

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
OF THE PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND.

THE Fifty-eighth Annual General Meeting of the Fund was held at the Rooms of the Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, W., on Wednesday, 20th June, 1923, D. G. HOGARTH, Esq., C.M.G., D.Litt., F.S.A. (Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum), presiding.

Letters of apology were read by the Chairman from Sir George Adam Smith, Rev. Dr. Ewing, Rev. George Christian, Dr. Barbour, Miss Stewart, Rev. Prof. Sayce, Bishop Ryle, and Rev. Prof. Robertson Buchanan.

Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN (Hon. Secretary) then read the Minutes of the Meeting held on May 30th, 1922, which were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN announced that last year the Society included upwards of 300 members, and that 83 new names had since qualified for membership.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen. We meet to-day on a truly epoch-making occasion in the history of this Society, for we are about to undertake the excavation of the City of David. That has always been the goal of our ambition and the ambition of everyone who has ever wished to excavate in Palestine. I do not think I need enlarge upon the extraordinary interest of that particular site. I do not say that it is an excavator's site. I do not say that, if it were not for its special interest, it is a site which an excavator simply in search of antiquities would choose, because there is a rocky hill, and what we shall have to expect are rather pockets of earth than any very great continuous blanket of earth which may conceal unlimited possibilities. In fact, the excavation of Ophel will be more like that of the Acropolis of Athens than anything I myself have seen. Those who know the Museum of modern Athens will know from the extraordinary wealth of things to be seen there what an immense light was thrown upon the history of Athens by the nature of the discoveries made upon the summit of the Acropolis. And it is something of that kind we must expect upon the Hill of Ophel.

I should like to read what was thought by the Dean of Westminster of this particular project. He has written to Dr. Masterman, our Honorary Secretary, as follows :—

“It has always been my hope, since British control was established in Jerusalem, that this work might be undertaken, provided that a skilled excavator and archaeologist was in command of the enterprise. Nothing, in my opinion, could be of more value and interest than the excavation of this site. I have always dreamed that the tombs of the kings might be found; and it is quite conceivable that beneath the accumulations of rubbish the most valuable discoveries might be made, possibly going back to the time of David and Solomon. At any rate, I congratulate you upon the step which has been taken, and still more upon your good fortune in obtaining the skilled assistance of Prof. Macalister. You could not have found a better man for the work. I enclose you a cheque for £10, and I wish you and your colleagues all success in what I should regard as research of most thrilling possibilities. The country ought to be grateful for the assistance given by *The Daily Telegraph*.”

There is another letter from an old friend and member of this Society well known to everybody here by name, if not personally, namely, Prof. Sayce.

You see what the Dean of Westminster expects. We shall all expect different things from the Tomb of Ophel according to our particular idiosyncrasies; but I should like to say that the Fund does not dig there expecting, or hoping, for any particular thing, and that it certainly does not mean to dig there in the interest of any one particular hope. We are going there to fulfil the first duty of an excavator, which is to dig right down to the bedrock of that portion of the site which is allotted to us, to record everything and to publish everything. As the Dean of Westminster has said, we are peculiarly fortunate in that we have been able to secure for this work the services of Professor Macalister (hear, hear), because, as all those who know his record realise, and as all those who have read his three great volumes on Gezer also know, he belongs to that class of excavators who find the small things, which are very often much more valuable than the big. He does not leave other people to find the things

which you cannot miss because you break your shins over them in the dark! I have seen that kind of excavator fairly often. Professor Macalister is not of that type. You may be perfectly certain that what there is in the soil of that portion of the Hill of Ophel which is allotted to us will be found, recorded and published. As I say, we have always wished to excavate the Hill of Ophel, but we have never had the funds for the purpose until now. It is the question of funds, as perhaps I might now explain, which has caused us to interrupt that excavation which we undertook three or four years ago on the site of Askalon. The site of Askalon was one of extraordinary interest if you could get down to the bottom of it. But in those lean years which, you will remember, immediately followed the War, it was not to be expected that the name of Askalon would cause people to unbutton their tightly-buttoned pockets and open their purses. The result was that as soon as we found we were up against that, as soon as we found we had to deal with a site with an enormous overlying stratum of later remains, a site, part of which was cultivated and expensive to appropriate, we were compelled to desist from the attempt to uncover the Philistine City.

The Hill of Ophel is a far more attractive site to those who are able to support us, and I am glad to say that not only are we secure as regards the Palestine Government, for we have received a telegram assuring us that we shall have the Concession of a part of the site and that we can begin our work without delay, but we have also been assured by a series of most fortunate occurrences of the proper supply of funds. I should say that the Palestine Government stipulated that £5,000 must be in hand before they would allow any part of the site of Ophel to be dug. That seemed to us at first rather a hard saying, but on reflection we saw that the Palestine Government was perfectly right. It has to clear the site, to expropriate the owners, and it would, of course, land them in extreme difficulties if the excavations were begun and then, as in the case of Askalon, had to be abandoned. They were perfectly justified in stipulating that there should be such funds forthcoming at once as would secure the continuance of the excavations for at least two years.

In view of the present expense of all excavation work we cannot reckon that the sum of £5,000 will necessarily last more than two years; at the same time, however, we hope it will. That

£5,000 has been got together in this way : Your Society was able by considerable strain, and with the assistance of the British Academy, to provide £2,000 of it. Then an unexpected and very generous and public-spirited benefactor in the person of Mr. Charles Marston, whom we are glad to welcome here (applause)—knowing our difficulties and knowing the extreme uncertainty of our obtaining that money by merely issuing appeals for public response, came forward with a generous offer of £2,000 without any conditions whatever. (Applause.) He does not ask that we should dig the site in any particular way or that he should receive any part of the proceeds in the form of antiquities. He does not stipulate, in fact, anything but simply gives us, in the most open-handed and generous way, £2,000 in order that this great scientific work may go forward. That put us in possession of £4,000. The remaining £1,000 has been made up by the public spirit of Lord Burnham, the proprietor, as everyone knows, of a very great journal. He is acting partly from his own interest in the excavation of a sacred city like that of Ophel. He is also acting in the interests of his great journal. He places at our disposal not only £1,000 now, but he has been good enough, not to promise, but to suggest, that if the work prospers and if more money is forthcoming, that he may be able to find still more for us in the future. (Applause.)

More than that, as Prof. Sayce has indicated in the letter I read to you just now, Lord Burnham secures for us that publicity which is so essential. If we are to ever undertake other sites than the City of David, sites which appeal less strongly to the public mind, if they appeal hardly less strongly to the scientific mind, —as, e.g., Askalon—we need to be better known, and we shall attain that through the interest which Lord Burnham betrays in us by his generous gift. He only asks in return that the Expedition shall be called the Joint Expedition of the Palestine Exploration Fund and the *Daily Telegraph*. Your Committee has seen no reason not to agree gladly to that. But at the same time Lord Burnham has most emphatically said that the whole management of the excavation shall remain in the hands of the Palestine Exploration Fund. They will be the managers ; it will be for them to treat with the Government of Palestine and it will be for them to determine how and in what way results shall be published. Only, every article written by any member of the staff upon the excavation during the course of the work will be put at the

discretion of the *Daily Telegraph*; they can publish it if they like, or pass it on if they like. I ought to add that Lord Burnham has said that when the *Daily Telegraph* has published the reports of the excavation from the City of Ophel he will then place what has appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* at the service of every newspaper and every publishing agency in the world, free of cost. (Applause.) So that the news of what we do will go out into the ends of the world, and I think it will not be difficult to find in any part of the world someone, and generally a number of people, who have a great interest in the exploration of Jerusalem.

We start, therefore, our excavation under singularly favourable auspices. Not only in the respects of which I have already spoken, but also in the matter of the Palestine Government. It will be within your knowledge that the present High Commissioner of the British Government under the British Mandate in Palestine has always been one of our warmest and most constant friends. Sir Herbert Samuel has displayed throughout the greatest interest in our excavations, and has been present at one or two of our meetings when in London, and we can be perfectly certain that he will give this excavation every support in his power—and a very great deal is in his power. We are further fortunate in having as Director of the Department of Antiquities in Jerusalem at the present time Professor Garstang. Professor Garstang, as also you must know, is himself a very distinguished and successful excavator. He knows not only what should be done in excavation; he knows what should be done in the way of recording an excavation, what should be done in the way of publishing the results of an excavation, and he is not in the least afraid to insist that what he knows is right shall be done. I think we are very fortunate in having to deal with him. He will be present in Jerusalem probably during most of the time the excavation is going on, and we shall be able to refer to him on any matter of difficulty which we have with the inhabitants, the Government, or in any other direction. He is assisted, as you know, by Mr. Phythian-Adams, who has actually been the honorary representative of the Palestine Exploration Fund in the excavations of last year. He is also a trained archaeologist, trained by several excavations in the north and in Syria, and his assistance and co-operation will be very valuable to us. I think I need say no more with regard to the staff we are going to send except

this: that we hope to give Professor Macalister, before he goes, a trained assistant who will be able, should it be necessary in the future, to carry on the excavations when Professor Macalister's many duties at home recall him from the work he is eager to go out to do. So I think we may say that we start very well equipped on this excavation of the City of David on the Hill of Ophel.

I may say the excavation is intended to cover the whole of that semi-circular area lying to the south of the Haram, but I need hardly say it is not intended to entrench in any shape or form upon the Haram. We shall respect every prejudice, every sensibility and sentiment. No one need think for one moment that there is any chance whatever of the jealously-guarded area of the Haram being in anyway violated by the work done by us or anybody else connected with the excavation of Ophel.

I see, indeed, only one small cloud upon the horizon. I do not think it will grow to cover the whole sky as once on neighbouring Carmel. I think it will disappear. Of course you cannot help noticing for yourselves in the papers accounts of a certain liveliness in Palestine, a certain unrest upon the roads, a certain tendency to political boycott on the part of the Arabs. I do not myself think that will be in the least likely to impede our work at Jerusalem. It is the last place in which it will impede it. Had we been on some distant provincial site in Philistia, for instance, there might have been some danger; but we may observe at Beisan, which, although it is upon the railway between Haifa and the Sea of Galilee, is rather a remote place with a surrounding Bedouin population which does not enjoy too good repute, that the American excavators who are there have been in no way interfered with by any political conditions. I think on the whole we may confidently expect that, so long as the British Government maintains a firm hand in that country—and it is likely to do so at least as long as this excavation goes on—we excavators will be in no danger of disturbance or our plans in no danger of being brought to nought. So I think we may all congratulate ourselves on being present to-day on an occasion on which we make a public announcement of certainly the greatest and most important enterprise which your Society has ever undertaken and one which is likely to attract by far the greatest attention from the whole civilised world, not only of the Christian denomination but of all other denominations. (Applause.)

I should like to say one word more, if you will allow me. On this occasion one cannot help regretting particularly the absence of one of our recent colleagues upon the Executive Committee, and that is Professor George Buchanan Gray. He was present when the first intimation was made to the Society that the excavation at Ophel was in contemplation; that is to say, when the Palestine Government first communicated to the Society its desire that that hill should be dug and its determination by the legal means in its power to make that excavation possible. He was a constant attendant at the meetings of the Executive Committee, and brought to it immense knowledge and very sound judgment. You know how suddenly he was called last autumn. I can only say, speaking for the Executive Committee, that we can hardly imagine any member of it whom we could more ill have spared, and certainly at the present moment one could wish that Professor Buchanan Gray were present here in person to see the fulfilment of the hopes which he always himself cherished warmly. If there was any one member of the Committee more than another who particularly wished the City of David should be dug and become the main aim of the energies of the Fund it was George Buchanan Gray.

DR. E. W. G. MASTERMAN.—I want also to read, as is customary on these occasions, the names of other members deceased since the last Annual Meeting:—

Of the Executive Committee:

Rev. Professor G. Buchanan Gray.
Mr. W. H. Rylands.

Of the General Committee:

Lord Eustace Cecil.
Père Germer Durand.
M. Clermont-Ganneau.
Rev. James Hastings.
Professor Henry Porter.
Professor T. Witton Davies.

The CHAIRMAN.—I now beg formally to move the adoption of the Report and Accounts in your hands.

Prof. MACALISTER.—It is my duty to second that motion, and I may perhaps take the opportunity of saying a word or two about the work to which you, Mr. Chairman, have so sympathetically referred.

Through the generosity of a small number of subscribers, the Palestine Exploration Fund has been put in a position to organize, and to undertake single-handed, an enterprise which, when it was originally planned, was expected to call for the co-operation of a number of different societies of as many different nationalities. With the Palestine Exploration Fund will be associated the *Daily Telegraph*, a newspaper which has had an honourable record in connection with exploration work in the East. We recall with pleasure that it was the *Daily Telegraph* which financed the expedition of George Smith to Kuyunjik, after that remarkable man had discovered the first of the "Flood Tablets," now in the British Museum, in the year 1873.

The excavation which, it is hoped, will begin in September next, will be on the Eastern Hill, south of the present walls of Jerusalem—the hill accepted by practically all modern scholarship as the site of the original Jebusite fortress, which afterwards became "The City of David," or, as Sir G. A. Smith more picturesquely renders the Hebrew name, "Davidsburgh." I am looking forward to be associated practically with the work for the first three or four months, but my University and other duties in Ireland will not permit me to remain longer in the field; the work will, after the end of the present year, be in the charge of my future colleague.

When a work of the kind is in contemplation it is inevitable that the excavator should be asked "What do you hope to find?" If he is a wise man he will imitate a famous character in Ethiopian folklore, and will "lie low and say nuffin'." Excavation is essentially a work that involves disappointments and surprises; and the excavator who goes to a site with the intention, or even in the expectation, of finding an inscription of some particular king, or of solving some outstanding problem in topography, is inevitably laying up disillusionment both for himself and for his patrons. By the new regulations under which the work is carried out, the expedition is entitled to the concession of a certain area of land, proportioned to the amount of the funds subscribed for the work; I calculate that we shall have,

speaking very roughly, about an acre assigned to us. We shall dig that acre as thoroughly as possible, and shall take out of it whatever gifts the gods may see fit to send us.

What those gifts will be I do not presume to foretell. What they might be could be made the subject of almost endless speculations. It is on the whole wiser to pitch our anticipations low rather than high. On that account I would put in the forefront the grounds for *discouragement*. Let us not forget, first, that the native civilization of the country was never very high, so far as art products are concerned. It was practically entirely dependent for its art upon foreign civilizations, in turn Egypt, Crete, Cyprus, Babylon, Greece, Rome. The iconoclastic reforms of the late kings of Judah, such as Hezekiah and Josiah, were naturally most of all directed against foreign abuses at the capital itself; and, therefore, little in the way even of imported works of art is to be anticipated.

Again, we must remember the perfectly extraordinary scarcity in Palestine of historical inscriptions. Excavations have been carried on, since 1867 at Jerusalem itself, Lachish, Taanach, Megiddo, Samaria, Jericho, Gath, Azekah, Marissa, Gezer—and the total record of literary inscriptions in stone, previous to the Exile, still remains where it was—the stele of King Mesha of Moab, and the inscription in the Siloam Tunnel: that is all. We can hardly add, even as a makeweight, the calendar-tablet from Gezer. But if such inscriptions are anywhere at all, they ought to be in Jerusalem!

Moreover, let us not forget how many times the city has been besieged and pillaged by powerful monarchs greedy of gold. The Treasures of the Temple have been either captured by foreign pillagers, or used by native kings to buy off foreign aggressors, over and over again. These stores of gold had to be replaced, and no doubt the gold possessed by the private citizens was levied for the purpose. Hence, we need scarcely expect any hidden stores of wealth in the shape of the precious metals, whether worked or unworked.

In the fourth place, I confess that I am much perturbed when I read the account given by Josephus of certain operations carried out by Simon Maccabaeus. Down to the time of that great leader there was something in Jerusalem called “The Akra.” It was a sort of citadel, and was so lofty that it over-

topped the Temple, making it possible for a hostile army to occupy it and to attack the Temple and its worshippers. Indeed, so convenient was it for this purpose that in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was determined to destroy all the distinctive features of Judaism, the Temple was actually deserted, and those who refused to submit to the king's edicts fled from the Holy City. After the successful Maccabæan rising, when the Temple worship was restored, Simon summoned all the citizens of Jerusalem, and caused them not only to demolish the citadel, but actually to level the hill upon which it was built, so that never again could the Temple be thus commanded.

No one knows exactly where the Akra was, but certain rather obscure topographical indications have suggested to some scholars that it was on the site of the City of David. If then Simon demolished this building and levelled the underlying hill, casting the materials into the adjacent valley—Josephus tells us that the citizens of Jerusalem worked unceasingly, day and night, for three years—then what untold damage he must have done to the remains of the city of the Jebusites and of David!

I have emphasised these four facts because they should not be forgotten. They must necessarily influence our anticipations, and may quite possibly be the cause of real disappointment.

But we need not remain altogether in this sombre mood. In the first place, we shall surely find evidence from which various aspects of the daily life of the city can be reconstructed. Our history shows us an almost empty city through which David and Absalom, Ahaz and Isaiah, Jeremiah and Jehoiakim pursue their lonely courses, each according to his own disposition. We shall people that city with potters and carpenters, with bronze-workers and smiths; we shall bring the crowds on to the stage and reveal the very people who jostled the living men that bore the names just mentioned. Whatever may not be found, of this at least we can be sure, we shall paint in a background that the historians have only vaguely outlined. We must not overlook the fact that at any given moment in the history of the city, for one man whose name has crept into the record there were thousands who were not so fortunate; so that the probability is enormously in favour of our work being among the "mute, inglorious" folk, rather than among the men of fame.

But if we were to give reins to our imagination, of what

prizes might we not dream! The Tell el-Amarna tablets reveal to us a king called Abdi-Khiba, an accomplished intriguer and diplomat. He must have conducted a correspondence with other kings in Palestine and with the king of Egypt: this follows almost inevitably from the contents of the six or seven letters written in his name that were included in the correspondence referred to. His archive-chamber ought to be somewhere in the mound, and *might* be in our acre. Then David, and yet more probably Solomon, might well have set up an inscribed monument setting forth their victories; there is no valid reason why this is to be rejected as inadmissible. As for the Tomb of David, I should like to say a word. There have been some quite unauthorised articles in the papers, especially in America, stating that the Tomb of David is the objective of the proposed expedition. I desire emphatically to contradict this. The objective of the expedition is to excavate a certain area of the ancient city, and to discover what may lie hidden therein—nothing more and nothing less. If the Tomb of David happens to be within the area, we shall find it; but even then we must not expect a Palestinian sensation like the discovery of the tomb of Tut-ankh-amen last year. That is one of the might-have-beens, if, once more, we are to believe Josephus, who tells us that John Hyreanus, son of Simon Maccabaeus, opened the Tomb of David and took out of it no less than three thousand talents of silver—which he expended, at least partly, in maintaining an army of foreign mercenaries. And later, Herod the Great, “having heard that Hyreanus, who had been king before him, had opened David’s sepulchre, and taken out of it three thousand talents of silver, and that there was a much greater number left behind, and indeed to suffice all his wants, he had opened that sepulchre by night and went into it. . . . As for any money, he found none as Hyreanus had done, but that furniture of gold and precious goods were laid up there; all of which he took away.” So that even if the tomb be found it will be an empty cave, like the countless rifled tombs which gape in the hillsides all round the city.

When we come to the later phases of the monarchy of Judah, we naturally think of the prosperous times of King Uzziah. It is not improbable that he is directly referred to on a seal, now in the Louvre, belonging to a person describing himself as

Shebaniah, servant of Uzziah. A little later the Assyrian menace is weighing heavily upon the city: the famous Siloam tunnel was constructed under its shadow. Later still, Judaea becomes completely tributary to Assyria, and Assyrian legal forms are imposed upon its peoples. Two Assyrian tablets were found at Gezer, relating to the sale of property, and dated about this time; and it has been noticed that the description of the documents involved in Jeremiah's purchase of a field at Anathoth fits the appearance of a cuneiform clay tablet, with its countersigned envelope. Further relics of this phase of the history might come to light.

Of the post-exilic period many important remains are already known, and many no doubt are still awaiting discovery. The foundations of some of the chief structures erected by Herod have yet to be found, though it is improbable that these will be included in the area at our disposal. I, therefore, shall say nothing about them, nor shall I speak of the problem of the identification of the Pool of Bethesda.

As an illustration of the unexpected, I may make a passing reference to the Synagogue remains, with the important inscription of Theodotos discovered by M. Raymond Weill just before the outbreak of the War. When we get on to the possibility of important buildings of which there is little or no literary record, the field of speculation is quite limitless.

Thus, though there is ground for discouragement, as I have not hesitated to admit, there is also ground for hope. We are setting forth into unknown waters; we may meet with but moderate results, but we may win prizes of the first magnitude. Nothing is certain: but anything is possible.

Those are just a few preliminary remarks which comprise all one can venture to say about the work at present in contemplation. I now simply content myself with seconding the motion proposed by the Chairman. (Applause.)

The Report and Accounts were then unanimously adopted.

Dr. PERCY D'ERF WHEELER: I beg to move that the following gentlemen be elected to the Executive Committee for 1923:—

Chairman: H. R. HALL, ESQ., D.LITT., F.S.A.

Hon. Treasurer: COLONEL SIR CHARLES CLOSE, K.B.E., C.B., C.M.G., F.R.S.

Hon. Secretary : E. W. G. MASTERMAN, ESQ., M.D., F.R.C.S.
 STANLEY A. COOK, ESQ., LITT.D. (*Editor*).
 REV. CANON DALTON, K.C.V.O., C.M.G.
 PROF. ARCHIBALD C. DICKIE, M.A., F.S.A.
 SIR ARTHUR EVANS, D.LITT., LL.D., F.R.S., F.S.A.
 HON. EVERARD FEILDING.
 D. G. HOGARTH, ESQ., C.M.G., D.LITT., F.B.A., F.S.A.
 LIEUT.-COLONEL E. M. JACK, C.M.G., D.S.O.
 A. W. A. LEEPER, ESQ., C.B.E.
 PROF. R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, LITT.D., F.S.A.
 CHARLES MARSTON, ESQ.
 ROBERT L. MOND, ESQ., M.A., F.R.S.
 HON. W. G. E. ORMSBY-GORE, M.P.
 BRIG.-GENERAL E. N. PAUL, C.B., R.E.
 F. W. PERCIVAL, ESQ., F.S.A.
 SIR WILLIAM M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L., LITT.D., LL.D.,
 PH.D., F.R.S.
 REV. PROF. SAYCE, LL.D., D.D., D.LITT.
 REV. P. N. WAGGETT.
 GENERAL SIR CHARLES WARREN, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., F.R.S.,
 R.E.

BISHOP MACCARTHY : Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have the pleasure of seconding the proposal for the election of the Executive Committee whose names have just been read, and in doing so, with your permission, sir, I should like to congratulate the authorities of this Fund upon the splendid future that seems to lie before them in this excavation which is about to take place at the City of David. I think it appeals to the imagination and to the interest of so many tens of thousands of people in our own country and in other countries ; in fact my own impression, ever since the very few years during which I have been just a simple subscriber to this wonderful Society, has been one of extreme wonder that the work in which it is engaged, being so intensely interesting to all who know anything of the Bible, to all who are in any way interested in the history of ancient times, my wonder is always that there are not thousands upon thousands of subscribers of a simple guinea a year instead of the comparatively few who do subscribe. I do wish some way could be found of making the work of the Society more thoroughly known in various centres throughout the

country. I cannot help thinking, though I am not prepared to say how it should be done, that there must be some way of making the work and the needs of the Fund better known. There must be thousands of people in all the great centres of population in England who, if they only knew the intense interest of the work being carried on by the Fund, would subscribe to it. With those few remarks I beg to second the motion for the election of the members of the Executive Committee named.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Dr. H. R. HALL (Chairman, Executive Committee) then gave an address upon the early relations between Egypt and Palestine.

One of the most interesting periods in the history of Palestine is that of the Egyptian conquest and overlordship in the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, from about 1500 B.C. to about 1370 B.C., and its revival under the XIXth Dynasty, from about 1320 B.C. to about 1190 B.C. For about 250 years in all Palestine was more or less a subject province of Egypt, and it is becoming increasingly probable that the Egyptian control, at any rate during the earlier period, was a good deal more closely exercised than has usually been supposed.

Recent discoveries are beginning to make us wonder whether the early Egyptians, before the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, were quite so isolated from their neighbours as used to be thought. The campaign of Sekmem (which Eduard Meyer identifies with Shechem), in which the warrior Khusebek fought in the time of Senusret III, was probably by no means an isolated incident, any more than the journey and exile of Sinuhet or the coming of Abshai and his family to Beni Hasan. Archaeological evidence shows that connexion with Egypt was by no means rare under the XIIth Dynasty. And now under the Old Kingdom we have the remarkable discoveries of M. Montet at Byblos, which have shown us that that Phoenician seaport was already, at the time of the Pyramid-builders, a sort of Egyptian colony, owing allegiance to Egypt, with Egyptian temples of Egyptian gods. This fact is very interesting on account of the traditional connexion of the Osiris legend with Byblos, and explains the fact that 1500 years later, under the XVIIIth Dynasty, the Phoenicians spoke of their ancient subjection and loyalty to Egypt. In fact, the relations of the Delta with the Lebanon coast must have been very close even in

earlier days than those of Seneferu and Khufu. It was the trade in wine and olive-oil, and in timber, none of which could be produced satisfactorily in hot Egypt, that brought the Nile ships to Phoenicia and Phoenician ships to Egypt in the grey dawn of history, when Osiris the Syrian god came from Nysa, the land of corn and wine, of milk and honey, the "Promised land," in fact, to Egypt. On these lines we are likely to hear very much more of interest in the near future, when Syria seems to be shaping out in our minds as one of the original foci of civilization on this planet.

We must modify our idea of the Egyptians as living in almost complete isolation in early days. With Palestine and Syria they were connected, not only by the land route, but also by that of the sea, which was perhaps safer, for there were not always pirates on the "Very Green," whereas the Bedouin robber was always with them. And sea traffic was no uncommon or new thing. It was not only with Phoenicia that trade went on: Crete and Aegean, perhaps even the more distant coasts of Sicily and Italy, sent their mariners to Egypt, and may have seen Egyptian or, at any rate, Phoenician sailors on their coasts, long ere the early classical times to which hitherto we have been disposed to limit their distant maritime activity. And down the Red Sea the Egyptians navigated to Puenet (Somaliland) or further, at least as early as the XIth Dynasty, probably much earlier; and Babylonians came from the mouths of the Two Rivers, round the Arabian coast, and into the Red Sea to the land of Māgan ("the land where ships went"), perhaps even while the Egyptians were still in the pre-dynastic period, certainly under the Old Kingdom, the days of the patesis of Lagash and of Ur.

In the case of Byblos the Egyptian connexion was one of sovereignty, it is obvious. And this may have been the foundation for later claims over the *hinterland*. As yet no Egyptian king claimed to rule beyond his borders, however. It was aggression from the Syrians, the Hyksos invasion and conquest, that turned the minds of Egypt's rulers to the conquest and domination of Syria and Palestine. I have myself suggested more than once that the Exodus of the Hebrews may be nothing but the same event as the Expulsion of the Hyksos looked at from another angle, the Semitic angle of vision rather than the Egyptian. This view is no new theory, though it has recently attracted no attention until I recorded it in my *Ancient History of the Near East*. It is of respectable

antiquity, and emanated originally from no less a person than Josephus, who knew a great deal about his own countrymen and their history, and also about the history of Romans, Greeks, and Egyptians. It is perhaps the typical view of the man who stands outside the strict national-Jewish fold, of the man who is without preconceived notions on the subject, and dispassionately selects the explanation that seems to him most probable.

As a view it suffers, of course, from difficulties, though the long period it entails for the sojourn in the wilderness is to my mind one of the least of them. And if the invading tribes of the Khabiru, who entered Palestine in the time of trouble and revolt which marked the reign of the heretical King Akhenaton are, as some think, to be identified with the Hebrews entering the Promised Land under Joshua, the period of wandering in the wilderness will correspond with that of the first Egyptian domination in Palestine.

Like the Hyksos, the Hebrews, according to the latest views, left Egypt by the well-known north-eastern gate of the country at Avaris, the later Raämses, called by the Greeks Pelusium, owing to the muddy and marshy nature of its surroundings. And on their march eastward by the coast-road by the sea and the Serbonian bog, the pursuing forces of the Egyptians may well have been overwhelmed in an attempt to cross the marsh, the Sea of Reeds as it is called in the Bible (translated in our version as "Red Sea"). Afterwards we are told the Hebrews did not pursue the usual eastward route to Gaza, the Way of the Philistines, but turned into the desert, southward perhaps to Sinai, if the Sinai of Christian and Moslem tradition which we now call Sinai is in reality the Sinai of the Book of Exodus, which is disputed.

I do not, however, wish now to discuss disputed points, but to give an idea of Palestine as it probably was under the earlier Egyptian domination.

We must think of it as a Palestine without either of the two contending nations which to us, with our familiarity with the Old Testament, seem the most prominent and characteristic of ancient Palestine, viz., the Hebrews and the Philistines. The Hebrews were, according to the Josephan view, in the Wilderness, probably in the mountains of Edom and the desert to the south-eastward. The Philistines had not yet arrived in their ships from the coasts of Kaphtor, the lands and isles of south-east Asia Minor from which they are now considered to have come. They did not come till a

much later period, the beginning of the twelfth century B.C., and their coming marked the end of the Egyptian domination. We are speaking of the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. The Canaanite was then in the land, the Hivite, the Jebusite, and the other tribes which we know of as conquered by the invading Hebrews. Further north, on the coast were the Phoenicians, then, as they were later, seafarers, traders, and artificers, each city of them on its little island or coast-settlement, ruled by its king. Inland were the Amorites of the Lebanon, and the other Syrians of the inland plain. To the north of them, the Hatti, or Hittites, of Anatolia, were already pressing down southward into Syria, and some of these Anatolians may already have filtered into southern Palestine, where we certainly find them at the close of the earlier Egyptian period and before the entry of the Hebrews. We also find there at that time a most interesting ethnic element, intrusive chiefs and nobles, if not peoples, of Indo-Iranian blood from the land of Mitanni, probably, the land between the Euphrates and Tigris in northern Mesopotamia, the district watered by the river Khabūr.

We must distinguish in our minds the Hittites from these Indo-Iranians. Many of us are no doubt aware that quite lately the labours of a Bohemian and of a Swiss cuneiform scholar, Professors Hrozný and Forrer, have revealed the fact that the language of many of the cuneiform tablets discovered by Hugo Winckler at Boghaz-Keui in Anatolia, the site of the ancient Hittite capital, was Indo-European, and West Indo-European at that, being in fact akin to Latin! Further research seems to show that though the syntax of this language and much of its vocabulary is Indo-European, many of its words undoubtedly resembling Latin, yet a very large proportion of its vocabulary is non-Indo-European. In this respect it resembles Greek, which is, properly speaking, as Indo-European in its syntax and general character as Latin, but seems to have in its vocabulary a far greater non-Aryan element, no doubt derived from the pre-Hellenic Bronze Age people whom we call Mycenaeans, Aegeans, or Minoans. The *tout-ensemble* of this Aryan Hittite, however, by no means resembles Greek, and its Aryan element seems closer to Latin, as I have said. The non-Aryan element in it is no doubt derived from the pre-Aryan population of Anatolia, where non-Aryan tongues, also found fragmentarily in Hittite cuneiform, were still spoken at the time of which I speak, and are also being investigated by Dr. Forrer. One of these no doubt,

probably the "Proto-hattic" of Forrer, was the tongue of the national Hittite hieroglyphic or picture-writing of the monuments, which survived till quite a late date, perhaps the ninth century B.C., at Carchemish on the Euphrates, but must, in the nature of things, have been used by the Hittites in Anatolia before they adopted the use of cuneiform from the Babylonians.

The Indo-Iranians of whom I have spoken were a different race from the Hittite Indo-Europeans: they came from the east across the Zagros into Mesopotamia, where some of them, the Kassites, usurped the sovereignty of Babylonia, while others lived in Mitanni alongside another invading race, perhaps of Turkic stock from Central Asia, the Kharri. The princes of Mitanni, who were more or less subject-allies of Egypt at this time, were of this Aryan race, and they worshipped the Indian gods Mitra, Indra, Varuna, and the *Ásvins* or *Nasātya*-twins. In South Palestine princes of this race ruled among the Canaanites, who bore such Aryan names as *Yazd-dāta* and *Surya-dāta*, "Sun-giver" (like the Greek *Heliodotus*), *Biridiya*, *Labaya*, *Namyawaza*, and others.

Such was the welter of chiefs and peoples whom the Egyptians found in Palestine: the native Semitic block with its aboriginal pre-Semitic elements akin to the Minoans and other pre-Aryan Mediterraneans, shot through and through with Anatolian West-Aryan, East-Aryan, and even other intrusive elements from the North.

Most of the ancient cities we know in the Hebrew period already existed, Gaza, Joppa, Tyre, Sidon, Aleppo, Carchemish, and the rest, including, of course, Jerusalem itself, then confined to the little tongue-like hill-slope of Ophel. The work of the Palestine Exploration Fund under Messrs. Bliss and Macalister has shown how old are such places as Lachish and Gezer, for instance. We may well hope that in the course of the excavations which Dr. Macalister is about to inaugurate on the Hill of Ophel at Jerusalem he may discover relics of this early period. The native Canaanite civilization was of a high order. We have one proof of this in the list of spoil of gold, of precious garments, and of chariots, which Thotmosis III of Egypt took at the storming of Megiddo about 1478 B.C. There is no doubt that Syria was a highly civilized country in very early times, yet excavation has revealed singularly little of this culture in Palestine. We cannot doubt that the great revolt under Akhenaton was a destroyer of

civilization. The Hebrews, who in all probability then entered the land, had little use for the higher culture of the Canaanites, and it was destroyed, to arise again perhaps for a time in the Israel of the days of Ahab, despite the opposition of the sterner puritans of Judah.

Thotmes or Thotmosis III was the first real Egyptian conqueror. His predecessors of the XVIIIth Dynasty had usually raided Palestine and Syria to glut the wrath of Egypt on the Semites who, as the Hyksos, had invaded and ruled her for so long. Thotmosis set out with the fixed intention of subduing and holding Asia as far as the Euphrates. And after a series of campaigns he succeeded. His son, Amenhotep II, was as much king of Syria and Palestine as of Egypt, and so were his successors, Thotmosis IV and Amenhotep III. And the kings of the Hittites, of Mitanni, of Assyria, and of Babylon sent them gifts, recognizing them as fellow-kings in Asia. The recognition of Egyptian sovereignty west of the Arabian desert is unqualified. Canaan is the Egyptian king's land, its people are his subjects, he is responsible if the caravans of Babylon are attacked by it. Egyptian resident governors and travelling inspectors uphold his authority. Canaanite princes, like a certain Ishtar-washur of Taanach, obey an Egyptian resident as an Indian Rajah does his British mentor to-day. The Canaanite kings receive their unction as anointed kings from their Egyptian overlord. The sons of Canaanite Chiefs are sent to Egypt for their education. Phoenician kings are subjects of Egypt, not mere tributaries. It is not a land simply terrorised by a series of razzias: it is Egyptian territory ruled by Egypt, loosely here, more closely there, but still ruled.

And it was ruled not so much in the interest of the Egyptian king as in that of his god, Amon of Thebes. To the Treasury of Amon the great part of the tribute of Asia flowed, and the effect is seen in the wealth and splendour of Amon and his temples at this time. Amon had conquered the Asiatics, to him mainly belonged their tribute. And we see how when, under Akhenaton, the Aten or Sun-disk had taken the place of Amon as the King's god, the King insistentlly calls upon the chiefs of Palestine and Phoenicia to send him the tribute of "the Sun," in spite of revolt and invasion.

In the oft-repeated story of this revolt, which we know from the cuneiform tablets found at Amarna and Boghaz-Keui, we can see many indications of the nature of the control exercised or supposed

to be exercised by Egypt over Palestine at the beginning of the fourteenth century B.C. We hear of Egyptian commissioners, resident or travelling, some of whom knew the country and some did not; we hear of Egyptian generals, several of whom seem to have been extraordinarily incompetent and were so badly served by their Intelligence staff that they could not distinguish friends from foes, and attacked the former in mistake for the latter. We see native princes, some truly, others falsely, protesting their fidelity to their rightful lord, the Pharaoh. We see Egyptian troops garrisoning such places as Jerusalem, and often acting at cross-purposes with native authorities who honestly desired to remain faithful: thus the black Sudanese troops in garrison at Jerusalem ran amok and murdered some of the inhabitants, to the despair of the loyal local king, Abdi-khiba. The impression given is that of a legal paramount Egyptian authority, largely concerned with the receiving and transmission of the tribute of Amon or the Aten, normally recognized and obeyed, but having of course no real hold on the affections of any of the subject people, except such of their rulers as were bound to Egypt by ties of ancient loyalty, personal friendship, or private interest, so that when revolt and invasion by desert tribes synchronized with Egyptian weakness at home and indecision abroad, the Egyptian dominion collapsed.

We see how this revolt was engineered by the ambition of the Hittite over-king, Suppilulius or Shubbiluliuma, and how, after Akhenaton had played into his hands by his pacificism, it ended in the establishment of Hittite supremacy (though probably nothing like the old Egyptian sovereignty) in Syria. But not for long was this supremacy undisputed by Egypt, whose kings regarded themselves as the rightful owners of the land. When a young and warlike king, Sety I, ascended the throne about 1320 B.C., it was immediately challenged, and if there was anything more than a vague suzerainty of the Hittites in the south, it was speedily overthrown.

Sety determined to leave very visible monuments of the restored Egyptian authority in Palestine. Some years ago a monument of him was found at Tell esh-Shihāb, east of the Jordan, and now a most important memorial of his re-conquest has been discovered by Mr. Clarence Fisher and the American excavators at Beisan, the ancient Beth-Shean. This is a stele with an inscription, two-thirds of which are unluckily illegible, giving a list of tribes of Palestine

subdued by Sety. We have not seen the actual Egyptian text of this stela, but have the information that it contains besides the names of the Rutennu, or Syrians, the Aamu or Canaanites, and the Sethtiu, Sutu or Bedouins, those—and this is most important—of the tribes called Aperiu and Tuirsha.

Now the Aperiu were long ago identified with the Hebrews, but of late years the identification has been rejected owing to the fact that the Aperiu are mentioned as Egyptian mercenary troops in the eastern Egyptian desert in the time of the XXth dynasty, a century later than the latest date proposed for the Exodus, the reign of Merneptah (about 1225 B.C.). They are first mentioned under Thotmosis III. The identification still seems to me very doubtful, but if they were the Hebrews their presence as a tribe of Palestine in the time of Sety I, nearly a century *before* Merneptah's day, is an argument against the postponement of the Exodus to so late as that king's time, and in favour of some such earlier period as the identification with the Expulsion of the Hyksos would necessitate. The other mentions of them would also accord best with the earlier date. We need not suppose that in that case they were a body of Hebrews who remained in Egypt, though this is of course not impossible. They may have been re-immigrants or prisoners taken in war. If we suppose that they and the Khabiru are identical with the Hebrews, their mention as slaves under Rameses II would point to their having been captured in the wars of Sety I and Rameses after their entry into the Promised Land, while the mercenaries of the XXth dynasty may have been either descendants of these prisoners, or more probably warriors who of their own free will sought service in Egypt. In any case, their occurrence on the monument of Sety I at Bethshean is of the highest interest.

The Tuirsha were a foreign tribe of Mediterranean, probably Asia Minor origin, who haunted the coasts of Palestine and Egypt at this time, and were probably of the same race as the Tyrseni or Etruscans of Italy. These, Herodotus tells us, emigrated from Asia Minor to Italy in the grey dawn of history, a statement corroborated by our knowledge, derived from Egyptian monuments, of these seafaring tribes. They are mentioned with the Shardina, also probably from Asia Minor, who both raided Egypt and served as royal bodyguards there, like the Vikings at Constantinople in far later days. They gave their name to the island of Sardinia, where they finally settled. The first mention of the Tuirsha in Egypt is

also about the time of Sety, when a certain In-Tuirsha, "Pillar of the Tuirsha," settled at the modern Gurob, near the entrance to Fayyūm, where Professor Petrie found his grave and many relics of other foreigners thirty years ago. These Mediterranean tribes had already established settlements on the Palestinian coast, and appeared as warriors among the Canaanites in the land where their relatives the Philistines settled later on.

We have little evidence as to the organization of the Egyptian dominion in Palestine under Sety and Rameses II. Probably the old settled dominion of the XVIIIth dynasty was never fully restored. It was a time of constant war with the Hittites, Syria proper was probably left to the Hittites, and Egypt was content with Palestine, which finally fell away from her as a result of the Philistine invasion eighty years later, in spite of an attempt by Rameses III to restore Egyptian sovereignty. We would give much to know from Egyptian sources how the Israel of the period of the Judges comported itself with regard to the Egyptian domination before the arrival of the Philistines in the land, but we have as yet little evidence on the subject.

Egyptian fortresses existed, such as the citadel of Bethshean, which in later days was held for a century by the Philistines. It commanded the eastern end of the plain of Esdraelon and the crossing of the Jordan, and was always one of the chief strategic points in Palestine. Sety renamed it "the Fort which secureth the faint-hearted," just as Thotmosis III before him had renamed the strong place of Megiddo "Menkheperre is the surrounder of the Asiatics." The Egyptians were wont to give these long names to their fortresses, just as the Assyrians did. The little we can learn points to military domination pure and simple. The Ophel Hill at Jerusalem very possibly was one of these forts. It would certainly be held by the Egyptians as it had been in the days of Akhenaton, when either there, or possibly at Bethshemesh ('Ain-Shems), was Khinatuni, probably an Aten-temple, which the heretic king set up in Asia as he did in Ethiopia. Jerusalem was not yet conquered by the Hebrews, possibly owing to an Egyptian garrison. It was not carried in the first rush of Joshua's invasion and long remained unconquered. The Hebrews were settled in two groups, confined to the hill-country of Mount Ephraim to the north and Judah to the south of Jerusalem, the germs of the two later kingdoms. During the reigns of Sety and Rameses they remained in their hill-

fortresses, leaving the plains to the Canaanites and the passing and re-passing Egyptian armies. Then in the reign of Meneptah they seem to have joined the Canaanites in a revolt, with disastrous consequences: "Israel is desolated, his seed is not," says the Egyptian king in his inscription, an inscription that in itself is a pretty strong argument against the Exodus having taken place in his reign. This is the first mention of the name Israel in a contemporary inscription and its identity is absolutely certain. From the way in which the name is written, with the determinative signs denoting a whole people, women included, it is evident that it was not merely a defeat of the warriors of Israel that took place: the Egyptians must have carried fire and sword through Mount Ephraim and harried Israel in its own home. The recovery must have taken long, and the Philistine domination in the hill-country from the time of Eli (about 1080 B.C.) to that of David again retarded the development of the Hebrews, who did not assume their dominant position in Palestine till the time of David and the taking of Jerusalem from the Canaanites, who had held it inviolate since the days of Egyptian domination. (Applause.)

Dr. E. W. G. MASTERMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, I will not detain you very long, but I want, in the first instance, to propose a vote of thanks to the Chairman for so very kindly taking the Chair this afternoon. He disclaimed his qualification for it, but I am sure you are all satisfied we could not possibly have had a better friend to the Fund and one who could more ably have taken the Chair on this most momentous occasion. (Applause.) I would like to say that though many may practically realise it, it is really only those who have been on the Executive Committee who can know with what an enormous sense of thankfulness and relief we meet this afternoon. At the beginning of this year we had before us the possibility of co-operating in this excavation, and it was manifest to us all that it was an absolutely unique thing; it was a possibility greater than we have ever had before us. It was felt if it slipped through our hands we would not deserve any longer to be called the Palestine Exploration Fund, and England would, I think, have been archaeologically disgraced. We had in hand, as you have heard, £1,000, and the Treasurer was rather reluctant in saying we could afford £1,000. I cannot now go into all the details, but the Schweich Fund of the British Academy came

forward with the promise of another £1,000, and it was rumoured that there might be something else if we could help ourselves. Then came the very splendid offer of Mr. Charles Marston of £2,000 given unconditionally. (Applause.) Then, to crown all, came the very splendid offer by Lord Burnham. I cannot tell you how much we appreciate that offer. (Applause.) He has put it forward in a most generous way; he has disclaimed any desire to control in the least the work of the Fund. He has left the Committee as free as before to make their own appointments and arrangements. He has placed £1,000 in our hands with every possibility of more, and he has also offered what is, you will fully admit, more to us than money—a splendid propaganda through the *Daily Telegraph*. (Applause.) It is quite impossible for us to express how grateful we feel for it, and we only hope that the results of the excavations will be such as to fully justify this enterprise. We feel sure it will be. I feel that you will all watch this work, and you will have opportunities of getting further news about it quicker than you would get ordinarily, because the *Daily Telegraph* is to publish most interesting letters with regard to the work. I have only one word more to say. We have no Treasurer here this afternoon because he had to be in the Channel Islands, but I am perfectly sure that I ought to voice what he would say, and that is this: we must not be content with the amount of money we have in hand; the Society, of which most of you are members or subscribers, has got to rally to this in order that we may be in a position such as friends in the *Daily Telegraph* wish us to be in—a position of greater strength than we have ever been in before. We ought to have far more members than we have. Last year the privilege was open to those, who would subscribe a comparatively small sum, of becoming members and of having a right of sharing in the management, in the election of the Committee, and so on, a privilege which was not available before. Our total members number something like 400, but I do not think we ought to be content with less than 1,000. It is not a large number for a Society of such importance, and I very sincerely hope that, now the excavation we are undertaking is being made known everywhere, the Fund will have further support. I understand that the *Daily Telegraph* are to open a fund, and I hope that will be a fund for what we may call “outsiders”; at the same time I hope there will be a great number who will become regular annual subscribers and

help us not only now but through thick and thin in the years to come.

There is one other point that I think I ought to mention, and that is with regard to co-operation to which reference has already been made. When the proposal was first made to us we anticipated, and in the Committee we spent some time in evolving plans for, co-operation with other societies. I do not think that on the lines we then proposed we are to have now that co-operation, but I am perfectly certain that I speak for Prof. Macalister when I say that we wish for the fullest co-operation of those who will be on the spot, either excavating or watching the work. Baron Rothschild, of Paris, has been doing important work at the southern end of that Hill, and if we could so co-operate that whatever he does is, as I now believe it is, put at our disposal, and Prof. Macalister is able to bring that into use with his own work, we shall be able to double the amount of interest. I hope we shall have co-operation there, and I think I voice the feelings of all present on that matter. We have some friends on the spot who have been very good co-operators in the past, the Dominicans. Père Vincent knows probably more detail about the archaeology of Jerusalem and Palestine generally than almost any living man, and I know from what he has written to me that he is only too anxious to co-operate with us. I feel sure we shall all wish him to do so in the most absolute way, probably not so much in money as in special knowledge and general local help. (Applause.) The work in which all co-operate will be all the more valuable to us.

I do not know that I need say very much about another little matter, because it has already been made plain this afternoon. There has been a little agitation in the Press over the subject of the Tomb of David, and especially in the daily papers. The traditional Tomb of David, which lies on the Western Hill, as I think probably you all know, has nothing in the world to do with the Tomb of David, as we believe it actually lies on Mount Ophel. We are not doing anything that could injure the susceptibilities of any of our ecclesiastical friends who might think that we were interfering with them in their tradition.

I have the greatest pleasure in proposing a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

Prof. A. C. DICKIE. In rising + second the vote of thanks which has been proposed by Dr. Stermann, I should like, first of

all, to emphasise the sense of satisfaction which we all feel at the result of the negotiations which have been successfully carried out by the officers of the Fund in getting arrangements completed with regard to the excavations at Ophel. The work which Prof. Macalister will have to do will be done under conditions which in the case of previous excavations in Ophel were very different. He will not have to be compelled to modify his wishes at the caprice of some owner, or fancied owner, of a patch of land which grows cabbages, such as we used to have to do in 1897, when an old lady named Latefi used to visit the diggings regularly and stop the work until she obtained "backsheesh" to settle her claim. Nor will he be afflicted by Government, which in the case of the diggings in Ophel, in 1897, one day arrived with a patrol and marched the whole of the workmen away to prison. We must congratulate ourselves very warmly on having secured the services of Prof. Macalister, and I think he must also be congratulated upon entering upon the work under very much better conditions. I now formally second the vote of thanks to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN, in response to the vote of thanks, said: I am very much obliged to you, and I will not detain you very long, but there was a certain passage in Dr. Macalister's exceedingly able speech, one of the best expositions of the subject I have ever listened to, which was, I think, perhaps almost pessimistic; it almost reminded us of the official declaration in this country of the Battle of Jutland. (Laughter.) It ought to be remembered that when a site has been intentionally destroyed, that is usually considered an excavator's very best chance. In a destruction of that kind things are battered down, an inner floor is made, and the excavator has a chance of finding a great deal of the period embedded in that floor. So that events such as deliberate destruction which has overtaken Jerusalem do not inspire me so much with pessimism as with optimism.

Before we part, we ought to express our thanks to the Society of Antiquaries in whose room we now meet. It is a great boon to be able to meet in such a central position as this, and I am sure we owe the Society our very cordial thanks. (Applause.)

The proceedings then terminated.