CHAPTER 11

Mayhem: Archaeology, Museums and Mandates

> Les Anglais, les Français, les Allemands, se donnent réciproquement et à bon droit les noms de vandales et de dévastateurs; hélas! la question n'est plus aujourd'hui que de savoir si les débris des plus beaux monuments de l'Orient font meilleure figure dans les musées de Berlin que dans ceux de Londres ou de Paris.[1] [1876]

A concatenation of circumstances already described in earlier chapters spelled grave consequences for the antiquities of Syria, and much the same thing happened all over the Eastern Mediterranean and North Africa. That is, creeping modernisation and westernisation countered the free-for-all experienced by early private collectors (conspicuously Lord Elgin), eventually replacing it with a régime of strict permits which allowed only the favoured (such as the Kaiser) to export antiquities. Mislin in the quote above laments the squabbles between the European nations, condemning their extraction of antiquities from the region as vandals who devastated the land for the profit of their museums back home. Unfortunately, modernisation also occasioned a vigorous repopulation of areas erstwhile fallow but rich in archaeological remains. These new settlers proceeded to recycle in vast quantities, obliterating many sites. As awareness of antiquities grew, and travel to see them increased, so their quantity and integrity inexorably declined, perhaps leading us to question whether Elgin, the Kaiser and their ilk were not saviours rather than vandals?

Thus it is the very acme of irony that, as knowledgeable perception of areas worthy of archaeological investigation went up, so their number was whittled away. On the same see-saw, those tourists who contributed to the growing prosperity of Syria (and perhaps contributed to exploration societies, and encouraged museums to collect) necessarily encountered fewer antiquities than did previous generations. Because in earlier decades the country was traditional rather than modern – supposedly the biblical landscape that so enchanted those modern pilgrims ignorant of the intervening centuries of history and monuments. And there is a further irony: if we can congratulate the Ottoman Government on trying to quell the rapacity of foreign diggers and their museums back home, the population policies they promoted in their efforts to modernise the Empire (as hinted above) served to destroy some of the very sites that their later antiquities legislation was designed to protect. Under their mandate, the French tried to save objects and cluster them into

© MICHAEL GREENHALGH, 2017 | DOI 10.1163/9789004334601_013
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license.

local museums, as at Suweida. Captain Carbillet arrived as Governor of this djebel in 1923, and founded the museum in 1924, because on his tours "il fut frappé de l'abondance des documents anciens qui gisaient un peu partout et de l'état lamentable d'un bon nombre de monuments."[1]

In spite of the frequent attachment on the part of our travellers to the lands they visited and described, the enduring result of European engagement with outposts of the Ottoman Empire was far from beneficial. Indeed, it was deadly – a foul brew of scholarly, political and military mayhem, laced with lies all round and the betrayal of several promises to aid local independence. The first involved archaeologists in unseemly and often duplicitous attempts to populate the museums back home before local regulations and silly locals could prevent such exports (some of them simple smuggling) by cutting off supplies. The second occupied European governments from at least the mid-19th century in planning what they might gain by the break-up of that Empire which was already feeble, antiquated and fragmenting, and judged in dire need of continuing European expertise, meaning a takeover.

The trigger for the actual breakup of the Ottoman Empire was indeed military mayhem, resulting from Western machinations during and then following the First World War, helped along by Kemal Ataturk and the Young Turks. The new country of Turkey was formed, centred on Anatolia, but the outposts were dealt with by France and Britain, which at San Remo, following the division of the spoils at the Paris Peace Conference, accepted mandates covering Syria (1922–45) and Palestine (1920–48) respectively. As we admire trophies from the Middle East in our museums, and puzzle over the foolhardiness and hugger-mugger secrecy of the artificial maps drawn by the victorious powers, it is far from hysterical to view current developments in Syria and the whole region as distasteful results part-fathered by crude European interference and imperialism, and possibly aided by pre-war spying by archaeologists such as Wooley, Bell and Lawrence, plus an equivalent cast of Germans.[2] Later Western interference in the region has been no less disastrous.

Archaeology

As we have frequently seen in previous chapters, many travellers thought Syria in need of all kinds of development, and especially education, the alibi

1 Dunand 1934, 1.

2 Satia 2008; Sconzo 2008: development of Syrian archaeology.

for appropriating antiquities (and trying to avoid local regulations)[3] being the perception that the locals were unable to take care of them, and the undeniable proof being that monuments were fast disappearing. Conversely, it was an object of faith that museums, an European invention, could give objects context, constructing "a coherent historical network made up of works culled from diverse ancient sites and repositioned into a three-dimensional compendium located at home."[4] Nor were exploration and digging confined to Syria.[5] Yet just how removing objects from their original context could help coherence and understanding was surely puzzling: the task would presumably be left to the labelling.

All the developments described in detail in previous chapters (trade, tourism, steamships, pilgrimage, desertification, Bedouin, marauding sheikhs) had important knock-on effects on archaeology. Without local knowledge about routes, sites, assistance, translators, possible firmans and protection provided by traders and their supporting consuls, no expedition of any size could proceed. Modern ships hauled baggage for archaeologists as well as tourists whose enthusiasm for the area helped generate financing from back home, and eventually encouraged the founding of various exploration societies, conspicuously the Palestine Exploration Fund (London 1865), the Palestine Exploration Society (New York 1870), and in Berlin the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft and then the Deutsche Institut für ägyptische Altertumskunde (1896 and 1897).[2] Interest in Greater Syria was provoked by travellers' accounts, and also by discoveries of sites and antiquities, for example:

3 Díaz-Andreu 2007, 159: antiquities laws of 1874 & 1884: "From then on, being under Ottoman rule, legislation led to the most valuable pieces being sent to the museum in Constantinople instead of to the European and the new American powers." Chevalier 2002, 13–112: L'archéologie française dans l'Empire Ottoman. 29–46 Ottoman regulations and French reactions. Ibid. 283ff: L'archéologie française en Syrie et au Liban. Vernoit 1997, 3–4: the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft, and the spinoff excavations in Palestine and Mesopotamia, including Babylon and Ashur. Brion 1937 for an overview of recent discoveries entitled "La resurrection des villes mortes" I 119–152 for Syria; I 153–182 for Palestine. The book emphasises French archaeology, and newly discovered sites such as Ras Shamra and Mari.

4 Shaw 2003, 37–38: details the European extraction and export of antiquities from Ottoman territory.

5 Chevalier 2009 for the French at Susa; 29–51: Trente années de la vie quotidienne d'une mission au Perse (1884–1914) – Marcel & Jane Dieulafoy, Jacques de Morgan, then Pillet. Cf. 176–181 for biographies of the diggers. Liverani 1994: overview of archaeological surveying in the East.

1812: Burckhardt discovers Petra;
1827: Laborde in Syria and Arabia Petraea;
1845–7: Layard excavates Nimrud;
1857–8: Rey travels in the Hauran;
1861–2: De Vogüé travels in the Hauran;
1864: Luynes travels in Syria;
1881: Clermont-Ganneau travels in Phoenicia;
1887: Tombs of princes, Alexander sarcophagus, found at Sidon;
1897–8: Brünnow and von Domaszewski in Arabia;
1899 & 1904: Butler in Syria;
1899–1904: German investigations at Baalbec.

National pride was involved in the frequent cozening of competitors,[6] and the French had a better grip because of their long-lived engagement with Syria.[7] There were parallel developments in Egyptian archaeology, where Muhammad Ali had already given orders in 1835 for a museum to be founded.[3]

It was in the 19th century that archaeology developed somewhat fitfully from trophy-collecting, which had been one aim of consuls and travellers for centuries, especially the French.[8] Pingaud in 1887 defines the interests of Choiseul-Gouffier, French consul at Constantinople in the later 18th century, as having nothing to do with the modern meaning of archaeology:

> Il demandait à la pierre les témoignages d'un art exquis et non l'histoire fragmentaire d'une civilisation ... Cette poursuite ardente de tant de chefs-d'œuvre mutilés constituait, avec leur reproduction par le crayon, le principal intérêt de son œuvre.[4]

And this Ambassadeur Académicien was recompensed by the French government for "une nombreuse collection de médailles & d'antiques; ses dépenses énormes pour faire fouiller les tombeaux de la Troade, mouler la plupart des chefs-d'œuvre d'Athènes, & réunir plusieurs milliers de vieux morceaux de marbre."[5]

Just what might be unearthed by large digs was seen in present-day Iraq, where in 1843–4 Mohl & Botta employed 300 workmen to excavate Khorsabad, believing it to be Nineveh, and in 1845–7 Layard excavated Nimrud, privately

---

6 Chevalier 2002, 46–63: L'archéologie française face à l'Angleterre et à l'Allemagne (1842–1890).

7 Roederer 1917, 33–41: L'influence intellectuelle de la France en Syrie et en Palestine; 45–47: Langue et culture française en Syrie.

8 Chevalier 2004 for an overview.

funded by Stratford Canning. Greece was also yielding up her treasures: in 1863 a dig was organised at Kavala in Greece by the French Vice-Consul Champoiseau; work was then started at Samothrace, just across the water, in 1873, and four years later (again by the French) on Delos. In recent decades Syria has presented archaeologists with excellent digging opportunities.[9]

Certainly, sailing ships had transported large and heavy artefacts back to eager museums in London, Paris and Berlin; and the only way to satisfy such a growing thirst was to document and illustrate the Oriental past, and to dig up what might still be called trophies for European museums, all of which were in effect looters. As Flinders Petrie wrote in 1918 of vandalised tombs in Egypt:

> The most beautifully sculptured tomb at Thebes had the best parts prized away – now in Berlin. Another, a painted tomb, was wrecked, and its fragments are in Florence. The most beautiful of the early sculptured tombs was ruined, and the broken fragment of the best part is in the British Museum. These pieces have all been obtained with open eyes, knowing quite well how they were stolen, and what damage was done for this filthy lucre.[6]

Tourism itself provoked thirst for antiquities, and museums felt pressure to satisfy the need back home for erstwhile travellers, now educated by what they had seen abroad. Here Napoleon was from one perspective exemplary but unfortunate. In 1798 on his invasion of Egypt, as well as the first printing presses for Cairo (to print his proclamations), he took no fewer than 167 scholars, members of the Commission des Sciences et des Arts with him who eventually produced the monumental *Description de l'Égypte* (23 vols, Paris 1809–29). This was no mere flummery on Napoleon's part: he was a member of the Institut de France, was very proud of the fact, and in Paris wore its uniform rather than military dress. Banishing the regret that the French did not research and publish likewise for Syria, this was the greatest of Western contributions to knowledge of Egyptian civilisation ancient and modern, and has never been surpassed for detail, accuracy and illustrations. Unfortunately, Napoleon set the tone for the export of antiquities during his European conquests; the Italian states, for example, would not join in any scholarly applause, for many of their artworks ended up in French museums, and not all were returned.

9 *Contribution française* 1989, IX, Tate: "La Syrie est le plus riche du monde par le nombre, la variété et intérêt scientifique de ses vestiges archéologiques. Aussi les missions de fouille et de prospection y sont-elles plus nombreuses qu'ailleurs."

Marooned by Nelson, who destroyed the majority of his fleet, Napoleon took his army into Syria, unsuccessfully attacked Acre, and descended on Jaffa, where his army was devastated by plague.[10] His expedition was translated into academic tourism for the many later scientific expeditions to the region, funded by the French government,[7] and from the fruits of which several reports appear throughout this book. In 1799 a French artillery officer, Boussard, found the Rosetta Stone, taken along with other antiquities as spoils of war by the British, and for ever afterwards in the British Museum. This and other trophies triggered poetic admiration back home, such as Shelley's *Alastor, or the Spirit of Solitude*, of 1816.[11] But the French also derived a good laugh from the exercise, since it was a Frenchman, Champollion, who deciphered it. The French also had the expertise to decipher the Moabite Stone, if not the luck to get it to the Louvre in one piece.

For Syria, Flinders Petrie in 1918 worried about the innumerable mounds, containing buildings "more or less perfect":

> All of these buildings need preservation, and cannot be left to be quarried out as mere masonry. In Egypt most of the ancient sites have been claimed by land grabbers within living memory.[8]

A long view was required:

> When once the security of life and produce, without extortion, is assured, the rapid development of unworked lands is certain in the present age. We must not have repeated in Mesopotamia and Palestine the ghastly results of our inefficiency, which we have exhibited in Cyprus and in Egypt.[9]

Digging was needed to retrieve buried structures. The digging impulse was fed by nationalist interpretations of the past erected during the 19th century, which is where the Young Turks caught the disease. The emphasis was "on retrieving ancient works of art to fill national and private collections in Europe."[12] The

10 Hachicho 1964, 117–130: military operations against Napoleon.

11 Hachicho 1964, 192: Obedient to high thoughts, has visited / The awful ruins of the days of old: / Athens, and Tyre, and Baalbek, and the waste / where stood Jerusalem, the fallen towers / Of Babylon, the eternal pyramids....

12 Vernoit 1997, 2: "This discovery of ancient civilizations greatly overshadowed curiosity in Islamic history ... the development of Islamic archaeology had more in common with the archaeology of medieval and later Europe than with that of ancient times."

French persuaded themselves that the Crusades were part of the French past and of French culture, just as the Germans "harnessed the popularity of the Crusades and Crusader archaeology to the wagon of German nationalism." In 1873 the Kaiser provided funds to buy the cathedral site at Tyre, and search (fruitlessly) for the remains of Barbarossa.[13] A silver belt was found, naturally associated with Barbarossa, and sent to Berlin as a present for the Kaiser.[10] In France scholars such as De Vogüé saw Gothic in the Holy Land as specifically a French invention, to the disdain of the Germans; the battle was a long one, exemplified in Pierre Francastel's Paris 1945 assertion that the Germans did *not* invent Gothic: *L'Histoire de l'Art instrument de la propagande allemande*, a classic demonstration that old architecture can serve contemporary political ends.

In Syria, there was an *embarras de richesses* for archaeologists. Grand dreams were formulated, but the majority remained just that – dreams. They were continually prompted about where to dig (as they continue to do when possible),[14] but funds were nearly always lacking. In 1840 La Salle thought the ruins of Jerash so extensive that a commission of painters, architects and archaeologists was needed to deal with them.[11] It would indeed have been wonderful to have a complete plan and description of antiquities classical and Islamic at this date, before later re-occupation of that site! In 1868 Porter proposed a program for archaeological action in Syria and Palestine,[12] beginning with mapping the exact location of important towns and ancient sites, copying all inscriptions, making a geological survey of the shores of the Dead Sea, and also:

3. Excavate some of the artificial mounds in the plains of Damascus, Buka'a, and Hums, and in the valley of the Orontes.
5. Excavate the sites of Tyre, Sidon, Gebal [Byblos], and Aradus, as far as practicable, for remains of Phoenician art and inscriptions. The recent discovery of sarcophagi at Sidon may serve as a sufficient stimulus to this work …
6. Excavate and examine the subterranean tombs of Palmyra, and copy the Palmyrine inscriptions.

To which he added an examination of mosques: "The best specimens are, like Mohammedanism itself, rapidly decaying." Porter's desiderata echoed the plan of campaign on which the PEF had been launched in 1865, such as plotting maps and towns, and pointing out what treasures had been found elsewhere:

13 Ellenblum 2007, 32, 36–39.

14 Clermont-Ganneau 1923.

> Who can doubt that if the same intelligence, zeal, knowledge, and outlay were applied to the exploration of Palestine that have recently been brought to bear on Halicarnassus, Carthage, Cyrene – places without a single sacred association, and with little bearing on the Bible – the result would be a great accession to our knowledge of the successive inhabitants of Syria – Canaanite, Israelite, Roman?[13]

Archaeologists no doubt agreed with Porter's ambitious program – for who would not? But they were caught between a rock and a hard place, trying to balance scarce funds against perceived importance. It was certainly easier to dig at home where, however, there was often not just one past to be investigated, but a choice of several. In 1849 a complaint was registered in Britain against the emphasis on recording Roman remains there, while "slabs and crosses covered with beautiful and singular sculpture, and often bearing inscriptions which have to the present time baffled the skill of the keenest antiquaries, lie scattered over Great Britain and Ireland, a few only of which have hitherto been engraved."[14] Great Britain did not see its own Ancient Monuments Act until 1882, "and yet, though the monument is thus to be maintained at the public expense, it neither becomes public property, nor is it made accessible to the public."[15]

There were two ways of making archaeology useful, and bringing it to public attention. One was to ensure that expensive digs abroad (along the lines of Porter's 1868 proposal above) uncovered and brought home spectacular antiquities with which to amaze not only the home constituency but also the whole of Europe, and to generate funds which would allow archaeologists to target likely sites not yet explored. In 1883 Conder & Kitchener listed the best sites for exploration: Caesarea, Samaria, Ascalon, Herodium and Masada,[16] plus the large number of tells in Judaea not yet examined.[17] Herodium was an obvious target, well known from Josephus, and with little left on the surface: "Les aqueducs, les escaliers en marbre, les palais, la ville même, tout a disparu . . . on ne rencontre dans la plaine que quelques blocs dépareillés et quelques monceaux de débris informes."[18] Kitchener repeated his list in 1891, adding Jerash, Baalbek and Carchemish:

> Unfortunately the state of the East is very unfavourable to the antiquarian; but it must not be supposed that exploration is complete while fields as yet hardly worked exist all along the eastern shores of the Mediterranean.[19]

The second solution was to travel into little explored regions, and substitute exploration and discovery for digging. For example, Rey and De Vogüé went

to the Hauran, and others further south and east of the Jordan. Merrill paid a compliment to De Vogüé by translating extracts from him in his own 1881 volume, which reported on the 1875 American Expedition to east of the Jordan: “the reader may the more readily indulge me in placing before him in this manner the views of this well-known scholar upon this deeply interesting subject.”[20] Topographical precision was valued, so Schumacher’s 1889 railway planning for a line to run from Haifa to Damascus, through the Hauran, was accompanied by plenty of prospective archaeological meat: “the country is so rich in antiquarian and archaeological remains that a survey to be thoroughly exhaustive would in truth occupy many years.”[21] Still in 1905 Goodrich-Freer was pointing out sites for excavation, for example at Beisan, near Tiberias, and invoking the nationalist bogey, discussed below:

> Where can the archaeologist find richer promise? There is, happily, a rumour that it is one of the many sites likely to be taken in hand by German skill and perseverance.[22]

Unsurprisingly, then, here was the third way, compounded of increasing political and military influence, and money. The French had adopted this approach in the mid-19th century, but towards its end it was the Germans who drove developments. Softened up by the Kaiser’s 1898 visit to Baalbek,[23] the Porte issued a firman for digging there, and 160 workmen were employed for two years:

> They have cleared the walls to their foundations; they have restored columns and pillars that had fallen in many places; they have built new masonry to sustain old arches; have repaired much of the damage done by the earthquakes and have removed all Arab construction so far as possible.[24]

Failing transporting prestigious finds, publishing information, plans and photographs was the new and inevitable trend, as governments tightened up and sometimes banned the export of antiquities. Paper reconstructions could also be made. At Beisan, for example, in 1854 Van De Velde suggested that “numerous columns everywhere scattered about demand the scientific skill of the archaeologist to call again into fancied being the buildings of which once they were so prominent a part.”[25] By the new century, Butler’s Princeton Expedition brought back no antiquities; instead they published topographical data, site and monument plans, some of them measured, and inscriptions, plus many photographs.[26]

Intemperate excavation could ruin sites. The Duc de Luynes, travelling in 1864, complained about the work of the French Commission at Ras-el-Abiad (and Haran or Omm-al-Awamid = the Mother of Columns), on the Phoenician coast, where it

> vint faire des fouilles en ce lieu et bouleversa ces ruines en les explorant avec trop peu de méthode. II en résulte beaucoup d'incertitude sur les édifices dont on comprendrait bien mieux le plan et l'usage, s'ils étaient restés tels que leur destruction naturelle les avait laissés. Quoi qu'il en soit, il faut espérer que le savant chef de l'expédition tirera parti de son exploration, et l'on dit qu'il a exhumé de ces ruines une inscription phénicienne d'une certaine valeur scientifique.[27]

Digging in Palestine

In Syria it seems to have been partly a lack of safety, and partly a developing governmental reluctance to help populate foreign museums, which held back serious digging. Many locals, as narrated in Chapter Three, were convinced foreigners dug in their country to retrieve the treasure the location of which (they believed) was indicated in inscriptions, or arrived at by magic. When locals took an interest in exploratory digs, it was often so that, having avoided the hard work of soil-shifting, they could move in and filch any useful stones.

The hardest place was Jerusalem itself, where excavations in 1866 had to go some 12m deep in laying foundations for a church.[28] But the main problem was not detritus but rather bureacracy. An 1869 letter to *The Times* pointed out that the bureaucratic maze ensured that "prejudice or allowable sentiment opposes to our search a barrier harder than porphyry." Nevertheless, "even through these difficulties many curiosities have been sent to England by Lieut. Warren, and nine cases of those newly found will be shipped in the steamer with me."[29] However, the prospect for research in Jerusalem was disappointing as an 1873 report made clear:

> Considering the great portions of the city which have been already turned up in the many recent public and private buildings with such small results, we may fairly expect that we shall find little to reward us from an archaeological point of view in any future research.[30]

This was a plea for money, so that the PEF might "explore by means of scientific agents on a well-defined plan," followed by the irresistable dig (a keep-off-the-grass hallowed by all archaeologists) that any donor "may help the Americans

by not encouraging small expeditions into that tempting country east of the Jordan, where so many treasures lie hidden."[31]

The Americans were in the forefront of well-funded expeditions, sending out a surveyer and archaeologist to Syria in 1875, and funded for two years with $6,000: "the larger part of the money raised by the American Society has been subscribed by leading New York merchants." No doubt the funds were provided from sheer philanthropy, for the notice mentions a survey but not digging; or were objects for museums also to be sought?[32] One result of penury in the United Kingdom was for the PEF in 1877 to change focus and, instead of digging, turn to the examination of topography, which would illustrate "the accuracy and consistency of the Bible history; and thus the discovery of even the most obscure of Bible towns." Such work, plus the examination of the ethnography of the peasant population, constitute "studies of infinitely more valuable character than the costly attempt to explore by excavation, with results which, though of antiquarian interest, have no bearing on Bible questions."[33] The subtext here (for what must have been recognised as a second-best) seems to be that such work would not be contentious, and could interest a readership that did not focus exclusively on Greater Syria via the Bible. The PEF was presumably attempting to widen its audience as a conduit to generating more funds. What excavations were conducted could be written up in glowing terms. Thus Conder in 1891 trumpeted excavations round the Haram al-Sharif as prime examples of "measurement and scientific exploration,"[34] while De Hass four years previously was still convinced that "fragments of sculpture, rare marbles, and beautiful columns found in the Mosque of Omar, Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and other more modern buildings, without doubt belonged to the Temple and its cloisters."[35]

Revived pilgrimage and biblical study both contributed to archaeological exploration, with "science" as a tool, which was a common 19th-century idea. For archaeology was believed by some to be necessary to prove the truth of the Bible and thereby put Darwin to flight. In 1852 Wilson had already lamented that there was so much to find in Jerusalem, but serious digging was then impossible. A firman was granted to Warren in 1869 "to make excavations, under certain conditions, at localities where antiquities are likely to be found," but the Temple Mount was excluded.[36] By 1871, however, "at last the excavations of Jerusalem have been begun."[37] But outside the Jerusalem area (and outside the auspices of the Palestine Exploration Fund, which was perenially short of funds)[15] very little extensive excavating was done. Butler of Princeton led expeditions in 1904–5 and 1909, and took large numbers of photographs

15 Bar-Yosef 2005, 165–181: The PEF, the Public, and the 'Popular.' 166: PEF's poor finances and membership.

and measurements.[38] In 1908 they camped near Jericho, and "late in the afternoon we walked over to the site of the ancient city to see the German excavations then being carried on."[39] At Qanawat they began work early, "some going with a band of muleteers to do a little excavating at Sî."[40] But throughout their published volumes there is nothing on excavation; and none of the words spade, shovel or trench appear; excavation appears only in relation to German work at Jericho.

Filling Western Museums

France had a long track-record of exporting antiquities from the Orient, and presumably saw no reason why she should stop doing so. Antiquities seized in earlier centuries from the East were many, and the French were well aware of the source of Venice's splendour.[41] One illustrious name is Claude Fabri de Peiresc, whose very networking was impressive as he sought information and objects for his private collection.[16] Some searchers were government employees, as were those calling the tune; they thoughtfully provided shopping lists of desiderata. In 1671 Carcavy, the Royal librarian, asked Père Wansleben to find "des statues ou bas-reliefs, qui soyent de bons maistres," and to note that at Baalbek "quantité de belles statues ensevelies sous des ruines, qu'on pourroit en tirer, ayant la permission du bâcha de Damas d'y faire fouiller."[42] In 1683, at the behest of Colbert, D'Arvieux sent from Aleppo to Paris "une grande caisse de très beaux manuscrits orientaux très bien choisis pour sa bibliothèque et celle du roi,"[43] and drawings of Palmyra and Baalbek (from Tripoli) reached Paris in 1706, long before Wood's publication.[44] Direct orders came from the King's representative to Lucas[17] in Syria telling him not only what to collect (specific medals only, to fill in gaps in the collection!), but also the route to take; other instructions reckoned Greece and the Propontis should also be trawled.[45] A catalogue of Lucas' finds was published as part of his travel narrative.[46] Like coins and medals, manuscripts were a favourite collecting item, being easily portable, and to be welcomed within Vatican collections as well.[47] The Marquis de Villeneuve, travelling 1730–1740, sent at least two cases of manuscripts back to the King, most of them from Syria.[48] With

16 Brentjes 2010, Variorum pagination VII 1–56: Peiresc's interests in the Middle East and Northern Africa in respect to geography and cartography. 4–14 Peiresc's network in the Ottoman Empire and its dependencies [including Syria] – an impressive list.

17 Göçek 1987, 98: Lucas' haul, and for those of Pitton de Tournefort and the Abbé Sevin, the last returning with 600 MSS.

the help of the French navy, in the early 18th century the King's consul at (Libyan) Tripoli was shipping back statues and columns to France.[49] The various find-lists and instructions written for the King's servants found a wider circulation in Montfaucon's c.1720 *Mémoire pour servir d'instruction à ceux qui cherchent d'anciens monumens dans la Grèce et dans le Levant*, which was still in use in 1742.[50]

Of course, selling antiquities to foreigners was a cottage industry everywhere. De Saulcy, at Sidon in 1853, wrote that "Partout on nous offre des médailles, des pierres gravées et des débris antiques de toute espèce."[51] Unfortunately, however, by then the locals had nothing interesting to sell.[52] He did better at Hebron, however, buying "une sorte de petite capse en marbre blanc, et en forme de sarcophage, portant une croix patée, à branches égales, sur 1'une de ses faces," probably extracted from local chamber tombs.[53] Buying coins and medals often seemed to be easy, since few locals realised their inherent value, and often sold them for only a little more than the value of the metal.[54] But the supply was evidently running out, as Hunter found at Beirut in 1842, where he picked up a lot of items for only two shillings, "these included the only articles I thought worthy of attention."[55] Finding-lists such as the French had been issuing for centuries were perhaps the natural vade mecum for explorers in lands new to them. In 1864 Guérin proved to the government his credentials for Samaria by emphasising the lists he had made of his discoveries.[56] The result was lists like Rey's in his report to his French Government sponsors, for example of the 27 objects he sent back to Paris in 1867.[57]

In a perfect world, European acquisitions would have ceased when export regulations were enforced, and local museums founded. But this rarely happened. Even today, trophy-collecting by prominent museums is not always frowned upon, as some recent high-profile investigations have demonstrated. Looting continues to be a curse.[18] Many trophies collected in earlier centuries remain in our museums, and they remain indispensable to demonstrate the skill and results of excavation. Museum labels can also be very instructive, those in the Louvre (for example) indicating provenance, with much Syrian material accessioned from the 1860s onwards.[19] And as already noted, nationalistic impulses frequently made digs and discoveries a competition between

18 Gerster 2005, 373–379: The curse and frustration of archaeologists – looting.

19 Dentzer-Fedy 1993: much of the material entered the Louvre 1880–90, later acquisitions being largely from private collections.

Western countries, to the inevitable impoverishment of the regions from which antiquities were extracted.[20]

For the Europeans, confronting antiquities in the Middle East was a race against time (and vandalising tourists and locals), and an exercise in evading regulations as soon as they were set in place. Egypt evolved a monuments protection policy under Auguste Mariette from 1858, as did the Ottoman Empire under the control of the Ministry of Education in 1884.[21] From 1884 Hamdy Bey was in charge of archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, and "henceforth no person received permission to explore more than one ancient ruin at the same time, and this only with the express stipulation that all the antiquities recovered became the exclusive property of the Imperial Museum in Constantinople."[58] However, already in 1872 Burton found the policy of preventing export under the pretext that they were wanted for a home collection as "highly invidious," at least in part because he knew how it could be circumvented:

> Were this the case, no complaint could be made; the step has been taken by civilised powers. But here it means simply a bakhshish ad valorem to the local governor, and the place for housing such valuables is yet in nubibus … Meanwhile interesting remains are left in the streets to be broken by boys; and foreigners are subject to all manner of annoyance.[59]

Yet even if formal restriction did not exist in the 1850s, Van De Velde was eyeing the ground around Sidon: "If it were possible to make excavations in the grounds around Sidon, without getting into difficulties with the Turkish government, many an interesting relic of antiquity would be dug up."[60]

"Do not export" did not mean "Do not collect," and several foreigners living for years in Syria formed large collections. One was that of M. Péretié, dragoman to the Consulat de France in Beirut, which received a glowing review from Luynes, travelling in 1864. Clearly, Péretié had agents who dug, and brought interest items to him for his collection:

> Le salon, plus loin, était un vrai musée d'antiquités, terres cuites, bronzes, médailles, pierres gravées, cylindres, choisis avec un goût excellent parmi

---

20 Weber 2006 for museum survivals: #1 torso of naked youth, found in reuse in the Umayyad Mosque, in mediaeval masonry; #2 fragment of colossal arm, marble, same source; 56–57 for tribal shrine at Ahr al-Ledja; 79–82 sculpture from Umm Al-Jimal; 83–90 Bosra, where some 50 sculptures have been found; 92–97 sculpture from Qanawat; 100–109 sculpture from Souweida.

21 Vernoit 1997, 2.

> ce que les fouilles et les découvertes opérées par les agents de M. Péretié pouvaient offrir de plus remarquable.[61]

Conder describes his collection as "probably the finest in Syria."[62] After his death, his collection was dispersed, some early material going to the Rev. Greville J. Chester (who was interested in Phoenician material), and an archaic head to Copenhagen. The Duc de Luynes had already bought from him the Esmunazar Sarcophagus, of black stone, found in Sidon in 1855 on land Péretié subsequently purchased, and now in the Louvre. It was this splendid find which brought Sidon to the attention of scavenging archaeologists.[63] Two Sidon sarcophagi of white marble were also sold direct by Péretié to the Louvre. Renan's 1864 *Mission de Phénicie* is full of references to Péretié, because he got there first, and Renan was obliged in his turn to purchase land from him in order to execute some of his digs.[64]

Renan naturally sent quantities of material back to the Louvre, including a fine mosaic from a church at Tyre,[65] and another for which he engaged a mosaicist from Rome to lift, so that it might be installed in Paris, in the Palais de l'Industrie.[66] No doubt his interest in matters Phoenician drew local attention, for by the 1880s inscriptions were being forged,[67] and much interest was developing in the remains of Syria much earlier than the Romans.[68] When Clermont-Ganneau sent back to Paris the finds from his 1881 excavations (including 23 bronze statuettes and 13 sculptures[69]), he did not even mention any difficulties with regulations, so presumably had made arrangements beforehand. Similarly, he wrote of a "magnificent marble head found some years ago [at Samaria], and taken by me to the Louvre in 1882."[70]

Before Hamdy Bey's iron rule, the Sidon sarcophagi were too important to go uncontested by Britain and France. When Wortabet arrived in 1855, a new sarcophagus had just been discovered, but "so warm became the discussion between these allies of the Turkish government, that the pasha deemed it best to bury the sarcophagus under ground, until these "deputy-provisionary-sub-vice-pro-acting-consuls" should have settled the matter amicably in a law-suit, which he would hear and decide upon. They had been a month engaged upon it, and the law-suit was as far from termination as on the first day it began."[71]

In spite of Hamdi Bey's efforts, in Syria (and elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire) there was minimum regulation (sometimes not even enforced) before the First World War, and quantities of antiquities went to Europe and the United States, some of them under an agreed division of spoils with the government, but some of them actually smuggled. The Mandate authorities for Syria, naturally with a European rather than local perspective, encouraged

European and American digs "in Greater Syria, allowing them to repatriate many of their finds, at a time when such liberality had become a thing of the past in Egypt and Iraq and, of course, in Turkey as well." When archaeologists found they could not fruitfully dig in Turkey, they went to Syria.[22] Funding was still on the museum mind: "As one plainspoken official at the British Museum stated, regarding a proposed expedition in Syria, 'the question is, will [it] give the trustees an adequate material return for their money.'" Local museums could also be deployed to serve political purposes, the French in Syria demonstrating Arab roots, but the Phoenicians in Lebanon differently, "to appeal to a Maronite constituency."[23] What was Syria, and what was Lebanon?[24]

Money bought objects, Gallois finding it normal that in exchange for their work at Baalbek the Germans should have the right to choose

> quelques jolis souvenirs archéologiques, ce qu'elle n'a pas oublié en envoyant à Berlin, statues, frises, morceaux d'entablement, sculptures variées, tous souvenirs, comme bien on pense, triés avec soin et naturellement non des moins intéressants et des moins précieux.[72]

In 1910 Jessup assessed the political implications of the Kaiser's visit:

> This has already had its effect. It has diminished sensibly the prestige and influence of France in Syria and Palestine . . . French influence here has been identified with the worst phases of Jesuit intrigue and anything that weakens it is a public benefit.[73]

The Kaiser certainly intended to make an impact: with 1,000 in the party (supplied by 250 mules and horses), he had a staff of 120, bolstered by 140 naval and military officers.[74] The German politicians were after railway concessions, and their archaeologists after digging rights. (Indeed, building railways

---

22 Goode 2007, 2; 59 for details of digs in the 1920s & 1930s, including the Committee for the Excavation of Antioch and Vicinity, which provided loot for the Louvre and for several museums in the USA.

23 Goode 2007, 12–13, 14.

24 Salibi 1988, 71: "To the Syrian people, Syria is simply a country which happens to be there, perhaps fortunately, to serve as 'the throbbing heart of Arabism', as the country is often poetically described. With Lebanon, it is a different matter. Even before the present Lebanese state came to exist on the political map of the modern Arab world, a number of theories had been developed, sometimes locally, sometimes by external parties, which depicted Lebanon as a national entity of special historical character. Are any of these theories historically or philosophically plausible?".

or roads, and digging for antiquities, are often consonant activities.) Thus the American Vice-Consul at Haifa (Schumacher, explorer and archaeologist) gave up his American nationality in favour of Germany because "he could get no rights and secure no concessions for archaeological excavation and exploration, whereas a German subject can get any concession that is desired."[75] The railway was indeed the hand of fate as far as antiquities were concerned, Adolf Michaelis commenting mournfully in 1908 that "Fate has been more favourable at Baalbec-Heliopolis than in the Hauran, although here also the railway, the friend of man, but the enemy of ancient structures, has approached to within a short distance."[76] The Germans celebrated by carrying off sections of Baalbek's architecture for re-erection in the Pergamon Museum in Berlin, where they can be seen today.

In clear competition with the Germans (some of whose ancestors also crusaded in the Holy Land) scholarly propaganda in Syria was developed to appeal to a French constituency, by the publication of accounts of surviving religious and military monuments, built by the French (or so it was affirmed). As Batissier wrote in 1851, "ils appartiennent à notre ancienne civilisation et à notre histoire."[77] This free-for-all from Europe and the USA was not to last, as Pingaud vainly thought in 1887, because "l'Orient se rapproche insensiblement de l'heure où il échappera sans effort, pour commencer un nouvel avenir, à ses maîtres d'aujourd'hui."[78]

In Britain as well as in Germany and France, an interest in the crusading past developed in tandem with a focus on national history and document archives, strengthening throughout the 19th century. France was to the forefront in crusader studies, and also in paying for scholars to visit and report on Syria. Hence it is scarcely surprising that it was France who, through trade as well as church and school foundation and proselytising (long before the American evangelicals) believed she had a strong claim to be a principal guide for the development of sections of Syria after the First World War. In a sense, this chapter has been a preliminary briefing for the two mandates, which were to make easier the acquisition of antiquities from Syria for European museums.

The First World War and the French & British Mandates

> [L'Europe] devrait s'appliquer uniquement à développer tant d'éléments divers par l'influence matérielle et morale qu'elle exerce sur les populations de la Syrie, et à les protéger contre tous périls par son autorité et son intervention prévoyante dans les affaires d'Orient… Dans cette grande tâche, le rôle principal appartient naturellement à la France.[79] [1861]

At the behest of the Ottoman Empire, in the 19th century Western experts helped develop necessary infrastructure such as roads and railways, just as they had in matters military (training, fortifications, uniforms, ships, artillery) in the previous century. Western companies continued to be involved in international trade but, by the late 19th century, this was focussed on providing local markets for European goods whereas in the past it had been Europe which bought the products made in or merchandised through Syria. Tourism then provided countries such as Syria, Turkey and Egypt with foreign exchange, and generated dependencies which have grown enormously in the decades following the Second World War.

Western involvment with Syria, and Syrian dependence on Europe, was therefore part-realised well before the disastrous carve-up following the First World War, and was clear to commentators a generation beforehand.[80] Many had measured the country against governance and prosperity in the West and found it wanting; and a few had seen it as ripe for Western colonisation. In the famous Chinese prevarication (prophecy?), it is too soon to tell whether the French Revolution was a success. No such doubt surrounds the consequences of Western involvment in the Middle East from the Crusades and into the 21st century, as we shall see in the Epilogue (below).

Yet there were compartmentalised and partial successes, such as the opportunities the Mandates gave to archaeology.[25] For example, it was the French who created of the Institut des Lettres Orientales at Beirut, and the Institut Français at Damascus, as well as museums at Beirut, Damascus, Aleppo and Suweida, and "Effective steps were taken to preserve existing monuments; and restorations, usually in excellent taste, were carried out on a wide scale. The restoration of Krak of the Knights was in itself a major achievement."[26] Again, it was French rather than British scholarship which was responsible for first attentions to Islamic monuments in Cairo. Nor had the local governor been idle. Cemal Pasha had been sent to Syria in 1914, and was enthusiastic both about the modernisation of her towns, but also about the restoration of her monuments, which he considered as complementary endeavours. In 1916 he proposed a programme as follows, targeting monuments of the Byzantine,

25 Kennedy 1994, 4–5: "The [French] mandate may not have been a happy period politically but it saw an unparalleled explosion of archaeological activities, among them the excavations at Ugarit and Byblos, the aerial survey of the Roman desert frontier by Poidebard and the study of the antique villages of the limestone plateaux of the north by Tchalenko. Crusader studies too benefited from this interest, especially as the presence of Franks in the area in the twelfth and thirteenth century could give a sort of legitimacy to their presence in the twentieth."

26 Fedden 1955, 223.

Islamic, and Turkish (pre-Ottoman and Ottoman) periods, which he placed placed under the direction of Theodor Wiegand:

> 1. The creation of a reliable inspection agency for the preservation of monuments; 2. The removal of new buildings inside and around old buildings, the cleaning of ruins, and the prohibition of using ruins as building materials; 3. The improvement of access roads to ruin sites and the creation of suitable accommodation to facilitate visits by domestic and foreign [tourists].[27]

But war made the completion of this ambitious programme impossible, and Cemal's plans met with financial objections from fellow administrators, and jealousy (at the intrusion of Germans) or worse from the French.

The breakup/carveup after the First World War was helped by the fact that the Ottoman Empire and its constituent, Syria, were a congeries of different peoples and groups with entirely different interests. It was dragged down by its fragmented nature which, as Volney noted, even in Syria was not one nation, "mais comme un alliage de nations diverses."[81] Wortabet echoed this in 1856: "I am a native of Syria, but I cannot tell you to what race I belong. Our country has been overrun, over, and over, and over again. It has been re-re-reconquered."[82] This was frequently stated, "Turkey, though an empire, is not a nation; it is rather an aggregate of nationalities or governments accidentally united by having been the subjects of a common conquest,"[83] which fact was to contribute to its break-up, and to the emergence of numbers of minorities jostling for survival.[28] Various military disasters were experienced by the Ottoman Empire early in the 20th century, and the loss of much of the Balkans was, demographically, "a terrible economic blow for the Ottoman economy and state."[29]

The First World War further fractured the Empire, with the forced movement, maltreatment and massacre of hundred of thousands of Armenians, partly the result of "a monumental failure by the state to protect and sustain the deportees."[30] The earlier resettlements of Circassians had been on a smaller scale, and made for reasons of political economy and planting

27 Çiçek 2014, 192–196; quote 194.

28 White 2011, passim.

29 Quataert 2005, 112.

30 Erickson 2013, 4: "Although it is true that individuals, and large groups of Armenians, were relocated from all parts of the empire; provincial-scale relocations en masse were regionalized in just six militarily critical provinces in the empire's core, while elsewhere the relocations were limited to selected groups of Armenians." Quote 221.

prosperity; whereas the Armenians in Anatolia were claimed to be a danger to the state, and had to be moved, some as far as Deir al-Zor, 440km to the east of Damascus. Such population movements dictated by governments had a long history, but now they were joined by nationalist ideas. These were another European import, profoundly antithetical to imperialism, the basis of which "everywhere shifted from liberalism to authoritarianism, statism, and ethnocentrism."[31] Sympathy for the Christians militated against any welcome for the French Mandate from other inhabitants.

Much reported throughout Europe, the Armenian massacres helped sealed the fate of the Ottoman Empire from the outside, bolstered by the nationalistic attitudes and then actions of the Young Turks themselves.[32] The 1915 decision to relocate Armenians was also used by Britain to influence American attitudes to the war effort,[33] while Western pre-war policies toward Syria and Palestine were labyrinthine and confused.[34] Other faiths and ethnicities had played an important (if inferior, and often heavily taxed) part in the functioning of the Empire. The post-war plan of the Young Turks was to turn the Empire into a nation,[35] with emphasis on Turkish nationality, made definitive by the exchange of populations between Turkey and Greece in 1921. This was but the final act, for several hundred thousand Greek Orthodox Christians had been forcibly relocated before and during the War. Both the French and the British had clients to satisfy,[36] with Jordan (given to Abdullah) and Iraq (given to his brother Faisal) new countries created for the chessboard.[37] Britain and France squabbled over the post-war spoils,[38] the former aiming at one point to annex Syria to Egypt, while "for religious, economic and historical reasons, France saw herself as having a role to play in Syria's affairs."[39] This was partly in response to the long-standing Christian connections between the two

31 Bloxham 2005, 92: "nowhere else during the First World War was the separatist nationalism of the few answered with the total destruction of the wider ethnic community from which the nationalists hailed." Ibid. 59 for quote.

32 Butler 2011, chap.10: The Fall of the Sultan's Realm. Bloxham 2005, 101–103 Kemal and Resurgent Turkish Nationalism, 1919–23.

33 Uyanik 2016.

34 Khalidi 1980.

35 Kayali 1997; Barkey 2008, chap. 8: On the Road out of Empire: Ottomans Struggle from Empire to Nation-State.

36 McHugo 2015, chap 2: French rule, 1920–1946., emphasising the arbitrary nature of the mandate boundaries.

37 Ansari 2009, 311.

38 Andrew & Kanya-Forstner 1981, 222–226.

39 Fromkin 1989, 94.

countries. As Smith wrote in 1918, it was not true that "Palestine is the national home of the Jewish people and of no other people … Has Christianity "made no history" and "left no image of its spirit" on the Holy Land?"[84]

This is not the place for a detailed examination of the European carve-up of the Ottoman Empire after the First World War, and the intricacies of the British and French Mandates,[40] let alone for the movement or imposition of new populations, although this was a lingering hot topic. Plenty of justifications of the French Mandate were written, but only by Christians, not by Muslims.[41] The carve-up in fact began in 1916 with the Sykes-Picot agreement between Britain and France,[42] and was to be enforced with troops. Nor should we devote space to rail at the disgraceful treatment handed out by Allied governments to its peoples, (with the British promising, in exchange for their support, territory to the Hashemites, Saudis and Jews)[43] except to remind the reader of how conveniently it met the expectations and suggestions of many travellers from the 18th century onward encountered earlier in this book. A century later, the continuing impact of such mis-steps is clear.

Britain and France must have known via travellers and diplomats just what a task they would be taking on with their wartime meddling and then their mandates. Syria especially had long been viewed in the West as a country rich in resources and labour, and ripe for exploitation and modernisation, "where France might one day have territorial claims and where, therefore, it was essential to maintain the primacy of French influence,"[44] the result deriving from "une vision de la puissance française projetée outre-mer."[45] In 1911 was founded the Comité de défense des intérêts français en Orient, a pressure group to publicise and develop "toutes les Œuvres qui font honneur à la France dans les pays d'Orient et contribuent à y étendre son action."[85] A member was sent out to visit French-based educational establishments, and also

40 Fedden 1955, 212–223: overview of the the French and British Mandates; Salibi 1988, passim.

41 George-Samné 1921, a Greek Catholic from Damascus.

42 Nevakivi 1969, 13–44: the 1916 partition of Asiatic Turkey (the Sykes-Picot agreement). Ibid. 148–171: Deterioration in Anglo-French relations regarding the Syrian Settlement. Fulton 1984, 157: the diminished power of French governments. Fourtnié & Riccioli 1996: France's engagement with the Near East, 1916–1946.

43 Ansari 2009, 298: "Despite the many quibbles, qualifiers, and disclaimers offered over the years about who agreed to what and what was promised to whom, that's the gist of the situation, and it guaranteed an explosion in the future."

44 Fulton 1984, 138. Tannenbaum 1978: France's Middle Eastern policies during World War I and the ensuing peace conference.

45 Cloarec 2010, 391.

("subsidiairement" he writes so unconvincingly!) "de recueillir quelques informations sur les principales entreprises financières, industrielles, commerciales et agricoles créées ou dirigées par nos nationaux dans le Levant."[86] In 1913 this merged with the Comité de l'Asie Française, and echoed other pressure groups such as the Comité de l'Orient and the Comité Libanais de Paris.[46]

Even before the mandates were conferred, the Allies took over the country. Damascus was abandoned by its Turkish garrison in late September 1918, and at the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919 Syrian attempts to acclaim Faisal as king were defeated.[47] Then the two mandates gave them control. The French Mandate for Syria (1922–45) was not welcomed there, and when a 1925 revolt in the Hauran spread to Damascus the French bombed the city. Scars remain from citizens' clashes with the French, who gained from the occupation with bursts of scholarship,[48] indeed over large areas of the Middle East,[49] spin-offs from recent French influence in the Levant.[50] Archaeology in Algeria had also been relatively well served by the French occupation (or rather "opened up to science," as Michaelis has it[87]), although the country and its inhabitants suffered from their century-plus occupation.

From its seat in Beirut, the Service des Antiquités established in 1919 (i.e. before the Mandate) promised formal protection, and promoted the archaeological investigation of antiquities throughout Lebanon and Syria, which it divided into four provinces. For Roederer in 1917,

> L'histoire du Levant, c'est presque dans l'histoire de France qu'on devrait l'apprendre, tant les deux sont intimement mêlées. Chaque phase de notre vie nationale eut sa répercussion là-bas et s'y manifesta par un acte.[88]

Unsurprisingly, then, "this sense of (French) ownership over the antiquities of Syria and Lebanon was to continue, and increasingly cause friction as Europe descended once again into war."[51] Nor were local traders delighted, for their developing prosperity since the later 18th century was clear to see.[52] However,

46 Andrew & Kanya-Forstner 1981, 46–47. Chevalier 2004.

47 Fromkin 1990, chaps 36 & 37: The Road to Damascus; The Battle for Syria.

48 Burns 2005, 272. Ibid. xiii, "tremendously fertile outpourings of French scholarship during and after the Mandate years recorded the city's past."

49 Chevalier 2002, 215–392: L'archéologie française au Moyen-Orient de la première à la seconde guerre mondiale.

50 Cloarec 2010, 11–18.

51 Potts 2012 I, 80; ibid. 82 for quote.

52 Norris 2013, 18–19 for Palestine: "In the late 18th and 19th centuries the heightened interest of imperial states in the Eastern Mediterranean as a new sphere of colonial development

one anglophone judgment on the French "colony" of Syria, dripping with Schadenfreude, was that "they thought to make it a second Morocco, they have succeeded in making it a second Rif."[53]

Ownership of Syria was physical as well as spiritual. In 1929 Krak des Chevaliers, its villagers displaced, was appropriated as a French monument under the care of the French Administration des Monuments Historiques and, as Kennedy writes, "meticulously restored, joined Palmyra, Baalbek and Qal'at Sim'an among the great tourist attractions of the French Levant." French scholars promoted the connection between the Levant and Paris. Dussaud visited and wrote much, and eventually headed the Department of Oriental Antiquities at the Louvre. In 1925 Enlart strengthened the Crusader/Christian link with his *Les Monuments des Croisés dans le royaume de Jérusalem: architecture religieuse et civile*.[54] Exhibits had also familiarised the West with some important monuments in Palestine well before the Mandates.[55] Rostovtzeff saw the Mandate as a grand opportunity for protection, restoration and digging at Palmyra, noting that "since the introduction of motor-cars the despoiling of Palmyra had made giant strides. In a few decades scarcely a column or an arch would have been left standing on the site."[89] Dura Europos was similarly blessed with digging thanks to the initiative of the Académie des Inscriptions, the Belgian archaeologist Franz Cumont using soldiers of the French Foreign Legion as workmen.[90]

For reasons elaborated in previous chapters, Palestine received more digging attention in the 19th century than the rest of Syria,[56] and also attention from the French.[57] The British Mandate for Palestine article 21 offered legal

---

had given rise to a new breed of merchant, highly attuned to the possibilities this process presented for intermediary economic actors. This was particularly the case in the coastal regions of today's Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine."

53 Roberts 1929, 602; 603: "France failed, because she antagonized the town-dwellers and then, almost inconceivably, alienated her former supporters, the rural producers. This she could accomplish only by a studious disregard of their interests."

54 Kennedy 1994, 5–6.

55 Bar-Yosef 2005, 136–165 'Palestine has come to them': Panoramas, Models, and Exhibitions. Ibid., 154: "Jerusalem, too, was transferred to the West in a similar fashion: the massive, 11-acre 'Jerusalem' constructed at the 1904 St Louis World's Fair included full-scale reconstructions of the Holy Sepulchre, the Wailing Wall, and the Dome of the Rock, as well as twenty-two streets, 300 buildings, and 1,000 indigenous Jerusalemites who were brought over from Palestine." Fortin 1999 for a well-illustrated Paris exhibition, which naturally and concentrated on exhibitable small objects.

56 Murray 2007, 715–717: Palestine from the 19th century, with details of digs.

57 Chevalier 2002, 354ff: Archéologie française dans les pays sous mandat anglais.

protection of monuments. “This law shall ensure equality of treatment in the matter of excavations and archaeological research to the nations of all States Members of the League of Nations.” It offered yet more for diggers, who were assured of their loot: “The proceeds of excavations may be divided between the excavator and the competent Department in a proportion fixed by that Department.”[58] The document offers nothing about arrangements for any local museums. But the Mandate did improve safety for visits to Petra: the Bedouin were cowed, or if rowdy, vigorously pursued, by the Transjordanian Legion; and, as a result, “European and American ladies run but a very slender chance of being carried off by some wild Arab sheikh and must fall back upon such romantic incidents as may happen in Petra’s tents.”[91] As with Syria, so with the British Mandate a Department of Antiquities was established in 1920, which in the 1930s saw excavation at Khirbat al-Mafjar and Qasr al-Heir West and in the 1960s at Qasr al-Heir East.[59] What should be dug is still a hot topic, with the influence of the Bible sometimes eclipsing attention to the monuments of Islam:

> Palestinian archaeologists accuse biblical scholars of neglecting Islamic sites and overlooking Islamic layers not only because they lack interest, but also because they lack knowledge of Islamic civilization and culture.[60]

58 El-Eini 2006, 465–466, Mandate Article 21, notes 7 & 8.

59 Vernoit 1997, 6, including the development of Islamic archaeology.

60 Pollock & Bernbeck 2005, 71.

[1] Mislin_1876_II_620
[2] Michaelis_1908
[3] EB_1910 sv
[4] Pingaud_1887_41
[5] Ferrières-Sauveboeuf_1790_I_210–211
[6] Flinders_Petrie_1918_84–85
[7] AMSL_1890_Table
[8] Flinders_Petrie_1918_88
[9] Flinders_Petrie_1918_1
[10] Berners_1876_38
[11] La_Salle_1840_I_363
[12] Porter_1868_I_xlviii–xlix
[13] PEF_Committee_1873_14B
[14] AJ_VI_1849_86
[15] AR_I_1888_189–190
[16] Conder_&_Kitchener_1883_443
[17] Conder_&_Kitchener_1883_176
[18] Mislin_1876_III_124
[19] Conder_1891_242–243
[20] Merrill_1881_60
[21] Schumacher_1889_241–242
[22] Goodrich-Freer_1905_316
[23] Puchstein_1905_6
[24] Curtis_1903_174–175
[25] Van_De_Velde_1854_II_360–361
[26] Butler_1905_393
[27] Luynes_I_1874_33–34
[28] Ritter_1866_61
[29] PEFQS_1869–70_19
[30] PEF_Committee_1873_100
[31] PEF_Committee_1873_221B
[32] PEF_1875_110–111

[33] PEFQS_1877_40
[34] Conder_1891_4
[35] De_Hass_1887_147
[36] Wilson 1871_256
[37] Wilson 1871_XIV
[38] Butler_1930_2
[39] Butler_1930_83–84
[40] Butler_1930_93
[41] AMS_IV_1867_327–328
[42] Omont_1902_60
[43] Masson_1896_507
[44] Omont_1902_274
[45] Omont_1902_332
[46] Lucas_II_1720_321–345
[47] Omont_1902_528
[48] Omont_1902_677
[49] Omont_1902_1046
[50] Omont_1902_414
[51] Saulcy_1853_I_34
[52] Saulcy_1853_I_42
[53] Saulcy_1853_I_110
[54] Saulcy_1853_I_587
[55] Hunter_1842_II_48
[56] AMS_I_1864_396
[57] AMS_III_1867_371–373
[58] Hilprecht_1903_205–206
[59] Burton_&_Tyrwhitt-Drake_1872_II_283–284
[60] Van_De_Velde_1854_I_91
[61] Luynes_I_1874_8
[62] PEFQS_1881_214
[63] Hilprecht_1903_615–616
[64] Chauvet_&_Isambert_1882_578
[65] Lortet_1881_26
[66] Perrot_1888_425
[67] Rendel_Harris_1891_35
[68] Paton_1901_X
[69] Clermont-Ganneau_1884_54
[70] Clermont-Ganneau_1896_333
[71] Wortabet_1856_I_336–337
[72] Gallois_1907_190
[73] Jessup_1910_II_656
[74] Carpenter_1923_250
[75] Jessup_1910_II_751
[76] Michaelis_1908_281–282
[77] AMS_I_1851_210–211
[78] Pingaud_1887_VII
[79] Paris_1861_126–127
[80] Miller_1894_476B
[81] Volney_I_1792_212–213
[82] Wortabet_1856B_11
[83] Farley_1862_1–2
[84] Smith_1918_52
[85] Pernot_1912_1
[86] Pernot_1912_V
[87] Michaelis_1908_283–284
[88] Roederer_1917_4
[89] Rostovtzeff_1932_123
[90] Rostovtzeff_1932_155
[91] Rostovtzeff_1932_39