The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

**Rawlinson's History of Phoenicia *History of Phoenicia.*
by George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of
Ancient History in the University of Oxford. London
and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1889. Pp. xxii.
583. 8vo. 24s.**

Cecil Torr

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 03 / March 1890, pp 126 - 127

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00189838, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00189838

How to cite this article:

Cecil Torr (1890). Review of E.C. Spary 'Feeding France: New Sciences of Food, 1760-1815'
The Classical Review, 4, pp 126-127 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00189838

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

interesting chapter (Book IV., cap. vii.) on 'the Language of the Romaioi in the Sixth Century.' He distinguishes 'three kinds of Greek: (1) the vulgar spoken language from which modern Greek is derived, (2) the spoken language of the educated, which under the influence of the vulgar tongue tended to degenerate, and (3) the conventional written language which endeavoured to preserve the traditions of Hellenistic prose from the changes which affected the oral "common dialect." He concludes, partly from the strange dialogue between Justinian and the Green Faction which has been preserved by Theophanes, that the Hellenic language was 'already far on its way to becoming what is called Romaic and was in fact already known by that name.'

'A sixth-century inscription in Nubia proves that the word *νηρόν* was then used for "water," whence comes the modern Greek *νερό*. A mule is *βορδώνης* instead of *ήμίονος* and *σγαυδάριν* or *γαυδάριν* is apparently used

for an ass. A standard is *βάνδον*, an iron-headed club is *δίστριν*, luggage is *τούλδον*, and *σκούλκα* is used for a guard or watch. Besides the strange vocabulary, derived partly from Latin and partly from local Greek words, changes are taking place in the grammar and syntax. Terminations in *-ιον* for example are becoming corrupted to *-ιν*: the perfect tense and many prepositions and particles are falling into disuse.'

We conclude, as we began, by commending to the attention of all historical students, but especially of those who may have been chiefly occupied hitherto with the fortunes of Athens and the Elder Rome, this careful and patient survey of the history of the Roman Empire during a period which witnessed changes of the most momentous import to the nations of Europe and Asia, the effects of which we are continually feeling in the political controversies of our own day.

THOS. HODGKIN.

RAWLINSON'S HISTORY OF PHOENICIA.

History of Phoenicia. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1889. Pp. xxii. 583. 8vo. 24s.

THE Bible is the chief source of Prof. Rawlinson's information about Phoenicia: he cites it more than 250 times as his authority. Its evidence appears to him conclusive, and is accordingly exempted from any criticism. Thus he says on p. 449:—'The army which he [Sennacherib] set in motion must have numbered more than 200,000 men.' And in a note he gives his reason for this estimate:—'It was the same army which lost 185,000 men by miracle in one night (2 Kings, xix. 35).' And yet he at times fails to take note of important biblical statements; e.g. in speaking of the siege of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar, he says on p. 473 that the city submitted:—'Thus Tyre, in B.C. 585, fell from her high estate. Ezekiel's prophecies were fulfilled.' But Ezekiel himself, xxix. 18, admits the notorious fact that his prophecies were not fulfilled, inasmuch as the siege failed.

The Egyptian and Assyrian sources have not been properly utilized. For Egyptian sources, there is one reference to Brugsch's

History of Egypt, and three references to two translations in *Records of the Past*: and that is all. Consequently on pp. 406, 407, there is only some vague talk about Egyptian supremacy and its decline, where there should be precise statements about the Egyptian invasion of Phoenicia in the twenty-ninth year of Thothmes III., the invasion of Egypt from Phoenicia in the eighth year of Rameses III., and so forth. There is no allusion to the alleged Phoenician origin of the Hyksos; nor to the suggested identification of the Fenchu of the inscriptions with the Phoenicians. For Assyrian sources, there are only references to George Smith's *Eponym Canon*, and to translations in *Records of the Past*. Consequently many historical events are completely ignored: e.g. the reduction of Cyprus by Sargon, attested by the Larnaka inscription. The Babylonian or Assyrian origin of Phoenician writing, maintained by some high authorities, is likewise ignored; though space is found on p. 378 for wild conjectures about Hittite hieroglyphic and the Cypriote syllabary. Curiously E. de Rougé's theory of derivation from Egyptian hieratic is attributed by Prof. Rawlinson on p. 377 to a writer in the last edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, as if it were there enunciated for the first time.

The Greek and Latin sources were pretty completely collected by Movers; and then Kenrick appropriated most of his results. But Prof. Rawlinson has been imprudent in trusting entirely to Kenrick. For instance, Movers made a perfectly convincing emendation of *sixteen* for *sixty* in Josephus, *Antiquitates*, ix. 14. 2, but Kenrick missed this; and accordingly Prof. Rawlinson has made mistaken observations on pp. 446, 447, in the belief that the number really was sixty. Such of the Greek and Latin sources as have been utilized, have not been properly sifted: the trustworthy and untrustworthy being cited with provoking impartiality. And many of them have not been utilized at all. There is no allusion, for example, to the so-called Treaty of Kallias: though the prosperity and foreign commerce of Phoenicia must have been profoundly affected by an agreement which secured the Aegean to the Greeks and the eastern waters round Cyprus to the Persians and their dependents the Phoenicians.

The material sources of information about Phoenicia have lately been discussed by MM. Perrot and Chipiez in the third volume of their work: and their results might have been subjected to judicious condensation. As it is, some things are noticed at length, while others of equal importance are dismissed in a few words or simply ignored. Thus, exactly one tenth of the whole space devoted to architecture and art and manufactures is occupied by a detailed description of a series of bowls: and this is mere description in the style of an auction catalogue, quite valueless apart from criticism. The illustrations, with hardly an exception, are taken from this volume of MM. Perrot and Chipiez. The obligation is generally acknowledged: but on p. ix. of the preface and in the list of illustrations it is stated that many of them are taken from various other books there mentioned. This is misleading: they were taken from those books by MM. Perrot and Chipiez. There are similarly misleading statements on pp. vii. and ix. to the effect that Prof. Rawlinson has drawn materials from Movers. He has them at second hand through Kenrick.

For Phoenician inscriptions Prof. Rawlinson has relied, in every case but one, upon the translations in Gesenius and in the early parts of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*. But he quotes the inscription of Tabnith on p. 395 from his own book, *The Story of Phoenicia*. Had he referred to his real authority, M. Renan's translation in the

Revue Archéologique for July 1887, he would have seen that he has left out a line. On pp. 396, 397, he gives a rendering of *C.I.S.* No. 1: and says in a note that he has followed M. Renan's translation. Here is a portion of this translation:—'Omnis regia stirps et omnis homo qui addiderit facere opus super al[tare hoc et super] coelaturam auream hanc et super porticum hanc, [pono] ego Iehamelecus, [rex Gebal, faciem meam adversus eum qui] fecerit opus hoc, et sive...sive...istum. Et quicunque... super locum hunc, [et quicunque..., aboleat] domina Baalat-Gebal hominem ipsum et semen ejus.' And here is the rendering of this:—'Every royal personage and every other man who shall make additions to this altar, or to this golden carving, or to this portico, I, Jehamelek, king of Gebal, set my face against him who shall do so, and I pray my lady Beltis of Gebal to destroy that man, whoever he be, and his seed after him.' The rendering, *whoever he be*, is really admirable.

The slipshod reasoning on imperfect or inaccurate information, which is too characteristic of this book, cannot be fully exposed in a brief review. The opening statements of the book must serve here as specimens of its style throughout. Prof. Rawlinson begins by saying that the palm-tree 'formed a leading and striking characteristic' of Phoenicia: and hence the Greeks 'called the tract Phoenicia, or the Land of Palms; and the people who inhabited it the Phoenicians, or the Palm-tree people.' Now, it is true that *Φοῖνῃξ* means a Phoenician and also means a palm-tree, and that *Φοινίκη* means Phoenicia. But the argument from mere identity of name goes just as well the other way:—the Greeks called the palm-tree the Phoenician because it was characteristic of Phoenicia. And then the meaning of the name must be considered. The Phoenicians may have got the name because they were themselves of ruddy countenance, or because they traded in the ruddy dye; but palm-trees are not strikingly ruddy. He then argues that the palm must anciently have been among the chief ornaments of the coast round Aradus, because 'the palm is the numismatic emblem of Aradus.' It is only on one small series of the coins of Aradus, from 244 to 183 B.C., that the palm occurs as an emblem. But the inference would be unwarrantable in any case, for such emblems were chosen quite capriciously.