currently published in the *CIS*, are from the *tophet*.

[2] Information in this respect is limited by the fact that we do not know whether the offerer was the first-born.

The study of the names of professions, functions and the public officials, not only from the point of view of the terms used[3] but also, and above all, their diffusion, can provide important information regarding the relative distribution of the social categories[4] who made sacrifices at the *tophet*, as well as furnishing additional indications as to the nature of this cultic site[5]. In effect, the presence of inscriptions by slaves (*ʿbd*)[6] or by individuals who are indicated as "belonging" (*š*) to another person, shows that all social classes could make offerings in this centre of the cult. The spread of inscribed stelae by all social ranks also informs us on the use of writing during the Hellenistic period.

As we are in the process of classifying all of the Punic inscriptions from the *tophet*, we would like to provide here a few examples of the kind of work envisaged, taking as our basis the dedications made by a specific category, namely women.

Of the 3747 dedicatory inscriptions registered, that is *CIS* I 178-3245 and 5260-5940 (the subsequent texts are funerary or of mixed genres), 406 are dedications made by women[7], that is to say more than 10% of the total number of texts under consideration. The name of the person making the dedication is illegible or only partially legible in 54 of these texts, but here we shall leave aside the study of onomastics which has been more

---

[3]   Cf. FÉVRIER 1948.

[4]   For use of the data from the inscriptions in a reconstruction of social organisation, cf. MOSCATI 1968; SZNYCER 1975; SCHIFFMANN 1976: 50-52, for the inscriptions in general cf. HUSS 1985, especially p. 496-503. Regarding women see FERJAOUI 1999 (with details not present in my article of 1988, in particular lists concerning rank and origin of the family, father's profession, etc.). In general, cf. also LANCELLOTTI 2003.

[5]   Cf. fn. 8.

[6]   Cf. for *ʿbd*, for ex.: *CIS* I 236, 253, 318, 319; for *š*: *CIS* I 317, 5714, 5735, 5895, 5933.

[7]   Lists of dedications considered to have been made by women: *CIS* I 191, 207, 212, 216, 221, 222, 226, 228, 231, 232, 263, 273, 279, 280, 281, 302, 304, 307 308, 321, 349, 362, 371, 372, 375, 378, 382, 383, 385, 386, 387 395, 401, 402, 406, 409, 414, 415, 417, 429, 430, 438, 441, 444, 446, 452, 453, 459, 462, 469, 470, 479, 481, 482 (=1069), 486, 495, 502, 515, 517, 532, 533, 553, 564, 580, 582, 595, 600, 605, 624, 627, 628, 644, 646, 661, 675, 677, 696, 709, 712, 713, 717, 725, 727, 730, 731, 740, 759, 760, 768, 770, 775, 789, 792, 810, 815, 818, 843, 846, 848, 853, 857, 868, 877, 879, 881 , 884, 887, 894, 895, 896, 912, 948, 954, 961, 967, 968, 980, 98'C 988, 1014, 1017, 1033, 1039, 1043, 1044, 1062, 1069 (=482), 1077, 1101, 1105, 1106, 1118, 1129, 1149, 1150, 1153, 1157, 1162, 1163, 1165, 1173, 1181, 1189, 1193, 1200, 1209, 1210, 1214, 1216, 1219, 1244, 1246, 1253, 1256, 1259, 1260, 1264, 1267 1268, 1301, 1304, 1317, 1322, 1335, 1339, 1343, 1348, 1359, 1362, 1366, 1371, 1372, 1384, 1385, 1389, 1400, 1407, 1416, 1417, 1427, 1428, 1434, 1446, 1447, 1453, 1460, 1464, 1480, 1482, 1490, 1495, 1504, 1515, 1516, 1518, 1519, 1520, 1531, 1532, 1542, 1543, 1546, 1554, 1560, 1561, 1565, 1573, 1575, 1583, 1585, 1762, 1811, 1852, 1880, 1885, 1901, 1903, 1905, 1923, 1926, 1928, 1939/ 1949, 1957, 1967, 1982, 1989, 2005, 2010, 2021, 2023, 2024, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2033, 2035, 2045, 2051, 2058, 2063, 2065, 2069, 2073, 2074, 2082, 2092, 2097, 2107, 2114, 2116, 2118, 2121, 2134, 2145, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2158, 2159, 2169, 2173, 2174, 2181, 2201, 2202, 2204, 2208, 2211, 2216, 2221, 2224, 2230, 2243, 2244, 2267, 2274, 2279, 2308, 2313, 2354, 2376, 2397, 2411, 2434, 2445, 2446, 2450, 2451, 2468, 2485, 2491, 2508, 2515, 2518, 2535, 2538, 2559, 2560, 2562, 2573, 2576, 2578, 2593, 2605, 2612, 2622, 2632 (= 2683), 2641, 2645, 2647, 2655, 2657 2668, 2670, 2680, 2683 (= 2632), 2685, 2694, 2732, 2738, 2755, 2760, 2769, 2774, 2780, 2782, 2788, 2798, 2814, 2818, 2831, 2856, 2857, 2868, 2892, 2894, 2907, 2923, 2931, 2933, 2987, 2993, 2995, 3010, 3026, 3038, 3042, 3047, 3071, 3075, 3083, 3087, 3127, 3148, 3149, 3162 (=3165), 3171, 3207, 3212, 3214, 3219, 3220, 3226, 3238, 3240, 3243, 5273, 5502, 5517, 5521, 5541, 5547 5586, 5599, 5662, 5692, 5697 (=5886), 5699, 5702, 5713, 5733, 5738, 5745, 5756, 5758 (=5911), 5759, 5761, 5764, 5771, 5773, 5775, 5778, 5779, 5822, 5823, 5844, 5863, 5866, 5870, 5876, 5878, 5881, 5883, 5886 (= 5697), 5911 (= 5758), 5918, 5924, 5939, 5940.

than amply dealt with elsewhere. As regards the identification of the woman making the offering who, according to the generally accepted reconstruction of the rites practiced in the *tophet*[8]*,* must have offered her own child or an animal as its substitute, one would expect her to be identified by her husband's name, as is the case in a number of funerary inscriptions where the name of the deceased woman is followed by her genealogy and the name of her husband, with or without his genealogy[9]. This is not, however, the case in the majority of the inscriptions from the *tophet*; the woman offering the sacrifice is generally identified by her patronymic followed by the name of other eventual ancestors, whereas the name of the husband is given in only 8 of the examples registered: *CIS* I 232, 385, 627, 1253, 1885, 2647, 3185, 5844. It should be noted that only in text 627 do we find the name of both the father and husband of the woman making the dedication, *ʾmtmlqrt bt bdʿštrt ʾšt ʾdrbʿl* ("Amotmelqart, daughter of Bodashtart, wife of Addirbaal"). At the end of the inscription 3185 a certain *ʿmtmlqrt* (*sic*) *ʿšt* (*sic*) *ʾdnbʿl* is cited whose relationship to the offeror is unknown due to a break in the stone.

If, as is general practice, we assume that when the dedication is made by a man this would have been the father of the child offered (or offerer of the substitute sacrifice), then we may further imagine that he makes his offering also in the name of the mother, which would be normal praxis in a patriarchal society. When the offering is made by a woman, the father clearly is relegated to second place, for reasons which we cannot determine or judge. In those few cases where the husband is also mentioned, we could presume that the woman's family was sufficiently important to merit mention alongside or even before that of the husband, although we have no certain evidence to confirm this. Nor are such uncertainties resolved by the banal hypothesis that it was the mother who was named in the inscription if it was she who promised her child to the gods in exchange for grace, like Hannah at Shiloh[10]. We must also, undoubtedly, take into account births outside wedlock.

As had already been noted, women also appear in the genealogies as mother of the offerer, who is qualified in terms of a matronymic instead of the more usual patronymic. This is the case in *CIS* I 253, where the offerer is *ʿbdʾšmn bn ʾmʿštrt bt ytnṣd* ("Abdeshmun, son of Emashtart, daughter of Yatonsid"), and *CIS* I 902, where the offerer is *ʾrš bn gdnm* (*sic*) *bt ʿlšt*. This latter example seems particularly interesting as the genealogy provided is purely feminine, *ʿlšt* being a name given solely to women. To these may be added examples in which the person making the dedication is identified by a matronymic and not a patronymic, that is: *CIS* I 378, was offered by *ʾbʿl bt gdnʿmt*, who is qualified by the term *ʾmtʾlm* "servant of the god"; *CIS* I 383 was possibly offered by *gdnʿm bt ʾršt*; *CIS* I 1407 was given by *ʾbbl* (*sic*) *bt kbdt*, and, lastly, *CIS* I 2798, was dedicated by *ʾrštbʿl bt ṣdnt bt ʿštrtytn*. Examples of this type have been explained by A.

---

[8] Cf. in particular LEGLAY 1966: 311-358, AMADASI GUZZO 1986 A (with bibliography); further, with reservations, HEIDER 1985. In support of the interpretation of the *tophet* as a cult place and children's cemetery, cf. RIBICHINI 1985; MOSCATI 1987. For further bibliography see MELCHIORRI 2013 and the contributions in XELLA 2013. Regarding the rite in Israel, see DEWRELL 2017. Recently, for the archaeological D'ANDREA 2014; discussion of interpretations in D'ANDREA 2018.

[9] Cf., for example, *CIS* I 5941, 5950, 5958, 5961, 5979, 5987, 5988, 5991, 5994; with only the name and genealogy of the deceased: *CIS* I 5945, 5948, 5949, 5957, 5966.

[10] 1 Sam. 1, 2.

Verger[11] on the basis of the practice of sacred prostitution, a hypothesis seemingly supported by *CIS* I 378, cited above, in which the mother of the offerer is called "servant of the god". It has not yet been shown that this was always the case in examples of this kind, but would seem probable in relation to a few, specific examples[12]. To the evidence cited we can add that the daughter of *gdnʿmt*, the "servant of the god" who dedicated inscription 378, is called *ʾbbʿl*, "Baal is my father", which might be an allusion to the role of the mother. The name could equally relate to the absence of a legitimate father, and it is perhaps this latter meaning that we could attribute to the name of the offerer of *CIS* I 1407, *ʾbbl* (*sic*) daughter of *kbdt*, without further indications of her genealogy. Clearly the name *ʾbbʿl* could not always have had this kind of connotation as can be seen in the example of *CIS* I 1901 where the offerer *ʾbʿl* (*sic*)[13] is daughter of a legitimate father, *ʿzrbʿl*, and at least one more of whose ancestors was cited in the dedication[14].

A number of other inscriptions represent particular cases of offerings and indicate women who made sacrifices in association with their paternal family. *CIS* I 5702 is an offering made by *ʿzrbʿl* and her daughter *mtnbʿl*, descendants of a high-ranking official. The text, in line with the common form of dedication used, is as follows: *ʾzrm ʾš w ʾ[z]rm ʾšt ʾš ndr ʿzrbʿl bn bdʿštrt ḥrb bn mlkytn wbtʾ mtnbʿl kšmʿ qlm ybrkm* (lines 2-6: "a *ʾzrm ʾš* and a *ʾ[z]rm ʾšt,* which was offered by Azorbaal son of Bodashtarth, the *rab*, son of Milkyaton and his daughter Muttunibaal; because he (the god) heard their voice; may he bless them!"). In this case it is clear that two sacrifices were made, corresponding to two offerers: these sacrifices consisted of a masculine and a feminine offering, possibly relating to the gender of Azorbaal and his daughter Muttunibaal. However, it should be noted that elsewhere we find attested a male who offers a *ʾzrm ʾšt*[15]. The father of *mtnbʿl* is a *rab*; the woman named, therefore, belongs to a high social rank and one could think that it is the importance of her lineage that caused her to sacrifice together with her father. Offerings made on the same occasion and by members of the same family also occur elsewhere. A dedication made by two brothers is attested at Motya[16], and another example can be found in the inscription *CIS* I 386, the first section of which has been lost but which preserves, in part, the names of the offerers: *ḥtmlkt* (reconstructed) *wbʿlytn bn ʿzmlk* ("Hutmilkot and Baalyaton, the sons of Ozimilk")*,* very probably brother and sister offering a sacrifice together[17]. Once again, the possible husband of *ḥtmlkt* is not mentioned.

---

[11]   Verger 1965: 263-264.

[12]   Cf. also *CIS* I 263 where the offerer is *ʾmʿštrt ʾš bʿmt ʾš ʿštrt* "Emashtart who is in the 'group' of the Ashtart personnel" (or: "in the 'group' belonging to Ashtart").

[13]   Here, and in a few other examples, the name has this writing. For the attestations both a masculine and feminine name, cf. Halff 1963-1964: 85, 92; Benz 1972: 257.

[14]   The inscription is fragmentary.

[15]   Cf., for example, *CIS* I 5741. For the terminology, cf. Février 1955: 57-63 (interpretation in doubt); the expression (with the complement in the masculine and feminine form) is frequently attested at Guelma, cf. Chabot 1918: 72-94 (= Chabot 1916/2: 498-520).

[16]   Amadasi Guzzo 1986 B: 29-30, n° 22.

[17]   Cf. also *CIS* l, 384 dedicated by a father and son. Of note are the unusual cases of *CIS* l, 382, 383, offering by a woman and a man without any evident relationship existing between them. *CIS* l, 385 would appear to have been dedicated by two women.

As far as the social ranks of the offerers are concerned, inscriptions dedicated by women naturally offer less information than those by men. We have seen, and there are many more examples, women who belong undoubtedly to the aristocracy, since their ancestors include *suffetes* or *rabs*[18]. Examples where the woman offering the sacrifice does not have a genealogy indicate a more modest social status[19], although we cannot talk in terms of "lower" class as we do not know how widely writing was known. On the other hand, there are examples where the offerer is qualified by the term *ṣdn*, an expression which probably indicates a class similar to that of the Roman *liberti,* according to the interpretation proposed by J. G. Février and M. Sznycer[20]. Here, as an example, we can cite *CIS* I 279, an inscription dedicated by *ʾlst ʾš ṣdn bd ʾdny bd bʿlḥnʾ*. It is curious to note that the expression *ʾš ṣdn* would appear to be masculine, whilst in all of the attestations *ʾlšt* is a woman's name. In *CIS* l, 273, it is the father of the offerer who is *ʾš ṣdn* and it is to be noted that he is called *mṣry*, the "Egyptian", although we cannot know whether this was his name, a common name at the time, or whether it indicated his birthplace[21]. His daughter, who makes the offering to the *tophet*, bears the name *ṣdn*, again of uncertain meaning but possibly relating to her father's rank. The latter was a scribe (*spr*) and, therefore, of a certain social standing, and though a freedman.

CIS I 5939 represents an interesting case in relation to both the social categories performing sacrifices at the *tophet* and the rite itself. It is the offering made by *ʾlšt ʾl ʾdnw*, without further details given. A woman without genealogy makes a sacrifice "for" or "in the place of her lord" (*ʾdnw*, where we have the suffix pronoun written -w, not attested elsewhere at Carthage)[22]. We may suppose that here we are dealing with a woman, who was not a free citizen, sacrificing in the place or in the name of her master.

Amongst the offerers we find people of foreign origin. This is not proven in the case of those names which are not Semitic. For example, *plmnʾ* of *CIS* I 1301, a name possibly to be interpreted as a transcription of the Greek *Φιλουμένη*[23]*,* has an evidently Phoenician patronymic, *bʾlytn*, and her name could, instead, derive from the mother's possibly foreign origins. *Plypnʾ* of *CIS* I 3148 is certainly not a Semitic name either and the patronymic in this case is not complete but could have been a composite of *ʿbd*. On the contrary, a clear example is provided by *CIS* I 191, the dedication made by *Euklea*, who does not have a genealogy and whose name is written in Greek characters whilst the rest

---

[18] Cf. *CIS* I 207 212, 216, 221, 222, 231, 371, 372, 375, 3026, 5697 5883, 5886; cf. further: *CIS* I 231 (the husband of the offerer is a *rab*), *CIS* I, 273 (the father of the offerer is a *spr* "scribe"), 321 (the father is *rpʾ* "doctor"), 349 (*mdd* "measurer"), 5547 (*ng[r] šmḥšbm* "carpenter of…".Translation uncertain), 5692 (*šnʾ*, uncertain meaning), 5699 (*šrʾ* or *rbʾ*, uncertain reading), 5866 (*ʾš ʾmḥnt* (*sic*) "soldier", lit. "belonging to the army").

[19] These are not very numerous and not always certain, cf. *CIS* I 191, 430, 441, 760, 3087, 3212, 5599, 5870, 5939. The traditional writing and orthography are, generally, less carefully rendered.

[20] FÉVRIER 1951-52; SZNYCER 1975: 56-59. The offerer bears this title in *CIS* I, 279, 280, 281. Cf. VAN DEN BRANDEN 1979; HELTZER 1986 (see especially p. 242-243).

[21] On the names of towns used as proper names by metics, cf. HUSS 1985: 501 and n. 72.

[22] Cf. also *CIS* I 3784, 7, which the editors always interpret as a conjunction and, possibly, Pyrgi *KAI* 277, 6; see *PPG*[3], §112. I.II. In any case, the suffix written -w, according to our knowledge, cannot be feminine; perhaps we have here a mistake. Regarding the title "lord", it would not appear that it could relate to a god.

[23] BENZ 1972: 195, proposes *Φιλουμένη* or *Palmina*; HALFF 1963-1964: 140, suggests *Φιλημωνη* for *plypnʾ* in n. 3148. Cf. also HUSS 1985: 502, proposing perhaps *Φιλιππιανή*.

of the text is in Punic letters; this is undoubtedly a foreign woman, probably of humble origins[24]. This example shows, once again, that all of the inhabitants of the town - irrespective of class or origin - could sacrifice, at the *tophet*, perhaps according to specific requirements. We can compare the dedication by *Euklea* to the inscriptions in Greek characters in Constantine[25].

Based on the presence of genealogies, an attempt has been made to discover whether it is possible to reconstruct family lineages. The identification of members of the same family, whilst possible in theory, must take into account all of the available documentation. It must also be noted that the genealogies of the dedicatory inscriptions examined here are rather brief, most of them going back to the grandfather and, more rarely, great-grandfather, and dedications with only the patronymic are also quite frequent. In the case of common names, in fact, it is not possible to identify with certainty any cases of homonymy between offerers among the inscriptions registered or to determine whether we are dealing with the same person[26]. At present, therefore, it would appear that we must adhere to the hypothesis that the *tophet* was a place of cult where sacrifices were offered only once[27].

2. More documents and remarks

The inscriptions of *CIS* I 3252-5275, not previously reviewed, were consulted here. The dedications made by females or with women's names in the genealogy number roughly 317[28]. The texts examined do not reveal any change in the situation outlined in 1988. Here below certain characteristics are highlighted, which were noted also in the inscriptions examined at that time. Furthermore, a few specific details are found both in the group currently being studied and in other groups of inscriptions found in this kind of sanctuary. Here, again, details of the feminine onomasticon are not analysed, except insofar as some particularly rare or non-Phoenician names are concerned.

Study has confirmed that the sum of the offerings made by women in the *tophet* of Carthage published in the *CIS*[29] account for over 10% of the total. The female names are,

---

[24]   On the names of slaves of Greek origin cf., for example, in the Etruscan sphere, cf. DE SIMONE 1968-1970; DE SIMONE 1972: 491-525.

[25]   BERTHIER – CHARLIER 1955: 167-176.

[26]   *CIS* I 482 and 1069, 2632 and 2683, 3162 and 3165, 5697 and 5886, 5758 and 5911 are texts which have been edited twice.

[27]   Cf., on the contrary, the hypothesis put forward in M. G. AMADASI GUZZO 1986 A: 205.

[28]   Uncertainties persist regarding the reading and/or interpretation and, therefore, the total is only approximate. The numbers of the inscriptions bearing dedications by females are: 3269, 3270, 3319, 3320, 3323, 3325, 3334, 3347, 3349, 3356 (?), 3369, 3454-3467, 3518, 3525, 3532, 3537, 3546, 3557, 3563, 3567, 3569, 3580, 3589, 3590 (?), 3599, 3603, 3612, 3613, 3616, 3620, 3622, 3637, 3638, 3640, 3648, 3654, 3666, 3689, 3695, 3708, 3776, 3780, 3789 (?), 3791, 3800, 3801, 3802, 3822-3846, 3906, 3965, 4084 (?), 4442 (?), 4596 (?), 4597-4669, 4671-3733, 4733 bis-4742, 4742bis-4775, 4796, 4804, 4808, 4814, 4815, 4816, 4855, 4856 (?), 4885, 4887, 4925, 4933, 4935, 4944, 4950, 4977, 4982, 4984, 4987-4998, 5000-5015, 5213.

[29]   Thorough research is required concerning all of the inscriptions from Carthage found subsequent to the *CIS*, but that is beyond the scope of this work which aims, instead, at providing a wide-ranging survey. Analysis should also be extended to include all of the inscriptions from the *tophet*; partial surveys do, however, seem to show a situation elsewhere that differs from that at Carthage (women being less

generally, the same as those already noted and are included within the usual formulaic inscriptions and which present few variants[30]. With regard to the orthography, it can be noted (as, already, for previous inscriptions) that there are frequent exchanges or omissions of pharyngal and laryngal consonants in the writing. Non-traditional orthography (oversights, *matres lectionis* or changes due to the omission/modification of the pronunciation of consonants) is more common in the spelling of the names of the gods to whom the sacrifices were offered[31] and, where present, in the concluding formulae[32], than in that of personal names (although the exchange between *alef* and *ain* or the omission of *alef* occur very frequently, whereas the exchange of *ḥet* and *he* is quite rare[33]). As already noted, the female name is that of the person making the offering, usually identified via a genealogy which frequently goes back to the grandfather and, quite often, the great-grandfather. Longer genealogies are extremely rare, as are dedications entirely without any genealogy although, in a number of cases, only the patronymic is given.

The examples in which the offerer is presented as "wife of…" are, as in previously studied inscriptions, very rare[34]. The offerer of *CIS* I 3569 is [ʾm]*tmlqrt bt špṭ* [ʾš]*t ʾrš bn*

---

present). Also to be borne in mind is the far lower number of texts from other cities compared to Carthage, although one would expect similar ratios also from other sites (and especially, Constantine). In the group from Constantine published by M. Sznycer (see BERTRANDY – SZNYCER 1987), the dedicatory inscriptions definitely made by women (out of 142 nn., not all of which are, however, legible or inscribed) only 3 are without doubt offerings made by women: s. nn. 95, 120 and 116 in Greek. In the collection of inscriptions published by BERTRANDY – SZNYCER 1955, out of 281 inscriptions in Phoenician, 4 are dedications by women (nn. 24, 67, 122, 187), one if by an individual with matronymic (n.187: ʿ*drbʿl* (sic) *b̠t g̠zty*; the reading of *bt* is likely but not certain; photograph is lacking). Number 122 is an offering by *mtnybʿl* (probably a female name) in favour of/on behalf of (ʿ*l*) Hutmilkot, another woman (*ḥtmlkt bt yʾrḥm*).

[30] In a few cases Baal is mentioned first, or in the place of Tinnit; the goddess can be *rbtn* "our lady" instead of *rbt*, the name of one or of both divinities can be missing, the verb *ndr* can be substituted by *nšʾ*; the verb "dedicate/offer" can be replaced by the noun *ndr* (/nidr/) or be entirely lacking; some examples have only proper names. Few examples include the expression *bš(ʾ)ry/m btm* or ʾ*zrm ʾš/ʾšt*. In the group under consideration here, the noun *mlk(t)* is found in some examples, whilst a very few cases have *mtnt* "gift". Such peculiarities are also found in the inscriptions with a male subject. The final formula is not present in most cases; when present, the tenses of the verbs used vary: in general suffix conjugation - mostly for the verb *šmʿ* "to listen" - , or prefix conjugation; the person is usually the 3rd masculine singular (referring only to Baal Hammon); there are few cases of 3rd person plural, which can be identified on the basis of the spelling of the suffix pronoun of the 3rd person singular: e.g. *yšmʿ ql ybrky* in *CIS* I 4620, offering by ʾ*mtmlqrt* (note the spelling *ql* for /qulā /) "may they (the gods) listen to her voice, bless her!".

[31] Es.: *dn* or ʿ*dn* for ʾ*dn*, *pʾn* or *pnʾ* for *pn*, *bl* or *bḥl* for *bʿl*, etc.

[32] The most frequent spelling in all of the inscriptions is *šmʾ qlʾ* (this formula being preceded, or not, by *k-* and followed, on occasion, by the verb *brk*, see fn. 30). On the concluding formulae, see JONGELING 1999 and KERR 2016 (with the hypothesis of a jussive meaning in all of the cases).

[33] Various examples of the fem. *hnʿl* considered an erroneous writing of *ḥnbʿl*, see BENZ 1972: 108, 303.

[34] In *CIS* I 4643 where the offerer is ʾ*št bt qrtʿlṣ* the *CIS* (and F. L. Benz) presume that the first name is an erroneous writing of ʾ*ršt*; for the second name the *CIS* proposes a more recent writing and an error in the place of *mlqrtḥlṣ*; according to BENZ 1972: 407 *qrt* (only in three names, see p. 179) is an abbreviation of *mlqrt* (Melqart) and not a mistake.

šmrb[*ʾl*] "Amotmelqart, daughter or Shapot, wife of Arish, son of Shamorbaal"[35]; the fragment *CIS* I 3637 mentions …]*mlqrt ʾšt ḥ*…..[*ʾ*]*bd ʾšmn bn y ʿzr*; inscription *CIS* I 3822 is a dedication by *ʾmtb ʿl ʾšt b ʿl ʿzr bn bdmlqrt bn ʾšmnytn*[36] "Amotbaal, wife of Baalazor, son of Bodmelqart, son of Eshmunyaton"; *CIS* I 4619, is an offering made by *ʾmtmlqrt ʾšt ḥmlkt bn bdmlqrt* "Amotmelqart, daughter of Himilkot, daughter of Bodmelqart"; *CIS* I 4650 is offered by *bnt ʾšt mtn* "Banot(?), daughter of Muttun"; *CIS* I 4734 is by *mtn*[*b ʿl*] *ʾšt ḥmb ʿl š*[37] *bdmlqrt bn pdy* "Muttunibaal, wife of Hambaal(?), 'in the employ of' (lit. 'belonging to') Bodmelqart, son of Padi". *CIS* I 4746 is lacking the name of the offerer, possibly to be reconstructed as [ʿk]*brt*[38], who is *ʾšt mgn <u>bt</u> ʾdnb ʿl bn <u>ʿbd</u> bn mgn bn ʾšmnytn*[39] "wife of Magon, daughter of Adonibaal, son of Abdo, son of Magon, son of Eshmunyaton". The lengthy genealogy of the offerer's husband suggests a relatively high social rank despite there being no mention of any official position or profession.

There are only seven inscriptions in which the female offerer presents herself as the daughter of another woman[40]. *CIS* I 3830 has the formula: *ʾš ndr nš ʾ ḥldl*[41] *bt ʿmtmlk (sic)*; in *CIS* I 3840 the matronymic is the only attestation: the inscription is by *ʿlšt bt qnṣty bt b ʿlšlk*; the matronymic has been compared (but without finding any explanation) to that of *qnnst* daughter of *šnn* who makes the offering *CIS* I 3843[42]. *CIS* I 4627 is the dedication *ʾršt bt ʾrštb ʿl* "Arishut, daughter of Arishutbaal"; *CIS* I 4758 is offered by *ʿlšt bt ḥtlt bt šmrb ʿl bn ʿbd ʾšmn* " *ʿlšt*, daughter of Hutilat(?), daughter of Shamorbaal, son of Abdeshmun"[43]; in *CIS* I 4808 the offering is made by Muttunibaal (*mtnb ʿl bt ʾṭn ʾ*[44] *bt ḥmlkt hšpṭ*), granddaughter of a suffet, a rare but not unique example. *CIS* I 3776, is interesting, being another case of an offering made by a woman identified by the name of her mother, "Arishutbaal daughter of Amotmelqart, daughter of Abdmilk", followed by the

---

[35] The spelling of the names is simplified; the vocalisation is conventional. Not all of the expressions cited are translated, either because they all deal with the same sequences or because some readings are uncertain; moreover, the vocalisation of the names is in some cases particularly doubtful.

[36] The name is followed by the expression *bšry ʾ* and the formula *yšm ʿ ql ʾ ybrk* (without any indication here of the direct object suffix).

[37] If not an erroneous writing of *ḥnb ʿl*, the name is formed by the noun *ḥm* "father-in-law"; see BENZ 1972: 311-312 (names: *ḥm ʾ, ḥmy, b ʿlḥm ʾ*); *ḥmb ʿl* is "of Bodmelqart (*š bdmlqrt*), son of Padī", indicating a relationship which is not clear (see below, the case of *š ʾzrt*).

[38] The male name *ʿkbr* is found frequently (66 examples in the *CIS*), whilst the female version is attested only twice (*CIS* I 4747, 5799). *ʿkbr* means "mouse" and the name finds parallels in Hebrew and Ugaritic (see BENZ 1972: 377).

[39] The underlined letters are uncertain. The authors of the *CIS* note that the second *bt* could be read as *bn*, a more probable reading since Adonibaal is not attested as a female name.

[40] *CIS* I 3347 is offered by *ʾbbl (sic) bt ʾrš bt ʿzmlk*, where the second *bt* is perhaps a mistake instead of *bn*.

[41] The editors translate the formula *ndr nš ʾ* as "vovens obtulit" or as "votum posuit" (*ndr* participle or noun). They propose that the name be corrected as *ḥldt* (also does BENZ 1972: 109).

[42] The two names are considered to be "Numidian" in the *CIS*. The second is catalogued as Libyan by BENZ 1972: 191.

[43] The first name is not explained; the second is probably an abbreviation of *ʾḥt ʾlt* "sister of the goddess/Elat" (BENZ 1972: 379, 265, 268).

[44] The name is attested only here. It is considered to derive from *ṭn ʾ* "to erect" (but the formation is uncertain).

expression (possibly referring to the offerer) "servant of Astarte of Eryx"[45] (*ʾrštb*[*ʿ*]*l bt ʿmtmlqrt* (*sic*) *bt ʿbdml*[*k?*] *ʿmt* (*sic*) *š*[46] *ʿštrt ʾrk*)[47].

This last example, in particular, indicates as far as we can determine a relatively high social position. Other offerers are linked to families in which a member was or is a suffet or rab. In the badly damaged *CIS* I 3567, the offerer, who is perhaps called *m*[*tn*], is the daughter of *ʾd*[*r*]*mlk* or *ʾd*[*n*]*mlk špṭ*[48] *bn bʿlʿms*. *CIS* I 3825 is an offering by *ʾm ʿštrt bt bdʿštrt hšpṭ* "Amotashtart, daughter of Bodashtart the suffet"; *CIS* I 3833 is by the daughter of a suffet, in this case *lbt bt ʿzrbʿl hšpṭ* "Libit/Labit, daughter of Azorbaal the suffet", who belongs to a family of suffets: Azorbaal is, in fact, the son of "Bodmelqart the suffet, son of Bodashtart the suffet" (*bdmlqrt hšpṭ bn bdʿštrt hšpṭ*). We do not know to what Libit or Labit (?) owes her name, interpreted as relating to "Libyan" ethnicity. *CIS* I 4814, is an inscription by *ʾršt bt bʿlḥnʾ bn ʿbdʾšmn hšpṭ bn bʿlḥnʾ bn ʿbdʾšmn* "Arishut, daughter of Baalhanno, son of Abdeshmun the suffet, son of Baalhanno, son of Abdeshmun"; *CIS* I 4815 is offered by *ḥld bt ʿzrbʿl hšpṭ bn ḥnʾ*, "Hulda, daughter of Azorbaal the suffet, son of Hanno", and *CIS* I 4816 is dedicated by *ḥld bt ḥnʾ bn ʿzrbʿl hšpṭ bn ḥmlk hrb*, "Hulda, daughter of Hanno, son of Azorbaal the suffet, son of Himilk the rab"[49]. Is it possible that this could be a relative of the preceding offerer? The names used in these two texts are found very frequently, but the order in which they are given would appear to place them in the same genealogy.

It is impossible to furnish a certain explanation of the reason for the offering by a woman who does not name her husband or to know the object of the dedication here or in other cases of this type[50]. It is not clear whether the offering was made in order to have further descendants or, instead, as seems more likely, to obtain/to give thanks for some benefit or for avoiding/having avoided some risk concerning the entire family group.

Possibly relating to offerings with this kind of aim, that is to say, supplications in favour of the offerer's family or a specific relative/kinsman, we have cases of offerings made by (or in favour of?) a third person, a relative or an individual upon whom the dedicator is in some way dependant. *CIS* I 4642 has the formula *ʾš ndr ʿl ʾršt bt bdmlkt* "who has offered on behalf of/in favour of Arishut daughter of Bodmilkut", with the

---

[45]   In the *CIS* this is presumed to refer either to the function of the daughter or of the mother; the title, however, follows the patronymic and seems more probably to refer to the offerer herself.

[46]   Instead of using a construct-phrase to indicate the specifying complement, the relative particle is used, indicating a recent stage of the language.

[47]   Interesting but of uncertain interpretation is the case of *CIS* I 4856, in which the offerer, Shopet son of Addirbaal (*špṭ bn ʾdrbʿl*) defines himself as a servant, apparently of a woman: *ʿbd ʾš ḥṣkrtt* (the *CIS* gives the expression *servus Asae* τῆς *Skirtatae*, without any possible explanation of the last term, which appears to be a feminine adjective preceded by the article).

[48]   Note the lack of the article.

[49]   At Costantine one of the few female offerers is "chief priestess": "Arishut, chief priestess (*ʾršt rb khnt*) offered (*ndrʾ*, fem.)", BERTHIER – CHARLIER 1955: n. 67; also the mother of the offerer of n. 72 is *ḥmlky hkʿnt* (*sic*), "the priestess".

[50]   Lack of information regarding the archaeological context and, in any case, the frequent removal of the stela in relation to the vase containing the remains of the offering, are particularly frustrating aspects of any study. Recent excavations could provide more certain data. The inscriptions 108 and 109 in BERTHIER – CHARLIER 1955 are offerings by two individuals who are undoubtedly father and son: *špṭ prnly bn ʿbdmlqrt* (108) and *ʾršm bn špṭ prnly bn ʿbdmlqr*[*t*] (109).

subject of the verb (male or female) now lost. Otherwise, together with the authors of the *CIS*, we may presume that *ʾl* was inserted by mistake in the inscription. A similar case has already been cited regarding *CIS* I 5939, the offering by *ʾlšt* "for her (?) lord" (*ʾl ʾdnw*) (see above)[51].

In a few rare cases the profession of the offerer's father can be identified: thus we have Hutmilkot (*ḥtmlkt*) in *CIS* I 4877 who is *bt ʿbdʿšrt ḥṭbḥ*, "daughter of Abdashtart, the cook (or: the slaughterer)"; Gadnoamat, who offers the inscribed stela *CIS* I 4887 is the daughter of "Masop the perfumer" (*gdnʿmt bt msp*[52] *hrqḥ*), a profession which is quite frequently mentioned. *Grgšt*[53] in *CIS* I 4885 is *bt bʿlytn hrpʾ*, "daughter of Baalyaton, the doctor"; in relation to this inscription it should be noted that *CIS* I 4884 is an offering by *ʿbdʾšmn bn bʿlytn hrpʾ* "Abdeshmun, son of Baalyaton, the doctor". The name Baalyaton is very common but we cannot exclude the possibility that Gargashit (an entirely conventional vocalisation) and Abdeshmun were siblings. We would thus have a new case of an offering within the same family, as in *CIS* I 4596, an inscription that includes several scribal errors but where it can be read that the offering was made by *šṣp* and *šṣpt* "the two sons of Maherbaal, son of Gerashtart" (*ʾšn bnʾ mhrbʿl bn grʿštrt*)[54].

In some cases, the origins and "social class" of the family of the offerers are not very clear. This is the case of stela *CIS* I 4855, an offering by "Emeshmun (?), daughter of *sṭrds*": *ʾmšmn* (*sic*) *bt* (*bt*) *sṭrds ʿbd ʾzrt ʿzrbʿl bn ʾšmnytn*; the origin of the name *sṭrds* is not clear, nor is the position which appears to be that of dependant (*ʿbd*, "servant") of a family group or, rather, a form of association (*ʾzrt*), in some kind of relation with a certain Azorbaal, son of Eshmunyaton[55].

Some names are unique, or almost, and are difficult to interpret. Here we give only a few examples. Inscription *CIS* I 4651 on the basis of *CIS* reading, is an offering by *brqnd bt ʿbdmlqrt bn bʿlytn*; it is, however, possible, that this is a mistake instead of *brqny*, already attested as a female name in numbers 1256, 2153 and 2159 (in this latter case, it

---

51 The inscription BERTHIER – CHARLIER 1955: n. 24 is offered by Akbarat (*ʿkbrt*) … *lhgw* "for (in favour of) the community" (note the graphical indication of the article after the preposition *l-*).

52 BENZ 1972: 323-324 links this name to the root *ysp* "to add"; it is, instead, better explained as Libyan, according to JONGELING 1994: 86 s.n. masof.

53 BENZ 1972: 299 notes that the name (male *grgš*, 12 examples at Carthage and *grgšm*, 8 examples at Carthage; two female examples as *grgšy* in 1573 and 4663), attested in his collection by 6 Carthaginian examples, is known at Ugarit as both a personal and as a place-name.

54 The numeral has the form with the prosthetic *alef*: the final vowel of the plural in construct state, -ē, is also indicated by *alef*. It is interesting that the brother and sister have the same name in masculine and feminine forms (which would derive from the term *šṣp* indicating a type of sacrifice in the so-called Marseille Tariff, see *KAI* 69). The name is quite common, see BENZ 1972: 185 (various forms, see also p. 425).

55 The meaning of *ʾzrt*, translated in *DNWSI*, 27-28, s.v. *ʾzrh*, as *family, clientele,* appears to refer to the wider family; the precise difference is not clear between this and the noun *špḥ* which must indicate the blood-tie family (for epigraphic references, see *DNWSI*, 1181, s.v. špḥ). In the *CIS*, *sub* 4854, an offering by Baalshillek, son of Namel, son of Baalshillek (*bʿlšlk bn nml bn bʿlšlk*), *ʿbd ʾzrt* of Adonibaal, son of Azorbaal, son of Eshmunhalos (*ʾdnbʿl bn ʿzrbʿl bn ʾšmnḥlṣ*), it was presumed that the expression relates to a *servus vestiarius praepositus* (Greek ἱματιοφύλαξ) without, however, any convincing elements to confirm this. The term *ʾzrt*, from the contexts, seems to refer, instead, to a wider (familial?) group, if not an association of some kind (the etymology is uncertain: from *ʾzr* "to bind"? (as, with uncertainty, *DNWSI*).

is uncertain whether the name is female)[56]. *CIS* 4708 has the unexplained name *ṭršt bt ḥw bn r ʿmlk*; here both the authors of the *CIS* and F. L. Benz presume that it is an erroneous writing of *ʾršt*, even though it is not easy to confuse the signs for *alef* and *ṭeṭ*. The patronymic *ḥw* with this spelling is also attested only here (*ḥwʾ* in *CIS* I 2924).[57] The name of the grandfather is also quite uncommon (a further 4 attestations)[58].

CIS I 4709 also has an unusual onomasticon; this is a dedicatory inscription by *yptʿštrt bt šmḥyʾ*. The two names are not included by Benz: the first element of the female name appears in the hypocoristic form of the name *yptʾ* in Constantine (El-Hofra 161)[59]; the second name is associated, in both the *CIS* and Benz, with the substantive for "joy" (*šmḥ*, Heb. *śmḥ*) and with the female names *šmḥyt* and *šmḥt* of *CIS* I 281, 3214 and *CIS* I 532. *CIS* I 4775 is offered by *štn ʿmt bt ʿbd*[…; if the reading is correct, this name is unknown[60].

Some anthroponyms derive from ethnic origins: *CIS* I 4720 records the offering by *lbt*[61], daughter of *zybqm* (see also *CIS* I 3833) in favour of someone else since the preposition *ʿl* is present[62]: the reading of that which follows the patronymic is, however, uncertain. As already noted, the name is explained as an ethnic "Libyan" (masc. *lby*)[63] and it is interesting to observe that, here, the patronmyic is also probably Libyan. Other offerers who have names derived from ethnic adjectives have, as in other examples where the name *lbt* appears, ancestors with Phoenician names. Of fairly frequent use there is, for example, the name *mṣrt* "Egyptian (f.)"[64]. In the present group we find this recurring in *CIS* I 4723, with quite a long genealogy (*mṣrt bt ʿ[b]dʾšmn bn bdʾ b[n]* …. *bn bdʾ*, "Masrit, daughter of Abdeshmun, son of Bodo, son of… son of Bodo") and in 4724,

---

[56] V. already BENZ 1972: 101 (in 4840 the masc. *brqny* is attested. See p. 292 for the explanation (from the noun "lightning" + the adjectival suffix *-ānīyu > -ōni; e.g. *ʾštrny*; cf. *PPG*³ § 206); the female gender of the anthroponym in question is not clear.

[57] BENZ 1972: 109 and 308; the name would derive from *ḥwy* "to live"; the authors of the *CIS* suggest, possibly, *ḥ[n]ʾ*.

[58] BENZ 1972: 179.

[59] BERTHIER – CHARLIER 1955: 116; BENZ 1972: 129, 335, where it is presumed that the name is Libyan.

[60] In the *CIS* it is suggested correcting this to *mtn ʿšt[rt]*; BENZ 1972: 427 proposes integrating [ʾ]*štn ʿmt*, recognising, however, that *ʾšt* is never used as an element in personal names. One possibility might be to read *šmn ʿmt* (formed with the element *šm* "name"), a form never attested, however. *CIS* I 4933, read as *ʾš ndrʾ mttz b ʿlt* …, is perhaps to be divided as follows: *ʾš ndrʾ mtt z* "who has dedicated this offering" + PN; in this way *ʾ* would be explained as the late form of the article *h-*, and *mtt* as the noun "gift" in the "Phoenician" form, with assimilation (Punic. *mtnt*); the subject would, thus, be male, formed by *bʿl* + an element that began with *t-* (to my knowledge, only *bʿltm* is attested, but other possibilities exist).

[61] In this group of inscriptions, the name is attested in 7 examples, the same number as the previous attestations, see BENZ 1972: 133. Only in 4721 (probably re-edited under n. 5586 [same genealogy and lacunae; 5586 is not reproduced]) do we find it in the form *lbtn*. Other ethnic names, with Phoenicians ancestors, are *mṣrt* (7 attestations in total) and *šrdnt* (5 attestations), which have the corresponding masculine forms *mṣry* (16 examples at Carthage) and *šrdny* (6 examples), *šrdnʾ* (1 example); see BENZ 1972: 142-143 and 185.

[62] The context is not clear: (*ʾš ndrʾ*) *lbt bt zybqm bš . ʿl bl[t]* according to the *CIS* (perhaps *bš[r]* or *bš[rm]*?).

[63] See BENZ 1972: 337-338. The name *lbt* is quite commonly used and is found in the Carthaginian inscriptions listed by F. L. Benz (p. 133 with 16 names: in our group it is attested in 4714- 4719, 4721, always with ancestors bearing Phoenician names, as already noted by Benz; in 4722 we find – as in 5586 – the variant *lbtn*, which is difficult to explain). Cf. for interpretation and other observations *ibid.*: 338).

[64] Cf. BENZ 1972: 143 with 7 examples, all from Carthage.

where a certain Masrit is "daughter of Gerashtart, son of Himilkot (*mṣrt bt grʿštrt bn ḥmlkt*). There is the similar case of *šrdnt* "Sardinian (f.)" which is attested twice in the present group[65], and always with ancestors bearing clearly Phoenician names[66].

Lastly, offerings by women from towns other than Carthage are very rare. In the present group there is only one attested case, *CIS* I 4910, an inscription by Arishut, citizen of Eryx, daughter of Azzimilk" (*ʾršt bʿlt ʾrk bt ʿzmlk*). Relations between the two cities were certainly close given the possible presence of a temple of Ashtart of Eryx[67] in Carthage.

To conclude, as well as the comments already made, we would like to recall once more how the analytical study of the modest votive inscriptions from Carthaginian *tophet,* monotonous and repetitive as they may be, can if examined in a methodical manner furnish a great deal of information regarding the society and, quite possibly, the customs, cults and rites of this centre and this environment. As regards women, a comprehensive and analytical study would undoubtedly provide more information not solely or so much relating to the *tophet* ritual (although, certain onomastic data could perhaps enable some hypotheses to be proposed)[68], but concerning the social status of the offerers and regarding the organisation and hierarchy of family lineage, name-giving traditions within family circles, family relationships and the distribution of jobs and functions. The notable number of dedications by women cannot today be explained by the possible reconstructions proposed of the ritual performed in the *tophet* and their purpose which, in my opinion, are not so closely or exclusively linked to the field of lineage.

References

Amadasi Guzzo 1986 A = M. G. Amadasi Guzzo, "La documentazione epigrafica del tofet di Mozia e il problema del sacrificio molk", in C. Bonnet *et al.* (eds), *Religio Phoenicia* (Studia Phoenicia IV / Collection d'études classiques 1), Namur 1986: 187-207.

Amadasi Guzzo 1986 B = M. G. Amadasi Guzzo, *Scavi a Mozia. Le iscrizioni* (Collezione di Studi Fenici 22), Roma 1986.

Amadasi Guzzo 1988 = M.G. Amadasi Guzzo, "Dédicaces de femmes à Carthage", in E. Lipiński (ed.), *Carthago* (Studia Phoenicia VI / OLA 26), Leuven 1988: 143-149.

Benz 1972 = F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Studia Pohl 8), Roma 1972.

Berthier – Charlier 1955 = A. Berthier – R. Charlier, *Le sanctuaire punique d'El-Hofra à Constantine*, Paris 1955.

Bertrandy – Sznycer = F. Bertrandy – M. Sznycer, *Les stèles puniques de Constantine*, Paris 1987.

Chabot 1916 = J.-B. Chabot, "Les inscriptions néopuniques de Guelma (Calama)", *JA* 1916/2: 467-520.

Chabot 1918 = J.-B. Chabot, *Punica*, Paris 1918.

CIS = *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum ab Academia Inscriptionum et Litterarum Humaniorum conditum atque digestum. Pars prima: Inscriptiones phoenicias continens*, Paris 1881-1962.

---

[65] Benz 1972: 185 lists 5 attestations.

[66] In *CIS* I 4771 it is *šrdnt bt ḥmlkt bn mlqrtḥlṣ* ("Shardanit, daughter of Himilkot, son of Melqarthalos") and in *CIS* I 4772 it is *šrdnt bt bdmlqrt bn ḥnʾ bn ʿbdʾšmn* ("Shardanit, daughter of Bodmelqart, son of Hanno, son of Abdeshmun").

[67] Cf. for the cult Lietz 2012. Inscription: *CIS* I 3776.

[68] I refer, in particular, to the siblings *šṣp* and *šṣpt* in *CIS* I 4596.

D'ANDREA 2014 = B. D'ANDREA, *I tofet del Nord Africa dall'età arcaica all'età romana (VIII sec. a.C.-II sec. d.C.). Studi archeologici,* Roma 2014.

D'ANDREA 2018 = B. D'ANDREA, *I bambini nel "limbo". Date e proposte interpretative sui tofet fenici e punici* (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 552), Roma 2018.

DE SIMONE 1968-1970 = C. DE SIMONE, *Griechische Entlehnungen im Etruskischen*, Wiesbaden 1968-1970.

DE SIMONE 1972 = C. DE SIMONE, "Per la storia degli imprestiti greci in etrusco", in *ANRW* 1/2, Berlin / New York 1972: 491-525.

DEWRELL 2017 = H. D. DEWRELL, *Child Sacrifice in Ancient Israel* (Explorations in Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations), Winona Lake (IN) 2017.

DNWSI = J. HOFTIJZER – K. JONGELING, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions* (Handbuch der Orientalistik I/21), Leiden / New York / Köln 1995.

FERJAOUI 1999 = A. FERJAOUI, "Les femmes à Carthage à travers les documents épigraphiques", *REPPAL* 11, 1999 : 77-86.

FEVRIER 1948 = J. G. FEVRIER, "Magistratures et sacerdoces puniques", *RA* 42, 1948: 81-87.

FEVRIER 1951-52 = J. G. FEVRIER, "Vir Sidonius", *Semitica* 4, 1951-1952: 13-18.

FEVRIER 1955 = J. G. FEVRIER, "Le vocabulaire sacrificiel punique", *JA* 1955: 49-63.

HALFF 1963-1964 = G. HALFF, "L'onomastique punique de Carthage", *Karthago* 12, 1963-1964: 63-146.

HEIDER 1985 = H. HEIDER, *The Cult of Molek*, Sheffield 1985.

HELTZER 1986 = M. HELTZER, "Phoenician Theophorous Names with the Root *ʿms*", in C. BONNET et al. (eds.), *Religio Phoenicia* (Studia Phoenicia IV / Collection d'études classiques 1), Namur 1986: 239-247.

HUSS 1985 = W. HUSS, *Geschichte der Karthager* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 3/8), München 1985.

JONGELING 1994 = K. JONGELING, *North-African Names from Latin Sources*, Leiden 1994.

JONGELING 1999 = K. JONGELING, "The Concluding Formulae in Punic Votive Inscriptions", DS-NELL 4, 1999: 39-79.

KERR 2016 = R. M. KERR, "*Facio ut des.* Zum Verbgebrauch in punischen Weihinschriften", *Kusatu* 20, 2016: 119-122.

LANCELLOTTI 2003 = M. G. LANCELLOTTI, "La donna", in J. A. ZAMORA (ed.), *El hombre fenicio. Estudios y materiales*, Roma 2003: 185-198.

LEGLAY = M. LEGLAY *Saturne Africain. Histoire*, Paris 1966.

LIETZ 2012 = B. LIETZ, *La dea di Erice e la sua diffusione nel Mediterraneo: un culto tra Fenici, Greci e Romani*, Pisa 2012.

MELCHIORRI 2013 = V. MELCHIORRI, "Tophet: A Selected Bibliography", in XELLA 2013: 283-312.

MOSCATI 1968 = S. MOSCATI, "Il popolo di Bitia", *RSO* 43, 1968: 1-4.

MOSCATI 1987 = S. MOSCATI, *Il sacrificio punico dei fanciulli: realtà o invenzione?* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Problemi attuali di scienza e cultura. Quaderno 261), Roma 1987.

PPG[3] = J. FRIEDRICH – W. RÖLLIG, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik*. 3. Auflage, neu bearbeitet von M. G. Amadasi Guzzo unter Mitarbeit von W. R. Mayer (Analecta Orientalia 55), Roma 1999.

RIBICHINI 1985 = S. RIBICHINI, "Morte e oltretomba a Cartagine: a proposito di un libro recente", *SMSR* 51, 1985: 353-364

SCHIFFMANN 1976 = I. SCHIFFMANN, "Zur Interpretation der Inschriften IFPCO Sard 36 und 39 aus Sardinien", *RStudFen* 4, 1976: 49-52.

SZNYCER 1975 = M. SZNYCER, "L'assemblée du peuple dans les cités puniques d'après les témoignages épigraphiques", *Semitica* 25, 1975: 48-68.

VAN DEN BRANDEN 1979 = A. VAN DEN BRANDEN, "Le *ʾš ṣdn*", *Bibbia e Oriente* 36, 1979: 157-160.

VERGER 1965 = A. VERGER, "Note di epigrafia giuridica punica 1. Matronimici e ierodulia nell'Africa punica", *RSO* 45, 1965: 261-265.

XELLA (ed.) 2013 = P. XELLA (ed.), *The Tophet in the Phoenician Mediterranean* (= *SEL* 29-30), Verona 2013.