

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE HONORARY SECRETARY,
CAPTAIN FRANCIS W. H. PETRIE, F.G.S., &c.

VOL. XXI.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute).

INDIA : W. THACKER & Co. UNITED STATES : G. T. PUTNAM'S SONS, N.Y.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND : G. ROBERTSON & Co., LIM.

CANADA : DAWSON BROS., *Montreal*.

S. AFRICA : JUTA & Co., *Cape Town*.

PARIS : GALIGNANI.

1888.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

ORDINARY MEETING, MAY 17, 1886.

D. HOWARD, Esq., V.P.C.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following Elections were announced :—

LIFE MEMBER :—Rev. F. H. Baring, M.A., London.

ASSOCIATES :—H. Carr Smith, Esq., Reading ; J. K. Barton, Esq., M.D., T.C.D., F.R.C.S.I., Dublin.

The following paper was then read by Mr. H. CADMAN JONES, M.A., the author being unable to be present on account of his official duties.

ON THE CONNEXION BETWEEN JEWISH, PHŒNICIAN, AND EARLY GREEK ART AND ARCHITECTURE. By the REV. J. LESLIE PORTER, D.D., LL.D., President of Queen's College, Belfast.

A FEW years ago I had a favourable opportunity, when cruising in a yacht along the shores of the Mediterranean, of inspecting and exploring some of the ancient cities and temples whose ruins stud the coasts of Greece, Asia Minor, and Africa. I had previously visited, and examined with considerable care and minuteness, almost every spot of antiquarian and historic interest in Palestine, Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Northern Egypt. I had seen those remarkable relics of primeval art and luxury exhumed by Schliemann from the mounds of Troy and the tombs of Mycenæ. I had read, too, the graphic narrative of the researches of Di Cesnola, and his full description of the Phœnician and Greek sculptures and ornaments of gold and silver discovered by him in the temples, tombs, and subterranean chambers of Cyprus. I have since, as far as time and important official duties permitted, endeavoured to compare with each other the antiquarian remains of the several countries and cities I have named, with a view, if possible,

to trace the origin of art and architecture, and to ascertain to what race or nation we are mainly indebted for the first designs, and for the earliest principles, of art; and in what way, and by what agency, the knowledge was propagated and art developed. I had another object in view—to throw some additional light, if possible, upon the accounts given by the sacred writers of the building and decoration of Solomon's Temple and Palace in Jerusalem.

I must here confess that it is with extreme diffidence I venture to express my views on this subject before a London audience. In prosecuting my studies I have laboured under great disadvantages. Though I have visited so many of the ancient sites, and explored so many of the old ruins, I have not had any special training for such work. I was a mere amateur. And when in my library at home I have not had access to those vast and invaluable stores of antiquities laid up in the British Museum, nor have I enjoyed the incalculable advantage of intercourse with those *savants* in this great metropolis who have devoted their special attainments and learning to classical and Oriental archæology. I have simply investigated, read, and thought for myself. My aim now is to give the results in a short, popular form, and thus to try at least to direct the attention of others, better qualified than I can pretend to be, to matters which, in my opinion, are of no small importance, especially for Biblical students.

ARCHITECTURE.

During my wanderings over Bible lands and along the classic shores of the Levant, I was often struck with the close resemblance, in many respects, between the most ancient architectural remains of the Jews, the Phœnicians, and the Greeks, both in their own country and in their colonies in Asia Minor. I read with renewed interest and attention the accounts given by the sacred writers of the building of Solomon's Temple and Palace in Jerusalem—how the foundations and massive walls were built “of costly stones, even of hewn stone, according to measure, sawed with saws, within and without, even from the foundation unto the coping, and so on the outside unto the great court. And the foundation was of costly stones, even great stones, stones of ten cubits and stones of eight cubits” (1 Kings vii. 9, 10). Josephus makes the size of the stones greater still, some being forty cubits long (*Ant.*, xv. 11). Many of the stones of the encircling wall of the Temple platform are in their places. I

have measured several varying from twenty to thirty-eight feet in length by nearly six in thickness; and the wall itself rises in places to a height of one hundred and fifty feet. The huge platform, so constructed, is on the crown of Mount Moriah, and is about five hundred yards long by three hundred broad. Near its centre, standing on the natural rock, was the Temple itself,—the *ναός*, “shrine,” as distinguished from the *ἱερόν*, “sacred enclosure,”—a site now occupied by the great Mosque. I could not fail to admire the grandeur of the site and the magnificence of the masonry. I observed, as others have done, that many of the large stones had cut upon them masons’ marks,—Phœnician letters,—showing, as the sacred writers inform us, that the buildings were erected by Phœnician workmen. Solomon, in his letter to Hiram, King of Tyre, acknowledges that among the Jews there were no skilled workmen, and therefore asked men from Hiram, and when they arrived “they hewed out great stones, costly stones, to lay the foundation of the house with wrought stone. And Solomon’s builders, and Hiram’s builders, and the Gebalites did fashion them” (1 Kings v. 7, 17, 18).

Here is the first link of connexion between Jewish and Phœnician architecture, and it is a remarkable confirmation of the accuracy of the Bible record, that we can now see the marks of those Phœnician masons upon the great stones they laid in Solomon’s days. There is another noteworthy allusion in the passage I have quoted. The *Gebalites* are specially mentioned, for this is the true rendering of the Hebrew word translated “stone squarers” in our Authorised Version. They were the inhabitants of the old Phœnician city of Gebal, at the foot of Lebanon, north of Sidon; and I have seen in its own old ramparts colossal stones of the very same type as those in Jerusalem (Cf. Ezek. xxvii. 9). They occur also in the extant foundations of Sidon, Tyre, and Arvad; indeed, in most of the ruins along the Phœnician coast and on the neighbouring heights of Lebanon. Perhaps, however, the most remarkable is the stylobate, or platform, of the temples of Baalbek. The Phœnician architects appear to have had a special liking for colossal stones; and in Baalbek they surpassed all their other works in this respect. Three stones placed on a massive sustaining wall, at a height of twenty-five feet from the ground, measure in length, respectively, sixty feet, sixty-three feet, and sixty-four feet, by fourteen feet deep and fourteen broad. It is worthy of note, too, that this ancient site bears the name to this day of the Phœnician sun-god, *Baal*. *Baal-bek* signifies “City of Baal.” The Greeks called it in their own tongue,

Heliopolis, "City of the Sun." It was to Baal, her Sidonian deity, the infamous Jezebel, daughter of *Eth-Baal*, built a temple in Samaria (1 Kings xvi. 31-33). The worship of Baal was then introduced into Israel, and had a most degrading influence both upon the faith and morals of the nation.

TEMPLES.

The plan of Solomon's Temple was Phœnician—the spacious open court, the massive encircling wall, the commanding site, and the central shrine. We have the same plan at Baalbek; at Palmyra, that eastern outpost of Phœnician commerce; and, upon a much smaller scale, at Amrit, on the coast near Arvad. At the latter place the court is mostly excavated in the solid rock; and the shrine, in some respects resembling that of Jerusalem, is a portion of the natural rock, left standing, and moulded into a kind of throne. In Greece, we find the same general plan in the Acropolis of Athens; also, but not so definitely circumscribed, in the Acrocorinthus of Corinth; in the Larissa of Argos; in Tiryns, and in Mycenæ; also, apparently, in the *Cadmeia* of Thebes, which long retained the name of its Phœnician founder, Cadmus.

INTERNAL DECORATION.

The internal decorations and gorgeous fittings and furniture of Solomon's Temple are minutely described in the Bible. The entire walls, the floor, the ceiling, the pillars, the doors, the sacred ark, the altar were overlaid with pure gold, richly chased and carved with designs of fruit, palm-trees, and cherubim. The porch, too, was overlaid with gold. The sacred vessels were all of gold. The chief artist in this gorgeous work was a Phœnician. The King of Tyre thus introduced him to Solomon:—"I now have sent a cunning man endued with understanding, the son of a woman of the daughters of Dan, and his father was a man of Tyre, skilful to work in gold, and in silver, in brass, in iron, in stone, and in timber, in purple, in blue, and in fine linen, and in crimson; also to grave any manner of graving, and to find out every device" (2 Ch. ii. 13-14). We read that he was a lapidary as well, for "he garnished the house with precious stones for beauty" (iii. 6). His skill in carving and gold-beating must have been wonderful. "He made two cherubim of olive-wood, each ten cubits high. And five cubits was the one

wing of the cherub, and five the other wing, from the uttermost part of the one wing unto the uttermost part of the other were ten cubits; and the wings were stretched forth, so that the wing of the one cherub touched the one wall, and the wing of the other the other wall. . . . He made two doors of olive-wood, and carved upon them carvings of cherubim, and palm-trees, and open flowers, and overlaid them with gold, and he spread the gold upon the cherubim, and upon the palm-trees . . . fitted upon the graven work" (1 Kings vi. 23-33).

In front of the great gate of the Temple two brazen pillars were set up, each apparently thirty-five cubits in extreme height, and twelve in circumference (Cf. 2 Chron. iii. 15-17, and 1 Kings vii. 15-20). So far as I can gather, they seem to have had no structural connexion with the main building or the porch. They were isolated—one on each side of the gate; but their costly material and elaborate ornaments would appear to indicate some high mystic signification and purpose. Pillars, obelisks, and tall pyramids, generally of stone, have been found in front of Phœnician sanctuaries in various parts of the Levant; and they are not unfrequently figured on coins. Most of the great temples in Egypt had a pair of obelisks in front. Probably the nearest approach in form to Jachin and Boaz of Solomon's Temple are the pillars of Persepolis.

One of the grand adjuncts of the Temple was the brazen sea, or cistern, ten cubits in diameter. It was supported on twelve oxen, also of brass, three facing each of the cardinal points. Sculptured figures of lions, oxen, and cherubim surrounded the edge, and were linked together by pendent floral wreaths. Underneath were other elaborate ornaments, wrought in brass, of fruit, foliage, and flowers. In design and execution, this magnificent laver was probably unequalled in ancient times. The costliness of material employed in the decoration and fittings of the Temple, and in the other buildings constructed by Solomon, was no less remarkable than the artistic genius and skill of the workmen. The sacred vessels, lamps, cups, censers—in fact, all the utensils of whatever kind used by the priests in the sanctuary—were of pure gold. And, in addition to these, we are told that Solomon made, doubtless by the hands, or under the direction of the same Phœnician artist, "three hundred shields of beaten gold" and "two hundred targets of beaten gold," and put them in "the house of the forest of Lebanon." "Moreover, the king made a great throne of ivory, and overlaid it with the finest gold." Six steps led up to it, and at the end of each step were two lions (1 Kings x. 16-19). The correspondence between this display

of wealth, luxury, and art, and that of some of the ancient palaces and temples of Greece I shall show presently.

The building of the Temple occupied seven years, and when it was finished, Solomon built a palace for himself, and decorated it in a corresponding style of splendour. In this work thirteen years were spent. There were evidently several distinct courts in the palace, each having suites of apartments, just as we find in modern Oriental palaces. There was apparently one court containing the judgment-hall and public offices; another, the private apartments of the king and his male attendants; another, or perhaps several, for females. The House of the Forest of Lebanon was apparently the royal armoury. The recent excavations of Schliemann in the citadel of Tiryns, one of Greece's most ancient capitals, have brought to light the plan and foundations of a palace which resemble that described by the sacred writers. The architects were of the same nationality, for Tiryns was founded by Phœnicians (Schliemann, *Tiryns*, p. 28).

DIFFERENCES IN STYLE.

In comparing the sacred architecture and art of the Jews with other nations, the fundamental difference between their religious principles and forms of worship must be kept in mind. A purely spiritual faith forbade any visible representation of Deity. The Divine command was singularly clear:—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them." The Fetichism of Egypt, Phœnicia, and Assyria, as well as its subsequent more intellectual development in Greece, was thus sweepingly prohibited. In the Jewish temple, however, we have the ark, with its mercy-seat and overshadowing cherubim, the altars of incense and burnt offering, and all the vessels and utensils connected therewith. No scope for the prurient fancy, no sphere for the materialistic tendencies of the human mind, and, above all, no opening for debasing and licentious symbolism, were here afforded in Jewish art. The grand truth that God is Spirit, and that those who worship Him aright must worship Him in Spirit, was enshrined from the very outset in the Jewish religion, and exhibited in the decorations and arrangements of the Temple. Under it no form of idolatry was, or could be, tolerated.

In Phœnicia, and indeed among all the aboriginal tribes

of Syria, the earliest sanctuaries were "high places," whence the rising and setting sun, the chief object of worship, could be seen. The name *Baal*, "Lord" or "Master," was given to the sun as the supposed ruler of the universe, and the source of life and energy. It would appear, however, that the close proximity of Phœnicia to Israel and the friendly relations of the two peoples—perhaps, also, to some extent the wisdom and counsel of Solomon—exercised more or less of a refining influence upon the religion of the Phœnicians, and instilled into the minds of some of their sages a faintly-rational idea of one supreme God, the Creator and Governor of the universe; and this idea the name Baal would be easily made to embody. It is a remarkable fact that the Jews and Phœnicians always dwelt together on friendly terms. With the other surrounding peoples the Jews were often at war; with the Phœnicians never. The Phœnicians were a practical people, devoted to manufacture, commerce, and colonisation. They had no taste, and, perhaps, little natural talent, for speculation, whether religious or philosophical. The Israelites took advantage of their manufacturing and nautical skill and enterprise, and were able thereby to collect wealth from all parts of the world. They built a fleet for Solomon at Ezion-geber, on the Red Sea; "and Hiram sent in the ships his servants, shipmen that had knowledge of the sea, with the servants of Solomon" (1 Kings ix. 26, 27). The Jews were thus brought, through the instrumentality of the Phœnicians, into mercantile relations with distant nations. We read that the ships of Solomon went to Tarshish with the servants of Hiram once every three years, bringing gold, silver, and ivory; and the kings of the earth sought the presence of Solomon to hear his wisdom; and they brought presents—vessels of silver and gold, and robes, and armour (2 Chron. ix. 21, *seq.*). Thus the art-treasures, as well as the wealth, of the East and West were carried to Jerusalem.

I have said that the earliest sanctuaries of the Phœnicians were "high places." Against the idolatrous worship subsequently practised on those the Israelites were repeatedly and sternly warned by the prophets, and not always with success. This mode of worship seems to have had a special attraction for the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine. At first it appears to have been simple nature-worship; but in time the sun came to be symbolised by an image placed in the temple, or on the rude cairn. I have seen several such images—the sun's face with its circle of rays. The idol-god, as a matter of course, changed in form and character, according to the ideas of the worshipper; and the religion of the people

gradually degenerated into a degrading Pantheism, which deified the whole hosts of heaven, and personified and worshipped with licentious rites the forces of nature. The homage paid by the Phœnicians to Astarte, the deity whom Jeremiah (xliv. 18) calls the "Queen of Heaven," beguiled the Hebrew women, and brought disgrace and misery upon them and their country. Its chief seat was on the brow of Lebanon, where the ruins of the temple now lie, beside the great fountain of the River Adonis, which issues from a cavern in the hillside. The well-known lines of Milton refer to the shameful rites :—

. . . Thammuz came next behind,
Whose annual wound in Lebanon allured
The Syrian damsels to lament his fate
In amorous ditties all a summer day ;
While smooth Adonis from his native rock
Ran purple to the sea, supposed with blood
Of Thammuz, yearly wounded.

Astarte was supposed to represent the moon, and she is figured as a female with the crescent on her forehead. She was also supposed to symbolise the planet Venus, and she is therefore spoken of by Jewish commentators as the "Star of Heaven." It may be that the "Crescent and Star," the standard of Islam, is a relic of the old Syrian deity.

JEWISH AND PHENICIAN TOMBS.

Among the most remarkable and interesting of Jewish monuments are tombs, and in these also we find some striking points of resemblance to those of Phœnicia and Greece. From the earliest ages the Jews selected with much care, secured as far as possible from violation, and also to a considerable extent decorated, the abodes of their dead. The tombs were usually caves, sometimes natural, but often hewn in the rock at great expense. Here the bodies were laid in state, and, in the case of nobles and princes, gold and jewels were not unfrequently placed beside them. In the Book of Job, probably among the oldest in the Bible, this practice is referred to, where the Patriarch, speaking of his own mournful state, and his wish that he had died in infancy, says : " Now should I have lain down and been quiet . . . then had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth, which built desolate places [rock-tombs] for themselves, or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver " (iii. 13-15). So, also, the prophet Isaiah was commissioned to denounce the pride of

the royal treasurer, Shebna, in these words: "What dost thou here, and whom hast thou here, that thou hast hewed thee out here a sepulchre? hewing him out a sepulchre on high, graving an habitation for himself in the rock?" (xxii. 15, 16). Palestine abounds with rock-tombs; and the cliffs and hillsides around its old cities are often honeycombed with sepulchres. Abraham's first possession in the land was the cave of Machpelah, which he bought from the Hittites of Hebron as a tomb for Sarah. In it Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were subsequently laid. At some period during the Israelitish monarchy the cave and rock were encircled by a massive wall, still standing, the masonry of which resembles that of the foundations of the Temple area, and may be the work of Phœnician masons. From the earliest times Machpelah has been guarded with religious care. Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans have in succession preserved it from violation; and it is not impossible that some remains of the patriarchs, especially of the embalmed body of Jacob, may still be there. Much older mummies have been exhumed from the tombs of Egypt.

The rock-tombs around Jerusalem are innumerable, and some of them, such as the tombs of the prophets on Olivet, the tombs of the judges, and the tombs of the kings (or of Helena) are of vast extent. The princes and nobles of Israel appear to have been as anxious to prepare for themselves splendid sepulchres, when dead, as palaces while living; and their architects and engineers displayed amazing ingenuity and skill in their arrangements to prevent access to the bodies and to the treasures that were generally entombed with them. Josephus gives a glowing account of the vast store of gold placed in the sepulchre of David, which was partly plundered by Hyrcanus, in order to buy off the besieging army of Antonine. Herod the Great afterwards tried to rob it; but it is affirmed that the sacrilegious act was prevented by supernatural interposition. The larger tombs had usually sculptured façades, hewn in the rock, at the entrance, with an open area, either excavated or levelled, in front. Occasionally, also, a pyramid or monument of some sort was built over them—the *σῆμα* of Homer—to mark the place beneath which the honoured dead lay. Several examples still stand in the Kidron Valley at Jerusalem—the so-called tombs of Absalom, Zacharia, Jehoshophat, St. James, &c. Of this kind probably was the pillar set up by Jacob on the grave of Rachel (Gen. xxxv. 20).

In nearly all these respects the customs of the Phœnicians resembled those of the Jews. Their tombs were generally caves. I have visited hundreds of them around the old cities

of Sidon, Tyre, Gebal, and Arvad, and along the adjoining slopes of Lebanon. Those in the cemetery of Arvad, at Amrit, are the most striking, with their pyramids and remarkable monuments. The tomb of Esmûnazar, discovered a few years ago at Sidon, attracted much attention, partly by the beauty of its Egyptian-shaped sarcophagus and partly by its long Phœnician inscription. The inscription appears to have been written by the monarch himself, and expresses the horror he entertained of having his body disturbed. The following is an extract :—"King Esmûnazar said thus :—I am carried away ; the time of my non-existence has come ; my spirit has disappeared. . . . I am lying in this coffin, in the place which I have built. . . . May no royal race and no man open my funeral bed, and may they not seek after treasures here. . . . Every man who shall open the covering, or who shall carry away the coffin, . . . shall have no couch with the Rephaim, . . . nor shall he be buried, nor shall he have son to succeed him, and the holy gods shall extirpate them." The sarcophagus was opened and removed by the French, and is now in the Museum of the Louvre.

The Greeks also have left famous tombs, both in their native country and in their colonies. Some are excavated in the rock, like those of Phœnicia and Palestine. Of these there are many examples in Cyprus (Di Cesnola, p. 203), in which were found ornaments in gold, vases in terra-cotta, and other specimens of early art. There are also Greek rock-tombs near Ephesus, in various parts of Asia Minor, and in the Morea. Some tombs are sunk in the ground, the sides built up with huge stones, and arched, or simply flagged, over ; such as those of Mycenæ, which Schliemann opened, finding vases, cups, pateræ, and numerous ornaments in gold and silver, the repoussé work and carving on which closely resemble those described in Solomon's Temple. Perhaps the most remarkable treasures there found were the masks and coats of thin beaten gold which covered the faces and bodies of the dead. The gold was spread upon the dead, just as we read in the Bible that the Phœnician and Jewish artists "spread the gold upon the cherubim, and fitted it upon the graven work," in the Temple of Solomon. So artistically was the gold fitted on the bodies found in the tombs of Mycenæ that the forms and features of the dead were clearly and even minutely defined.

The great dome-shaped structures around Mycenæ were, in all probability, tombs. That of Atreus, so called, is fifty feet in diameter and fifty high. It was entirely subterranean, and is constructed of large, well-hewn stones in concentric layers,

gradually contracting to a point at the top. The holes in the masonry and fragments of broad-headed nails still remaining show that it was originally coated internally with plates of metal, most probably bronze; and in this respect it resembled the gold-covered shrine of Solomon's Temple. Plates of polished metal, as I shall presently show from some striking descriptions of Homer, were employed by the early Greeks to give splendour and dignity to their palaces and sanctuaries, just as they were employed by the Israelites during the reign of Solomon. Gold and silver, when they could be obtained, were lavishly used in interior decoration, and in the manufacture of household utensils. The enormous quantities found by Di Cesnola in a few tombs and subterranean chambers in Cyprus and the rich collection made by Schliemann in Mycenæ and Troy are proofs of these statements. The magnificent Mausoleum of Caria; the tombs found and described by Sir C. Fellows in Lycia, especially those along the Xanthus, many of which are cut out of the rock in the form of little temples; the long ranges of tombs which are being opened year after year in the road leading from the gate of Athens towards the Piræus, all testify to the importance attached by the ancient Greeks to their places of sepulture. They, though they sometimes burned their dead, were almost as lavish in their expenditure on the remains of departed worthies as the Phœnicians, Jews, and Egyptians. Their *σῆλαι*, "tablets," and *κίονες*, "columns," outside the tombs were tasteful and attractive; while the statues and other works of art inside were often executed in the highest style.

I have thus shown that Phœnicia was the connecting link between Palestine and Greece, both in architecture and art. It was, in fact, the England of antiquity, uniting by means of its restless enterprise, its vast commerce, its manufactures, and its widespread colonies, all the countries of the known world. Phœnicia itself was but a narrow strip of land hemmed in by the Mediterranean and the mountain-range of Lebanon. The sea was its natural highway to the outer world, and how eagerly and successfully the people took advantage of it history tells. It speedily colonised Cyprus, various parts of Asia Minor, Greece, Crete, Malta, Sicily, Sardinia, Spain, and even distant Britain. Carthage, its most famous colony, for a time contended for the empire of the world with Rome itself. The influence of the Phœnicians upon the trade, commerce, art, letters, and general civilization of mankind can scarcely be over-estimated. How they extended, and in many places originated, literature is evident from historic records and from the inscriptions they have left behind them. The alpha-

betic characters, which they were among the first to use, were speedily disseminated over Europe and Northern Africa, and revolutionised all literature. Phœnician inscriptions, as a rule, throw light upon the customs and religion of those who wrote them. An inscription discovered in Malta tells us of the erection of three or four sanctuaries in the little island of Gozo—one to Sadam-Baal and another to Astarte, Phœnician deities; and the ruins of temples, perhaps those referred to, have been found in the island. The huge stones, some being twenty feet long, and the style in which they are dressed, remind one of the colossal substructions of the walls of Arvad, Gebal, Sidon, and the Temple of Jerusalem. Ruins of a similar kind, with huge monolithic jambs and lintels, exist in Malta, and among them have been found rude altars, images, ornaments, and especially the mystic cone, such as is met with so frequently in the ancient sanctuaries of Phœnicia (Perrot and Chipiez, *Art in Phœnicia and Cyprus*, i. 302, seq.). In Sicily, also, are some most interesting relics of Phœnician art and worship. At Marsala stood a temple of Ammon, and on its site there was recently discovered a tablet, having on its upper part the figure apparently of a priest in a flowing Oriental robe and pointed cap, worshipping the emblems of Phœnician idolatry—the candlestick, or incense-altar, and the sacred cone; while overhead is a triple pyramid surmounted by the crescent and star. Beneath is a Phœnician inscription recording the dedication of the tablet by a certain Hanno, son of *Adon-Baal*, that is, “Lord Baal.” Other votive tablets have also been found, bearing the names of *Baal-Shâmayim*, “Baal of the Heavens”; *Baal-Ammon*, and *Astarte-Erek-Hayim*, “Astarte the Giver of Long Life” (*Id.* i. 319).

In every place where the Phœnicians settled they left behind them the marked characteristics of their art, their architecture, and of the symbols of their worship. While their temples are essentially Oriental in plan and style, they yet, as it seems to me, embody the germs of those more magnificent and elaborate structures subsequently reared up by the genius of the Greeks. The main feature of the temple was, as I have already said, its spacious open court, in the midst of which stood the comparatively small shrine. The image of the deity was usually insignificant in size and rude in form. It was such as could be easily made, and as easily moved from place to place in the track of commerce. The main object of the Phœnicians was to promote the material prosperity of their nation. They were artisans, handicraftsmen, rather than artists. They excelled in all

kinds of metal-work, and carving, and stone-work, but they never rose to those grand conceptions of strength, beauty, and intellectual life and power so marvellously realised and exhibited in the works of Greek sculptors. To trace a flower, or a leaf, or an animal, or a human figure, upon stone or metal was the highest aim of the Phœnician artist. To manufacture vases, cups, and ornaments of gold and silver, armour and arms of bronze, robes of fine texture and rich embroidery, and to supply the marts of the world with them, the Phœnicians laboured with surpassing skill, energy, and success. They thereby left the impress of their talent and industry in every land, from Babylonia to Britain. The decoration of Solomon's Temple and Palace was perhaps among the earliest of their great achievements, and served, doubtless, in no small degree, to spread abroad their fame; for we read that "Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches and in wisdom. And all the earth sought the presence of Solomon to hear his wisdom" (1 Kings x. 23).

Subsequent history and recent researches show how wonderfully graphic and accurate in detail is that sublime passage in which the prophet Ezekiel describes the wealth, the far-reaching commerce, and the lordly pride of Tyre, Phœnicia's great capital:—"O thou that dwellest in the entry of the sea, which art the merchant of the peoples unto many isles. . . . Thou hast said, I am perfect in beauty." Then he goes on to enumerate the various peoples employed by the Tyrians, each in the department of skilled work in which it excelled; and also the several countries and cities with which they had commercial dealings. Some of these deserve special notice here:—Fine linen with brodered work from Egypt; carved and inlaid wood from the isles of Kittim (Cyprus); silver, iron, tin, and lead from Tarshish (Spain and Britain); in vessels of brass with Javan (Ion, Greece); ivory and ebony from the distant isles (India and Ceylon); with Syria (including Judæa) in purple, embroidery, fine linen, and precious stones. It is a wonderful and instructive catalogue, and serves to throw fresh light upon the decorations and furniture of Solomon's Temple and Palace.

PHœNICIAN ART IN GREECE AND ITS COLONIES.

I shall now attempt to sketch the introduction of Phœnician art into Greece, and its development there under the inspiration and guidance of Greek genius. Probably the first contact of Phœnician and Greek—such contact, at least, as produced mutual action and culture,—was in Cyprus. The

Phœnicians occupied that island in prehistoric times, and I have seen there numerous traces of their language, art, and manufacturing skill in monuments, vases, cups, and personal ornaments. The names of their deities—Baal, Astaroth, and Melkart,—are found everywhere inscribed on tablets and vases. Astaroth is not unfrequently named *Melketh Hash-Shamayim*, “Queen of Heaven,” as in the writings of Jeremiah (vii. 18; xlv. 17, 18); and she was accepted by the Greeks as *Aphrodite*, the goddess of love. Her symbol was a cone, “such as stood in the adytum of her temple at Paphos” (Di Cesnola, *Cyprus*, p. 19). The oldest cities in Cyprus—Paphos, Amathus, and Citium—were founded by Phœnicians. The most ancient traditions affirm that Greek colonisation began with the return of the heroes from Troy. Salamis, it is said, was built by Teucer, and named after his native island. These traditions cannot be fully relied upon, for Homer mentions Cyprus as well known in his day. Ulysses celebrates the hospitality of Dmetor, “Cyprus’s haughty lord” (*Odyssey*, xvii. 525), and Menelaos says:—

For eight slow circling years by tempest toss’d,
From Cyprus to the fair Phœnician coast
(Sidon the capital), I stretch’d my toil
Through regions fatten’d with the flows of Nile.—*Od.* iv. 83.

It would seem, in fact, that so soon as the Greeks had settled in Asia Minor they crossed over to Cyprus, and established themselves along the whole northern and western coasts, founding Soli, and Cythrea, and Lapethus, and Curium, and other towns. It is evident that Phœnician and Greek dwelt together, and their artists and goldsmiths worked together in the manufacture of those ornaments of gold, silver, bronze, and terra-cotta, such large numbers of which have recently been brought to light by the researches of Di Cesnola and others (*Cyprus*).

It is interesting to note that *Citium*, the old Phœnician capital of Cyprus, whose remains now lie beneath and around the modern Larnaca, was the *Kittim* mentioned by Moses in Genesis x. 4, and the *Chittim* of Isaiah and the other Prophets (Isaiah xxiii. 1; Jeremiah ii. 10; Ezekiel xxvii. 6; Daniel xi. 30), with which the ships of Tyre were wont to trade. This mention of the close commercial relations between those two cities is strikingly illustrated by a coin of the fifth century B.C., on which is a Phœnician inscription to the following effect:—“Of the King of Kition and Tyre.” It thus appears that the two cities were then ruled by one monarch (De Luynes, *Numismatique des Satrapies*, 72).

From Cyprus the Phœnicians proceeded westward along the coast of Asia Minor to Rhodes, where they formed a settlement, and have left many traces of their presence. Their next station appears to have been in the little island of Thera, one of the Sporades, in which there is a good harbour. On the shore are tombs, fragments of colossal masonry, and Phœnician inscriptions. The letters of the inscriptions are almost identical with those of the Moabite stone, and of the tablet recently discovered on the side of the subterranean channel between the Fountain of the Virgin and the Pool of Siloam at Jerusalem. From Thera the voyage was short and easy to the Morea and other parts of Greece. In the ruins of the cities of Tiryns and Mycenæ, probably among the oldest in Greece, I observed the very marked characteristics of Phœnician masonry—colossal stones roughly hewn at the edges, monolithic jambs and lintels, rudely-dressed and irregularly-shaped blocks piled up without order. The masonry of the citadel of Tiryns, of the celebrated Lion Gate of Mycenæ, and of the subterranean tombs of Atreus and Agamemnon (so called), closely resemble that of the Phœnician temples in Malta and Gozo; of the wall of Eryx in Sicily, also Phœnician; and of the most ancient fragments in Arvad, Sidon, Baniyas, Jerusalem, and Hebron. We learn from the *Odyssey* that the word Cyclopean, as applied to masonry, was of Phœnician origin. In fact, wherever solid building is mentioned by Homer, it is attributed, directly or indirectly, to Phœnician workmen (see Gladstone, *Juventus Mundi*, 131; Schliemann, *Tiryns*, 20, 21). And the inscriptions found on the sites of several of the oldest cities of Greece—Athens among others (*History of Art in Phœnicia and Cyprus*, i. 249)—show that Phœnician enterprise and culture were introduced at a very early period.

It is, however, when we examine the ceramic and metallurgic art, and the gems, seals, coins, and intaglios of the Phœnicians, Israelites, and Greeks, that we see the close resemblance in design and execution. Fortunately, many precious specimens have come down to us, and minute descriptions are given of others by ancient writers. The Phœnicians, we know, executed the finest work for the Jews, and introduced the art into Greece. They carried their art with them to their colonies, and they supplied their most finished and costly products to such princes and peoples as were able to buy them. Mr. Gladstone, in his *Juventus Mundi*, says:—"With respect to fine art, it seems impossible to resist the clear and ample evidence of the Homeric text, to the effect—first, that works well deserving of that name in all essentials

existed in the time of Homer; and, secondly, that they are exhibited to us as proceeding from a Phœnician source" (p. 133). Again he writes with greater fulness (p. 520):— "The Homeric poems give us a view substantially clear of the state of art in the time of the poet. They also contain conceptions of the principle of art, so vivid as perhaps never to have been surpassed. And, unless I am mistaken, they indicate to us the source from which the specific excellence of Greek art, in its highest form, proceeded. By the term art I understand the production of beauty in material forms palpable to the eye; whether associated with industrial purposes or not. . . . There are many works of art mentioned in Homer; but, in the whole of them, it is associated with some purpose of utility. The greatest of them all is the Shield of Achilles. Next, perhaps, the armour of Agamemnon, various bowls, the baldrick of Heracles, the golden clasp of the mantle of Odysseus. In all of them living form is represented. There are other objects belonging rather to mere decoration. Such are the necklace of gold and amber, carried by the Phoinikes (Phœnicians) to Suriè, the couch of Penelope, and the burnished sheets of copper in the palaces of Alkinoos and Menelaos. There are also works of simple mechanical skill, such as the airy net of metal worked by Hephaistos." Hephaistos was the Phœnician Vulcan to whom tradition attributes the invention of work in metals. He was like the Tubal Cain of the Pentateuch (Gen. iv. 22). And with his wonderful metal-work, here mentioned by Homer, may be compared the no less wonderful "nets of checker-work, and wreaths of chain-work," made for the capitals of Jachin and Boaz (1 Kings vii. 17). Mr. Gladstone rightly adds, after a critical review of the whole subject, that "in most of the cases where a true work of art is mentioned"—by Homer—"it is referred directly to Sidon or the Phœnician." The description of the works in gold, silver, and brass given by Homer throughout the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* remind one forcibly of the works of Hiram in the Temple and Palace of Solomon. One would almost imagine the Greek poet had the sacred and royal buildings of Jerusalem before his mind when he wrote these lines, which I give in the version of Pope:—

The front appear'd with radiant splendours gay,
 Bright as the lamps of night, or orb of day.
 The walls were massy brass; the cornice high
 Blue metals crown'd in colours of the sky;
 Rich plates of gold the folding doors incase;
 The pillars silver, on a brazen base;
 Silver the lintels deep-projecting o'er,
 And gold, the ringlets that command the door.

Two rows of stately dogs on either hand,
 In sculptur'd gold and labour'd silver stand.
 * * * * *
 Fair thrones from space to space were raised,
 Where various carpets and embroidery blazed.
 Od. vii. 110.

The "fair thrones" remind one of the throne of Solomon, made of ivory, and "overlaid with the finest gold." There were six steps to the throne and "twelve lions stood there on the one side and on the other upon the six steps" (1 Kings x. 18-20). Homer speaks of carpets "blazing with embroidery," and in another place of "rich tapestry, stiff with inwoven gold" (*Od.* iv. 406), which recall in style of workmanship and richness of material the veil of the Temple (2 Chron. iii. 14).

And at the present time we are not dependent on even the most graphic descriptions of poets or sacred writers for our knowledge of Phœnician and early Greek art and workmanship. The excavations of Di Cesnola in Cyprus and of Schliemann and others in Greece and Troy have brought to light some of the works themselves—cups, and vases, and necklets, and rings, and chains of gold; plates of beaten gold, almost as thin as tissue-paper, fitted on to the faces and persons of the dead, and also on carved wood and ornaments of every form. These illustrate the words of the sacred writers, who tell us that Hiram carved upon the doors of the Temple "cherubim, and palm-trees, and open flowers, and overlaid them with gold; and spread gold upon the cherubim and upon the palm-trees and the whole house he overlaid with pure gold" (1 Kings vi. 32, *seq.*). The vessels and entire utensils of Solomon's Temple and Palace were gold, made by Hiram the Phœnician. In the *Iliad* (xxiii. 704, *seq.*), we read that Achilles offered as a race-prize, at the funeral of Patrocles, a silver goblet, unrivalled for beauty of workmanship, made by Sidonian artists. Another goblet, made by Hephaistos, was presented by the King of Sidon to Menelaos, as we read in the *Odyssey* :—

The silver bowl, whose costly margins shine,
 Enchased with gold, this valued gift be thine;
 To me this present of Vulcanian frame
 From Sidon's hospitable monarch came.

But perhaps the most remarkable connecting link between early Greek, Phœnician, and Jewish art was discovered some few years ago. It is a fragment of a bronze cup, containing part of a Phœnician inscription of the oldest

type of letter, to the effect that the cup was dedicated to Baal-Lebanon by a certain Hiram. It is now in the French National Library. But who was this Hiram? Was he the artist who made the cup, or was he Solomon's friend, Hiram, King of Tyre? We cannot tell. The style of workmanship and the form of the letters are both archaic, and may be, probably are, of the age of Solomon. It is at least interesting to find on the fragment the familiar Scripture name, which is not a common one (see *History of Art in Phœnicia and Cyprus*, i. 90; ii. 340).

Another patera, or bowl, of beautiful workmanship, was discovered about ten years ago at Præneste, one of the oldest cities of Italy. It is of silver, overlaid with gold, and is covered with figures arranged in concentric circles—in the centre a group of men fighting, in the next circle horses, and in the outer horses and chariots, resembling those on Phœnician coins. A Phœnician inscription on the patera gives the name of the maker or owner. Numerous pateræ, similar in form and style of ornament, have been found by Di Cesnola in Cyprus, and are figured in his splendid book. One is able from them to see how the original designs of the Phœnicians, borrowed from both Egypt and Assyria, were gradually developed into the more bold, chaste, and artistic forms of the Greeks. The archaic style prevailed in the decoration of Solomon's buildings—modified, of course, so as to exclude everything opposed to the monotheistic principles and lofty moral feelings of the Jews. The Phœnicians had almost a monopoly of artistic work in metal, from the earliest historic period down to about the sixth century B.C. They attained to great skill and excellence; but more, perhaps, in the extreme minuteness and delicacy of their manipulation than in the excellence of their designs. In this respect they resembled the Persians, Indians, and Japanese of our own day. The Greeks at first adopted the Phœnician models, but their superior taste and artistic genius soon enabled them to excel to such an extent that competition became impossible. They studied mainly the various phases of human life, and their chief aim was to imitate them, transferring the visible symbol of every movement, act, and thought to marble or metal. Their range of artistic study was much wider and more instructive than that of either Jew or Phœnician. The beauty, grace, and majesty of the human face and form were the main inspiring objects of the Greek artist, who was able in his ideal conceptions to look beyond and beneath the mere outward mould, and to give expression to thought, passion, and intellectual power.

The researches of Schliemann and Di Cesnola have likewise served to throw some fresh light on those personal ornaments of which we read in the sacred writings—bracelets, rings, necklaces, anklets, head-tires, crescents, nose-jewels, amulets, gems, and other articles, for the profuse wearing of which the prophet Isaiah sternly rebukes the Jewish women (iii. 17-23). Of each and all of these the tombs of Greece and Cyprus have furnished admirable specimens, manufactured, too, in all probability, by the very artists and goldsmiths who supplied the maids and matrons of Israel. Bangles, bracelets, chatelaines, and even crosses were in those early days almost as fashionable as they are now in Constantinople harim or London drawing-room.

I have, I fear, more than exhausted my space, and yet I have only just been able to touch the borders of an interesting and almost inexhaustible subject. The study of it has helped me at least to understand more fully many portions of Holy Scripture. It has given me a clearer conception than I might otherwise have had of the splendour, the artistic finish, and the wondrous richness in decoration and furniture of that Temple which Solomon and a devoted people reared up and dedicated to the service of the Living God. All the resources of his own kingdom, all the wealth he could gather from foreign nations, all the skill and talent he could obtain from the most celebrated architects and most accomplished artists then in the world were, with surpassing zeal and energy, concentrated in the grand effort to erect a house in some measure worthy of the JEHOVAH GOD of Israel. King David had said:—"The house that is to be builded for the Lord must be exceeding magnificent, of fame and of glory throughout all countries" (1 Chron. xxii. 5). His promise and most sanguine anticipations were fulfilled in the Temple of Solomon.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. D. Howard, V. Pres. Chem. Soc.)—I have now to ask you to pass a vote of thanks to Mr. Cadman Jones for having read this paper in the absence of the author, Dr. Porter, who is obliged to be present at Queen's College, Belfast, of which he is president. It is a very interesting paper, and it has added to our pleasure to hear it so admirably read. We shall now be glad to hear any remarks which those present may desire to make. The subject is one which, as the writer of the paper says, opens up a vast sphere of inquiry. The interchange of ideas in early times on the subject of architecture and the true history of the artistic and technical knowledge displayed in the very early days here referred to are matters of peculiar interest. We are apt to suppose that the Greeks

invented almost everything that is excellent in the shape of artistic and architectural productions ; whereas it really appears that they were among the most successful of borrowers. We have been accustomed to suppose that the alphabet associated with his name was the invention of Cadmus ; but we now learn that it was only an adaptation of the older Phœnician, Egyptian, and other forms, the Phœnicians being successful borrowers from Egypt. Whether their marvellous series of structures were, in the early forms of art, invented by the Egyptians, or whether they only borrowed them from others, is at present a mystery. Mr. Trelawny Saunders being present, may I ask him to open the discussion ?

Mr. TRELAWNY SAUNDERS.—I feel somewhat taken aback at being called upon to commence this discussion, as I think it would have been more becoming in me to have taken a humbler share in to-night's proceedings. I am sure we must all deeply regret the absence of Dr. Porter on this occasion. The mere sight of that man would have been a matter of interest in itself. He is one who has contributed much to our knowledge, especially of the regions east of the Jordan, and of the Hauran and the Lebanon ; and he has also, from his profound knowledge of the Holy Land, been chosen as the latest editor of *Murray's Handbook of Palestine*. We regret not only his absence to-night, but also the distressing political circumstances that prevent his being here. I naturally feel some diffidence in taking up a subject that has been opened—and only opened—by so able a master ; because I cannot doubt that, had more time been afforded him, he would probably have expanded his lecture in the direction in which it will probably be led during this discussion. The paper, upon the whole, leads us to look upon the Phœnicians as if they were almost the prime movers in the civilisation of the world. Now, for my part,—although whatever I may think about the matter is of little importance,—I cannot help saying that this is not the view entertained by the greatest authorities among us. I may cite the opinion expressed in all sorts of ways by one whose name will certainly carry with it great, if not the greatest, weight,—I allude to Sir Henry Rawlinson, who says, in speaking of Babylonia, the Land of Shinar, that part of the earth's surface to which our attention is first directed after the Flood, that it is to Babylonia we must look for the real cradle of early civilisation. Those who have gone most deeply into the question of Egypt, which was at one time regarded from this point of view, have come to the conclusion, or at all events are drifting in the direction of such a conclusion, that Egypt derived her theology and religion, and her forms and ceremonies, from Assyria ; and, if I were disposed to move in any direction away from Assyria in regard to this point, it would certainly not be either westward or southward, but eastward. We have had great light thrown on all this class of subjects of late years by the Sacred Books of the East being translated and made accessible to those who have unfortunately limited their studies to the English language, and in that volume of those sacred books which relates to the Zoroastrian writings—the *Zend-Avesta*—there is a remarkable list of

the countries through which the migrations of man proceeded, prominence being given, in the first place, to the country eastward of the Land of Shinar. I think we may be the more inclined to look eastward, from the circumstance that the Bible itself, in speaking of the Land of Shinar, tells us that the people who came to occupy it came from the east. There are various points in the history of primitive peoples that tend in one direction. The early books of the Hindoos, which are among the oldest in the world, say that the people who settled in the country between the Sutlej and the Jumna came from the north-west. Here we have a very specific and distinct bearing, as distinct as the one relating to the Land of Shinar; and in the earliest of the Chinese books we are told that the people with whom we become acquainted for the first time on the banks of the Yellow River came from the west. Now, it is at least an understood matter that we should mark off on the globe these several bearings and see where they meet. It so happens that they meet exactly in that region pointed out by the *Zend-Avesta* as the first nest of mankind, from which man was driven by the snows. It is the Arianem Vaejo of the Vendidad, as distinguished from the Ariana of the present day. The Arianem Vaejo, or ancient Ariana, is the land of the Pamir which lies at the source of the Oxus, and where, at the present moment, the great races which divide the ancient world find their meeting-place. The Turanian and the Mongol, the Turk, the Hindoo, and the Iranian—all these people meet just at that great mountain-knot. But I find I am wandering off—as one finds it very difficult to refrain from doing when led away by so tempting a text as this. I will, therefore, endeavour to confine myself, as far as possible, to the remarks called for by this paper. We cannot fail to see that in tracing the origin of art and architecture we are, in fact, also tracing the origin of religion. The author of the paper says: "It is worthy of note that this ancient site"—speaking of Baal-bek—"bears the name to this day of the Phœnician sun-god, Baal. Baal-bek signifies 'City of Baal.'" Now, what does "Baal" signify? This, we are told a little further on, in page 7, signifies "Lord" or "Master," and we have to distinguish between "Baal" and "Bel"; and, although the latter word is frequently confused with the Assyrian deities, it signifies "to confound," and is identified with Kush, whose name is identical with "chaos," the father of Nimrod, who took a leading part in that confusion—that permanent and primitive confusion—the confusion of tongues, so that he may well be called "the confounder." Now, although Dr. Porter ascribes the plan of Solomon's Temple to the Phœnicians, nevertheless, when he seeks for examples with which he may compare the famous pillars, Jachin and Boaz, at the entrance to King Solomon's Temple, he draws the comparison, not with anything in Phœnicia, but with the pillars of the famous ruins of Persepolis, on the borders of Assyro-Babylonia. It is remarkable that no reference is made in this paper to the labours of a very distinguished man who has only recently gone to his account—Mr. James Fergusson. Mr. Fergusson drew a plan of Solomon's Temple, and he distinctly looks for the

primitive origin of the design to Assyria. The very word Cadmus, as is well known, has been referred to the East. It appears to me—in fact, I feel sure—that the great obstacle in the investigation of these ancient questions lies in the circumstance that we have to take the names from the Roman and Greek authorities, who were not content with the names as they found them, but who greatly complicated them by reducing them to forms appropriate to their own languages ; so that, before we can really understand an Eastern or Oriental name found in Greek or Roman forms, we must first reduce it to its original form. There is little doubt that Cadmus really means Kedom—that is, the East. I may observe here that Dr. Porter differs from Mr. Ferguson with regard to the position of the great pillars, Jachin and Boaz, in King Solomon's Temple. Dr. Porter thinks they stood outside the porch, independently, whereas Mr. Fergusson made them the outer pillars of the porch itself. Another remark I should like to make is with reference to the great Brazen Sea or cistern, which was ten cubits in diameter, or not less than 17 ft. The Cup is a prominent feature in the religious mysteries of Assyria and of the East generally, and the nearer you approach Assyria the nearer do you approach the dominating religious influence which that country exercised over surrounding peoples. This cistern was of large dimensions ; but there was another cistern of perhaps greater dimensions—the cistern of Semiramis—referred to by Pliny ; and these cisterns are associated with the greatest mysteries of the religious systems of the East.* I believe they were connected with the mystery of regeneration—the mystery of baptism—the mystery of the new birth—the washing away of sin—and that this was the meaning of the great cistern which occupied so prominent a place in the temples of the Jews and in those of Babylonia. The allusion in the paper to “a purely spiritual faith” on the part of the Jews is, I think, scarcely supported by what the Bible tells us about that people. We are there told that the Jews were offered a purely spiritual faith, but they resolutely objected to it. I must not attempt to give you my interpretation of the passages in the Bible which I believe to reveal the origin of religion, nor must I attempt to take you through that book and show you how completely it unfolds very important steps in the degradations that have taken place in the history of religion from the time when Noah was in direct communion with God ; when Abraham, going out of the land degraded by the religion set up by Nimrod, established no temple and no system of ministry in the land whither he went, but was brought again, like Noah, into direct communication with the representatives of the Almighty at the door of his tent. With the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob this condition of

* The use of the Laver in the Mosaic ritual is described in Exodus xxx. 18–21 ; xl. 30, 31. The figurative meaning of a cup in the Bible is denoted by Cruden in the complete editions of his Concordance. The symbolical significance of the *Cup* in the Chaldean, Greek, and Roman mysteries is elucidated by Bislop in his *Two Babylons*, 5th edition, pp. 77, 78, also pp. 7–10.

things terminated through the fickleness of Jacob, who gave up the land promised by his fathers for the material food which Egypt offered him, although that offer led him to abandon the substantial enjoyment of the soil he had held for three generations. I am sadly tempted to go on with this view of the subject, but I must proceed no further. I think, however we ought to understand that the Jews and the Phœnicians certainly belonged to different families of the human race. The Phœnicians, according to a variety of evidence—the early Christian Fathers among others—distinctly called themselves Canaanites, and they were Canaanites. Therefore they were not Shemites. There is a question as to Tarshish which I should like to touch upon ; but I have taken up a good deal of time, and the thing I would next deal with is the name and meaning of Astarte. [In the discussion I mentioned only one meaning of Astarte, but it will be more satisfactory to refer the reader for a fuller notice to Hislop's *Two Babylons*, Appendix, Note J, pp. 407-501. Partridge : London, 1873.] As to Phœnicia, I think we can speak of that country as the connecting link between Palestine and Greece, or between the East and West generally. I am not disposed to attribute to the Phœnicians any higher function than that of commerce. They were so engaged in commerce, shipping, and everything that belongs to money-making, that they had no consideration for anything of a higher character, and they appear to have been the greatest monopolists the world has ever known. I think there is great question as to Cyprus being the first place in which the Phœnicians and Greeks came into contact. That, however, is too large a subject to go into now. With regard to the reference made to Tiryns and Mycenæ, and the great Cyclopean buildings, I will give you the interpretation of the word "Cyclops," and how it carries the origin of the Cyclopean art of building back to Babylonia. The meaning of the word "Cyclops" is derived from "Khuk," signifying king, and "Lohb," signifying flame—which, together, mean King of the Fire-worshippers, or Nimrod (see Hislop, p. 374, note). There are other remarks I should have liked to add, but I feel that I have already taken up enough of your time, and will detain you no longer.

Captain FRANCIS PETRIE (Hon. Sec.).—Among the letters received from those unable to attend is one from Mr. E. A. W. Budge, of the British Museum, who kindly places at our service another translation of the inscription, alluded to in page 10 ;—a cast of the original inscription of King Eshmunâzâr II. may be seen in the Phœnician room in the Museum :—

"I am torn away before my time, a son of a few days, an orphan, the son of a widow. I lie in this chest in the grave which I have built. I adjure every royal person and man not to open this bed, and not to seek treasures, for there are no treasures here. Every royal person and man who shall open the chamber of this couch, or who shall carry away the chest of my couch, or who shall build over this bed, may they have no bed among the shades, may they not be buried in a grave, may they have neither son nor posterity to succeed them, and may the holy gods deliver them into the hands of a mighty king to rule over them."

Mr. W. St. Chad Boscawen (F. R. Hist. Soc.).—Dr. Porter's paper is an extremely interesting one. He has collected much matter on a subject of great importance, and he has very clearly set forth the position of the Phœnicians as having been the first missionaries of culture journeying from east to west, a people who not only bore art and art treasures to the occident, but who carried with them what is still more precious to us, namely, the alphabet we use at the present day. But I think the writer of the paper has hardly brought out with sufficient prominence the real position the Phœnicians occupied in the matters he has touched upon. They were the early intermediaries between east and west, and, in looking at the work they did, whether as shown in their inscriptions or their art productions, nothing is more remarkable than to realise how entirely void they were of the inventive faculty. Their works were mere adaptations. For example, let us take those beautiful bowls from Cyprus, and especially that from Præneste, to which the author refers. Any one studying Assyrian art will see that these bowls were very much like what he sees in so-called artistic products in this country, where you find a bit of Watteau with work of modern French art combined together. In fact, those works are simply a combination of the art of Egypt and Assyria joined together in the most bizarre manner. It is this wholesale borrowing that renders Phœnician art of so much value to us; and it is important to note that the place where this tendency is most strongly exhibited is the island of Cyprus, which occupied a very important position in the East in ancient times, and formed, as it were, a point of union between the three great human families—the three most constructive peoples of the human race, the Hamitic family in Egypt, the Semitic family in Assyria and Syria, and at later times the Greek, who mingled with the other two, each in touch with each and all, learning some new lessons of beauty and thought, which in after-time gave rise to that art which reached its zenith in the works of ancient Greece. There is a great difference between the art of the Phœnicians themselves and the art which they were the means of propagating. It is remarked by M. Perrot, in his excellent work on the art of Assyria, that its chief characteristic was bas-relief. The Assyrians, as we know, never attained to any degree of skill in sculpture in the round, and never even in their finest bas-reliefs represented the undraped figure; and it was not until the art of Phœnicia was brought in contact with the art of Greece that the last remaining fragments of stone were cut away from the high reliefs which had gradually been coming more and more into prominence in the sculpture they produced. This may be said to be the principal factor which the Greeks in Cyprus contributed to the art which had been brought there by the Phœnicians and Egyptians. We have only to look at the Cyprus monuments in the British Museum, and at the collection which should be there but which is now in the Metropolitan Museum at New York, in order to see how the art of the three great empires of the East was mingled in the work produced in the island of Cyprus. Another point to which I would refer

is the connexion with and influence of the Phœnicians upon the Jewish people. I agree in much that Dr. Porter has said upon this subject, but there is a good deal as to which I differ from him. The Temple of Solomon was certainly of Phœnician architecture. There can be no doubt as to that. It was probably copied from existing Phœnician temples, but those temples were themselves merely copies of the temples of Chaldea. I may also state that the worship of Astoreth was likewise the worship of the Goddess Istar of Chaldea. In the construction of the Temple of Solomon we have an exactly similar arrangement to that of the oldest temples of Chaldea; and not only is the arrangement the same, but, as I pointed out a few weeks ago, the very names of the different parts of the temple are the same. The inner portion, or Holy of Holies, was called "Paraku," a word which finds an equivalent in the Hebrew פֶּלֶקֶת, or the veiled portion.* So that, when we attribute the temple to Phœnician origin, we must remember that the Phœnicians and Assyrians themselves borrowed the design and arrangement from Chaldea. With regard to what is said about the gold work I will not go into that, because it would take up too much time, but I would refer to a point which Dr. Porter seems to have overlooked and that has reference to the two great pillars, Jachin and Boaz. I know that they have been subjects of considerable discussion, but I think their origin is clearly traceable in the stones or pillars we see standing in front of the Phœnician temples. I may here specially refer to the coins of Bylbus, where you see two pillars standing in front of the temple, and there is an inscription which Dr. Porter does not quote but which was discovered by M. Renan and published in his work on Phœnicia, and also, with careful corrections, in a later work on the inscriptions, wherein reference is made to the erection of columns in front of the temple and the making of a brazen altar. This is an inscription of much antiquity. I am not quite sure of the date, but I know it is older than the Eshmûnâzâr inscription, and is a most interesting commentary on the construction of the Temple of Solomon. Again, I cannot agree with Dr. Porter's explanation of the name of Baal-bek. We have no authority for saying that the word "Bek" means a city, and with regard to the word "Astarte," referred to by Mr. Saunders, I cannot quite accept his etymology. The word seems to have been clearly established by M. Ganneau, who has shown that in the old Semitic and Assyrian languages there was the root "satar," "to shine," from Istar, and Astarte, the Goddess of the night or the morning star, as they derived their names. With regard to the Phœnicians in Greece, that is a subject of great interest and one that has been greatly elucidated by the monuments discovered in Cyprus, and also by those of Mycenæ and Troy discovered by Dr. Schliemann. The monuments discovered at Troy are of great interest because of the negative evidence they may be said to give. I would refer you on this point to the discussion in the *Times* and other papers with regard to Dr. Schliemann's discoveries at

* פֶּלֶקֶת, or veil.—J. L. P.

Troy and Mycenæ, there being in the latter case the clearest traces of Phœnician influence in the propagation of Grecian art, while we get no such traces at Troy. Any one looking at the gold plaques and cups, and especially at the remarkable seal discovered by Dr. Schliemann at Mycenæ, and comparing them with the ornamentation on the Assyrian robes and vases as well as with the Babylonian seals on which figures are cut with the same flounced dresses, represented in the same way as on the seal obtained by Dr. Schliemann, must feel convinced that they were the work of artists influenced by the art of Assyria, and are totally distinct from what some anonymous writer in the *Times* would have us suppose, namely, that they were the work of Celts from northern Europe. There is a similarity between these gold ornaments and the Chaldaic representations, and there is evidence that in both cases the designs are from the conventional forms derived from the great school of nature, to which all primitive artists turned for the means of decorating ornamental objects. If this be the case at Mycenæ, it is equally interesting to find that in the relics discovered at Troy there is hardly a trace of anything definitely Phœnician. This brings us to the writings of Homer, who speaks of Troy and of Phœnician art and of the Trojan intercourse with the Phœnicians. We know that Homer wrote probably about the tenth century B.C., after Troy had been destroyed, and he would seem to have gathered together the legends still current with regard to that city; but, although he does not appear to have been in Troy himself, he may have visited its site. If we turn to Cyprus and to Assyria, and look at the artistic remains which have come down to us of the early art of those places, we see exhibited on the bronze bowls from Nimroud, and on some of the objects discovered by Di Cesnola in Cyprus, as well as by Dr. Schliemann at Mycenæ, an art which ranged perhaps over a period of a century and a half—the art which Homer describes and which furnished him with the material for many of the graphic descriptions he gives of the works of Troy. Dr. Porter's paper, as will be generally admitted, is one which embraces a very wide area. It brings us in contact with Jewish history and with that of the great empires of the more distant East. There is one point which I think Dr. Porter might have mentioned in the beginning of his paper. He seems to have forgotten the very beautiful examples of Phœnician art we have in the tombs of Egypt, although he speaks of having visited them. Why, I ask, has he not made some reference to that remarkable procession of the Phœnicians in the time of Thotmes the Third, carrying various objects and works of art as presents to the King? We know, that so thoroughly had the Phœnicians settled themselves in Egypt, and become part and parcel of the people of Lower Egypt, that the district of the delta on which the Jewish people had dwelt during their captivity in Egypt was known by the name of *Keft aur*, or greater Phœnicia, while the land of Phœnicia itself, on the shores of the Mediterranean, was known by the name of *Kefti*; and it is in the contact which took place between these Phœnicians and the Jews in the regions of Zoan and in the land of Goshen that we may

trace the close connexion and brotherhood which always existed between the two. That brotherhood was, as has been very properly said, not a brotherhood of blood. The Phœnicians were certainly not a Semitic people; but, although their language and religion were Semitic, there certainly was a large Canaanitish element in their national life. These are but a few of the points on which I might touch in connexion with this paper. I repeat that I regard it as a most important paper, inasmuch as it has gathered together in a precise, simple, and straightforward manner all that Dr. Porter has been able to glean, and places before us in the form of an interesting *résumé* the main points in connexion with the subject. There is one other matter to which I would like to refer, and that is the translation he has given of the inscription on the sarcophagus of King Eshmonazer. He says, "King Eshmûnâzâr said thus:—'I am carried away; the time of my non-existence has come; my spirit has disappeared,'" which is an expression of belief in the immortality of the soul; but this translation has been disputed, and by those who consider that the expression in question is not to be found upon the monument. The inscription was most carefully copied and published in a work by M. Renan, and has been very lately carefully examined by M. Ganneau and M. Renan, with the result that Eshmûnâzâr said "he was the only son of his father." I think the paper is a great addition to the Transactions of the Society.

MR. TRELAWNY SAUNDERS.—There is one correction which I think ought to be made in the paper. Dr. Porter says:—"It is a remarkable fact that the Jews and Phœnicians always dwelt together on friendly terms. With the other surrounding peoples the Jews were often at war; with the Phœnicians never." This is hardly the fact, for the Bible gives us a case in which the Jews and Phœnicians did quarrel. The narrative informs us that the tribe of Dan found themselves within limits that were too narrow for them, and they sent out an expedition to find some spot on which they could found a colony. The expedition came back, and reported that it had been as far as Laish, and found it occupied by the Zidonians, who dwelt carelessly, and the Danites sent six hundred men, who seized upon Laish and burnt it, and built on its site a city which they called the City of Dan (Judges xviii.).

MR. J. D. CRACE.—I agree with Mr. Boscawen that the paper does summarise in a brief and interesting form a great deal of matter which not only affords room for further study, but which will be useful for reference from the way in which it brings together the various topics with which it deals. The field of discussion it opens up is so wide, that I have no doubt, if everybody belonging to the society and qualified to speak on the subject were present to-night, we might have a great variety of opinion, and probably some very interesting views differing from those already expressed. I beg very cordially to second the vote of thanks to Dr. Porter.

DR. T. CHAPLIN.—I came here merely to listen and learn, and am hardly prepared to speak; and, as the hour is late, it would be unbecoming on my part to occupy much of your time. I would only, therefore, say, if I may

do so without any seeming want of respect to the author of the paper and those who have already spoken, that I think too little prominence has been given to the fact that the Temple at Jerusalem was in its general plan, as well as in its details, a copy or an enlargement of the Tabernacle in the Wilderness, and that the pattern of that Tabernacle was determined long before the Phœnicians were engaged in carrying out their work. I cannot help thinking that, if we put together the plan of an Egyptian temple and the plan of the Jewish Tabernacle in the Wilderness, or the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem, we shall discern a very close resemblance between them. In the first place, there was the large outer wall enclosing the sacred space, which corresponded in Jerusalem to what the Jews called "the Mountain of the House." Then, there was the entrance; and, leading up from that, a series of courts, more or less completely divided from each other, and increasing in sacredness as they proceeded, until at last the most sacred place of all was reached. There are many other matters in connexion with the paper on which it would be interesting to dilate; but I feel that it is too late to further occupy your attention.

Mr. CRACE.—May I say that, had I dwelt on the subject at all, I should have taken the same view as the last speaker. The point he has brought forward is precisely one of those that I had noted down as important and one not to be overlooked. There is no doubt that the Egyptian plan may be closely compared with the Temple plan, and it is to be noticed, not only that Solomon's Temple followed, to a great extent, the design of the Tabernacle in its original arrangement, but that it was a very natural thing that Solomon should have further followed the general plan of the Egyptian temple, inasmuch as his queen was the daughter of the King of Egypt. There can be little doubt that his contact with the Egyptians was constant, and of a kind likely to influence his architecture.

The CHAIRMAN.—In asking you to pass a vote of thanks to Dr. Porter for his interesting paper, I may say that the discussion has thrown great light on the suggestion that the Phœnicians were great borrowers themselves. It is also interesting to remember that there is nothing new under the sun, and that some of the greatest novelties are at least as old as the days of the Phœnicians.

The meeting was then adjourned.

THE AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I wish here to express my thanks to Mr. Cadman Jones for his kindness in undertaking to read the foregoing paper in my unavoidable absence—an absence which I very much regretted. I have also to thank the speakers who were so good as to give their valuable criticisms, for the most part favourable. The able and learned remarks of Mr. Trelawny Saunders throw much additional light upon an interesting subject; and upon the whole I am glad now, after reading the discussion, to be able to say that one of my chief objects in writing has been served: it was, as I have stated, “to try to direct the attention of others, better qualified than I can pretend to be, to matters which, in my opinion, are of no small importance, especially for Biblical students.”

One or two of the points raised I wish very briefly to notice. Mr. Trelawny Saunders says: “The paper, upon the whole, leads us to look upon the Phœnicians as if they were almost the prime movers in the civilisation of the world.” This was not my idea. My purpose was to show that they were the propagators of the principles of ancient art and architecture. I have said that they were to a large extent devoid of the creative or inventive faculty (see p. 34). They adopted and improved upon what they saw. They borrowed freely “from both Egypt and Assyria” (p. 40), and then, by their wide commercial relations, they communicated what they had thus obtained to Greece and Europe.

I entirely agree with Mr. Trelawny Saunders that the original centre from which all real knowledge sprang was Chaldea, or Mesopotamia, and that from that centre it was carried eastward as well as westward. But the eastern development was, in my opinion, very different from the western. The former was largely speculative,—I might perhaps call it metaphysical,—as shown in the sacred books of India and China. The latter, on the other hand, was more practical, and this was propagated by the Phœnicians. It tended to develop architecture and art, more especially in their relation to what was useful and profitable.

When I say that the religion of the Jews was purely spiritual (p. 28), as distinguished from the gross materialism of heathen nations in general, I refer not to the popular religion of the Jews in old times, which was generally corrupt, but exclusively to the religion of the Bible, the pure Revelation of God, and I quote in proof the Divine command.

Mr. St. Chad Boscawen thinks it strange I did not refer to the examples of Phœnician art in the tombs of Egypt. My only reply is, my paper was a mere outline, from which I was compelled to exclude many other most

important details. For the same reason I did not mention the works of the late Mr. James Fergusson. His writings have been long known to me. After a very careful examination of his account of the Temple of Jerusalem on the spot, I was unable to agree with his views. But no man had a higher esteem for his learning, and what I might call his architectural genius, than I had.

The accuracy of my extract from the famous inscription upon the tomb of Eshmúnazar is questioned by Mr. Boscawen. I admit at once that the original Phœnician text was not before me when I wrote, but I copied the words inserted from the translation given by Dr. Julius Oppert in *Records of the Past*, vol. ix. p. 111; and he says: "Some forty different scholars have endeavoured to explain this important text. . . . Among the principal . . . we must mention Bargès, Münck, Schlottman, Schröder, and Kämpf." Then he adds: "The author has himself been the last to write upon and to explain some difficult passages." I thought myself justified in adopting his version.

In conclusion, I must say I feel deeply grateful for the additional hints and information I have received from a perusal of the discussion.

THE SEPULCHRAL CHAMBERS AND THE SARCOPHAGI OF SIDON.

THE account of the recent exploration of the above has most opportunely just come to hand (July, 1887), and its insertion here, following as it does Dr. Porter's paper on Jewish, Phœnician, and Early Greek art, seems very appropriate:—

“The Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund have received from Herr Gottlieb Schumacher, of Haifa, a brief and preliminary account of the examination held by his Excellency Hamdi Bey, Director of the Museum of Constantinople, of this magnificent find, most of which is now on its way to the Imperial Museum. Herr Schumacher (the *Times* says) was instructed to accompany and assist Hamdi Bey, but was, of course, unable to write any report upon the work so long as the outside world were not admitted to the works. The French missionaries of Sidon and others have, however, now been permitted to examine and describe the chambers and their contents, which have thus become, so to speak, public property. Herr Schumacher sends a printed description of the tombs by Père E. Nourrit, of Sidon, together with notes of his own, and he promises photographs and drawings at an early date. Until these arrive it is well to refrain from detailed descriptions at second-hand. Suffice it to say that the first letter on the subject from Dr. William Wright, of the Bible Society, published in the *Times* three months ago, glowing and full of promise though it seemed, is now shown to have fallen short of the actual reality. We have here a ‘find’ of Phœnician, Lycian, and Greek art which appears to be unequalled and unrivalled. The facts as put before the readers of the *Times* being confirmed by recent accounts, it is only necessary, pending the arrival of the photographs and drawings, to sum up the results of Hamdi Bey's examinations.

1. The chamber on the eastern side of the square excavation (which is truly orientated) contained two sarcophagi in white marble. One of these is perfectly plain, and the other is ornamented with sculptures of the richest and most beautiful kind. This is the chamber which is surrounded by an arcade [adorned with eighteen mourning figures in relief, dressed in Greek costume, each in a different pose. It is not stated whether the arcade itself or any portion of it has been removed.

2. The south chamber had two sarcophagi, one in black marble, plain, and the other in white with splendid sculptures.

3. The western chamber had one sarcophagus in white, mummy-shaped. But this chamber proved to be the vestibule to another containing four sarcophagi, one of which was the richest and finest of all those found. The walls of this chamber also are richly decorated.

4. The chamber on the north has two plain mummy-shaped sarcophagi. On removing the *débris* which covered the ground two other chambers were found, one on each side, on a lower level. One of these contained a small tomb; the other, four white marble sarcophagi.

Under the eastern chamber also was found another containing a sarcophagus of black stone, in which were the teeth, bones, and hair of a woman.

All these tombs had been violated by breaking a corner of the coffin-lid. But in carrying out the works for the removal of the sarcophagi a chamber was found in which at first nothing was remarked but two fine bronze candelabra, each about five feet in height. The flooring of this chamber, however, on examination, proved to consist of a bed of great stones laid with the utmost care. Beneath these was a second bed of stones and then

a third, and under all, thus carefully covered up and hidden away, a great monolith covering an opening in the rock. In this deep chamber was found a splendid sarcophagus in black stone, resembling that of the King Eshmunazar, in the Louvre. It was also, which is more important, provided with an inscription in Phœnician, eight lines in length.

The inscription has not yet reached us. In the *Badeir* (published once a week at Beyrout in French and Arabic) a translation is proposed, which is copied for what it is worth. Probably considerable modifications will be made in it when the inscription is in the hands of scholars:—

‘I, Talnite, Priest of Astarte and King of Sidon, son of Eshmunazar, Priest of Astarte and King of Sidon, lying in this tomb, say: “Come not to open my tomb; there is here neither gold nor silver nor treasure. He who will open this tomb shall have no prosperity under the sun, and shall not find repose in the grave.’

There seems to have been little else of importance found in these chambers; some gold buttons, a coin or two, collars, rings, and bracelets, two bronze candelabra, and some terra-cotta lamps exhaust the list so far as can at present be learned. Something however will, doubtless, have to be added, and it is meanwhile interesting to note that his Excellency Hamdi Bey proposes to recommence operations in the early spring of next year.”

ORDINARY MEETING, JANUARY 3, 1887.

A. McARTHUR, ESQ., M.P., V.P., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the following Elections were announced:—

MEMBERS:—His Excellency Sir F. A. Weld, G.C.M.G., Singapore; D. Biddle, Esq., M.R.C.S.E., England; J. B. Braithwaite, Esq., England; Rev. President A. W. Cowles, D.D., United States; Josias Howard, Esq., South Africa; Leslie A. Norman, Esq., New Zealand; Professor T. Otis Paine, LL.D., United States; Gerard Smith, Esq., M.R.C.S.E., London.

LIFE ASSOCIATE:—Rev. E. J. Penford, Kent.

ASSOCIATES:—The Right Rev. Bishop Thompson, D.D., United States; the Right Rev. Bishop Hare, D.D., Dakota; the Very Rev. Dean Gott, D.D., Worcester; E. Bourdillon, Esq., C.E., South Africa; Rev. H. Brancker, M.A. Oxon., Wimbledon; E. E. Cornaby, Esq., London; C. M. Cresson, Esq., LL.D., United States; Rev. S. W. Duffield, B.A. Yale, United States; Ven. Archdeacon P. P. Fogg, M.A. George, South Africa; Rev. G. Grenfell, Congo; Rev. J. A. Harris, D.D. Pen., United States; Rev. W. Harrison, Canada; Purl Lord, Esq., United States; Rev. Professor A. Mangum, A.M., D.D., United States; Rev. G. H. Muzy, New South Wales; Rev. Professor H. S. Osborn, LL.D., United States; Rev. C. J. Ridgeway, M.A. Camb., London; Rev. J. S. Shields, D.D., T.C.D., Blackheath; Rev. W. Tucker, D.D., United States; Professor J. N. Vail, United States; Rev. L. B. Wolff, India.