THE MONASTIC CEMETERIES OF THE WÂDY ER-RABÂBI.

By Professor CLEEMONT-GANNEAU, LL.D.

I BELIEVE it is possible to draw a further, and somewhat important, conclusion from the copy of the inscription in the Wâdy er-Rabâbi, No. 13, Pl. V, pp. 236, 237, where I propose to read:—

+ Ο ἴη εἰαφέρουν τόδ
ἀγιον Σε[ρ]γ[ιά]. . . . . τό?
ὑποσωρά. . . . . . . . . . .

"Tomb belonging to the (Convent) of St. Sergius . . . the hypsorion . . . . ."

The word hypsorion does not occur in the lexicons, but it is
frequently found in funerary epitaphs, more especially in Lycia,\(^1\) where it denotes the subterranean floor of the sepulchre in which the slaves belonging to the family were generally buried. This lower floor, perhaps, still exists uninjured in the tomb of the Wâdy er-Rabâbi.

The Convent of St. Sergius at Jerusalem is mentioned in the Commemoratorium de Casis Dei, the compilation of which appears to go back to the commencement of the ninth century. The same document also mentions the Convent of Sancta Sion and that of Sanctus Georgius, the names of which recur in the other inscriptions from the group of monastic cemeteries in the Wâdy er-Rabâbi. We have here a chronological indication for the whole epigraphic group, the value of which cannot be mistaken.

As regards the topographical observations made in p. 239, we should remember that the Convent of Juvenal, the position of which I have attempted to determine in a memoir referred to by the Père Lagrange and Mr. Macalister—if, indeed, it is this convent which is alluded to in the inscription—was not necessarily in the immediate neighbourhood of the tomb which belonged to it. Different convents could occupy various sites within or outside Jerusalem, while their respective cemeteries were grouped together in the same region of the Wâdy er-Rabâbi.

Paris, July 24th, 1900.

---

THE COLLECTION OF BABYLONIAN TABLETS BELONGING TO JOSEPH OFFORD, ESQ.

By Theophilus G. Pinches, Esq.

Since the publication of my article upon these documents in the July Quarterly Statement, I have found that the British Museum tablet 89-10-14, 330, is a duplicate of the fourth tablet of Mr. Offord’s collection, which is described and translated on pp. 264–268. To all appearance the museum tablet is either an ancient copy or a first draught of the inscription, and not the official text, as it is unprovided with the seal of the seller. There are two

---

\(^1\) See, for example, the inscriptions in Le Bas and Waddington: "Voyage Archéologique," Nos. 1272, 1275, 1278, 1279, 1280, 1287, 1301, &c.