The Greek Inscriptions of the Temple at Damascus

Louis Jalabert

To cite this article: Louis Jalabert (1912) The Greek Inscriptions of the Temple at Damascus, Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 44:3, 150-153, DOI: [10.1179/peq.1912.44.3.150](https://doi.org/10.1179/peq.1912.44.3.150)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/peq.1912.44.3.150>

Published online: 20 Nov 2013.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 4

View related articles [↗](#)

In conclusion, the cenotaphs are monuments, not tombs. Under the church is the original Cave Tomb of Machpelah. In the church pavement are three movable slabs, which give access, by ladder or rope, to the Cave. But two are fastened up, and not even Moslems are allowed to enter by the third. It is used to throw down written petitions to Abraham; and, looking down, the floor is seen to be covered as with snow-flakes. When George V visited the mosque, a light was let down, and the rocky sides were seen, and a doorway entering out of this ante-chamber into the Tomb Cave itself.

Almost all the facts, dates, descriptions, and explanations in the above article have been taken from a very valuable report by the late Colonel Conder, R.E., in the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, October, 1882, pp. 197-206, where is also the best plan of the Haram yet printed, Colonel Conder (then Captain) having accompanied George V (then Prince) to the Hebron Mosque in that year. But these photographs add some details which are not to be found even in Colonel Conder's report.

THE GREEK INSCRIPTIONS OF THE TEMPLE AT DAMASCUS.

By Father LOUIS JALABERT, S.J.,

University of St. Joseph, Beirut.

HAVING studied the inscriptions of Damascus with a view to the *Corpus* of the Greek and Roman Inscriptions of Syria, I am in a position to furnish some additional observations relating to the new text published by the Rev. J. E. Hanauer in the *Quarterly Statement* for January, 1912, pp. 40 *sqq.* As the editor has not appended to it any transcription, I may be allowed first to propose the reading, which is the more easy since the copy of your correspondent is excellent, and requires only a slight correction:—

Ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ Μηνόδω-
ρον Ζένωνος νεώτερον
ἱεροταμιῶν ᾠκοῖομή-
θησαν καὶ ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ
ταύτῃ δόμ[ο]ι εἰς τῶν
τοῦ κυρίου Διδ[ός].
Ἔτους θμτ'.

This inscription belongs, as the Rev. Hanauer has well seen, to a series of texts relating to the activity of various commissions of "temple-stewards" (*hierotamiai*) who have successively presided over the temple of the Damascene Jupiter.¹ He cites four of these² :—

- (a) Waddington, No. 2551 *a* = *CIG*, 4512.
- (b) Waddington, No. 1879 = *CIG*, 4513; Porter, *Five Years in Damascus*, I, p. 60; and *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, second series (1856), p. 367 (after Porter's copy).³
- (c) *Q.S.*, 1910, p. 40, with the corrections proposed by Prof. Clermont-Ganneau, *ibid.*, p. 85.

To these texts must be added four which your correspondent has not noticed :—

- (d) Waddington, No. 2551 *b* = *CIG*, 4514.
- (e) *Q.S.*, 1896, p. 225, and 1897, p. 84; Clermont-Ganneau, *Études d'Archéol. Orient.*, II, p. 149; *Revue Biblique*, 1900, pp. 92, 307 and 441; Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'Archéol. Orient.*, IV, p. 83; *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XIV, p. 19, No. 1; *Izvestiia rous-skago archeolog. institouta v. Konstantinopolie*, VII, p. 100.
- (f) *Revue Biblique*, 1900, pp. 92 and 307; *Recueil d'Archéol. Orient.*, IV, p. 83.
- (g) *Ibid.*, p. 93.

All these texts do not expressly mention the office of the temple-stewards; we find them only in *a*, *b*, *c*, *f*, as also in the text edited by the Rev. Hanauer, and in that of Dr. Popolani (*Q.S.*, 1912, p. 42). The inscription *e* mentions the "first architect"—*ὁ πρῶτος* [*ἀρ*][*χ*ι][*τ*ε]*κ*[*τ*ω]ν, if we adopt Uspenski's reading.

If to the seven inscriptions enumerated above we add that published by the Rev. Hanauer and that discovered by Dr. Popolani, and if we complete the series by Waddington, 2549 (*cf.* Froehner, *Mélanges*, XI-XXV, p. 31), 2550 and 2551 (Renan, *Mission en Phénicie*, p. 359), we should actually possess a group of twelve inscriptions relating to the great temple of Jupiter Damascenus.⁴

¹ See, for this temple, the note by Perdrizet, *Revue Biblique*, 1900, p. 440 *seq.*

² *CIG*, 4516 = Waddington, No. 2562 *g*, has no connection with the temple at Damascus.

³ It may be asked whether the inscription published in the *Athenaeum*, 1881, June 4th, p. 759, is not a bad copy, and an imperfect one, of this text.

⁴ I leave out of account the inscription published by A. Dumont (*Revue Archéol.*, 1869, I, p. 456); it seems patently of a funerary character; moreover, there is no space here to introduce the inscriptions relating to the Christian basilica which followed the temple of Jupiter.

Of these the most interesting are those which have preserved, though in a fragmentary state, details of the works executed in the temple and its immediate surroundings. The details are as follows:—

- (b) . . . τὸ γάμμα ἀπὸ τοῦ . . . [μέχρι] τῆς ἀμαξηλάτου εἰσόδου ἐθεμ[ελιώθη . . .] ἐκ τῶν τ.ῦ κυρίου Διός.
- (c) ᾠκοδομήθη τὸ παρὸν τίχος τοῦ δ[υτικοῦ μέρους . . . or περιβόλου]. One can scarcely venture upon any more complete restoration—[τῆς αὐ]λη(ς) σπονδῇ . . . —because the extent of the lacuna is not known exactly.
- (e) [ἐπ]ο[ιη]σ[ε]ν Μητροφάνης . . . The restoration of the first word, proposed by Clermont-Ganneau, seems to be justified by the copies of Masterman, von Oppenheim and Uspenski. The word ἐποίησεν, very vague in itself, received a more precise sense from the place which the block occupied in the original building. As a matter of fact it is no more *in situ*.
- (f) ὁ πύργος ἀπὸ τοῦ τρ I do not venture upon a restoration since the extent of the lacuna is not certain. The restoration of the continuation proposed by Clermont-Ganneau may well be the best—[ἐκ μαρ]μαραίου [λ][θ]ου—but one would rather have expected μαρμαρίνου. If the lacuna is, as it seems, very short, one may perhaps think of restoring simply ἀπὸ τοῦ τρ[ίτου μαρ]μαραίου [λ][θ]ου. The remainder of the restoration, as proposed by Clermont-Ganneau—appears to me to be open to question—καὶ σὺν τῷ ἐν[ύ]δ[ρῳ] ταφρεύματι καὶ σπαλ[-ίωνι].
- (h) . . . ἐπάνω κύματι . . . [ἐ]ξέδρας; perhaps, [σὺν τῷ ἐ]πάνω κύματι (?)

Finally the inscription published by the Rev. Hanauer furnishes the following information: ᾠκοδομήθησαν καὶ ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ ταύτῃ δόμο[ι] ε', or ιε', if the horizontal line surmounts the two characters as in his copy; in this case the engraver or the copyist has omitted one of the two successive 1. Thus, apart from *other* works, there will have been placed 5 (or 15) courses on the side east of the peribolus—that is, if the stone is still approximately in its original position.

If we have to allow for the probable removal of all these inscribed stones, one can scarcely venture to locate the works to which they refer. It will be noticed, however, that the Rev. Hanauer's inscription was discovered north of the triple bay on the east; the same provenance is indicated for the text *c*. Inscription *d* seems to have been seen on the north (?) of the ancient temple, while *b* was recovered on the south, a little way away from the peribolus. Dr. Popolani's inscription was found on the west, and finally, *e* was built into the wall south of the great mosque, and *f* and *g* on the northern part of the eastern wall.

Thus, we see, the epigraphical data fix the four sides of the building. The information which the texts bring to us are not to be ignored.

Through them we get to know some details of the works, we know who has presided over them, and what purse has paid the expenses.

Four texts even contain some chronological indications: α mentions the Emperor Julian; two others are dated respectively **LZ** (f) and **ΘMT** (Hanauer); the last (c) has only preserved of the date the characters **II**.

It is not necessary to read solely η' or $\iota\beta'$, as the Rev. H. S. Cronin has proposed (*Q.S.*, 1910, p. 42); the date should contain three letters, like the two texts which are better preserved.

It is evident that the two dates **Z** and **ΘMT** are not to be calculated after the Seleucid era in use at Damascus.¹ The Rev. Hanauer is right, I think, in introducing the era of Pompey, which commences in 64 B.C. or October 63.² Following this computation, the Rev. Hanauer's inscription will date from A.D. 285 or 286, and will be a few months later than the advent of Diocletian. This date harmonizes very well with the palaeography, which points to a rather low period. This is characteristic of all the texts in question, only inscription α is apparently more ancient.

THE PILGRIMAGE OF SYMON SIMEONIS.

By PROF. R. A. S. MACALISTER, M.A., F.S.A.

MR. MARIO ESPOSITO of Dublin, whose name is honourably known for his researches into the writings of mediaeval Irish Ecclesiastics, has recently contributed to *Hermathena* (the journal published by Trinity College, Dublin) an interesting account of the itinerary of Symon Simeonis, an Irish Franciscan, who visited Egypt and Palestine in the year 1322. There is but one manuscript of this document extant, in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which was very inaccurately edited in 1777, and has since been completely neglected. In the company of another friar, called in the itinerary Hugo Illuminator,³ he travelled from his monastery, the name of which (Clen . . .) is unfortunately

¹ At Damascus it underwent a slight modification: cf. Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'Archéol. Orient.*, I, p. 9 seq.

² At least at Gerasa: cf. Brunnow, *Provincia Arabia*, III, p. 304.

³ No doubt a translation of some native Irish name—Aedh Solusta, or the like.