

1925.

THE DIAMOND JUBILEE OF THE PALESTINE  
EXPLORATION FUND.

By GENERAL SIR CHARLES WARREN, G.C.M.G.,  
K.C.B., F.R.S., R.E.<sup>1</sup>

SIXTY years bridge the gulf of time separating the date of the first efforts of the Palestine Exploration Fund and the present day, and what a wealth of information has been collected during that period, and is still coming in, under the able guidance of the present Committee and the splendid efforts of the workers at present employed.

I wish to be permitted to say a few words about our methods of work, in past and present, and as I am the only one left of the old guard, except the Rev. Canon Edward Hanauer—unless Sergt.-Major Birtles, my dear Fidus Achates of yore, is still on watch—I have some claim to be heard, even though on the war-path.

My object is to incite the writers and thinkers on the Holy Land at the present day to be less reticent in their criticisms as to ancient sites, and to use more keenness and latitude in expressing their views.

The first inception of the organization of the P.E.F. was in 1864-5, in Great Britain (backed up by America) and was due to the intense interest in Palestine, the land of the Bible, created by the recent publications and travels of numbers of people of all nations during the years 1820-64. The leading and most active characters that I came across at that time were Dean Stanley, George Grove, Walter Morrison, H. H. Holland, James Fergusson, Phené Spiers, the Count de Vogüé, Professor Palmer and Emmanuel Deutsch, Lewin, Hepworth Dixon, and William Simpson. Walter Besant came in later. And what struck me most of all was that these men were partisans holding extreme views, differing one from another, and yet each assisting to work with one will in pushing on the P.E.F.

James Fergusson and one of his most violent opponents might be seen walking into a public meeting on the most friendly terms,

<sup>1</sup> For Sir Charles Warren's conditional offer, *see* p. 54.

and yet on the platform and in print using violent and scathing language against each other. But it made no difference to their entire friendliness in private life.

The basis of the movement was the accurate Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem (and its water sources), at present in use, carried out by Captain C. W. Wilson, R.E., in 1864-5, the necessary funds for which were supplied by Miss Burdett Coutts. This survey was followed up by a rapid examination of all Palestine by Captain Wilson and Lieutenant Anderson, R.E., and the conclusion they came to was that the most interesting site in the Holy Land for exploration was the Holy City itself.

By this time, 1866-7, the P.E.F. had developed into a going concern, full of good intentions for getting money and spending it on good work. Her Majesty the Queen was Patron and the Archbishop of York the first President. But it takes time to develop the machinery for getting in large sums of money by small subscriptions, and at first the money-making process lagged behind the work in the field.

In the autumn of 1866 I had recently returned to England after nearly seven years in the Mediterranean, and I was offered the post of explorer to the P.E.F. I took it up early in 1867, and held it for three years, until forced to relinquish the work through malaria contracted in the souterrains of Jerusalem. In relinquishing the work I called attention to the fact that the most pressing work in Palestine at that time was an accurate Topographical Survey of the Holy Land, because treasures underground would keep safely a few years longer, but, above ground, the march of civilization was causing a disruption of all the Holy sites, and most valuable relics were being burnt up into lime.

Accordingly the Survey of Palestine was next taken up and carried out most successfully by Lieutenant C. R. Conder, subsequently assisted by Lieutenant H. H. Kitchener. Let me state in parenthesis that since 1871 there have been very few excavations in the very ancient sites of Jerusalem. We all had to await more favourable circumstances for such work, and the time has now struck—fifty-five years afterwards.

My work during three years in Palestine consisted chiefly of excavations in the Holy City and reconnaissances of the Plain of Philistia and the Jordan Valley. At first money failed to flow into our coffers, and for months we were at our wits' end as to how

to survive the crisis. The Committee sent me S.O.S. messages, "Get results and we will send you money," and I retorted, "Send me money and I will get you results." George Grove telegraphed, "For Heaven's sake find the Tomb of David or we shall be bankrupt," and I replied, "If I do find the Tomb of David I shall certainly seal it up again; such good things are not for the like of us." I firmly believe that up to the day of his departure George Grove had an uneasy notion that I had struck the Tomb of David and, on account of my views about the desecration of tombs, would not give it out to the public.

Now in those days (1865-70)—it seems to me like yesterday—there were most divergent views on the topography of Jerusalem. Let us first give place to the great works of the Americans: Thomson's *Land and the Book*, Barclay's *City of the Great King*, Robinson's great work on Palestine. Then in England we had Williams' *Holy City*, Jerusalem by Thrupp, Lewin, James Fergusson, de Vogüé (in France) and Tobler (in Germany).

Our Committee were in the early days strongly impressed with the views of James Fergusson; they could not help it, his personality and strength of invective were so great. I went out to Palestine a strong adherent of Fergusson. But the results of the excavations disillusioned me one by one, and in a short time I was bare of theories and only sought results. It was not until the last year of my work in Jerusalem that I began to build up theories; but most of the minor topographical questions remained unanswerable, and they remain so still.

What I wish to call attention to is that with the most divergent views, and the most pungent criticism, we worked together *con amore*, freely, and the truth gradually emerged.

I feel so strongly on the subject that I do not think that there can be any elucidation of the problems of the Holy Land without controversy and criticism.

Let me give an instance. The subject of the position of Zion or the Akra. The book of Nehemiah certainly places it south of the Temple site, while the Psalms and Josephus place it to the north. For various reasons I preferred the northern situation, and held it for 40 years, but about 1895 it came in upon me that if Akra or Zion were taken to mean only "the citadel" instead of being the proper name of a site in Jerusalem, there might have been two or three sites for Zion, and accordingly I reckoned the Zion of early

Davidic times to be south of the site of the Temple of Jerusalem, and the Zion of the Psalms, of Josephus and the Maccabees to be on the north of the Temple site. Colonel Conder was very wrath with my changes of view and wiggled me severely for my lapse into heterodox views; but that did not destroy our friendship.

Sir Charles Wilson, Colonel Conder and I, whilst exercising the most cordial relations in private matters, for certainly 35 to 40 years held the most divergent views about the topography of Jerusalem, and so will all thinkers on the subject, until the solutions of various questions are arrived at.

What I wish to call attention to is the absence of controversy in recent years about the Holy Land (partly no doubt due to the effects of the Great War), and the necessity, if we are to get a move on, for introducing controversy and criticism again, if the public are to take a real interest in the Holy Land.

But there is not merely a lack of controversy at present, there is also a lack of speculation and of imagination. All our old fighters have gone under. For many years we had a *Controversialist-in-Chief*—the Rev. Canon Birch of Manchester; in season, out of season, he blossomed forth in some new theory, and we found our wits sharpened up to keep pace with his propositions. I should guess his speculations brought in at least £1,000 a year to the coffers of the P.E.F.

We do, however, now and again get the very kind of paper we require for the Journal of the P.E.F. As one of them, may I call attention to a recent paper by Redcliffe N. Salaman, M.D., "What has become of the Philistines?"

I would now make my proposals for the year of the Diamond Jubilee, 1925.

(1) That the reports of the writers in the field, when full of technical language, should, in addition to the original report, be also translated into our mother tongue for the benefit of the public. I understand something about the terms made use of in Palestine, but I quite fail to grasp the difference which appears to exist in the terms Hellenistic and Greek walls (pp. 13, 14), Maccabean and Greek black pottery (p. 15), Seleucid (p. 20), Maccabean, Hebrew and Bronze (p. 16).

(2) I propose that the Chronological terms given by the P.E.F., *Q.S.*, April, 1923, should either be adhered to or be revised, and that when a new term is used it should be explained.

(3) Writers to the *Q.S.* should be encouraged to enter more freely into controversy and speculation and endeavour to get the general public interested. Several experts who know their subjects should be asked to criticize, and those who are known to have vivid imaginations might be asked to give vent to them and to bring forward new theories. The mere knocking of them over, right or wrong, will help to bring out the truth.

(4) The objective of the P.E.F., always kept before the public in early days, should again be brought forward and adhered to, and the public invited to contribute short papers and notes.

(5) There should be various *corners* in each *Q.S.* for *Notes and Queries* and *speculations*, just as they have in *Nature* and other periodicals of a progressive character. I believe if this can be done there will be an increase of at least £1,500 to £2,000 during the year available for excavations at Jerusalem.

I sincerely trust that what I have said in this paper will not be agreed to by all, but that it will arouse the antagonism of many who may think my observations worth powder and shot. We want to be on the war-path to succeed. I consider that controversy is the breath of life to undertakings like the P.E.F.

As for myself, I am ready to fight on any of the theories I uphold, but how can one enjoy shooting if one's antagonists lie low or hold up their hands?

---

## A LEADEN OSSUARY.

By THE REV. J. GARROW DUNCAN, M.A., B.D., F.S.A. (Scot.).

THE Ossuary reproduced in the accompanying photographs is the property of Mr. Hughes, of Jerusalem, who has kindly allowed me to photograph and publish it.

It is made of lead, which is by no means of uniform composition, but is soft in parts and quite hard in others. This is perhaps to be attributed to the fact that the lead has not been refined, rather than to the mixture of some alloy.

The box of the Ossuary was cut out of a sheet of lead, the sides and ends being cut to the exact size of the pattern used, being afterwards doubled up into position and soldered together