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ABSTRACT

Most modern histories of Palestinian archaeology claim that the earliest work of any real archaeological significance was that conducted by the Palestine Exploration Fund in the 1860s or even that by Flinders Petrie at Tell el-Hesi in 1890. Although they generally date the advent of archaeology in Palestine to the beginning of the nineteenth century, the discussion of the research which took place prior to the 1860s is confined to published sources and, moreover, retains a superficiality which allows little or no appreciation of the archaeological merit deserved by, at least, some individuals. The mention of travellers visiting Palestine prior to the turn of the eighteenth century is rare and, when it occurs, scant.

The published texts written by individual British travellers visiting Palestine between c.1670 and 1825, as well as their manuscript journals, letters and site plans, provide the primary data on which the present study is based. The abundance of this material made it necessary to be selective. Thus, the core of the thesis is composed of a detailed examination of the commentaries made by individual travellers on a few key sites. From this an evaluation of the methodology applied by these individuals in interpreting the archaeological remains and an objective analysis of their standards of research is derived.

In studying the various reports and associated texts it became apparent that, for each individual traveller, one or more main motives inspiring their travels in Palestine could be discerned. The writer considered it would be both interesting and of academic value to establish whether motive and standard of research bore any correlation. Thus, each traveller is allocated to a particular group based upon the motive/s identified and the final analysis shows that the most significant archaeological research was in fact carried out by those travellers for whom the opportunity to conduct such research constituted a prime motive for their travels in Palestine.
The greatest value of the present study is that it clearly demonstrates that intelligent archaeological research was conducted by early British travellers visiting Palestine between c.1670 and 1825 and that this research produced some significant original results.
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Chapter One

Background

The Intellectual Milieu of Britain: its Influence on Archaeological Ideas and Practices

It was at Rome, on the fifteenth of October, 1764, as I sat musing amidst the ruins of the Capitol, while the barefooted friars were singing Vespers in the temple of Jupiter, that the idea of writing the decline and fall of the City first started to my mind.¹

By the time of Gibbon’s writing a second age of enlightenment was well established in both Britain and Europe. For the philosophers of this movement, the metaphor of bringing light into darkness meant the conquest of religion by science, an interpretation inspired by the Roman poet Lucretius,² and which formed the fundamental objective of the movement. For Gibbon, as a philosophical historian, the barefooted friars symbolised the superstitious believer, and the temple of Jupiter represented the classical philosopher. He “resolved to study how that city, the home of the first Enlightenment, had fallen to the merchants of Belief”.³

The actual beginning of this second age of enlightenment cannot be clearly defined. That intellectual precursors existed in the Middle Ages and Renaissance period has been demonstrated. As Peter Gay notes, both Petrarch and Machiavelli admired the objectivity and strength of classical

²P. Gay, The Enlightenment: An Interpretation. The Rise of Modern Paganism, pp.102-103. Indeed, some recent studies have rejected this harsh division between religion and science in Enlightenment thought. Peter Harrison maintains that the concept of “religion” and “the religions” first emerged through the Enlightenment and permitted the scientific study of religion to commence (P. Harrison, “Religion” and the Religions in the English Enlightenment, p.1), and James Force and Richard Popkin aim to expand an appreciation of Isaac Newton beyond his scientific achievements by emphasising, in particular, his influence as a religious thinker. J. Force, Essays on the Context, Nature, and Influence of Isaac Newton’s Theology, pp.viii-ix. See also A. Kors, Anticipations of the Enlightenment in England, France, and Germany, p.3.
philosophers and decried the superstitious thought of the Christian era. Also, he draws attention to the fact that Renaissance historians refined their techniques of research to throw doubt on the tales of Hebrew prophets or Christian saints. Michael Hunter has shown that scientific methods of archaeological research were being applied in Britain as early as the fifteenth century.

The period covered by this study coincides largely with the so-called Age of Enlightenment. Certainly the level of scientific expertise reflected in the archaeological research of the individual British travellers who visited Palestine between the last decades of the seventeenth century and the early decades of the nineteenth century varied considerably. Perhaps their intellectual backgrounds and reasons for visiting Palestine were causative factors leading to this discrepancy. By making a selection of sites and studying in detail the methodology applied by individual travellers to the archaeological remains it has been possible to produce a more complete analysis of the archaeological research carried out in Palestine by the British during this period than has so far been made.

6 To define the terms 'archaeological' and 'scientific' as used in the context of this thesis is pertinent at this stage. The trend in modern studies on the history of archaeology is to concentrate on prehistoric archaeology (F. Hole, An Introduction to Prehistoric Archeology; B. Fagan, In the Beginning. An Introduction to Archaeology; B. Trigger, A History of Archaeological Thought), and to nominate most earlier efforts as antiquarianism (Fagan, In the Beginning, pp.17-21; Trigger, A History, pp.45-72). Significant developments in prehistoric archaeology occurred only in the nineteenth century with advancements in relative dating techniques and in the evidence for a great antiquity of mankind (Trigger, A History, pp.73ff.). By necessity, prehistoric archaeology is closely linked with geology and anthropology (Hole, Prehistoric Archeology, p.58). On the other hand, antiquarianism involved the description and collection of antiquities, often for their aesthetic value (Hole, Prehistoric Archeology, p.7; Fagan, In the Beginning, p.17), and if archaeology is defined as the technique of studying man's past using material remains as a primary source, the inclusion of antiquarianism within this discipline is limited by its artistic and historical biases. However, many of these so-called antiquarians in Britain extended their efforts beyond such limits and applied purely archaeological data to site interpretation. The efforts of several of these individuals will be discussed later in this chapter. Throughout the remainder of the thesis, it will be demonstrated that much of the research conducted by early British travellers in Palestine was also distinctly archaeological. The application of the term 'scientific' to the archaeological research of the early British travellers in Palestine refers to the efforts of these individuals to study the material remains first-hand and, from that experience, draw conclusions about their significance. This represents an empirical approach (A. Quinton, 'Empiricism', p.269), and clearly an advancement on mere description of the remains.
However, to appreciate more fully the research of these early travellers it is, first of all, pertinent to discuss the developments in archaeology and its related fields current in Britain at this time as these composed the relevant academic background from which archaeological work abroad could emanate.

According to Stuart Piggott, a conscious distinction between historical and archaeological research did not occur in England until the end of the nineteenth century.⁷ Although this premise may, in essence, be true, it does not negate the fact that the research, recording and interpretation of archaeological data accelerated from the late seventeenth century onwards. In the medieval period, studies of artefacts had been carried out, but these represented isolated endeavours.⁸ In 1586, Camden first published his *Britannia* and it was, undoubtedly, this and its successive editions in Latin and English which inspired and promoted an interest in antiquarianism amongst the educated public of early seventeenth century England.⁹ But, as Hunter observes,

Camden’s *Britannia* and his contemporaries’ and followers’ books on allied subjects, though antiquarian in a broad sense, are certainly not archaeological in these narrow terms. Camden’s consciousness was primarily historical, and his materials were almost all literary. Though they included written sources from archaeological contexts, such as inscriptions and coins, he had little interest in purely archaeological evidence which appears as an afterthought to his account of the history of a site.¹⁰

The application of scientific method to the study of archaeological data which flourished from the end of the seventeenth century reflected the popular acceptance amongst the scientific

---

⁷S. Piggott, *Ruins in a Land Scapce. Essays in Antiquarianism*, p.3. In his recent study, Van Riper claims that historical archaeology remained the dominant practice in Britain throughout most of the nineteenth century despite the fact that prehistoric archaeology was established as a distinct discipline by the early 1860s. See A. Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths. Victorian Science and the Discovery of Human Prehistory*, pp.15-43.


community of the empirical approach initiated by Bacon some time earlier. This Baconian idea formed a fundamental philosophical principal of the enlightenment movement. But equally important for the expansion and transmission of all aspects of scientific research at this time in England was the formal acceptance of the principles of the scientific community by society as recognised in the formation of the Royal Society in 1662. The correspondence of Sir Joseph Banks contains a letter written by Sir John Cullum to the Rev. Michael Tyson in 1778 which describes the process which ultimately led to the establishment of this association:

It was during the fifth and sixth decades of the seventeenth century, when extremist licence of thought was permissible if only it were shielded from exposure and controversy, that intelligent men sought freedom from the vexatious troubles of the time by engaging in scientific inquiry. As Dr. Whewell finely says, 'There arose about this time a group of philosophers, who began to knock at the door where Truth was to be found.' After the Restoration, the members of these pioneers increased. Their meetings were frequent, and well-attended. On July 15, 1662, a Royal Charter was granted them, constituting them a body corporate as the Royal Society. The King himself was a devoted patron; his office was not purely nominal, for he took an active and often sagacious part in the proceedings. He was elected a Fellow on January 9, 1665, being one hundred and seventy-first on the roll.

From the 1680s, archaeological articles frequently appeared in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society. Although British material was the prime focus of study, the

---

11Piggott, Ruins in a Landscape, p.20.
13Smith, The Life of Sir Joseph Banks President of the Royal Society with some notices of his friends and contemporaries, p.57.
earliest published account of the ruins of Palmyra was included amongst their number. This was written by William Halifax in the early 1690s and appeared in print in 1695.16

In the 1670s and 1680s, John Aubrey F.R.S., accumulated a large corpus of archaeological material which he presented in his *Monumenta Britannica*. His method was, as in contemporary natural science, classificatory and included little comment or theory.17 Historical material was employed only to elucidate the interpretation of the archaeological remains. Indeed, the great Scottish antiquary and philosopher, Sir John Clerk of Penicuik (1676-1755) stressed the importance of collecting material remains of ancient civilisation as an essential complement to the reading of classical authors. He wrote, "The things themselves speak and for the most part explain themselves; but descriptions, however accurate, present to the mind only confused or shadowy ideas".18 A similar concept was expressed by Dr. Robert Plot F.R.S. in his *Natural History of Staffordshire* (1686).19

This growing awareness of the intrinsic value of archaeological data is also apparent in the many other regional studies published in Britain between 1660 and 1730. The most obvious example of this change in emphasis from historical to empirical evidence in studies of this kind is provided by the revised edition of Camden's *Britannia* (1695). To produce this account, Edmund Gibson assembled a team of eminent men to carry out their own regional field-work in which the preference for antiquities and natural history is quite clear.20 Another important example of the

---

17Piggott, *Ruins in a Landscape*, p.16.
19In his *Natural History of Staffordshire*, Plot wrote "it... [is]... my designe... to omit, as much as may be, both persons and actions, and chiefly to apply my self to things". Cited in Hunter, "The Royal Society: I", p.116.
trend to record archaeological evidence for its own sake is to be found in the large series of country maps prepared by private cartographers during the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{21}

From its beginning, the Royal Society itself endeavoured to augment its 'Philosophical Stock' with maps and drawings made by travellers to distant lands,\textsuperscript{22} as the correspondence between the early British traveller, Thomas Shaw (c.1730) and Hans Sloane, then President of the Royal Society, exemplifies.\textsuperscript{23} Furthermore, ethnographic objects brought back from abroad were collected in its Museum of Natural and Artificial Rarities.\textsuperscript{24}

Since the novel empirical approach to the study of the phenomena of natural history had necessitated accurate illustration, it followed that the scientific approach to archaeology required the same standard of draughtsmanship in recording artefacts, monuments and site plans. In his discussion of the development of archaeological illustration, Stuart Piggott includes several plates which exemplify this.\textsuperscript{25}

Whereas some of these early archaeologists did their own drawings,\textsuperscript{26} others employed draughtsmen to carry out this task for them.\textsuperscript{27} By the beginning of the nineteenth century in England, the trend to employ specialists to perform certain aspects of field-work was becoming more firmly established. Thus, in his study of the \textit{Ancient History of Wiltshire} (1810-1821), Sir

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21}C. Phillips, 'Archaeology and the Ordnance Survey', p.195.
\item \textsuperscript{22}S. Piggott, \textit{Antiquity Depicted. Aspects of Archaeological Illustration}, p.25.
\item \textsuperscript{23}MS.S. 4058 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, British Library), ff. 193r-193v; 3986, ff. 45r-75v; 4051, ff.156r-156v; 4052, f. 210r. The correspondence deals with descriptive material and maps on Tunis, Algiers and Barbary being forwarded by Shaw to Sloane.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Piggott, \textit{Antiquity Depicted}, p.25.
\item \textsuperscript{25}Piggott, \textit{Antiquity Depicted}, pp.33 (Figs. 20,21), 34 (Fig. 22) for artefacts; pp.14-15 (Figs. 6,7), 16-17 (Fig. 8) for monuments; pp. 41 (Fig. 25), 42 (Fig. 27) for site plans, although Piggott notes that such plans were still comparatively inaccurate to those produced by modern surveying techniques (Piggott, \textit{Antiquity Depicted}, pp.40, 42-43).
\item \textsuperscript{26}Piggott, \textit{Antiquity Depicted}, pp. 31-32, 40, 43-44.
\item \textsuperscript{27}Piggott, \textit{Antiquity Depicted}, pp. 30-31, 35, 42.
\end{itemize}

Richard Colt Hoare planned and directed the field-work and excavation, but this was actually carried out by William Cunnington. The illustrations were, in fact, made by Philip Crocker; originally a surveyor and draughtsman in the newly formed Ordnance Survey.28

One aspect of fundamental importance to the theory of modern archaeology which developed through the application of scientific method to the interpretation of archaeological remains was a rudimentary appreciation of the significance of their stratigraphic association.29 Undoubtedly this development related to the progress being made in the associated fields of palaeontology and geology through the impetus of the Industrial Revolution which was causing large amounts of previously hidden terrain to be exposed for examination and utilisation.30

Although the early archaeologists in Britain were beginning to apply the concept of relative dating to artefact interpretation, their evaluation of absolute dating of archaeological remains relied on the evidence of epigraphy, and that of the Mosaic chronology by which the age of the earth had been calculated at 6000 years. The Mosaic chronology had, however, become a subject of scrutiny by natural historians in both Britain and on the Continent as a result of their empirical observations of the earth itself. Indeed, some scientists of the French Enlightenment proposed an ancient human antiquity to match their notions of an eternal earth history in which God played no part.31 But, for most scientists, the Mosaic chronology was retained as accurate at least for the age of mankind and the theory of an eternal globe remained an unacceptable concept.

Thus when Edmund Halley (1656-1743), Secretary of the Royal Society, suggested that, if one knew the present salt content of the ocean and the rate at which that content was increasing,

the age of the ocean, and therefore the world, could be determined by extrapolating this rate back through time, he aimed, primarily, to refute the notion of an eternal world. However, he was also aware that the world might be found to be much older than a literal interpretation of the biblical account would allow. Such a result concurred with the conclusions reached by other scientists of the enlightenment period.

To compromise the biblical account with an assertion of an ancient earth required a reinterpretation of the Mosaic chronology as representing an allegorical time span. This theory which retained a major acceptance amongst the natural historians of both Britain and the Continent until well into the nineteenth century is well defined by Halley:

> There have been many Attempts made and Proposals offered, to ascertain from the Appearances of Nature, what may have been the Antiquity of this Globe of Earth; on which by the Evidence of Sacred Writ, Mankind has dwelt about 6000 years; or according to the Septuagint above 7000. But whereas we are told that the Formation of Man was the last Act of the Creator, 'tis no where revealed in Scripture how long the Earth has existed before this last Creation, nor how long those five days that preceded it may be to be accounted, since we are elsewhere told, that in respect of the Almighty a thousand Years is as one Day... Nor can it well be conceived how long those days should be to be understood of natural Days, since they are mentioned as Measures of Time before the Creation of the Sun, which was not till the Fourth Day.

---

Outside the scientific community in late seventeenth to mid-nineteenth century Britain, the Bible continued to be interpreted literally along with the belief that an earth without people would be an earth without purpose.\textsuperscript{35}

Thus, in both scientific and non-scientific circles, the age of mankind continued to be based upon the genealogical information with which the Mosaic chronology was compared. Unfortunately, this theory implied that the evidence of human remains found in an ancient context would be misinterpreted. The well-known account by John Bagford of the discovery by John Conyers of a handaxe near the remains of an elephant in London and Bagford's assignation of these as Roman is a case in point.\textsuperscript{36} Since many early archaeologists in Britain concentrated on superficial architectural remains and their associated artefacts the need to consider evidence of human existence in ancient geological strata did not arise.\textsuperscript{37}

The above discussion has focussed on the main aspects and developments occurring in the science of archaeology from the late seventeenth to early nineteenth centuries in Britain, and which were consequent to the growth of empiricism in the natural sciences.

However, not all research of this period in Britain, either in archaeology or in other potentially scientific fields was being conducted objectively. As Stuart Piggott states,

by the 1730s... changing moods were bringing about a decline in the standards of many disciplines, including the natural sciences, historical research and....

\textsuperscript{35}Even Robert Richardson, a medical doctor, who travelled to Palestine in 1818 makes clear his cynicism of the absolute chronology proposed by some French philosophers and his belief in the authenticity of the Mosaic chronology. See Robert Richardson, *Travels along the Mediterranean, and Parts Adjacent; in Company with the Earl of Belmore, during the Years 1816-17-18* (T. Cadell, London; W. Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1822), Vol. I, pp.312-313; hereafter cited as Richardson, *Travels*, Vol. I or II.

\textsuperscript{36}For a detailed discussion of this case, see Grayson, *Human Antiquity*, pp.7-8.

\textsuperscript{37}Grayson, *Human Antiquity*, p.2.
archaeology: 'The mood was shifting from rational to romantic, from classical calm to barbarian excitement',\textsuperscript{38}

It is considered that this change in outlook, known as the Romantic Movement, continued until about 1820.\textsuperscript{39} Far-reaching as its effects were, however, it must be stressed that it by no means annihilated research based on empirical method, as Piggott has inferred.

The form of archaeological research which typified this movement was the tour in search of the picturesque in which 'The Gothick' formed a major attraction. These tours were frequently carried out and written up by men with little or no background in scientific archaeological research\textsuperscript{40} and, consequently, their reports lack the objectivity achieved by empirical method.

The antithesis between the mentality of the Romantic movement and that of the Enlightenment implies the reactionary status of the former to the latter. That the empirical approach to scientific research would have caused such a reaction seems unlikely. A much more feasible motive may be found in the anti-Christian sentiment and consequent flourishing of deism which occurred in France and England during the eighteenth century\textsuperscript{41} and, in England, posed a threat to the stability of the Church of England itself. This would clearly concern educated members of the scientific and non-scientific communities alike.

One most interesting and extreme example of transformation in archaeological method from empiricism to romanticism as a reaction to deism is provided by the work of the famous eighteenth century antiquary, William Stukeley.

\textsuperscript{38}Piggott, \textit{Antiquity Depicted}, p.44.
\textsuperscript{39}S. Piggott, 'Prehistory and the Romantic Movement', p.31.
\textsuperscript{40}Piggott, 'Prehistory and the Romantic Movement', pp.32-33.
Between 1718 and 1727, Stukeley, with his scientific background in medicine, produced accurate plans from his field-work at both Stonehenge and Avebury. Gradually he became fired with religious enthusiasm tinged with the overtones of Druidical mysticism. By 1729 he had been appointed to the living of All Saints, Stamford. As Piggott explains,

[Stukeley] had decided that every pagan religion, particularly that of the Druids, was a foreshadowing, not only of Christianity, but of the doctrine of the Trinity, and with this weapon he was going to battle against the sceptics in 'this age of epidemical infidelity'.

No longer concerned with empirical method, Stukeley modified his plans of the Overton Hill Stone Circles at Avebury to fit his new 'romantic' theory, and it was one of these modified plans which was ultimately published. In a letter to Roger Gale, Stukeley clarifies his later interpretation of the site and the reason for his continued interest in it.

The form of that stupendous work [at Avebury] is the picture of the Deity, more particularly of the Trinity... A snake proceeding from a circle is the eternal procession of the son from the first cause... My main motive in pursuing this subject is to combat the deists from an unexpected quarter, and to preserve so noble a monument of our ancestors' piety, I may add orthodoxy.

Stukeley's theory was indeed eccentric, but his promotion of Christianity through assumed archaeological evidence represents one significant precept of the Romantic Movement. The material most frequently applied to this purpose, though often by men with little or no archaeological background was that identified as Gothic. To the philosophers, Gothic symbolising

---

42S. Piggott, 'Stukeley, Avebury and the Druids', p.28.
44Piggott, 'Stukeley, Avebury and the Druids', Plate V. Compare with his original field sketches in Plates II, III.
45Piggott, 'Stukeley, Avebury and the Druids', p.30. A recent investigation of Stukeley's manuscripts on Celtic Religion and his surviving fieldnotes have revealed that he was already committed to romantic notions in the early 1720s. See P. Ucko, Avebury Reconsidered from the 1660s to the 1990s, p.53f.
the art of Christians, was the object of their common dislike. The establishment of its acceptability by the 'romantic archaeologists' must be perceived as one significant means of undermining such movements as deism by reinforcing the Christian foundation of English society.

Concomitant with these trends in archaeology was the upsurge of religious enthusiasm inspired by such revivalists as John and Charles Wesley early in the eighteenth century. That the Evangelical Movement, with its emphasis on biblical infallibility, was a reaction to the philosophy of the Enlightenment is clear, but in a more specific sense, it also represented a reaction to the general apathy which had permeated the Anglican church at this time. Like the imaginative archaeological theories of Stukeley and the growing admiration of the Gothic, religious enthusiasm typified the Romantic mentality.

As the century progressed, the Evangelical Movement extended its influence through the growth of the Methodist and Baptist churches, and by further permeating the Church of England. However, the greatest boost to the Evangelical revival in England was occasioned by the aristocracy toward the end of the century primarily in reaction to the events taking place in France. Horrified by the French Revolution and the ideas that spread before its outbreak, the English aristocracy found in the Evangelical Movement an effective means to maintain the social order at home and to create outlets for the new religious zeal in missionary work abroad. The economic and social changes resulting from the Industrial Revolution and the consequent success of English commerce and colonisation all contributed to the Evangelical revival.

48 Tibawi, *British Interests*, p.4. In 1792 the Baptist Missionary Society was founded; in 1795 the London Missionary Society; in 1799 the Church Missionary Society; in 1804 the British and Foreign Society; and in 1809 the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. See Tibawi, *British Interests*, p.5.
The Evangelical Movement provided a prime source from which anti-Catholic/French propaganda could be disseminated throughout English society.⁴⁹ In a lighter tone, but no less poignant, the press offered a further means for the spread of these notions as the following cartoons from the latter part of this period illustrate (Plates 1-4).

Certainly, a competent analysis of the archaeological research of the early British travellers in Palestine between the late seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries demands an appreciation of the relevant intellectual, political and religious attitudes and practices which took place in Britain during this period. However, it is also important that the rationale behind the British efforts to establish a foothold in Palestine at this time be understood as this caused the political and religious attitudes current in Britain to be projected into this foreign environment and could potentially influence the early British travellers in their interpretation of the archaeological data. It is to the situation in Palestine that our attention now turns.

**Palestine: A Cogent Prize for British Colonial Expansion**

Within a program of colonial expansion, the appearance of missionary activity within that colony has been identified as the cultural aspect of that program, and that which generally followed upon the territorial, commercial, and political aspects.⁵⁰ But, in the British efforts to establish a firm foothold in Palestine, this was not the case.

⁴⁹Jeremy Black gives a résumé of the varying relationships between Britain and France in the European political scene throughout the eighteenth century. But even such events as the Anglo-French alliance of 1716-31 and Britain's defeat of France in the Seven Years War (1756-63) did not alter the fact that "Anti-Catholicism was the prime ideological stance in eighteenth-century Britain". See Black, *The British and the Grand Tour*, pp.163, 189.

Plate 1. A French Ordinary

"The attractions of a cheap French table d'hote are ludicrously set forth... The slovenly old cook is emptying the morsels left from the plates of the customers, into the capacious pot-au-feu, to reappear dished up for succeeding convives. A lean cat is seated in the frying pan, probably in course of fattening for the spit; as to the larder, the main provisions consist of dead cats and frogs; it was an accepted axiom that all the Jean Crapauds, as our Gallic neighbours were playfully christened by John Bull, lived more or less on frogs'.

'The complex nature of the famous Broad-Bottom Administration known as 'All the Talents', is set forth in an allegorical representation, which is supposed to include the several qualifications of the vaunted illuminés. It may be remembered that this Ministry, which came to power under Liberal and popular auspices, retired on the rejection of their favourite measure, Catholic Emancipation, which they were pledged to introduce. The King, and his friends, the remnant of the Pittites, made a desperate stand against this measure, and the consequence of its defeat was the immediate withdrawal of 'All the Talents' from office. As embodied by Rowlandson's pencil, the combination of heterogeneous elements produced a curious monster: the wig of a learned judge is worn on the head of a spectacled ape, with an episcopal mitre and a Catholic crosier; a lawyer's bands, a laced coat, and ragged breeches; wearing one shoe, and a French jackboot; and dancing upon a funeral pyre of papers, the results of the Administration, its endless negotiations with France, and its sinecures and patronages, which are blazing away.'

Plate 3. Doctor Gallipot

Doctor Gallipot, a brandy-faced empiric, who is dressed in the height of the 'Frenchified' fashion, the better to support his quackeries, is laying the implements of his profession, as his fortune, at the feet of a slightly theatrical looking lady.

Plate 4. The Mother's Hope

'The Mother's Hope is a pretty juvenile tennagant, a Turk of the most irreclaimable order. The young rebel is dancing about in a fine rage, scattering his playthings, and 'making a bobbery' which is setting the entire house by the ears... The wilful child is making a general statement of the refractory resolutions: 'I don't like dolls - I don't like canary birds - I hate battledore and shuttlecock - I like drums and trumpets - I won't go to school - I will stay at home - I will have my own way in everything!' The horrified grandmother is growing prophetic on the strength of this irreconcilable prodigy: 'Bless the Baby - what an aspiring spirit - if he goes on in this way he will be a second Buonaparte!'

The Industrial Revolution in Britain had created an unprecedented need for sources of raw materials, and for export markets for manufactured goods, especially cloth. Furthermore, secure lines of communication between Britain and her raw materials and markets were now essential.\(^5\) Palestine, with its crops of raw cotton, its potential markets for manufactured goods and, most significantly, its vital position connecting the Mediterranean with the Persian Gulf and thereby India, was a cogent resource for both political and economic gain.

However, it was not until the fourth decade of the nineteenth century that the British government officially established a foothold in Palestine by inaugurating a British consul in Jerusalem.\(^5\)\(^2\) Certainly British consular agents or vice-consuls had resided in several coastal towns from a much earlier period, but these were employed by the Levant Company rather than the British government and, moreover, were natives of the Levant.\(^5\)\(^3\) The renowned, eccentric British resident of Mt. Lebanon, Lady Hester Stanhope, contrasted the inefficiency of these men with the effectiveness of the French consular officials in this region.\(^5\)\(^4\) Visiting Palestine in 1814, a British traveller of military background, Henry Light, explains the advantages of employing English nationals to consular posts:

> The agents for England on the coast of Syria and Cyprus, at Damietta in Egypt, with the exception of those at Acri and Larnica, are natives: at Larnica, the vice-consul is a native of Zante; at Acri, a Genoese. The information that might be obtained would be worth the expense of appointing Englishmen to these situations, who would influence the conduct of the agas and chiefs in that country, and encourage a preference to English commodities. The agents for France are generally anciens militaires; and I do not see why English officers should not be

---

\(^5\)Chapman, 'British Archaeology in the Holy Land in the 19th Century: Sources and a Framework for Study', p.3.

\(^5\) A British consulate was first established in Jerusalem in 1838. See Tibawi, British Interests, p.31.

\(^5\) Tibawi, British Interests, p.7.

found capable and willing to support the commercial interests of the country, while their experience as soldiers would enable them to give political information.\textsuperscript{55}

Over the period covered by this study, France's influence in Palestine posed the major obstacle to Britain's infiltration. Even the minor political gains achieved by Britain through their defeat of the Napoleonic campaign in this area were only transient. Indeed, France still maintained its patronage of the Latin church in Palestine. Fully aware of the political and economic power enjoyed by France through this protective role, the British government pursued, in early nineteenth century Palestine, a program of colonial expansion aimed at establishing a comparable foothold and, thereby, a base of potential counter-attack against the French.

The Evangelical Movement in Britain had created the widespread conviction that the Second Coming of Christ was at hand, and together with that conviction went a desire to save souls before the dread event. In turn this led to a religious lobby bent on saving 'Fallen Israel', with the chosen race of Jewry being marshalled under Christ's banner.\textsuperscript{56}

Thus, the Jews became the object of patronage by the British missionaries sent to Palestine in the early nineteenth century,\textsuperscript{57} although their work soon extended to other religious groups as well. The formal recognition of the political significance of the missionary activities is reflected in the support offered by British government officials stationed in neighbouring regions.\textsuperscript{58} Furthermore, the acknowledgement of their own need for political protection within Palestine itself.

\textsuperscript{56}M. Hannam, 'Some Nineteenth-Century Britons in Jerusalem', p.54.
\textsuperscript{57}Hannam 'Some Nineteenth-Century Britons', p.54.
\textsuperscript{58}James Connor, a missionary of the Church Missionary Society who travelled in Palestine in 1820, frequently refers to the important role played by British consular representatives in setting up a local network to assist with the distribution of scriptural texts. James Connor, Visit of the Rev. James Connor, in 1819 and 1820, to Candia, Rhodes, Cyprus, and Palestine, in William Jowett, Christian Researches in the Mediterranean, from MDCCCXV to MDCCCCXX in Furtherance of the Objects of the Church Missionary Society, 3rd ed. (L. B. Seeley and Son; J. Hatchard and Son, London, 1824), pp.423, 426, 447, 449-451 (re Mr. Barker in Aleppo), 452 (re Mr. Rich in Bagdad); hereafter cited as Connor, Visit.
made the missionaries the main promoters of the project of the consulate. In 1838, the evangelical Lord Shaftesbury intervened, on their behalf, with Palmerston and, as a result, the British consulate at Jerusalem was established.\(^\text{59}\)

Throughout most of the period covered by this study, the French in comparison with the British retained a far stronger foothold in Palestine. As patron of the Latin church in Palestine, the French government held control over the numerous Holy Places associated with this church. Furthermore, competent officials of the French government resided in the coastal cities and, consequently, French merchants were able to dominate European trade in this region.

To appreciate the sacred and political significance of the Holy Places in Palestine, a brief account of the relevant history of these sites is worthwhile. It becomes clear that their 'possession' provided a vital source of power in the arena of international politics for the countries concerned. Thus, any reduction in the political viability of these sites would benefit the British government's attempts to establish its own foothold in Palestine. It seems likely that the archaeological work of several early British travellers which aimed at undermining the authenticity of the Holy Places was inspired by the anti-French/Catholic movement which dominated the British political scene. However, the earliest formal application of this policy in Palestine took place in the early nineteenth century in the form of British missionary activity. The close liaison between the missionary movement and the British government has been noted. The political implications of the missionary efforts to promote a Christianity based on faith rather than the worship of its material remains are obvious.

The Holy places were considered to be the sites connected with the historic sacred events of Christianity. As such they were thought to retain supernatural potency, and visitors thereto

\(^{59}\)Tibawi, *British Interests*, p.34.
might experience miracles, like healing or revelation. Employing rather dubious methods, their locations were initially identified in A.D. 326 by Empress Helena, the mother of Constantine. Emperor Constantine used the Holy Places to promote his imperial power and prestige. Fundamental to the effectiveness of this plan was the supreme role attributed to Christianity in the new Christian Empire. The emperor was believed to be the representative of God on earth, and his empire, the image of Christ's kingdom. It followed that any improvement in the material culture of the Christian church would result in a corresponding increase in the emperor's own personal status. The Holy Places, being associated with the most significant events of Christianity were prime objects for glorification. Over the two most important sites in Palestine - the Cave of the Nativity in Bethlehem and the site of the Crucifixion on Golgotha - Constantine built sumptuous basilicas. He restored the name Jerusalem to the city of Aelia, and promoted the church and city of Jerusalem to the Church of the Holy Places and the Holy City of the Oecumenec respectively. Emperor Constantine, assisted by the Empress Helena, in fact, established the 'Cult of the Holy Places'.

61 N. Silberman, Digging for God and Country: Exploration, Archaeology and the Secret Struggle for the Holy Land 1799-1917, pp.5-6. The Jewish uprisings against the Romans in A.D. 66-70, A.D. 115-116 and A.D. 133-135 (see Jones, The Decline of the Ancient World (Longman Group Ltd., London, 1966), p.27) had so utterly devastated the landscape of Palestine that the locations of the holy Christian sites were unrecognisable. Thus, Empress Helena embarked on her journey through Palestine with the express purpose of rediscovering these spots. Through divine inspiration and extensive excavation she produced results with which she and her clerical entourage were satisfied. See Silberman, Digging, pp.5-6.
62 For a discussion of the transformation of the pagan Roman Empire to a rudimentary Christian Empire under Constantine, see R. Markus, Christianity in the Roman World, pp.87-104.
63 Markus, Christianity, p.104.
64 Silberman, Digging, p.6.
65 In A.D. 135, Emperor Hadrian (Aelius Hadrianus) successfully terminated the third Jewish revolt. Jews were no longer permitted anywhere near the city of Jerusalem, which was rebuilt as a Roman garrison and renamed Aelia in the emperor's honour (see Eusebius, The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine, Bk. 4, Ch. 6). Under Constantine, Jews were still barred from visiting Jerusalem. See Silberman, Digging, p.6.
66 Wardi, 'The Question of the Holy Places', p.385. At the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), the bishopric of Jerusalem was promoted to the rank of patriarch. See Jones, Decline, p.261.
Except for one period of Latin domination during the Crusades, the church in Jerusalem and its associated sites remained, until the fourteenth century, in Orthodox hands. With the admission of the Franciscan friars to the Holy Land in 1333, the rivalry for the rights to the Holy Places began in earnest. The Franciscans soon took control of the principal Holy Places, and by the expedient use of archival material, maintained their supremacy until the seventeenth century. In 1535, a treaty of friendship concluded between the Ottoman Sultan and King Francis I of France, gave France the right of 'protection' over the holy sites. France also claimed the right to protect the Catholic communities of the Ottoman Empire. Undoubtedly, France's patronage of the Franciscans in the Holy Land contributed to their success.

Under the Ottoman sultans, the Orthodox Church of Jerusalem was subjugated to the Greek Patriarchate of Constantinople. From then on, the Orthodox clergy in Palestine and the Patriarch of Jerusalem were always Greeks. The Patriarch of Jerusalem now resided permanently in Constantinople, and made only occasional visits to Jerusalem.

---

67 In 1099, Jerusalem was captured by the Crusaders and remained in their hands until 1187 when it was recaptured by Saladin. During this period a Latin patriarchate ruled the church of Jerusalem. See Tibawi, British Interests, p.65.
69 Silberman, Digging, p.8; J. Hurewitz, Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East: A Documentary Record: 1535-1914, Vol. I, p.2 (article 1). This treaty of friendship, otherwise known as the French Capitulations, included several other privileges, granted primarily to foster trade. For a transcript of the 'Treaty of Amity and Commerce: The Ottoman Empire and France (February 1535)' and pertinent background information, see Hurewitz, Diplomacy, Vol. I, pp.1-5.
70 Tibawi, British Interests, p.30 (incl. Footnote no. 2). Tibawi points out that 'the original capitulations were actually in respect of the foreign 'Franks' resident in, or trading with the Ottoman Empire, and not in respect of the native Christians who were Ottoman subjects' (see Tibawi, British Interests, p.30 (Footnote no. 3)). Not until the later Capitulations of 1740 was France's protectorate over the Catholics of the Ottoman Empire officially recognised. See Wardi, 'The Question of the Holy Places', p.390.
72 D. Hopwood, 'The Resurrection of Our Eastern Brethren' (Ignatiev); Russia and Orthodox Arab Nationalism in Jerusalem', pp.398-399.
73 Tibawi, British Interests, pp.64-65. It was not until 1845 that the Patriarchs of Jerusalem resided more or less permanently in Jerusalem. See Tibawi, British Interests, p.65.
Thus both the Orthodox and Catholic clergies in Palestine were now represented at the Sublime Porte; the Orthodox by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Greek diplomats, the Franciscans by the French ambassador. The Greeks at the Porte realised the value of producing official documentation to support the Orthodox claims to Holy Places. Despite retaliation from the French ambassador, a firman was issued in 1638 in favour of the Orthodox who, consequently, held the rights to the majority of Holy Places for the next fifty years.

Throughout the seventeenth century, the Ottoman Empire suffered a succession of military defeats and associated territorial losses. Finally, in 1688, a particularly severe defeat by the combined forces of Austria, Poland and Venice resulted in the loss of Belgrade. Desperately in need of a foreign ally and mediator, the Ottomans approached France. France responded favourably and, now in a strong bargaining position, was able to procure a firman in 1689/90 which reconfirmed the rights of the Franciscans to the most important Holy Places. However, in 1757, an Orthodox rebellion against the Latin domination of the Holy Places erupted in Jerusalem. Being the eve of the Seven Years War, France could no longer offer the Ottomans her political support. The Holy Places wrested from the Greeks in 1690 were officially returned. Russia entered the scene in 1774 when the Treaty of Kütçük Kaynarja afforded her the right of 'speaking up' for the Ottoman Orthodox. Thereafter, Russia assumed the role of their protector, although this was never officially recognised.

80 Tibawi, British Interests, p.30.
The especial attributes associated with the Holy Places made them particularly prestigious assets for the sect or sects involved. The local conflict took place primarily between the Franciscans and the Orthodox clergy. This local conflict was echoed in the diplomatic circles of the Sublime Porte. Here, the rights of worship at the Holy Places in Palestine were a matter of international power politics. As the Ottoman Empire disintegrated, foreign powers began taking possession of former Ottoman territories. In Palestine, however, the tight strong rule of the local potentates in the mountain regions, and the Bedouin domination of the plains, did not permit such foreign intervention to occur. The closest semblance to a territorial possession in Palestine by a foreign entity was the right to worship at a Holy Place, or the control of a religious institution, such as a convent or church. Thus, the competition between the Orthodox and Roman Catholics for the right to the Holy Places was utilised by their patrons at the Porte, the Greek (later Russian) and the French ambassadors, to establish for their respective nations a nominal 'territorial' claim in Palestine.

82 The disintegration of the Ottoman government began in the second half of the sixteenth century and reached its lowest ebb in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. By comparing the density of settlement between c.1580 and c.1880 for several regions of Palestine and Transjordan, W. Hutteroth has shown that the areas most accessible to Bedouin incursions had the highest percentages of lost villages, such as those in the Jordan Valley, the Transjordan heights and the border regions of the Western Uplands. In contrast, only a small percentage of villages had been deserted in the mountain regions of Judaea and Samaria (see W. Hutteroth, 'The Pattern of Settlement in Palestine in the Sixteenth Century', pp.3-10; Fig. III). In the seventeenth century, Turkoman, Kurdish and Bedouin tribes arrived in the mountain districts of Nablus, Jerusalem and Hebron, the Bedouin forming the largest of these groups (see M. Abir, 'Local Leadership and Early Reforms in Palestine, 1800-1835', pp.285-286). However, only in that of Hebron which bordered on the southern deserts, did the impact of these invasions lead to a significant exodus of the local population (see Abir, 'Local Leadership', p.294). In the districts of Jerusalem and Nablus, the inherent protection offered by a more isolated mountain zone prevented the invading tribes from disturbing the settled population to any great extent. Rather, the tribal chiefs (sheikhs) took advantage of the decay of the Ottoman authority to establish themselves as virtual masters of these mountain districts (see Abir, 'Local Leadership', pp.286, 288-291; Cohen, Palestine in the 18th Century, pp.2, 164-165; James Silk Buckingham, Travels in Palestine through the Countries of Bashan and Gilead; Including a Visit to the Cities of Geraza and Gemala in the Decapolis (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, London, 1821), pp.550-551; hereafter cited as Buckingham, Travels in Palestine; John Lewis Burckhardt, Travels in Syria and the Holy Land, W. M. Leake (ed.) (John Murray, London, 1822), p.342; hereafter cited as Burckhardt, Travels in Syria. New local powers also emerged during the second half of the seventeenth century in the Sancak of Safed. See Cohen, Palestine in the 18th Century, p.2.
Commercial activity supported by a strong consular presence was the other means by which French implantation in Palestine took place. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, French merchants dominated European trade in this region, with commercial activities concentrated in the northern area nominated the Eyalet of Sidon. The following account gives some details of the agricultural and commercial developments which took place in this Eyalet and shows how it became, politically and economically, the most viable part of Palestine and, ultimately, the target of the Napoleonic campaign in Palestine.

In 1635, the famous Druze ruler, Fakhr al-Din II was captured, taken to Constantinople, and executed. His death heralded the end of Ma'nid supremacy in Galilee. However, their rule had provided a protracted period of security ensuring the basis for a sound agricultural economy which would flourish during the following century.

With the Ma'nid disintegration, a political vacuum developed throughout the district. Since the office of Vâli (governor) of Sidon was weak, local families vied with each other for authority. In 1701, Henry Worsley observed that Lower Galilee had already yielded to the economic and political control of a united force, now manifest as the Bedouin family of Zaydâni.

P. Hitti, History of the Arabs from the Earliest Times to the Present, p.731.

At the time of the Ottoman conquest of Syria in 1516 (see Hitti, History of the Arabs, pp.726, 729), Mt. Lebanon was subject to the independent rule of various Druze sheikhs and emirs (see Hitti, History of the Arabs, p.729; M.C-F. Volney, Travels through Syria and Egypt, in the Years 1783, 1784, and 1785, Vol. II, pp.39-40) of whom the family of Ma' n were the most powerful (see Falah, 'A History of the Druze Settlements', p.37). Selim I confirmed the autonomous rule of these local potentates in their various fiefs and, in return, demanded only a comparatively light tribute (see Hitti, History of the Arabs, p.729). Likewise, the political supremacy of the Ma' nid family was officially recognised by awarding their leader, Fakhr al-Din I, the Emirate of the Druzes (see Falah, 'A History of the Druze Settlements', p.37). His successor, Korkmaz (1544-1586) incorporated Tyre, Acre and Caesarea into his realm, and his successor Fakhr al-Din II (1586-1635) extended his control over all Galilee. See Falah, 'A History of the Druze Settlements', p.37; Volney, Travels, Vol. II, p.42.

cultivation, to which the growing European demand gave impetus. Early in the eighteenth century, French merchants at Acre were already concluding direct commercial transactions with the Zaydānī sheikhs. At this time, French traders from Marseilles residing in Sidon and Acre, held a virtual monopoly on Palestinian trade with Europe. Cotton, in its various forms, was already the main export commodity.\(^{87}\)

The 1730s and 1740s saw a turning point in the administrative organisation of Galilee. By means of military prowess and outstanding organisational skills, one member of the Zaydānī family, Dāhir al-ʿUmar, began to subordinate the other local potentates of the district to his authority. By the mid-1740s, he had established centralised control over all Lower Galilee and, around 1760, the Metouali mukātāa of Bilād Bishārā in Upper Galilee joined his domain. Like other Zaydānī sheikhs, Dāhir derived the strength of his economic status from participation in cotton cultivation and marketing.\(^{88}\) Early in his career, he realised the potential value, both economically and politically of controlling the main export outlet for this commodity.\(^{89}\) The French merchants, with whom the sheikhs of Galilee conducted their transactions, were settled in Acre.\(^{90}\) Dāhir's ambition was to subjugate this port and make it the commercial and administrative capital of his centralised government.

Dāhir successfully subordinated Acre and ousted the Aga. From the Vātī of Sidon he sought legitimation of his authority. In return, he promised to pay the tribute of the district,


restrain the Bedouin and implement a program of environmental improvement. Dahir's request was granted, the Vali of Sidon having little option.91

Despite the concerted assaults of the Vais of Sidon, Tripoli and Damascus in the late sixties and early seventies,92 Dahir managed to further a de facto rule to include the sancaks of Joppa, and Gaza and Ramla.93 In 1771, he even succeeded in expelling the Vali of Sidon.94

Dahir was killed during an Ottoman naval attack on Acre in August 1775.95 The Porte appreciated the potential value, both economically and politically, of Dahir's achievements and incorporated his legacy into the newly structured office of Vali of Sidon, thereby channelling more of the fiscal resources of Galilee into the state treasury and bringing the entire district under the centralised control of this one official.

In October 1775, Jezzar Ahmed Pasha was appointed to this office96 and retained this position for the next thirty years until his death in 1804.97 This long term of office enabled him to consolidate and extend his centralised authority and accumulate great personal wealth and prestige. Like Dahir, he employed as his prime tools, military strength and involvement in international trade.

Thus, on his accession, Jezzar made Acre, and not Sidon, his provincial capital. By the mid-1780s, his domain included "all the country from the Nahr-el-Kelb, to the south of Kaisaria,

91Cohen, Palestine in the 18th Century, p.130; Volney, Travels, Vol. II, pp. 94-96.
92For an account of the campaigns conducted by these Vais and of the counteraction by Dahir's forces and his allies, see Volney, Travels, Vol. II, pp.105-124.
97Cohen, Palestine in the 18th Century, p.21.
between the Mediterranean to the west, and at Anti-Lebanon, and the upper part of the course of
the Jordan, to the east.\textsuperscript{98}

Jezzār implemented various schemes to consolidate his centralised authority and ensure the
future security of the region. Like his predecessor, he was concerned with the two most
vulnerable areas of his domain, the eastern border and the coast. His role as official ruler of the
region did not preclude the possibility of Ottoman intervention, a fact he fully realised.\textsuperscript{99} On the
eastern front, the Bedouin, too, posed a constant threat.\textsuperscript{100} Thus, in the fortified town of
Tiberias,\textsuperscript{101} and in other frontier towns,\textsuperscript{102} permanent garrisons were installed. At Acre, the
fortifications were improved,\textsuperscript{103} and garrisons were placed here\textsuperscript{104} and at two other main ports of
the Eyālet, namely Sidon\textsuperscript{105} and Beirut.\textsuperscript{106}

By the 1780s, Jezzār had monopolised the cotton and corn trade of Galilee, thus
augmenting his already considerable income.\textsuperscript{107} Then, Jezzār took a drastic step to eliminate
competition completely. As W. G. Browne writes,

Till the year 1791 the French had factories at Acré, Seide, and Beirut. At that
period they were all expelled from the territory of Jezzār by a sudden mandate
which allowed them only three days to abandon their respective habitations, under
pain of death.\textsuperscript{108}

\textsuperscript{99}Volney, \textit{Travels}, Vol. II, pp.183-184. To safeguard his interests, Jezzār paid salaries to both spies and sponsors in
\textsuperscript{100}Cohen, \textit{Palestine in the 18th Century}, p.105.
\textsuperscript{101}Cohen, \textit{Palestine in the 18th Century}, pp.105-106. Buckingham (1816) found a garrison of twenty to thirty
soldiers still stationed at Tiberias. See Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.481.
\textsuperscript{104}Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.78.
\textsuperscript{108}W. G. Browne, \textit{Travels in Africa, Egypt, and Syria, from the Year 1792 to 1798} (T. Cadell Junior and W.
The expulsion of French traders from the main ports posed a severe threat to the French foothold. Under Jezzar, the town of Acre had become the administrative centre of a far-reaching commercial and political network, and its possession meant virtual control of all Syria and Palestine. Thus, the motives underlying Napoleon’s attempt to capture Acre in 1799 are clear, as are those of the British forces in supporting the counterattack by the Turks. Writing during this period, Captain William Martin Leake explains that,

of all the places on the Coast, Acca is the most worthy of attention, as well on account of the present power and influence of Djezzar Pasha, the most important Character in Syria, as from its critical position, its short distance and easy communication with the Capital of Damascus, its Port and the Anchorage of Haifa on the opposite side of the Bay, and the fortifications which have lately been erected by Djezzar, and are the only works in Syria capable of arresting the progress of an enemy.

For these reasons Acca should be the point of attack for a European invader. The possession of it would be followed by that of all Syria; at least it is certain that every province was prepared to make its submission to Bonaparte as soon as Acca fell.109

The writings of British travellers who visited Palestine in the early nineteenth century reveal that little or no recovery of French trade had occurred at Sidon or Acre.110 Turner (1815) reports

---

109 William Martin Leake, "Journey through Syria, by William Martin Leake (1802), MS. 85598, Martin Leake Family MSS., Accession 599 (Hertfordshire Record Office), ff.7r-7v (but n. pag.), Martin Leake Family MSS., Accession 599, Hertfordshire Record Office; hereafter cited as Leake, Syria. Other early British travellers expressed similar notions regarding the strategic value of Acre and the importance of gaining its possession. See A Field Officer of Cavalry [i.e. Mackworth], Diary of a Tour through Southern India, Egypt, and Palestine, in the Years 1821 and 1822 (J. Hatchard and Son, London, 1823), pp.345-346; hereafter cited as Mackworth, Diary of a Tour; Light, Travels, p.195.

110 Charles Barry, Travel sketchbooks, notebooks and diaries (British Architectural Library: Drawings Collection, RIBA), Vol. 12, Saturday 15th May 1819 (n. pag.); hereafter cited as Barry, Diaries, Vol. 9, 10, 11 or 12; John Fuller, Narrative of a Tour through Some Parts of the Turkish Empire (Richard Taylor, London, 1829), p.349; hereafter cited as Fuller, Narrative of a Tour; Frederick Henniker, Notes, during a Visit to Egypt, Nubia, The Oasis, Mount Sinai, and Jerusalem (John Murray, London, 1823), p.300; hereafter cited as Henniker, Notes, during a...
that French ships now went to Beirut and Latikea,\footnote{Visit, Light, Travels, p.208; William Turner, \textit{Journal of a Tour in the Levant} (John Murray, London, 1820), Vol. II, p.112; hereafter cited as Turner, \textit{Journal of a Tour}, Vol. I, II or III.} and Robert Wilson (1821) states that the former city was enjoying the most extensive commerce in Syria.\footnote{Robert Wilson, 'Extracts of Wilson's letters to his brother during travels in Greece, Palestine, Asia Minor, Sicily, and Egypt in 1819-26', MS. 434 (Dept. of Manuscripts and Archives, Kings College, Aberdeen University), f. 8v (but n. pag.); hereafter cited as Wilson, MS. 434.}

Thus, in the early nineteenth century, their efficient consular representation and patronage of the Latin church with its associated Holy Places gave the French government a firmer stronghold in Palestine than did French involvement in local commerce. Nevertheless, politically and even commercially, France continued to outweigh Britain's influence in Palestine.

\textit{Aims and Method}

The prime objective of this thesis is to produce a more thorough analysis of the archaeological research carried out by early British travellers in Palestine from c.1670 to 1825 than has hitherto been made. The interest in early travel literature and in the history of Near Eastern archaeology is well established, but these studies offer, at most, a brief mention of the efforts of the better known early British travellers.\footnote{A comprehensive discussion of the relevant literature is presented in the concluding chapter of this thesis.} In general, modern scholars date the earliest occurrence of archaeology in Palestine and elsewhere in the Near East to the beginning of the nineteenth century\footnote{For example, Silberman, Digging, pp.18-20; S. Lloyd, \textit{Foundations in the Dust}.} and, furthermore, claim that an overlay of scientific naïveté persisted until such efforts...
as those of the Palestine Exploration Fund in the 1860s or of Flinders Petrie at Tell el-Hesy in 1890 legitimized the methodology as archaeological.115

The present study has required the scrutiny of a wide range of materials, both manuscript and published, left by the early British travellers and, in order to produce a meaningful evaluation from the abundance of data available, it is necessary to be selective. By concentrating on the commentaries, written and/or graphic, on a few key sites the writer is able to study, in detail, the methodology applied by the individual travellers in evaluating the archaeological remains and to produce an objective analysis of the standard of research carried out by each individual.

A further dimension is included in the present study. In reading the materials it became clear that individual travellers could be grouped according to the key motive/s which apparently inspired them to travel in Palestine. The writer considers it would be both interesting and of original academic value if a correlation between particular groups and standards of archaeological research did, in fact, exist. In the following chapter the individuals are allocated to appropriate groups and, in the concluding chapter to the thesis, the results of the analysis of the individual's work, are evaluated from this perspective.

The sites selected for this study met with certain relevant criteria. To compare the research methods of the large number of individuals included in this study meant that sites selected needed to be reported upon by most, preferably all, these people. The sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem (Chapter 3), and the Pools of Solomon (Chapter 4) largely met this requirement. But, whereas the traditional sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre had strong religious and political significance for the French government and Latin clergy, the Pools of

---

115 For example, Y. Ben-Arieh, The Rediscovery of the Holy Land in the Nineteenth Century, pp.13, 195ff; M. Miller, 'Old Testament History and Archaeology', p.56.
Solomon was a non-Christian site. As such, these sites held the potential for the writer to assess if, in fact, the political and religious attitudes current in Britain influenced the early British travellers in their evaluation of archaeological data in Palestine.

In contrast to the above sites, Jerash (Chapter 5) was visited by comparatively few early British travellers. Fundamentally a classical site about which little historical documentation existed, it seems to provide the ideal circumstances to stimulate an evaluation of its remains based upon archaeological method alone. Furthermore, the present writer had come across several unpublished plans of the site which provide a valuable supplement to the published material in establishing the standard of research conducted at Jerash during this early period, and in further elucidating the communication between the individuals who visited there. Thus, to include a study of the site of Jerash seems both relevant and valuable.

In the earlier part of this chapter, discussion took place on the intellectual movements which occurred in Britain during the period covered by this study, and the effects which these, the Enlightenment and the Romantic Movement, had on the developments in local archaeology. In its political and religious spheres, it was shown that British society became permeated with a strong anti-French/Catholic sentiment and, in consequence, religious fervour in the form of evangelism and the emergence of missionary societies took place.

When the situation in Palestine was described, it became clear that, throughout the entire period under review, the French government maintained a firmer foothold, both politically and commercially, than did the British. The French methods involved patronage of the Latin church and possession of the associated Holy Places, domination of European commerce in the region, and appointment of French nationals as consular representatives.
It is in the light of this background information that the reasons which motivated the early British travellers to travel within Palestine can be identified and understood. Many individuals were, of course, motivated by a combination of factors but, in most instances, a prime reason can be discerned.
Chapter Two

The Early British Travellers

The Importance of Travel to the Development of Archaeological Research

The impetus to travel which occurred in the Renaissance period was profoundly relevant to the development of archaeological research. Renaissance scholars expanded their appreciation of classical antiquity beyond its literary parameters to include its art and architecture as source material to be studied and copied. In the early fifteenth century, an Italian merchant, Cyriacus of Ancona, conducted research of such high calibre that he has been nominated 'the first archaeologist'. Travelling extensively in Greece and the eastern Mediterranean over a period of twenty-five years, he copied hundreds of inscriptions, made drawings of monuments, and collected books, coins and works of art.¹

From the late fifteenth century, Italian popes, cardinals and noblemen sponsored the systematic search for and recovery of portable works of art for their personal collections. This interest in classical antiquity quickly spread throughout Europe.² In 1734 a group of English gentlemen who had travelled in Italy formed a Society of Dilettanti in London to '[encourage], at home, a taste for those objects which had contributed so much to their entertainment abroad,³ and for the next eighty years this society played a significant role in promoting and sponsoring archaeological research in the Aegean region.⁴ It financed the publication of the great work entitled The Antiquities of Athens produced by the painter James Stuart and the architect Nicholas

¹Trigger, A History, p. 36.
⁴Trigger, A History, p. 38.
Revett and, in 1764, financed an Ionic expedition consisting of Revett, Richard Chandler, and William Pars, the results of which were published in The Antiquities of Ionia.\(^5\)

In the latter half of the eighteenth century, art history became an integral part of classical studies following the publication of Johann Winckelmann's *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* in 1764. From that time classical studies have been based on the dual investigation of written documents and art history. It has been claimed that this method was adopted in the development of Egyptology and Assyriology with the decipherment of hieroglyphics by Jean-François Champollion by the 1820s and of cuneiform script by Henry Rawlinson and others by the 1850s enabling the interpretation of the inscriptions and texts.\(^6\)

However, archaeological research was well underway in these countries prior to the decipherment of their ancient texts. Certainly modern scholars draw attention to the 'tomb-robbing' and destructive 'excavations' which took place in both Egypt and Iraq in the early nineteenth century,\(^7\) but these events should be interpreted from a political perspective rather than considered typical of contemporary archaeological practice. Primarily, they reflected the competition between the British and French governments, carried out by their consular representatives, to stake territorial claims through excavation and returning the booty therefrom to their national museums. From the sixteenth century onwards empirical archaeological research was, in fact, being conducted in both Egypt and Iraq, and often on an individual basis. Thus, European travellers in Mesopotamia studied the tells identified in Jewish and Arab traditions as the sites of Babylon and Nineveh\(^8\) and, in 1811, Claudius James Rich, the British Resident in Baghdad, conducted a thorough survey and examination of the site of Babylon, publishing his results in

---

Memoir of the Ruins of Babylon (1812) and Second Memoir on Babylon (1818). As early as 1638, John Greaves of Oxford produced the first accurate measurements of the Great Pyramid and first accurate drawing of its interior. Furthermore, he purported it to be a royal tomb and a symbol of immortality. The results of his research were published in Pyramidographia. Travelling in Egypt in 1737 and 1738, the early British traveller Richard Pococke described the pyramids at Sakkara and Dahshur and produced the earliest account of the stepped pyramid of Zoser. He described the mastabas at Giza and correctly identified them as the tombs of princes and nobles. The dissertation written by John Wortham provides a detailed account of the serious archaeological research conducted by numerous British travellers in Egypt from the sixteenth century onwards.

Clearly the inspiration to travel in pursuit of archaeological remains, which Renaissance scholarship produced, influenced developments in British archaeology in both local studies and research in the Near East. Of John Leland who was appointed King’s Antiquary in 1533, Bruce Trigger writes,

He... toured England and Wales recording place-names and genealogies as well as objects of antiquarian interest, including the visible remains of prehistoric sites. Although he was only vaguely aware even of major changes in architectural styles in medieval times, his great innovation was his desire to travel to see things rather than simply to read about them.

The importance of travel in pursuing archaeological research was emphasised by the famous eighteenth century 'antiquary' William Stukeley when he states that his purpose was

9Daniel, A Short History, pp. 72-73.
10Daniel, A Short History, p. 22.
12Trigger, A History, p. 47.
to oblige the curious in the Antiquities of Britain: [to give] an account of places and things from inspection, not complete from others' labours, or travels in one's study.\textsuperscript{13}

In Britain, the collecting of data for local histories began to involve members of the middle class in archaeological research who were not in a position to participate in a Grand Tour of Europe. The material which was studied and recorded for these local histories extended beyond local antiquities to include such subjects as natural history, topography, languages and customs. The participation of middle class individuals in observing and recording data for local histories had its repercussions for research in the Near East. Many of the early British travellers who visited Palestine and other Near Eastern countries and produced accounts of their journeys belonged to this class including scholars, merchants, diplomats, clergymen, and medical and military personnel. Some of these individuals were sent to the Near East as part of their professional duties whereas others came of their own volition inspired by the desire to travel and study local material as members of their class were doing at home. The reports written by early British travellers in the Near East often reflect the multifarious approach of the local histories and cover such topics as local politics, economics, demography, customs and religions, topography and agriculture, in addition to observations and interpretations of local archaeological sites.

This trend of observing and recording information on a wide range of topics in a detailed, objective manner had its foundations in the empirical method of scientific research promoted by the Royal Society and by the philosophy of the Enlightenment Movement. Certainly, the individual reports produced by early British travellers visiting Palestine between c.1670 and 1825 vary considerably in the general standards of reporting and topical emphasis. The present writer considers the latter to provide a significant means of identifying the key motive/s which inspired an

\textsuperscript{13}Daniel, \textit{A Short History}, p. 29.
individual to travel in Palestine and the latter part of this chapter contains an extensive discussion of these motives and the groups of individual travellers which can accordingly be formed.

A most important group for the present study is that for which the opportunity to conduct serious archaeological research was a key motive. Most individuals in this group had a formal academic background, or training in a field readily applicable to archaeological practice. Of course these travellers also studied and made notes on numerous other topics in which they were keenly interested. One individual, Jean Louis Burckhardt, actually underwent an extensive period of cultural, academic and physical training to enable him to study and record the wide range of data required by the African Association who sponsored his travels to the Near East and Africa.

Most early British travellers who visited Palestine between c.1670 and 1825 travelled fairly extensively, generally west of the Jordan, although some visited the more volatile regions to the east. Palestine, unlike Egypt and the classical lands, presented little opportunity for the collecting of small items of antiquarian interest as the catalogues of objects collected by Richard Pococke (1738) during his travels exemplify. Pococke's catalogues list Greek and Roman coins, Etruscan vases, Egyptian figurines, statues and mummies but, from Palestine, only a few items of geological interest are mentioned.¹⁴

Furthermore, excavations rarely took place in Palestine during the period under review. Not only were the prospects for finding 'treasure' less apparent here but, more relevant, was the lack of strong consular representation, especially on the part of the British, to assert this method for obtaining territorial rights as was occurring in Egypt and Iraq. In fact, only three excavations

¹⁴Richard Pococke, A Catalogue of a Curious Collection of Greek, Roman, and English Coins and Medals, of the Right Reverend Dr. Pococke, Lord Bishop of Meath, Collected by his Lordship, during his Travels; A Catalogue of a Large and Curious Collection of Ancient Statues, Urns, Mummies, Fossils, Shells, and other Curiosities, of the Right Reverend Pococke, Lord Bishop of Meath, Deceased; Collected by his Lordship, during his Travels.
are recorded in the reports of the early British travellers. In 1815 the eccentric English noblewoman, Lady Hester Stanhope, instigated an excavation at Ashkelon in search of a treasure mentioned in a manuscript\textsuperscript{15} and a follow-up search near Sidon when the first effort proved unsuccessful;\textsuperscript{16} and at Jerusalem in 1818 William John Bankes organised an illegal excavation at the Tombs of the Kings to clarify their plan.\textsuperscript{17}

Thus, the archaeological research conducted by early British travellers in Palestine was concerned with producing an academic evaluation of the site material rather than utilising the site as a resource of valuable and interesting 'souvenirs'. From the numerous sites visited and reported upon by these early travellers, the writer selected a small number of sites, for reasons already discussed, on which to base the analysis of the archaeological research conducted by these individuals. A brief synopsis of this research will give a general overview of archaeology in Palestine from c.1670 to 1825.

\textbf{An Overview of Archaeology in Palestine from c.1670 to 1825}

From the earliest period covered by this study, British travellers were making use of historical and archaeological evidence to evaluate the authenticity of the sites tradition assigned to Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre. Furthermore, as early as 1738 the scholar Richard Pococke carried out a topographical study of Jerusalem and made a significant attempt at producing a historical-geographical analysis of the ancient city and, by extending his survey north

\textsuperscript{16}Meryon, \textit{Travels}, Vol. III, pp. 185-186.
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of the present city wall, he discovered archaeological remains which he used to delineate the course of Josephus's Third Wall.

In 1801, the scholar Edward Daniel Clarke put forward a novel theory in which he identified the Holy Sepulchre as one of the rock-cut tombs situated in the northern side of the hill generally named the Mountain of Offence. His re-evaluation of the topography of ancient Jerusalem necessarily followed. Clarke based his arguments on historical texts and a wide range of scientific data, of which archaeological evidence constituted a major component. Despite later opposition to his theories, Clarke's ideas were instrumental in stimulating other early British travellers to extend their research beyond the traditional limits and to incorporate archaeological and topographical surveys into their field-work, the results of which will be examined in detail.

The Pools of Solomon and their associated architectural remains are situated close to Bethlehem and were, therefore, readily accessible to the early British travellers. Consequently, there are a great many reports available on this site from which an assessment of the varying standards of archaeological research can be made. Most individuals present information on the dimensions of the pools and the functional relationship of at least some of the architectural elements with which the complex is composed. There is also some discussion on the authenticity and date of the site. The application of relative and absolute dating techniques by James Silk Buckingham (1816) is significant, despite the dubiousness of his report.

Generally the standard of research is not impressive although exceptions certainly occur in which the detail of architectural structure and analysis of functional status of the particular features of the complex are extremely well presented and, in some instances, represent original contributions to the pool of archaeological knowledge. Henry Maundrell's (1697) description of the Sealed Fountain and Charles Barry's (1819) of the subterranean passage which led from it are particularly impressive for their detail and accuracy; and Richard Pococke's (1738) and Charles
Barry's (1819) respective discussions of the water system connected with the lowest of Solomon's Pools represent highly analytical research efforts.

Situated in the Bedouin-occupied regions east of the Jordan, the site of Jerash was visited by only a few early British travellers in the latter part of the period under review. Their site plans and corresponding descriptions provide valuable examples of archaeological theory and practice in the early nineteenth century. All these travellers surveyed the architectural remains of the site but varied in the accuracy of detail recorded, in their analysis and identification of building complexes at the site, and in their appreciation of evidence for town planning. The most successful plan resulted from the survey conducted by Charles Irby and James Mangles (1818) illuminated by the discovery and interpretation of epigraphic data made at the site by William John Bankes. The records from Jerash also provide an extremely useful means of evaluating the communication of archaeological information between early British travellers who carried out research at that site.

After studying the reports left by the early British travellers, the writer has attempted to allocate each individual to a certain group depending upon the key motive/s which apparently inspired their travels in Palestine (Table 1). In the subsequent three chapters an analysis of the research conducted by these individual travellers will be presented and, in the final chapter, the results of this analysis will be viewed in the light of these groupings to see if, in fact, there is any correlation between apparent key motive/s for visiting Palestine and the standard of research carried out there.
Table 1.

**Grouping of individual early British travellers based upon the apparent key motive/s for their travels in Palestine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Archaeological Research</th>
<th>Missionaries</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pilgrims</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tourism</th>
<th></th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Shaw (1722)</td>
<td>Charles Cook (1824)</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Rae Wilson (1820)</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. G. Browne (1790s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buck Whaley (1789)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Thompson (1734)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mackworth (1822)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Mosley Master (1819)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[? fictitious]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Hyde (1820)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Pococke (1738)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Wilson (1821)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Daniel Clarke (1801)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Louis Burckhardt (1812)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Meryon (1812, 1816)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Silk Buckingham (1816)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William John Bankes (1816, 1818)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Leonard Irby and James Mangles (1818)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Richardson (1818)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Barry (1819)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Medical Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.B. Spilsbury (1800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Wittman (1800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Military Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Martin Leake (1800-1, 1802)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Jowett (1823)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Cook (1824)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Pilgrims</td>
<td></td>
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1. *Archaeological Research*

A significant number of travellers were strongly induced by the opportunity to carry out detailed archaeological research at various sites. Most of these individuals had a formal academic background or a comprehensive training in a practical field readily applicable to archaeology.

William Halifax (1692), Henry Maundrell (1697) and Thomas Shaw (1722) all served as chaplains to the Levant Company and all were graduates of Oxford University. Halifax and Maundrell held consecutive posts at Aleppo, and Shaw worked at Algiers. After returning to England, Halifax took out the degree of D.D. in 1695 and, in 1699, was appointed to the rectory of Old Swinford. Shaw returned to England in 1733. In his absence he had been elected a Fellow of Queens College (1727). He proceeded B.D. and D.D. in 1734 and was presented to the vicarage of Godshill on the Isle of Wight. In 1740 he became principal of Edmund Hall and in 1741 was appointed regius professor of Greek at Oxford. Maundrell met his early death in Aleppo at the age of thirty-five.

Halifax produced two reports of archaeological value. The first, entitled *Relation of a voyage to Tadmor begun 29 September 1691*, was published in the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society for 1695. In 1692, he wrote *A relation of a voyage from Aleppo to Jerusalem* which remains in manuscript form. Its content is the more pertinent to the present study.

---

19 Shaw, Thomas', *DNB*, pp. 1384-1385.
21 William Halifax, 'A Relation of Two Journeys: one from Aleppo to Tadmor; the other from Aleppo to Jerusalem, and back again', British Library MS. Add. 6245 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, British Library); the latter account is hereafter cited as Halifax, *Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*. 
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Maundrell's account of *A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem at Easter A.D. 1697* was first published in 1703 and was one of the best known and well respected travel reports of its time. Thus, introducing his section on Syria, Phoenicia and the Holy Land, Shaw writes, "I am now entering upon those countries, where Mr Maundrell has travelled before me; and, as it may be presumed that every curious person is acquainted with that author, I shall only take notice of such things as seem to have been either mistaken or omitted by him." During his thirteen years residence in Algiers, Shaw made a series of expeditions to Egypt, the Sinaitic Peninsula and Cyprus (1721), Jerusalem, the Jordan and Mt. Carmel (1722), Tunis and the ruins of Carthage (1727), in addition to various excursions in Algeria, Tripoli, and Morocco. Shaw's letters to Hans Sloane, President of the Royal Society, demonstrate his willingness to communicate his findings to the Royal Society and his underlying hope for his election thereto. With his contribution to the *Philosophical Transactions* of 1729 of *A Geographical Description of the Kingdom of Tunis* he was elected a Fellow in 1734. In 1738 the report of his extensive research was published as *Travels or Observations Relating to Several Parts of Barbary and the Levant*. It was esteemed on account of its illustrations of natural history, of classic authors, and of the Scriptures.

---


24Shaw, Thomas', *DNB*, p.1384.

25The following correspondence deals with descriptive material and maps on Tunis, Algiers and Barbary being sent by Shaw to Sloane. MS. S1.4058 (Dept of Western Manuscripts, British Library), ff.193r-193v; 3986, ff.45v-75v; 4051, ff.156r-156v; 4052, f.210r. Shaw's hope for election to the Royal Society is clearly expressed in a letter to Sloane, dated Queens College, February 25, 1733-4. See MS. S1. 4053 (Dept of Western Manuscripts, British Library), f.172r.

26Shaw, Thomas', *DNB*, p.1384.
However, the published account of early travel which received the most favourable critiques until well into the nineteenth century was Richard Pococke's *Description of the East and Some Other Countries*. This book, translated into German, French and Dutch, was acclaimed in particular for its antiquarian and scientific merit. Like Halifax, Maundrell and Shaw, Pococke was an Oxford graduate. In 1725 he obtained a B.A. degree, in 1731 a B.C.L., and in 1733 a D.C.L. Pococke visited Palestine during 1738. In 1741 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. Later, he became successively Archdeacon of Dublin, Bishop of Ossary and Bishop of Meath.

In 1801, the Cambridge scholar, Edward Daniel Clarke, visited Palestine as part of an extensive tour of Europe, Asia and Africa. The author of Clarke's obituary explains Clarke's decision to extend his travels beyond the confines of the Grand Tour. He writes,

Soon after taking his degree, Dr. Clarke accompanied the present Lord Berwick abroad, and remained for some time in Italy. The classic scenes he there met with, and his own inquisitive genius, stimulated him to enter into a wider field of research; and shortly after his return to England, he embarked on those travels, which have rendered his name so celebrated.

Clarke's biographer, William Otter, first met Clarke during their undergraduate years at Cambridge. Of this early stage of his academic career, Otter states that Clarke was already keenly interested in history and antiquities, as well as natural history, especially mineralogy. Certainly mineralogical research was a significant motive for Clarke to pursue his travels, but, in Palestine,
his reasons were primarily archaeological. As Clarke writes, 'Our plan was to pursue the history of Jesus Christ, from his nativity to his death'.

After returning to England, Clarke's multivolume work, Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa, was published. Moreover, 'as some return for the splendor, which his name had reflected upon the University, he was complimented in full-Senate with the degree of LL.D.'. Clarke spent the rest of his life working as Professor of Mineralogy at Cambridge University, Librarian of that university, Rector of Harlton, and Rector of Great Yeldham, Essex.

In 1808, Clarke played an important role in preparing another traveller for his research in Asia and Africa. A Swiss by birth, Jean Louis Burckhardt had adopted the anglophile attitude of his parents. His father had been imprisoned by Napoleon and Burckhardt believed that Napoleon's defeat could best be brought about by the expansion of the British Empire.

After spending a year at Göttingen University studying sciences under the celebrated Professor of Natural History, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, Burckhardt proceeded to England armed with an introductory letter written by his former professor to Sir Joseph Banks. Alongside his presidential role in the Royal Society, Sir Joseph was an active committee member of the African Association which he had helped establish in 1788. The aim of this society was to promote the exploration of Africa, then still largely terra incognita. In May 1808, Burckhardt offered his services to the Association despite the unfortunate fate of most of its earlier explorers. As William

---

35Clarke, Obituary (n. pag.).
36Clarke, Obituary (n. pag.).
38Sim, Desert Traveller, p.38.
Martin Leake wrote of Burckhardt, "To a mind equally characterised by courage, a love of science and a spirit of enterprise such an undertaking afforded peculiar attractions."  

The Association accepted Burckhardt's offer but, also, instigated a thorough training program to optimise his likelihood of success. Between May 1808 and January 1809 Burckhardt studied at Cambridge and London, the Arabic tongue, and those branches of science which were most necessary to discharge with success the duties he was about to undertake. He attended lectures on chemistry, astronomy, mineralogy, medicine and surgery; and in the intervals of his studies, he exercised himself by long journeys on foot, bare-headed, in the heat of the sun, sleeping on the ground, and living upon vegetables and water.

Whilst at Cambridge, Burckhardt studied under and established a strong friendship with Clarke and maintained a steady correspondence with him throughout his travels.

On leaving England, Burckhardt's preparation was far from complete. As Crichton explains,

As an intimate knowledge of Arabic was the most important acquirement of all, Burckhardt was instructed to proceed in the first instance to Syria, where at the same time that he studied the language in one of its purest schools, he might accustom himself to the habits and manners of the people he was to mix with, at a distance from those countries which was to be the scene of his researches, and consequently without much risk of being afterwards recognised. After sojourning

---

40 Sim, Desert Traveller, pp.44-49.
41 A. Crichton, 'Memoir of Burckhardt', pp.28-29.
42 Sim, Desert Traveller, pp.59-61.
43 A wide collection of letters written by Burckhardt to Clarke are published in Otter, Life and Remains, Vol.II.
two years in Syria, he was instructed to proceed to Cairo, and thence, accompanying the Fezzan Caravan to Mourzouk by the same route which Hornemann had pursued, he was directed to make that town the point of his departure for the interior countries.\textsuperscript{44}

Burckhardt's untimely death prevented him from accomplishing the ultimate goal of his mission.\textsuperscript{45} Nevertheless, he had travelled in Syria, Palestine, the Sinai Peninsula, Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, Barbary and Arabia,\textsuperscript{46} and had planned these journeys to study parts of these countries which had been least frequented by European travellers.\textsuperscript{47} By so doing Burckhardt aimed to augment the current pool of geographica, historical-geographical and archaeological data, and, in addition, produce a perceptive account of the manners and customs of the Bedouin. His report on the Holy Land and Syria includes a large amount of archaeological material.\textsuperscript{48} The accounts of all these journeys were forwarded to the African Association in London and all were published.\textsuperscript{49}

In a letter written to Clarke, Burckhardt defines the motive inducing William John Bankes to travel, and the personal attributes possessed by this significant individual:

Mr. Bankes, who has lately been here [in Cairo], and is now in Syria, has made the history of architecture his principal object ... he is fully acquainted with his object, and draws beautifully, and is besides well stacked with learning... He is certainly a

\textsuperscript{44}Crichton, 'Memoir of Burckhardt', p.29.
\textsuperscript{45}Burckhardt planned to accompany a caravan of Moggrebys, or West Africans, travelling home by way of Cairo and Fezzan in December 1817, but died of dysentery in the October. See Crichton, 'Memoir of Burckhardt', pp.122-125.
\textsuperscript{46}Crichton describes each of these journeys in some detail, see Crichton, 'Memoir of Burckhardt', pp.37-122.
\textsuperscript{47}Crichton, 'Memoir of Burckhardt', p.39.
\textsuperscript{48}Burckhardt, Travels in Syria.
very superior man, who bears his faculties, and rank, and fortune, most meekly; and is both indefatigable and accurate in his researches.\textsuperscript{50}

After graduating from Cambridge, Bankes followed a political career path although there is no doubt that art, architecture and archaeology formed his true vocations. Travelling in Europe and then the Near East from 1812 until 1820, Bankes collected art works and antiquities which he used to decorate his ancestral home of Kingston Lacy in Dorset,\textsuperscript{51} despite Burckhardt's plea to present the antiquities to the public.\textsuperscript{52}

Unfortunately none of Bankes's own reports on his travels have been published. The Dorset Record Office holds correspondence written between Bankes and other early British travellers,\textsuperscript{53} as well as brief reports, in Bankes's handwriting, on Djerash, the Tombs and Sepulcres about Jerusalem, and Oom Kais (the ancient Gamala).\textsuperscript{54} At Kingston Lacy, the archives include large numbers of drawings executed by Bankes on his travels, and various plans on the site of Jerash. The significance of these plans forms a major part of a later chapter.

Reports on the archaeological research in which Bankes participated appear in the published books of other authors who worked alongside Bankes at various sites. Indeed, Bankes later claimed that the detailed account and illustrations published by James Silk Buckingham\textsuperscript{55} of their conjoint travels in Palestine in 1816 contained material plagiarised from his own notes.\textsuperscript{56} The descriptions of the archaeological work given by Charles Leonard Irby and James Mangles\textsuperscript{57} are

\textsuperscript{50}Otter, \textit{Life and Remains}, Vol II, pp.322-323.
\textsuperscript{51}A. Mitchell, \textit{Kingston Lacy}, p.5.
\textsuperscript{52}William John Bankes, Correspondence and Papers, MS. D/BKL: HJ1 (Dorset County Record Office), "Letter from Ibrahim ibn Abdullah [J. L. Burckhardt], Cairo, 15 July 1816 to WJB", ff. 2r-2v.
\textsuperscript{53}William John Bankes, Correspondence and Papers, MS. D/BKL: HJ1 (Dorset County Record Office). Hereafter individual letters will be cited following the prefix Bankes, Correspondence.
\textsuperscript{54}William John Bankes, Travel Papers, MS. D/BKL (Dorset County Record Office). Hereafter individual reports will be cited following the prefix Bankes, Travel Papers.
\textsuperscript{55}Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}.
\textsuperscript{56}Bankes, Correspondence: Copy letter from WJB, Thebes, 12 June 1819 to Sir Evan Nepean, Bombay', ff. 2r-3r.
\textsuperscript{57}Irby and Mangles, \textit{Travels}. 
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often brief and lack illustration, as are those of Giovanni Finati\(^{58}\) who acted as Bankes's interpreter and guide. This is unfortunate since all three individuals worked with Bankes in Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Jordan at a large number of sites. In his *Travels of Lady Hester Stanhope*, Charles Meryon provides an appreciative account of the work conducted by Bankes in 1816 at a Greek sepulchre which Meryon had discovered near Sidon.\(^{59}\)

A letter written by Captain James Mangles F.R.S. in August 1843 provides an insight into the circumstances and interesting motives which inspired both him and his co-traveller, Captain Irby to undertake their travels abroad. Mangles writes,

> [having] arrived [in England following the defeat of Napoleon] in March 1815 — after which time I remained on half pay — and being unable to procure active employment afloat I accompanied Capt Charles Leonard Irby on a Tour abroad which lasted from August 1816 till the close of the year 1820.... previous to our departure from Constantinople we made a voluntary offer to our Ambassador Sir Robert Liston if he would procure a Firman from the Sultan. To go down to Boudroum the Ancient Halicarnassus, and bring away at our own expense and freight to England the ancient Sculptured Marble slabs of Frieze — studded in here & there in the walls of the fortress — & offer them gratuitously to the British Museum these Antiquities are supposed from their high character of design and execution to have been part of the Mausoleum of Mausoleus — and if we could have procured them for our National collection we thought such an act would probable have led to our being employed afloat — and eventually to our promotion Altho' these circumstances are wholly unprofessional — still in peaceable times — when so few officers can obtain employment afloat — they may be received as evidence that their time has not been wholly unprofitably passed. The refusal of


our Ambassador to assist us in our project left us at liberty to prosecute our researches in other quarters and after visiting Egypt & Nubia, Syria & Arabia Petraea, Asia Minor and Karamania we were compelled by a prolonged and severe attack of fever to return home.\textsuperscript{60}

The preface of their published account, \textit{Travels in Egypt and Nubia, Syria, and the Holy Land}, makes no mention of the above circumstances. Here, their increasing interest in antiquarian research is nominated as the key motive which led to an extension of their travels beyond the confines of a continental tour.\textsuperscript{61}

Earlier, it was noted that, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was a growing trend in English archaeological research to employ specialists to carry out certain aspects of fieldwork. Thus, Bankes chose to work closely with three individuals of naval background with associated skills in surveying, namely Irby and Mangles, and James Silk Buckingham.

In his autobiography, Buckingham informs the reader that his formal education was limited to one year at an academy for boys at Hubbarton where rote learning of religious material was emphasised,\textsuperscript{62} and to attendance at a dame's school in the village.\textsuperscript{63} Thereafter he attended the naval academy at Falmouth for three months to learn the theory of navigation.\textsuperscript{64}

\begin{flushleft}
\textbf{In the Merchant Navy, Buckingham travelled extensively and it became `[his] constant practice to furnish... [himself]... on every new voyage with all the books... [he]... could procure on}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{enumerate}
\item James Mangles, MS. Add. 38047 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, British Library), Letter dated `Cambridge Terrace, Hyde Park, August 2, 1843', ff.480r-480v.
\item Irby and Mangles, \textit{Travels}, p. v (but n. pag.).
\item Buckingham, \textit{Autobiography}, Vol. I, p.42.
\end{enumerate}
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the countries and seas about to be visited’. Buckingham's familiarity with an extensive range of scientific, political, historical, and contemporary travel literature, as well as the writings of the classical historians, is well documented throughout his various publications. Buckingham's texts also describe his encounters with individuals of archaeological or geological merit which occurred prior to his travels in Palestine, but the majority of these encounters were brief and of little academic value.

In 1816, Egypt's ruler, Mohammed Ali selected Buckingham as his official envoy to carry a trade convention to the British merchants in India. Buckingham proceeded by an overland route through Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia and Persia. The extensive archaeological content of the accounts published of this journey confirm that Buckingham's commission gave him the opportunity to pursue an area of keen personal interest.

When Charles Barry visited Palestine in 1819, his role was clearly defined. While training as a surveyor, Barry was developing a keener interest in the field of architecture. Attaining his majority in 1816, he resolved to devote the remaining funds he had inherited from his father to an architectural tour of the continent. In August, 1818, Barry had reached Constantinople and was about to return home when a Mr. Baillie proposed that he accompany him on a tour of Egypt, Syria and the coast of Asia Minor. All Barry's expenses would be paid and he was to receive a salary at the rate of £200 per annum. In return, all of Barry's sketches, plans etc. were to be

---

Baillie's property although Barry retained the right to make copies from the originals for himself, but not for publication. Barry accepted the offer.\footnote{71}{K. Adkins, (ed.), \textit{Personal and Historical Extracts from the Travel Diaries (1817-1820) of Sir Charles Barry (1785-1860)}, p.52; A. Barry, \textit{Life and Works}, pp.27-28.}

During his three and a half years of travelling abroad from 1817 until 1820, Barry wrote seventeen diaries, four of which include material on Palestine.\footnote{72}{Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vols. 9-12.} In his diaries, Barry made meticulous descriptions of every building he saw,\footnote{73}{A. Barry, \textit{Life and Works}, pp.20-22.} and his awareness and interpretation of archaeological remains illustrate his personal interest in this field of research. These diaries remained within the family until 1938, when Barry's great-grandson, Caryl Arthur Barry, presented them to the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in London where they still remain.\footnote{74}{A. Barry, \textit{Life and Works}, p.1.}

Barry's son, Reverend Alfred Barry, included excerpts of these diaries in his biography of Sir Charles,\footnote{75}{A. Barry, \textit{Life and Works}.} and Barry's great-granddaughter, Kathleen Atkins, published an edited and abridged version of the diaries.\footnote{76}{Adkins, \textit{Personal and Historical Extracts}.}

The RIBA also received, from Sir John Wolfe Barry, a large number of sketches, architectural drawings, and some archaeological plans made by Barry during his travels. These include sketches made in Syria and the Holy Land,\footnote{77}{Sketches made by Barry in Syria and Palestine are to be found in \textit{Pencil Sketches by Sir C. R. Barry R. A.: Holy Land and Syria}; \textit{Pencil Sketches by Sir Charles Barry R. A.: Egypt and Nubia, Holy Land and Syria, Asia Minor and Archipelago}; and in a small untitled album. All these items are catalogued Acc. no. 1972-72 (British Architectural Library: Drawings Collection, RIBA).} and some plans relating to the site of Jerash.\footnote{78}{See Sir Charles Barry and John Lewis Wolfe, \textit{Classical Architecture Sicily & Greece 1818-20. Early Designs by Barry} (British Architectural Library: Drawings Collection, RIBA).} Further plans of this site, drawn by Barry, are contained in the archives of Kingston Lacy.\footnote{79}{These plans will be discussed in detail in the chapter on Jerash.} The Ashmolean Museum holds illustrations and plans of Egyptian temples drawn by Barry, as well as
his plans of the Tombs of the Kings at Jerusalem, of the cisterns at Ras-el-Ain near Tyre, and a map showing the party's route through Palestine.80

Accompanying the travelling party of the Earl of Belmore as its physician, Robert Richardson journeyed through the Mediterranean and its adjacent lands from 1816 to 1818.81 His official role was defined and Richardson makes clear his interest in applying his professional skills whenever required either within the party or within a local context.82 However, in writing the report of his journey, Richardson aimed primarily to 'promote a more extensive acquaintance with antiquity, and a more correct knowledge of the modern state of the most celebrated places in ancient history'83 and, certainly, the content of his book, which concentrates on Egypt, Palestine and Syria, complies with this statement.

Before reaching Palestine in 1818, Richardson, by travelling with Belmore's party in Egypt, had the opportunity of meeting and being instructed, on site or through discussion, by some of the leading individuals in Egyptian archaeological research, including Salt, Belzoni and Beechy.84 Furthermore, Richardson accompanied Belmore in his own excavations at the temple of Karnac. Richardson's discussion thereof shows his appreciation of the deductive value of purely archaeological evidence in formulating conclusions regarding site identification.85 Through his scientific training in the field of medicine, Richardson was familiar with the principles of empiricism which could be applied to his archaeological research.

80 These are contained within two untitled albums, MS. no. 93, Barry MSS. (Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum): The smaller album contains Egyptian material plus the aforementioned plans and map.
81 Richardson, Travels, Vols. I, II.
85 Richardson, Travels, Vol. II, p.91. To Richardson, the presence of certain artefacts in the innermost apartment of the temple caused it to be identified as the sanctuary.
For the above travellers, the opportunity to conduct serious archaeological research represented a main reason for travelling in Palestine. Based solely on the content of his text, Charles Thompson (1734) should be included within this group. Of this individual, however, we have no biographical information of any substance. Moreover, whilst denying claims that Thompson was fictitious, the Editor of Thompson's text apparently contributed an inordinate amount to the original material, if, in fact, any existed. As this Editor states,

Mr. Thompson on his Death-bed committed to me the care of his Manuscripts, giving me full Liberty to add or retrench whatever I thought proper, and to prepare them for Publication. To this End I carefully revised and digested them, connected those which had a relation to each other, filled up the Chasms I met with, and made very considerable Additions from the Writings of other Travellers, which I have so interwoven with Mr. Thompson's, that I imagine they will not easily be distinguish'd... In doing this I had recourse to a great Number of Authors of the best Credit, such as Sandys, Wheeler, Burnet, Addison, Maundrell, Shaw, Pococke, Thevenot, Tournefort, and many others, whom it is needless to enumerate.

2. Medical Personnel

Surgeons of the British navy and army respectively, J. B. Spilsbury and William Wittman travelled to the Near East for the purpose of participating in the British military mission against the Napoleonic forces, and although both took the opportunity to `sight-see' in Palestine, their interests for being there were, primarily, medical.

86 Charles Thompson, The Travels of the Late Charles Thompson, Esq; Containing his Observations on France, Italy, Turkey in Europe, The Holy Land, Arabia, Egypt, and Many Other Parts of the World, 3 vols. (J. Newberry and C. Micklewright, Reading, 1744); hereafter cited as Thompson, Travels, Vol. I, II or III.
87 Thompson, Travels, Vol. I, p. i (of Preface, but n. pag.).
88 Thompson, Travels, Vol. I, pp. ii-iii (of Preface, but n. pag.).
Spilsbury produced an illustrated account entitled *Picturesque Scenery in the Holy Land and Syria*.\(^8^9\) His descriptions of places visited are brief and superficial and reflect little indication of real archaeological interest on behalf of the author.

Wittman states his motive for undertaking a tour to Jerusalem was merely 'to gratify... [his]... ardent curiosity'.\(^9^0\) However his book does contain a considerable amount of valuable information in other respects. In the preface, his desire to collect data on local maladies, particularly the plague, is clearly stated\(^9^1\) and his text contains abundant examples of his findings.\(^9^2\) That Spilsbury augmented Wittman's knowledge of the plague confirms the prime interests of the former individual.\(^9^3\) Wittman also gives a detailed account of the progress of the British and Turkish armies from Palestine through the desert to Egypt, their ultimate occupation of Cairo, and the corresponding evacuation of the French in July 1801.\(^9^4\)

3. **Military Personnel**

William Martin Leake received his professional education in the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich.\(^9^5\) In 1799, being now Captain Leake, he was appointed to a mission to Constantinople for the purpose of instructing the Turkish troops in the use and practice of artillery to improve their chance of success against the Napoleonic army.\(^9^6\)

\(^8^9\) F. B. Spilsbury, *Picturesque Scenery in the Holy Land and Syria, delineated during the campaigns of 1799 and 1800* (G. S. Tregear, London, 1823); hereafter cited as Spilsbury, *Picturesque Scenery*.


\(^9^2\) See, in particular, Wittman, *Travels*, pp.483-547 where he provides detailed descriptions of case histories.

\(^9^3\) Wittman, *Travels*, pp.139-140.

\(^9^4\) Wittman's account of the military campaign continues throughout most of the text.


In January 1800, Leake and several other British officers left Constantinople to proceed to the coast of Egypt where they would assist the Turkish army.\textsuperscript{97} Leake's journey was interrupted by illness and he spent his recovery period visiting the ancient sites of Cilicia and the islands along the coast. Leake's biographer believed that this experience 'exercised a powerful influence upon Captain Leake's thoughts and pursuits during the remainder of his long life. Before the school-boy reminiscences of Homer and Herodotus had been effaced from his mind, he found himself treading upon what was regarded as classic soil'.\textsuperscript{98} Leake was to become one of the most significant scholars in the field of classical Greek archaeology and was renowned for his use of numismatics in site identification.\textsuperscript{99}

Unfortunately Leake's visits to Palestine did not produce material of any significant archaeological value as his motive for being there retained a fundamentally military character. Leake eventually reached Jaffa and spent the winter of 1800-1801 in Palestine.\textsuperscript{100} He accompanied Wittman's party on their excursion to Jerusalem\textsuperscript{101} but no report of Leake's is available of this journey. In February 1801, the British officers proceeded toward Egypt.\textsuperscript{102} Following the expulsion of the French, Leake was employed, in conjunction with Lord Elgin's private secretary, Mr. William Hamilton, in making a general survey of Egypt.\textsuperscript{103} Leake and Hamilton then proceeded to Palestine and Syria to continue similar researches there until June 1802.\textsuperscript{104}

---

\textsuperscript{97} Marsden, A Brief Memoir, p.3.
\textsuperscript{98} Marsden, A Brief Memoir, p.8.
\textsuperscript{99} Marsden provides a summary of Leake's academic achievements, including his literary output. See Marsden, A Brief Memoir, pp.38-43.
\textsuperscript{100} Marsden, A Brief Memoir, p.10.
\textsuperscript{101} Wittman, Travels, p.150.
\textsuperscript{102} For an account of the military proceedings between the departure of the British and Turkish troops from Jaffa in February 1801 and the defeat of the French troops and their evacuation from Cairo in the following July, see Wittman, Travels, pp.249-320.
\textsuperscript{103} Marsden, A Brief Memoir, p.10.
\textsuperscript{104} Marsden, A Brief Memoir, pp.10-11.
Unfortunately Leake's manuscript on Egypt sank on the way home, although Hamilton's publication of the *Antient and Modern State of Egypt* in 1810 demonstrates the high calibre of their conjoint research in this country. The manuscript of Leake's account entitled *Syria* is held in the Hertfordshire Record Office. Its descriptions are rather general and the information it provides is mainly related to British military intelligence.

4. **Missionaries**

The English Protestant missionary societies began sending their representatives to Palestine during the 1820s. James Connor (1820) and William Jowett (1823) were missionaries of the Church Missionary Society, and Charles Cook (1824) belonged to the Methodist Missionary Society. The 'Advertisement' which prefaces the first volume of Jowett's *Christian Researches* clearly defines the responsibilities of these individuals. It states,

> The objects of the Society, in establishing Representatives in the Mediterranean, were — the Acquisition of Information relative to the state of Religion and of Society, with the best Means of its Melioration — and the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, by the Press, by Journeys, and by Education.

Whereas the journals of Connor and Jowett were published, Cook's journal and a large amount of his correspondence remain in manuscript form and both are kept in the library of

---

105 Marsden, *A Brief Memoir*, p.11.  
106 William Richard Hamilton, *Egyptiaca; or, Account of the Antient and Modern State of Egypt, as Obtained in the Years 1801, 1802*.  
107 See Leake, *Syria*.  
109 Connor, *Visit*.  
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the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at London University. All provide abundant detail on demographic statistics and on the missionaries' efforts to distribute scriptural texts amongst the local religious groups. The close co-operation between the British consular representatives and the missionaries is frequently mentioned.

5. Pilgrims

The journey conducted by some individuals is best described as a pilgrimage. An early account, edited by Nathaniel Crouch in the late seventeenth century, is clearly entitled A Strange and True Account of the late Travels of Two English Pilgrims... to Jerusalem. It describes the journey undertaken by the author, a mariner, and his companion, John Burrel, from Cairo to Jerusalem and back to Alexandria, and finishes, 'I got aboard of my ship, when I had been from it fifty daies: And so I ended my Pilgrimage.'

John Luke begins his manuscript on Jerusalem with, 'Accompanied wth Seigni Frate Thomaso of Rome who hath lived 10 years in the Holy Land I see... Sanctuaries, at the festival! of Easter. 1668'. He proceeds to list the various Holy Places visited, and offers little more than similarly brief notes on his visit to Bethlehem, the mountains of Judæa, the River Jordan and his

---

112 H. T., 'A Strange and True Account of the Late Travels of Two English Pilgrims some Years since, and what Admirable Accidents befell them in their Journey to Jerusalem, Grand Cairo, Alexandria, etc.', in Two Journeys to Jerusalem, Nathaniel Crouch (ed.) (Nath. Crouch, London, 1683); hereafter cited as Crouch (ed.), Tymberley. The identity of the author H. T. as H. Tymberley is discovered through the manuscript version of this report. See Journey to Jerusalem by H. Tymberley and J. Burrell, 1604; MS. Sl. 2496 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, British Library), fr. 62-696. To include this early account within the present study seems permissible since, in the late seventeenth century, the editor of the book in which it is published clearly found it compatible with an account of another journey to Jerusalem which took place in 1669.
113 Crouch (ed.), Tymberley, p.71.
return journey to Smyrna. His account includes several place-names written in Arabic. The scantiness of this report is strange considering Luke's academic calibre. A graduate of Cambridge University, Luke was the chaplain to the Levant Company at Smyrna from 1664 to 1669 and from 1674 until 1683. In 1676 he obtained the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and, in 1683, was elected a fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. Two years later he was elected Professor of Arabic at Cambridge, a post he held until his death in 1702. In 1692, he was appointed Rector of Rayleigh in Essex. The brevity of his account of journeying in Palestine suggests his motive was to perform a pilgrimage rather than to carry out archaeological or linguistic research.

The modern scholar, Ben-Arieh, asserts that William Rae Wilson travelled in Palestine in 1820 to gather material for his book, although Wilson, himself, denied any intention to publish. Rather, his desire to undertake a pilgrimage is implied when he writes, "Having long entertained an ardent desire to visit that country, where transactions of the most sacred and important nature to the best interests of the human race are recorded to have occurred, and which rendered it in my apprehension more attractive than any other spot on the face of the earth... I left London in September 1819." Certainly Wilson later became the author of many popular travel books but this may have been the natural consequence of his ultimate decision to publish his *Travels in Egypt and the Holy Land*, rather than his original reason for travelling.

The reason Wilson gives for deciding to publish this book relates to his support of the Evangelical Movement and reaction against any forces which might undermine the substance of its foundation. He states,

---

by... committing the Travels to writing... they might remove, in some degree, the opinions entertained by sceptics, as to any correspondence between the actual situation of the Holy Land and the narrative imparted of it by Scripture. Further, in any age like the present, it might contribute to counteract the poison and blasphemy disseminated in publications... with the view of undermining the great and established bulwark of the Christian faith and hope.

This is clearly a reaction against the anti-Christian ideas of the Enlightenment. Later in his book, Wilson appeals to missionary societies in England to send missionaries to the Holy Land to absorb that country back into the evangelical realm.

A cavalry officer on two years leave of absence, Mr. Mackworth, recorded, in diary form, his journey from India to London which took place between August 23, 1821 and June 13, 1822. Mackworth, describing himself as 'wholly unscientific', makes frequent references to his lack of antiquarian knowledge and skills. Although he includes some interesting military data, this forms only a minor part of his journal.

Rather, 'his efforts have been mostly directed to the collection of information connected with the exertions of those Societies which have been instituted for the conversion and instruction of Pagan nations: and... if any profits shall arise from the sale of the Work [i.e. his published text], they are intended to be entirely devoted to the promotion of Christian Missions in general'. By the time Mackworth reached Palestine in 1822, Protestant missionary activity had already begun.

---

119 W. Rae Wilson, Travels, p. viii.
120 W. Rae Wilson, Travels, p.191.
121 Mackworth, Diary of a Tour. Mackworth wrote his account under the nom de plume, 'A Field Officer of Cavalry'. The identification is confirmed by cross-referencing Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, pp.329-331 with Joseph Wolf, Missionary Journal and Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Wolf, Missionary to the Jews, p.245.
122 Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p.211.
123 Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, pp.205, 211, 275, 300, 338, 360.
124 This discussion revolves around planning strategies to enable British troops to conquer Egypt and Syria. See Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, pp.252-253, 341-346.
125 Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p. vii.
In Egypt, Mackworth had attempted some intervention with local officialdom on their behalf.\textsuperscript{126} However his text on Palestine implies that his role here was predominantly that of a pilgrim being guided through the country by the Bible alone.\textsuperscript{127}

6 a, b. Tourism

A desire to see the famous 'sights' of Palestine seems to have been the key motive inspiring most of the remaining early British travellers to travel within this country. The reports left by Robert Mosley Master (1819), John Hyde (1820) and Robert Wilson (1821) show that the superficiality of their Palestinian archaeological 'research' did not apply to their endeavours elsewhere and it is unfortunate that their accounts of Palestinian material are so deficient.

Immediately after his ordination, the Reverend Robert Mosley Master spent over a year and a half in foreign travel, accompanied by two friends, Captain Henry Hoghton and Archibald Edmonstone Esquire. The British Library contains a transcript made by Master's son of his father's notebooks and this includes the original illustrations.\textsuperscript{128} But whereas Master's account of Egypt abounds in descriptions, plans and other drawings of temples and pyramids, in that of Palestine, the Sepulchres of the Kings at Jerusalem are the only archaeological remains of which a plan is presented.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{126}Whilst at Damietta in Egypt, Mackworth conversed with the British Vice-Consul, a Greek Arab, named Signor Micaele Seroor on the subject of the Christian religion. Consequently, Signor Seroor promised to assist the Bible Society if so required. See Mackworth, \textit{Diary of a Tour}, p.269.
\textsuperscript{127}As Mackworth writes, 'I will not allow myself to disbelieve those accounts of places, which, on closely consulting the Bible as my only guide, I have reason to think may be true; and I will decidedly reject every history of them as fabulous, to which the Bible makes no allusion'. See Mackworth, \textit{Diary of a Tour}, p.290.
\textsuperscript{128}Robert Mosley Master, 'Journal of a Tour in Egypt, Palestine, and Greece, in the Years 1818, 1819', MS. Add. 51313 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, British Library); hereafter cited as Master, \textit{Journal}.
\textsuperscript{129}For his account of the Holy Land, see Master, \textit{Journal}, ff. 232r-257r; the previous part of the MS. deals with his travels in Egypt. His plan of the Sepulchres of the Kings at Jerusalem appears on f. 242r.
None of the seven volumes of John Hyde's notebooks and journals provide any biographical information on this traveller. Whilst in Egypt he met up with Charles Barry and his party, and then with a party composed of Bankes, Beechy and Ricci. With the latter group he travelled up the Nile to Amarna. Like Master, Hyde provides detailed descriptions and plans of numerous Egyptian temples, but, in Palestine, the only archaeological plan he makes is that of the Tombs of the Kings at Jerusalem. Although his interests in Egypt were predominantly archaeological, in Palestine he seems more interested in witnessing the 'tourist attraction' of the Easter ceremony of the Holy Fire in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

From Palestine, Hyde travelled to Syria, and from Aleppo proceeded with Robert Wilson to Iraq and Iran. Hyde then journeyed to India where he planned to 'Visit Elephanta, Salsiti, Carli & Ellorah to compare them with Ipsumbul & [illegible] in Nubia' but died of cholera before he was able to pursue this research.

The manuscripts left by Robert Wilson are held at Aberdeen University, the majority in Kings College Library, and some notebooks and maps in the Marischal College Museum. An interesting collection of Wilson's own furniture and memorabilia are displayed in a room of this museum.

130 John Hyde, "Journals and notebooks of his travels in Egypt, the Near East and India, 1818-1825", MS. Add. 42102-42108 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, British Library); hereafter cited as Hyde, Add. 42102, Add. 42103, etc.
131 Hyde, Add. 42102, f. 67v.
132 Hyde, Add. 42102, f. 82v.
133 Hyde, Add. 42102, f. 87v-132r.
134 These appear throughout Hyde, Add. 42102, and in Hyde, Add. 42103, ff. 1r-58v.
135 Hyde's travels in Palestine are described in Hyde, Add. 42103, ff. 59v-77v; Hyde, Add. 42108, ff. 1v-37v. His plan of the Tombs of the Kings appears in Hyde, Add. 42108, ff. 24v-25r.
136 Hyde, Add. 42103, ff. 63r-64r; Hyde, Add. 42108, ff. 36r-37v.
137 For Hyde's travels with Wilson, see Add. 42103, ff. 93r-97v. Hyde pursued more extensive travels in Persia with Dr. Andrew Jukes and others, which are mainly described in Hyde, Add. 42104.
138 Hyde, Add. 42103, f. 97r.
Wilson graduated in medicine from Aberdeen University. His manuscript notes show he attended lectures on natural philosophy, and a catalogue of his books reveals his interest in such subjects as geology, the philosophers of the Enlightenment Movement, travel literature, archaeology and antiquarianism, and the classical historians.

After four voyages as surgeon with the East India Company, Wilson left the Company's service and pursued his own travels, beginning with the European tour and then to the Near East and India. Attempting to identify the forces which inspired Wilson to travel, Hargreaves, in his article on Wilson, states,

He did occasionally make use of his medical skill, but with no intention of practising professionally. In his latest travels there is undoubtedly a commercial motive... and it may be that his earlier travels, undertaken for their own sake, led on to further trips to exploit what he thought a profitable venture... Whatever his motives, what he calls his "journals", preserved in a series of note-books... are more strongly indicative of his antiquarian interests than of anything else.

Unfortunately, Wilson's journal, Palestine and Syria, is his least informative in this regard. The script deals mainly with his travels in the Hauran and the Decapolis. Wilson claims that the threat of Bedouin attack prevented him from conducting detailed surveys of sites visited or even

---

140 Robert Wilson, 'Notes on Professor Copland's lectures on natural philosophy in Marischal College, 1803', MSS. 438-9 (Dept. of Manuscripts and Archives, Kings College, Aberdeen University).
141 Robert Wilson, 'Catalogue of the Wilson studio', MS. 443 (Dept. of Manuscripts and Archives, Kings College, Aberdeen University).
144 Robert Wilson, 'Palestine & Syria', MS. 418 (Dept. of Manuscripts and Archives, Kings College, Aberdeen University); hereafter cited as Wilson, MS. 418.
from making notes. It should be noted that the same circumstances did not prevent other early British travellers from producing more informative reports.

Wilson's other journals contain considerable amounts of archaeological data of a descriptive nature both written and graphic. Consistent with the paucity of his journal on Palestine is the dearth of souvenirs he collected there compared with those he brought home from other parts of the Near East and from India.

Both Charles Perry M.D. (c. 1740) and the African traveller W. G. Browne (1790s) rationalised their lack of descriptive efforts on Palestine by asserting that the publications produced by earlier travellers to that region had dealt with all significant information. The superficiality of their approach implies that they travelled to Palestine primarily as tourists unconcerned with furthering the pool of knowledge on this country. This is particularly disappointing when we consider the substantial treatises written by Perry on such topics as the history of the Ottoman Empire, the political and cultural history of Egypt, the customs and manners of the ancient Egyptians, and the antiquities of Athens and of Egypt, or by Browne on his travels in Africa and Egypt.

The Bodleian Library contains an anonymous manuscript which has been identified as the account of the travels of the Hon. Frederic North, afterwards Lord Guildford, in the Mediterranean.

145Wilson, MS. 418, pp. 18, 26, 45, 55, 58 (but n. pag.).
146Robert Wilson, 'Egypt and Nubia', MS. 415; 'India', MS. 416; 'Persia', MS. 417; 'Mesopotamia, MS. 419. These manuscripts are held in the Dept. of Manuscripts and Archives, Kings College, Aberdeen University.
147Robert Wilson. Three notebooks with lists of artefacts brought back from his travels (Marischal College Museum, Aberdeen University). The Marischal College Museum also holds a map of Wilson's travels.
149For Perry's account of Palestine, see Perry, A View of the Levant, pp. 122-135; and for Browne's, see Browne, Travels, pp. 359-373.
area in 1791-92. In line with Robert Wilson, Perry and Browne his report on Palestine is superficial and 'touristic', whereas other parts of his manuscript are substantial and well researched.

For the above individuals the opportunity to conduct serious archaeological research inspired at least some of their travels in the Near East, although their efforts in Palestine would classify them as tourists. Other early British travellers were motivated solely by curiosity and the enjoyment of travel and sight-seeing. These represent the precursors of the influx of 'real tourists' which began in the 1830s and was stimulated by the secure conditions produced by the Egyptian occupation of Palestine beginning in 1831. Most accounts written by these individuals belong in the genre known as popular travel literature.

Thomas Legh (1818) offers an interesting explanation for the Near East becoming a focus of popular British tourism at the time of his travels. He writes,

At a period when political circumstances had closed the ordinary route of continental travelling, and when the restless characteristic propensity of the English could only be gratified by exploring the distant countries of the East, an entirely new direction was given to the pursuits of the idle and the curious.152

---

150 Some Account of a Tour from Rome to Sicily, Malta & the Coast of Africa: through most of the Islands of the Archipelago to Athens, Corinth and Asia-Minor... made in the Years 1791 & 2', MS. Eng. Misc. c. 433 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, Bodleian Library); hereafter cited as Anon. 1791-2, MS. c. 433; 'Continuation of a Tour through Syria, Caramania & the Archipelago with a particular description of the Cities Alexandria, Grand Cairo, Joppa and Jerusalem made in the Year 1792', MS. Eng. Misc. c. 434 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, Bodleian Library); hereafter cited as Anon. 1791-2, MS. c. 434. On the verso of the front cover of Anon. 1791-2, MS. c. 433 is written, in pencil, 'Lord Guildford's Tour of Greece', and to the following page is adhered a piece of paper on which is written, 'When Lord Guildford died in London in the year 1792 his son Fred. North was abroad in his Travels in the Levant, and having been advised of his father's death came over to England in the same year, and lady Caroline Lindsay his sister recollects perfectly hearing him mention many anecdotes of his Travels in Turkey. This is the account Lord Sheffield has been able to give me of the early Travels of his Uncle'.

151 Hitti, History of the Arabs, pp. 725, 746.

Although Legh travelled in Palestine and Arabia Petææa with Bankes, Irby and Mangles, his writings show that he was content to keep his own level of interest and understanding of the archaeological sites visited at a superficial level. Of Petra, he states, 'I abstain from attempting to enter into a more minute account of the wonders of this extraordinary spot, conscious as I am of my own inability to do them justice, and because the public will probably soon be favoured with a much more detailed and accurate description of them from the pen of Mr. Bankes'.  

He goes on to claim that 'The chief aim of my narrative will be to endeavour to give the reader some insight into the mode of life followed by the wandering tribes of Arabs we fell in with'. Compared with the research conducted by Burckhardt in this field, Legh’s comments are trivial.

The publications produced from the writings of these early British travellers had, primarily, popular appeal, and the motives described by these authors for assuming their travels or for writing their accounts thereof are in keeping with this type of audience.

Thus John Fuller (1819) states that he had written for his friends but 'should they find... [his book]... deficient in antiquarian or scientific research, they will recollect that the object of the traveller was simply to amuse himself'. Sir Frederick Henniker (1820) explains that 'the amusement of drawing and shooting prevented me the trouble of making long notes' and, regarding an inscription on the pyramid of Chephrenes, he writes that 'I regret I did not copy it; but I had gone up merely for pleasure, and had no intention of making a book'. John Madox (1825) states that he was travelling for his amusement and that he wrote in the first instance only

---

154 Legh, Journey from Moscow, p. 230.
155 Fuller, Narrative of a Tour, p. iii.
156 Henniker, Notes, during a Visit, p. v.
157 Henniker, Notes, during a Visit, p. 207.
for the interest of friends. When Henry Light (1814), a Captain of the Royal Artillery in the garrison at Malta, obtained leave to travel in the Near East and Cyprus he writes that 'Curiosity and amusement were his object: he kept a journal... of what he saw, and made sketches of the most interesting places. They were meant to recall to his memory what he was not likely to visit again'.

But Thomas Joliffe (1817) and John Carne (1821) attempted to increase the personal appeal of their accounts by presenting them in the format of a collection of letters written en route. John Carne, a Cambridge graduate, had taken Holy Orders but became a literary figure instead. He followed up his original Letters from the East with a Continuation of the Letters, but was probably better known for the illustrated volumes of Syria, the Holy Land, Asia Minor etc. for which he wrote the text.

The Journal of Sir Henry Watkin Williams Wynn, travelling in the Mediterranean area, 1811-12 remains in manuscript form and is to be found in the Bodleian Library. Certainly Wynn was interested in visiting archaeological sites, but the general nature of his reports and basic standard of diagrams throughout the manuscript would place him within this group of early tourists.

---

160 Light, Travels, p. xi.
162 N. Shepherd, The Zealous Intruders. The Western Rediscovery of Palestine, p. 41.
6c. A Tourist with Diplomatic Interests

To some extent William Turner (1815) should be categorised as a tourist. He informs us that his friends encouraged him to publish his journal and that he, himself, rests his hopes in exciting interest on the opportunity afforded by the informal style of a journal, for describing the manners of the countries he had visited.\textsuperscript{166}

At the time of his travels to Palestine, Turner was secretary to Sir R. Liston, British Ambassador at the Porte, although his travels were undertaken in an unofficial capacity.\textsuperscript{167} Nevertheless, his vocational background effected the content of his journal and this differentiated it from being merely a tourist report.

Thus, in writing about 'The Arabs' he elevated his account above the standard produced by, for example, Legh, by augmenting his own observations with information from the authoritative source of J. L. Burckhardt whom he met in Egypt.\textsuperscript{168} Moreover, Turner includes details of trade and population statistics of the various places he visits.\textsuperscript{169} And, in keeping with the close liaison between the British missionary societies and the British consular representatives in the Near East, Turner describes both his own efforts to assist in the distribution of scriptures throughout the Levant and the ways by which the representatives could facilitate this activity.\textsuperscript{170}

Although the French dominated European trade in Palestine throughout the period covered by this study, several British merchants, working in Syria and the Levant, visited Palestine and left accounts of their journeys. An element of tourism pervades even these early accounts as reflected in the superficial interest shown by these individuals in viewing and describing various sites and Holy Places. However they also include interesting information of personal professional relevance.

John Ashley (1675), David Falconar (c. 1750) and James Haynes (1760s) all travelled to Palestine, in the first instance, to conduct trade. Ashley gives details of the exports he collected. The letters composing the book by James Haynes contain considerable data on commodities, business methods and composition of factories throughout the Levant. In his script, apparently addressed to someone of political influence in England, David Falconar draws attention to the dramatic decrease which has occurred in English trade in the Mediterranean between 1737 and 1750 and suggests methods of protecting the English presence there.

The other accounts provide a description of an excursion undertaken by a group of employees from the Levant Company in Aleppo. For the authors, at least, the opportunity to 'sight-see' provided a key motive. The anonymous account of The Travels of Fourteen English Men to Jerusalem, in the Year 1669 was later edited and published by Nathaniel Crouch and, in
1678 and 1697, John Godschall\footnote{Godschall, \textit{Account of a journey}.} and Richard Chiswell\footnote{Chiswell, \textit{Travels and Journeys}.} described their respective journeys, both of which remain in manuscript form. Information includes details on local exports and imports, the state of various harbours, and the composition of factories. Chiswell also provides particulars of local politics.

7. Miscellaneou{s}

Early this century, Sir Richard Carnac Temple published, in the journal, \textit{The Indian Antiquary}, an article entitled \textit{The Travels of Richard Bell (and John Campbell) in the East Indies, Persia, and Palestine 1654-1670}, which represents an edited version of a manuscript from the British Library.\footnote{R. Temple, "The Travels of Richard Bell (and John Campbell) in the East Indies, Persia and Palestine. 1654-1670", \textit{The Indian Antiquary}, Vol. 35, 1906, pp. 131-142, 168-178, 203-210; Vol. 36, 1907, pp. 98-105, 125-134, 173-179; Vol. 37, 1908, pp. 156-170; hereafter cited as Bell, \textit{Indian Antiquary (35), (36) or (37)}. The manuscript source for this article is MS. S.1. 811 (Dept. of Western Manuscripts, British Library), ff. 45b-56.} The authorship of this manuscript is confusing. Temple believes that Bell wrote, from dictation, Campbell's travelogue, except for the last 42 pages which are Bell's own original account.\footnote{Bell, \textit{Indian Antiquary (35)}, p. 131.} To Temple, the manuscript's importance lay in the fact that, despite its often fantastic quality, it did include 'quaint and out-of-the-way information' on India, of which English records from the 'period, 1654-1670, are so scanty that any account by an eye-witness is worthy of reproduction'.\footnote{Bell, \textit{Indian Antiquary (35)}, p. 132.}

The manuscript informs us that Richard Bell has been employed as gunfounder to Shāh Jahan and to his son Auranāzib between 1654 and 1668.\footnote{Bell, \textit{Indian Antiquary (35)}, p. 132.} The account describes his journey homeward. For the purpose of this study, the identity of the author on the section on Palestine is

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
not important. Rather, the value of the report lies in the fact that it provides an early appraisal of the Holy Places and other sites through the eyes of a British traveller who may best be described as an interested observer.

In 1701, Henry Worsley visited Palestine. Although Worsley later pursued a diplomatic career in Portugal and then the Caribbean, his motives for visiting the Near East are not defined. His political bent, however, influenced the focus of his attention in Palestine and he provides a perceptive account of tax-farming and of local politics. His description of the growing regime of the al-Zaydani family in Galilee is particularly impressive for its detail and rarity.

Buck Whaley (1789), an Irish adventurer and politician, set out to travel to Jerusalem in order to fulfil a 'large and serious wager'. Whaley was a Roman Catholic, and as such his perception of the Holy Places provides an interesting comparison with that of other early British travellers, almost all of whom were Protestant.

---

183 The section on Palestine occurs in Bell, Indian Antiquary (36), pp. 177-179; (37), pp. 156-162.
185 Henry Worsley, 'Abstract of his Excellency Henry Worsley, Esq., his instructions as Captain general and Governor in chief of Barbados St. Lucia Dominico St. Vincents Tobago and the rest of the Charibee Islands lying to Windward of Guadalupe in America. 24 August, 1722, MS. 34 (Worsley Deposit, Lincolnshire Archives Office).
186 Worsley, Journey, p.76.
187 Worsley, Journey, pp. 53, 59, 76-77.
Chapter Three

The Sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, and the
Topography of Ancient Jerusalem

The awesome circumstances which tradition associated with the sites designated as Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, charged them with emotional appeal stronger than that emanated by other Holy Places. The political significance of the Holy Places in Palestine has been discussed as has the fact that the Latin clergy there received patronage from the French government. Since this clergy long held exclusive rights to the Holy Sepulchre,¹ the French were thereby in control of an extremely powerful political entity.

Also, it was deemed likely that the anti-French/Catholic attitude current in Britain would be projected, by the early British travellers visiting Palestine, into this foreign environment and this could influence their interpretation of archaeological data. The traditional sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre presented the ideal circumstances to elicit such responses and, in the following analysis, the reports of the early British travellers will be evaluated in these respects.

The report written by Edward Daniel Clarke in 1801 receives particular attention as it represents the first major attempt at forwarding novel theories to query the authenticity of the traditional sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, and offering alternative solutions based on a reassessment of Jerusalem's topography, and an application of archaeological, epigraphic, geological, sociological and historical evidence. Although later research proved Clarke's theories

¹Until 1757 the Latin clergy held official right of control over the Holy Sepulchre and thereafter retained the exclusive right to say mass at this Holy Place. See Halifax, Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, f.45v; Perry, A View of the Levant, p.124; Wynn, Journal, f.119.
Plate 5. Portrait of Edward Daniel Clarke
invalid, his efforts had far-reaching effects. It was the publication of Clarke's theories which
stimulated discussion and provided the impetus for later travellers to extend their analyses of
relevant material well beyond any earlier framework. This chapter is, therefore, structured
chronologically around Clarke's report.

The Pre-Clarke Reports

Some early British travellers visiting Jerusalem prior to Clarke describe the Holy Sepulchre
and Mount Calvary as authentic sites situated within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Such
statements are based solely on acceptance of traditional evidence. Other travellers comment on
the exclusion of Mount Calvary from the city limits at the time of Christ's crucifixion, but in only a
few cases are details of the relationship between Mount Calvary and the city wall at this time
specified. Crouch (ed.), Tymberley (1669) states that 'Mount Calvary, [was] without the gates of
the old City, about a stones cast and no further', and Godschall (1678) informs us that Mount
Calvary was just without the Gate of Judgement. Although the Bible supplied the historical
evidence on which these reports rely, none specify this source. In 1738, Richard Pococke made
the first significant attempt at a historic-geographic analysis of Jerusalem. Unfortunately his
comments on the course of Josephus's Second Wall, by which Mount Calvary and the Holy
Sepulchre are thought to have been excluded from the city limits, are scant. He made little attempt
to co-ordinate his topographical and historical data to produce a theoretical reconstruction of the
course of this wall, although the data he collected had potential to do just that. Pococke did,

---

2Luke, Rough Notes on Jerusalem, ff. 382r-384r; Bell, Indian Antiquary (37), p.158; Crouch (ed.), Fourteen
   Englishmen, p.89; Perry, A View of the Levant, pp.123-125; Whaley, Memoirs, Vol. II, pp.197, 201, 207; Wittman,
   Travels, p.159. The Irishman, Whaley, clearly accepted the established traditions.
3Crouch (ed.), Tymberley, p.55; Godschall, Account of a Journey, p.35 (n. pag.); Maundrell, Journey, pp.91-92;
   Worsley, Journey, p.42; Spilsbury, Picturesque Scenery, p.59.
4Crouch (ed.), Tymberley, p.55.
5Godschall, Account of a Journey, p.35' (n. pag.).
6Hebrews xiii. 12 states, 'Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered
   without the gate'.
7Pococke, Description, Vol. II, pp.7-26 (misnumbered 28).
however, apply both forms of data to locate the probable position of one important point of
reference in this wall, namely the Gate of Judgment.\(^8\)

Shaw (1722) accepted the traditional identity of both Mount Calvary and the Holy
Sepulchre. Nevertheless he employed both textual and archaeological data to provide a more
rational basis to his argument. The validity of traditional evidence received confirmation from the
text of Eusebius which revealed that,

These [sites], no less than the grotto at Bethlehem... were so well known in the
time of Hadrian, that out of hatred and contempt to the Christian name, a statue
was erected to Jupiter over the place of the holy sepulchre, another to Venus upon
Mount Calvary.... these continued, till Constantine, and his mother, St.
Helena....erected over them those magnificent temples which subsist to this day.\(^9\)

Textual evidence could also be applied to explain the changing relationship of the two sites to the
city walls. Shaw states,

Even the very situation [of Jerusalem] is altered.... and its ditches filled up; whilst
the places adjoining to Mount Calvary, where Christ is said to have suffered
without the gate, are now almost in the centre of the city.\(^10\)

The biblical evidence is clearly shown in Italics.\(^11\) In mentioning the filling of ditches, Shaw is
drawing upon the text of Josephus although this is not emphasised.\(^12\)

\(^8\)Pococke, Description, Vol. II, pp.10-11.
Life of the Blessed Emperor Constantine', Bk.3, Ch.25-26.
\(^11\)Shaw is referring to the passage, Hebrews xiii. 12, although this is not specified.
\(^12\)Wars, Bk.5, Ch.4.139.
Undoubtedly Shaw's most complex attempt to apply rational evidence in support of the traditional is seen in his discussion of the Holy Sepulchre itself. By drawing parallels between the structural composition of ancient cryptae he has examined elsewhere in Lebanon and Palestine,\(^\text{13}\) and the biblical description of Christ's tomb,\(^\text{14}\) Shaw is, in fact, confirming the veracity of biblical evidence. He then proceeds to compare favourably the modified remains of the Holy Sepulchre with further biblical material.\(^\text{15}\) Although the sheer lack of physical data at the site itself makes his argument inconclusive, Shaw's efforts at correlating archaeological and textual evidence represent a significant objective attempt at analysing the material remains of this site.

Visiting Jerusalem some years prior to Shaw, Halifax (1692) proposed a theoretical reconstruction of the Holy Sepulchre based solely on archaeological evidence found within the Church itself. He states,

> in the chappel of the Syrians... are two sepulchres, which deserve notice, one of Joseph of Arimathea, and the other of Nicodemus, both which being empty, and in their natural forme, as they were hewn out of the rock, help the imagination to conceive how that of our Saviour's was before it was hid under so much ornament.\(^\text{16}\)

The proximity of this evidence to the Holy Sepulchre augments its relevance. It seems strange that Shaw did not include these items with his other structural parallels.

Prior to Clarke's radical report, it is apparent that a querying of the traditional evidence related to these prime Christian sites was already developing in the minds of some early British travellers. As early as 1675, John Ashley is dubious of the traditional identity of the site, wherein

\(^{13}\text{Shaw, Travels, Vol. II, pp.12-13.}\)
\(^{14}\text{Matt. xxvii.60. See Shaw, Travels, Vol. II, p.13.}\)
\(^{16}\text{Halifax, Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, f. 45r.}\)
the cross was erected, and attempts to rationalise his uncertainty by employing evidence of a
physical nature. He states,

at ye upper end of ye first Chappel [on Mount Calvery] they shewed us ye Place
where our Savior was Crucified & ye verrie Hole (as they say) wherein ye foott of
ye Crosse Stood ... ; appears more credulous by ye Cleft of ye rock from ye Top
to ye Bottome of S'd Mount ... Demonstrates its selfe to bee realie naturall & not
aniwaiies Artificiall.17

However, this cleft [or rent] in the rock was significant only through traditional evidence, a fact
which Godschall (1678) emphasises when he says,

Heere on ye left hand ye place of our Sav€ crosse is a cleft in ye rock, wch seemes
not to have been done by art, wch they say was rent at ye tytne of his crucifixion, &
reaches to ye center of ye Earth, wch is more than they know I am sure.18

Regarding this feature, Maundrell (1697) follows a similar line of thought to Godschall but
presents his discussion without cynicism.19

In 1792 an anonymous British traveller visited Jerusalem and produced a report which
represents the closest precursor to that made by Clarke a decade later. Clearly stating his "want of
faith in the stories that have been told me",20 Anon (1791-2) maintained that the only genuine
antiquities by then visible in Jerusalem were grottos, caves, sepulchres and cisterns. These alone
could be identified through biblical texts.21 Nevertheless, this traveller does not go so far as to

---

17Ashley, Description of a journey, ff.5v-6r.
18Godschall, Account of journey, p. '60' (n. psg.).
20Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, f.121.
21Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, f.121. He suggests that 'These requiring more labour to destroy than to preserve, may
probably be the same that are mentioned in the sacred Scriptures', but cites no references. See Anon (1791-2), MS.
c.434, f.121.
annihilate the traditional identity of the sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, nor to place these in alternative situations. His scepticism is quite clear, however, when we read of the latter site,

You are to suppose that the Sepulchre is here, but you see nothing of it _ all you can see is neat white marble slabs of top, front and the ends of a large altar, & you are told that it covers the Sepulchre. 22

William Martin Leake (1800) was a soldier of the British Army campaigning against the Napoleonic forces in the Near East. Although Leake accepted the traditional identity of the key Christian sites of the Holy Sepulchre, Mount Calvary, and the birthplace of Christ at Bethlehem, he maintained that the majority of other Holy Places were mere inventions 'to the credulous pilgrim by the Monks'. 23

Several reports cited above reveal a growing scepticism amongst early British travellers toward the authenticity of the Holy Places and the Latin clergy who extolled their traditional associations. Most probably, it was the growing tension between Britain and the Roman Catholic power of France who patronised the Latin clergy in Palestine which caused this scepticism to increase to a point of almost total disbelief as exemplified by the reports of Anon (1791-2) and Leake (1800). Thus by 1801 the stage was set for Clarke to introduce alternative theories to those based, primarily, on tradition.

22Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, 110-111.
23Leake, Syria, ff.10v-11r.
The Theories of Edward Daniel Clarke: A Critical Survey

Speaking of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Clarke states,

Everything beneath this building seems discordant, not only with history, but with common sense. It is altogether such a work as might naturally be expected from the infatuated superstition of an old woman, as was Helena, subsequently enlarged by ignorant priests.24

To add credence to his opinion, Clarke draws upon evidence of an archaeological, geological and sociological nature. An application of the latter form of data is unusual amongst early British travellers to Palestine but clearly reflects the interest in this field and the related one of anthropology which had been taking place in Britain and Europe for some time.

In disclaiming the authenticity of the site tradition identified as Mount Calvary, Clarke employs both geological and sociological evidence. He states,

among all nations [there is a general practice] of connecting with a Lusus Naturae, or any extraordinary physical appearance, some wild and superstitious fantasy25....

An accidental fissure in one of the rocks of Jerusalem suggests the idea of a possible consequence resulting from the preternatural convulsion of Nature at the Crucifixion, and is immediately adopted as an indication of the spot.26

26 Clarke, Travels, Vol.4, pp.339-340. Clarke supports his statement with other studies, both contemporary and historical, of supernatural phenomena associated with natural objects (see Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, pp.336-337 (plus Footnote nos. 3-7); and for a comparative modern study, see K. Oakley, 'Folklore of Fossils', pp.9-16, 117-125). In rejecting this belief, Clarke is following a mode of thought which was inspired, more than a century earlier, by Newtonian philosophy. The modern scholar, Donald Grayson, draws attention to these ideas in his attempt to explain the intellectual impetus which caused man-made tools and organic fossils to be distinguished from a generalised group known simply as 'fossils'. See D. Grayson, The Establishment of Human Antiquity, p.6.
Prior to Clarke, both Ashley (1675) and Godschall (1678) had described this fissure as natural and had been clearly dubious of its traditional associations. By incorporating comparative sociological evidence into his argument, however, Clarke provides the rational basis to his conclusion unseen in these earlier reports.

To undermine the validity of the site of the Holy Sepulchre Clarke relies, primarily, on geological evidence and, in fact, follows a similar line of argument to that presented earlier by Anon (1791-2). Clarke states that all the rocks of Jerusalem are all of common compact limestone, but that,

the stone [before the mouth of the sepulchre] wherein the Angel sat.... is a block of white marble... [and] The sides consist of thick slabs of that beautiful breccia, vulgarly called Verde-antique marble; and over the entrance, which is rugged and broken, owing to the pieces carried off as relics, the substance is of the same nature.27

In addition, Clarke employs his knowledge of comparative archaeological data to undermine the reliability of a statement made by Eusebius regarding the rediscovery of the Holy Sepulchre by St. Helena. Citing Eusebius, Clarke states, 'the Holy Sepulchre... is... said to be discovered beneath a heap of earth and stones'.28 But as Clarke points out, 'as a Jewish Crypt, its being described as thus buried seems to imply an impossibility'.29 The text of Josephus (Antiq., Bk.8, Ch.15.3) would, however, refute Clarke on this point.30

29Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.341. But Clarke omits to mention that Eusebius, in the passage cited, clearly explains that it was the Romans who covered Jesus's tomb with soil in order to lay a stone pavement upon it.  
30In this passage Josephus describes the opening of the Israelite tombs by Herod and Antiochus, and how neither of them came to the coffins of the kings themselves, for their bodies were buried under the earth so artfully.
A significant piece of archaeological evidence existing in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was omitted from Clarke's text. As early as 1692, William Halifax drew attention to the importance of two empty sepulchres situated in the chapel of the Syrians and traditionally assigned to Joseph of Arimathea and to Nicodemus. Halifax points out that these being 'in their natural forme, help the imagination to conceive how that of our Saviour's was before it was hid under so much ornament'. Clarke totally ignores the significance of these features. Rather, on the basis of his evidence and his interpretation of the Hebrew word 'Golgotha' as 'the place of a Scull' or 'a public Coemetry', Clarke maintained that the church, now supposed to mark the site of the Holy Sepulchre, exhibited no evidence which could associate it with such a place.

Having, in his mind, successfully obliterated the validity of the sites tradition assigned to Mount Calvvary and the Holy Sepulchre, Clarke states his future intentions,

It is time to quit these degrading fallacies; to break from our Monkish instructors; and, instead of viewing Jerusalem as pilgrims, to examine it by the light of History, with the Bible in our hands... It was with this resolve, and the determination of using our own eyes, instead of peering through the spectacles of priests, that led to the discovery of antiquities undescribed by any author.

Fundamental to Clarke's novel theory was his identification of Christ's tomb as a rock-cut sepulchre situated in the northern side of the hill generally named the Mountain of Offence. His reinterpretation of the topography of ancient Jerusalem necessarily followed.

On the hillside opposite to Mount Sion, Clarke observed a number of excavations in the rock ('B' on Fig. 1). He states that structural parallels exist between these and the cryptae

---

31Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.325.
32Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, pp.319-320.
described by Shaw (1722) in Lebanon and Palestine and draws attention to Shaw's premise that of such a nature was the tomb of Christ.\textsuperscript{34}

One particular tomb, Clarke said, showed an 'extraordinary coincidence with all the circumstances connected with the history of our SAVIOUR's Tomb'.\textsuperscript{35} A coincidence between biblical evidence and archaeological remains forms the basis of his argument. Clarke states that,

The large \textit{stone} that once closed its mouth had been, perhaps for ages, rolled away \textit{[Mark xvi. 3,4]}. \textit{Stooping down to look into it [John xx. 5,11]}, we observed, within, a fair \textit{sepulchre}, containing a repository, upon one side only, for a single body \textit{[Matt. xxvii. 60; Mark xv. 46; Luke xxiii. 53; John xix. 41]}; whereas in most of the others, there were two, and in many of them more than two'.\textsuperscript{36}

Clarke employed several other pieces of evidence in support of his premise. His interpretation of the Hebrew word GOLGOTHA as a public cemetery has already been noted. Drawing upon biblical evidence he argues that,

\begin{quote}
\textit{every one of the Evangelists... affirm, that the place of Crucifixion was 'the place of a Scull', that is to say, a public Cemetery.} The circumstance of the Tomb of Joseph of Arimathea being there situate was complete proof that it was a place of burial, 'called, in the Hebrew GOLGOTHA; without the city, and very near to one of its gates. St. Luke calls it CALVARY, which has the same signification'.\textsuperscript{37}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{34}Clarke, \textit{Travels}, Vol. 4, pp.322-323.
\item\textsuperscript{35}Clarke, \textit{Travels}, Vol. 4, p.327.
\item\textsuperscript{36}Clarke, \textit{Travels}, Vol. 4, pp.327-328. The references to \textit{Mark xvi. 3, 4 and John xx. 5, 11} are cited in the discussion which follows (see Clarke, \textit{Travels}, Vol. 4, p.328 (including Footnote nos. 3, 4)). Those passages which refer to the sepulchre having been prepared for Joseph of Arimathea are discussed by Clarke elsewhere (see Clarke, \textit{Travels}, Vol. 4, p.311 (including Footnote no. 5)) but are clearly inferred here.
\item\textsuperscript{37}Clarke, \textit{Travels}, Vol. 4, p.325.
\item\textsuperscript{38}Clarke, \textit{Travels}, Vol. 4, pp.324-325.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
That the tombs in this area ('B' on Fig. 1) were of great antiquity was, Clarke believed, implied by the structural parallels discussed above. To add further credence to this claim, it is interesting that Clarke again made use of sociological data. He states,

The Karaites, of all other Jews the most tenacious in adhering to the customs of their ancestors, have, from time immemorial, been in the practice of bringing their dead to this place for interment.\(^{39}\)

However, this new position for Christ's tomb necessitated a reinterpretation of the topography of ancient Jerusalem. Evidence of an epigraphic nature provided Clarke with the key. Upon several of the sepulchres in his area B, including that identified as the tomb of Christ, a Greek inscription occurred which translated into the words 'OF THE HOLY SION'.\(^{40}\) Clarke believed that these inscriptions implied that the mountain, at the foot of which these sepulchres were situated, was, in fact, Mount Sion.\(^{41}\) From the bible, he obtained evidence of the proximity between the tomb prepared for Joseph of Arimathea and the place where Christ was crucified.\(^{42}\) The opposite summit, now called Mount Sion, and without the walls, could, Clarke surmised, be identified as Mount Calvary ('A' on Fig. 1).\(^{43}\)

Clarke was aware of the tentative nature of his argument and of the necessity of providing evidence of a more concrete nature. Detailed archaeological research, he believed, was the means by which this could be produced. On the top of the mountain he designated as Mount Sion were, he reported, the presence of ruined walls and the remains of sumptuous edifices. He maintained that,

\(^{40}\)Clarke, *Travel*, Vol. 4, pp.326-329. The inscription THCAIIAC CIWN was carved in the face of the rock, either over the door, or by the side of the sepulchres. See Clarke, *Travel*, Vol. 4, p.326.
\(^{42}\)Clarke, *Travel*, Vol. 4, p.325 (including Footnote no. 1 in which Clarke specifies the reference John xix. 41).
\(^{43}\)Clarke, *Travel*, Vol. 4, p.325.
If the foundations and ruins, as of a citadel, may be traced all over this eminence, the probability is, that this was the real Mount Sion.44

The new position proposed for Mount Sion necessitated a reinterpretation of the other topographical features of ancient Jerusalem (see Fig. 1). Two types of evidence form the basis of Clarke's argument, firstly, a personal observation of the modern topography of Jerusalem, and secondly, the historical text of Josephus. His assessment of the modern topography is, however, superficial, and his use of Josephus omissive.

Viewing Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, Clarke claimed that the modern city, instead of covering two conspicuous hills, now occupied one eminence alone, namely Mount Moriah.45 Therefore, the valley of Gehinnom was, in fact, the valley called Tyropœon by Josephus.46 Clarke drew upon the text of the early historian for confirmation. 'Josephus (lib. vi. de Bell. Jud. c.6.)' he says, 'describes the valley which separated the upper town [on Mount Sion] from the lower, as terminating with the Fountain Siloam; and this is the case with Sandys' Valley of Gehinnom'.47

Pococke's detailed examination of the city's topography revealed the presence of several valleys and eminences. He defined the course of the Valleys of the Carcases and of the Tyropœon and, also, their relationship to Mounts Sion, Moriah and Acra.48 Clarke was familiar with

---

44Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.331.
45Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.351.
46Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.331 (including Footnote no. 2 in which Clarke specifies the reference De Bell. Jud. lib. vi. c.6). In the edition of Wars used by the present writer the passage under discussion appears in Bk.5, Ch.4.
47Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.354 (Footnote no. 2).
48Pococke describes the course of the valley he identifies as that of the Carcases, thus: "The vale to the north of mount Sion, I take to be chiefly about the place where the street of the pool now is, ... [and] extends also eastward to the shops in the quarter about the hospital of saint Helena, having mount Calvary to the north west, and mount Acra to the north east.... and joins to the eastern valley of Millo [Tyropœon]. Of the latter he says, "[this] we may suppose was bounded to the east by mount Moriah, about the street which goes from the house of the rich man's, along by the west side of the court of the temple.... All this street.... [seems] to be the valley of Millo, extending all down the hill to the south as far as the pool of Siloe' (see Pococke, Description, Vol II, pp.9-10). Elsewhere Pococke describes this valley as running between Mounts Sion and Moriah (Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.24). The course of the Valleys of the Carcases and the Tyropœon, as described by Pococke, are marked on his
Pococke's text but makes no reference to it in this context. Furthermore, he has omitted aspects of the text of Josephus which support Pococke's findings. Instead, Clarke selects a passage from Josephus which, viewed in isolation, supports the premise at hand. Considered in the light of other parts of this text and of Pococke's topographic evidence, the fallibilities in Clarke's argument become apparent.

Josephus (Wars, Bk.5, Ch.4, 136-141) (see also Fig. 4) informs us that the city was built upon two hills and the lower city was situated on Mount Acra, not on Mount Moriah as Clarke insists. Between Mount Acra and the upper city [Mount Sion] ran 'a valley to divide them asunder'. A third hill was situated 'over against... [Acra]... but naturally lower than Acra, and parted from the other [Sion] by a broad valley'. The temple was built on this third hill [Moriah]. As Josephus writes, 'in those times when the Asamoneans reigned, they filled up that valley with earth, and had a mind to join the city to the temple. They then took off part of the height of Acra, and reduced it to be of less elevation than it was before, that the temple might be superior to it'. Josephus makes both the identity of this valley and its full course clear. 'Now the Valley of the Cheesemongers [Tyropreon], as it was called, and was that which we told you before distinguished the hill of the upper city [Sion] from that of the lower [Acra], extended as far as [the fountain of]

map in green and blue respectively (Fig. 2). His assessment complies with modern surveys of these features, although his Valley of the Carcasses is renamed the Transversal Valley or Cross Valley and his Millo as Tyropreon or Central Valley (See R. Hubbard, 'The Topography of Ancient Jerusalem', p.134 (Fig. 1); N. Avigad, Discovering Jerusalem, p.25 (Fig. 6)). That Pococke identified the Tyropreon Valley as Millo probably resulted from an interpretation of the biblical passages, II Samuel v.9; I Chron.xi.8, in the light of the commonly held misconception that the hill by then called Mount Sion was that on which the City of David was built. The word millo is etymologically related to the Hebrew noun melo, meaning 'filling', 'fullness', or 'mass'. Kathleen Kenyon's suggestion that millo is the system of massive stone-and-earth terraces of the Late Bronze Age town is now generally accepted. Kenyon's excavations demonstrated that the terraces were kept in good repair until the 7th century BC. so at least part of the structure remained visible throughout the Israelite period. Since the terraces probably formed the substructure of the Jebusite fortress, they would have been closely associated with the succeeding City of David. See G. Wightman, The Walls of Jerusalem from the Canaanites to the Mamluks, pp.27-28; also see Fig. 3 (no. 24 on plan).

49 The modern scholar, Kathleen Kenyon, dated the earliest section of filling excavated in the Tyropreon Valley to the period after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in A.D. 70. See K. Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land, p.234.
Siloam'. Thus the Tyropoeon was bordered on one side by the Upper City [Sion] and on the other by the temple [on Moriah] and by Acra. Pococke's topographical research confirmed this course. Clarke's sole reference to Josephus's account of the filling of the Tyropoeon is of its mention in a secondary source. The necessity of discussing its context within the historical document is thus avoided. Clarke need not mention that Josephus reported that the Asmoneans filled the 'broad valley' to join the city [Mount Sion] to the temple [Mount Moriah]. Instead he retains his identification of the Valley of Gehinnom as that of the Tyropoeon by arguing against the validity of Josephus's account. Clarke writes,

Is it possible to credit this; especially when such a valley was in use in fortifying the city, by rendering the walls above less accessible? Josephus says (lib. vi. de Bell. c. 6. Colon. 1691.) that the oldest of the three walls was extremely strong, owing to the depth of the inferior valley.

Again Clarke isolated a passage to support his argument. The description given by Josephus of the course of the First Wall (Wars, Bk.5, Ch.4. 144-145) clearly indicates both a proximity between Mount Sion and the temple, and a position directly west of the temple for the northern section of this wall. Irrespective of this evidence, Clarke's argument contains an inherent flaw in logic. In the above context, the term 'inferior valley' would refer to that valley which, in relation to Mount

---

50Pococke misinterprets Josephus's text regarding the position of Acra and places it north rather than south of the temple (see Fig. 2). The modern scholar, G. J. Wightman, points out that despite the lack of archaeological remains of the Seleucid citadel or Acra, the only plausible candidate for its position is the eastern hill just south of the Hellenistic Temple enclosure, i.e. at the highest point of the post-exilic 'City of David'. He draws attention to Josephus's location of Acra in the Lower City [the city of David] and the fact that, at the time of the Maccabees, the name Acra was applied not only to the citadel building itself, but more broadly to the whole south-eastern hill and Ophel. See Wightman, *The Walls of Jerusalem*, pp.107-108 (Footnote no. 37).

51Clarke, *Travels*, Vol. 4, pp.353-354 (Footnote no. 5). In this footnote, Clarke merely informs us that, 'Rauwolff, speaking of the Tyropoeon mentioned by Josephus, says, 'This valley hath been, since the desolation, so filled up, that no depth at all appeareth in our days, but only without the Fountain Gate, by the Fountain Siloah'. (See 'Travels into the Eastern Countries', Ray's edition, p.289. Lond, 1693.)'

52Clarke, *Travels*, Vol. 4, pp.354 (Footnote no. 5).
Sion, lay in the most southerly position. In Clarke's revised topography, this would not be his Tyropœon but, rather, a valley lying south of his Mount Sion.

Clarke maintained that the identification of this mountain as Mount Sion provided the only means of reconciling the accounts given by ancient authors of the space occupied by the former city. He writes,

Eusebius allows a distance of twenty-seven stadia, or three miles and three furlongs, for the circumference of the ancient city. The circuit of the modern town does not exceed two miles and a half, or twenty stadia, according to the measure of Eusebius. We cannot therefore, without including this mountain, embrace an area sufficiently extensive even for the dimensions afforded by Eusebius.\(^53\)

Textual and archaeological evidence, with which Clarke was familiar, provided viable options, but these he chose to ignore in this context. Elsewhere in his report, Clarke accepted Pococke's interpretation of Josephus's text regarding the course of the Third Wall of Jerusalem and its related features.\(^54\) Josephus described the northern section of this wall as running opposite to the Sepulchres of Helena, queen of Adiabene.\(^55\) By interpolating the later discussions of Villalpandus regarding the so-called sepulchres of the kings, Pococke concludes these are one and the same.\(^56\) To confirm his interpretation of the historical text of Josephus, Pococke included archaeological evidence, but of this Clarke makes no mention. Around the course proposed for


\(^{56}\) Clarke, *Travels*, Vol. 4, pp. 381-2 (including Footnote nos. 5-8 (on p. 381)). See also Pococke, *Descriptions*, Vol. II, p. 20, where he states, 'The sepulchre of Helena is mentioned [by Josephus, *Antiq.*, Bk. 20, Ch. 4.95. This reference is not specified by Pococke, although Clarke does so, citing it as *Antiq.*, lib. xx.c.2, p. 689. Colon. 1691] as having three pyramids over it; and Villalpandus, describing them as sepulchres of the kings takes notice of one pyramid, standing over them in his time, which is a great proof that it was the sepulchre of Helena; the other two probably having been destroyed, as the third has been taken away since his time'.
the Third Wall, Pococke identified 'some imperfect remains' (Fig. 2) the relevance of which modern excavation has confirmed.58

This region north of the city enclosed by the Third Wall was, undoubtedly, the most feasible reason for an increase in area covered by the ancient city. However its existence would refute Clarke's novel topography and thus he refrained from mentioning its significance in this regard.

Of all Clarke's arguments, the least rational were those which led to a conclusion undermining the very topography he was attempting to establish. Drawing upon comparative archaeological evidence and early historical accounts he stated that 'The cemeteries of the Antients were universally excluded from the precincts of their cities'.59 The traditional site assigned to the Holy Sepulchre, he maintained, could be justified by pretending that it was originally situated outside the city wall.60 Demographic considerations inferred otherwise, since

a doubt must necessarily arise as to the want of sufficient space for the population of the city, between a boundary so situate and the hill which is now called Mount Sion.61

57Pococke, Descriptions, Vol. II, p.19. On Fig. 2 the course of these remains is outlined in red.
58No modern scholar has acknowledged the significance of this part of Pococke's research. Rather, Edward Robinson was the first to be accredited with noting signs of this wall during his survey in 1838 and, as Mazar states, these were confirmed by later excavation (B. Mazar, The Mountain of the Lord, p.83). For a discussion of the findings of the relevant excavations conducted by Sukenik and Mayer from 1925-27, see N. Avigad, 'Jerusalem', p.609; M. Avi-Yonah, 'The Third and Second Walls of Jerusalem', p.106; and by Sukenik and Mayer in 1940, and Ben-Arict and Netzer in 1972-73, see Avigad, 'Jerusalem', pp.609-610. Avigad's illustration of the position of these various findings (Fig. 5) complies with Pococke's assessment of the course of the wall (Fig. 2).
59Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.323 (including Footnote no. 5). Comparative archaeological evidence was to be found 'in the ruins of all antient cities in the East'. The texts of Quaresmius, Cicero and Plato provided appropriate accounts of this mode of burial. Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.323 (Footnote no. 5) for further detail.
60Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.323.
61Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, p.323.
However Clarke offered no statistical evidence to substantiate this statement. Rather, the more likely position of the ancient cemetery was that of the sepulchres in his Area B, since 'these appear to have been situate beneath the walls of the citadel, as was the case in many ancient cities'.\(^{62}\) Comparative archaeological evidence supported this observation,\(^{63}\) as did the inscriptions he had found on several of the tombs.\(^{64}\)

The inference drawn from Clarke's conclusion is that his Mount Sion stood, at the time of Christ's crucifixion, as an entity isolated from the rest of the city. Historical documentation, alone, showed that this was not the case,\(^{65}\) but, more significantly, Clarke himself stated that it was only when the city was rebuilt by Adrian in A.D. 137 or 138 that Mount Sion was excluded.\(^{66}\)

Following the publication of Clarke's report, many early British travellers visiting Jerusalem produced accounts relevant to the Holy Sepulchre, Mount Calvary, and the topography of the ancient city which show an appraisal from a wider perspective than occurred in earlier reports. Clearly Clarke's discussion provided the impetus evident in a number of cases. However the significance of underlying cultural factors in moulding the attitudes of Clarke and some of those


\(^{65}\)Josephus makes it clear that the hill, then known as Mount Sion, was encompassed by a wall (the First Wall) (*Wars*, Bk.5, Ch.4.142-145) until Titus destroyed the city in 70 A.D. Even then, Titus decided to spare the western wall of the Upper City and the three towers Phasael, Hippicus and Mariamne so that they might serve as barracks for the Roman garrison of the Tenth Legion (*Wars*, Bk.7, Ch.1.1,2,5). This act of Titus is confirmed by modern archaeological research (see H. Geva, 'The Camp of the Tenth Legion in Jerusalem: An Archaeological Reconstruction', p.248). Nevertheless, excavations on the so-called hill have exposed only sparse remains identifiable with the encampment of the Tenth Legion of this period (see Geva, 'The Camp of the Tenth Legion in Jerusalem', pp.243-244, 246). These findings combined with evidence of both historical texts and archaeological finds elsewhere in Palestine have led the modern scholar, Hillel Geva to conclude that only a small detachment of the legion, commanded by a high ranking officer, encamped in the ruined Upper City of Jerusalem (see Geva, 'The Camp of the Tenth Legion in Jerusalem', p.246 (including Footnote nos. 48-50)).

\(^{66}\)Clarke, *Travels*, Vol. 4, p.351 (Footnote no. 3): wherein Clarke cites the relevant literature. Modern archaeological evidence indicates that the south-western hill was again occupied by the Tenth Legion, albeit sparsely, during the period of Aelia Capitolina. See Geva, 'The Camp of the Tenth Legion in Jerusalem', p.251.
who followed must also be stressed. Their aversion to the emotional power exerted by the Holy Places and, in consequence, the Latin clergy who controlled them surely reflects the anti-French sentiment rife in Britain.

Fuller (1819), sceptical of the Holy Places in general, made a clear statement of the contrast between his view and that of the French traveller, Chateaubriand:

'Enfin', says Chateaubriand, 's'il y a quelque chose de prouvé sur la terre, c'est la vérité des traditions Chrétiennes à Jérusalem.' And in this instance at least, he will not be very far from the truth who shall adopt an opinion exactly opposed to that of the eloquent Frenchman.

Several early British travellers emphasised the contrived approximation of relevant sites within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and Robert Wilson (1821) drew attention to the actual value of these Holy Places when he said, 'Most of these places have been seized on by particular sectaries which has been the cause of much contention, and unchristian Charity'. Likewise, Mackworth (1822) commented on 'the sad mummeries' and confusion which abounded within the church.

William Jowett, a representative of the Church Missionary Society, who visited Jerusalem in 1823 took his appraisal of the Holy Places beyond a statement of their inaccuracy to an assertion of their total unimportance. He states,

---
67 Fuller, Narrative of a Tour, p.278.
68 Fuller, Narrative of a Tour, p.279.
69 Meryon, Travels, Vol. I, p.214; Light, Travels, pp.161, 186; Wilson, MS. 434, p.'4' (n. pag.).
70 Wilson, MS. 434, p.'5' (n. pag.).
71 Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p.315.
I felt, I confess, no particular anxiety to see what are called the 'Holy Places'... If to have come hither should prove the means of raising me one degree higher in love to this adorable Redeemer, I would be thankful: but let me remember, that He desires us chiefly to view Him with the eye of faith.72

This affront to Roman Catholic imagery and promotion of Protestant doctrine expressed by Jowett typified the approach employed by Protestant missionaries, both British and American, who began their activities in Palestine around this time.73 Despite active resistance by the Latin clergy,74 the British missionaries worked in close co-operation with their local consular representatives75 to develop a British power base in Palestine, culminating in the establishment of a Consulate in Jerusalem in 1838,76 and an Anglican Bishopric there in 1842.77

---

72 Jowett, *Syria and the Holy Land*, pp.210-211. A similar sentiment is expressed by another English missionary, Charles Cook, who visited Jerusalem in 1824. He says, 'when we were near Jerusalem. I saw a very large tree on a small eminence overlooking the valley of Hinnom... While on this eminence, the thought struck me that very probably Calvary was here. It is impossible to say where it was, and it is of little importance'. Cook, *Journal*, p.52 (of small pp.).

73 The British and American missionaries were in close contact and often travelled together in pursuit of their work (see Jowett, *Syria and the Holy Land*, pp.73-74, 124, 278; Cook, *Journal*, pp.18-21 (of large pp.), 19-20, 22-25, 31, 44 (i.e. 2nd p.44), 51-66, 76ff. (of small pp.)). They considered the distribution of scriptural texts vital to their success for two reasons. Primarily, access to Scriptures provided the only means by which the local population could attain salvation (see Connor, *Visit*, pp.430, 437, 446; Cook, *Journal*, pp.45 (i.e. 2nd p.45), 46, 66, 72 (of small pp.), but of almost equal importance was the potential which common accessibility to these texts held for undermining the authority of the Latin clergy. As Jowett states, 'the Sacred Books are claimed as the exclusive property of the Sacred Order; their possession... diminishes the mental power of their spiritual subjects... [and maintains the] religious Superior, as the legitimate master of... [the subject's] mind and... conscience'. See Jowett, *Syria and the Holy Land*, pp.326-327.

74 Charles Cook refers to an extract of a letter he received from the American missionary, Mr. Fisk, dated Aleppo, August 2, 1824, in which Fisk describes a recent firman issued by the Grand Signor prohibiting the distribution of scriptural texts and ordering a collection of those already distributed. Fisk attributes the creation of this firman to 'Romish Intrigue', namely the combined effort of the Latin clergy with that of the French consul at Sidon and the Austrian consuls at Acre to diminish English influence and promote that of the Pope (see Cook, *Letters*: Letter from C. C., Beyroot, August 13 1824 to Rev3 Joseph Taylor, f. 1r-1v). About a month later, Cook writes of the Anathema which the new Pope had pronounced against the 'Biblica' [i.e. distributers of scriptures] and the Protestant missionaries in the Holy Land, and of the current efforts by the Latin clergy to destroy the distributed texts. See Cook, *Letters*: 'Letter from C. C., Alexandria, 19 September 1824 to Rev3 Joseph Taylor', f. 1r; and for further examples of active resistance by the Latin clergy, see Connor, *Visit*, p.426; Jowett, *Syria and the Holy Land*, pp.159-160.

75 The British consular representatives played an important role in setting up a local network to assist in the distribution of scriptural texts. See Connor, *Visit*, pp.423, 426, 447, 449, 450, 451 (re Mr. Barker in Aleppo), 452 (re Mr. Rich in Bagdad).

76 A. Tibawi, *British Interests in Palestine 1800-1901*, p.31. The missionary Charles Cook clearly saw the need for a British consulate at Jerusalem to protect the welfare of Christians as there was no consulate of any European power in any part of the Pachalik of Damascus in which Jerusalem was placed. Since the Pachaliks were
Clarke's Theories as an Inspiration for Later Research

The Holy Sepulchre

The following early British travellers did not support Clarke's identification of the Holy Sepulchre. Nevertheless, his work inspired them to extend their research beyond the city walls to include a survey of sepulchral remains and, in consequence, present their own evaluation of Clarke's ideas.

Buckingham (1816) drew attention to Clarke's flaw in logic which inferred that his Mount Sion was outside the city at the time of Christ's Crucifixion. However he agreed with Clarke's identification of Mount Sion. Like Clarke, he designated the sepulchres on the side of Mount Sion as Israelite, but assigned their original usage to an earlier period when, he said, they would have been included within the city limits. Buckingham employs both textual and archaeological evidence to support this premise. He specifies several biblical passages which describe royal and private tombs of the early Israelites as situated within Jerusalem, and points out that the design of the sepulchres on the side of Mount Sion coincides with the description given by Josephus of the tomb of David.

Although modern excavations have shown that Davidic Jerusalem was situated further east, in the area south of Temple Mount between the Tyropoeon and Kidron Valleys, Buckingham was...
correct in assigning a two stage period of occupancy to some of the tombs. Like Clarke he believed the Greek inscription THC AΓIAC CIWN found on some of the tombs confirmed the identity of the mountain above them, but suggested that the cross affixed to the front of some of these inscriptions indicated re-use of the tombs by Christians 'after Sion had become desolate'. Modern scholarship supports this opinion.

Buckingham upheld the authenticity of the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre, and drew upon semantic evidence to undermine Clarke’s novel theory. Clarke had interpreted the word Golgotha as 'the place of a Scull' or 'a public Cemetry'. But, as Buckingham states,

Golgotha is not... 'a place of skulls,' but simply 'a skull,' in the Syro-Chaldaic language.... St. Luke is the only one of the Evangelists who has strictly translated the word Golgotha, though he be the only one who has not introduced the name.

Buckingham suggested this description was based on external appearance and, as such, was 'likely to be preserved with as little corruption among the vulgar as among the learned'.

Visiting Jerusalem in 1818, William John Bankes carried out an extensive survey of the various tombs and sepulchres in and around the city. The frequent occurrence of tombs shaped similarly to those of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea led Bankes to conclude that the

---

84 Buckingham, *Travels in Palestine*, p.279.
85 Avigad, *Jerusalem*, p.621. Avigad reports that most of the tombs found in the Valley of Hinnom from the Byzantine period are re-used Jewish tombs, and that on the tombs it is stated that the persons buried there are from 'Holy Zion' across the Valley.
86 James Silk Buckingham, 'Lectures on the East', MS, Dec.30 (Special Collections Department, Edinburgh University Library), p.30.
89 Bankes, *Travel Papers*: 'Tombs and Sepulchres about Jerusalem'.
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[traditional] Holy Sepulchre was originally of this form.\textsuperscript{90} By employing the principle of deductive logic, he was offering a rational solution to the non-compliance between the biblical description of Christ's tomb with that shown as the Holy Sepulchre. Of the Greek inscriptions observed by Clarke on the tombs in the valley of Hinnom, Bankes merely states they were Christian and of little interest.\textsuperscript{91}

Like Bankes, John Hyde (1820) studied and wrote detailed descriptions of the numerous tombs and sepulchres around Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{92} To disprove the authenticity of the tomb nominated by Clarke as that of Christ, Hyde put forward an alternative assessment of its structural remains. He states,

\begin{quote}
[this tomb] does not seem to me at all to answer the description that is given of the Tomb of our Saviour. The entrance to the repository for a single body is at the North angle or right hand cornice in looking into the Sepulchre but there are also numerous other Recesses for Bodies at the further extremity of this tomb.\textsuperscript{93}
\end{quote}

This argument based on the inconsistence of archaeological and biblical evidence is indeed sound. However, a discrepancy between the two accounts implied that Hyde was not, in fact, describing the tomb identified by Clarke as that of Christ. Whereas Clarke states that the inscription adorning this tomb lacked the prefix of a Greek cross,\textsuperscript{94} Hyde reports that such a cross was partly visible.\textsuperscript{95}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[90] Bankes, \textit{Travel Papers}: "Tombs and Sepulchres about Jerusalem", f.3r.
\item[91] Bankes, \textit{Travel Papers}: "Tombs and Sepulchres about Jerusalem", f.3r.
\item[92] Hyde, \textit{Add. 42108}, ff. 10r-13r, 14v, 18v, 22r-25r.
\item[93] Hyde, \textit{Add. 42108}, f. 10v.
\item[94] Clarke, \textit{Travels}, Vol. 4, p.329.
\item[95] Hyde, \textit{Add. 42108}, f. 11r.
\end{footnotes}
Carne (1821) refuted Clarke's theory on the Holy Sepulchre, commenting that 'tradition on so memorable an occasion could hardly err'. The stimulus of Clarke's report impelled Carne to extend his research and explanation beyond a mere acceptance of tradition although his scholarship is superficial in comparison with the above three reports. The tombs in the valley of Hinnom, he says, were 'no doubt... the tombs of the ancient Jews', but he offers no rationale for this conclusion. The incongruous composition of the rock of the Holy Sepulchre which formed an essential in Clarke's argument was explained by Carne as a covering of marble placed over the native rock by the priests as protection against the over-zealous pilgrims.

Mount Sion

The new identity proposed by Clarke for Mount Sion and his discussion of its position relative to other features stimulated a response in several later reports.

Buckingham (1816) maintained the authenticity of the traditional sites of the Holy Sepulchre and Mount Calvary, but followed Clarke in identifying the mountain south of the valley of Hinnom as Mount Sion (Fig. 6). He used several of Clarke's arguments to support this claim but augmented his discussion with a further application of biblical and historical evidence.

99 Like Clarke, Buckingham claimed Jerusalem occupied two main hills, Mount Sion and Mount Moriah (*Buckingham, Travels in Palestine*, p. 268). Although Buckingham presents the entire passage from Josephus, *Jewish Wars*, book v. c. iv. s. i (*Buckingham, Travels in Palestine*, pp. 266-267 (including Footnote on p. 267)), he reaches the same conclusion as Clarke that the Tyropoan Valley or Valley of the Cheesemongers ran north of Mount Sion dividing it from Mount Moriah (*Buckingham, Travels in Palestine*, p. 271). Mount Moriah, says Buckingham, was composed of three separate eminences: Acre, Moriah and Bezetha, which were separated from each other by less marked boundaries than the two great ones (Mount Moriah and Mount Sion) were (*Buckingham, Travels in Palestine*, p. 268). Finally, Buckingham draws upon the epigraphic evidence of the Greek inscriptions on the tombs at the foot of the mount on the southern side of the Valley of Hinnom to confirm its identity with Sion (*Buckingham, Travels in Palestine*, p. 279).
Buckingham attempts to illuminate the passage II Samuel v. 6, 7, 9 with the corresponding description given by Josephus in Antiq. Bk.7, Ch. 3.65-67.100

The biblical passage states,

And the king and his men went to Jerusalem unto the Jebusites, the inhabitants of the land... Nevertheless David took the strong hold of Zion: the same is the city of David... So David dwelt in the fort, and called it, The city of David: and David built about from Millo and inward.

Naturally Josephus based his interpretation of this biblical text on the contemporary topography of the city, and not on the site now acknowledged as that occupied by Jebusite and Davidic Jerusalem (Fig. 3).101 Thus Buckingham states,

This account of the taking of the Lower City first, and afterwards of the citadel on Mount Sion, is confirmed by Josephus with the same details. He adds, however, 'David made buildings round about the Lower City, he also joined the citadel to it, and made it one united city; and, when he had encompassed all with walls, appointed Joab governor. It was David, therefore, who first cast the Jebusite out of Jerusalem, and called it by his own name, the City of David'.102

Relying too heavily on Josephus's interpretation of the biblical evidence, Buckingham misappropriates the latter and incorrectly concludes that the city of David was composed of two sections: the Citadel or Mount Sion and the Lower City or Jebus,103 although the bible makes no such statement.

100 Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, pp.275-276 (including Footnotes in which the references are specified).
101 See also Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land, p.236 (Fig. 69).
102 Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, pp.275-276.
103 Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.271.
This misconception enables Buckingham to cite other biblical evidence in confirmation of his proposed topography. In describing the borders of the tribe of Benjamin, *Joshua* xviii.16 states,

> And the border came down to the end of the mountain that lieth before the valley of the son of Hinnom... and described to the valley of Hinnom, to the side of Jebusi on the south.\(^{104}\)

Buckingham concludes incorrectly, 'Hinnom... it is said, passed by the south of Jebusi, but was for the same reason, to the north of Sion'.\(^{105}\)

Richardson (1819) rejected Clarke's identity of Mount Sion.\(^{106}\) His argument is partly based on a logical application of the text of Josephus to the surrounding topography and partly on an innovative comparative study of the geographic statistics and the texts of the Bible and of Strabo. Richardson writes,

> Josephus... states, that the besiegers [David and his men] could not get at Mount Zion, without having first possessed themselves of the lower city, which would not apply to any fort erected on... [this]... hill... [and moreover] that the ravine between Mount Zion and the lower city was filled up by the Ashmoneans; but the ravine between this hill and Mount Zion is all the way open.\(^{107}\)

Reporting that the hill traditionally called Mount Sion is, in fact, higher than that assigned as such by Clarke,\(^{108}\) it follows that '[Clarke's] Mount Zion would be the lower city... [although]
Scripture says it was the upper city.\textsuperscript{109} Despite Richardson's misinterpretation of the biblical evidence,\textsuperscript{110} his application of geographical data is sound. The coincidence of geographical statistics of the traditional Mount Sion with the description given by Strabo gives confirmation. Richardson states, 'The breadth of this ditch [encompassing Mount Sion on the east, south and west] is stated by Strabo to be about 150 feet, and its depth, or the height of Mount Zion above the bottom of the ravine, to be about 60 feet. The measurement, in both instances, is nearly correct, and furnishes one, among many proofs that we derive from other sources, that the places now called by these names are the same as those that were anciently so denominated'.\textsuperscript{111}

Charles Barry (1819) also drew attention to geographical incongruities displayed by Clarke's Mount Sion. Like Richardson he noted its comparative lowness,\textsuperscript{112} but commented on other features as well:

It is not insulated but connected with the high valley of Rephaim on the West.... It is formed of two great hills shelving(?) to the plain and connected by a narrow creek(?).\textsuperscript{113}

Thus, stimulated by Clarke's discussion Barry had incorporated a topographic survey of this feature into his research.

The early British travellers who examined Clarke's Mount Sion confuted his report of the presence of remains of ruined walls and sumptuous edifices on the summit.\textsuperscript{114} The most likely

\textsuperscript{110}Richardson accepted the traditional site for Mount Sion which, as discussed above, archaeological evidence would relocate.
\textsuperscript{112}Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 9, 'Jerusalem 1819', p.9 (n. pag.).
\textsuperscript{113}Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 9, 'Jerusalem 1819', p.9 (n. pag.).
explanation for Clarke's misrepresentation of evidence in this regard is offered by Buckingham who suggests that Clarke had merely borrowed this part of his description from the text of Sandys.\footnote{Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.273.} In order to uphold his own identity of this mount as Sion, Buckingham proceeds to demonstrate the relevance of the negative archaeological evidence to the biblical record by citing the passage \textit{Micah} iii.12 which states, "Therefore shall Zion... be plowed as a field."\footnote{Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.273 (including Footnote I).} But, since this piece of physical evidence played a vital role in confirming Clarke's otherwise tentative assertions, its misappropriation weakens the foundation of his conclusion considerably.

\textit{The Size and Shape of Ancient Jerusalem}

In evaluating the area covered by the Jerusalem of Josephus, Barry (1819) draws attention to a significant disparity between the historian's description and the novel topography proposed by Clarke. He states, "[Clarke's Mount Sion] is at least 3½ miles in circumference which is larger than the whole city was together."\footnote{Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 9, "Jerusalem 1819", p.10' (n. pag.).} Rather,

It is likely the present city is the same as that of Adrian and with the addition of that part of Mount Sion that is now excluded perfectly corresponds with the Jerusalem of Josephus.

There are three walls described by Josephus as built at various times. The first... [embraced] the whole of Sion.

The second ran from the Tower Hippicus to the tower Antonia at the NW angle of the temple including a part of Acra.

The third began at the tower Hippicus towards the N ran to the Tower Psephina and thence on the north side towards the Tower Antonia till it made an angle embracing Bezetha and joining the Temple on the East.\footnote{Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 9, "Jerusalem 1819", p.2' (n. pag.). Barry has, in fact, misquoted Josephus regarding the latter's descriptions of the course of the Second and Third Walls. When we consider that Barry argued in favour of...}
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Fundamental to Barry's argument are the locations he proposes for the Towers of Hippicus and Psephinus and for the northern section of the Third Wall. He follows Pococke in placing the site of the Tower Hippicus at the north-west corner of Mount Sion presently occupied by the Tower of the Pisans.\textsuperscript{119} Archaeological data supplied the criteria for fixing the other points of reference.

The text of Josephus implies that the Tower of Psephinus stood at the north-west angle of the Third Wall.\textsuperscript{120} Barry identifies this tower as the ruins of an extensive building, situated in the north-west angle of the city,\textsuperscript{121} which he claims bore evidence of 'remote antiquity'.\textsuperscript{122} He provides a detailed description of the dimensions and structure of its archaeological remains,\textsuperscript{123} including,

At the SW angle are several very large blocks of stones regularly squared and laid in courses projecting \textit{in an angular(?) direction in the form of a buttress}. On the east side is an entrance to a vaulted stable in \[2\] we found the main walls to be 12 feet thick. At the angles of the \[2\] are large squared blocks of stone.\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{120}See Footnote no. 118 (above). Also, Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 9, "Jerusalem 1819", p. 6 (n. pag.).
\textsuperscript{121}Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 10, Saturday 24th April 1819.
\textsuperscript{122}Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 9, "Jerusalem 1819", p. 6 (n. pag.).
\textsuperscript{123}Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 10, Saturday 24th April 1819.
\textsuperscript{124}Barry, \textit{Diaries}, Vol. 10, Saturday 24th April 1819.
In this context Barry does not specifically nominate these features as demonstrating 'remote antiquity', but relative dating is inferred by his comments on comparative material he claims to have noticed elsewhere along the north wall. In fact, modern scholars have considered these particular features and others, discovered at the north-west angle of the city, as typical of Herodian architecture. Vincent (1912) proposed a connection with the Tower of Psephinus, but Avi-Yonah defied the substantiation of any such claim.

Barry offers further proof of this building's identity by reporting, 'On ascending to the top we saw to the foot of the chain of Mountains east of the Dead Sea', since this observation concurs with Josephus's description of the Tower of Psephinus in Wars, Bk.5, Ch.4.160. It appears, however, that Barry contrived this evidence. The modern scholar, Avi-Yonah, points out that under no circumstances could an equally extensive view as that described by Josephus be obtained from 'Goliath's Castle' (i.e. the modern name of this building). Rather, he said, 'An appropriate position for such a tower would be at the elevation of 798m, somewhere near the bend of Prophets' Street, not far from the quarry'. This location also suited Avi-Yonah's theory of a more northerly course for the Third Wall.

---

125 Barry states, 'the lower stones of the wall are of considerable size and certainly not of Turkish construction. I think there can be little doubt that the northern wall is that of Elia Capitolina and probably of the Jerusalem of Josephus'. Barry, Diaries, Vol. 9, 'Jerusalem 1819', p. 7 (n. pag.).

126 For a detailed description see, Avi-Yonah, 'The Third and Second Walls of Jerusalem', p.104 (including Fig. 2).

127 Barry, it seems, was describing the features nominated 'a' by Avi-Yonah.

128 Vincent attributed the remains of the corner of a mysterious tower 'X' to the Tower Psephinus. See Avigad, 'Jerusalem', p.608. This is the feature nominated 'b' by Avi-Yonah. See Avi-Yonah, 'The Third and Second Walls of Jerusalem', p.104.

129 Barry states, 'the lower stones of the wall are of considerable size and certainly not of Turkish construction. I think there can be little doubt that the northern wall is that of Elia Capitolina and probably of the Jerusalem of Josephus'. Barry, Diaries, Vol. 9, 'Jerusalem 1819', p. 7 (n. pag.).


131 As illustrated by Avi-Yonah, 'The Third and Second Walls of Jerusalem', p.102 (Fig. 1).
Barry proposes a course for the northern section of Josephus's Third Wall which followed that of the present northern city wall. He ignores the historian's references to the relationship between the Third Wall and the monuments of Helena and the royal caverns, and bases his argument solely on archaeological evidence. Along part of the wall, Barry claims to have observed a wide ditch and the foundation of towers at regular distances. In addition, he notes that the lower stones of the wall are of considerable size and, therefore, not of Turkish construction. He concludes, 'I think there can be little doubt that the northern wall is that of Aelia Capitolina and probably of the Jerusalem of Josephus.'

The veracity of this evidence is extremely dubious. No other early British traveller nor modern scholar reported a superficial sighting of such remains. In fact, only since modern excavations have been carried out in the area of the Damascus Gate and elsewhere along the line of the north wall has pre-Islamic architecture in these places come to light. Barry's reference to the regular occurrence of towers along the line of the Third Wall seems yet another attempt to comply with the text of Josephus (Wars, Bk.5, Ch.4.158).

---

132 See Footnote no. 118 (above).
133 Barry, Diaries, Vol. 9, 'Jerusalem 1819', p.6-7 (n. pag.).
134 Barry, Diaries, Vol. 9, 'Jerusalem 1819', p.7 (n. pag.).
135 Barry, Diaries, Vol. 9, 'Jerusalem 1819', p.7 (n. pag.).
136 The scarcity of architectural remains related to Aelia Capitolina has led modern scholars to query the very existence of a city wall at this time (Avigad, Discovering Jerusalem, p.207; Geva, 'The Camp of the Tenth Legion in Jerusalem', p.251). In 1937-38, Hamilton uncovered fragments of the city wall which he related to Aelia Capitolina, near the present Damascus Gate and, further east, in Trench E of Herod's Gate (Fig. 4; Avigad, Jerusalem, pp.610, 645). Kathleen Kenyon claimed that the excavations conducted by Hennessy in 1964-66 at the Damascus Gate (Fig. 5) revealed an accumulation of the time of Aelia Capitolina below Crusader and Byzantine levels. Below the accumulation was the original surface and then the foundation trench of the original wall. An inscribed stone found within a rebuilt section of a side arch dated to Hadrian's Aelia Capitolina. The layers of the foundation trench provided a terminus post quem for the wall of the first half of the first century A.D. and could be confidently ascribed to Herod Agrippa (K. Kenyon, Jerusalem. Excavating 3000 Years of History, pp.162-163; see also G. Wightman, The Damascus Gate: Excavations by C. - M. Bennett and J. B. Hennessy at Damascus Gate, Jerusalem, 1964-1966). This terminus post quem supports Barry's theory that the northern section of Josephus's Third Wall followed that of the present city wall. Kenyon was clearly a later adherent to this theory. The more northern wall, discovered by Pococke and identified by him as the Third Wall was, according to Kenyon, a part of the circumvallation which Titus reportedly (Wars, Bk.5, 504, 508) built around Jerusalem to enclose the besieged population (Avi-Yonah, 'The Third and Second Walls of Jerusalem', pp.112-113). It is evident that the course of Josephus's Third Wall remains a much disputed question.
Despite the shortcomings of Barry's account, his methodology, aimed primarily at establishing the validity of the text of Josephus through coincidence with archaeological evidence, was theoretically sound, and his research of the architectural remains identified as the Tower Psephinus was, indeed, innovative and valuable. Without doubt, Clarke's work had provided the impetus necessary to inspire Barry's efforts beyond a mere reiteration of traditional or textual evidence.

Concluding Remarks

The events connected with Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre were essential elements in Christian faith. Moreover, these places and their relation to the topography of ancient Jerusalem abound with historical connections. That any early British traveller would consciously disassociate the historical from the archaeological data when dealing with places of such religious importance is most unlikely.

The foregoing discussion has clearly shown, however, that archaeological research was, in fact, carried out to elucidate the sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, and the topography of ancient Jerusalem. Prior to E.D. Clarke's visit of 1801, the efforts of Halifax, Shaw and Pococke held most significance in this regard. From an archaeological perspective, the merit of Clarke's work was two-fold. Firstly, he made an innovative, albeit rudimentary, attempt at introducing a multidisciplinary approach to archaeological research by incorporating various forms of relevant scientific evidence and, secondly, his novel theories provided the stimulus for subsequent early British travellers to extend their research beyond the traditional sites. Notable amongst these later efforts were Barry's research of Jerusalem's topography and, in particular, the course of Josephus's Third Wall, and Bankes's and Hyde's respective surveys of the tombs and sepulchres around Jerusalem.
However, Clarke's report was also extremely important in another dimension. Written just after the Napoleonic campaigns in Palestine and Egypt, his account substantiates the premise that the anti-French/Catholic attitude current in Britain influenced the early British travellers in their interpretation of archaeological data. Certainly scepticism of the traditional sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre were noted in much earlier accounts, and such attitudes in relation to the Latin clergy and Holy Places, in general, intensified toward the end of the eighteenth century presumably concomitant with the growth of Napoleonic power. But Clarke was the first early British traveller to produce a major study of these two key sites and to present an alternative thesis. Although we are not certain whether Clarke was aware of the political significance of his actions, he was, in fact, promoting a significant method of diminishing French influence in Palestine.
Fig. 1. Edward Daniel Clarke's Plan of Jerusalem.

Source: Clarke, Travels, Vol. 4, Plate opp. title page.
Fig. 2. Richard Pococke's Plan of Jerusalem
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Fig. 3. Schematic Plan of the Solomonic Citadel at Jerusalem and the City of David.

Source: G. Wightman, *The Walls of Jerusalem*, p.31 (Fig. 7).
Fig. 4. A Modern Interpretation of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.

Source: Josephus, The Jewish War, p.488.
Fig. 5. Excavations in Jerusalem.

Source: N. Avigad, 'Jerusalem', p.646.
Fig. 6. James Silk Buckingham's Plan of Jerusalem.
Chapter Four

The Pools of Solomon

Many early British travellers visited the Pools of Solomon and reported on their findings. Most accounts provide superficial and incomplete descriptions of the three pools and their associated water channels. In a few instances, however, wider research of the elements composing the complex resulted in detailed records of physical data and in attempts to analyse the interrelationships of these various elements. Such reports are significant for the originality of material they present, since they predate those reports of later investigators who have, until now, been credited with such observations.

The local Roman Catholic clergy traditionally assigned a Solomonic origin to the three pools and to the 'sealed fountain' situated above them. The valley below the pools they identified as the site of Solomon's garden. Biblical evidence supporting these claims was to be found in Eccles. ii. 5,6, and Cantic. iv. 12.¹ Many of the reports of the early travellers present only this traditional assessment. Although some notes of scepticism appear, no effort is made to utilise any supplementary evidence, either of a textual or archaeological nature to support or query the identification. Some instances do exist, however, of the use of other available resources to validate or undermine the authenticity of the traditional evidence. Although modern research has at times produced contradictory results, the methods employed by these early investigators remain significant as they represent the beginning of a rational assessment of evidence rather than a mere reliance on established tradition.

¹ Cantic. iv. 12: 'A garden enclosed is my sister, my spouse; a spring shut up, a fountain sealed'.
Eccles. ii. 5,6: 'I made me gardens and orchards, and I planted trees in them of all kinds of fruits. I made me pools of water, to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees.'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper Pool</th>
<th>Middle Pool</th>
<th>Lower Pool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Width</strong></td>
<td>233 (mean)</td>
<td>232 (mean)</td>
<td>177 (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth</strong></td>
<td>East End: 25</td>
<td>East end: 39</td>
<td>East end: 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robinson &amp; SWP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West End: 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East End</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West End</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crouch (ed., 1669)</strong></td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>West end: 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Depth</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>East end: 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Godschall (1678)</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>West end: 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiswell (1697)</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maundrell (1697)</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worsley (1701)</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thompson (c. 1730)</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pococke (1734)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whaley (1789)</strong></td>
<td>530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anon (1792)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wittman (1800)</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light (1814)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turner (1815)</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buckingham (1816)</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jolliffe (1817)</strong></td>
<td>90 that of Lower Pool</td>
<td>Same as other 2 Pools</td>
<td>4½ times that of Upper Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richardson (1818)</strong></td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barry (1819)</strong></td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master (1819)</strong></td>
<td>400 (160 paces)</td>
<td>Same as others</td>
<td>Same as others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilson (1820)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Came (1821)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Depths vary depending on the inequalities of the rock which form the bottoms.**

**Sources:**
Description and Surveying of the Site

Every early British traveller who visited and reported on this site provided some information on the three pools. By gathering together the various comments made by individuals on the layout, general architecture, interrelationships, and dimensions of these structures, their varying degrees of competence become clear. In general, a superficial level of research is indicated, although exceptions certainly occurred.

Pococke (1738) made an early attempt to understand the architecture of the pools by examining them in the context of their topographical setting. His text is detailed and logical and includes diagrams (Fig. 1). He states,

The valley below this mountain is terminated at the west end by a high hill, the first part of the ascent to it is very easy, on which there are three pools one above another, as represented in the eighth plate; they lie west north west, and east south east. These pools are partly sunk below the surface of the earth, and partly encompassed with a low wall about seven feet thick on the lower side, and three feet in thickness on the other sides, which has been lately repaired: The highest pool A, is the shallowest, by reason that the ground there is nearer a level than below E;... The second pool C is deeper, and seems to have been sunk as low as it could be, without the immense labour of hewing away the rock, which appears at D.²

Only a few other travellers commented on the adaptation of the architecture of these structures to the topography of the site. Anon (1791-2) noted the presence of a strong embankment at the highest pool to keep the waters from running over.³ Richardson (1818)⁴ and Carne (1821)⁵ reported on the presence of a supporting system of internal buttresses. But only

²Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43.
³Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, f.126.
Plate 6. Portrait of Richard Pococke
Source: R. Pococke, Tours in Scotland 1747, 1750, 1760, opp. title page.
Charles Barry (1819) equalled Pococke in his understanding of this characteristic of the pools. Like Pococke, Barry noted that the lower end of each pool was thicker than the upper end to contend with the slope of the valley and, also, that the pre-existing valley floor was utilised as a base for the pools. These observations regarding the valley floor are upheld by later surveys conducted at the site. The claim made by several other travellers that the pools were excavated out of the rock is, in turn, invalidated.

Nevertheless, Pococke is remiss in not mentioning some structural attributes of the pools which were readily discernible and included in many early reports. It was frequently observed that each pool had a set of steps descending into it, and also, that the inner surfaces of the pools were lined with a substance, variably described as plaster or cement.

It is clear from their reports that almost all the early British travellers who visited the Pools of Solomon were aware that the comparative position of the three cisterns allowed water to flow in sequence from the highest to the lowest. Perry (c.1740) (Fig. 2), and Buckingham (1816)...

---

6 Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Sunday April 18th 1819. In describing the pools and their environs Barry frequently reversed the words 'east' and 'west' probably due to the pressure of taking hurried notes on the spot. Thus he states, 'The west [should be east] wall of each pool is much loftier and stouter than the others, the valley dipping from east to west [should be west to east']


9 Crouch (ed.), Fourteen Englishmen, p.93; Godschall, Account of a Journey, p.50; Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.225; Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Sunday April 18th 1819. Pococke records the presence of steps at the middle pool only. Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43; and 'E' on Fig. 1.

10 Maundrell, Journey, p.119; Thompson, Travels, Vol. III, p.160; Wittman, Travels, p.162; Richardson, Travels, Vol. II, p.379. In describing the Pools of Solomon and other features at this site, Thompson relied heavily on the text of Maundrell. The spurious nature of the former traveller was discussed in Chapter 2 (above).


12 The following are listed in chronological order of visiting the site: Crouch (ed.), Fourteen Englishmen, p.93; Godschall, Account of a Journey, p.50; Chiswell, Travels and Journeys, f.46v; Maundrell, Journey, p.118; Worsley, Journey, p.17; Thompson, Travels, Vol. III, pp.139-160; Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43; Perry, A View of the Levant, pp.128-9; Whaley, Memoirs, Vol. II, p.214; Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, f.126; Browne, Travels, p.362;...cont.
(Fig. 3), included illustrations in their text which exemplify this process and, in Pococke's diagram, a channel is shown running between pools C and F (Fig. 1). Only two accounts make no reference to the relationship between the cisterns. After briefly reporting on the sealed fountain, Luke (1668) alludes only to "Three fair large pools," and Bell (1669) merely states that by the sealed fountain "are 3 large fish ponds of grt depth."

With very few exceptions, all the early British travellers who reported on the Pools of Solomon specified at least some of the dimensions of these structures, but with widely varying results (Table 2). The measurements taken at a later stage by Edward Robinson (1838) agree with those presented in the The Survey of Western Palestine (SWP) and are accepted as accurate by Conrad Schick, and thus provide the necessary standard for comparative purposes. Consequently the most successful attempt is seen to have been carried out by Charles Barry. His measurements agree in their general proportions with those of Robinson and the SWP, although they are consistently less. Considering Barry's technical training in surveying and his obvious attention to detail, one might query the accuracy of his measuring equipment. It is to his credit that he is the only early British traveller to record with some degree of accuracy details of the variations between the west and east, and north and south sides of the pools.

Wittman, Travels, p.162; Light, Travels, p.168; Turner, Journal of a Tour, Vol. II, p.246; Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.225; Joliffe, Letters from Palestine, p.95; Richardson, Travels, Vol. II, pp.379-380; Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Sunday April 18th 1819; Master, Journal, f.243v; Fuller, Narrative of a Tour, p.281; W. Rae Wilson, Travels, p.144; Hyde, Add. 42106, ff.26r-27r; Carne, Letters from the East, Vol. I, p.321; Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p.312. The flow of water between the cisterns was not specifically mentioned by Godsehall, Pococke, Light, Turner, Fuller, Hyde or Mackworth although their comments on the comparative position of the three pools infer their awareness of this fact. Discussed in the following text, Pococke's diagram confirms his awareness of this fact.  

14Bell, Indian Antiquary, (37), p.159.  
17C. Schick, "Die Wasserversorgung der Stadt Jerusalem", pp.146-147.  
18The chart (Table 2) gives Barry's measurements for the length and width of the upper pool as 348 feet and 213 feet respectively. In his diary, Barry assigns these measurements to the 'east pool' but the context of his description indicates he is referring to the upper pool and has written 'east' rather than 'west' by mistake. See Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Sunday April 18th 1819; also Footnote No.6 (above).  
Although no other early British traveller assessed the dimensions of Solomon's Pools as accurately as Charles Barry, several did present a correct picture of their comparative sizes. The earliest to do so was Maundrell (1697) who paced out the widths and lengths of each pool. The later reports of Thompson (c.1734), Wittman (1800), and Master (1819) give almost identical statistics to those of Maundrell and may well have copied directly from the latter's text. If 36 inches be allowed for a pace rather than the standard 30 inches, then Richardson's (1818) dimensions for the pools also comply with Maundrell's. The comparative sizes of the three pools are also correctly maintained by Whaley (1789) and Buckingham (1816), although the measurements of the former are generally far too high, and those of the latter represent an estimate only. Pococke (1738) illustrates the comparative sizes of the three pools and is right in stating that the upper pool is the shallowest. The measurements obtained by using the scale on Pococke's diagram provide a more accurate assessment of pool size than was generally achieved.

The remaining accounts of the dimensions of Solomon's Pools are either very general but in essence correct or, alternatively, quite inaccurate. The dimensions given by Light (1814) and Joliffe (1817) belong to the first group. Although Light's estimate of the size of the lower pool is too small, he is correct in the comparative sizes assigned to each pool. Likewise, Joliffe's estimate of the length of the lower pool as one and a half times that of the upper pool is reasonable. All other accounts include significant errors. Godschall (1678), Chiswell (1697), and Anon (1791-2) report a consistent size for all three pools. Godschall notes some variation in shape and is, in fact, correct in observing that the middle pool is broader at one end than the other. It is strange that Chiswell should have made such a blatant mistake in his assessment of the pool sizes as he visited the site with Maundrell. Crouch (ed.), Fourteen Englishmen (1669) is incorrect, in equating the size of the upper and lower pools and in claiming the middle pool is smaller than both, as is Worsley (1701) in reporting that the middle and lower pools are smaller than the upper. Turner (1815) completely inverts the correct comparative sizes of the three pools. The comments of
Plate 7. Portrait of Henry Maundrell
Source: Maundrell, Journey, opp. title page.
William Rae Wilson (1820) and Carne (1821) that the pools vary in length are too vague to be assessed.

The descriptions produced by most early British travellers visiting the pools revealed a level of research extending little beyond a general perusal of these structures with little or no concern for accurate reporting of physical data. Only a few individuals produced accounts which reflect an effort to examine the pools in detail. Pococke's (1738) assessment of the relationship between the architecture of the pools and the topography of their site is outstanding for its originality and accuracy of detail. Charles Barry (1819) was the only other early British traveller to fully appreciate this characteristic. His comparatively successful record of the dimensions of the pools is further evidence of the meticulousness of his approach. Maundrell (1697) produced the earliest correct assessment of the comparative sizes of the pools by measuring in paces, and examined the pools closely to comment on their construction. In fact, it will be shown that Maundrell, Pococke, and Barry displayed in their research of the various elements composing the complex at this site attention to detail and an attempt to explain their interrelationships which far surpassed that level of generality maintained by most other early British travellers.

The next item to be considered is the 'sealed fountain' for which Maundrell (1697) provided the earliest comprehensive description. As late as 1838, Edward Robinson claimed that no better account of this feature had since been written. 20 Maundrell's text states,

...at about the distance of one hundred and forty paces from... [the pools]... is the fountain from which principally they derive their waters. This the friars will have to be that sealed fountain, to which the holy spouse is compared, Can. iv. 12... [access is] by a little hole like to the mouth of a narrow well. Through this hole you descend directly down, but not without some difficulty, for about four yards;

---

and then arrive in a vaulted room, fifteen paces long, and eight broad. Joining to this, is another room of the same fashion, but somewhat less. Both these rooms are covered with handsome stone arches, very ancient, and perhaps the work of Solomon himself.

You find here four places at which the water rises: from those separate sources it is conveyed, by little rivulets, into a kind of basin, and from thence is carried by a large subterraneous passage down into these pools. In the way, before it arrives at these pools, there is an aqueduct of brick pipes, which receives part of the stream, and carries it by many turnings and windings, about the mountains, to Jerusalem.21

The description given by Pococke (1738) of the sealed fountain complies, in most details, with that of Maundrell.22 The diagram included by the later traveller clarifies the lay-out of the fountain and its position in relation to the other features of the site (Fig. 1). However one fundamental difference exists between these two accounts. In contrast to Maundrell, Pococke fails to mention the subterraneous passage leading from the sealed fountain. His text merely states that, all the water goes out by two holes one over another at X; and, as they informed me, divides into three parts; one going to the upper pool, another to the castle, north of it, and a third to Bethlehem and Jerusalem.23

That Pococke's account does not discuss the subterraneous passage seems strange since published descriptions of it were available and one would expect a scholar of Pococke's calibre to have been aware of these. Maundrell (1697)24 and others25 had noted the presence of this passage. The

21Maundrell, Journey, pp.119-120.
22Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.44. The accounts of the sealed fountain given by Maundrell and Pococke vary in a few particulars. In the inner room, Pococke observes an outlet for superfluous water, and a bank of earth containing a cistern which go unmentioned by Maundrell. Pococke reports that the inner room is larger than the outer. Maundrell claims the reverse is true, and this finding is upheld by the later survey of C. Schick. See Schick, 'Die Wasserversorgung', p.150.
23Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.44.
24Maundrell, Journey, pp.119-120.
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implication is that Pococke is employing his own observations for his description or, when this is not possible, information gleaned from the local clergy accompanying him.

Maundrell's (1697) account of the subterraneous passage is basically correct although deficient in several details. By thoroughly examining this passage and recording his findings, Charles Barry (1819) augments this earlier report considerably. He informs us that the sealed fountain is connected with a small well situated near the north-west angle of the upper pool and about 100 yards distant from the sealed fountain by a passage about 5 feet wide and 8 feet high covered with large slabs of stone laid against each other, in the form of a ridge. The sides of this passage are partly built and partly formed by an excavation in the rock... [the] small well... receives the water from its source [the sealed fountain] and distributes it to the pool by 2 conduits as well as supplies the aqueduct to Jerusalem which runs parallel to the pools on the north and entirely independent of them.26

The detail given by Barry of the architecture of the subterraneous passage itself is unsurpassed by any later account and, until Charles Warren investigated the site in 1864, there was no improvement on Barry's analysis of the system of water channels associated with the subterraneous passage. Near the upper pool Warren noticed that the water from the sealed fountain was joined by a rush of water from a higher level. He suggested two possible sources for this second flow of water, either the aqueduct of Wady Byar or, more likely, another sealed fountain to the south-east of that already known.27 The report published by Conrad Schick in 1878 following his examination of the site supports Warren's latter premise. Schick identified the

26Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Sunday April 18th 1819.
27C. Wilson, The Recovery of Jerusalem. A Narrative of Exploration and Discovery in the City and the Holy Land, p.236. Warren states that "near the Upper Pool of Solomon... [the water from the Sealed Fountain]... is joined by a rush of water from a higher level, apparently from the aqueduct of Wady Byar, which, however, is dry a few hundred yards higher up. Probably there may be another sealed fountain to the south-east of that known at present".
source of this second flow of water as 'Ain el-Burak (or Castle Spring), an underground spring arising a little southward of the castle.28

The reports of other early British travellers on the sealed fountain and its associated water system are, on the whole, superficial and incoherent. Two of the most comprehensive accounts clearly relied on Maundrell's text for the basis of their descriptions.29 The reports of Perry (c.1740)30 and Whaley (1789)31 lacked detail but covered the main features of this part of the complex, except for Perry's failure to mention the aqueduct leaving from the subterraneous passage. Several of the earliest accounts mention the presence of the three pools and of the sealed fountain but fail to note an interconnecting system.32 That Chiswell (1697) merely states, 'the uppermost [pool] is supplyed by a Fount hard by' is surprising since he accompanied Maundrell to the site.33

Most reports written by the travellers who visited the site after Pococke show superficial and incomplete research of the pertinent archaeological evidence and, as a result, a limited appreciation of the functional interrelationships of these various elements. Some travellers noted the existence of the three cisterns and of an underground spring or sealed fountain as their water supply but failed to mention the connecting passage or give any description of the items observed.34 Richardson (1818)35 and Hyde (1820)36 neglected to mention the function of the

28 Schick, 'Die Wasserversorgung', p.149. As early as 1822, Mackworth identified 'an abundant spring in the rock at the foot of the castle wall', which, he claimed, supplied the upper pool. He failed, however, to give details of its course and connections. See Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p.312.
30 Perry, A View of the Levant, pp.128-129.
33 Chiswell, Travels and Journeys, f.46v.
spring as a water supply to the cisterns, and several failed to acknowledge its underground status. After describing the three cisterns, Light (1814) records no more than the presence of an aqueduct to Bethlehem carrying water from a fountain. Mackworth who visited the site in 1822, failed to mention the sealed fountain or its associated channels. Despite the paucity of his report he does draw our attention to an item which had apparently gone unnoticed by other early travellers. Mackworth observes an abundant spring in the rock at the foot of the castle wall near to the upper reservoir and claims this spring as the water supply thereof. It seems that Mackworth had identified the source of the spring known as 'Ain el-Burak, although the relationship of this spring to other elements of the complex was not fully comprehended until C. Schick’s examination of the site.

The aforementioned reports are undeniably shallow and incomplete but the information which is presented is, in essence, correct. In three instances this is not the case. In 1792 an anonymous traveller visited the site and reported,

`Neare... [the three cisterns] ...enclosed within a Sort of Castle with very high walls, are what they call the sealed fountain, which are conveyed to this spot by parts of the same spring in pipes underground.`

No other early British traveller records this position for the feature traditionally designated as the sealed fountain. It is particularly strange that Anon (1791-2) failed to identify this feature correctly as his script reveals a familiarity with the text of Pococke. One can only conclude that

---

37Richardson, Travels, Vol. II, p.379; Wittman, Travels, p.163; Fuller, Narrative of a Tour, p.281.
38Light, Travels, p.168.
39Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p.312.
40Schick, 'Die Wasserversorgung', p.149. See also Footnote no. 28 and corresponding text (above).
41Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, f.126.
42Compare Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, f.125 with Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43 regarding the textual material used to identify the site; and Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, f.126, with Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.44 regarding the structure of the aqueduct.
this traveller made little, if any, attempt to examine the site himself but merely recorded
information presented by the local monk acting as his guide. In discussing a spring connected with
the castle, the guide may have been referring to ‘Ain el-Burak which Anon (1791-2) accepted, in
his ignorance, as the spring known as ‘Ain es-Ṣāliḥ from the sealed fountain. This traveller’s
deficiency in personal observation of the site is confirmed by another statement. He says,

These cisterns were the more necessary as the stream that supplied them was very
small, but collected in this way forms a very considerable body of water.43

With the exception of Buckingham (1816)44 whose credibility at this site will be shown to be
extremely dubious, other early British travellers made specific references to the copious nature of
both the sealed fountain45 and the spring issuing from the castle.45

The description produced by William Rae Wilson (1819) reveals his ignorance of the
structure and layout of this part of the site and infers that he, also, examined it barely if at all. His
text states that,

The spring from which these reservoirs are supplied is at a short distance, which I
was told by the monks, is considered to be that alluded to in the Song of Solomon,
and is at the head of the first fountain [i.e. pool or reservoir]47 secured by a door...
I have observed, that the place still appears to be secured by a door, through which
the water flows, and is conducted by a small subterranean canal, on the side of
the road, to Bethlehem and Jerusalem.48

43 Anon (1791-2), MS. c.434, f.126.
44 Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.225.
46 Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p.312.
47 Earlier in his text, W. Rae Wilson refers to the three pools as fountains. See W. Rae Wilson, Travels, p.144.
48 W. Rae Wilson, Travels, p.145.
That the aperture of the sealed fountain was, by the time of Wilson's visit, secured by a door is confirmed by the report of Joliffe who visited the site only two years earlier. However, Wilson misplaces the sealed fountain to a position at the head of the upper pool and is apparently unaware of the subterraneous passage leading from the sealed fountain and providing the connection with the aqueduct.

The least accurate of all the reports on the sealed fountain and its associated channels is given by James Silk Buckingham (1816). He writes,

Near these reservoirs there are two small fountains... These are said to have originally supplied the cisterns through subterranean aqueducts, but they are now fallen into decay from neglect, and merely serve as a watering-place for cattle, and a washing stream for the females of the neighbouring country.

He also claims that nothing could be seen of the aqueduct by which the waters were said to have been conveyed from this place to Jerusalem. None of the reports of early travellers nor those of the later surveyors denied the functioning status of the complex nor the visible remains of aqueducts. It seems impossible that someone with Buckingham's technical and naval background could unwittingly produce such a misrepresentation of the available evidence. The most likely explanation is his desire to uphold the chronology he proposes for the site. For various reasons to be discussed in a later part of this chapter, Buckingham dates the pools and the nearby castle to the Saracen period and claims they form one functional entity. Other material remains at the site which would complicate his novel theory he either denies, as in the case of the aqueduct, or reduces in significance, as in the case of the sealed fountain.

49 Joliffe, *Letters from Palestine*, p.95. The SWP also records that the rock chamber containing the underground spring of 'Ain Silleh (i.e. the sealed fountain) was closed by a wooden door. See Conder, *SWP*, Vol. III, p.90.
Of all the early British travellers who visited the site, only Pococke (1738) and Barry (1819) made extensive efforts to understand and describe the relationship of the pools with the aqueduct system beyond that part of the complex already discussed. Pococke states:

The stream K, on the other side, they told me comes from the sealed fountain, and either goes into the lower pool, or continues its course towards the valley (Fig.1).

Pococke is the earliest British traveller to draw attention to the course, at Solomon's Pools, of the channel later identified as part of the Low Level Aqueduct. In his diagram he correctly shows this channel, designated stream K, running parallel to the north side of pool F. Unfortunately Pococke did not investigate its course at the middle and upper pools and, as noted above, he lacked personal knowledge of the subterranean passage leading from the Sealed Fountain toward the upper pool. As a result, he accepts the over-simplified interpretation of the local clergy that 'stream K...comes from the sealed fountain, and either goes into the lower pool, or continues its course towards the valley'. Indeed, accounts, both early and modern, confirm that the sealed fountain supplied water to the Low Level aqueduct, and that the connection between these two features was more complicated than Pococke suggested.

Nevertheless, Pococke's report is original in describing the passage of the Low Level Aqueduct (his 'stream K') along the north side of the lower pool (F) and its connection with the lower pool. No other early British traveller commented on the course of the Low Level Aqueduct in relation to the three pools until Barry visited the site in 1819. Barry reports that the aqueduct ran parallel to all three pools on the north, an observation later confirmed by Robinson (1838).

53Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.44.
54These early accounts have already been discussed, and the later surveys of Robinson (1838), and A. Mazar and Y. Cohen (1969) uphold the earlier findings. See Robinson, Biblical Researches, Vol. II, p.166; A. Mazar, 'The Aqueducts of Jerusalem', p.81.
55Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Sunday April 18th 1819.
and Mazar. Pococke's statement regarding a channel conducting water from 'stream K' to the lower pool, was not upheld by Barry who claimed the aqueduct ran independently of all three pools. Pococke's observation was later confirmed by Robinson (1838) who reported that the aqueduct channelled a portion of its water to both the middle and lower pools as it ran past them to the north.

A most significant part of the work conducted by Pococke at this site was his attempt to identify and delineate the water channels associated with the lower end of the lower pool (Fig. 1). No other early British traveller, except for Charles Barry, made any effort to elucidate the details of this part of the complex. Pococke relies mainly on his own observations for this part of the report which is seen to contain several accurate details when considered in the light of later research. His text states,

[regarding pool F]... there is a water runs into it at H, which, they told me, comes from Hebron, a little below there is another stream I, that rises at a fountain called Hatan, in a valley to the south east, and runs in a covered channel; and, I suppose can on occasion, be turned into the stream of Hebron, and so into the lowest basin... The fall by steps marked L, has a grotto under it, in which there are three outlets, that may be shut or opened at pleasure; the water runs at present through one of them into the great canal below.

---

59Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, Vol. II, p.166. Richardson (1818) may be referring to independent connections between the cisterns and the aqueduct when he says that 'The fountains communicate freely with each other and are capable of containing a great deal of water, which they discharge into a small aqueduct that conveys it to Jerusalem'. See Richardson, *Travels*, Vol. II, p.380.
The one piece of information for which Pococke counts on the local clergy proved unreliable. Water was not channelled to the lower pool from Hebron.61 Regarding the fountain of Hatan, his own observations are astute and original, and predate by more than a century those generally credited with discovering the significance of this water supply. His remarks on its situation, its passage toward the lower pool in a covered channel, and its function as a water supply to the lower pool were later confirmed by the findings of the SWP62 and those of C. Schick.63 Although Pococke does not mention the fact in his text, his diagram clearly shows a channel running from stream I to the lower part of stream K as the latter heads toward the valley. The inference is that Pococke was aware that stream K, later identified as the Low Level Aqueduct, received a supply of water from the fountain of Hatan, although the earliest statement of this connection was made by Charles Wilson in his report of the *Ordinance Survey of Jerusalem.*64

The identity is uncertain of the feature described by Pococke as a grotto entered by a fall of steps, and which is shown in his diagram at the lower end of the lower pool. Two alternative interpretations are possible. It may represent a well, later observed by Robinson (1838) in this position. Robinson stated that water, conducted here in an aqueduct from the southern valley, ran across the bottom of this well. It then flowed down with a channel coming from the lower pool to enter the aqueduct leading from hence to Bethlehem and Jerusalem.65 namely the Low Level Aqueduct. However, neither Pococke's diagram nor text concur sufficiently with Robinson's description to identify Pococke's grotto as Robinson's well. Robinson makes no mention of steps, nor of controlled outlets for water within the well itself. Also, it is probable that the aqueduct

61For maps illustrating the aqueduct system related to Solomon's Pools, see Mazar, *'The Aqueducts of Jerusalem',* p.83 (map); J. Wilkinson, *'Ancient Jerusalem. Its Water Supply and Population',* pp.38 (Fig. 4), 46 (Fig. 9).
63Schick, *'Die Wasserversorgung',* p.152.
which Robinson states brought water from the southern valley is that which Pococke describes as leading from the fountain of Hatan. In Pococke's diagram this channel is clearly shown running its course outside the grotto, whereas Robinson says it ran along the base of the well.

The other possible identification for the grotto is the chamber situated under the lower pool. In his diary, Barry (1819) includes a fairly detailed description of this chamber, although he mistakenly states its entrance was by a large buttress in the west wall, rather than east wall, of the lower pool.66 His script continues,

In this buttress is a low passage about 90 feet long & arched leading by three steps to a small square chamber at the head of an aqueduct which runs by Bethlehem to Jerusalem. The chamber was too dark to discover much. We heard the water rushing profusely from above in two directions as into an open channel sunk in the floor... the aqueduct to Jerusalem which runs parallel to the pools on the north... is joined by a conduit from the chamber in the buttress of the lower pool... which carries off all the surplus water.67

The descriptions of Pococke and Barry present certain parallels. Both mention the presence of steps leading down to the grotto/chamber. Barry describes a conduit conducting water from the chamber to the aqueduct which, as discussed above, was later identified as the Low Level Aqueduct. Pococke mentions a similar occurrence in his text, and clearly shows in his diagram a channel of water emerging from the grotto to join this aqueduct. Barry does not comment on 'the three outlets, that may be shut or opened at pleasure' which Pococke claims were present in

66Barry's script states that 'The west [should be east] wall of each pool is much loftier and stouter than the others, the valley dipping from east to west [should be west to east], and that of the lowest pool where the valley or ravine is rather deep, is strengthened with a large buttress in the middle'. See Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Sunday April 18th 1819. 'The likely cause of Barry's tendency to reverse the words 'east' and 'west' has already been discussed in Footnote No. 6 (above). That this buttress was situated in the east wall of the lower pool is confirmed by C. Schick. See Schick, 'Die Wasserversorgung', p.151.
67Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Sunday April 18th 1819.
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the grotto. At a later stage, Conrad Schick examined the chamber under the lower pool and his observations may support Pococke's on this point. Schick noted three lots of water emerging into the chamber: a channel conducting the water of `Ain Farūdsche (a spring emerging under the lower pool), a pipe from `Ain el-Burak and `Ain es-Ṣāliḥ, and another pipe from `Ain `Atān (or the fountain of Hatan). These all ran into a stone box situated in the north-east corner of the chamber and from thence led into the Low Level Aqueduct. Schick believed that the chamber served to regulate the water flow.68

Pococke and Barry were the only early British travellers who attempted to understand the complex system of water channels situated at or near the lower pool. A few others reported on this part of the complex but their comments, by comparison, are superficial. They merely mention the presence of an aqueduct carrying water from the lower pool to Jerusalem,69 and Perry includes a basic diagram illustrating this fact (Fig. 2).

**Site Identification and Date**

The early reports of Bell (1669),70 Crouch (ed.), *Fourteen Englishmen* (1669),71 and Godschall (1678)72 make no use of textual or archaeological evidence to support or query the traditional Solomonic identification of the site based on biblical sources. Nevertheless, the cynicism with which Godschall viewed the traditions propounded by the local monks is quite apparent. He writes,

---

68 Schick, 'Die Wasserversorgung', pp.151-152.
70 Bell, *Indian Antiquary* (37), p.159.
71 Crouch (ed.), *Fourteen Englishmen*, pp.92-93.
The water was so clear & good y\textsuperscript{4} they fancy Solomon to keepe itt for his own use sealed itt whence itt had y\textsuperscript{e} name fons signatus, building upon a very slight conjecture only Because in y\textsuperscript{e} Canticles, Cap: 4: v: 12 hee compares his beloved to a fountain sealed, & tis my thinks altogether as slight a conjecture y\textsuperscript{4} because hee compares her in the same place to a garden enclosed, that therefore hee had such a garden, wch they show you... not far from this place wch they call hortus inclusus.\textsuperscript{73}

Godschall's arguments are based on his own personal prejudices and, therefore, are of no scientific merit. In contrast, Maundrell (1697) seeks out a rational basis to support or undermine the traditional identifications of the features at the site. To query the practicability of the place which tradition has designated as that of Solomon's gardens he employs evidence of a topographical nature by drawing attention to the rocky terrain at this spot.\textsuperscript{74} In other instances he uses archaeological evidence. Of the three pools he says,

it is probable enough, they may be the same with Solomon's; there not being the like store of excellent spring-water, to be met with any where else, throughout all Palestine.\textsuperscript{75}

To reach this conclusion Maundrell has applied two purely archaeological methods: a thorough examination of the material remains of the feature itself, and a comparison of the results of this research with appropriate material remains found elsewhere. Unfortunately he does not specify the comparative data used. Maundrell believes that the sealed fountain and the aqueduct leading to Jerusalem receive some confirmation of their Solomonic origins by the presence of ancient stone arches in the former,\textsuperscript{76} and by the complex and durable construction of the latter.\textsuperscript{77} Although

\textsuperscript{73}Godschall, Account of a Journey, p.50.
\textsuperscript{74}Maundrell, Journey, p.120.
\textsuperscript{75}Maundrell, Journey, p.120.
\textsuperscript{76}Maundrell, Journey, p.119.
\textsuperscript{77}Maundrell, Journey, p.121.
Maundrell's application of archaeological evidence to support his conclusion is rather superficial, his intention of producing a rational basis to his argument is clear.

Between Maundrell's visit in 1697 and Buckingham's in 1816, the use of archaeological evidence by early British travellers to date the various parts of the complex is negligible. Most record only the traditional Solomonic origin of the site, albeit sometimes cynically. An expanded use of textual evidence to elucidate its identification and date is introduced by Pococke (1738). This technique, like the archaeological, has a rational basis and will be discussed later in this chapter.

Buckingham is determined to disprove the traditional Solomonic date of the complex and propound his own novel theory of a much later date. To dispute the Solomonic origin of the three cisterns he employs the use of comparative data, but his method represents an example of misappropriate use of archaeological evidence. He states,

[the cisterns] are hardly to be reckoned among the splendid monuments of a luxurious sovereign's wealth or power, since there are many of the Hindoo tanks in Bombay, the works of private individuals, in a mere commercial settlement, which are much more elegant in their design, and more expensive in their construction than any of these.

Buckingham has assumed a continuity of material culture between Palestine and India which is unfounded. As a result his conclusions are invalid.

---

79Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.225.
In another instance, Buckingham applies absolute and relative dating techniques to assign a Saracenic date to the three pools and the castle nearby. His method is logical but the accuracy of his observations is extremely doubtful when viewed in the light of the other reports on the site. By observing the presence of Arabic inscriptions over the door of the castle, Buckingham arrives at an absolute date for this structure to the old Saracen period.\textsuperscript{80} He then proceeds to use the method now known as relative dating when he claims that the masonry of this edifice appeared to be of the same age as the lining of the reservoirs themselves.\textsuperscript{81} Based on this evidence he concludes that the whole [was] rather the work of the Mohammedan conquerors of Judea than of the Jewish monarch.... [making] both the cisterns, and the castle to guard them, a work worthy the attention of the Saracens.\textsuperscript{82}

Several other reports record a Turkish or 'modern' date for the castle,\textsuperscript{83} but none mention the presence of Arabic inscriptions over the door, nor note a resemblance between the masonry of the castle and the lining of the cisterns. That Buckingham misrepresented archaeological evidence at the site is reinforced by the distorted image he presents of the sealed fountain and by his blatant denial of the existence of an aqueduct leading to Jerusalem. The 'absence' of this aqueduct undoubtedly facilitated his theory of the cisterns and the castle forming a self-contained Saracenic complex, and to support his observations regarding the aqueduct he has the audacity to misquote Pococke.\textsuperscript{84} Buckingham states that the two fountains which supplied the cisterns had 'fallen into

\textsuperscript{80}Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.226.  
\textsuperscript{81}Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.226.  
\textsuperscript{82}Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.226.  
\textsuperscript{84}Buckingham states that 'he saw nothing of the aqueduct by which the waters were said to have been conveyed from this place to Jerusalem' (Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.226) and then confirms this observation by pointing out that, 'Pococke has observed, that an aqueduct from these cisterns to Jerusalem would be useless, as they could always be cut off by an enemy... Pococke, Vol. ii, part i, p.43' (Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.226 (Footnote *)). In fact, Pococke said, 'This aqueduct could be of no service to Jerusalem in time of war, as the enemy....cont.'
decay'. By so doing he avoids the necessity of describing the sealed fountain and its associated water channels and his theory can remain intact.

The early British travellers who visited the site after Buckingham made scant use of archaeological evidence to identify and date the site. Robert Richardson (1818) claimed that the tradition attributing a Solomonic origin to the cisterns and the aqueduct was upheld by the antiquity of their appearance. Similar statements regarding the cisterns were made by Carne (1821) and Mackworth (1822). But Fuller (1819) warns against drawing conclusions from such a general characteristic when he says of the cisterns that 'of their date nothing is known; but, like all other great monuments of antiquity in Syria and Palestine, the popular belief attributes them to Solomon'.

Robert Richardson (1818) does, in fact, incorporate the use of archaeological evidence of a more specific nature to support a Solomonic date for the cisterns and, in doing so, produces a crude attempt at classifying architectural remains into a cultural grouping. Of the cisterns he states that 'The workmanship throughout, like every thing Jewish, is more remarkable for strength than beauty'. Richardson's interpretation as a 'Jewish style' of architecture provides an interesting alternative to the common status awarded the cisterns by Buckingham.

Archaeology, if applied correctly, provided one objective method by which the validity of the traditional identification of the site could be assessed. An examination of pertinent references would always cut off the communication; which made the cisterns under their houses, and the fountain of Siloe so necessary to them. See Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43.

---

85 Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.225.
88 Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p.313.
89 Fuller, Narrative of a Tour, p.281.
in ancient historical texts was another. Certainly many of the early British travellers mentioned the biblical references which the local monks associated with the various parts of the site, but the vagueness of these biblical descriptions combined with a mistrust of the clergy themselves to produce an account of little substance in the eyes of several who visited there. Only three of these early travellers, however, made use of other textual evidence to clarify the site's identity.

Pococke's method was the most complex as he co-ordinated the writings from several different sources to support his argument. By drawing upon a passage from Josephus (Antiq. viii, 7), Pococke put forward a name for the site as being that of Etham. This passage also supported the traditional Solomonic origin of the three cisterns and the `garden'. Pococke's text states,

Josephus... says, that there were very pleasant gardens abounding with water at Etham, about fifty furlongs, or six miles and a quarter from Jerusalem, to which Solomon used frequently to go.91

By the use of several biblical references Pococke then sought to confirm these factors and to include the sealed fountain within the Solomonic complex.92 So far, however, no mention had occurred of the aqueduct system. To include this feature Pococke employs evidence from the Talmud that the waters were brought by Solomon to Jerusalem, from the fountain of Etham.93 Viewed in isolation this evidence is irrelevant. By co-ordinating it with the passage from Josephus, however, Pococke makes it a valuable adjunct to his argument.

91Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43 (plus Footnote o).
92Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43 (plus Footnotes p, q, r). The biblical references used by Pococke are Judges xv. 8; Eccles. ii. 5.6; Cantic, iv. 12; II Chron. xi. 6; although he fails to specify the last reference, quoting its content only.
93Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43. In the corresponding footnote, Pococke cites Relandi Palæstina illustrata, I. I. C. See Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43 (Footnote s). Reland does not specify the Talmudic passage involved nor, indeed, the definiteness of the Talmudic evidence in this regard (see Adrian Reland, Palæstina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata, BK.1, Ch.XLVII, pp.cclxxxvii-cclxxxvii). One assumes he is referring to the content of Zebahim 54b which describes the decision to build the Temple in a position lower than that of the well at Etham (i.e. at Jerusalem) rather than at the well itself. A connection between the well and the Temple is inferred but not stated. See Zebahim 54b.
As a result of his extensive and logical use of historical texts the traditional status of the site was strongly inferred but, nevertheless, remained inconclusive. It is to Pococke’s credit as a scholar that he acknowledges the main weakness in his argument when he states,

it is very probable that these [gardens, pools, sealed fountain] are the works of Solomon, as well as the aqueduct, though no express mention is made of it by any other author, so as positively to fix it to this place.94

Attempts at fanning an argument based on historical evidence, other than those standard biblical references applied to the site, were made by Turner (1815)95 and Mackworth (1822).96 Both refuted the traditional evidence which favoured a Solomonic date for the cisterns, sealed fountain and aqueduct system. A more likely alternative, they claimed, was to be formed in II Kings xx.20 which states that it was ‘Hezekiah... [who]... made a pool, and a conduit, and brought water into the city’. That this passage refers to the structure at Jerusalem known as Hezekiah’s Tunnel could not have been realised by Turner or Mackworth as its rediscovery had not yet taken place.97 However, the Bible does contain other references to Hezekiah and his constructions to bring water to Jerusalem and these passages imply a proximity between this city and these undertakings.98 Turner and Mackworth were either unaware of these passages or, more likely, decided to ignore them. The inherent weakness of the method employed by both these travellers lies in the distorted representation of the source material used to validate the premise at hand. Viewed in isolation, the selected passage (II Kings xx.20) provides a realistic alternative to

94Pococke, Description, Vol. II, p.43.
96Mackworth, Diary of a Tour, p.312 (Footnote *).
97In 1838, Edward Robinson rediscovered the tunnel and partly explored it (Robinson, Biblical Researches, Vol. I, pp.498-508). Its identity as Hezekiah’s Tunnel was confirmed by the discovery of an inscription in 1880, and in the excavations of 1909-11, the entire tunnel was cleared out. The meticulous examination carried out at the time by Pere Vincent showed how the work was done (see K. Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land, p.291). The construction and plan of Hezekiah’s Tunnel and its associated water system are discussed by Ruth Amiran in ‘The Water Supply of Israelite Jerusalem’, pp.75-78.
98II Chron. xxxii. 2-4; II Chron. xxxii. 30.
the traditional identity of the site, but when considered in the context of the other passages referring to Hezekiah and his works, its relevance to the site of Solomon's Pools becomes improbable.

Despite the want of historical definition, Pococke's application of textual evidence to support a Solomonic origin for the complex composed the only historical argument of any substance in this regard. Significantly, a similar discussion is used by the modern scholar, J. Wilkinson, when he argues that the lower pool and Low Level Aqueduct leading from it to the Temple at Jerusalem were products of the Israelite monarchy.99

The above account of the research conducted by early British travellers at the Pools of Solomon reveals a superficiality of approach in several cases but, most importantly, clearly demonstrates that scholarly research and interpretation of archaeological data were carried out by some individuals. In particular, the efforts of Henry Maundrell, Richard Pococke and Charles Barry produced results outstanding for their detail and originality.

Inset showing details of sealed fountain:

- **V**: Access through hole in ground
- **O and P**: Arched rooms
- **Q**: Basin
- **S**: 3 streams
- **T**: Stream
- **X**: 2 holes through which water leaves room P
- **D**: Outlet for superfluous water
- **E**: Bank of earth containing a cistern

---

**Fig. 1. Richard Pococke's Plan of the Pools and Sealed Fountain of Solomon.**

Fig. 2. Charles Perry's Diagram of the Pools of Solomon.


Fig. 3. The Pools of Solomon as published by James Silk Buckingham

Chapter Five

The Site of Jerash

A most valuable resource of interpretative data is to be found in the plans produced by some of the British travellers who visited the site of Jerash in the early nineteenth century. When viewed in the light of the modern archaeological reports, these plans, augmented with textual description, reveal the original contribution made by the early travellers regarding the identification and interpretation of the architectural remains at the site. Furthermore, an extremely interesting feature emerges from a comparative study of the individual plans, namely the communication of information which took place between travellers regarding the outcome of their research. This feature also proves useful in another respect. It elucidates the underlying dynamics of the well-advertised accusation of plagiarism launched against James Silk Buckingham by William John Bankes following their two joint visits to Jerash in 1816, and offers some explanation of Bankes's failure to publish the results of his research at the site.

In a letter dated Thebes, June 12, 1819, Bankes wrote to Sir Evan Nepean at Bombay,

The whole substance of what is recited as forming.... [Buckingham's]... second volume [of Travels], with the exception of the last six chapters... is the result of a journey prepared by myself... and is extracted from a journal dictated in part

1Other early British travellers who visited Jerash and left reports on their findings were Thomas Legh who visited the site in 1818 with William John Bankes and Captains Irby and Mangles; John Fuller who visited in 1819; and Robert Wilson in 1821. No plans are included within these reports. Considering the high standard of research which was carried out by Bankes, Irby and Mangles, Legh's report is surprisingly scant and inaccurate. Apparently, Legh did not participate in the main research programme but restricted his activity to a few independent observations. The descriptions given by Fuller and Wilson offer a generalised picture of the remains and include nothing of novel value. See Legh, Journey from Moscow, p.248; Fuller, Narrative of a Tour, pp.332-338; Wilson, MS. 418, pp.35'-46' (n. pag.).

2For accounts of the case, see James Silk Buckingham, Travels among the Arab Tribes Inhabiting the Countries East of Syria and Palestine (Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Browne, and Green, London, 1825), pp.v-ix, 599-668; hereafter cited as Buckingham, Arab Tribes; R. Turner, James Silk Buckingham 1786-1855. A Social Biography, pp.143-146, 218-225.
by me, & in part written with my own hand, of which I imprudently permitted him to retain a copy. What is yet more imprudent, the plans (especially of Gerasa\textsuperscript{3}) announced ... are the work of my own hand, he not even pretending to me, or to any one else whilst he was with me to have any of the qualifications of a draughtsman. He begged me to be allowed to make tracings, for his own satisfaction, with a promise that he would not suffer them to be copied or published.... I have servants still with me who can attest.... [these facts].... & the originals of the papers are all in my Father's hands in England.\textsuperscript{4}

Bankes's wrath undoubtedly inspired the strongly critical assessment of Buckingham's \textit{Travels in Palestine} which appeared in Volume 26 of the \textit{Quarterly Review}.\textsuperscript{5} Ultimately the case of Buckingham versus Bankes came to trial in October, 1826. The notes presented by Bankes were found insufficient to prove his allegation of plagiarism and the outcome was in Buckingham's favour.\textsuperscript{6}

Writing to his friend, B. Babington, from Calcutta on June 3, 1820,\textsuperscript{7} Buckingham states the point of view he maintained throughout the later proceedings against him. He writes,

But, with all our joint pains, the plan of Jerash was very defective; and accordingly, after I had parted with Mr. Bankes.... I made a third visit to Jerash, accompanied by two guides of my own; and being unmolested throughout the whole day, had an opportunity of making a new and more accurate plan of the town generally, besides plans of the separate edifices, with bearings of all the principal points, and memoranda of every useful particular, from which, and not

\textsuperscript{3} Several early British travellers identified the site of Jerash with the ancient city of Gerasa and, in most cases, the similarity between the ancient and the Arab names was cited as positive evidence (see Burckhardt, \textit{Travels in Syria}, p.252; Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.397; Bankes, \textit{Travel Papers}: 'Djerash', f.1r, Fuller, \textit{Narrative of a Tour}, p.338; Wilson, MS. 418, p.'35' (n. pag.). Inscriptions revealed through later research at the site confirmed this identification. See S. Applebaum, 'Gerasa', p.417.

\textsuperscript{4} Bankes, \textit{Correspondence}: 'Copy letter from WJB, Thebes, 12 June 1819 to Sir Evan Nepean, Bombay', ff. 2r-3r. Words underlined as in original.

\textsuperscript{5} 'Art. V -- Travels in Palestine', pp.374-391.

\textsuperscript{6} Turner, \textit{James Silk Buckingham}, pp.224-225.

\textsuperscript{7} Buckingham, \textit{Arab Titles}, p.619.
from our former joint imperfect draft, the plan I have announced for publication is taken.\(^8\)

**The Site Plans**

When Jean Louis Burckhardt visited Jerash in 1812, the threat of Bedouin attack kept his research to a hasty four hour survey of the ruins.\(^9\) Nevertheless, he produced the first plan of the site which was later published in his *Travels in Syria and the Holy Land* (Fig. 1).

From the conjoint visits of James Silk Buckingham and William John Bankes to Jerash in 1816 we have four site plans at our disposal for examination. As well as the plan published in Buckingham's *Travels in Palestine* (Fig. 2), a rougher copy of this plan exists amongst the archival material held at the former family home of the Bankes family at Kingston Lacy in Dorset (Fig. 3). Two further plans of the site contained in these archives are apparently the work of Bankes. One is entitled 'ME Bankes Plan with his observations made in 1816' (Fig. 4) and the other, entitled 'Plan of the Ruins of Djerash in the District of Adjeleoon beyond the River Jordan' (Fig. 5), is, most probably, the original draft made by Bankes at the site. Despite its anonymity, this plan is very similar to that on Fig. 4 and, moreover, other features on this page concur with material directly related to Bankes.\(^10\)


\(^10\)On Fig. 5, the paragraph contained within the area of the site plan representing the eastern part of the city, and beginning 'All this Eastern Portion...' (marked (a)) reappears in a similar position on Fig. 4 (marked (a)) where Bankes is nominated as the author. Likewise the 'Notes' situated at the top left of the site plan on Fig. 5 reappear as the 'References' on Fig. 4. The inset placed at the lower left-hand corner of Fig. 5 shows a diagram of the southern theatre and gives a description thereof and of the northern theatre. When this diagram and script recur amongst a set of plans (Fig. 12), Bankes is specified as the source. The inset situated at the lower right-hand corner of Fig. 5 shows several inscriptions (for enlargement, see Fig. 13) and the accompanying script designates Shech Ibrahim (i.e. Burckhardt) as the source of the lower four of these. The *Quarterly Review* article cited above actually states that Bankes had copied into the margin of his own ground plan some of the many inscriptions from Jerash which Burckhardt had shown him (see 'Art. V - Travels in Palestine', p.387 (Footnote)). Furthermore, these four inscriptions plus the other from the inset on Fig. 5 all appear in... cont.
The articles at Kingston Lacy also contain a plan entitled 'Mr Barry's Plan drawn from the measurements of Messrs. Bankes, Mangles & Irby made in 1818 collated with his own measurements & memorandums taken on the spot in 1819' (Fig. 6). The key source employed by Charles Barry to compose this plan is easily identified. Amongst the Kingston Lacy archives is another anonymous plan, entitled 'General Plan of the Ruins of Djerash' (Fig. 7), which amongst other similarities shows the course and shape of the city wall as identical to that on 'Mr. Barry's [collated] Plan'. A perusal of Barry's own plans leaves no doubt that this anonymous plan represents the site drawing produced by Bankes, Irby and Mangles in 1818, and is not Barry's contribution to the later collated plan. Barry's plan of the site is contained within a collection of his drawings held in the Royal Institute of British Architects in London and is entitled 'Jerash 1819' (Fig. 8). A rougher, and perhaps the original, draft of this plan is kept in the archives at Kingston Lacy (Fig. 9). The most obvious difference between these two plans and that in Fig. 6 lies in the shape and course of the city wall. In his journal, Barry incorrectly identifies the triumphal arch which stood to the south-east of the stadium as the south gate of the city and, consequently, his plans show the southern section of the city wall running its course in this region. In contrast, the plan allegedly produced as a result of compiling his efforts with those of Bankes, Irby and Mangles shows the southern course of the wall running well north of the stadium following the line shown on Fig. 7.

It is apparent from a letter written by Barry's patron, David Baillie, to Bankes in January, 1820 that Baillie was willing to assist Bankes in his preparations for publication and keen to establish a working relationship between this well-respected traveller and Barry. That Bankes had already expressed an interest in employing Barry is inferred. Baillie writes,

I imagined that you might reach England in the fall of the year & in that persuasion I requested Terrick Hamilton to tell you that if any of Mr. Barry's

Buckingham's published account of his visit to Jerash with Bankes in 1816 (Fig. 14). All the above evidence confirms that the site plan on Fig. 5 was drawn by Bankes, most probably on site, in 1816.

11Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Monday 3rd of May 1819.
drawings plans or architectural details could be of any service to you I should have the greatest pleasure in placing them all at your absolute disposal, an offer which I beg here to repeat.... [However] I hope and trust that you will be induced to prolong your stay in Rome until Holy Week & in that case we shall meet & you will have an opportunity of looking over my portfolio & selecting from it at your pleasure. [Of Barry, he states,] I have every reason to be satisfied. He is the most diligent person I ever knew, & it is rare I think to find one & the same person who draws so well in so many different manners. He is besides of a most obliging disposition, & will I am sure do anything that you may choose to ask of him, but I doubt very much whether he would like to engage himself for any pecuniary consideration with any one again either at home or abroad, as his great desire now seems to be the active duties of his profession; at all events you had better become intimate with him before you make a proposal of that kind. I have told him frequently that I meant to offer you the use of his drawings & I think he would be flattered if you were to select any of them for engraving.13

Subsequently, Bankes and Barry established a working relationship which endured for many years. The basis of Barry's employment, however, was as an architect being commissioned by Bankes to carry out private projects for him in England.13 We do not know whether Barry assisted Bankes with his later Oriental studies on a professional basis or if such items as 'Mr. Barry's [collated] Plan...' merely represent a voluntary contribution to Bankes's work.

**Selective Architectural Evidence**

A vast amount of superficial architectural evidence was available to the early British travellers visiting Jerash and was studied and evaluated by these individuals to varying degrees. From this extensive pool, a few architectural complexes have been selected as these provide a viable source of comparative data to determine the individual traveller's contribution to

13A. Mitchell, Kingston Lacy, p.53.
archaeological research and, also, to elucidate communication of knowledge occurring between these individuals.

**The Artemis Temple Complex**

The Preliminary Report of the first two campaigns carried out at Jerash by Yale University and the American Schools of Oriental Research in 1930 states, 'The casual visitor misses one of the most impressive features of the Artemis complex (see Fig. 10). This is the marvelous skill with which the building and its approaches have been adapted to the hill.' Describing the integral parts of the temple complex lying east of the main street or cardo, the authors write,

On his axis he [the architect] threw across the river a bridge that, as it had too sharp a rise for vehicular traffic, must have supported a wide flight of steps. Where this reached the level of the first terrace on the western bank was built an arched monumental gate. This led to a short colonnaded street, raised on a causeway above the neighbouring houses. This afterwards became the nave of a church, and its boundary walls the outside of the two side aisles. The gateway was embodied in the apse.... Where this street joined the main avenue of the city, there was a trapezoidal open space, with two large exedrae at the ends....

---

14 The modern scholar, A. H. M. Jones, drew attention to a Latin inscription found on an altar connected with the temple and which showed that this temple was dedicated to 'Dea anae' [in Greek, 'Artemis'], the patron goddess of Gerasa. See A. Jones, 'Inscriptions from Jerash', pp. 147-148.

15 Significant excavation of Jerash began after World War I with the establishment of the British Mandate. Under John Garstang's direction, the principal street was cleared, as were the two theatres, the propylaea to the Artemis temenos, the propylea church, the Nymphaeum and the south temple and, under J. W. Crowfoot, twelve churches, a synagogue, and various chapels and baptistries were cleared and described. In the two campaigns of 1930, the area situated south of the Temple of Artemis and west of St. Theodore's Church revealed houses and other structures including a small Roman temple. The associated small finds indicated the presence of 6 strata from Hellenistic to Arab times in this area. The 1930 campaigns also concentrated on further elucidating the architectural features of the Artemis Temple Complex including details of the Arab modifications to the Temple building. C. Fisher, 'Jerash-Gerasa 1930. A Preliminary Report of the First Two Campaigns of the Joint Expedition of Yale University and the American Schools of Oriental Research', p. 1 ff; see also Fig. 10.

Plate 9. Portrait of Jean Louis Burckhardt
The opening on the street had large columns between antae, resting on a base of several steps.\textsuperscript{17}

The modern scholar, Applebaum, later noted that the trapezoidal open space became the atrium of the church.\textsuperscript{18}

An examination of the graphic and written descriptions made by the early British travellers of that section of the temple complex lying east of the cardo produces some interesting results.

Burckhardt's (1812) plan (Fig. 1) shows that he correctly assessed the alignment of the temple complex, but his text makes it clear that he did not recognise the relationship of the architectural remains on the east of the main street to the propyleum (n) and temple (a) on the west,\textsuperscript{19} nor did he identify the remains of the church which now occupied the spot.\textsuperscript{20} Nevertheless, he was essentially correct in describing the course of a colonnaded street (o) running from the cardo to the river which was crossed at this point by a bridge (p).\textsuperscript{21}

In 1816, Buckingham and Bankes made their conjoint visits to Jerash. Of the features with which the Artemis Complex was composed, Bankes makes no mention in the 'Observations' which accompanied his plan (Fig. 4). However, his representation of these features finds close parallels in Buckingham's plan (Fig. 2) and text, inferring that the interpretation of the Artemis Complex given by Buckingham concurred with Bankes's ideas at this time. Buckingham writes.\textsuperscript{22}

There are appearances of one continued line of building from the semicircular sanctuary [7] to the palace [9], which is near the centre of the city, or at least of

\textsuperscript{17}Fisher, 'Jerash - Gerasa 1930', pp.25-26.
\textsuperscript{18}Applebaum, 'Gerasa', p.424.
\textsuperscript{19}Burckhardt, \textit{Travels in Syria}, p.262.
\textsuperscript{20}Burckhardt, \textit{Travels in Syria}, p.262.
\textsuperscript{21}Burckhardt, \textit{Travels in Syria}, p.262.
\textsuperscript{22}Note on Fig. 2, the architectural details referred to in the following quote.
Plate 10. Portrait of James Silk Buckingham
the western portion of it. The front of this is still entire, and leaves no doubt that the edifice was a place of residence, and not a temple.... Opposite to this palace, immediately in front of it, on the eastern side of the street is the long-extended façade of a Corinthian temple, with a semi-circular termination to the eastward. The façade is that of a spacious and grand edifice... The most imposing edifice among all these ruins, both for size, grandeur, and commanding situation, is the large Corinthian temple [10] to the W.N.W. of the palace last described.23

This description affords no notion of the existence of a temple complex. Rather, the relevant architectural remains are perceived as unrelated entities. It may be that this interpretation permitted Buckingham to accept a flaw in his appraisal of their spatial relationships. On his plan, the temple is shown out of alignment with the propylæum (Buckingham's palace), and the bridge (16) with the monumental gateway (the semicircular end of Buckingham's Corinthian temple).

In contrast, the plan produced by Bankes in 1816 (Fig. 4) shows the temple in line with the propylæum. In other details of this part of the site, this plan does, however, correspond with that of Buckingham. Both show a line of building extending from the semicircular sanctuary to the 'palace', and the edifice opposite the palace is represented in a similar form on both plans, with neither traveller recognising the presence of the trapezoidal court which faced the main street. The concurrence of these features exemplifies the compatibility of ideas shared by Bankes and Buckingham at the time of their conjoint visits to Jerash.

One may suggest that the alternative orientation of the Artemis temple, the appearance of the bridge, and the increased detail of the edifices themselves on Buckingham's plan did, in fact, result from his own later research at the site.24

24Buckingham maintained that during an independent visit to Jerash later in 1816, he corrected and augmented his original plans. See Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p.132; also, the passage from his letter to Babington quoted earlier in this chapter.
Plate II. Portrait of William John Bankes
The research conducted by Bankes, Irby and Mangles in 1818, and by Barry in 1819 resulted in a more accurate recording of architectural detail of the various parts of the complex and a greater appreciation of their interrelationships than previous research had produced. The content of Bankes’s earlier plan (Fig. 4) and Buckingham’s associated text indicate that the surveying expertise of Irby and Mangles provided the major contribution to the improved analysis of the archaeological evidence shown in the later plan (Fig. 7). This theory finds confirmation in a passage of Mangle’s text which states, that whilst Bankes was drawing, and copying inscriptions, it was, in fact, Irby and Mangles who were measuring the architectural remains at the site. The collated plan (Fig. 6) drawn at a later stage by Barry provides a further example of this co-operation between travellers to improve the outcome of their research.

In his journal, Barry (1819) writes,

In front of the Temple facing the Principal Street is a Propylon.... formed into 3 openings the central extremely large the others small on each side with niches I think above them. The wall is of considerable thickness and at each end of the front project the usual shoulder walls at right angles terminating in antae. In front was a row of 4 Corinthian Columns on pedestals in line with those of the street.... On the opposite side of the street appear to have been a Colonnade and other Archways of approach which appear since to have been converted into a building. The front wall and large semicircular alcove in the rear are evidently additions to the original plan. The columns in the S. side still remain. They are small & of the Roman Ionic order. At the back or east of the present alcove appears to be the abutment of a bridge that probably extended across the valley. There are however to be no other traces of it.

Only two items mentioned in this excerpt from Barry’s journal do not appear on the plans entitled ‘Jerash 1919’ (Figs. 8,9). These are the abutment of the bridge and the archways

25Irby and Mangles, Travels, p.96.
26Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Monday 3rd of May 1819.
of approach.27 In other respects, the text and plans coincide. Barry's plans show that he accurately aligned the various parts of the temple complex he identified, and his script reveals that he correctly attributed the relevant architectural remains on the east of the principal street to this complex.

Although Barry recognised that a later modification to the original architecture had occurred, he failed to identify this secondary structure as a church, and thus would not have perceived the relevance of other pieces of superficial archaeological evidence which Bankes, Irby and Mangles incorporated into their plan (Fig. 7). By comparing Barry's representation of this feature with that of Bankes, Irby and Mangles, and, indeed of modern scholars (Fig. 10), two main differences become apparent.

Barry does not define the trapezoidal court, fronting the main street, which is shown on the other plans. Consequently, in his journal, he wrongly identifies the wall at the back of the court as the front of the secondary building. Whereas Barry presents the colonnade of approach as being the same width as that of the later building, in the other plans it runs within the two outside walls. As the authors of the Preliminary Report write, '[the] short colonnaded street... afterwards became the nave of the church, and its boundary walls the outside of the two side aisles'.28

The 'General Plan of the Ruins of Djerash' by Bankes, Irby and Mangles (Fig. 7) is by far the most accurate and detailed representation of the superficial archaeological remains of this site produced by early British travellers as a result of direct examination of the material evidence. Their delineation and description of the composite parts of the Artemis Temple

27 Although Barry refers to the presence of archways of approach he offers no descriptive detail. The Preliminary Report mentions the presence only of an arched monumental gateway which had been later embodied within the apse of the church (see Fisher, 'Jerash - Gerasa', p.25). Although Barry correctly observes that the large semicircular alcove at the rear of the building is a later addition he fails to mention the presence of the earlier arch in this feature.

Complex are largely congruent with the results of modern research and, therefore, reflect the original status of their observations.

Regarding the temple itself, the plan produced by Bankes, Irby and Mangles in 1818 corresponds in almost every detail to that appearing in the Preliminary Report (Fig. 11). Although the latter includes a reconstruction of the peristyle, the corresponding text states that 'The peristyle on three sides had already disappeared, leaving only the eastern portico intact.'

This is the exact condition shown on Bankes's plan (Fig. 7). Furthermore, these early travellers observed remains of thermae in the basement of the temple which may correspond with the 'interesting series of vaults' described by modern researchers.

That the early (1818) plan omits to show the presence of steps leading up to the temple courtyard and, also, up from the gateway of the propylæum is explained by the fact that these only came to light during later excavation. However, Bankes, Irby and Mangles drew attention to 'Eight Corinthian Columns on pedestals' situated at the extreme front of the temple courtyard and suggested that these 'probably made part of a second propylæum.' This premise complied with the findings of later research which showed that these columns formed part of a portico standing in front of the blank wall which was pierced by the gate of entrance to the temple courtyard. This portico was reached by the steps uncovered by the later excavations.

---

30 Fig. 7, Reference no. 18.
32 Re. the steps leading up to the temple courtyard see, G. Lankester Harding, *The Antiquities of Jordan*, p.95; and for a description of the restored propylæum, see Fisher, 'Jerash - Gerasa', p.26.
33 Fig. 7, Reference no. 15.
34 Harding, *Antiquities*, p.95. On the early site plans, the temple courtyard is shown surrounded by either a single or a double colonnade. It later became clear that the boundary of the temple courtyard was composed of a single Corinthian colonnade bordering the inside of a solid wall which continued around the area. The space between this colonnade and the blank wall was filled with rooms and recesses. See Harding, *Antiquities*, pp.90 (Fig. 4), 96.
With regard to the feature nominated as the 'Grand Propylæum' on the 1818 plan, several parallels exist between its depiction by Bankes, Irby and Mangles, and that of modern scholars (Fig. 10). All place it at some distance back from the main street and show the three entrances recessed from the façade of the edifice. Furthermore, the façade is shown as extending to the line of the outer walls of the temple courtyard. The modern plans record two square towers flanking the entranceway, a feature which apparently went unnoticed by Bankes, Irby and Mangles, although Barry's plan (Fig. 9) indicates that superficial remains of this characteristic were, at least, partially visible.

The recording and interpretation of the relevant archaeological remains lying east of the Cardo is perhaps the most impressive part of the work carried out by Bankes, Irby and Mangles on the Artemis Temple Complex. Comparing their output with the modern plan reveals an almost identical delineation of these remains and reflects the vast improvement they had achieved on all other attempts by early British travellers at recording and interpreting these features. The trapezoidal court is now clearly defined and the colonnade placed correctly within the boundary walls. Even the vestiges of the bridge are shown in an appropriate relationship to the complex. Furthermore, both the primary and secondary use of the remains are now correctly identified as belonging to an 'Edifice originally part of the approach to the Northern Temple, subsequently converted into a Christian Church'.

When the results of Bankes's earlier survey are considered in the light of those produced by this later effort, the latter had clearly stemmed from an integration of an intense examination of the superficial archaeological evidence with an expert survey thereof. During this later visit, Bankes had discovered and recorded epigraphic data which proved, for the first time, the presence of Christian remains at the site.

---

35 Fig. 7, Reference no. 13.
36 Irby and Mangles, Travels, p.147. Bankes, Irby and Mangles actually conducted two separate periods of research at Jerash in 1818 (see Irby and Mangles, Travels, pp.93-97, 147) and it was not until the later visit that epigraphic evidence of Christian occupation at the site was identified. It is clear from Bankes's manuscript.
At a later stage, Charles Barry produced a plan of the ruins of Jerash reputedly based upon a collation of his own observations and measurements taken in 1819 with those taken by Bankes, Irby and Mangles in 1818 (Fig. 6).

It is clear that Barry now rejects his own representation of the parts of the Temple Complex and their relative position within the site (Figs. 8, 9) in favour of those of Bankes, Irby and Mangles (Fig. 7). Moreover, the references to the constituent parts of the complex given on the new plan (Fig. 6) are transferred straight from Bankes’s earlier plan (Fig. 7). The greater accuracy of Bankes, Irby and Mangles in depicting and interpreting the elements of the temple complex compared to Barry has already been demonstrated, and one might surmise that Barry’s acknowledgement of this fact resulted from the communication which was established between Barry and Bankes after their return to England. The minor addition to Bankes’s 1818 plan of the temple complex which Barry incorporates into his so-called collated plan is merely a clearer definition of the architectural remains rather than evidence derived from his own research.

On the collated plan (Fig. 6), the side boundaries of the forecourt which stood inside the ‘Grand Propylæum’, and those of the temple courtyard, as well as the rear boundary of the latter are now more clearly defined, although Barry retains the misconception common amongst the early British travellers that these external boundaries of the temple courtyard are composed of a colonnade of Corinthian columns.37 It was not until modern excavation of the site took place that part of the side walls of the forecourt was actually revealed (Fig. 10).

---

37 See Footnote no. 34 (above).
It is unfortunate that Barry did not augment Bankes's representation of the 'Grand Propylæum' with the architectural remains appearing on his own plan which were later identified as the square towers flanking the entranceway (Fig. 9). 38

The City Wall

During his hurried survey of Jerash, Burckhardt (1812) traced the outline of the ancient city wall by following the line of insulated fragments visible upon the surface. 39 The shape he produced (Fig. 1) coincides but vaguely with that determined by later, more accurate surveys (Figs. 7, 10), and the architectural details he noted are limited to the presence of the north and south city gates and the structural composition of the wall itself. 40

In his text, Buckingham (1816) reports that the city of Jerash occupied nearly a square, the sides of which were not perfectly straight due to the inequality of the ground along which they ran. 41 These remarks are illustrated in his ground plan of the course of the city wall (Fig. 2) which conveys a shape even less consistent with that shown on the modern site plan (Fig. 10) than that presented by Burckhardt.

Like Burckhardt, Buckingham reported the presence of a north and a south city gate, but also added, 'there are..... [are no]... conclusive appearances of there ever having been any other than these two entrances into the city'. 42 Furthermore, he described the presence of two towers at the north-west angle of the city wall 43 and clearly shows these on the plan. Another

40 Burckhardt reports that the wall was upwards of eight feet in thickness and built of square hewn stones of middling size (Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p.253). A similar description is given by G. Lankester Harding in his Antiquities, p.97.
41 Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, pp.353-354.
42 Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.355.
43 Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, pp.391.
feature included by Buckingham within the fortification system lay west of the north city gate. Here he records the presence of a wall of a large and solid edifice which "from its plainness, strength, and situation, we thought to be a military guard-house".\textsuperscript{44}

A comparison of Bankes's 1816 plans (Figs. 4, 5) of the city wall and its associated features with that of Buckingham shows almost total agreement regarding the shape of the wall, the presence of only two city gates in the south and north walls respectively, the inclusion of two towers within the line of the wall at the north-west angle, and the identification of the feature lying west of the north gate as a military guard-house.\textsuperscript{45}

Amongst the criticisms of Buckingham's archaeological work presented in the article of the \textit{Quarterly Review} cited above were his recognition of only two entrance gates in the city wall of Jerash\textsuperscript{46} and his identification of the architectural feature lying west of the north gate as a military guard-house.\textsuperscript{47} By the time this article was written, Bankes was fully aware that the western section of the city wall contained two gates leading into the northern and southern cross-streets, and also that the "military guard-house" was merely an indented section of the city wall itself (Fig. 7). Nevertheless, his 1816 plans make it clear that, at this time, his ideas on the city wall and its associated features concurred with those expounded by Buckingham in his published plan and text.

One may suggest that the inferior quality of such findings precluded Bankes from publishing his own earlier plan, although doing so would have sustained a basis to the accusation of plagiarism he was directing against Buckingham. Rather, it seems, Bankes chose to highlight the inadequate standard of Buckingham's research.

\textsuperscript{44}Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, pp.391.
\textsuperscript{45}Below 'Reference E' on Fig. 4, the script states, "There seems to have been no other gates to the city besides the two which are noticed. The great building near the northern gate which is projected forwards parallel to the main street was perhaps a Military Guard house". This passage also appears as the last 'Note' on Fig. 5.
\textsuperscript{47}"Art V – Travels in Palestine", p.386.
The ground plan of the course of the city wall which resulted from the detailed research conducted at Jerash in 1818 by Bankes, Irby and Mangles (Fig. 7) is striking for its similarity with that produced by modern archaeologists (Fig. 10) and must be acknowledged as the earliest accurate representation of this feature of the site. The inferior quality of Bankes's earlier plans (Figs. 4, 5) combined with the statement cited above from Mangles's text support the premise that Irby and Mangles were primarily responsible for the detailed survey which produced this vastly superior result.

The feature identified in 1816 by Bankes and Buckingham as the 'military guard-house' is now clearly shown as part of the northern section of the wall. The four main entrance gates are now defined and coincide in position with the modern plan, and many additional towers have been identified along the western and eastern sections of the city wall.

In contrast, Charles Barry's (1819) ground plans of the course and architecture of the city wall (Figs. 8, 9) reflect a deficiency of research unusual for this particular traveller. Although he correctly identifies the 'military guard-house' as part of the city wall he shows it running almost parallel to the principal street rather than angled to it (Figs. 7, 10). The north entrance gate to the city is accurately placed, but the one gate in the western section of the wall which he notices is put at the north-west angle rather than at the termination of the line of the northern cross-street. The shape of the wall is ill-defined and no towers are identified along its course.

However, the most significant flaw in Barry's plans is the delineation he proposes for the southern part of the wall. The southern gate of entrance recorded by other early British travellers who visited the site before him does not even appear on Barry's plan. That Barry

---

Footnote no. 25 (above) and corresponding text.
identified the Triumphal Arch lying south of the city as the southern gate is confirmed in his journal where he writes, 'near the S. E. corner of the... [stadium or Naumachia]... is the South gate of the city consisting of a large central archway and a lesser one on each side'.

The modern scholar, G. Lankester Harding, was later to observe that 'The Triumphal Arch was erected to celebrate... [the personal visit of Emperor Hadrian in 129-130 A.D.]... and it would seem that there was the intention to extend the area of the city as far as the Arch, for the ends were left rough, as though for bonding in to a wall'.

One surmises that the rough ends of the arch caused Barry to assume that the wall led out from it on each side, although this is nowhere stated. The course he delineates for the city wall in this region is based purely upon archaeological evidence confabulated to support his mistaken identity of the south gate of the city. That Barry's later communication with Bankes enlightened him to his earlier misinterpretation is shown by the course of the city wall he drew on Fig. 6.

City Planning

Burckhardt's (1812) brief reconnaissance of the ruins of Jerash enabled him to evaluate, with reasonable accuracy, a rudimentary street plan of the site (Fig. 1). He correctly identified the course of the principal street as running from the north city gate (w) to a large open space (f) enclosed by a magnificent semicircle of Ionic columns, fifty-seven of which were still standing. At points (r) and (d) this main street was intersected by two cross-streets.

Furthermore, Burckhardt found paving which he associated with a street running southwestwards from the remains of a small temple (b) to the southern cross-street (c). He was, in fact, the only early British traveller to describe this street or include it on his plan. Modern

49 Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Monday 3rd of May 1819.
50 Harding, Antiquities, p.85.
51 Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, pp.256-257.
52 Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, pp.255, 260-261.
53 Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p.255.
excavators later found a street running in front of the Churches of St. John the Baptist, St. George, and SS. Cosmas and Damian,⁵⁴ and the similarity of its position on the modern plan (Fig. 10) with that street shown on Burckhardt's plan infers that Burckhardt had identified superficial remains of this street. Most probably his temple (b) was actually part of the complex of the three churches.

Burckhardt's delineation of the southern cross-street is correct as far as it goes. To the east he traces it to a bridge (k) which led across the river.⁵⁵ Its continuation past this point is ill-determined even on the modern plan (Fig. 10). Westwards, he identifies its course to the intersection with the street running down from his temple (b),⁵⁶ but apparently failed to examine the ground in which it continued past this point to the western part of the city wall.

The northern cross-street, he reported, continued east of the intersection (r) until it terminated in a large edifice (u).⁵⁷ It was later shown that the columns which Burckhardt identified as belonging to the eastern part of this cross-street were, in fact, part of the large edifice itself and lay south of the line of intersection with the main street. Undoubtedly Burckhardt's limited examination of the lay-out of this building and of its relative position to the intersection (r) caused this misconception.

Of the superficial architectural remains lying west of the intersection (r), Burckhardt associated only three Ionic pillars with the northern cross-street.⁵⁸ The row of large Corinthian columns (s) standing in line with these he describes only as an appendage to the theatre (t).⁵⁹ Burckhardt's failure to conjecture on the full course run by the western sections of both the

⁵⁵Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p.262.
⁵⁶Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p.255.
⁵⁷Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p.262.
⁵⁸Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p.261.
⁵⁹Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p.261.
north and south cross-streets was undoubtedly related to his ignorance of the two gates in the western part of the city wall.

Since Burckhardt's scant survey produced a rather disjointed and incomplete picture of the architectural remains of Jerash, he conceived no notion of a city plan underlying the arrangement of these features. This fact is confirmed by his comments on the age of the principal street. Observing the presence of capitals of both the Ionic and the Corinthian orders, he concluded that the long street was a patch-work, built at different periods.\textsuperscript{60} The concept of a city plan might have led to the correct supposition that the presence of Corinthian columns in part of the street represented only a later replacement of the original Ionic colonnades.\textsuperscript{61}

In contrast to Burckhardt, Buckingham (1816) writes,

\begin{quote}
The general plan of the whole [city] was evidently the work of one founder, and must have been sketched out before the Roman city, as we now see it in its ruins, began to be built.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

The paucity of epigraphic evidence seen by Bankes and Buckingham at Jerash in 1816 made Buckingham's text necessarily deficient in details of absolute dating of the various architectural features of the site and, besides, Buckingham showed little interest in applying relative dating even when appropriate evidence was readily available. Rather, his text is concerned with describing examples of city planning techniques evident in the architectural layout of Jerash and not with placing these examples in a chronological sequence of city development.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{60}Burckhardt, \textit{Travels in Syria}, p.256.
\textsuperscript{61}Harding, \textit{Antiquities}, p.85.
\textsuperscript{62}Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.354.
\textsuperscript{63}Modern scholars support the notion that the city was designed as a unit by a Roman architect in the first century A.D. and was built mainly in the first and second centuries. Subsequently, projects took place to modify or augment the initial plan. See C. McCown, \textit{The Ladder of Progress in Palestine. A Story of Archaeological Adventure}, pp.314-316, 318; Harding, \textit{Antiquities}, p.78.
The triumphal arch, 'naumachia' and south city gate (Fig. 2) comprised one such example of city planning. Since the triumphal arch lay in a direct line with the south city gate and the 'naumachia' lay parallel to this line of approach, Buckingham wrote that these items were built to celebrate the triumphal march and display of exploits of the honoured individual. He draws attention to the architectural similarity between the triumphal arch and the south city gate, although does not specifically refer to their implied contemporaneity.

Indeed, modern research has confirmed that a project of city planning took place in this part of the site and the reason for its instigation concurs with the theory presented in Buckingham's text. An inscription uncovered during the modern excavation of the triumphal arch showed that it was erected to honour Hadrian's visit to Gerasa in 130 A.D. Research also showed that, as part of this celebration, the original south gate of the city was replaced by a smaller replica of the triumphal arch. However modern scholars have varied in the date of construction assigned to the 'naumachia' from the first to the third century A.D.

Although the script on Bankes's 1816 plans (Figs. 4, 5) contains no interpretation of the functional relationship of these architectural remains, the representation of these features on his plans is very similar to that on Buckingham's plan (Fig. 2) and illustrates a flow of information between these two travellers at this time. Certainly Buckingham gives the 'naumachia' a more northerly orientation and depicts a more completed version of the path proposed for the triumphal march and of the stream leading to the 'naumachia' but these differences are slight and offer little proof of originality on Buckingham's behalf.

68 Applebaum, 'Gerasa', p.423.
70 Applebaum, 'Gerasa', p.423.
The article which later appeared in the *Quarterly Review* and aimed to denigrate Buckingham's work drew upon examples from this part of the site to further its cause. Buckingham is criticised for his identification of the feature he calls a 'naumachia', for failing to observe the presence of seats therein and for describing its water supply as crossing the main stream of the city in an aqueduct upon arches. A study of the script on Bankes's 1816 plans reveals a concurrence with all these opinions. As with the other examples cited from the *Quarterly Review* and discussed above, Bankes, through further research, became aware of the fallibility of these remarks. His possible motivation in suppressing the publication of his earlier material and for not employing it in his charge of plagiarism against Buckingham has already been discussed.

Buckingham's text draws attention to another architectural arrangement which was seemingly planned to give the illusion of the southern and northern gates of the city lying in a straight line with one another. Buckingham states,

On passing within... [the southern]... gate, the attention is suddenly arrested by the beautiful group of buildings which appear on the left, consisting of a peripteral temple, a theatre, and a circular colonnade. From the suddenness of the charm which this produces on the beholder, the actual deviation from a right line is not at all perceived... this illusion, which at first is principally caused by

---

71 Art V - 'Travels in Palestine', p.385.
73 Art V - 'Travels in Palestine', p.385.
74 Amongst the various measurements given at the top left-hand corner of Fig. 5 are four (second to fifth from top) referring to the 'Naumachia'. On Fig. 4, the 'Reference' describing feature 'B' (which corresponds to the second 'Note' on Fig. S) makes no mention of seats therein and, moreover, states that 'a channel for supplying it with water... might probably be traced to communicate with the aqueduct which is indicated on the plan crossing the Valley and the Stream upon three Arches'.
75 On Fig. 7, the 'naumachia' is now described as a 'Stadium convertible to the purposes of a Naumachia' (see 'Reference' no. 3). Although an 'artificial watercourse' appears on this plan, it is no longer delineated as crossing the stream upon arches. Amongst the Kingston Lacy archives is a page of plans, two of which are clearly cross-referenced with items (nos. 1 and 32) on Fig. 7. It seems likely that all the plans on this page of plans are diagrams of architectural features examined and drawn by Bankes, Irby and Mangles at Jerash in 1818. Of most relevance to the present discussion is a cross-section entitled 'Seats of the Stadium' which would confirm Bankes's knowledge of this characteristic by 1818. See 'Djerash. Plan of seats of stadium, City Gate, tomb no. 1 and 32', Part III A 11, Bankes MSS. (Kingston Lacy, Dorset).
the splendour of the whole view, is considerably assisted by the front wall of the 
platform of masonry, built to support the foundations of the peripteral temple 
above it, and partly, perhaps, to aid the effect. As this wall is perfectly parallel 
with the direction of the line of movement in going toward the colonnade, and 
the view is directed to the centre of this great circle, the deception is completed 
on arriving there by a magnificent prospect of the principal street, which is lined 
by a continued avenue of columns, extending to the opposite gate of the city on 
the north. Nothing could be more ingenious than this contrivance to hide an 
irregularity of plan. The nature of the ground seems not to have admitted the 
placing the gates of the city immediately opposite to each other, and having the 
street between them in a right line: but this defect is so happily veiled I believe, 
many persons might enter it at one end, and quit it at the other, without at all 
perceiving it.76

Regarding the 1816 site plans of Bankes (Figs. 4, 5) and Buckingham (Figs. 2, 3), those 
of the former are more in keeping with certain details contained in the above quote and with 
another relevant piece of information to be found in Buckingham's text. Buckingham wrote that 
the entablature of the 'great circle' was broken at the space opening to the great street on the 
north, and at the space fronting the façade of the peripteral temple and the city gate on the 
south,77 but regarding these last two details his plans are inconsistent with his text. Apart from 
the opening onto the main street, the entablature appears to continue around the entire 'circle'. 
Bankes has not attempted to reconstruct the 'circle' in this manner.

Furthermore, Bankes extends the front line of the temple platform beyond that shown on 
Buckingham's plans, so that its northern end would contact the line of the 'great circle' as later 
plans revealed to be the case (Fig. 10). But more pertinent to the content of the above quote is 
the fact that the extended line of the temple platform seen on Bankes's plans would readily 
support the desired optical illusion whereas that appearing on Buckingham's plans would not.

76Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.360-361.
77Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, p.376.
This agreement between Buckingham's text and Bankes's plans, and the dissension between Buckingham's text and plans would imply that Bankes conceived this example of town planning at Jerash and that Buckingham merely presented Bankes's ideas in his text without bothering to co-ordinate the relevant data with his own plan.

Likewise, Buckingham's discussion of the street system, which he presents as another example of town planning at the site, includes details which are inconsistent with the particulars shown on his plan but, significantly coincide with those on Bankes's 1816 plans. In his text, Buckingham writes that the main street was intersected at nearly equal distances of one fourth of its length from each gate by two other streets crossing it at right angles.\textsuperscript{78} Toward the east, the southern street of intersection led to a bridge.\textsuperscript{79} Toward the west, the northern theatre fell nearly in line with the northern street of intersection.\textsuperscript{80} The order in this northern street was Ionic and a few columns thereof remained standing.\textsuperscript{81}

On Buckingham's plan (Fig. 2), the southern cross-street does not terminate in a bridge, whereas on Bankes's 1816 plans (Figs. 4, 5) this feature is clearly marked. Likewise, Bankes shows the few remaining Ionic columns standing near the northern square of intersection and further along, in line with the street, he depicts two rows of columns. The text on another set of plans (Fig. 12) contained in the Kingston Lacy archives shows that Bankes was toying with the possibility that these two rows formed an open scene of the northern theatre. In contrast, Buckingham places the northern theatre in such close proximity to the square of intersection that there is barely room for the remaining Ionic columns. The latter are omitted from his plan altogether. The position he gives to the northern theatre would entirely obliterate the line of the street. The two rows of columns are no longer aligned with the square of intersection.

\textsuperscript{78}Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.355.
\textsuperscript{79}Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.355.
\textsuperscript{80}Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.386, 389.
\textsuperscript{81}Buckingham, \textit{Travels in Palestine}, p.389.
If credence is given to Bankes as the originator of the ideas on town planning at Jerash described in Buckingham's text, the identity of the surveyors who produced the plan of the site in 1818 as Irby and Mangles is, by inference, confirmed. On this plan (Fig. 7), the orientation recorded for the 'naumachia' would no longer allow its east side to align with a path leading from the triumphal arch to the south city gate. In fact, its north-east end would cut across this path entirely. Moreover, the border of the 'Elliptical peristyle of Ionic Columns' is reconstructed, as on Buckingham's plan, to enclose the inner space except for the opening to the main street.

By deviating from Bankes's 1816 plan in these two respects, the 1818 plan undermines the validity of the material evidence used to support two examples of town planning at the site. Had Bankes participated in the actual survey he would have surely encouraged a reassessment of these features. Since Bankes's 1816 plan does, in this regard, coincide more closely with the findings of modern research (Fig. 10) than does the 1818 plan, a reassessment of these remains in 1818 would have drawn this plan into line with the other two.

Despite these minor deficiencies, the 1818 plan provides the best representation of the site produced by any early British travellers. The layout of the street system is seen to be clearly and accurately defined when compared with the modern plan (Fig. 10). The relationship of the cross-streets to the gates in the western part of the city wall is apparent. The columns connected with the edifice adjacent to the eastern section of the northern cross-street are no longer misconstrued as part of the latter. Moreover, the two rows of Corinthian columns adjacent to the northern theatre are identified as a portico standing behind a closed scene and not as constituent parts of an open scene as Bankes had considered in 1816. The labelling attached to the enlarged diagram of this theatre headed 'MI Barry's plan of the Minor
Theatre..." (Fig. 12) clarifies this point.\(^{82}\) That this portico formed part of the northern cross-street is inferred by its position on the 1818 site plan.

Barry (1819) (Fig. 8) identified only one aspect of town planning at Jerash. In his journal he writes,

\[\text{The plan is simple. The principal street divides the city longitudinally and is intersected by 2 transverse streets with (probably) triumphal archways at the intersections... The principal street terminates in a circus surrounded by a peristyle of Ionic columns, 57 of which are still erect.}\(^{83}\]

Since Barry failed to correctly identify the south gate of the city, it would have been impossible for him to conceive either of the other two notions of city planning presented in Buckingham's text.

On his plan, Barry accurately depicts the principal street as running from the 'Ionic circus' to the north city gate, but his delineation of the northern and southern cross-streets is, in some aspects, unsatisfactory. No connection is shown with the western part of the city wall and, like Burckhardt, Barry confused the eastern portion of the northern cross-street with the colonnades which actually composed part of the adjacent edifice. Nevertheless, by identifying the columns adjacent to the northern theatre as part of the northern cross-street\(^{84}\) Barry concurs with the findings of Irby and Mangles and with those of later research.\(^{85}\)

---

\(^{82}\)Although this diagram is entitled 'Mr Barry’s plan... drawn from the observations and admeasurements of Messrs Bankes, Irby and Mangles in 1818 collated with his own admeasurements and memorandums made on the spot in the year 1819' it resembles far more closely the plan of the northern theatre seen on Fig. 7 than that on Barry’s own site plans (Figs. 8, 9). As with Fig. 6, it would seem that Barry has based this so-called collated plan on an earlier plan made by Bankes, Irby and Mangles.

\(^{83}\)Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Monday 3rd of May 1819.

\(^{84}\)Barry, Diaries, Vol. 10, Monday 3rd of May 1819.

In his later plan of Jerash (Fig. 6), Barry's representation of the form and relationship of the 'naumachia', triumphal arch and the south city gate, of the latter, the edge of the (southern) temple platform and the Ionic peristyle, and of the main street system is, with one exception, copied straight from the plan produced by Bankes, Irby and Mangles in 1818 (Fig. 7). Barry's only innovative measure is to outline distinctly the course of the western section of the northern cross-street. The northern theatre is now clearly placed to the south thereof.

Synopsis

An analysis of select architectural complexes appearing on the early plans of Jerash and in the relevant textual descriptions has produced important evidence of the academic communication between individual travellers and of their comparative standards of research. In addition, it has elucidated the factors which motivated William John Bankes to refrain from publishing his material on Jerash and from utilising it in his later assault on James Silk Buckingham. A brief recapitulation of the outcome of the analysis is worthwhile.

It was inevitable that the scant nature of Burckhardt's (1812) research at Jerash produced a limited and disjointed evaluation of its architectural remains. From the available documentation it is clear that Burckhardt communicated certain findings with Bankes who, in turn, passed these on to Buckingham, but the character of this material was epigraphic rather than architectural.86

The conjoint survey of the site conducted by Bankes and Buckingham in 1816 was more thorough than that of Burckhardt but still far from comprehensive. Such factors as their limited appreciation of the elements composing the Artemis Temple Complex, and their ignorance of the city gates in the western part of the city wall make this clear. It was shown that, in certain

86See Footnote no. 10 (above).
respects, Buckingham’s text complied more with the information on Bankes’s plan than with that appearing on his own published plan of the site. In attempting to understand why Bankes did not publish his own material and utilise this to support his accusation of plagiarism against Buckingham, one can only suggest that Bankes did not wish to expose publicly the inferior standard of his own earlier research at the site. Buckingham’s plan does, in fact, show some evidence of later research carried out by himself but its outcome was not impressive.

When Bankes revisited Jerash in 1818, he was accompanied by Captains Irby and Mangles. From the analysis of the material it has become apparent that the highly accurate site plan which now emerged was, primarily, the result of the surveying skills applied by these two naval officers. There can, however, be little doubt that Bankes’s research of the epigraphic data at the site assisted the survey by elucidating the identity of various architectural remains. The likely importance of his work in re-evaluating the elements connected with the Artemis Temple Complex was noted.

It is to Bankes’s credit as an early proponent of the scientific approach to field archaeology that he took advantage of the presence of Irby and Mangles by organising an extensive expedition to utilise their skills in order to upgrade the level of research previously carried out at various sites including Jerash. That the material Bankes accumulated from this expedition has not yet been published is most unfortunate.87

When Charles Barry examined Jerash in 1819 he made a few astute observations regarding the architectural remains but, on the whole, the outcome of his survey is disappointing. The friendship and working relationship Barry later established with Bankes in England undoubtedly expanded his knowledge of the site as his ‘collated’ plan reveals. It was

87Amongst the sites examined were Tiberias, Bysan, Jerash, the ‘Tombs of the Kings’ at Jerusalem, and Petra. Although a brief description of the tour appears in Irby and Mangles, Travels, pp.90-150, the archaeological discussion is scant.
noted that Barry did not appear to transfer any information from his own site plans even when this was more correct as in the case of the towers of the propylæum of the Artemis temple. His augmentation was limited to a clearer definition of a few architectural features. One may infer that, in this instance, Bankes was merely utilising the drafting skills of Barry to produce a more finished plan of Jerash than that made on site in 1818.
Fig. 1. Jean Louis Burckhardt's Plan of Jerash (1812).

Fig. 2. James Silk Buckingham's Published Plan of Jerash (1816)

Fig. 3. Rough copy of 'Mü Buckingham's published plan' (1816)

Source: 'Mü Buckingham's Plan with his observations made in 1816: Djerash. Plans of city by Bankes, Buckingham and Barry'. Part III A 18a, Bankes MSS., Kingston Lacy, Dorset.
Fig. 4. ME Bankes, Plan with his observations made in 1816.

Source: ME Bankes, Plan with his observations made in 1816, Dieracks, Plans of city by Bankes, Buckingham and Bank., Part III A 182, Bankes MSS, Kingston Lacy, Dorset.
Fig. 5. William John Bankes's 'Plan of the Ruins of Djerash in the District of Adjeloon beyond the River Jordan' (1816).

Fig. 6. 'Mr Barry's Plan drawn from the observations and admeasurements of Messrs Bankes, Mangles & Irby made in 1818 collated with his own admeasurements & memorandums taken on the spot in 1819'.

Source: 'Mr Barry's Plan drawn from the observations and admeasurements of Messrs Bankes, Mangles & Irby made in 1818 collated with his own admeasurements & memorandums taken on the spot in 1819: Djemash. Plans of city by Bankes, Buckingham and Barry', Part III A 18a. Bankes MSS., Kingston Lacy, Dorset.
Fig. 7. 'General Plan of the Ruins of Djerash' made by Bankes, Irby and Mangles in 1818.
Fig. 8. 'Jerash 1819' by Charles Barry.

Fig. 9. Original (?) Draft of 'Jerash 1819' by Charles Barry.

Churches of St. John the Baptist, St. George, SS. Cosmas and Damian

Fig. 10. Modern Plan of Jerash.

Source: S. Applebaum, "Gerasa", p.418.
Fig. 11. Modern Plan of the Temple of Artemis.

Fig. 12. 'Mr Bankes' Plan of the Great Theatre with his observations made in 1816; 'Mr Barry's plan of the Minor Theatre'.

Source: Djerash. Plans of Theatres at Djerash, drawn to same scale, Part III A 38a, Bankes MSS., Kingston Lacy, Dorset.

See overleaf for enlargement of script.
The enlarged Plan of the more Southern of the two Theatres, chiefly for the purpose of enlightening the Architectural Designs of the Scenes (which is drawn in our last Number), shews in its actual state, the upper part is very imperfect throughout, and the lines are traced in outline only. The superstructure or whatever may have stood on the top of them must be very high, for some of the columns do not amount much of an foot proportion, and yet the three Stage Rooms are built up to their tops; or, if accurately traced as it is, the scene is the most exquisite that I have ever seen, and my estimate of their size and arrangement would give a very perfect idea of what these buildings were and of their general effect. In the manner that occupied the whole space would be found the stage, which measures about 15 feet wide, and 12 feet 6 inches deep, and the breadth of the stage is about 12 feet 6 inches and in the semicircle that is above the stage and in the centre of the stage about 12 feet. The stage house is a square, four stories high, with open spaces on the side; and the rooms above the stage are lighted by windows on all sides. It is estimated that the theatre was calculated to hold 15,000 people. The first piece of the other Theatre is in a much grander style, but it is not easy to understand how to build a proper theatre of a scale, being altogether a reproduction of these columns, which are of the Corinthian order, of a respectable size, and disposed in two series, one parallel to each other, each bearing its architrave and frieze. The main entrance is a temple front, and consists of six columns, which are attached to square pilasters at the sides and, it appears to the eye, that the line towards the centre are set more apart than the others. The inner range of columns is imperfect, but only remaining erect and entire. The columns that were originally similar and similarly disposed with the other, but I am not certain as to which was the first to be completed, or how many were in the last mentioned Theatre. It is possible that the inner line of columns may have been always intended in the centre to give more effect to the perspective, and so had two only towards each extremity of the scene, so that one half is still standing.
Fig. 13. Enlargement of Inscriptions from Bankes's 'Plan of Djerash in the District of Adjeloon beyond the River Jordan' (1816).

Fig. 14. Inscriptions from Jerash published by James Silk Buckingham.

Source: Buckingham, Travels in Palestine, Plate opp. p.405.
Chapter Six

Conclusion

At the outset of this study it was claimed that by making a selection of sites and studying in detail the methodology applied by individual early British travellers to the archaeological remains it would be possible to produce a more complete analysis of the archaeological research carried out in Palestine during the period c.1670-1825 than has so far been made. Certainly, comprehensive works on early travel literature and on the development of Palestinian archaeology have been produced, but these do not deal, in any depth, with the archaeological research conducted by the individual travellers discussed in this study. A résumé of these other accounts is pertinent.

Most writers date the start of Palestinian archaeology to the beginning of the nineteenth century or even later. Their interpretation of the format which this research took shows some variation.

Neil Asher Silberman's *Digging for God and Country* is a history of Palestinian archaeology from the dawn of the nineteenth century to World War I.¹ Silberman asserts that the scientific investigation of Palestine began with Edward Daniel Clarke's archaeological research at Jerusalem in 1801. Of the few early British travellers mentioned in his study, only Silberman's comments on Clarke go beyond a summary of travels or résumé of subject matter contained in the published accounts. But his discussion of Clarke's work is still descriptive rather than analytical, and the present study has shown Silberman to be incorrect in concluding that Clarke made the original application of secular learning rather than ecclesiastical tradition in examining the ancient remains of Palestine.²

²Silberman, *Digging*, pp.18-20 (re E. D. Clarke), 21-23 (re J. L. Burckhardt), 23 (re J. S. Buckingham), 27 (re C. L. Irby and J. Mangles).
In a similar vein, Naomi Shepherd writes that, only after the siege of Acre in 1799, was "Palestine... now to be rescued from obscurity and to be subjected to the analytical scrutiny inherited from the eighteenth century." Although Shepherd includes several early British travellers in her discussion, their reports are used to produce an accurate representation of the diverse aspects of Palestine in the early nineteenth century. Indeed, Shepherd mentions their main archaeological enterprises, but her discussion thereof is descriptive and superficial. Shepherd's book, The Zealous Intruders, is, primarily, an account of the means by which Western nations infiltrated Palestine and the factors which motivated them. Her use of travel literature is extensive.

"British Archaeology in the Holy Land in the 19th Century: Sources and a Framework for Study" is designated by its author, Rupert Chapman, as a preliminary general study of the intellectual history of British archaeology in the Holy Land, a study which Chapman places within the context of the developments in general archaeology. Once again, the first period of British archaeological work in the Holy Land is claimed to have commenced with Edward Daniel Clarke's exploration in 1801, but Chapman draws attention to a scientific naïveté of this early research. Of this first period, nominated the 'Antiquarian, or Fact-Gathering Period', he writes,

the artefacts and monuments were studied largely as objects of interest in their own right, illustrative of the historical documents. Although the aim of the individuals concerned was the same as that of modern archaeologists, to learn more about the past, the artefacts and monuments were not seen as sources of information in and of themselves, independent of the historical record.

3N. Shepherd, The Zealous Intruders. The Western Rediscovery of Palestine, p.16.
7Chapman, "British Archaeology in the Holy Land in the 19th Century", p.6.
8Chapman, "British Archaeology in the Holy Land in the 19th Century", p.7.
Chapman maintains that this approach did not fundamentally change until the publication of Petrie's report on Tell el-Hesy in 1891 introduced a methodology based on a careful study and recording of the context of the artefacts and the associations between artefact types. Now, the facts garnered concerning individual artefacts and artefact types are not simply to illustrate the known historical record, but to learn about aspects of the past not mentioned in the historical record, and/or to check the accuracy of that record as presently received and understood.9

Certainly the early British travellers discussed in the present study did not apply the principles of stratigraphy to their analysis of the archaeological material, although instances of such application had already occurred in Britain. Nevertheless rudimentary attempts at relative dating and classification of archaeological remains have been noted. Moreover, Chapman's claim that Petrie was the first archaeologist in Palestine to appreciate the value of artefacts in learning about aspects of the past not mentioned in the historical record is surely undermined by such facts as Bankes's observations on town planning at Jerash, and the extensive analyses of the water system at Solomon's Pools made by Pococke and, later, Barry.

Like Chapman, Max Miller, in his article, Old Testament History and Archaeology, claims that Petrie's excavations at Tell el-Hesi heralded a second phase in the development of Palestinian archaeology10 and his assessment of activities prior to this event infers their historical bias. He writes,

The first phase took place in the nineteenth century, [and] was marked by explorations, general surveys, and mapping projects... and... [these] yielded results that to this day have relevance for studies in biblical history. These pioneers... surveyed... the surface archaeological remains of the land... [and] made significant headway in clarifying the historical geography of Palestine.11

---

10 M. Miller, 'Old Testament History and Archaeology', p.56.
11 Miller, 'Old Testament History and Archaeology', p.56.
In this context, Miller emphasises the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund and of the historical geographers, Edward Robinson and George Adam Smith, and makes a fleeting reference to the earlier travellers, Jean Louis Burckhardt and Ulrich Seetzen.\textsuperscript{12}

In his famous early study, \textit{The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible}, W. F. Albright put forward a similar assessment to Miller of 'the first phase of Scientific Exploration',\textsuperscript{13} as did J. Benzinger in his even earlier account.\textsuperscript{14}

Introducing his text on \textit{The Rediscovery of the Holy Land in the Nineteenth Century}, Yehoshua Ben-Arieh misinforms the reader in writing, 'At the beginning of the 19th century, Palestine was a virtual \textit{terra incognita} from a scientific point of view'\textsuperscript{15} and, furthermore, modern scientific investigation of the country began only with the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund in the 1860s.\textsuperscript{16} Earlier travel accounts, dating from 1799, he claims, were primarily useful in reconstructing the physical and social landscape of nineteenth century Palestine\textsuperscript{17} and some contained material of historical-geographical value.\textsuperscript{18} Ben-Arieh draws upon published sources to present an informative account in these areas. Except for some details of the work conducted by Charles Warren at Jerusalem later in the century,\textsuperscript{19} Ben-Arieh's book contains little of archaeological significance.\textsuperscript{20}

The practice of dating the beginning of the history of Palestinian archaeology no earlier than the start of the nineteenth century is paralleled in historical studies dealing with developments in archaeology elsewhere in the Near East. Thus, Seton Lloyd's text,

\textsuperscript{12}Miller, 'Old Testament History and Archaeology', p.56.
\textsuperscript{13}J. Garstang, 'The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible', pp.222-223.
\textsuperscript{14}J. Benzinger, 'Researches in Palestine', p.581ff.
\textsuperscript{15}Y. Ben-Arieh, \textit{The Rediscovery of the Holy Land in the Nineteenth Century}, p.12.
\textsuperscript{17}Ben-Arieh, \textit{Rediscovery}, p.5.
\textsuperscript{18}Ben-Arieh, \textit{Rediscovery}, pp.85-91 (re Edward Robinson).
\textsuperscript{19}Ben-Arieh, \textit{Rediscovery}, pp.199-203.
\textsuperscript{20}Certainly, Ben-Arieh mentions several early British travellers in his text. Of these individuals, he gives some biographical information and a brief overview of the content of their publications, emphasising, in particular, their contributions to the geographical and historical geographical knowledge of Palestine. Select illustrations and maps from various early publications are reproduced in Ben-Arieh's book. See Ben-Arieh, \textit{Rediscovery}, pp.24-63.
Foundations in the Dust, describes the growth of Assyriology from the early nineteenth century to the 1940s, and Glyn Daniel confines his discussion of early Near Eastern archaeology to a brief description of excavations and surveys being carried out by English and European archaeologists in the first half of the nineteenth century in Greece, Persia, Egypt and Mesopotamia.

In his extensive history of the developments which took place in British Egyptology between 1586 and 1906, John Wortham draws attention to this practice with regard to studies on Egyptology. His comments on the distorted picture which resulted coincide with the findings of the present study. As Wortham writes,

The standard histories of archaeology always begin their account of the rise of Egyptian archaeology with the expedition which Napoleon led to Egypt in 1798, but anyone who has consulted the works of sixteenth-seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century travellers in the Middle East soon perceives that any history of Egyptology which does not take account of the work performed before 1798 will badly represent the manner in which that discipline developed.

In particular, he points out, these other histories lacked appreciation of the early developments in decipherment of the ancient Egyptian systems of writing and in the exploration of prehistoric sites in Egypt.

By systematically dealing with accounts of Egypt left by individual travellers, several of whom appear in the present study, Wortham provides a résumé of their travels and main archaeological discoveries and a brief discussion on the content and accuracy of their archaeological records. His bibliography, although considerable, is limited to published works.

21 S. Lloyd, Foundations in the Dust.
22 G. Daniel, A Hundred Years of Archaeology, pp. 68-77, 152-159; see also the same pages in his later extended version entitled, A Hundred and Fifty Years of Archaeology.
24 Wortham, Uraeus, p. xi.
25 Wortham, Uraeus, p. xii.
Some studies, in fact, mention individual early British travellers who visited Palestine prior to the turn of the eighteenth century, but these do little or nothing to enhance an appreciation of the archaeological work of these individuals.

In the preamble to his *Short History of Palestinian Excavation*, M. E. Kirk includes Maundrell, Pococke, and Shaw amongst the early travellers he nominates as 'early archaeologists', a term with which the present writer agrees. But, of the research of this group of individuals, Kirk merely acknowledges their 'tendency to copy inscriptions, measure and plan buildings, and explore and describe tombs'.

Likewise, Robin Fedden, in his *English Travellers in the Near East*, mentions a few of the eighteenth-century travellers dealt with in this thesis, but he generally describes their accounts merely as 'reliable' or otherwise. Fedden does, however, discuss Pococke at some length and states that 'His *Description of the East* is the fullest and most authoritative English travel-book on the Levant in the eighteenth century'. But, of Pococke's archaeological work, Fedden simply writes, 'as befitted an eighteenth-century gentleman, archaeology was his first interest and he produced drawings of Egyptian antiquities that are among the earliest careful records'.

Like Fedden, Sarah Searight, in her history of *The British in the Middle East*, mentions accounts of eighteenth-century British travellers but produces nothing informative regarding their archaeological research.

---

26 M. Kirk, *Short History of Palestinian Excavation*, p.132. Kirk also includes the early nineteenth-century British travellers J. L. Burckhardt, J. S. Buckingham, C. L. Irby and J. Mangles within this group.

27 Fedden considers the accounts of T. Shaw, C. Perry, J. Haynes and H. Maundrell (1697) as reliable, but draws attention to the questionable authenticity of Charles Thompson's account. See R. Fedden, *Early Travellers in the Near East*, pp.11 (Footnote no.1), 14 (Footnote no.1).


31 S. Searight, *The British in the Middle East*, pp.68-69 (re H. Maundrell), 76-77 (re R. Pococke). She also mentions the nineteenth-century travellers J. S. Buckingham (pp.173-4), and C. L. Irby and J. Mangles (p.73) but, again, includes nothing of archaeological value.
In 1977, Anita Damiani presented a most interesting thesis entitled *Travel Attitudes to the Near East in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries* in which she discusses the writings of several early British travellers to the Near East, including those of Shaw and Pococke. These various texts she interprets in the light of the contemporary philosophical ideas and draws attention to the influence of the latter on the attitudes of these travellers as reflected in their interpretation of the data encountered. Although archaeological descriptions are included in this data pool, Damiani is not concerned with the traveller's interpretation of this material per se.\(^{32}\)

Clearly, most modern studies place the beginning of archaeological research in Palestine to the start of the nineteenth century but maintain that research of real scientific merit commenced much later. Only rarely is the work of researchers prior to 1801 acknowledged. In no instance has there been a significant evaluation of the archaeological methodology of the early British travellers as presented in this thesis.\(^{33}\)

This analysis of the archaeological work of early British travellers in Palestine between c.1670 and 1825 has demonstrated that an evaluation of purely archaeological materials was being applied well before the date designated by other modern writers. This is hardly surprising when we consider the early examples of such practice recorded in Britain and, also, the fact that the Royal Society promoted an empirical approach to research from the latter half of the seventeenth century.

Although Stuart Piggott's assertion that a conscious distinction between historical and archaeological research did not occur in England until the end of the nineteenth century seems valid, the results of the present study query the applicability of this statement to British archaeological research in Palestine. Certainly, in many instances, historical evidence was used to interpret archaeological remains and, at times, site identification was based solely on textual

---

\(^{32}\)A. Damiani, *British Travel Attitudes to the Near East in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*.

\(^{33}\)Silberman's analysis of the early excavation conducted by Meryon at Ashkelon represents the only possible exception. See above, Chapter 2 (Footnote no. 59).
evidence. Nevertheless, a developing trend to concentrate on archaeological evidence for its own sake is apparent. The most impressive example of this is the research carried out by Bankes, Irby and Mangles at Jerash. The paucity of historical data connected with this site, undoubtedly, encouraged this approach.

However, the present study has also shown that the identification of sites and interpretation of archaeological material by early British travellers in Palestine were not reached solely by an evaluation of available concrete evidence, either textual, archaeological, or other. The British interest in establishing a foothold in Palestine had caused the anti-French/Catholic attitude current at home to be projected into this foreign environment and this could, and did, effect the perception of many early British travellers in site interpretation. Sites revered by the Latin clergy held most potential in this regard.

The methods used by individual early British travellers to interpret the selected sites has been discussed in detail in the main body of this text. An outline of the main archaeological methods employed by these individuals and illuminated with select examples is worthwhile.

Surveying provided one important means of obtaining data to elucidate the archaeology of a site. Surveys were either of a topographical or architectural nature. Thus, by surveying the topography of Jerusalem, Richard Pococke (1738) produced his commendable historical-geographical analysis of the ancient city, and by carefully observing the topography of the traditional site of the Gardens of Solomon, Henry Maundrell (1697) queried the rationale of this identification. By surveying the environs of Jerusalem for architectural remains, Pococke (1738) delineated a course for Josephus's Third Wall, and Edward Daniel Clarke (1801) found an alternative site for the Holy Sepulchre. Undoubtedly the most impressive architectural survey discussed in this thesis was that conducted by Charles Irby and James Mangles (1818) at Jerash as it produced a plan, comparable in detail and accuracy, to those resulting from modern surveys of the site.
Another method, fundamental to archaeological research, was the close examination of the material remains of a site in order to record details and clarify function of its composite parts. The work was conducted respectively by Pococke (1738) and Charles Barry (1819) on the water channels at the lowest of Solomon’s Pools exemplify this method, as do the examples of city planning elucidated by William John Bankes (1816) at Jerash.

The multidisciplinary team approach reflected in, a rudimentary mode, by Clarke’s (1801) use of multifarious forms of scientific data to support his novel theory, and in Bankes’s (1818) employment of specifically skilled individuals to upgrade the level of research at various sites including Jerash has clear parallels in modern archaeological practice.

Early British travellers also made use of comparative archaeological data examined personally or gleaned from the reports of other travellers to deduce information about the material being examined. Thus Clarke (1801) drew upon data collected by Thomas Shaw (1722) on the forms of ancient crypts in Lebanon and Palestine to support his own identification for Christ’s tomb, whereas William Halifax (1692) used the tombs of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as evidence in favour of the traditional site.

To date archaeological remains, early British travellers made use of both absolute and relative dating techniques, although in the sites discussed the latter was more frequently applied. James Silk Buckingham (1816) employed both absolute and relative dating, albeit rather dubiously, to arrive at a Saracenic date for the Pools of Solomon and the nearby castle. Barry (1819) used relative dating to synchronise the building he identified as the Tower of Psephinus with structures he claimed lay along the course of the present north city wall. Epigraphic evidence was also used as a means of establishing relative dates. Thus, Buckingham (1816) interpreted the ‘cross’ affixed to the inscriptions on tombs at Jerusalem as indicative of a secondary use of these structures by Christians, and the epigraphic evidence of
Christianity at Jerash facilitated an accurate interpretation of the two building phases evident in the part of the Artemis Temple Complex which lay east of the principal street.

Throughout the discussion of sites, emphasis was placed on the original contributions made by several individuals to the pool of archaeological knowledge. At this stage it is relevant to offer a synopsis of these and other significant findings in order to highlight the varying standards of research which occurred between the various groups of travellers as defined by the writer.

*Mount Calvary, the Holy Sepulchre and the Topography of Ancient Jerusalem*

The momentous events with which Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre are associated had produced an abundance of historical documentation. Furthermore, traditional evidence claimed to authenticate their material remains in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The political relevance which these and other Holy Places had come to hold for the French and British governments has been discussed, as have the intellectual, political and religious movements occurring in Britain which could, and did, influence early British travellers in their interpretation of such sites. That the first extensive effort to undermine the authenticity of the sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, as represented by Clarke's diatribe, was written soon after the Napoleonic campaigns in Palestine and Egypt is therefore no coincidence.

Certainly, the discussions written by early British travellers on the traditional sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre infer that little, if any, conscious distinction between historical and archaeological research was being made. Probably, the historical significance of these sites and the abundance of relevant historical documentation reinforced this approach. The intelligent application of archaeological or other types of purely scientific evidence did take place, however, and, at times, these forms of evidence were, in fact, evaluated for their own sake.
The early British travellers who accepted the authenticity of the sites of Mount Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, either through traditional evidence or a superficial application of historical data occur in most groups except the first (i.e. Archaeological Research) and, of course, the group nominated Missionaries. The Irish traveller, Buck Whaley (Miscellaneous), naturally accepted the established traditions.

Scepticism of the traditional evidence was early expressed by Merchants with Tourist Interests and later by Anon 1791-2 (Tourism (a)) and William Leake (Military Personnel). After Clarke's dissertation was published, antipathetic attitudes appear in reports written by Tourists, Missionaries, Pilgrims and that of Charles Meryon (Archaeological Research).

Undoubtedly the most thorough attempts to evaluate the data at hand were carried out by individuals for whom archaeological research was a key motive in pursuing travels in Palestine (i.e. Group (1): Archaeological Research).

As early as 1692, Halifax proposed a theoretical reconstruction of the Holy Sepulchre based solely on archaeological evidence found within the church itself, and in 1722, Shaw made use of archaeological data he had collected in Lebanon and Palestine to confirm the veracity of the biblical description of Christ's tomb.

The outstanding calibre of Pococke's research has been noted. Not only did he make a significant attempt at a historical-geographical analysis of Jerusalem, but he made an original contribution to the pool of archaeological knowledge by discovering and recording material remains which he attributed to the Third Wall of Josephus, a discovery previously accredited to Edward Robinson's survey of 1838.

---

34 Anon 1791-2 did, in fact, expand his argument by drawing attention to negative archaeological evidence at the Holy Sepulchre itself and by identifying only the grottos, caves, sepulchres and cisterns then visible in Jerusalem as genuine biblical antiquities. Unfortunately, his discussion lacks substance.
Despite the flaws inherent in his logic, Edward Daniel Clarke made an extensive and innovative use of diverse types of scientific data to verify his arguments. His approach surely reflects the transition from an historical to scientific consciousness in archaeological research, and also represents a rudimentary attempt at incorporating a multidisciplinary approach to analysing the data at hand, albeit, in this instance, carried out by one individual. Clarke's report also proved extremely effective as inspiration for later research as reflected in the reports of several early British travellers.\(^{35}\)

Buckingham agreed with Clarke's identification of Mount Sion but argued for the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre. Drawing attention to Clarke's flaw in logic which inferred that his Mount Sion was outside the city at the time of Christ's crucifixion, Buckingham assigned the sepulchres on the side of the mount to an earlier period than Clarke, when they would have been within the city limits. Although Buckingham's absolute chronology for their original period of usage is not upheld by later research, he was correct in assigning a two-stage period of occupancy to some of the tombs and in maintaining that the cross which appeared before some of the inscriptions indicated re-use of the tombs by Christians.

Like Buckingham, Bankes disagreed with Clarke's identification of the Holy Sepulchre and it seems that his extensive survey of the tombs and sepulchres in and around Jerusalem was, at least, partly inspired by Clarke's novel theory. By using deductive logic, Bankes offered a rational solution to the non-compliance between the biblical description of Christ's tomb with that shown as the Holy Sepulchre.

Both Richardson and Barry made an innovative use of geographical statistics to dispute Clarke's identity of Mount Sion and Barry responded further by incorporating a topographical study of the area into his research. To support his theory on the course of Josephus's Third Wall, Barry thoroughly examined and described a feature he identified as the Tower of

\(^{35}\)The relevant reports are those of J. S. Buckingham, W. J. Bankes, J. Hyde, J. Carne, R. Richardson and C. Barry.
Psephinus, an identification supported by the later scholar, Vincent. Moreover, Barry attempted a practical application of relative dating by comparing material found in his Tower Psephinus with that appearing in other places along the course of the present north city wall. Despite the dubious nature of these latter observations, Barry's theory that Josephus's Third Wall followed the course of the present north wall finds advocates in the modern scholars, Hamilton, Hennessy and Kenyon.

The reports of tourists like Carne (Tourism (b)) and Hyde (Tourism (a)) clearly reflect a response to Clarke's ideas. Thus Carne commented, albeit superficially, on the tombs in the Valley of Hinnom and attempted to rationalise the incongruous composition of the traditional Holy Sepulchre. Hyde studied and described the tombs and sepulchres around Jerusalem but, unfortunately, appears to refer to a different tomb to that selected by Clarke, when attempting to demonstrate incongruities between the archaeological and biblical evidence used by Clarke in identifying Christ's tomb. Only in this section of his report on Palestine and in his treatment of the Tombs of the Kings at Jerusalem does Hyde's standard of archaeological research approach that seen in his reports on other areas of the Near East.

**Pools of Solomon**

Lying en route between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, the so-called Pools of Solomon were visited by many early British travellers. Generally, a Latin monk from the convent at Jerusalem or Bethlehem accompanied the traveller as guide and propounded a traditional identity of the three cisterns and associated parts of the site based ostensibly on biblical evidence.

Certainly, cynical remarks targeted at this tradition were expressed, most often by travellers classified here as Tourists, and probably reflected the anti-Catholic attitude current amongst many British nationals. As a non-Christian site, however, the degree of emotional reaction elicited by the Holy Places did not occur. Most early British travellers accepted the
Solomonic identity of at least some parts of the complex and, even the sceptical, perused the remains with objective interest.

In fact, the use of historical evidence, outside the traditional biblical references, to assess the Solomonic identity of the site was scarce. Only Pococke (Archaeological Research) produced a logical and solid argument based on alternate sources. The conclusions reached by Turner (Tourism (c)) and Mackworth (Pilgrims) were derived from an omissive use of biblical material.

Likewise, only a few early British travellers applied archaeological data to evaluate the age of the site and, of these, the only significant efforts were made by three individuals of the first group (Archaeological Research). Their methods represent early examples of techniques generally associated with modern archaeological practice. Maundrell drew upon negative archaeological evidence apparently derived from his research in other parts of Palestine to uphold the traditional identity of the site; Buckingham applied the principles of absolute and relative dating to support his novel chronology; and Richardson made a crude attempt at classifying the architectural remains into a cultural grouping he nominated 'Jewish style'.

In the discussion of this site, the present writer remarked that 'The descriptions produced by most early British travellers visiting the pools revealed a level of research extending little beyond a general perusal of these structures with little or no concern for accurate reporting of physical data'. Despite these deficiencies, the non-Christian nature of the site did enable travellers to concentrate on evaluating its archaeological remains per se, without undue concern for their supposed historical associations.

Maundrell (Archaeological Research) examined the pools closely to comment on their construction, and was the earliest British traveller to present a correct picture of their comparative sizes. Pococke (Archaeological Research) produced an original and accurate assessment of the relationship between the architecture of the pools and the topography of their
site. In fact, Charles Barry (Archaeological Research) was the only other early British traveller who fully appreciated the relationship between the architecture of the pools and the surrounding topography. Furthermore, he made the most successful attempt at specifying their dimensions.

Travellers from all groupings who reported on the site commented on the comparative position of the three cisterns which allowed water to flow from the highest to the lowest. However, more precise details of their architectural construction came mainly from travellers in the first group (Archaeological Research). Similarly, the dimensions of the pools were, on the whole, more correctly assessed by members of this group. Other travellers, mostly tourists (Tourism a, b, c, d) presented either a very general or erroneous assessment of the dimensions.

The original contribution to archaeological research made by Maundrell (Archaeological Research) in examining and providing a detailed and accurate description of the Sealed Fountain has been noted. In a similar vein was Barry's (Archaeological Research) account of the architecture of the subterranean passage leading from the Sealed Fountain. It was not until Charles Warren examined the site in 1864 that any improvement on Barry's analysis of the system of water channels associated with this passage was made. The detail given by Barry of the architecture of the passage itself remains unsurpassed.

The reports of other early British travellers on the Sealed Fountain and its associated water system were generally deficient. Of those who did not rely on Maundrell for a description, only Whaley (Miscellaneous) and Perry (Tourism (a)) comprehended the main features of this part of the site. Travellers from most groups (Medical Personnel, Pilgrims, Tourism (a, b, d), Miscellaneous (Bell), Archaeological Research (Richardson)) either failed to acknowledge the interconnecting features or basic architectural detail. Anon 1791-2 (Tourism (a)), W. R. Wilson (Pilgrims), and J. S. Buckingham (Archaeological Research) all misrepresented this part of the complex, the probable reasons having been discussed.

36The only groups not represented are Missionaries and Military Personnel.
Mackworth (Pilgrims) failed even to mention the Sealed Fountain or its associated channels, although his apparent discovery of the source of the spring known as 'Ain el Burak was commendable.

Several tourists (Tourism a, b, d) briefly mentioned the presence of an aqueduct carrying water from the lower pool to Jerusalem. Through his outstanding research, Pococke (Archaeological Research) initiated an understanding of the system of water channels connected with Solomon’s Pools which far exceeded such generality. Pococke drew attention to the course at the pools of the channel later identified as the Low Level Aqueduct and correctly observed its connection with the lower pool. In attempting to identify and delineate the water channels associated with the lower end of the lower pool, he reached conclusions which later research largely confirmed. His observations regarding the fountain of Hatan predate more than a century those generally accredited with discovering the significance of the water supply. And, finally, if Pococke’s grotto be identified as the chamber situated under the lower pool, the originality of his observation of ‘[the] three outlets, that may be shut or opened at pleasure’ is confirmed. At a later date, Barry (Archaeological Research) offered further information on the course of the Low Level Aqueduct at the pools, but his more valuable contribution was the detailed description he wrote of the chamber under the lower pool.

Jeras

One of the most impressive programmes of archaeological research discussed in this study was the work conducted by Bankes, Irby and Mangles (Archaeological Research) in 1818 at the site of Jerash. Certainly the dearth of historical data connected with this site necessitated a greater dependence on evidence of a purely archaeological nature in order to analyse the material remains than was the case at the other sites discussed. This archaeological evidence was mainly architectural, although epigraphic remains played an important role in identifying the Christian buildings at the site. To optimise efficiency, Bankes organised his archaeological research programme on a multidisciplinary team approach which is comparable
to modern archaeological practice. The success of this approach is reflected in the excellent plan which provides the first detailed and accurate assessment of the layout and relationships of all the superficial architectural remains of the site.

Clearly, the lack of historical evidence on Jerash meant that any analysis of the site must be based on an interpretation of the material remains. However, it must also be remembered that Jerash was primarily a classical site and as such would elicit none of the emotional reaction in the early British travellers as could the Holy Places. Thus, an interpretation of the data based solely on an empirical approach was compatible with the very nature of this site.

All the early British travellers who studied Jerash, in at least some detail, and reported on their findings, belong to that group for whom archaeological research was a key motive for pursuing travels in Palestine. The reports written by Robert Wilson (Tourism (a)) and John Fuller (Tourism (b)) give only a generalised description of the remains, and that produced by Thomas Legh (Tourism (b)) is surprisingly scant and inaccurate considering he visited the site with Bankes, Irby and Mangles in 1818.

Threatened by Bedouin attack, Burckhardt (Archaeological Research), in 1812, conducted a rather hasty survey of Jerash but yet produced a plan showing a fundamentally correct evaluation of the street system and course of the city wall. Furthermore, Burckhardt recorded epigraphic data which he later communicated with Bankes. It is to Burckhardt's credit that he was the only early British traveller to correctly recognise, from remains of paving, the course of a street which modern excavation showed to be the street running in front of the Churches of St. John the Baptist, St. George, and SS. Cosmas and Damian.

The plans produced by Bankes and Buckingham (Archaeological Research) from their conjoint research at the site in 1816 and Buckingham's corresponding text clearly reveal a flow of ideas between these two travellers. The weaknesses in their assessment of the Artemis Temple Complex and features of the City Wall have been fully discussed, as have the
associated reasons for Bankes's failure to publish his findings. However, it also became clear
that Bankes deserves credit for recognising several units of city planning at the site based solely
on an interpretation of archaeological data. The accuracy of these original ideas was later
confirmed by modern scholarship.

The results of Charles Barry's (Archaeological Research) archaeological research at
Jerash were disappointing, in particular his grossly inaccurate assessment of the course run by
the southern section of the City Wall. Barry was, however, the only early British traveller to
record the square towers flanking the Grand Propylæum of the Artemis Temple, and his text
and plans show a reasonably accurate evaluation of the layout of the Artemis Temple Complex
and recognition of its secondary architecture east of the Cardo. That Barry was later exposed
through Bankes to the outstanding assessment of the site made by Bankes, Irby and Mangles in
1818 is shown by his later 'Collated Plan'.

The present study and a synopsis of the main findings have clearly demonstrated the
important contribution made by early British travellers visiting Palestine from c.1670 to 1825
to the pool of archaeological knowledge, and the use of scientific method in carrying out
archaeological research. It is also apparent that those travellers for whom archaeological
research provided a key motive in pursuing their travels were most effective in these respects.
The originality of much of the work of these individuals has, until now, gone unrecognised.
Moreover, the potential which their various records hold for further examples of original
archaeological research and discoveries in Palestine and elsewhere would surely be a
worthwhile resource for further investigation. The most important aspect of the present study
is the acknowledgement, albeit belated, of the exceptional abilities of these early pioneers of
archaeology.
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