

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING  
OF THE PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND.

THE Sixtieth Annual General Meeting of the Palestine Exploration Fund was held at the Rooms of the Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London, W.1, on Wednesday, 17th June, 1925. DR. H. R. HALL, D.Litt., F.S.A., Chairman of the Executive Committee, presided, and was supported on the platform by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Gore, D.D., Prof. E. Grant (Hon. General Secretary for the Fund in U.S.A.), Sir Charles Close and Dr. E. W. G. Masterman, Honorary Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said: We had hoped at this meeting to have welcomed Lord Balfour as our Chairman, and though at first he thought it possible he might be able to preside, he came later to the conclusion that he was not sufficiently acquainted with the archaeological side of the work to take the chair. Field-Marshal Lord Plumer, who has been appointed to succeed Sir Herbert Samuel as Governor-General of Palestine, was also invited, but he, too, declined on account of his want of knowledge of the archaeology of the subject, but, with the geniality which is a well-known characteristic of his, he sweetened his refusal with a very acceptable donation to our funds.

The HON. SECRETARY announced that letters regretting inability to be present had been received from Sir Charles Warren, Brigadier-General Paul, Prof. R. A. S. Macalister, Richard Cadbury, Esq., and the Rev. A. T. Richardson.

The Minutes of the 29th Annual Meeting held on 13th June, 1924, having been read, confirmed and signed, the HON. SECRETARY reported that 47 subscribers had qualified for full membership since the last Meeting, including three Life Members. The Hon. Secretary regretted to have to report the death of Lord Abercromby, a munificent supporter of the Fund and one whose loss would seriously be felt, and also the death of the Rev. Dr. C. F. Burney, whose loss, though great to the Fund, was even greater to the Sister Society, the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, of which he had been Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN, in moving the adoption of the Annual Report and Accounts for the year 1924 and already in the hands of Members, asked that they be taken as read. This having been agreed, he said :— Whilst moving this resolution I should like to take the opportunity of showing you a few slides of the American excavations at Beth-shan. These excavations, parallel with our own at Ophel, should interest our members very much, especially those who are also interested in the Egyptian relations of Palestine, as, of course, I am. The excavations were carried on for the Philadelphian University Museum by Dr. Fisher, with whom, for a time, was associated our Assistant Secretary, Mr. Ovenden. Beth-shan, as you probably know, is at the eastern end of the Vale of Esdraelon and overlooking the Jordan, where it once commanded a very much frequented ford over that river leading from Galilee into Syria and so northward to the Sea of Tiberias and Damascus. The mound, which was crowned by the ancient fortress, is a typical tell of that part of the world, and we find that its strategic importance was recognised very early in the history of Palestine by the Egyptian conquerors. No doubt, when the Egyptians first advanced northwards from Palestine in the course of their conquest of Syria in the 18th Dynasty, they occupied and fortified this site, but it is not until the succeeding period of the 19th Dynasty that we find any considerable Egyptian relics there. On the top of the mound were the remains of the Egyptian fortress of the time of the 19th Dynasty, but I cannot show you the actual place where the famous reliefs of the Kings Seti and Rameses II were found, as it lies just outside the photograph on the screen. The columns you see are not of that period, but of Byzantine Churches. The area covered by the Egyptian fort was considerable. One of the important remains found was a stela of King Seti I, a tall round-topped monolith with a figure of the King Menmaa-Rē Seti, offering to the God Rē, the Sun-god ; and below are the lines of the inscription in which he speaks of his conquests. The stela text has not yet been published, but we hope it shortly will be. Seti I is the king who restored the dominion of the Egyptians over Palestine after it had been overthrown by the revolt of the Syrians allied with the Hittites against the Egyptians during the reign of the pacifist King Akhnaton, who, we remember, refused to reconquer Palestine and Syria which had been subdued by his predecessors two hundred years before and of which he was the rightful king. He was regarded

by the other kings of the time in letters and despatches as the legitimate Lord of Syria and Palestine; as the anointed king who gave the holy oil of unction to the Semitic kings under him. But he chose, because of his—at that time—peculiar pacifist ideas to forgo his dominion over Syria, with the result that the whole country was plunged into chaos until Seti I reasserted the Egyptian dominion. The stela is his monument of that reassertion at Beth-shan. He put up other monuments, one near Damascus, one even as far north as Homs, and another east of the Jordan at Tell esh-Shihāb in the land of Moab, near Mzērib. His son Rameses II, who was called Rameses the Great, also put up a stela near Mzērib at Sheikh Sa'd, where Hrozny recently excavated and found fragments of supposed Hittite (?) sculpture and an inscription (Aramaic ?) of the VIIIth century B.C. (see *Times*, April 29th). Rameses II also put up at Beth-shan a stela similar to that of Seti; and he made in his inscription the very interesting statement that he used the tribe of the 'Aperiu to work on his fortress city of Per-Rēmasesu. That, no doubt, is historical confirmation of the Biblical tradition of the working of the Israelites at the cities of Pithom and Rameses, and at first sight it seems difficult to reconcile with recent theories, which would place the Exodus considerably earlier than has generally been thought. It has of late years generally been placed at the end of the reign of King Menepthah, about 1220 B.C., or even a generation later than his time. That theory meets with many difficulties, because it shortens the time of the Judges so enormously, and in spite of the fact that it has been supported by eminent authorities (rather, we suspect, in despair at the general paucity of evidence on the subject and as one clutches at a straw, so to speak), there is no doubt that it has very little in its favour.

The only other theory which seems to apply is that which makes the expulsion of the Hyksos, the shepherd kings, contemporaneous with the departure of the Israelites which was part of the same event as the departure of the Hyksos. Or, in other words, the Exodus is simply the expulsion of the Hyksos looked at from the Hebrew angle of vision. That, of course, would make the Exodus three hundred years before the time of Rameses II. We know from an inscription of King Menepthah that Israel already lived in Palestine in his time, so that the Exodus may fairly be regarded as having already taken place. In any case, the current statement

that Menepthah *was* the Pharaoh of the Exodus is not borne out by the facts. But his father Rameses II was, in all probability, the Pharaoh of the Oppression, nevertheless. It would look as if the accounts of the using of the Hebrews for the building of the cities of Pithom and Rameses relate to a period later than the period of the actual stay of the Israelites in the Land of Goschen; that they were, in fact, prisoners of war taken by Rameses II from Israel in the course of the campaigns of which this is the monument, three centuries after the Exodus and, probably, nearly a century after the entry into the Promised Land. Perhaps in the old days, when the Hyksos were in Egypt, some of their ancestors may have been used by the Egyptianized Hyksos kings in exactly the same way, and the two reminiscences may have been united, with the result that the working on the buildings of King Rameses has been placed in the earlier period.

At all events, I think you will agree that the mention of the 'Aperiu, who are in all probability the Hebrews, is a very good representation of the Hebrew 'Ibhrim, using the Egyptian plural sign instead of the Hebrew; and it is the same name as that used probably for the Hebrews in the el-Amarna letters, viz., *Habiru*.

You next see on the screen the latest monument of the three. It is a very curious statue, apparently intended for a figure of King Rameses III; but those of you who are well acquainted with Egyptian art will see that the figure, although more or less Egyptian in style in the way it sits on its throne and in the disposition of its hands upon its knees, yet is very crudely and barbarously rendered, especially in the face and in the long wig which is shown in a way in which it is never shown in Egyptian art. We can have no doubt that that is a native Palestinian representation of a figure intended for the King Rameses III, who was the king who came after the time of Menepthah, and in whose days (1196 B.C.) the Philistines, coming from Caria, Lycia and Crete, invaded Palestine, attacked Egypt and were defeated by him. So you see that he, again, asserted Egyptian authority at Beth-shan, but apparently not for long, because it cannot have been very long after that time that the Egyptian power finally disappeared from Palestine and the immigrant Aegean people of the Philistines became the dominant power in the south. I think you will agree with me that Dr. Fisher and his coadjutors, Mr. Rowe the Egyptologist and others, have made very valuable

discoveries indeed at Beth-shan, and one is sorry to hear that the work is not being continued there.

I want now for a moment to direct your attention to another interesting discovery which has been made on the confines of Palestine, and that is, again, a very important one in regard to the question of Egyptian domination and rule in that part of the world. This is the discovery by the French Expedition under M. Montet at Byblos, the modern Jebail, on the Phoenician coast, of remains that prove that this place was an Egyptian colony, even in the time of the Pyramid-builders, as far back as 3000 B.C. There were Phoenicians there then, and there was also an Egyptian colony there: an Egyptian temple after a thoroughly Egyptian style, and purely Egyptian remains, going as far back as the end of the 3rd Dynasty. And after that Egyptian rule in Byblos seems to have been continuous; it seems to have been throughout the ages a sort of Egyptian colony; and that explains how it was, during the long wars at the time of Thothmes and Rameses, that Phoenicia remained, on the whole, faithful to Egypt and was so even down to quite late days.

Another very important find which has been made by M. Montet which interests us very much is the oldest Phoenician inscription, the oldest known Semitic alphabetic screeed, which takes back our knowledge of the Phoenician-Aramaic script three hundred years earlier than we had before known it to exist. That was found in the tomb of Ahiiram, Prince of Byblos, a contemporary of Rameses II (c. 1250 B.C.). Accordingly the inscriptions on the Moabite Stone and the Siloam inscription are now antedated by possibly two or three hundred years. We find, then, that the alphabetic writing goes back to the 13th century B.C., and if it was, as seems likely, evolved from Egyptian hieroglyphic originals, its evolution must have taken place at a very much earlier time, and for all we know the territory of Byblos no less than the peninsula of Sinai (where Dr. Gardiner supposes it to have taken place) may have been the spot where the alphabet was first evolved.

The RT. REV. BISHOP GORE, D.D., in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Report, said: I really am not qualified to say anything of much interest or importance, but I have recently returned from a tour of some months in Egypt and Palestine and, of course, I am deeply impressed with the value of the work being done in

different directions by the processes of excavation and, in particular, by the work which is being done close under the walls of Jerusalem in the disclosure of the old walls of Jebus, as it seems, in the immediate neighbourhood, by this Society. It is impossible—I do not say merely to travel in Egypt and Palestine—but it is impossible to read history in its most modern form at all without being profoundly impressed with the results which have flowed from excavation of recent years, not merely in respect of what may be described as the more old-fashioned ideas of the purpose of excavation, but with regard to the whole re-writing of human history and human civilization. It is impossible to think of the results which we associate with the names of Crete and Ur without perceiving how revolutionary the effect of those excavations have been on our whole conceptions of human history. There is no question that the modern tendency is profoundly to deepen our impression of what came to mankind from the East, and even, in a certain sense, to reduce our impression of what came from Greece by its native genius. That sort of alteration of emphasis, if you come to trace its origin, has been almost all due to the results of excavation.

I suppose that there have been divers motives which have led to excavation. Originally people dug in the old sites mainly in the hope of discovering something beautiful. That is still, I am thankful to say, a result of excavation, as is plain if we think of all that has been discovered in connection with Akhnaton and Tutankhamen or in the more recent excavations at Sakkara. You cannot doubt that a wholly new conception of the extraordinary beauty to which Egyptian art attained at certain periods has been gained. I do not doubt, also, that the artists are at the present moment rather jealous of the archaeologists, so that they remark, with some bitterness, that they would pull down the Parthenon if they thought there was a Hittite tablet underneath. But without attempting to estimate the relative value of art and archaeology, you cannot doubt the extraordinary interest of the results in our broad conceptions of history; the immense alterations which have been produced by the discovery of archaeologists which have only been made possible by digging.

Just after seeing the Pyramids at Sakkara and the new discoveries of Mr. Firth, I travelled in the train with Professor Breasted, and I was talking of the discoveries being impressive. He said, "Of course they are. I shall have to re-write the first chapters of all my

books." It does upset one to witness that extraordinarily perfect work in connection with what claims to be the earliest stone building in the world—a building which goes back to the earliest Pyramid builders; the extraordinary beauty and perfection of that work does electrify one and does throw a new and a most interesting light on that very odd and discredited idea of progress.

In regard to Palestine—for, of course, I have no right to talk about Egypt in this place and under these circumstances—we appear to have an amazing flood of new light being thrown on the position of the Philistines. We know that Matthew Arnold was not the first to treat those unhappy people as a synonym for what is stupid and uneducated. I gather now we are to regard them as the pioneers of civilization, the inventors or introducers of writing and of the beginnings of art into Palestine, so that in future it will be the highest compliment to call a person a "Philistine." All this is profoundly interesting.

I trust that archaeology will never despise or override the claims of beauty for its own sake. I trust also that it will always continue to serve the purpose with which a good deal of it has been connected as a motive in Palestine—the purpose of elucidating the Bible—though at present it must be admitted that it has perplexed rather than elucidated the questions which arise about the interpretation and historicity of the Old Testament or, at any rate, about some important questions connected with it, such as that to which the Chairman alluded, of the date and period of the Exodus, and whether it was of the magnitude that we have been hitherto instructed to attach to it. But what cannot be doubted is the revolutionary effect on our ideas of the development of civilization and its antiquity which have resulted from excavation of recent times. Therefore, it is urgent and important not to allow those who are so thoroughly qualified to carry out this sort of exploration, and to give us the light which we need to put in order the materials, to fail for lack of funds and support at home. We all know there are a few who are exceedingly keen about it, but there is no reason in the world why a very much larger circle should not be interested in the subject and should not, therefore, give it the support which it so urgently needs, because it is no doubt an occupation which is not only very attractive but also exceedingly expensive.

And so I come to the particular point, which is the excavations which are being carried on under the auspices of this Society on what

seems to have been the original site of Zion and the original city of Jebus. I saw them twice, once under the guidance of the Bishop of Jerusalem and once under the guidance of Dr. Masterman. I am not at all expert, but they are extraordinarily interesting, and the conclusions arrived at appear to be fairly certain. It would be altogether lamentable if it was not possible to carry them out owing to the Society not being supported with money. Of course, in that as in other cases, people are apt to draw larger conclusions all of a sudden than the facts warrant. That is always so. As soon as you get excavations and discoveries there is always an exaggerated estimate of what has been attained which some people jump to and which then has afterwards to be reduced. The solid historical result which has been here attained is very considerable, and I daresay Dr. Masterman will explain it to you in a way which I should not be capable of. I only come back as a fairly ignorant tourist to bear witness to the extraordinary importance of what is going on in this particular place; to beg you to let it continue; and also to call your attention to the fact that in our general understanding of the history of human civilization the revolutionary results which have transformed our views within the last generation have been almost entirely due to these laborious and expensive diggings. Expensive they must be, and, indeed, if you see them being prosecuted, they carry their own evidence of expensiveness on the face of them. That is inevitable. But the results which have been attained, and especially those attained within the last thirty years, seem to me to make it indisputable that they are worth the expense because they are giving us a wholly new view of the origins and the history of civilization.

MR. H. BENTWICH, LL.B. : Before the Report is put, I rise, with some deference and hesitation after the profoundly interesting statements made by yourself, Mr. Chairman, and by Bishop Gore, from the archaeological point of view, with regard to the work which is being done by the Society, to make a comment on the Report itself and at the same time to make a suggestion. The thing that strikes me, and I dare say it has struck a good many members who have read the Report, is the rather inadequate result which has been obtained from the Ophel excavations having regard to the enormous expense of carrying them on. Necessarily that expense arises very much from the fact that those excavations adjoin the city, the

capital of Palestine, where it is very expensive indeed to secure the opportunity of carrying on the excavations. The results which have so far been published are scarcely adequate to the expense. I feel also that in that particular area there are a number of other societies carrying on similar work, and that the results which may be obtained from continuing excavations are not likely to be lost, because for the moment this Society may be unable, through the great expense, to continue the work, for the reason that it will be continued, no doubt, by the other societies interested in work on the spot. We saw in to-day's *Times* reference to a great discovery which has been made by the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society—the discovery of the Third Wall of the city. That is only one of the many organisations at work there. The Americans also have works in the neighbourhood and have done a great deal of work which they will, no doubt, be very glad to continue. But I am anxious, as a very old member of the General Committee of this Fund, that it should consider the desirability of resuming excavations which were dropped for a period on the ancient site of Gezer on the Jaffa-Jerusalem road which produced results of enormous value at comparatively small expense. That site is not near a city, but out in the open country, and the work there was carried on, even under the Turkish régime, with the minimum of expense. Certainly the work carried on there for six years by Professor Stewart Macalister produced the most notable of all the series of publications issued by the Society and the most notable contributions to archaeological science and to the discovery of beauty to which the Bishop has referred. I hope the Committee will take into consideration the desirability of renewing the excavations at Gezer, which were suspended in consequence of the difficulties, as an alternative to the very expensive operations at Ophel; and I want to give the assurance also that the Jewish community, being very much interested in the Gezer site through the new settlement being effected there, can be relied upon cordially to support a renewal of those excavations, if undertaken by the Fund.

The CHAIRMAN: As Chairman, I welcome what has been said by Mr. Bentwich, but I must point out that one must not expect that excavations will produce sensational results every time. We have all been a little spoiled by Tutankhamen and we expect things which cannot always be realised. As a matter of fact, I am not at all sure

that the work which has been done at Ophel, including the discovery of Millo and the breach which David made in the Jebusite wall, is not of very considerable importance, in spite of what Mr. Bentwich has said. I am by no means inclined to regard lightly the work which has been begun by an excavator of the capacity of Professor Macalister, to whose capabilities the speaker has borne witness and on whose advice we have worked at Ophel. It is a site which must be of very great interest; it is the site of the original Jerusalem—that is, the city which was the fortress of the Jebusites; the place which the King of Jerusalem in the time of Akhnaton ruled and to which he sent his letters and despatches to the King of Egypt; the place that Joshua could not take, but which David took when its time was fulfilled. Whatever we find there is of interest, even if we do not find a great deal, because it is the remains of the most ancient Jerusalem, and that is the place, after all, I think, most of us want to know especially about. Gezer is interesting; it would interest me in some ways even more than Jerusalem, because we should find probably there some of the Philistine antiquities which, no less than our last Chairman, Dr. Hogarth, I greatly desire to find, since they are the most civilized relics, seemingly, that we find of that period in Palestine; at all events, the Philistine culture was obviously much higher than that of the contemporary Israelites. But I do not deny the paramount interest of Jerusalem to the subscribers to the Palestine Exploration Fund, and, on the whole, I feel sure that the subscribers are satisfied with the results that have hitherto been gained, although not sensational, and I do not think they will ever be sensational in the ordinary journalistic sense. We are getting what is much more important, scientific results; and they are worth money, and plenty of it.

DR. E. W. G. MASTERMAN: I only want to say this, that as Honorary Secretary I am more than delighted that someone has criticized us. We recently received a letter from Sir Charles Warren in which he said the great bane of the Society was that subscribers did not raise controversies. We never get the subscribers' point of view. I, therefore, most heartily welcome criticism. Time makes it essential for me to be brief, but I must answer one point with regard to the suggestion that other societies are working at Ophel. They are not. When the Ophel site was offered to us we were engaged in

excavations at Askalon which were very interesting, but we felt that this was a unique opportunity. The offer was made to various societies, and any society was allowed to take it up who had £5,000 to start with. No society took it up but ourselves. It is perfectly true that Lord Rothschild has some land at the south which Professor Weill has excavated, but no society has done anything at Ophel. The Americans are not there, the French are not there, and the Jews are not and, judging by the action of people in the past, if we leave it, it is left altogether. It would be a thousand pities to leave it when we have just begun to get results of great importance.

Just a word with regard to what is put forward as the supposed Third Wall. When I was out in Jerusalem I found a single stone had recently been uncovered on the line of what had been years ago described, I think, by Robinson, as the possible line of the "Third Wall." In *The Times* to-day you read that they have come across some more thick walls of massive and splendid stones. Some of us know them. There is no proof—I am speaking subject to correction, because we have only had the report in *The Times*—that that is the Third Wall. Moreover, that is not an archaeological excavation. Certain stones have, by chance, been uncovered. Dr. Mayer, of the School of Archaeology, assisted by another, has been trying to see what they are, but the discovery must not be held to be the result of serious excavations.

The CHAIRMAN: Undoubtedly every consideration will be given to the sites we excavate as hitherto. We have gone to Ophel, I think, with the consent and the cordial support of our subscribers, and we are quite sure when we continue with the excavation we shall make some interesting discoveries, such as those which we have already made; but, as I said previously, excavations are not always productive of sensational results, and one must regard critically the first reports of work done as appearing in newspapers. The results may not be so wonderful as they, at first sight, appear.

The Report and Accounts were unanimously adopted.

PROF. E. GRANT (Hon. General Secretary for the Fund in U.S.A.) said: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—It is my privilege to propose the election of Officers and Executive Committee (the names are given below, p. 130), and I have been asked also to say a few words with regard to a visit I paid to Palestine this spring. My first

actual experience of the country, and I may say my first interest in the work of the Fund, began during three years' residence in Palestine some twenty years ago. At that time, through the courtesy of Professor George A. Barton, Director of the American School of Archaeology, I was included in a party of the School which enjoyed camp privileges at Gezer for several days as guests of Professor R. A. S. Macalister. Last spring I spent two months in the country noting the changes, the good government, good roads, and much else that might be mentioned. Motor cars have come in since my first visit, and I feared lest perhaps the remote villages and the life of the Arab peasants might have been affected unfavourably by some of the progressive changes which have taken place. But I found that whereas in the past the less serious tourist used to go through the land in something between five and seventeen days, now, thanks to the motor car, they can do it in two and five days and do much less damage! In many of the remoter villages away from the roads I found the same old courtesy, simplicity and hospitality, and not a trace of fanaticism.

I spent most of my time, as formerly, at Ramallah and in the district of which that is the head, comprising some sixty villages. It is the old country of Benjamin and Ephraim, and of the books of *Judges* and *Samuel*, a country that has not had too much attention in the past, partly, I think, because it is so near Jerusalem. People coming from the north and west usually hasten through it to Jerusalem, and it is just far enough from that city to discourage people from making it their headquarters. From extensive trips and observations made in the Ramallah district, I have found it profitable to visit rather freely the villages and the native fellahin, to study certain things which are found nearer the surface than exploration usually notes.

I may add that I went over some of the country looking for traces of occupation in Biblical times, particularly in New Testament times, and by collections of pottery taken from a great many places, which were submitted to experts in Jerusalem. I received the impression of many cities showing plain signs of occupation from the Persian period and onwards, and also in the earlier period.

I went over the sites of former excavations at Askalon, Gibeah, Taanach, Megiddo, Beisan (Beth-shan), Samaria and a number of

cities, finally closing with Ophel. But the thing that most amazed me in Palestine of to-day, with its wealth of opportunity and wide open privileges, was the great stillness on the archaeological front. Except at Ophel, almost nothing has been done lately. It seems as if we had fallen into a very quiet lull, which we hope is the prelude to the storming of some of the strongholds of antiquity. Owing to the kindness of Mr. J. Garrow Duncan, I saw the Ophel excavations more than once, and was impressed with his array of walls and ceramics. I was perhaps even more impressed with his unflinching kindness to the native people, with whom he seems to get on so well. But even in the Ophel fields south of Jerusalem, digging was almost at a standstill. The thing ought to be cleared to the rock. The chain of exploration from the days of Sir Charles Warren away up at the south-east corner of the city, the work of Bliss, Gütthe, Weill, Parker and others, who have worked on those sites now represented by this liaison excavation of the Palestine Exploration Fund, ought at some time, not too far distant, to be carried through to completion. We ought to know what is in that wide open space between the south wall of Jerusalem and the King's Gardens, at least we ought to clear the old city. Just now there is little besides cauliflowers and a few other respectable members of the vegetable world standing in our way. Such favourable conditions cannot last indefinitely. It seems a great pity that there should be even this lull; a greater pity that there should be any suggestion of ever letting go of the work on a mound without the most thorough and systematic scientific work being done, and that without regard to any theory or preconceived goal. Each place ought to be cleaned up in a scientific manner right to the rock.

REV. P. N. WAGGETT, D.D.: Ladies and Gentlemen,—I am allowed to second the proposed election of the Executive Committee although my name appears among them, and I am glad to have the opportunity of saying, as one of the Executive of the Society, a word of enthusiastic welcome of the kindly criticism which has been made. It is an immense advantage, and when that criticism comes from so steadfast a friend of our work and a bearer of a name so honoured, and to me so beloved, as the name of Bentwich, for I was associated with his son in the administration of justice when I was a Political

Officer for Palestine, it is an event which ought to rank high among the happy events of this Meeting. I hope it will tend towards an enthusiastic and almost excited support of the Executive in carrying on the work, not the work of excavation in general but of excavation in Ophel. Excavation does not mean looking for something that you want in the place where you believe it to be. Such excavation is a sort of child's play. Excavation means clearing up a site which, in general, by a long and unchanging tradition is known to be an interesting one; and what place in the world could be so interesting as the site of the original city which David took? May I be allowed as a morphologist to compare excavation with one of the processes in comparative anatomy? When I was a boy and had just taken my Degree at Oxford with some distinction I was set to work to ascertain the position of the renal organs in crustacea, that is lobsters, and the joke is that they have no such organs! But in order to establish even a negative result for the scientific world, which will not take anything on trust, it is necessary to go right through the thing from beginning to end. I hope that at Ophel we are going to establish something very different from a negative result. But science is so self-sacrificing that in order to secure certainty it will cut bang through a thing; and its method of investigating organic substances is to freeze them, or otherwise solidify them, and then cut them up into innumerable slices so that there is no portion which has not been investigated. And it is in the spirit of not expecting and not being doomed to a negative result that we have to continue to encourage men to go through this site of incomparable interest, I say "incomparable" advisedly. I feel as much as anybody among the ignorant can feel the immense attraction of the Philistine sites. That is a part of the country which we came to know very well in the course of conflict, and a part of the country which might and, in fact, has already produced startling results. Nevertheless, it cannot compare for sacred and historical interest with the Jerusalem site.

We can only do this work by steady, constant hammering away. It would be fatal to all scientific research if disappointment led the researchers to try somewhere else. That would never do. One word about expense, and the expense is rather considerable. With continued practice in using the men who have to be employed it may be possible to reduce the expense somewhat, but nothing will reduce it in the Holy Land much below four times what it was before the war.

The whole level of comfort and dignity has been raised ; the people there share in the rise of prices which is everywhere. They have learned from the West that it is not right for workpeople to work at the expense of their physical capital, to use up their bodies ; consequently, you will never get the expense below four times the figure that it was prior to the war, but that ought to be done. The expense of excavation, however, is a matter of months, it may be tens of months or even years ; but the rewards of excavation are those which continue to act through all the ages that follow. They give a new *point d'appui* for all future discoveries ; they alter the very basis of our science. That is what has happened with regard to the stelae. Found in a moment, they remain for ever to give fresh points of discovery. I can imagine nothing more worth while myself, apart from the work of Christian missions, than such work as that of excavation. I believe we have hold of a rare good thing. I was invited the other day through having fairly well-to-do relations, although I have no money myself, to invest in the recovery of the Navarino treasure ships. I was told that I should share in £10,000,000, and supposing I did so share, every pound is exactly like another. I have never seen one sovereign which differed from another in glory. But if I could find on a stela a new record of the conquest of David, new lines by which it would be possible to orientate better and more clearly define both the ancient, middle and modern or imperial cities of Jerusalem, then that would be worth all the sacrifice that could be made, because I should have something that would last for ever. I trust our meeting, which has been so much more interesting than usual, will lead to the resolve that there shall lay behind the Executive of the Palestine Exploration Fund the constant support of a large body of enthusiastic people.

The CHAIRMAN : I need hardly say that I associate myself with Father Waggett, and also with the Honorary Secretary, in welcoming Mr. Bentwich's criticism and suggestions, but at the same time I hope that he will have been converted by the eloquence of Father Waggett and that he will realize that we have a serious scientific intention in excavating Ophel. It must necessarily be the most interesting site in Palestine, since it is the original Jerusalem, and we want to find out the remains, small, humble though they may be, of the earliest and the oldest Jerusalem, and in that work I am sure we shall continue to have Mr. Bentwich's sympathy and support.

The motion was then put and carried and the Chairman declared the following duly elected:—*Chairman*: Dr. H. R. Hall. *Hon. Treasurer*: Sir Charles Close. *Hon. Secretary*: Dr. E. W. G. Masterman. Dr. S. A. Cook; the Rev. Canon Dalton; Prof. A. C. Dickie; Sir Arthur Evans; the Hon. Everard Feilding; Dr. D. G. Hogarth; Prof. R. A. S. Macalister; Charles Marston, Esq.; R. L. Mond, Esq.; the Hon. W. Ormsby-Gore; Brig.-General Paul; F. W. Percival, Esq.; Sir W. Flinders Petrie; the Rev. Prof. Sayce; the Rev. P. N. Waggett; General Sir Charles Warren; Ernest Richmond, Esq.; and O. G. S. Crawford, Esq.

SIR CHARLES CLOSE (Hon. Treasurer), pointed out the various places of interest on the map of Ophel, indicating especially a wall of Maccabaeian date and some caves communicating with the well-known underground channel going to Siloam. The Committee were anxious that it should be possible to follow in the map all the references that might be made in texts, and at the same time it was hoped to put on the map the results of all previous excavations on the whole of the spur of Ophel, including those of Dickie, Warren and others. The map shown had been prepared at the Ordnance Survey at Southampton under the general superintendence of Mr. O. G. S. Crawford, and it was hoped when complete the map would show not only what had been done in the past sixty years on the spur of Ophel but, more important, what was to be done next.

DR. E. W. G. MASTERMAN (Hon. Secretary), also pointed out various sites of interest on the map and said: Sir Charles Close when in Egypt very kindly undertook the mission of going over to Jerusalem to survey and properly record the new discoveries on the map, and that has enormously added to the scientific value of our work. It is mapped on a permanent basis and with it will be mapped all the previous discoveries. The Society is very grateful to Sir Charles Close for his careful Survey, and, I may add, that I spent a very pleasant time helping him.

You will see on the map the main part of the great tower which is generally considered to be early Israelite; it may be called Davidic or Solomonic, but it is certainly an early Hebrew tower which appears to have been inserted inside a glacis which belongs to the Jebusite wall and certainly older than the tower. There is also a small tower which shows what a confusion of things we have to deal with, and

that can be dated with great certainty to be of the Maccabean period. Following south, we have an extraordinary complex of walls which have by no means been fully cleared up; only about a week ago we received a photograph, for which I had specially asked, showing these various walls (see Plate II): the Greek wall lying partly on the top of a wall which can be put down to the time of Hezekiah, and behind that the remains of the ancient Jebusite wall lying upon the ancient scarp.

We have heard the criticism that we have very little to show, that the results are disappointing and that money has drained out because the costs of wages have been so great. But you must remember that we have a certain amount of money outflowing for office expenses and for publication and so on, but everything we get on top of that will be put to the work of excavation. I do not agree that we have nothing to show. This is a great national monument and the greatest Hebrew thing that has been found in Palestine. If it was safe to dig further it would be found that this great town goes down at least twenty feet below the level to which we have exposed it, but the danger is that it might topple forward and be destroyed. The Government Department of Antiquities are now clearing this up. The Palestine Exploration Fund have revealed this great national monument, and it is being strengthened and will be on exhibition for many years to come as the greatest monument to Jebusite and Hebrew civilization in the country. I do not agree that that is nothing. At the same time we do not want to stop the work, though I am obliged to tell you that we have to suspend this work at the present moment for a time. There are two special reasons for that. One is that the gentleman who is doing the work has only two years' leave from a certain life appointment which he now has to take up, otherwise he will lose it. The other is that we have but a few hundred pounds in hand, and that is not sufficient money to embark on another part of Ophel. We must get an accumulation of some hundreds of pounds before we can safely do that.

When Sir Charles Close and I went out to the country we were commissioned to see whether it would not be possible for us to try and recover the old walls on the western side, *i.e.*, to the east of the Tyropoeon. It is possible here to see portions of the main scarps on which the wall ran, and I have very little doubt that we shall find remains of the wall itself if we try. It was, however, decided, in

conjunction with Professor Garstang and Mr. Garrow Duncan, that to undertake it with so small a reserve would be absolutely useless. We are therefore going to delay it for a time whilst you help us, I trust, to get sufficient money to make a new start and take advantage of the opportunity we are obliged to let pass at the moment. Professor Garstang does not consider we are giving up our permit to excavate at Ophel; we are going to resume the work, but this particular section is now done. Part of what we have done will be covered in, part will remain, and when we begin again we shall want to see what there is on the other area. A most extraordinary condition here, which has been a little disappointing, is that builders in—probably—Maccabean times, for some reason, threw a great deal of the remains of the city over the walls into the valley. That you may see for yourself and those who study pottery say there is no doubt about it. There you have sloping down the valley, first of all, the Maccabean pottery; then the later Hebrew pottery, the Jewish and the pre-Israelite pottery in some cases right on top. I do not suppose that happened all over this site, but it has prevented us so far from getting as much of the actual old city as we should have liked. At the same time, the walls in themselves are very fine. I show you a picture of a corner tower on the north of the great bastion which has been built out either by Solomon or David, or one of the early Hebrew Kings, and on each side of north and south are the remains of the sloping glacis of the times of the Jebusites.

The tower I showed you is on the other side of the path shown on the screen in the picture before you. We were unable to remove the path, but the complex of walls has been excavated a little further south and followed down at least three times as far as shown in the picture. You can see the old scarp on which the Jebusite wall was built and a dark hole in which are the great caves, which we have cleared out. I may say that Mr. Garrow Duncan went over the whole of this again for fear he might have overlooked another of those extraordinarily interesting ostraka with Hebrew writing over it of which he found one, but he found no more. I give you the conclusions and results based largely upon the way the masonry has been cut and the character of the pottery that was found.

(The Hon. Secretary exhibited on magic lantern slides the photos reproduced as Figs. 1 and 2, and described them from the notes given by Mr. Garrow Duncan which are printed on [pp. 134-139.]

I can only add what has been so much more ably said by Dr. Waggett, that there is an enormous amount more that must be done by somebody. We have put our hand to it, and I think we ought to go on. Therefore I crave your help and hope you will get the help of your friends in order that we may carry on.

In conclusion, I wish to propose a vote of thanks to Dr. Hall for presiding, and I want to say, I feel sure in your name, how very much we appreciate the fact that a man such as the head of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum, gives us so much of his time. I need not say that in many ways the greatest object of our Society is elucidation of the Bible and everything connected with it. But in order that it may keep its thoroughly scientific aspect we have a number of distinguished archaeologists connected with our Society, and thus what is done can be done on thoroughly scientific lines and with the assurance that what is put forth is supported by the very best archaeologists, I am sure we feel we could not possibly have done better this afternoon than have the Chairman of our own Executive Committee to preside over us. We could not have had any one in the chair who gives more time, thought and energy and makes more sacrifices in our cause than our Chairman, Dr. Hall. I include in the vote of thanks our gratitude to all who have so kindly come to speak to us—Bishop Gore, Professor Grant and Dr. Waggett—and also thanks to the Society of Antiquaries for the use of this room.

The vote of thanks having been carried by acclamation, the CHAIRMAN thanked the Honorary Secretary for his kind words, and said he had been very pleased to preside on that occasion.

The proceedings then terminated.

---