

PLAN TO ILLUSTRATE DR BLISS'S TWELFTH REPORT

PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND



## TWELFTH REPORT ON THE EXCAVATIONS AT JERUSALEM.

By F. J. BLISS, Ph.D.

THE last two reports, while describing important remains found and followed during our search for the city wall, threw little light on the position of the wall itself. The present report, however, concerns itself chiefly with that matter, and adds considerably to our knowledge of it. The whole question will not be clear till we have fitted together the different pieces of the puzzle, but the bit last discovered promises to be one of the most important of the lot.

In the last *Quarterly* I mentioned that we had found the angle of the wall crossing the Tyropeon below the Old Pool, but no particulars were given, as the excavation was at that time incomplete. The wall at this corner may now be described. In order to connect it with what has gone before, a brief recapitulation will be in place. From the Protestant cemetery to a point outside the Old Pool at Siloam a city wall had been traced, passing during its course under the Jewish cemetery. For a distance of 100 yards (in a field south of Bâb Neby Daûd) the line was found to be double: that is, the lower wall was buried by *débris* upon which the later wall was built, on a slightly different line. The lower line was chiefly characterised by bossed masonry; the upper line by smooth. I affirmed (perhaps with an ardour more archaeological than scientific) that the line running down to Siloam was "certainly" the older, furnishing, as I supposed, an adequate explanation which, however, I seem not to have made entirely clear. For on p. 169 of the *Quarterly* for April, 1896, Colonel Conder says: "While agreeing with Dr. Bliss that the wall now found (*i.e.*, the lower wall where the line is double) is probably Jewish, I am not aware of any facts adduced by him (p. 14) to show that it 'certainly ran down to Siloam.' The masonry there found by Dr. Gütthe was very clearly Byzantine, and would have belonged to the wall of Eudoxia."

The facts were adduced on p. 11 of the January *Quarterly* for 1895. For some distance west of the Jewish cemetery the wall was destroyed, but the wall found entering the cemetery, emerging from the cemetery at the second gate, and crossing the valley, was characterised by bossed masonry, the peculiar smooth work of the upper line being entirely absent. Accordingly—while withdrawing the word "certainly"—I still assume, as the most probable explanation, that it was the lower line (seen before to have been characterised by bossed masonry) that ran on to Siloam. For the absence of the smooth masonry near the cemetery and on to Siloam I have given two possible explanations: either the old wall was in such good preservation, that it needed only to be repaired

the smooth stones of the reparation having since disappeared, or else the later line had diverged from the earlier at some point west of the cemetery. Colonel Conder's reference to the Byzantine masonry discovered by Dr. Gütthe at Siloam is not to the point, as it does not happen to exist on the line of wall we are describing, but occurs on a wall branching off from this line before it crosses the Tyropœon valley.

I must now refer the reader to the plan accompanying the Sixth Report, published in October, 1895, on which is shown the wall from the second gate to the point where it was traced crossing the mouth of the Tyropœon below the Old Pool. From the point B on, the wall shows signs of two distinct periods. The earliest is the line BK, from which at E, F, and I there advance buttresses, resting on a base-wall projecting in a line with their faces. The later period is represented by the line BJ, and was explained as follows:—"The first wall fell into ruins beyond the point B, but the buttresses and the base-wall remained. When the wall came to be repaired advantage was taken of these solid remains, the base-wall between the buttresses was carried up to the top, completing an unbroken face of wall, and this new line, at I, 12 feet outside the old line, was carried back to B, with a gradually diminishing distance between the two lines, till they met at B" (p. 311). A third period was indicated by a rough retaining wall of pocked stones (not figured on the plan, but shown in the sections), which was rendered necessary by the dangerous forward bulging of the wall owing to pressure of water from the Pool. On the present plan, the point of divergence B is represented by the letter A, and the first two periods are distinguished from each other by a difference in hatching.

Work on this wall was temporarily abandoned in August, 1895, as we were obliged to concentrate our forces on the excavations at the top of the hill. But in early winter we opened a shaft at H, finding the wall at a depth of 36 feet. Though we came upon masonry, no clear connection was established with the former line, and finally the rains compelled us to close up the shaft. Fortunately the land belongs to our friends the Khaldi, and we were not obliged to fill it up, but only to board it over at the mouth. In the autumn of 1896 we recommenced work there, and the line GI was clearly established. A glance at elevation HI will show that in the shaft nine courses of stones were observed. For seven courses from the rock the wall consists of rough rubble set without lime, and having a distinct batter. These run on beyond H. The eighth and ninth courses are of well-dressed, well-set stones, also without lime. The top course, being here ruined, does not run on to H. But the eighth course does thus run on, forming a return angle at H, the corner stone being bossed on two sides. In line with this fine eighth course, a rubble course runs on beyond H, resting on the battered seven courses below. (For the sake of avoiding confusion this is not represented on the elevation.)

Here, then, we find the same state of things as occurred in this same wall traced to the south-west in 1895. The double-bossed stone at H

represents the return angle of a buttress, similar to the buttresses at B, C, and D. The seven lower courses are part of the base-wall found before to project in a line with the buttress-faces. The rough work beyond the double-bossed stone represents the reparation, when the spaces between the buttresses were filled in by carrying up the base-wall to the top, thus completing an unbroken line across the valley. At H we tunnelled at right angles with the line of wall to ascertain its thickness. As the rock rises rapidly the work here was somewhat difficult. The total breadth was found to be 19 feet. As in the cases of the other buttresses, the internal angles were not clear (which is not strange, in view of the fact that the original wall was damaged and repaired), but, assuming the original wall to have had the usual thickness of 8 feet, there remain 11 feet for the projection of this buttress. This is about the same projection as the remains of the other buttresses indicated. When the pressure of the water in the Old Pool demanded a strengthening of the wall, by the filling in of the spaces between the buttresses, the total thickness of the dam came to be 19 feet.

The identity of the wall described at this corner with that excavated in 1895 is further proved by a detailed examination. In both cases the base-wall has a batter. The masonry of the buttresses is also the same: a mixture of drafted and plain-faced stones. The bosses project from  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 6 inches, the margins are worked by chisel-draft, but in a very few cases on the stones of the last discovered buttress the comb-pick has been used. In both cases the absence of lime was noted. In describing the buttresses discovered in 1895 I remarked that it was impossible to tell the character of the setting, as the joints were wrenched apart by pressure, causing the whole face to bulge forward.<sup>1</sup> The corner buttress HI preserves a perpendicular face, and a fine jointing is observed in the setting of the stones. As the wall here does not bulge forward there was no need of carrying the rough outer retaining wall to this point; at any rate, no such wall was found here. However, in front of HI there was masonry so ruined that we could make nothing of it, but as it was not bonded into the main wall it is clearly some later addition. As the wall at HI is proved to be identical with the wall discovered before, we have dotted in the part not excavated, assuming the buttresses E, F, and G.

The corner buttress HI is interesting. A few feet to the right of the shaft (*see* elevation HI) the last two stones of the top course drop, and appear to be set on end, being shifted from their original position. Beyond these only roughly-squared, quarry-picked stones carry on the line to the corner I, where bossed stones would be expected, if anywhere. Turning the corner, we tunnelled along the line IJ at an obtuse angle with IH (*see* key plan) to the point J, where a projection of 18 inches occurs. To the left of the projection (*see* elevation IM) the two top courses are of well-squared picked stones. Work had here become

<sup>1</sup> *See* "Specimen at F," *Quarterly* for 1895, p. 310.

exceedingly slow, owing to a mass of consolidated stuff glued against the wall, a sort of natural cement more difficult to break up than the solid rock. Accordingly we decided to approach the wall at a point higher up. In the new shaft were observed four courses of bossed stones, similar in height and dressing to the bossed stones at H. At J these were seen to project 18 inches from the continuing line of wall, immediately above the similar projection in the rough masonry, as seen in the tunnel below, but the bossed courses are broken off irregularly, not forming a corner, clear sign of a reparation. The similarity of the bossed work at H and J show that these represent the original work. In other words, the north-east corner of the original buttress had been ruined and repaired, the reparation having altered the shape of the corner, which probably first followed the dotted lines formed by a projection of HI and KJ. The stones of the reparation in the upper tunnel are smaller than the original bossed-stones, and are plain-faced, picked, and well squared, similar to the two top courses below.

The bossed work continues to the right of the shaft for a few feet, when it ceases, the wall running on in the same line but in rough rubble to K, where another projection occurs, this time of 22 inches. Built upon this projecting line of rubble we find a class of masonry quite different from anything seen before in this excavation. Five courses were seen in a shaft opened here. The stones are small, varying in height from  $9\frac{1}{2}$  to  $11\frac{1}{4}$  inches. They are set in lime, with fairly uniform joints. As to dressing, they are plain-faced and comb-picked, a few having chisel-picked centres but no projections—a favourite method of dressing in modern Jerusalem architecture. The courses have back-sets, varying from  $1\frac{1}{4}$  to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches. Owing to the rude nature of the rubble foundation and to this back-setting, the upper masonry falls generally into line with JK, thus counterbalancing the lower projection. At L there occurs another projection of 2 feet in the rubble, which runs on to M in an even ruder condition than observed before. It is here set in cement. At M the line LM butts up against the wall NP, which runs back of it for about 2 feet towards N, where NP is ruined. At NP we seem to have returned to the original line, the angle having been where a projection of JK would meet NP. In height the courses are identical with the original work at J and H, but they are less evenly set. In the top bed of the upper course lime was observed on a single stone, but no signs of lime were found below. The stones are mainly plain-faced (as are some along the line HI) and rough-picked, two having slightly projecting centres. As the few courses remaining at NP are built up against the rock it would have been impossible to recover its thickness had it not been for the conduit, 9 feet high, which breaks through the rock at right angles. NP is here built solidly back into this conduit, showing an inner face; hence the thickness could be measured and was found to be 8 feet.

Near P the wall butts up against the rock, but in the same line, just beyond, the top of the exposed natural rock is cut out in the form of beds for stones, which show how the face of the wall ran on. Five

such beds may be seen on elevation NP. This is a most important point, as it proves that the wall was carried fairly up the eastern hill. The presumption is strong that it ran on to meet Warren's Ophel Wall.

Similar beds occur along the top of the *scarped* rock, so far back from the face of the wall at N to permit of our supposing that they served for the stones of the inner face of the wall. Another supposition will be mentioned later. At T the stones of the wall NP are cut diagonally to let in a small buttress, the purpose of which is mysterious.

We have now to consider the wall TR (*see* key plan). This advances at about right angles from the wall NP, which, however, runs *back* of TR, sure proof that the latter is an addition. The face of TR consists of masonry similar to that found at K, but the height of the courses is greater, averaging 13 inches instead of 10½. The stones are well set in lime, having picked centres and comb-picked margins, but no projections. Towards T the dressing becomes finer, and a fine, comb-pick dressing mingles with the picked-work in the centres. About half-way between T and R a straight joint runs through the thickness, not occurring, however, in the facing stones. To the left of this joint the thickness is 8 feet; beyond the joint it is 9 feet. At the point R this wall no longer rests on the rock but on the consolidated stuff mentioned before. At R the wall stops, but we have no clear corner. Trenching in a line further on failed to reveal any continuation of TR. However, the rude wall RS was followed for some 35 feet at right angles. Breaking through its face at two places we found its thickness to be only 3 feet, but it was built up against a face of a *second* wall, which turned out to be 5 feet thick. This second face is of masonry, in general similar to that at TR, but not so finely dressed or well-set. Beyond S much work was done, which was tedious and expensive, owing to complicated land-ownership, and to the fact that we were obliged to destroy numerous small plots of lettuce at one shilling and ninepence the plat. Hence it was a disappointment to find no further traces of RS, though the point where it stopped was not ascertained within a few feet, owing to a quarrel between two landowners as to their boundary.

Our theory as to the line TRS is as follows:—The thickness of the wall TR makes it probable that it was part of the city wall, and its position indicates that it may have formed the side of a tower; the absence of a good corner suggests that this tower may have projected further; the *inner wall* along the line RS (5 feet thick) may have been a partition wall within the tower; when the original outer face was ruined the projection of the tower was decreased and the inner partition was strengthened by the added face, 3 feet thick, thus forming a new outer face, 8 feet thick, for the curtailed tower. The straight joint within the thickness of TR suggests some other sub-period. The probable limits of this tower are indicated by dotted lines on the general plan.

The question now arises: to what relative period are we to assign this tower? It is certainly later than NP, which runs back of it. It is hence

later than HIM, of which NP is a continuation. But it seems also probable that it represents a tower built after HIM was abandoned, as the long narrow passage between IM and TR is an arrangement difficult to explain, as the rock rising perpendicularly at the end of it shuts out the theory that a gate once existed there. Assuming, then, that this outer dam was abandoned, we may suggest that the inner dam, now existing (marked "Present Wall of Old Pool" on key-plan), was built at a later period, and used for the line of the city wall, which then ran along the stepped-up scarp at M (*see* elevation NP), and perhaps further on made use of the old line at P. TRS may then be considered as a tower projecting from this new line of city wall. I am obliged to mention that this assumption necessitates the corollary that the masonry at the point of reparation K is older than the line TR, which is so similar to it. If, however, they are contemporaneous, the theory may be so far modified as to include K as a sort of buttress in the new system. This would still do away with the very long narrow passage. It is a pity that the much-used road interfered with our determining the limits of the masonry at K, which does not continue to the next shaft.

A last period remains to be described. This is the wall TU, behind which NP also runs. It is built on the ruined remains of the wall TR, and is also 8 feet thick. It consists of large rough rubble. The corner occurs at U, beyond which it was traced for a few feet. Long and unsuccessful search was made for it further on. We assume it to be a small tower projecting from the later line of wall when the tower TRS was destroyed.

The work described in these few pages cost us much thought and money. Owing to the nature of the ground and to the jealousy of small proprietors, the number of shafts sunk relative to the length of tunnels bored was far greater than ever before. As some of the walls examined ran parallel and near to each other, the ground was pretty well honey-combed. The vegetables destroyed were of the more expensive varieties. The matter was much complicated by the various reparations and rebuildings. But it is just these that give the corner its great importance in the history of Jerusalem fortification, and justify the expenditure of time and money. These various reconstructions have been shown on the plans. Our study of these, on the ground, have forced us to admit *five distinct periods*, some of them showing indications of sub-periods, for the wall crossing the Tyropæon below the Old Pool and running up the eastern hill. At the risk of some repetition, we may recapitulate these in order :—

1. The wall with advancing buttresses, built without lime. This wall is in general 8 feet thick, but rests on a base-wall projecting in a line with the buttress faces, which project 11 feet from the upper wall, giving 19 feet as the thickness of the base-wall. A large corner buttress occurs at HI, the line running back north-west to the point N, and then turning up the hill in a north-easterly direction. Between the corner I and the point N this first wall had been much damaged, but the original

masonry is *in situ* at J. This system is represented on the key-plan in solid black.

2. The second period consists of a strengthening of the first by filling up the spaces between the buttresses with masonry carried up from the base-wall, thus giving about 19 feet as the thickness of the dam along its entire length. The ruined corner buttress was repaired, but its angle was altered. The character of the masonry of this first reparation may be seen in the work at the left of "projection J." No lime is used.

3. The masonry at K, so different from any observed elsewhere on the line, demands our recognition of a distinct reparation at this point. Not only are the stones smaller, but the dressing is peculiar, and the stones are set in lime.

The great strengthening of the wall across the valley was not sufficient to stand the pressure of water from the Old Pool, for its bulging forward necessitated the building of a rough retaining wall, seen in the cross-sections at F and I on plate facing p. 309 of the *Quarterly* for 1895. This work may have been contemporaneous with the reparation at K.

4. Thus far our recapitulation has been concerned with reparations on one line of wall. It has been shown before, however, that the tower TRS probably projected from an altered line of wall, *i.e.*, from a continuation of the present wall of Old Pool, when the lower dam had been abandoned. The similarity between the masonry along the line TR and that at K was noticed, and the possibility of K's being a buttress on the new line was admitted. But we would still have four periods up to this point, for, if K does not belong to the earlier dam wall, then the second strengthening of this dam would be earlier than K, thus falling under a distinct period. Indications of sub-periods in the tower TRS have been shown to exist.

5. The line TU has been taken to represent a tower projecting from the supposed second line of wall, built upon the ruins of the tower TRS. This brings up the number of periods to five.

We have presented to the reader the facts from which we have deduced these five periods, and our reasons for deducing them. He may not entirely agree with us in either the number or in the order of the periods deduced. The important point is that these various reconstructions actually exist. Any one glancing at the elevations, without reading a word of my explanation, will admit this. A wall may present one of two kinds of patchwork. It may have been built at one time out of various kinds of old material, which will then be jumbled together. Or the patchwork may result from reparations, effected at different times, in which case we would find blocks of homogeneous material, set in a distinct manner, extending for some considerable length. Such is the patchwork we are now considering. Whatever may be the exact relation of these various reconstructions they declare one fact: at many periods in the history of Jerusalem

the city wall crossed the Tyropœon below the Old Pool. The continuation of the line up the rock of the eastern hill proves that we are dealing with no mere dam wall. While excavating is still going on the digger should be careful in making historical deductions. However, I will venture my tentative opinion that our buttressed wall (built without lime) is the old Jewish wall, which, when the Siloam Aqueduct was constructed, in all probability included the pool within the city. The various reparations on it may have been the work of later Jewish kings. Leaving the line at the time of Herod an open question, we have to account for the tower TRS, which appears to belong to the line of the present existing dam wall, built after the old dam was abandoned. Eudocia found the pool excluded from the city and she included it; hence these works may have been the reconstruction. One thing is clear: the various periods along this line represent many builders, and Eudocia can hardly have been the first; hence it is reasonable to suppose that some of it must have been ruined and abandoned when she began the work.

Interesting light has been thrown upon the extent of the Old Pool; which reached to the buttress HI. We have shown elsewhere how the roughly-built retaining wall was permeated by a natural cement formed of carbonate of lime, produced by the action of water on the stones, doubtless through leakage or overflow from the pool. This exceedingly hard "stuff" was found also all around the buttress HI; none of it remains at K, but it occurs beyond. It extends as far as R, the later wall TR at that point being built upon it.

Reference has been made to the conduit closed by the wall NP which was built back into it. On the key-plan a branch may be seen to enter it from the right. This branch seems to be the main line of Schick's "Second Aqueduct" from the Virgin's Fountain to the Pool of Siloam (compare plan facing p. 13 of the *Quarterly* for 1891). These conduits are hewn in the solid rock. The branch conduit is at least 7 feet high; its floor being 5 feet 9 inches higher than that of the other, the drop being almost perpendicular. At the point of junction the main conduit is over 13 feet high, but its roof drops 5 feet at the point where the back of the wall NP is let in. The wall NP is clearly later than this part of the conduit. But we cannot tell whether it be later or earlier than the branch aqueduct conduit which, as I have said, represents part of Schick's "Second Aqueduct."

On p. 12 of the last report I spoke of a wall and scarp found to the west of the series of shafts sunk across the Tyropœon, separated from these by a road. Though the wall was built of small, rough stones (set in lime), in courses averaging only 10 inches high, its thickness, ascertained at a point where it is built directly on the scarp to be 8 feet, decided us to follow it. Elsewhere the thickness could not be determined: as its foundations are built *against* the scarp (12 inches out), the part once higher than the top of the scarp being ruined. It had been traced north to the road and south to a point where it had been ruined, the

scarp running on with two turnings. Our excavations since, while taking considerable thought and labour, have been negative in their results. A shaft was made to the north, beyond the road. A rough wall, partly in the rock, was found in the line desired, but only  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet thick. Pushing west from its inside face for 9 feet, under the road, we found a wall, running apparently parallel, of similar thickness and material. These two walls evidently belong to a small house. Between these two walls, and outside the first one, were the parallel walls of a cemented Birket,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  feet thick, older than the house. We trenched and tunnelled for some 30 feet along the descending rock east from the first wall, in order to catch any turn of the scarp or wall desired, with no results beyond the finding of another rude wall 4 feet thick. Thinking that the Birket may have occurred within the thickness of the desired wall (as sometimes happens, notably in the Crusading Wall discovered in the western hill) we followed the western Birket wall beyond the Birket limits, where its thickness was still found to be only 4 feet. In this tunnel another Birket was crossed.

In the meantime we were following the scarp at the southern end of the line discovered last season. This had been proved to be earlier than the wall built partly on it and partly against it, but it still was thought to represent possibly an earlier line of wall. It was followed this season along various turnings for over 50 feet. It is never more than 10 feet high, and its top is buried under only a few feet of soil. At one place a large chamber has been hewn back into the rock, with apertures, like small cupboards, cut into its sides, similar to other niches found at other points of the scarp, clear indication that we were following a system of rock-hewn dwellings, such as we had found before on this same line, and such as occur at many places on this western hill. The rock, forming the back wall of this chamber, was plastered. A thin wall of masonry enclosed it in front. The many windings of the scarp, occurring close together, while quite explicable on the theory of dwellings, would have no place on a scarp hewn for the base of a wall, hence this excavation was abandoned.

Owing to many causes the year 1896 was the most trying one I have experienced since I began to excavate. The beginning of it found us in Jerusalem with only a few days of work to be done before we should close for the winter, but so uncertain was the weather that we had to snatch a day here and a day there from the storms and we could not get off before January 22nd. The very day after our return in March, our valued foreman, Abu Selim, was taken ill with pneumonia and died a week after. Yusuf, our servant, was put in as foreman, but how we missed the tall commanding figure of Abu Selim, and his cheery welcome whenever we visited the shafts! The rainy season was very late and continued to interrupt our work. Then came the second sudden blow—the death of Ibrahim Effendi, our Commissioner. Fortunately we were able to keep the post in the family of the Khaldi to whom the excavations owe so much, and the son of Ibrahim Effendi was appointed. Showkat

Effendi has carried on the admirable traditions of his father, and has always shown himself anxious to serve our interests.

By the end of April we had at last settled down to steady work which we hoped to continue without interruption through the year, but the last day of our permit came on May 12th, and the notice of its renewal had not arrived! Then followed a period of waiting, writing, telegraphing, far more wearing than the hardest work. Meanwhile came the attack upon us, resulting in the breaking of Mr. Dickie's arm. I preferred to stick to the camp, but the weather had become terribly hot, and I found that a tent was no place for literary work in the middle of a summer's day. The delay grew more and more tantalising. The workmen were waiting, the tools were at hand, the weather was propitious, the clues were waiting to be unravelled—and yet we could not work.

With the permission to continue, which arrived in July, our luck changed. By increasing the number of shafts we were able to make up for lost time. Important discoveries at once begun to cheer us. After a while Mr. Dickie was able to return to camp and to work. Yusif soon showed a gratifying aptitude for his new responsibilities, and, notwithstanding his youthfulness, secured the respect of the workmen. The mantle of Abu Selim seems to have fallen upon him. He shows true interest in the work, and amuses himself—and us!—by making plans on paper, mixing ground-plan and elevations in the manner of the ancient geographers. He follows a clue with the instinct of an archæological fox-hound, but his enthusiasm fails to bear him up when we are seeking to prove a negative. To this scientific height his spirit does not rise, and he hails with an instantly reviving interest the orders to stop work on a long tunnel that has yielded no positive results. In this interest the workmen share. Whether they find a building or not their pay is the same, but when following an important clue they work with increased vigour. Indeed they are often quite disheartened when a shaft proves unsuccessful. The excavation of the Great Scarp, the Steps, and the Church, all within the same limited area, involved a honey-combing of the ground, but I am happy not to chronicle a single accident. Once a supposed crack in the side of a shaft threatened to produce a panic, which was averted by changing the head of the gang. The brave Ahmed was called from another tunnel, and his superb scorn of the supposed danger proved an effectual discipline. The Byzantine Church attracted numerous visitors, especially of the ecclesiastical orders, and as this could be approached at one point by a hole in the terrace, we were obliged to keep a guard at this entrance on Sundays. As we were working in a field held in common by the people of Siloam, we agreed to clear the Pool of a lot of rubbish which had fallen in, and further gratified them by facilitating the approach to the opening of the tunnel. This helped our work in many ways.

Thanks to the kindness of Père Germer, our camp was pitched in the land of the Augustinians, but we hired a little one-roomed house, with a cellar below, situated on the slope of the western hill some 150 feet

above the Old Pool, and just within the line of the ancient city wall. Here we stored our wooden frames, and kept our few antiquities, and here Mr. Dickie drew his plans. On hot days, when the tents became unbearable, we lunched in this upper room. From the door we could look up the Valley of Hinnom, from one window down upon Bir Ayûb, and from another we could see our shafts in the Tyropœon and on the eastern hill. We were thus within instant call if anything important turned up between our regular visits. When the rains drove us to the hotel, Yusif and our servant moved to this room, where every evening a number of Siloam people sat and drank coffee. These little receptions



(From a photograph)

CAPITAL FROM THE BYZANTINE CHURCH FOUND IN THE EXCAVATIONS  
AT THE POOL OF SILOAM.

had their value in establishing friendly relations with the owners of cauliflower and cabbage upon which we had designs. I look forward to some distant day when I may visit Jerusalem and walk the streets without having to eye everyone I meet as a possible owner of vegetables.

The work began at sunrise. As a rule we did not visit the excavations till after the half-hour's break for the men's breakfast at eight o'clock. Then all the shafts were visited, and various practical matters discussed with the foreman—the shoring up of a bad tunnel, the obstinacy (from our point of view) of some landowner uninterested in Jerusalem topography; the best (and cheapest) method of awakening such an interest; the laziness of some workmen.

Then followed lunch and a little rest, often interrupted by a summons to the work. Then another regular visit to the shafts, and perhaps the sudden giving out of a clue and the starting of new work. Often as we were just leaving the excavations for the day, a bevy of visitors would turn up, who required particular attention, and whom we were glad to see, though the hour might be untimely. On moonlight nights, dining in camp is delightful. Our tents were watched by a negro guard and a dog; these were really meant to watch each other. For the guard was instructed not to let the dog bark and disturb our slumbers; and the dog was instructed to bark whenever the guard showed signs of somnolence. Hence we were, on the whole, pretty well guarded.

In reviewing the work done during the last year, as well as all our work done since we began to dig at Jerusalem, there is one great regret. With the exception of a few remains, all our discoveries, achieved by arduous work of tunnelling, have been covered up again. Walls and towers, streets and mosaics, unseen and forgotten for centuries, have, during the last three years, been once more looked upon by a few observers, and again have been buried under the soil. Since the double wall on the western hill was excavated, a crop of barley has been sown and reaped in the ground which again covers it. I never fail to feel a sort of melancholy when I give the orders to repack the tunnels and to fill the shafts level with the surrounding fields. The one satisfaction is that it is safer to leave these ancient remains under the protecting cover of *débris*, than to irresponsible landowners, who would see in these monumental stones only material for building walls and houses. It is a comfort to feel that the Crusading Tower, found in the land of the Augustinians, has been left open, and is being carefully protected by the proprietors.

BEIRÛT, *February 20th*, 1897.

---