Introduction to: Bulletins and Supplementary Papers of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, 1922–1931

In 1922, only a few years after the turmoil of World War One died down in Bilad al-Sham, and despite meagre resources, the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem (hereafter BSAJ) launched a scholarly bulletin. The publication ran for just three years, until 1925 (with supplementary papers to 1931), perhaps finding it hard to carve out a distinctive space in competition both with existing international periodicals[1] and with local publications such as the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* (published 1920–1948), the *Revue Biblique* (official organ of the École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem, published from 1890 until today), and the short-lived journal of the first iteration of the Palestine Archaeological Museum.[2] A few years later, in 1931, the Department of Antiquities of Palestine, the official government body with which the British School of Archaeology co-operated and competed, established its own academic journal, the *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine*, which ran fairly consistently until the end of the British Mandate in Palestine in 1948, with its last issue dated 1950.

The journals presented in this volume form the output of that first short-lived British publication from Palestine: seven issues of the Bulletin itself, and the three supplementary publications — on Hittite names; the historical and architectural origins of the design of the Qubbet al-Sakhra (Dome of the Rock); and the churches excavated by a Yale University/BSAJ excavation at Jerash.[3]

I was hugely honoured to be asked to write the introduction to this volume, intended as the first publication from a larger programme of cataloguing, conservation and digitisation of the archives of the Council for British Research in the Levant (hereafter CBRL), the successor institution of the BSAJ and its sister centre in Amman, Jordan. In 2016, the CBRL, seeking to expand its journal coverage beyond the archaeology and ancient history that dominated *Levant*, launched *Contemporary Levant* under the editorship of Dr Michelle Obeid. Four years later, in 2019, Michelle passed that role on to me. In this sense, as editor of CBRL's newest journal, a century after the establishment of its first, there is a certain continuity.

I believe I can speak for the broader CBRL community when I say that the main impetus behind the re-publication of these issues in a digital and open-access format is to make them more accessible to more people. Very few of these publications still exist — perhaps only single figures remain for each issue — and the political environment in which CBRL works means that many people are barred from accessing those few remaining copies by the restrictions imposed by visa regimes, state borders and separation walls. Whilst digitisation and online access are not perfect solutions to the many issues surrounding access to archives and scholarly publications, this project will, it is hoped, make publications such as these BSAJ Bulletins easier to obtain, read and study. Indeed, improving access to journals such as the *Bulletins of the BSAJ* is not just a matter of making them available to those who are researching and studying the history of British archaeology or British colonialism in the Levant. Publications like this, produced in Jerusalem in the early years of Britain's League of Nations Mandate in Palestine, are also part of the heritage of today's Palestinians, Israelis and Jordanians. Whilst the role and value of colonial documents in researching and writing the histories of colonised peoples is still very much a live — and at times contentious — field of debate,[4] materials produced by colonising peoples can often provide important information about the colonial society and situation, if read critically, 'against the grain' and with questions and challenges constantly in mind.[5] Indeed, sometimes it is the silences and lacunae which are most informative: the names, jobs and uncelebrated tasks which are not mentioned, were probably carried out by indigenous men and women (or sometimes by colonial women), but which we know must have underpinned everyday life, and whose absent presence I discuss below.

The British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem

The British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem was born into a new and chaotic archaeological, institutional and regulatory environment. Before World War One, Britain had had no permanent or official archaeological presence in Ottoman Palestine. The Palestine Exploration Fund (hereafter PEF), a private organisation, had conducted annual excavations, as well as worked with the British military on surveys, but did not maintain a base in Jerusalem. This contrasted with the approach of other Western powers, such as France (École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem, established in 1890), Germany (Deutsches Evangelisches Institut für Altertumswissenschaft des Heiligen Landes, 1900) and the USA (American School of Oriental Study and Research in Palestine, also 1900).

In 1917, however, British and Commonwealth forces defeated the Ottoman and German armies in the Levant. Britain established itself as the colonial power in Palestine and Transjordan, first as a military and then a civil administration, finally institutionalised as a League of Nations Mandatory regime, informally from 1920 and officially from 1923. The British obsession with the 'Holy Land',[6] as well as the existence of the established archaeological institutions already in Palestine made the status of Palestine's antiquities a priority for both the local administration and international negotiators from very early in the British presence. The question of archaeology, and of international co-operation around antiquities laws and practices, was raised at the peace conferences that followed World War One and remained prominent in international affairs. This involved a delicate balance of Britain's position as the ruling power versus the established presence of the French and US institutes, given the long history of Anglo-French rivalry in Middle Eastern archaeology, and the significantly better funding available to US archaeologists from the country's lavish philanthropic tradition compared with that allocated by the British government to the new Department of Antiquities.[7] Germany, as the losing side, was excluded from negotiations as well as from actual excavation for at least a decade.

The British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem thus opened in 1919 in an atmosphere of competition and uncertainty in terms of the archaeological environment, as well as facing the challenges presented by establishing any kind of institution in Jerusalem in the immediate aftermath of World War One. The direct impact of four years of warfare on Palestine's society and economy was dire. The region suffered a terrible famine during the war, which killed up to a third of the population in some areas.[8] Meanwhile Ottoman actions such as the forced displacement of people and communities deemed suspicious,[9] the Armenian genocide,[10] and the exile of political suspects, created thousands of refugees and displaced people and families, impacting supplies of food, housing and other necessities.[11]

The BSAJ thus spent its first years moving between a number of different buildings, often sharing these with the newly-renamed American School of Oriental Research (hereafter ASOR). Negotiations to rent Bute House inside Jaffa Gate (previously owned by an extremely wealthy British aristocratic family) fell through,[12] sending both BSAJ and ASOR towards the newer suburbs outside the city walls, which had begun to develop in the late Ottoman period. ASOR found a permanent base in the 1920s, in what is now the Albright Institute at the top of Salah ed-Din Street, but the BSAJ remained homeless, moving between sites in the Greek Colony and other parts of the city until it settled in the CBRL's present-day Jerusalem home at the Kenyon Institute in 1967.[13]

John Garstang, who had been one of the main figures in negotiations over antiquities during the peace conferences following World War One, was appointed in 1919–20 to the twin roles of head of the BSAJ and Director of Antiquities for the Mandate administration. He was thus tasked both with creating and imposing a legal framework for antiquities in Palestine and with running a British scholarly institution in Jerusalem — roles which did not always sit comfortably together. Although the British antiquities regimen in Palestine is often presented as a novel institution,[14] created from the ground up, there were in fact a number of continuities from the Ottoman period, including both the Antiquities Laws on which British regulations were based, and the Palestine Archaeological Museum, which was built around an Ottoman institution, the Jerusalem Government Museum, opened in 1901. The latter is another illustration of the complex and competitive environment into which the BSAJ was born; the museum, established under the aegis of Osman Hamdi Bey, Director of the Imperial Archaeological Museum in Istanbul and Ismail Bey, Director of Public Instruction in Jerusalem, had been strongly shaped by Frederick Jones Bliss and Père Louis-Hugues Vincent.[15] The latter was one of the archaeologists of the École Biblique, the base of Britain's French rivals, whilst Bliss was the Lebanese-born American son of one of the missionary founders of the American University of Beirut. Employed as its head archaeologist by the Palestine Exploration Fund between 1890 and 1900, Bliss' support for an Ottoman museum in Jerusalem

— housing artefacts which the PEF wanted sent to London for its own collection — was the main reason for his dismissal.[16] Those PEF members who had been party to the split in 1900 would no doubt have been delighted that the museum's collection finally fell into British hands.

The Bulletins and their writers

The *Bulletin of the BSAJ* is, to some extent, a hybrid publication, fulfilling at least three different functions. First, it was a means of outreach for the newly-established British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, reporting on the School's activities, informing its networks of archaeological events in Mandate Palestine, and strengthening its connections and support. The latter is emphasised by the small slip of pink paper bound onto the front of the first edition of the *Bulletin*, which states that the government grants allocated to the School from 1922 to 1925 were conditional upon what would now be known as match funding, to be accrued by increasing the *Bulletin*'s subscriber base. Second, it was intended to be a scholarly journal, publishing ongoing reports of the School's larger excavations and briefer field notes on smaller sites, as well as contributions from archaeologists not working directly for the BSAJ. Third, it gives the impression of being a training journal — an opportunity for young archaeologists based at the BSAJ to write up their reports under the guidance of senior staff. The evidence for this last function comes from the style and format of much of the *Bulletin*'s contents. Many of its reports have no author credits attached to them, but the names of the current trainees at the School are sometimes found in the introductions to each issue, making it possible to identify probable, if not definite, authorship for each article. When the reports do have names (or, more commonly, initials), they are usually those of external contributors, such as P.L.O Guy (1885–1952), at the time Chief Inspector of Antiquities of the British Mandate government in Palestine, or Leo Aryeh Mayer (1895–1959), then Inspector of Antiquities for the Jerusalem district,[17] and a key figure in establishing Islamic studies at the Hebrew University.

Although the *Bulletin* is attributed to the British School in Jerusalem, each issue also bears the statement "Issued by the Council at 2 Hinde Street, London W1". This highlights the entangled nature of the British archaeological institutions in Mandate Palestine, as 2 Hinde Street was owned by and provided the headquarters of the Palestine Exploration Fund from 1911 until 2018. The PEF provided an administrative base for the committee of British archaeologists and orientalists which oversaw the BSAJ's affairs (and which also overlapped with the PEF's own personnel). In this sense, the *Bulletin* could be regarded as the least 'Palestinian' of the various archaeological publications that emerged from Mandate Palestine. The *Bulletin of the Palestine Archaeological Museum*, established in 1924 by the Department of Antiquities and running until 1927, declared itself to be issued by the Museum, i.e., an organisation based in Palestine rather than by an oversight institution in Britain. The copies I observed in the National Library of Scotland were printed by C. Tinling & Co. Ltd of Liverpool,[18] but it was not unusual for journals to be printed in two places and it seems likely that duplicates were also printed in Palestine; editions in the National Library of Israel are said in the catalogue to have been printed by an unknown publisher in Jerusalem.[19] There was considerable overlap between the two publications, with the *Bulletin of the PAM* often reproducing articles from the *Bulletin of the BSAJ*, without even the journal name in the header of each page being changed.[20] One notable difference, though, was in the design: where the BSAJ *Bulletin* remained spartan from first to last, the second, third and fourth issues of the PAM *Bulletin* all boasted a striking black-and-white border of humans, animals and objects such as amphorae and scrolls, drawn in a style influenced by the art of Pharaonic Egypt. Perhaps this was intended to appeal visually to museum visitors. But despite the Bulletin's unadorned design, the budget apparently allowed for noticeably good-quality paper for all seven editions, with glossy photographic paper for some of the image plates in the final two issues.

The ominous financial message of the pink slip attached to the first edition of the *Bulletin of the BSAJ*, and the brief lives of this and the *Bulletin of the Palestine Archaeological Museum,* are likely evidence of the impact on archaeology of the British Treasury's shoestring budgets during the Mandate administration.[21] The third archaeological publication to emanate from Mandate Palestine was the *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine*, which was also printed in both Jerusalem and Britain, this time by Oxford University Press. The longer lifespan of this journal might be linked to the fact that it was funded, along with the new Palestine Archaeological Museum, by US oil baron John D. Rockefeller, rather than by the parsimonious British authorities.[22] The *Quarterly* was a more substantial and scholarly effort than the *Bulletin*, clearly intended first and foremost to showcase excavations and other archaeological and antiquarian work being done in Palestine; it continued some of the *Bulletin*'s reporting of minor

events and archaeological news, but had less of the feel of an internal newsletter. Unlike the BSAJ and the PAM *Bulletins*, the *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities* is also notable for the presence of a significant number of articles by indigenous scholars such as Stephan Hanna Stephan, who worked in the Palestine Archaeological Museum and the Department's library from the early 1920s until 1948. The Bulletin's named and hinted-at contributors are all white British men, with the sole exception of L.A. Mayer, who was a Jewish migrant to Palestine from Stanisławów, Galicia (now Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine), but who, with his doctorate in Islamic art from the University of Vienna, was certainly not an outsider to European orientalist scholarly circles.[23]

Given the limited lives of the official archaeological publications, it is worth noting that the longest-running journal covering this and related topics in Mandate Palestine was the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, published by a learned society which was inspired by members of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, and which from its earliest days published work by indigenous Palestinian scholars such as Stephan Hanna Stephan (1894–1949), Tawfik Canaan (1882–1964) and Omar Salih al-Barghuti (1894–1965), while also including Arabs and Jews on its management and editorial boards. Although the somewhat starry-eyed narratives of coexistence that are sometimes told about the Palestine Oriental Society are questionable, its *Journal* certainly provided a long-lasting and widely distributed platform for scholars from a wide range of disciplines and backgrounds to publish their work on archaeology, history, ethnography, linguistics and other aspects of Levantine culture, albeit one which was not entirely immune from the increasingly contentious politics of the region during the 1930s and 1940s. The fact that the *JPOS* was publishing work by local Palestinians from 1921 onwards, whereas the BSAJ *Bulletin* was not, is worth a moment of consideration. Articles in *JPOS* were often on ethnographic and folkloric topics, where native speakers of colloquial Arabic could make use of their local knowledge to reach places, people and subjects that were harder to access for foreigners; indeed, the US Biblical archaeologist W.F. Albright actively encouraged some of the Palestinian scholars he encountered to contribute to *JPOS* precisely because he saw such studies as a quick way to increase the volume of information available to those who, like himself, thought that studying Palestinian rural culture was one of the keys to understanding the days of the Old and New Testaments.[24] A second possible reason for the distribution of work between the different publications is perhaps that the resources needed for ethnographic study were far smaller than those required for archaeology. With the latter dominated by European and north American scholars and demanding large-scale funding, especially for the huge workforces deployed on the sprawling excavations of the day, there were few spaces for indigenous scholars to become involved and especially to be recognised for it. By contrast, Tawfik Canaan did much of his ethnographic research whilst travelling around the villages of the Jerusalem region, pursuing his main job as a medical doctor,[25] whilst some of Elias Haddad's (1878/9–1959) investigations were seemingly conducted on a trip with just one companion, his friend and collaborator Hans Henry Spoer.[26]

Having said all this, what do the actual contents of the *Bulletins* tell us now, in the twenty-first century? What makes this digitisation and publication process something more than a collectable antique, a dead butterfly pinned into a case? The possible answers to this question are varied, and depend on a range of disciplinary and theoretical perspectives.

First, and most easily addressed, is the fact that the reports and details contained in these journal issues have the potential to fill gaps in archaeological knowledge — of the finds on certain sites or of structures which may now, a century later, be damaged or lost. For scholars with access to the libraries of old, established universities, this may seem a small matter. But for others, it is not — whether because they are cut off from access to such knowledge by political borders and boundaries, or because they are attached to less lavishly endowed institutions. As already conceded above, digitisation is not a panacea, but, as many discovered during the Covid lockdowns of 2020 and 2021, it can make sources far more widely available. In particular, making the second and third Supplements to the *Bulletin* available freely and online will be valuable, as K.A.C. Creswell's study of the Dome of the Rock and J.W. Crowfoot's survey of the churches at Jerash — a site best known for its Roman remains — are still widely referenced works.

Second, for those coming to the *Bulletins* from a perspective of the history of archaeology, rather than from the discipline of archaeology itself, the short run of the *Bulletins of the BSAJ* is an unusual and informative resource. The seven issues, with their numerous unsigned reports and oddly mixed nature of scholarly-journal-cum-training-ground, are a partial snapshot of an institution that did not just conduct archaeology in a remarkable, complex period of colonial and military history, but also trained new generations of archaeologists and was key in forming professional, intellectual and personal networks which helped shape the discipline in Palestine and beyond for several

generations.[27] In particular, the introductions and 'Notes and News' sections of each issue, as well as some of the articles themselves, sketch out an image of the School, with students, mainly but not exclusively, from British universities, and visiting scholars from Europe and North America, coming and going. Many of the names that appear in these early years, including some of the students, went on to make major contributions to their fields and/or to occupy roles that shaped the development of archaeology in Palestine and Transjordan, for good or ill.

Third, these journal issues can be read as texts produced by the new colonisers of a country only recently invaded and extracted from an empire that had controlled this terrain for the previous four hundred years. Moreover, the new occupiers had already promised it to an entirely different set of people. The articles, the ideas and assumptions that underpin them, and who or what does or does not get mentioned or discussed, all have something to tell us about the ways in which archaeologists and students writing about the land of Palestine thought about it, its people(s), and its manifold histories. The fairly frequent references to Biblical passages and events, for instance, illustrate a British (particularly Protestant) tendency to see anything and everything in modern Palestine through the lens of the Bible. On the other hand, sites of all dates, from early hominids until well into the Islamic period, are mentioned and discussed, so those in charge of both the School and the *Bulletin* did have a more rounded view on Palestinian history.

As discussed in greater depth below, Palestinians themselves are largely absent from the *Bulletins*, but the spaces where they should be — the shapes of the lacunae — are also historical facts, and archaeological writings are increasingly recognised as frequently being the sources of much unintended information.[28] And where they do appear, the brief mentions are sometimes highly informative: P.L.O Guy's report on his excavation of an Iron Age cemetery on Mount Carmel for instance, includes a passing comment in which we learn that Mr Aziz Khayat of Haifa, the landowner, had not only granted access to his property but "was good enough to provide the funds which enabled Mr G.M. Fitzgerald and myself to undertake the work which is here described". Khayat, a Melkite Christian Palestinian, was a businessman and entrepreneur who owned the city's most popular pleasure-beach (and after whom it was named), and was one of the most important figures in Mandate-era Haifa.[29] Given the tendency of both the Mandate authorities and many modern writers to dismiss Palestinians as uninterested in, and even destructive of, ancient heritage, to find Khayat paying for excavations by the British state on his own land is a fascinating glimpse into local attitudes towards antiquities. As such, these digitised volumes will, it is hoped, be a valuable addition to the sources for those studying the social, cultural and intellectual histories of Palestine in the 1920s.

The scope of the articles contained in the *Bulletins* is also highly suggestive of how their mainly British authors viewed the geographical space in which they worked. When the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem was established, the borders of the political entity of Palestine, and indeed of the other mandatory territories ruled by Britain and France, were still unfixed and contested. Only with the Battle of Maysalun in July 1920 was French rule over Syria imposed, with the defeat of Arab nationalist forces under Faysal, son of Sharif Husayn bin Ali of Mecca and one of the leaders of the Arab Revolt during World War One. Only in April 1921 did the British install Faysal's brother Abdullah as Amir (later king) of the Protectorate of Transjordan, marking more conclusively the separation of lands on the eastern bank of the Jordan River from Palestine — a division that enraged members of the Zionist political movement who considered these territories to have been promised to them under the Balfour Declaration and the terms of the League of Nations mandate over Palestine. This ambiguity of nomenclature and jurisdiction can also be witnessed in British approaches to antiquities. The earliest iterations of the Department of Antiquities for Transjordan might be found in Ottoman institutions; its Mandate existence began in 1923 as a sub-department to that in Palestine, under Garstang, remaining so until a separate body was established in 1928 — well after the demise of the *Bulletin*. Its contents, unsurprisingly, followed the same territorial imaginary, with articles in the *Bulletin* and its final, substantial, supplement featuring work on Jerash and a site near Amman, while mentioning field trips to sites such as Umm Qais.

The missing voices

What is not evident in the articles within the BSAJ *Bulletins* is the presence of indigenous Palestinians who, as we know from many other sources, were involved in archaeology in the region, and had been for many decades. They appear, albeit fleetingly: in the final edition of the *Bulletin*, for instance, one of the photographs of the palaeolithic caves in the Galilee excavated by Turville-Petre shows five figures, at least two of whom are probably women, sitting with spoil-baskets or standing with digging tools in a large trench. The photo is labelled simply

"Ibid. [i.e., Le Zuttiyeh, the location named in the previous image], interior during excavation". The workers, though clearly visible, are an irrelevance to the person writing the caption, unworthy even of the briefest mention. Workers are similarly unrecognised in Turville-Petre's report on the digs he led, and thus join the hundreds, if not thousands, of nameless Palestinians upon whose labour rested the archaeological and anthropological discoveries of the Ottoman and Mandate periods. By extrapolating from other sources, we can nonetheless make informed guesses about their experiences in Turville-Petre's employment. The men would have done the digging whilst women carried the spoil away in baskets; the latter would have been paid around half to two-thirds of the wages of the male workers. They probably came from local villages and most likely derived the vast majority of their living from agriculture, but seized the opportunity for daily paid work when it arose. And if the photo represents all of the local workers employed on the site, they were likely to have been related by blood or marriage, in order to operate within social rules about men and women spending time in close proximity.[30]

Photographs of archaeological excavations from the late Ottoman and Mandate periods often show large numbers of local workers engaging in the heavy manual labour of digging out huge quantities of earth and rubble, and then carrying it up from the trenches onto spoil heaps. It is notable that, despite Western stereotypes of the role of women in Arab societies as weak and secluded, many of these workers are female, and in fact women workers were a common sight on archaeological excavations well into the Mandate period. Examples of digs on which we know women workers were employed include Tel el-Hesi, excavated by the Palestine Exploration Fund in the 1890s,[31] and Sebastia, dug by an expedition from Harvard University between 1908 and World War One,[32] as well as digs carried out under license from the British Mandate Department of Antiquities in the interwar period, such as that at Tell an-Nasbeh, dug by the Pacific School of Religion in the 1920s and 1930s.[33] These massive-scale excavations were rarely undertaken by the Department of Antiquities or the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem themselves — mainly for lack of resources — but by teams from universities in Europe and North America, or sometimes with the sponsorship of rich philanthropists. Even small-scale excavations, such as those undertaken by the students of the BSAJ on their field trips to the Plain of Acre in the summer and autumn of 1922, employed a range of Arab labour, with the report on exploratory digging at Tell Amr and Tell el Kussis mentioning "12 Bedwin [Bedouin] from a neighbouring camp… four skilled Egyptian workmen with one Egyptian labourer… [and] Two local boys and one girl".[34]

The visual record of Palestinian workers found in such images, however rich it may be, can be somewhat misleading, as it implies that Levantine or Arab people were only involved in archaeology as manual labour. An increasing number of studies have, however, highlighted the important role played by educated locals in regional archaeology, and the fact that this role increased in scope and seniority between the nineteenth century and World War Two. Examples from the Ottoman period include Yusif Khazine and Yusif Kanaan, both Lebanese Protestants who were employed by the Palestine Exploration Fund between 1890 and World War One as foremen, supervisors and dragomans.[35] Both men exercised considerable responsibility, handling payrolls and money, making large-scale logistical arrangements, and conducting sensitive negotiations with the owners of land on which the PEF wanted to dig. The stories of their involvement with British-funded archaeology can be traced because of the Palestine Exploration Fund's extensive archives, and the habit of several of its head archaeologists of recording copious details about daily operations on their digs. We know much less about the men who occupied similar positions on other excavations, but we do know they existed: archaeologists such as Flinders Petrie, George Reisner and John Starkey, for example, brought Egyptian overseers to Palestine, where they both supervised work and trained Palestinians in specialised techniques.[36] Later, in the 1930s, Palestinian women were trained and promoted at least to the level of overseer and supervisor on excavations by Dorothy Garrod, on which local workers made finds which changed the understanding of human evolution.[37]

During the Mandate period, the role of local men extended beyond that of overseers and on-the-ground organisers. It is not clear from the existing archives when training Palestinians became part of the formal policy of the Department of Antiquities, but it seems to have been early in the department's existence. From its inception, the British Mandate authorities employed highly-qualified Jewish staff such as Leo Mayer and Michael Avi-Yonah as antiquities inspectors or within the library and museum.[38] Arab Palestinians with similar qualifications were not, however, available, and it seems likely that the post of Student Inspector of Antiquities was instituted in order to meet the terms of the League of Nations Mandate under which Britain ruled in Palestine, and which specified that the Jewish and Arab populations were to be treated equally. It is also possible that the personal

opinions of John Garstang, the first head of both the BSAJ and the Department of Antiquities, played a part in the decision; certainly, he later sympathised with the Palestinian position and may have wanted to level the playing field a little.[39]

Again, the archives do not make it clear how exactly the student inspectors were trained, but the most likely explanation is that they split their time between the Department of Antiquities and the BSAJ, until such time as they were deemed to have qualified and were promoted to Inspector of Antiquities.[40] The student inspectors who passed through this system during the Mandate were, as far as we can tell, Na'im Shehadi Makhouly from Kufr Yasif, and Dimitri Baramki, Salem Abdussalam al-Husayni and Awni Dajani, all from Jerusalem.[41] All pursued long-term archaeological careers. Makhouly spent almost thirty years working for the Mandate authorities, reaching the level of Senior Inspector; as a refugee after 1948 he also found employment under his former colleague Cedric Johns, the former head field archaeologist for the Mandate, who in the early 1950s became Director of Antiquities for the province of Cyrenaica in the newly-forged Kingdom of Libya.[42] Dimitri Baramki, having made a considerable name for himself heading the excavation of the spectacular Umayyad palace at Khirbet al-Mafjar (better known as Hisham's Palace), also left Palestine in 1948, but for a professorship in Beirut. Al-Husayni, like Makhouly — a refugee who had trouble finding archaeological work in the immediate aftermath of the Nakba, also went to Libya to work for Johns, staying until the late 1960s and leaving not long before Colonel Qadhafi's coup.[43] Awni Dajani, the last student inspector, joined the Jordanian Department of Antiquities, which he headed through the 1960s until his early death from cancer in 1968.[44]

Alongside the student inspectors and inspectors of antiquities, over the course of the Mandate period, several other Palestinian and other regional staff joined the Department of Antiquities and thus the entangled relationship it maintained with the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem. Most of these performed specialist and professional roles that evolved as archaeology became an increasingly complex and scientific discipline; cases in point include the chemist Haroutune Jamil Haleblian (an Armenian with a degree from the American University of Beirut) and Mubarak Saad, a well-known Palestinian sculptor whose skills were used in the Palestine Archaeological Museum as a formatore, repairing finds and making models.[45] That indigenous staff continued to be regarded as of lower status than European (including European Jewish) colleagues within the Department of Antiquities is, however, clear from the case of Stephan Hanna Stephan. He joined the department from the Mandate administration's Treasury; as a member of the civil service pool, perhaps his already-demonstrated interest in and talent for historical and ethnographic writing made allocating him to Antiquities a bureaucratic efficiency. Despite this, he remained an informal, seconded member of the antiquities team for over twenty years, only being promoted to a permanent and formal archaeological role in the final years of the Mandate, despite his copious publications in both the *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine* and the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*.[46]

Of these generations of Palestinian archaeologists, we know of only one — Na'im Makhouly — whose association with the British archaeological institutions in Palestine definitely overlaps with the lifespan of the *Bulletin of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem*. Makhouly was not a prolific writer during his long career; he contributed a few brief excavation reports to the *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities* but his talents very much lay in practical archaeology. As far as we can tell, he made no contributions to the *Bulletin*, unless his fingerprints might be detected in the abundant, unsigned work on the Plain of Acre and the site of Tantura, both of which were not far from his home in Kufr Yasif and were within his remit as Junior Inspector of Antiquities for the northern division of Palestine. *Bulletin* no.5 mentions that he had "cleared a number of tombs of the Roman age in the neighbourhood of Acre (at Shefr Amr and El Zib), of which we hope to give an account in a later Bulletin. He has been occupied principally with special inspections in Trans-Jordania".[47] The anticipated reports never materialised — there were, after all, only two more issues of the *Bulletin* before its demise. But this tantalising note is, as far as I know, the first published reference to a named Palestinian in the Mandate's archaeological institutions and, as such, represents a small but significant point in the long, complex, colonially-riven history of Palestinian, Israel and Jordanian archaeology.

Sarah Irving,
Staffordshire University

Endnotes

[1] Such as the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (established 1847) and the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly Statement* (1869).

[2] In the 1920s the Palestine Archaeological Museum, although technically a state institution, was housed in the same building as the British School of Archaeology, and despite the grand name consisted of just a few rooms of finds. A donation from US oil magnate John D. Rockefeller funded the construction of a much more imposing structure between 1930 and 1938. Known as the Palestine Archaeological Museum under British and then Jordanian rule, it became known as the Rockefeller Museum after its incorporation into the Israeli Antiquities Authority after Israel's occupation of East Jerusalem in 1967.

[3] Originally published as L.A. Mayer, *Index of Hittite Names Section A. Geographical. Part 1*, 1923; K.A.C. Creswell, *The Origin of the Plan of the Dome of the Rock*, 1924; and J.W. Crowfoot, *Churches at Jerash: a Preliminary Report of the Joint Yale-British School Expeditions to Jerash, 1928–1930*, 1931.

[4] Although digitised archives can be made easier for many researchers to access, techniques and challenges related to digitisation include: questions of what gets digitised and the transparency with which it is edited and revealed to the public; the ethics of digitising personal or controversial materials; issues of file size, storage, longevity of digital platforms and the speed and reliability of internet connections which can affect the dependability and quality of digital sources or access to them; and experiential differences between physical and digital archives which create or maintain unacknowledged hierarchies between those researchers with the privileges such as certain passports or institutional funding and those without them. Whilst digitisation may be a valuable part of decolonising archives and access to them, the connection is not unproblematic or simple. For further discussion of such questions, see e.g. Lise Jaillant, Katie Aske, Eirini Goudarouli and Natasha Kitcher, "Introduction: challenges and prospects of born-digital and digitized archives in the digital humanities", *Archival Science* vol.22 (2022): pp.285–291; Charles Jeurgens, "The Scent of the Digital Archive: Dilemmas with Archive Digitisation," *BMGN — Low Countries Historical Review*, 128, 4 (2013): pp.30–54, https://doi.org/10.18352/bmgn-lchr.9348; Megan Ward with Adrian S. Wisnicki, "The Archive after Theory", in *Debates in the Digital Humanities 2019*, ed. Matthew K. Gold and Lauren F. Klein (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019), pp. https://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/projects/debates-in-the-digital-humanities-2019. These questions are especially complex in the Palestinian case, as large quantities of institutional and personal archives were looted by Israeli forces in 1948 and 1967, as well as on other occasions, such as the theft of the collections of the Palestine Research Centre in Beirut when Israel invaded Lebanon in 1982. See, *inter alia*, Sabri Jiryis and Salah Qallab, "The Palestine Research Center," *Journal of Palestine Studies* vol.14, no.4 (summer, 1985), pp.185–187; Kareem Estefan, "Narrating Looted and Living Palestinian Archives: Reparative Fabulation in Azza El-Hassan's Kings and Extras", *Feminist Media Histories* vol.8, iss.2 (spring 2022): pp.43–69; Blair Kuntz, "Stolen Memories: Israeli State Repression and Appropriation of Palestinian Cultural Resources", *Journal of Radical Librarianship* 7 (2021), https://journal.radicallibrarianship.org/index.php/journal/article/view/54.

[5] Ricardo Roque and Kim Wagner (eds), *Engaging Colonial Knowledge. Reading European Archives in World History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

[6] See, e.g., Eitan Bar-Yosef, *The Holy Land in English Culture 1799–1917: Palestine and the Question of Orientalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

[7] For a detailed explication of these dynamics, see Mathilde Sigalas, "Between Diplomacy and Science: British Mandate Palestine and Its International Network of Archaeological Organisations, 1918–1938," in K. Sanchez Summerer and S. Zananiri (eds), *European Cultural Diplomacy and Arab Christians in Palestine, 1918–1948: Between Contention and Connection* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), pp.187–211.

[8] The famine of 1915–16 is often associated mostly with Lebanon (Melanie S. Tanielian, *The Charity of War: Famine, Humanitarian Aid, and World War I in the Middle East* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2017); Tylor Brand, *Famine Worlds: Life Amid Suffering in World War I Lebanon* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2022) but Palestine was also severely affected. See e.g., Salim Tamari, *Year of the Locust: A Soldier's Diary and the Erasure of Palestine's Ottoman Past* (Berkeley: California University Press, 2015); Eduardo Manzano Moreno and Roberto Mazza (eds), *Jerusalem in World War I: The Palestine Diary of a European Diplomat* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011).

[9] See, e.g., Glenda Abramson, "The 1914 deportation of the Jaffa Jews: 'a little footnote of war'?" *Israel Affairs* 28, 5 (2022): pp.706–23; Khalil Sakakini, "Khalil Sakakini's Ottoman Prison Diaries: Damascus (1917–1918)", *Jerusalem Quarterly* 20 (2004): pp.7–23; Dotan Halevy, "The Rear Side of the

Front: Gaza and Its People in World War I", *Journal of Levantine Studies* 5,1 (summer 2015): pp.35–57.

[10] See, e.g., Hagop Arsenian and Arda Arsenian Ekmekji, "Surviving Massacre: Hagop Arsenian's Armenian Journey to Jerusalem, 1915–1916", *Jerusalem Quarterly* 49 (spring 2012): pp.26–42; Sato Moughalian, *Feast of Ashes: The Life and Art of David Ohannessian* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2019); Bedross Der Matossian, "The Armenians of Palestine 1918–48", *Journal of Palestine Studies* 41,1 (2011): pp.24–44.

[11] Reports by ASOR, which was presumably less constrained by the need for diplomacy than its British counterparts, give a sense of the situation in Jerusalem as ASOR and the BSAJ sought to (re)establish themselves: "All of our staff are now on the ground, Dr. Albright having reached Jerusalem December 30th. The members of the staff have been engaged in establishing the necessary relationships in Jerusalem and carrying out negotiations with the authorities, who have uniformly shown themselves most sympathetic. Of the staff of the British School, Mr. Mackay is on hand; Director Garstang is expected to arrive about Easter. Dr. Garstang has already drawn up a very elaborate scheme for the proper recording of all the antiquities of Palestine and Syria… After a good deal of delay and uncertainty a home has been secured for the Joint British and American Schools. This is the Lord Bute House, lying just within the Jaffa Gate…The second story contains six rooms in which members of the staff can be housed. The American Director still occupies our rented School building outside the Jaffa Gate. We understand that Drs. Clay and Peters are now in residence in the Bute House. Ultimately the British and American Schools, and it is hoped a French School, will locate together, with their separate national hospices but with a common building for the joint work. As soon as location is decided upon and title to our land secured the American School can proceed to erect its building with the funds provided by the late Mrs. Nies" (*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* vol.2 (February 1920): pp.2–4). Perhaps a year or so after this, William Foxwell Albright, who would become one of the most famous Biblical archaeologists and who was writing as the new director of ASOR in Jerusalem, reported that: "In many respects the life of the scholar in Palestine has become more tolerable during the past year. Many of the restrictions which had hampered the work of scientific institutions under a military regime have been removed. While prices have not altered materially, there is reason to expect that they will remain fairly stable from now on. The housing problem, which has been no less serious in Jerusalem than in cities elsewhere, bids fair to be solved in large part in the course of next year, since building operations are planned, and some work has actually begun. It is, unfortunately, true that the country is not perfectly secure, and that riots and troubles of various kinds may be expected in the spring, but the uncertainty of life in Palestine for foreigners has been greatly exaggerated, and neither the present Director nor any of his associates have ever suffered personal loss or injury in any of their extended trips about the country" ("Report of the Director of the School in Jerusalem, 1920–1921," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* no. 5 (January 1922), pp.9–10).

[12] The files in the British National Archives at Kew contain correspondence to and from Garstang, the BSAJ and Department of Antiquities and the Colonial Office on the Bute House negotiations and other aspects of the longstanding question of the BSAJ's premises.

[13] Shimon Gibson, "British Archaeological Institutions in Mandatory Palestine, 1917–1948," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 131:2 (1999): p.123; Miriam Davis, *Dame Kathleen Kenyon: Digging up the Holy Land* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2008): p.146; Kathleen Kenyon, "The British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem the New School Building," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 89,2 (1957): pp.97–100; "Report of the director for 1967," *Levant* 1,1 (1969): p.V.

[14] Hamdan Taha, "Jerusalem's Palestine Archaeological Museum," *Jerusalem Quarterly* 91 (2022).

[15] Beatrice St Laurent and Himmet Taskömür, "The Imperial Museum of Antiquities in Jerusalem, 1890–1930: An Alternative Narrative", *Jerusalem Quarterly* 55 (2013): pp.17–18.

[16] Ibid., pp.18–19.

[17] Government of Palestine, *Blue Book for 1928* (Jerusalem: Government of Palestine, 1929).

[18] Palestine Museum, Jerusalem, *Bulletin*, vol.1 (1924): p.62.

[19] National Library of Israel bibliographical listing, accessed 29th January 2023: https://www.nli.org.il/en/journals/NNL-Journals990002783340205171/NLI

[20] For example, the first issue of the Museum journal contains an article by the Chief Inspector of Antiquities, P.L.O. Guy, "Mt. Carmel: an early Iron Age cemetery near Haifa" which was originally published in issue 5 of the *Bulletin of the BSAJ*; the plates showing photographs and drawings of ceramics from the dig still bear the BSAJ heading — presumably removing this from the plates was too difficult or expensive.

[21] See, e.g., Suzanne Schneider, *Mandatory Separation: Religion, Education and Mass Politics in*

Palestine (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018: pp.48–50) on the limited investment of the British in Mandatory Palestine and its impact on sectors such as education. For impacts on archaeology, see Gibson, "British Archaeological Institutions".

[22] W.J. Phythian-Adams, "THE QUARTERLY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTIQUITIES IN PALESTINE. Vol. I, nos. I and 2. Jerusalem: Published for the Government of Palestine by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1931. 5s each, yearly 18s 6d post free", *Antiquity* vol.6 iss.21 (March 1932): p.125.

[23] Sarah Irving, "Stephan Hanna Stephan and Evliya Çelebi's Book of Travels," in *Cultural Entanglement in the Pre-Independence Arab World: Arts, Thought and Literature*, ed. Anthony Gorman and Sarah Irving (London: I.B. Tauris, 2020): pp. 217–238.

[24] W.F. Albright, "Report of the Director, 1920–1921", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 5 (January 1922): p.15.

[25] Khaled Nashef, "Tawfik Canaan: His Life and Works", *Jerusalem Quarterly* 16 (2002): p.18.

[26] H.H. Spoer and Elias Nasrallah Haddad, "Poems by Nimr Ibn 'Adwān," *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 7 (1929): p.29.

[27] Amara Thornton's work is key in understanding the networks which were created and maintained by British archaeological institutions in the early phases of British Mandate rule in Palestine. See, "Social Networks in the History of Archaeology: Placing Archaeology in its Context", in Gisela Eberhardt and Fabian Link (eds) *Historiographical Approaches to Past Archaeological Research* (Berlin: Edition Topoi, 2015): pp.69–94; "Archaeologists-in-Training: Students of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, 1920–1936" *Journal of Open Archaeology Data* (2012), http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/4f293686e4d62; "British Archaeologists, Social Networks and the Emergence of a Profession: the social history of British archaeology in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East 1870–1939", unpublished PhD thesis, 2011. London: University College London.

[28] See, for instance, Zeynep Çelik's discussions of the range of unintended information available from archaeological writings, *About Antiquities: Politics of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2016): pp.155–173.

[29] Maayan Hilel, "Cultural Diplomacy in Mandatory Haifa: The Role of Christian Communities in the Cultural Transformation of the City", in *European Cultural Diplomacy and Arab Christians in Palestine, 1918–1948*, ed. K. Sanchez Summerer and S. Zananiri (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021): p.144.

[30] Sarah Irving, "A Tale of Two Yusifs: Recovering Arab Agency in Palestine Exploration Fund Excavations 1890–1924", *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* vol.149, iss.3 (2017): pp.223–236; idem., "Women versus Wheelbarrows: Labor and British Archaeology in Late Ottoman Palestine", *Journal of the Ottoman and Turkish Studies Association* vol.8, no.1 (2021): pp.427–433.

[31] Frederick Jones Bliss, "Report of Excavations at Tell-El-Hesy during the Spring of 1891: Excavating from its Picturesque Side", *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 23, 4 (October 1891): pp.282–298.

[32] Irving, "Women versus wheelbarrows", p.430.

[33] Melissa Cradic and Samuel Pfister, "Unsilencing the Archives: The Laborers of the Tell en-Nasbeh Excavations (1926–1935)", online exhibition at the Badè Museum, 2021, https://storymaps.arcgis.com/collections/dc601d4d131145f88f828196860b8a44.

[34] Anon., "Tell el Kussis," *Bulletin of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem* no.2 (1922): p.17.

[35] Irving, "Tale of Two Yusifs".

[36] See, e.g., John D.M. Green and Ros Henry, *Olga Tufnell's 'Perfect Journey': Letters and photographs of an archaeologist in the Levant and Mediterranean* (London: UCL Press, 2021): p.59; Joanne Rowland, "Documenting the Qufti archaeological workforce", *Egyptian Archaeology* 44 (spring 2004): pp.10–12; Peter Der Manuelian, *Walking Among Pharaohs: George Reisner and the Dawn of Modern Egyptology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022): pp.217–20.

[37] Jane Callander and Pamela Jane Smith, "Pioneers in Palestine: The Women Excavators of El-Wad Cave, 1929", in *Archaeology and Women: Ancient and Modern Issues*, ed. Sue Hamilton, Ruth D. Whitehouse and Katherine I. Wright (New York: Routledge, 2016): pp.76–82.

[38] As mentioned above, L.A. Mayer had a PhD from Vienna; Michael Avi-Yonah studied for a BA from the University of London in the 1920s, before studying at the BSAJ, and later earned an MA and PhD, also from London ("Prof. Michael Avi-Yona, 1904–1974", Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem webpage, https://archaeology.huji.ac.il/people/michael-avi-yona, accessed 1st February 2023).

[39] In 1936 Garstang published a pamphlet titled Palestine in Peril, a reprint of a piece written for *The Observer* newspaper of 20th September, 1936 in which he urged the Royal Commission announced that year (known as the Peel Commission after its head, the Conservative politician Earl Peel) to respect the

rights of Palestine's Arab population (Professor John Garstang, *Palestine in Peril: reprinted from "The Observer," Sunday, September 20, 1936* (Leeds: Beckwith & Son, 1936).

[40] I am grateful to Dr Amara Thornton for her advice and discussion on the likely training route for the student inspectors and the possibility of the BSAJ being involved.

[41] Sarah Irving, "Palestinian Christians in the Mandate Department of Antiquities: History and Archaeology in a Colonial Space", in *European Cultural Diplomacy and Arab Christians in Palestine, 1918–1948* ed. K. Sanchez Summerer and S. Zananiri (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021): pp.162–169.

[42] Sarah Irving, "Archaeological entanglements: Palestinian refugee archaeologists in Cyprus, Libya and Jordan", in T. Kiely, A. Reeve and L. Crewe (eds) *Empire and Excavation: Critical Perspectives on Archaeology in British-period Cyprus, 1878–1960* (Leiden: Sidestone Press, forthcoming 2023).

[43] Ibid.

[44] Mordechay Lash, Yossi Goldstein and Itzhak Shai, "Underground — Archaeological Research in the West Bank, 1948–1967: Management, Complexity, and Israeli Involvement", *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* 30, 1 (2020): p.8. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5334/bha-650; Solomon H. Steckoll, "Marginal Notes on the Qumran Excavations", *Revue de Qumrân* 7, 1 (December 1969): p.33.

[45] Irving, "Palestinian Christians".

[46] Sarah Irving, " 'A Young Man of Promise': Finding a Place for Stephan Hanna Stephan in the History of Mandate Palestine", *Jerusalem Quarterly* 73 (Spring 2018): pp.45–7, 48.

[47] "Introduction", *Bulletin of the BSAJ* no.5 (1924): p.47. Makhouly is also mentioned in Bulletin no.6, which reports that he and his fellow inspector Jacob Ory had "accomplished the work of excavation" at a mausoleum at Tell Barak (p.77).