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Abstract: While Arthur Penrhyn Stanley and his many achievements have been documented at some length, his contribution to the historical geography of the lands of the Bible is less well known. This paper discusses Stanley’s explorations and the reception of the publication of his travels by the English intellectual and religious communities. It argues that, as part of a larger program to put British biblical interpretation on a firm historical foundation, Stanley set out to replace the received text-based metaphorical understanding of ‘Holy Land’ with an empirically based literal apprehension, a change with deep implications for the nature and practice of English Christianity. It therefore traces a double encounter with the biblical landscape. A learned work on the historical geography of Palestine described the world ‘out there’ which Stanley had gone to see. Consideration of the ideological implications drew out the significance of that world for the situation ‘at home’ in England. This dual approach structured the critical response. The more realistic sense of the Bible lands was welcomed; Stanley’s liberal-Anglican proposals for a more truly biblical Christianity were resisted. An early example of ‘Anglo-Palestinian academic orientalism’, his work achieved only part of its purpose.

Arthur Penrhyn Stanley (1815-1881) was one of the ‘eminent Victorians’. From December 1856 he was Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church (though not installed until early in 1858) at Oxford. In 1864 he was made Dean of Westminster Abbey, the national cathedral, a post held until his death where he achieved both renown and notoriety by his liberality. Stanley was also a friend and confidant of the Queen, once Victoria got over her opposition to his ‘unnecessary’ marriage to one of her ladies in waiting, Lady Augusta Bruce. At the same time he was well connected with other members of the leadership elite, most notably William Gladstone, twice prime Minister in Stanley’s lifetime (1868-74, 1880-5). As one of the architects of the Metaphysical Society – a group formed to foster constructive debate between leading exponents of science and religion – Stanley was similarly at the centre of contemporary intellectual life. Alongside his public duties he was a prolific writer, whose many books and articles constituted a sustained commentary on the dynamics of church and culture in the early and mid-Victorian eras. More a man of letters than a theologian or a technically accomplished biblical scholar, Stanley was what today would be called a ‘public intellectual’.

Among his early works was Sinai and Palestine in Connection With Their History (1856), the result of the first of his two trips to the Bible lands. Like his other writings, it was not only popular but proved to have considerable staying power, being reprinted many times and passing through numerous editions. The importance of Sinai and
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Palestine in the era just prior to the commencement of systematic exploration in the Bible lands is recognized in scholarship by its frequent citation in histories of the nineteenth century western rediscovery of the Holy Land. Another study includes Stanley’s book among the significant contributions to the new genre of historical geographies of the Holy Land which emerged after 1840 (Ben-Arieh 1989). In these accounts Sinai and Palestine is assessed for what it contributed to the widening understanding of the lands of the Bible. However, unlike the similar works of Edward Robinson and George Adam Smith (Ben-Arieh 1989: 85-91; Butlin 1988; Campbell 2004: ch. 3), the text itself, and the motivations behind it, have never received detailed attention. This is something of an oversight, as Sinai and Palestine represents a powerful and successful bid to determine the contemporary apprehension of the biblical landscape in the English-speaking world. An analysis of its aims, structure and content, relation to the contemporary religious setting and reception by the British audience, this study attempts to assign Sinai and Palestine to its due place in the history both of British biblical archaeology in the period of its origins and of early Victorian religious culture.

When Stanley wrote, the lands of the Bible occupied an important place in British consciousness (Tuchman 1956, Bar-Yosef 2005). As the scene of the events described and reflected in the Bible, their primary religious text, ‘the Holy Land’ was an object of intense interest for the Victorians, as it had been for their forbears for hundreds of years. Yet for much of this time the interest had little to do with the actual territory of the Middle East. Cut off from the beginning of the sixteenth century by the spread of the Ottoman Empire, the notion of pilgrimage had in any case been transformed by the Reformation from a physical to a spiritual quest. Internalized and made accessible to all, the Bible lands were mediated by texts, principally the Bible (now translated into English) and John Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress. The spread of biblical culture facilitated identification of England as the Promised Land and the English as the chosen people at the very time when the acquisition of an empire required a new understanding of their place in the world. This reassignment of biblical categories to England and the English was remarkably enduring, as its Blakean expression in ‘Jerusalem’ testifies. But a new era in the British engagement with the Holy Land began with the opening of the Eastern Mediterranean by Napoleon in 1799. A literal apprehension based on encounter with the landscape itself gradually developed as the British joined the influx of westerners in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Yet these travellers did much to perpetuate the literary apprehension by the forms in which their experiences were presented — in Disraeli’s novel, Tancred, for example, or Alexander Kinglake’s impressionistic Eothen, or even Holman Hunt’s paintings. By 1850 the British understanding of the Holy Land was still predominantly literary and metaphorical. This was the challenge Stanley faced.

An emerging figure in the Anglican establishment
By the time Sinai and Palestine appeared Stanley was an emerging figure in the Church of England. Born in 1815, he was the son of Edward Stanley, a liberal minded and reforming Bishop of Norwich (1837-1849), and Catherine Leycester. After a time at a small private boarding school at Seaforth, Stanley had been educated, first at Rugby School where he was deeply influenced by the Headmaster, Thomas Arnold; and then as a scholarship winner at Balliol College, Oxford. After taking a ‘first’ in Classics, he was elected in 1838 to a fellowship at University College, where he became a tutor five years later. In the meantime he had taken holy orders, having been ordained as a deacon in 1839 and as a priest in 1843. A first offer of preferment came in September 1849 when Stanley was offered the Deanery of Carlisle. Dismayed by the distance from Oxford, and believing that the University was his ‘natural sphere’, he declined the offer (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 413-15). However, two years later he was more disposed to leave and accepted a canonry at Canterbury Cathedral. It was a decision that had a bearing on the writing of Sinai and Palestine. As his biographers observed: ‘His Canonry gave him rest, seclusion, and the tranquil opportunity for independent research and studious leisure.’ (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 429) They might also have mentioned a substantial stipend which supplemented his inherited wealth. As a member of the Anglican establishment Stanley now had the time and the means to produce such a work.

By this time Stanley was also a writer of some note. His first book, the celebrated 1844 biography of his Headmaster (Stanley 1844 & Zemka 1995), not only brought him to public attention, but also ‘gave him an assured position, and made him a power’ in both Oxford and the world of letters (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 324). It also associated him with the liberalism of his subject, an identification he was happy to own throughout the years to come. This impression was confirmed by his contribution to the periodical press. Over the following decade, Stanley wrote articles on a range of subjects in literary culture and on church-state relations, on which matter (like Arnold) he favoured making the national Church more comprehensive as a condition of its own survival and effectiveness. Each of his undertakings was an opportunity to pursue ‘the great object of his life – to show that Christianity is at once real and universal; that it does not belong to one set of persons, or to one institution, but to all; that not only religious, but secular, occupations fall within its sphere; that it ought to raise its voice, not only in the pulpit, but in education, in literature, in Parliament, in legislation, and in every question where there is a right and a wrong’ (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 384-5). With this commitment to inclusiveness in social arrangements and to the moral evaluation of contemporary affairs, Stanley was a liberal – and somewhat controversial – who looked to his writings to advance his causes.
The idea of visiting the Holy Land

The idea of visiting the Bible lands was a result of one of his literary projects. Some time in 1846 Stanley and his friend Benjamin Jowett of Balliol College decided to collaborate to produce a commentary on the entire New Testament. The decision arose out of his sermons as Select Preacher in 1846, subsequently published as *Sermons on the Apostolic Age* (Stanley 1847a). An expression of the need to apply the methods of free enquiry to the foundation documents of the faith, they were in part a reaction against the recent anaesthetizing effect of the Tractarian movement on the studies of the University and in part a response to the simultaneous advances of theology in Germany. They also made clear how much needed to be done in Britain to achieve an understanding of the New Testament up to the intellectual and academic standards of the age. For Jowett the commentary raised the whole question of the interpretation of Scripture, a matter he set himself to study systematically, a task which led to his notorious contribution to *Essays and Reviews* fifteen years later. For Stanley the commentary raised the whole question of the interpretation of Scripture, a matter he set himself to study systematically, a task which led to his notorious contribution to *Essays and Reviews* fifteen years later. For Stanley the commentary entailed without further reflection the task of putting the New Testament on a proper historical basis. In turn this called for the application to biblical writers of the same methods to be employed in understanding a Classical author in *Altertumswissenschaft*, the new approach to ancient world studies emanating from Germany. Much was at stake. As he had argued in the *Sermons on the Apostolic Age*, only an exegesis compatible with modern belief could save the Bible as a spiritual authority in contemporary Britain.

The importance of geography in the new historical understanding was an integral part of the Arnoldian legacy. Following the example of the German historian B.G. Niebuhr, Arnold had broken new ground in English historiography by including extensive discussion of the physical setting in his history of Rome published in 1838. Behind the discussion were visits to key sites, often with the works of ancient writers in hand. The need for such analysis had been part of Arnold’s teaching and example at Rugby and, as he was happy to acknowledge, Stanley had accepted it without qualification. By the time he made his commitment to the New Testament commentary, he was already a seasoned traveler. His journey through Greece and to Rome in 1840-1 in particular had confirmed the value of the physical setting for appreciating the literature and history of both (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 252-6, 264-89, esp. 269-72). Stanley expected a similar benefit to accrue from a tour to the Bible lands (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 380).

Nor should the novelty of Stanley’s actually going out to the Holy Land be underrated. For one thing, historical
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*Figure 2: Dean Stanley’s tomb in Westminster Abbey. He is buried with his wife Lady Augusta Bruce, daughter of Lord Elgin. Copyright: Dean and Chapter of Westminster*
geography in Britain was still in its early infancy. Although the progress of exploration in many lands had supplied plentiful materials, it did not yet exist as a seriously organized body of knowledge or a separate academic discipline. Among individual practitioners, Arnold had been the pioneer, and Stanley was one of the first to take up the perspective (Baker 1963: 33-50, 72-83). As he prepared for the tour, he was also impressed by the writers who had recently applied the Niebuhr-Arnold approach to the Bible lands. The American Edward Robinson had founded historical-geographical research on the Holy Land with his *Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai and Arabia Petraea in 1838*, published in 1841 (Ben-Arieh 1989: 75), while between 1848 and 1855 the German Carl Ritter wrote at great length to show the interplay between the physical conditions and the historical development of Israel (Ritter 1848-55). Even before he set out, both confirmed in the particular case of Israel the general belief in the connection between history and geography which Stanley had determined to put before the British public.

Stanley intended to make the tour in the late 1840s. Two developments delayed his departure. One was the death in 1849 of his father, which required him to attend to the domestic requirements of his mother and sisters. The other was his appointment in 1850 to the Oxford University Commission (Ward 1997: 306-36). A reformer from the first, and at the centre of the ‘Rugby group’ which pressed for state intervention to end the limits placed by Church authority on the colleges and teaching schools, Stanley seized the opportunity to realize his ideal of teaching and learning through political reform. The frequent meetings of the Commission required his presence in London for most of the next two years. The publication in May 1852 of its report (most of which as secretary he had written) again set Stanley free for foreign travel. Shortly afterwards he set off for the Continent and ultimately the Holy Land only, as it turned out, to be recalled on Cathedral business and to attend the funeral of the Duke of Wellington (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 436-44). When he managed to get away and leave behind the intense politicking of the Commission process, the need to contend for free and open learning through political reform. The frequent meetings of the Commission required his presence in London for most of the next two years. The publication in May 1852 of its report (most of which as secretary he had written) again set Stanley free for foreign travel. Shortly afterwards he set off for the Continent and ultimately the Holy Land only, as it turned out, to be recalled on Cathedral business and to attend the funeral of the Duke of Wellington (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 436-44). When he managed to get away and leave behind the intense politicking of the Commission process, the need to contend for free and open enquiry as the intellectual basis of authentic Christian faith was fresh in his mind.

Stanley’s long awaited trip to the Bible lands finally came about late in 1852. Travelling to Cairo, he met up with Theodore Walrond, Thomas Fremantle and William Findlay, with whom he sailed up and down the Nile as far as the Second Cataract. Then, in the early months of 1853, they crossed the Red Sea and, riding on camels, traversed the Sinai Peninsula to Akabah. From here they passed up the Wady el Arabah which led into Palestine and Syria via Petra. Easter was spent in Jerusalem. It was followed by extensive expeditions through the countryside before returning to Jerusalem for the Greek Easter. In April they sailed from the Holy Land along the coast of Asia Minor, stopping at Patmos, Smyrna and Ephesus, before heading up the Dardanelles to Constantinople in time to be present on the 400th anniversary of the city’s fall to the Turks. From here Stanley was able to visit Nicaea, a site which brought him into contact with the age of the Church Councils. Back in England in June he made the most of the comparative ease of the Canterbury Canonry in sustained literary activity over the next three years. In March 1856 he brought out *Sinai and Palestine*, a large work of over 500 pages. Together with *Memorials of Canterbury* (1855) and the two volume *St Paul’s Epistles to the Corinthians* (1855), *Sinai and Palestine* was one of the three substantial works he published in this period. Written more or less simultaneously, the three books were connected by the general need to understand the historical setting of Christian life and work in all ages. More importantly, *Sinai and Palestine* took its place with the commentary on Paul in the larger enterprise of putting understanding of the Bible on a firm historical basis.

A double encounter with the biblical landscape

*Sinai and Palestine* mediated a double encounter with the biblical landscape. On the one hand, it created a vivid sense of the world ‘out there’ which Stanley had gone to see. On his return to England his friend and successor as Tutor at University College, Goldwin Smith, had suggested that all Stanley needed to do was string together the letters written during the journey shorn of their beginnings and endings and the book would be written (Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 445-6). To an extent Stanley followed the suggestion. The ‘Introduction’ on Egypt consisted of just such a reproduction of what he had written at the time to family and friends (xxx-lv). The journey from Cairo to Jerusalem is illustrated in the same way (64-92, 99-106). Reproducing the letters written in *situ* was one way to fulfil the obligation Stanley felt ‘to leave on record, however imperfectly, and under necessary disadvantages, some at least of the impressions, whilst still fresh in the memory, which it seemed ungrateful to allow wholly to pass away’ (xxv). They also serve as a reminder that *Sinai and Palestine* is fundamentally a traveller’s account embodying a personal encounter with the biblical landscape.

But it was also intended for the instruction of others. The device Stanley employed for this purpose in the great bulk of the book was an ostensibly disinterested survey of the region. *Sinai and Palestine* poses as a ‘dissertation’, a general account written in the third person of what ‘the traveller’ sees and experiences in the Holy Land. That Stanley is at least the principal traveller is evident from his making clear what he himself did not actually see, so that everything else by implication was based on his own direct observation and research. But by identification with the generalized traveller the reader was enabled to see the biblical landscape for himself, and thereby join with Stanley in the experience. This was the other side of the encounter. It took place vicariously and ‘at home’ in Britain. As Stanley wrote up the account of his journey, the historical geography of the Holy Land as a genre was in
its infancy. This meant that there was still considerable freedom to decide the scope and style of the treatment. Even the concept ‘Holy Land’ was undefined. It was not a distinct administrative province in the Ottoman Empire. Nor was it in any sense a political unit, while the restriction of ‘Holy Land’ to Palestine did not occur until the British Mandate some 65 years later. Stanley took advantage of this flexibility by allowing his biblical interest rather than some political or socio-cultural construct to delimit his travels. This accounts for the range of territory – from Cairo to Lebanon – included in his survey. Moreover, having already travelled extensively in Greece and Italy, the tour of 1852-3 completed Stanley’s encounter with the lands that provided the physical backdrop to the biblical history and writings. What he had seen in Greece and Italy was used to inform and strike off the distinctive features of the Holy Land, so that it too played its part in the account. This unusually wide perspective meant that the book incorporated more than its title suggested. While the Sinai Peninsula and Palestine were in the foreground, what Stanley called ‘sacred geography’ encompassed almost the entire biblical world.

The coverage of the region in the foreground was similarly wide ranging. After Egypt, Stanley passed in review the Sinai Peninsula, Judaea and Jerusalem, the heights and passes of Benjamin, the mountains of Ephraim, the maritime Plain, the river Jordan and the Dead Sea, Perea and the Trans-Jordan, the Plain of Esdraelon, Galilee, the Lake of Merom and the head waters of the Jordan, and then Lebanon and Damascus. Like the tour itself, the movement is from south to north, and the account is ‘book-ended’ by an overview of Palestine at the beginning and a survey of the connection of its localities with ‘the Gospel History’ at the end. The significance of Stanley’s coverage emerged as the genre evolved (Ben-Arieh 1989: 70-4). In its more definite form, the historical geography of the Holy Land evinced a clear tendency to think of western Palestine as the principal region, and to relegate the lands of eastern Palestine and the Negev to secondary status. The Sinai Peninsula in the south, the Hauron and Damascus in the north east, and Phoenicia and Lebanon in the north west were regarded as of third rate importance. Stanley included them all in what turned out to be an unusually comprehensive account.
In its historical aspect the book ranged as widely chronologically as it did geographically. Indeed part of the interest of the Bible lands was the history that not only followed but, in an important sense, arose out of the biblical era. In the Preface Stanley referred to ‘a reflux of interest, another stage of history, which intermingles itself with the scenes of the older events, thus producing a tissue of local associations unrivalled in its length and complexity’. He continued:

Greece and Italy have geographical charms of a high order. But they have never provoked a Crusade; and, however bitter may have been the disputes of antiquarians about the Acropolis of Athens or the Forum of Rome, they have never, as at Bethlehem and Jerusalem, become matters of religious controversy — grounds for interpreting old prophecies or producing new ones — cases for missions of diplomatists or for the war of civilized nations. (x-xi)

The allusion to ‘new prophecies’ may have included Mohammed and the rise of Islam. In any case, they were an undeniable part of the history and therefore took a place — albeit a relatively minor one — as part of ‘the later development of the history of Palestine’ alongside ‘the rabbinical times of the Jewish history … [and] the monastic and crusading times of the Christian history’ (xiv). A structure of antecedent event and consequence set the true dimensions of the biblical history tied to this locality. ‘Sacred History’, Stanley’s term for the history of the Bible lands, spanned the era from the time of Abraham to the advent of the Ottoman Empire.

A learned work on the geography of Palestine

The key to Stanley’s intention in *Sinai and Palestine* is the topographical tradition he identified as reaching back all the way to the Old Testament itself and including subsequently Josephus among Jewish writers, Strabo and Pliny among Classical authors, and Origen, Eusebius and Jerome among the early Church Fathers (Stanley 1854a: esp. 356-69). Keenly aware that hundreds of travellers had preceded him, in preparation for his own journey Stanley familiarized himself with what he judged to be ‘the most voluminous mass of geographical literature that the world has produced’. As he analysed this ‘documentary history’ he identified six categories of writers:

1. The pilgrims, during the periods of the Roman Empire and the Crusades;
2. The early scientific travellers of the 15th to the early 18th centuries in whom the devotional interest is complemented by the desire for knowledge;
3. The ‘discoverers’ of the 18th century for whom the acquisition of knowledge was the primary object;
4. The scientific travellers of the 19th century;
5. The myriad popular travellers of the 19th century whose numerous defects were compensated in part by graphic descriptions of the land, the people and their customs; and
6. The writers of learned works on the geography of Palestine.

The most important category was the fourth, the ‘discovery travellers’ whose scientific interest caused them ‘for the first time, to desert the beaten track, and see for themselves, without regard to Scripture or tradition, what they conceived to be worth seeing … For strict fidelity to description and quickness of observation’, moreover, they had ‘never been surpassed.’ (Stanley 1854a: 360-1) While entertaining this preference for the breakthrough group, Stanley interacted with the whole tradition, invoking previous writers as appropriate, and seeking to confirm, correct and add to what had already been identified and described on the basis of his own investigations. In bringing his results together in a ‘dissertation’ Stanley aligned himself with the sixth group, those who, ‘partly from their own experience, partly from the experience of others, have composed, not travels, but learned works on the geography of Palestine’ (Stanley 1854a: 368). The production of such a work was his own aspiration.

It follows that *Sinai and Palestine* set out to confront the British people with the actual Bible lands. Its novelty consisted in its basis in direct observation. In standard works, such as T.H. Horne’s *Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, the landscape mattered, but Horne had not been there to see for himself (Horne 1846, vol. III). Nor had the more radical Henry Hart Milman, whose sensational *History of the Jews* raised disturbing questions about what ancient Palestine and its people were really like (Mason 2000: 319-28). In contrast, *Sinai and Palestine* presented for public appropriation the real Holy Land as Stanley and others had experienced it. Such a book was calculated to challenge and perhaps even displace the received metaphorical image. However, in setting out to provide a factual account of the world ‘out there’ for appropriation ‘at home’, the condition of its effectiveness was adequately reflecting the knowledge of the age. While Stanley as an activist and reformer was not a straightforward observer, because of its scientific aspiration *Sinai and Palestine* takes its place as part of the early Victorian literature of discovery and science.11

The desire to add to the stock of reliable knowledge of the Bible lands was pursued first in the identification of sites. This was an issue for westerners encountering the biblical landscape because many of the ancient locations were unknown, while identifications received on the basis of ecclesiastical authority were notoriously unreliable (Vogel 1993: 190-1; Shepherd 1987: 80-5). These problems were compounded by the locals’ practice of telling enquirers what they wanted to hear, the tendency of travellers to make the Israelites follow their own paths, and a lack of reliable data because the Peninsula had not yet been systematically explored. In endeavouring to locate biblical sites, Stanley
gladly followed the example of Edward Robinson, the pioneer of biblical topography, whose judgment he occasionally qualifies or criticizes (77, 98, 197 n. 5, 200 n. 1, 228, 327). While seeking to build on Robinson’s work throughout the region, Stanley’s curiosity was sharpest in relation to the period of the Exodus. Accordingly he devoted a good deal of attention to determining the point at which the Red Sea was crossed, the route taken through the Sinai Peninsula, and the site of the giving of the Law (29-44, 64-78). The state of the evidence meant that it was only possible to suggest likelihoods between alternatives. Thus he argued, against the traditional point further south, that the Israelites had crossed the Red Sea near Suez, where the water was shallow enough to have been parted by the wind and the width narrow enough to have been crossed by the people in the time allowed by the biblical narrative. From the crossing point the Israelites had certainly travelled along the coastal fringe between the sea and the table land of the Tih. Where they turned inland was unclear, but Stanley chose the Wadi Shellal, the ‘Valley of Cataracts’, which led to Wadi Feiran, the likely point for the encampment of Israel ‘before the mount’. He then upheld the traditional site of Jebel Musa – the Mount of Moses – as the Sinai on which the Law was given against the claims of nearby Mount Serbal, largely because of the existence of a plain below as a place for the encampment where the Law was received. But, on a subject where traditional piety looked for assurance, Stanley would not conceal that the facts were far from certain. Constructing a map of Palestine necessarily involved dealing with the traditions which had accumulated since the end of the national existence of the ancient inhabitants. The need to do so furnished Stanley with an opportunity to use the new critical methods supplied by Alterthumswissenschaft for analyzing the recorded consciousness of early civilizations. By applying these criteria, he identified three strands within the naming tradition (Stanley 1854a: 371-5). In the first, which afforded a high probability of authenticity, the ancient names of cities and towns were still associated with sites, although foreign and modern substitutes may have arisen. Less certain were those suggested by the endeavour to retain the recollection of events in a locality. While beyond verification, these identifications could be accepted when they were indigenous, early and corresponded with natural features in the landscape. Most problematic were the identifications from the ages of Constantine, the Crusaders and the Arab and Turkish conquests. Late in time and usually the products of the piety of pilgrims of different stripes, they could be accepted only when confirmed by independent investigation. Applied to the sepulchres, these principles showed that, with the few exceptions of graves known from ancient times in credible locations, the Muslim predilection for building mosques over the tombs of celebrated Old Testament figures, created so many false identifications as to throw doubt on all (147-9). Similarly, discarding Muslim and Christian traditions permitted the identification of Nebi-Samuel – for long thought to be the site of Shiloh – with

Figure 3: Stanley’s diagram of the heights of Egypt, Sinai and Palestine. (Sinai and Palestine 1856: frontispiece)
ancient Gibeon (210-13). This secured Robinson’s identification of Seilun as Shiloh (227-9), and provided a striking example of how critical historiography not only exposed legend and distortion in the record, but also clarified the connection between the country and its history (345-9, 378 n. 1, 391-2 & 403-4). 13

Natural science, which had been part of the home environment in which Stanley had been nurtured, furnished another side of the scientific aspiration of Sinai and Palestine. The text throughout describes at length the physical aspects of the land, generally at first in the survey chapter on Palestine, and then in close detail for each of the regions. Where necessary it goes beyond description to the explanations offered by ‘the discoveries of modern science’. Of greatest interest in this respect was the history of landforms supplied by geology, something of a vogue science in early Victorian Britain (145-55). The focus of this interest was the volcanic activity and earthquakes which Stanley saw as the explanation behind a number of important biblical events and attitudes, not least the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah and the story of Lot’s wife (283-4). 14 An earthquake too was most likely responsible for the oddities of the Jordan Valley and the Dead Sea, the peculiar saltiness of which was ascribed to a deposit of fossil salt at its southern end and rapid evaporation (284-6). The other aspect of the natural landscape requiring explanation was the vegetation (137-145, 162-3). Lack of water and rocky soil meant that it was generally poor and bare, and in some places so sparse ‘it might almost be said a transparent coating’ (17). Apart from occasional oaks and terebinths, trees were seen to be ‘humble in stature’ (138), while flowers appeared only in spring. There was no corresponding interest in fauna, but, as cognate sciences, geology and botany furthered the ends of sacred geography and enabled Sinai and Palestine to stand alongside (although it does not rank with) other early Victorian works of travel and scientific exploration such as Darwin’s Voyage of the Beagle.

The textual descriptions of the geographical configurations are supported by various cartographical devices. Highly detailed, coloured fold-out maps – of Egypt, the Sinai Peninsula (Figure 3), the vicinity of traditional Sinai, Palestine (Figure 5), the south of Palestine (Figure 6), and the Plain of Esdraelon and Galilee were intended to show the landforms as well as the locations. A cross section illustrating the ‘elevations of the heights of Egypt, Sinai and Palestine’, and coloured according to the appearance which the country actually presents, was a further help to appreciating what the landscape was really like (Figure 4). Indeed by juxtaposing the Dead Sea at 1,312 feet below sea level with Mount Hermon at 10,000 feet above, the mountainous character of the country was effectively exhibited for those who could not see for themselves. The same drive for realism made it important to disclose on the map of Egypt that ‘the colours … must be considered only as rough approximations to the truth, also the dark green, elsewhere used for forest, is used for the whole verdure of the Nile Valley’. Despite such limitations, cartography was an invaluable aid to the presentation of the realities of the biblical landscape. 15

In pursuing the scientific agenda of Sinai and Palestine Stanley ran into two main problems. One was the inadequacy of the geographical vocabulary in the received English translation of the Bible. Stanley complained that the Authorized Version loses the ‘richness and precision of the local vocabulary of the Hebrew language’ by an unprincipled approach to translation which allowed a ‘promiscuous use of the same English word for different Hebrew words, or of different English words for the same Hebrew word’ (471). To allow the full light of geographical terms to shine, he included a long appendix on the ‘Vocabulary of Topographical Words’. For no fewer than 102 words denoting landforms, the vegetation and various kinds of human habitation, he listed all the occurrences, analysed the roots, described the usage and identified the meaning. In turn this justified a uniform rendering of each word. The value of the exercise stood out in relation to the well known expression ‘the valley of the shadow of death’. Its original meaning, ‘a narrow ‘ravine’ where the shade of the closing rocks is ever present,’ brought out its perennial quality (476). Apart from vividness, important issues could hang on clarifying distinctions between similar words, such as that between ‘Hor’ and ‘Gibeah’ in deciding whether Mt Serbal or Gebel Mousa was the Sinai of Exodus (489). By bringing a greater precision, Stanley felt that ‘the geographical passages of the Bible seem to shine with new light, as the words acquire their proper force’ (471). Accurate knowledge and proper appreciation of biblical terms for the landscape required best philological practice and a challenge to the hegemony of the Authorized Version.

The other problem was variation in the landscape over time. Stanley’s approach also assumed a high degree of continuity from the biblical era to the present. At several points he insisted on its importance for his enterprise. For example, in relation to the general way of life of the current population as a reflection of life in biblical times, he claimed: ‘it is one of the great charms of Eastern travelling, that the framework of life, of customs, of manners, even of dress and speech, is still substantially the same as it was ages ago … the Bedouin tents are still the faithful reproduction of the outward life of the patriarchs – the vineyards, the corn-fields, the houses, the wells of Syria still retain the outward imagery of the teaching of Christ and the Apostles; and thus the traveller’s mere passing glances at Oriental customs … contain a mine of Scriptural illustration which it is an unworthy superstition to despise or fear (xxi-xxii; cf. 229).’ This confidence faced a formidable challenge in relation to the apparent contradiction between the status of the Holy Land as the land flowing with milk and honey and the harshness of its present environment. Stanley replied that it was a matter of perspective. The comparative fertility of Palestine in antiquity made it stand out as a land of promise in comparison with the deserts to the south and east. But it could hardly be denied that
environmental degradation and climate change had had a deep impact on the landscape (120-4). More broadly Stanley acknowledged important changes in the general aspect, climate and vegetation of the Bible lands (xxi), and even turned to some account the reality of change. While he probably overestimated the extent to which the modern observer can experience the processes of the past, variation was an effect for which allowance had to be made in a scientific treatment of the landscape.

**Bringing Together ‘Sacred Geography’ and ‘Sacred History’**

The aspirations and methods of scientific geography are pervasive in *Sinai and Palestine*, but they do not fully explain its purpose. It was by bringing together ‘sacred geography’ and ‘sacred history’ that Stanley believed he would make his contribution to an already large literature. “There have been comparatively few attempts,” he noted in the Advertisement, ‘to illustrate the relation in which each

---

*Figure 5: Stanley’s map of Palestine. (Sinai and Palestine 1856:111)*
stands to the other … to exhibit the effect of the ‘Holy Land’ on the course of ‘the Holy History’,” so that this ‘seemed to be a task not hitherto fully accomplished’ (vii-viii). Apart from the novelty, the warrant for the enterprise was a virtually limitless advantage to biblical culture. Historical and theological students would feel an additional power of understanding, ‘in the incidental turn of a sentence—in the appreciation of the contrast between the East and the West, of the atmosphere, and the character of the people and the country—in the new knowledge of expressions, of images, of tones, and countenances (xxiv-xxv).’ The result in turn would be a sense of the historical truth of the events of the Old and New Testament that would bring out their inward spirit and thereby ‘exalt the faith of which they are the vehicle’ (xxv). Stanley has been represented as among those who went to Palestine for the authentication of the Bible (Shepherd 1987: 94-6). This was true, not so much in the intended sense of seeking to verify the accuracy of the Bible (which Stanley did not in fact require for it to hold its place as an inspired record) (Prothero & Bradley 1893, II: 108-9), but, rather, in the sense that connection with the biblical landscape was needed to gain full access to the religious progress of humanity, of which it was the record and in part the cause.

The technique Stanley devised to accommodate this purpose was to pass in review all the sites he could identify and marshal the historical connections of each. The various stages in the history of Shechem in central Palestine, for example, began as the first resting place of Abraham after he crossed the Jordan on his way from Chaldea to the land of promise and as the site of the first altar which the Holy Land had known (232, citing Genesis 12:6). His descendant Jacob settled in the vicinity and made ‘the transition of the Patriarch from the Bedouin shepherd into the civilized and agricultural settler’ (232, citing Genesis 33:19). After the conquest Shechem was the seat of the main national assemblies and the scene of coronation in the age of the kings (233-5). It had been razed to the ground in the course of the uprising of Abimelech but was then revived by Jeroboam as the capital of the northern kingdom (236, citing Judges 9). After the exile it became the seat of the Samaritans. Nearby rose Mount Gerizim, ‘the sacred mountain’, according to one tradition the scene of Abraham’s encounter with Melchizedek and the near sacrifice of Isaac, appropriated at the outset of the conquest, and still in Stanley’s day the point of worship by the Samaritans. ‘Probably in no other locality,’ he observed, ‘has the same worship been sustained with so little change or interruption for so great a series of years as in this mountain, from Abraham to the present day.’ (236) Shechem was also the traditional site of both the tomb of Joseph and of the well of his father Jacob beside which Jesus met the Samaritan woman. Few other sites evinced so many connections with the history over such a long time span, but it indicates that the technique depended for its effectiveness more on association and accumulation than critical insight. The gain was a sense of the importance of particular sites. But there was also loss.

Nothing other than what was relevant to the Bible mattered. In Stanley’s eyes the landscape was biblicized.

Very striking is the confidence with which Stanley addressed the task of a geographical history of the Holy Land. It stemmed from a paper written to establish the claims of sacred history and geography in the early stages of preparing the book (Stanley 1854a: esp. 375-81). He identified five principles which were calculated to disclose the nature and extent of the influence of a country’s physical environment on its history:

1. The geographical features of a country elucidate the general character of a nation.
2. The geographical situation affects the forms and expressions of the nation’s poetry, philosophy and worship.
3. Place can explain (without actually causing or influencing) the events that have occurred in a locality.
4. The scenery furnishes evidences to the truth of the history.
5. It is instructive and engaging to realize the setting.

In the Preface to Sinai and Palestine Stanley added another:

6. The scenes of the Holy Land lend themselves to poetical and proverbial use (xxii-xxiv).

The obvious corollary of these six principles is that Stanley’s encounter with the biblical landscape involved much more than the simple empiricism implied by his scientific aspiration. A close reading suggests they might also be divided into two groups which correspond with the double encounter with the biblical landscape.

Principles 1 to 3 indicate that, as the domain of human activity, Stanley assigned a direct part to the physical environment in the formation of national identity and its expression in literature, world-view and spirituality. In the case of Israel ‘out there’, the geographical seclusion from the rest of the ancient world ‘agrees with’ their character as a people apart, while the smallness of the land only served to exalt the sense of divine favour and foster consciousness that their influence would extend well beyond the physical barriers (112-116). Stanley also suggested that the land shaped events. Although perhaps clearest in relation to battles (329-40), he maintained more generally that the mountainous character of Palestine is intimately connected with its history, both religious and political (131), explaining among other things the prominence of ‘the fenced cities’ and ‘the high places’ as centres of worship (127-36). Similarly the ‘bridging’ function of Palestine because of its central situation in the ancient near eastern world did much to account for the part played by the Egyptian and Mesopotamian empires in the life of Israel (116-17). What was true of the whole region could also be true of the regions such as Judah and Galilee (162-3, 354-6, 423-7). These views created an impression of geographical determinism which Stanley unsuccessfully attempted to avoid. In Sinai
and Palestine geography was not a mere backdrop; it was a vital part of the history itself.

This relation went directly to the all-important question of the bearing of the landscape on the formation of the biblical text. Features of the physical setting such as Mount Hermon shaped the imaginative conceptions of the writers, so that an appreciation of the landscape made their language intelligible (114-16, 119, 138-40, 162, 235-6, 396). Beyond this broad influence it could be shown that the environment actually suggested some of the thought and the language. The general aspect of Jerusalem, for example, excited the admiration of Psalmists and Prophets (182). More particularly, the Temple provided the chief images for the heavenly Jerusalem, while its corner-stone suggested the relation in which Christ stood to the Church. The influence could go the other way, as in Isaiah 10 where the text constructs the importance of the scene ‘to give greater force to the sudden check which was in store for’ Sennacherib (202-3). This interplay between setting and text is perhaps clearest in the Gospels. Galilee as the primary scene of Jesus’ ministry supplied many of the details and images of the evangelists’ accounts (367-78). The parables in particular – and even some of the discourses – were at least enlivened by, and perhaps sometimes the products of, the local scenery (412-23). Stanley’s inference applied well beyond the Gospels:

if it is clear that the form of the teaching was suggested by the objects immediately present … it is a proof, incontestable, and within small compass, that even that revelation, which was most unlike all others in its freedom from outward circumstance, was yet circumscribed, or … assisted by the objects within the actual range of the speaker’s vision (423).

Although some of Stanley’s contemporaries were not ready to accept the de-supernaturalizing effect, context could not be ignored as a determinant of the composition and meaning of the biblical text.

It was in the apologetic, imaginative and literary uses envisaged in principles 4 to 6 that the link with the interests of the society ‘at home’ became prominent. For they showed how the land connects past and present and feeds into the future, not only in the Holy Land, but also in lands beyond. At a purely physical level the wells of the countryside were one of ‘the links by which each successive age is bound to the other’ (145). But they were also seen to have an abiding evidential and hortatory value. The wells of Beersheba, for example, ‘are indisputable witnesses of the life of Abraham’, while that of Jacob ‘is a monument of the earliest and latest events of sacred history, of the caution of the prudent patriarch, no less than of the freedom of the Gospel there proclaimed by Christ’.

Figure 6: Stanley’s map of Southern Palestine. (Sinai and Palestine 1856:161)
(146-7). Being able to see what the protagonists themselves had seen remained a source of pleasure, understanding and reassurance to those who later come to the same scenes. The physical features provided a language in expressions such as ‘the wilderness of life’, the ‘Rock of Ages’ and ‘the view from Pisgah’ which continued to inform and shape religious life. By incorporating the interactions of people with the landscape these principles allowed for a human component in the influence of place upon history in the present as well as the past. The relationship between land and culture was especially important for the recovery of the meaning, authority and contemporary import of sacred history as the basis for the continuing religious progress of the world.

‘Anglo-Palestinian Academic Orientalism’

In addressing the ideological implications of the landscape, Stanley ran into the dilemma inherent in his project. Because of the place of the Bible in British culture, at one level the landscape of the Holy Land was already well known and familiar. However, in seeking to introduce the actual Bible lands Stanley believed himself to be bringing the British public into contact with an entity that was unknown, strange, even exotic. To forestall alienation from his project and to make the physical reality accessible, he employed two strategies. One was to minimize the strangeness. To this end he omitted any mention of Ottoman history. Only the Jewish and Christian experience of the region was germane. Apart from his guide, Stanley also said very little about the people presently populating the land and their activities. The historical geography of Sinai and Palestine was restricted to that to which the British people might be expected to relate.

The other bridge-building strategy was to compare the countryside with sites in Europe. The distinctive features of Shiloh and Ladadea, and the Styx’ (227); the three rivers flowing from the Esdraelon plain into the Jordan have ‘the same relation to the main body of the plain as the “legs,” as they are called, of Como and Lecco bear to the main body of the Lake of Como’ (328); Mount Hermon was the ‘Mont Blanc’ of Palestine (395). More particularly, whenever possible Stanley’s comparisons were with scenes in Britain. Jerusalem was the same elevation as Skiddaw (127); the landscape of southern Palestine resembled the ‘tangled featureless hills of the lowlands of Scotland and North Wales’ (136); the Lake of Gennesareth was ‘about the same length as our own Windermere’ (362); and the battlefield of Palestine resembled ‘the battle-field of Scotland, the plain of Stirling’ (329 n. 1). Perspective was also introduced from the British experience. A period of four hundred years was ‘a period equal in length to that which elapsed between the Norman Conquest and the Wars of the Roses’ (225); Eastern Palestine ‘has been to the main body of the people, what Scotland and Ireland, has been to the chief course of English history’ (317). In Stanley’s hands the biblical landscape was Occidentalized and Anglicized. This construction of the Holy Land to make it more accessible to the home audience links Sinai and Palestine with the ‘Orientalism’ that has characterized modern European attitudes to the East. At the time Stanley was the leading British representative of one of its principal manifestations, which Eitan Bar-Josef has called ‘Anglo-Palestinian academic Orientalism’ (Bar-Josef 2005: esp. ch. 2). The term refers to the concretization of the biblical landscape through textualisation on the basis of exploration and the burgeoning literature of travel and discovery. It also envisages the interplay between the world ‘out there’ in the East under construction by investigative and reflective processes and the intent of the vantage point ‘at home’ in the West. Bar-Josef’s discussion of Stanley focuses on the sermons preached on his second visit in 1862 (Stanley 1863). Evincing the same movement toward the east with one eye still firmly fixed on the requirements of the home situation in the west, Sinai and Palestine was a more substantial and influential (if less overt) example from almost a decade earlier. In time the benefit to Britain came to be seen in strategic terms, but Stanley’s ‘academic orientalism’ was directed to cultural appropriation rather than physical possession. His hope was for the encounter with the biblical landscape to transform British Christianity.

Stanley’s first domestic task was to convince the English religious public of the legitimacy of a topographical account of the Bible lands. He was well aware that a naturalistic handling of a sacred subject offended traditionally pious sensibilities. In the Preface he offered three reasons for the undertaking (x-xii). First, the natural features of Sinai and Palestine were in themselves interesting, a theme he sustained throughout the account by pointing out as appropriate unusual landforms such as (most dramatically) the Dead Sea. Second, they were the scene of ‘the most important events in the history of mankind’ (x). Third, the Bible itself invited this approach. From beginning to end the text is full of local allusions. The inherent curiosity intensified in ‘the Domesday Book of the conquest of Ca-naan’ in the book of Joshua which ‘almost compels a minute investigation’ (xi). Further, the general history of the New Testament ‘is connected with the geography of the scenes on which it was enacted, by a link arising directly from the activity and practical energy which is part of the nature of the Christian religion itself’. In the text Stanley added a fourth reason. To an extent unmatched elsewhere, Palestine was a land of ruins (117-120). Their antiquity gave the land a venerable appearance. The different historical stages they represent – ‘Saracenic, Crusading, Roman, Grecian, Jewish’ – were the key to the history. ‘This variety, this accumulation of destruction, is the natural result of the position which has made Palestine for so many ages the thoroughfare and prize of the world.’ (119) It was also an indication of how the land must have looked in every age. ‘What … we now see, must to a certain extent have been seen always—a country strewed with the relics of an earlier civilization; a country exhibiting even in the first dawn of history the theatre of successive conquests and destructions
... (120)." Against potential critics, the encounter with the biblical landscape was presented as a wide ranging act of piety, evincing due deference to the land, its history and to the Bible itself.

Stanley’s historico-geographical hermeneutics was also a help to biblical culture in that it tended to correct the excessive supernaturalism he held responsible for the divisions in British Christianity. Its aid was solicited in two ways.

Miracles were part of the biblical story, and thus an important platform in early Victorian orthodox Christianity (eg. Horne 1846, I: II). In the Preface Stanley brought out the bearing of the landscape on the subject:

If ... the aspect of the ground should ... indicate that some of the great wonders in the history of the Chosen People were wrought through means which, in modern language, would be called natural, we must remember that such a discovery is, in fact, an indirect proof of the general truth of the narrative. We cannot call from the contemporary world of man any witnesses to the passage of the Red Sea, or to the overthrow of the cities of the plain, or to the passage of the Jordan. So much the more welcome are any witnesses from the world of nature, to testify on the spot to the mode in which the events are described to have occurred; witnesses the more credible, because the very existence was unknown to those by whom the occurrences in question were described. Some changes may thus be needful in our mode of conceiving the events. (xix-xx)

Stanley applied this perspective at several points in his account. Properly located, the crossing of the Red Sea could be explained by the action of the wind on relatively shallow water. Apart from the manna and the quails and three interventions to supply water, the people of Israel might well have been supported in the desert from their own flocks and herds and the greater capacity of the environment prior to the desolation brought by natural occurrences and the wanton destruction of Bedouin tribes (24-6). Earthquakes were a sufficient cause of the withdrawal of the waters of the Jordan, the overthrow of Jericho, and a panic in the Philistine host in the near neighbourhood (279, 299-300). Stanley insisted that no loss of spiritual significance was entailed in this focus on secondary causes. 'Their moral and spiritual lessons will remain unaltered: the framework of their outward form will receive the only confirmation of which the circumstances of the case can now admit.' (xx) Both the import of the incidents and the veracity of the records gained from de-emphasizing the miraculous.

Stanley similarly turned the evidence of the landscape against the pundits of prophecy, for which there was a vogue in early Victorian England (Bebbington 1989, ch. 3). In principle he was opposed to the 'aid ... sometimes sought in the supposed fulfilment of the ancient prophecies by the appearance which some of the sites of Syria or Arabian cities present to the modern traveller' (xvi). These strictures applied in particular to the Phoenician towns of Tyre and Sidon, and to Capernaum, all of which had been the object of a forecast of desolation (266-8, 376-7). All, however, had had an extended history, and Sidon and Tyre were still functioning communities. Stanley cited the latter in particular as 'a striking instance of the moral and poetical, as distinct from the literal and prosaic, accomplishments of the Prophetical scriptures'. He applied the same principle to the prophecies directed against Askalon, Damascus and Petra. Together they justified the principle foreshadowed in the Preface: "Namely, that the warnings delivered by 'holy men of old' were aimed not against sticks and stones, that then, as always, against living souls and sins, whether of men or of nations (xvi)." It was a principle that applied 'as well as to those of which the fulfilment is supposed yet to be future'. The evidence of landscape did not support those who based their view of the present and future on fulfilment of prophecy yet to occur.

Alongside this corrective use of the biblical landscape was a need to guard against its misuse. The danger was localized in 'The Holy Places', a subject demanding attention because of the special localities and sanctuaries that had become places of pilgrimage (ch. XIV). With so many that might be considered, he confined himself to three centres – Bethlehem, Nazareth and Jerusalem. In relation to the disputed site of the Annunciation in Nazareth Stanley felt obliged to mention Loretto in Italy, ‘the European Nazareth’, to which the house in which Mary received the Angel Gabriel was ostensibly taken by angels at the end of the thirteenth century. Since then regarded ‘as an actual fragment of the Holy Land, sacred as the very spot on which the mystery of the Incarnation was announced and begun,’ it had become the most frequented sanctuary in Christendom. While it was maintained that the Latin convent in Nazareth was also the scene of the Annunciation, the monks at Nazareth made some attempt to square the two traditions by pointing to the spot from which the holy house had been removed. To expose the fable Stanley pointed out that the house at Loretto would not fit the site at Nazareth, while the building materials at the two locations were incompatible with one another. He conceded that ‘it may have seemed superfluous labour to have attempted any detailed refutation of the most incredible of Ecclesiastical legends’. Yet:

No facts are insignificant which bring to an issue the general value of local religion, or the assumption of any particular Church to direct the conscience of the world, or the amount of liberty within such a Church left on questions which concern the faith and practice of thousands of its members. (443)

Furthermore, the evidence of the landscape suggested an apparently providential obliteration of the Holy Places of Palestine, lest they attain ‘a sanctity which might endanger the real holiness of the history and religion which they served to commemorate’ (396, cf 376-8). The evidence of the biblical landscape militated against the claims of Rome to be the one true church and set people free from its superstitious and unnecessarily authoritarian claims.
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Sinai and Palestine had an anti-Catholic edge, the sharper in view of the recent restoration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England.  

Such strictures were part of Stanley’s wider program of saving British Christianity by concentrating on its moral force and ending sectarian disputation. The concentration on miracles and prophecy as ‘evidence’ showed that weight was being placed on Biblical texts that they were incapable of supporting. The relation of the Gospel history to the natural setting suggested a new reading of the Bible that would no longer be the cause of the alienation of the scientifically inclined and the cause of division among Christian enthusiasts. At one level the Gospel records evinced that disregard of time and place piety might have expected. Yet a careful reading pointed to a close connection between the life of Christ and the earthly scenes of his ministry. Stanley drew three conclusions. First, the simplicity and reality of a teaching grounded in everyday sights and sounds suggested a need to keep Christian teaching straightforward and generous. We are apt sometimes to carry out into an infinite series of moral and theological conclusions the truths which are stated under these material forms. It might, perhaps, serve both to restrain us from precipitate inferences, and also to relieve us from some difficulties, if we bore in mind that the distinctness which necessarily belongs to physical objects cannot be transferred bodily into the moral world’ (424). Excessive literalism and dogmatism were therefore deprecated. Second, the homeliness of Jesus’ teaching foreshadowed the true nature of Christianity. For it was an expression of ‘the same humble and matter-of-fact, yet at the same time universal spirit, which characterized the whole course of his life on earth and has formed the main outlines of His religion ever since (425-6). Third, it showed Him to be both human and divine – ‘so completely one of the sons of men … so universal in the fame, the effects, the spirit of his teaching and life’ (427). Stanley was well aware of the differing priorities and fashions in the interpretation of Christ across the ages, between the Nativity and the Death, as opposed to the life and Works of Christ. The landscape beckoned contemporary Britain in the direction of identification with the simple, inclusive, universal life and teaching of Jesus – to incarnationalism – as the basis of religious solidarity and social cohesion.

Further impetus to the changes Stanley envisaged for British Christianity flowed from the providential purpose he read in the landscape itself. He saw it, first, in the variety of its structure and climate (124-7). Stanley agreed that no other country contained so many and such sudden transitions, a feature which showed its fitness for the history or the poetry of a nation with a universal destiny, and to indicate one at least of the methods by which that destiny was fostered—the sudden contrasts of the various aspects of life and death, sea and land, verdure and desert, storm and calm, heat and cold; which, so far as any natural means could assist, cultivated what has been well called “the variety in unity,” so characteristic of the sacred books of Israel; so unlike those of India, Persia, of Egypt, of Arabia. (127)

Stanley also saw a providential purpose in the ordinari-ness of the landscape. This lack of distinctiveness was already a commonplace in the literature, but he inferred that this fitted the land to be the scene of the disclosure of a universal religion:

If the first feeling be disappointment, yet the second may well be thankfulness. There is little in these hills and valleys on which the imagination can fasten ... all this renders the Holy Land the fitting cradle of a religion which expressed itself not through the voices of rustling forests, or the clefts of mysterious precipices, but through the hearts and souls of men; which was destined to have no home on earth, least of all in its own birth-place; which has attained its full dimensions only in proportion as it has travelled further from its original source, to the daily life and homes of nations as far removed from Palestine in thought and feeling, as they are in climate and latitude; which alone of all religions, claims to be founded not on fancy or feeling, but on Fact and Truth. (154-5)

Stanley found a parallel in the teaching of Jesus, the homeliness of which made it accessible and intelligible to all lands and peoples. Thus the topography fused with the content of revelation to help realize its purpose.

A groundwork of historical and geographical fact, with a wide applicability extending beyond the limits of any age or country; a religion rising in the East, yet finding its highest development and fulfillment in the West; a character and teaching, human, Hebrew, Syrian, in its outward form and colour, but in its inward spirit and characteristics universal and divine—such are the general conclusions, discernible, doubtless, from any careful study of the Gospels, but impressed with peculiar force on the observant traveller by the sight of the Holy Land. (433-4)

Realistically conceived, the biblical landscape stood at the head of an historic progress which directed attention to the west as the locus of Christian civilization shifted. By implication this endorsed Britain and the British, and challenged them to rise to their historic destiny by bringing their religious arrangements into line with the divine intention.

The role assigned to the landscape makes it clear that Sinai and Palestine was informed by a conception of its importance in universal history. The framework of historical understanding Stanley brought to the task of interpreting the biblical landscape was the liberal Anglican idea of history purveyed within his circle – in addition to Arnold, by Richard Whately, H.H. Milman, Connop Thirlwall,
and Julius Hare. It was liberal in that it asserted moral progress as the direction of history against the conservative view that humanity had degenerated from a divine state of grace. It was Anglican in that it was providential and held the national Church as the channel of social change as an expression of God’s purpose. The fulfilment of a divine plan towards its goal, history’s engine was humanity’s ever more mature appreciation of God’s intentions, a process which presupposed a reinterpretation of divine revelation by successive generations on the basis of increased knowledge through scientific and literary endeavour. History was thus the means of progressive revelation, a conception reflected in Sinai and Palestine’s view of New Testament times as the organic fulfilment of the Old Testament era which had come before. ‘The Gospel history,’ Stanley said, ‘is the completion and close, without which the earlier history would be left imperfect. (408)’ This teleology was illustrated by Stanley’s progress through the biblical world:

the whole journey ... presents the course of the history in a living parable before us, to which no other journey or pilgrimage can present any parallel. In its successive scenes ... is faithfully reflected the dramatic unity and progress which so remarkably characterizes the Sacred History. The primeval world of Egypt is with us, as with the Israelites, the starting point—the contrast—of all that follows. With us, as with them, the Pyramids recede, and the Desert begins, and the wilderness melts into the hills of Palestine, and Jerusalem is the climax of the long ascent, and the consummation of the Gospel History represents itself locally, no less than historically, as the end of the Law and the Prophets. And with us, too, as the glory of Palestine fades away into the ‘common day’ of Asia Minor and the Bosphorus, gleams of the Eastern light still continue—first in the Apostolical labours, then, fainter and dimmer, in the beginnings of ecclesiastical history,—Ephesus, Nicaea, Chalcedon, Constantinople; and the life of European scenery and of Western Christendom completes by its contrast what Egypt and the East had begun (xxiii-xxiv).

Like the journey itself, Sinai and Palestine was a demonstration that God reveals his progressive purpose in the natural world and invites humanity to participate in that progress.

The British Reception

Although provocative, challenging received perspectives and dispositions, Sinai and Palestine was well received ‘at home’ by the British public. On its appearance in 1856 it sold well, running through three editions in the first year, and making money, unlike most books published in the field (Bar-Josef 2005: 94-104). Eventually there were 23 editions, including a shortened version for use in schools. Sinai and Palestine also circulated far and wide. In a striking piece of evidence for the existence of an imperial theology, John Fairfax, founder of the Sydney Morning Herald, presented a copy of Sinai and Palestine to Edward Knox, founder of Colonial Sugar Refineries, in Sydney in 1857. ‘It is a trifle as a gift,’ he wrote, ‘but its value and excellence must be measured by its historic records – proving as they do the truth of that Book, to which, alike in prosperity and adversity, we turn for hope and consolation. It may, too, prepare your mind for visiting those sacred spots – the scenes of the most simple but imposing solemnities of our early Christianity.’ A manifest publishing success, almost 20 years after its publication Sinai and Palestine was acknowledged by the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund as ‘the most widely known of recent books on the subject’ (Palestine Exploration Fund 1873, 11).

Clearly such a book catered for the taste of the educated public. One reason for its appeal was the way it addressed the eagerness to know more about the landscape and places encountered in the Bible arising from its central place in British culture. This interest had recently been intensified owing to the reception of the works of A.H. Layard outlining his discovery of ancient Nineveh. A spate of books on Egyptology also caused excitement about the possibilities of ancient near eastern studies for understanding and perhaps confirming the Bible (Cooper 1856). In view of the critical line he took in relation to contemporary theological orthodoxy, it is not unlikely that Stanley’s place as a member of the Anglican establishment and his reputation as a writer added to the appeal of Sinai and Palestine. It also coincided with a rising interest in scientific exploration and seems to have addressed the critical realism that was beginning to take hold of British literary culture (Martin 1858, Lewes 1858). Stanley’s work was carried along by several currents in contemporary cultural life.

The precise content of the reception is evident at several levels. Privately Stanley’s friends responded warmly. Mrs Arnold was evidently pleased with what Stanley had written, the more so as it stood as a memorial to the influence of her late husband. While Sinai and Palestine fuelled concern about Stanley’s latitudinarianism and soundness on biblical inspiration, at least in the eyes of the Evangelical statesman Lord Shaftesbury, A.C. Tait, his Tutor at Balliol and colleague on the University Commission and now Bishop of London, was undeterred. Shortly after the book came out he made Stanley one of his Examining Chaplains (Davidson & Benham 1891, 1: 208-9). Further endorsement came late in 1856 when he was appointed Professor of Ecclesiastical History by Prime Minister Lord Palmerston after lobbying from the new Dean of Christ Church, H.G. Liddell, and the Master of Pembroke College, Francis Jeune (Prothero & Bradley 1893, 1: 498; Bolitho 1930: 70). Dean Milman of St Paul’s Cathedral, something of a mentor for Stanley, noted in a new edition of the History of the Jews that his protégé had ‘the inimitable gift not only of enabling us to know, but almost to see foreign scenes which we have not had the good fortune ourselves to visit’ (Milman 1883, 1: xxxiv).
Others in the Oxford community were less benign. This was partly why the Tractarians, ever suspicious of the rationalism of the liberals, looked on with dismay when Stanley was appointed Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. John Keble was the most directly affected, for Stanley had paid particular attention to the geographical allusions in the celebrated The Christian Year, which had created some familiarity with the Holy Land in English readers. Keble wrote with thanks for ‘the partial mention, and (what is better) of friendly correction’. He felt obliged also to reveal how pained he was by Stanley’s failure to assert the full divinity of Christ. Keble had, of course, put his finger on the non-dogmatic tone of Stanley’s writing. More broadly, he also highlighted the tensions produced for the Victorians by the Chalcedonian definition of the two natures of Christ when they wrote about his temporal life. Picking up the early church setting of Keble’s criticism, Stanley replied that denying the truth in the Scriptural accounts of Jesus’ growth and teaching would be ‘a direct form of Eutychianism, Apollinarism, or Patripassianism’. His inferences from the topographical evidence on the eve of the Victorian vogue for ‘lives’ of Jesus took Stanley to the heart of one of the emerging theological controversies of the day (Pals 1982).

In public Sinai and Palestine provoked a reaction from individuals with a special interest in the subject. Within a month Charles Forster, rector of Stisted in Essex and an associate of Stanley’s as ‘one of the six preachers of Canterbury Cathedral’, entered the field. In passing through Sinai, Stanley had been obliged to notice the Sinatic Inscriptions, which he dismissed as the casual work (requiring no ladders or special equipment) of Arab pilgrims in the fourth and fifth centuries (51, 59-62). Forster took this as a slight to an important subject (Forster 1856). Invoking ‘the experimental system of philology’ as the only reliable source of truth in such matters, he set out to show that Stanley was wrong about the elevations of the inscriptions, their provenance, number and extent, and, above all, their importance. The natural and only adequate account of the phenomena was that they were the contemporary work of Israelites during their sojourn in the desert, and thus valuable contemporary testimony ‘to the exact veracity of the Mosaic history’. This was especially valuable in the face of the assaults on the Pentateuch by the speculative and sceptical theorizing of German neology with which Forster now associated Stanley. Sinai and Palestine was opposed by those who looked to the biblical landscape as a repository of empirical data in favour of the authenticity of the Bible.

In criticizing prophesy, Stanley had also attacked the powerful ‘Christian evidences’ interest. Indeed, he had singled out for particular attention one of its leading representatives, Alexander Keith (1792-1880), a Free Church of Scotland minister, who in 1823 had written Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Religion From the Fulfilment of Prophecy to answer the scepticism of David Hume. So renowned did this work become that, according to Thomas Chalmers, it was ‘known as a household word throughout the land’, and the author acquired the sobriquet ‘Prophecy Keith’ (Ritchie 2004). His case had always been that the geographical facts as attested by travellers in the Holy Land and the present condition of the Jewish race were literal fulfilments of prophecy which authenticated the Bible. Like Forster, he made appeal to the known facts, and maintained in a new edition of his celebrated work that they were against Stanley’s ‘poetical interpretations’ (Keith 1861). As travellers (including himself) had shown repeatedly, the remains of hundreds of ruined towns and cities attested the literal truth of the prophecies concerning them. Keith also alleged that Stanley’s treatment of the biblical evidence minimized both the testimony to prophesy and the evidence against his own alternatives. By associating Stanley with rationalists of the order of Hume and Gibbon, Sinai and Palestine was aligned with a long tradition of anti-Christian works which unsuccessfully impugned the Bible as a divinely inspired revelation.

Apart from interested individuals Sinai and Palestine had to run the gamut of the periodical press, for the Victorians the crucible in which public opinion was made and influence achieved. Predictably the church press (Altholz 1989), one of its main subdivisions directed to a particular class of readers, took a deep interest in Stanley’s book. In principle the reviewers approved of what he had attempted (Anon. 1856a, b, c; Anon. 1860a). The relation of the biblical writers to the external world was an important consideration; too much light could not be thrown upon the Bible; and the scientific approach settled many difficulties. Stanley was also regarded as an admirable observer, an important attribute when there were so many books on the subject, most of which were not good. He had, in fact, enabled the reader to travel to the lands of patriarch, prophet and the Saviour himself (Anon. 1860b: 410). There was wide agreement too that Sinai and Palestine was a valuable tool for getting the most out of the Bible. Christian writers found much that they could endorse and use.

The mainstream press was also distinctly favourable. The heterodox Westminster Review led the wider response to Sinai and Palestine with a brief but positive notice (Froude 1856: 251-2). Thereafter in substantial articles Fraser’s Magazine, the Edinburgh, North British, and Quarterly Review were enthusiastic. They commended Stanley’s research and the quality of his writing. On the subject matter the Quarterly assigned Sinai and Palestine its place among the works which ‘during the last half century [have] done more than all the centuries which preceded it, in furnishing an exact topographical basis for the facts of Sacred history’ (Conybeare 1859: 370). Fraser’s went much further:

For the first time the Holy Land is really brought near to us; for the first time we see it as it is and as it has been, and for the first time we have been made to feel that the history, the manners, and the literature of the Jews were in a wonderful degree
the reflection of the land in which they lived ... Mr. Stanley ... may almost be said to have discovered Palestine for us (Sanders 1856: 336).

Something of the benefit was evident in the likely appeal of the region:

... even independently of their doctrinal importance, or of the polemical or antiquarian illustrations to be derived from them, there is an intrinsic charm in these scenes to which no cultivated (not to say religious) mind can be insensitive. Without caring to determine the precise locality of every interesting incident, there are few imaginations, except of the very rudest, which will be dead to the influences of such a region (Russell 1856: 367).

The real basis of Stanley's success, however, was the place he assigned to the land in universal history:

What is really original in Mr. Stanley's treatment of the subject, is the bold, though thoroughly religious spirit in which he has transferred the study from the narrow field of Biblical archaeology to its true place in the general science of man; reverently gathering towards this sacred spot, as the one great centre of man's destiny, all the devious and delicate threads which converge thitherwards in the tangled web of history, and whose convergence, distinctly traceable, appears for a philosophical mind, to convert into a historical reality that simple belief still expressed in some of the mediaeval maps of the world ... which exhibit Jerusalem as the literal centre of the earth (Russell 1856: 382-3).

Dealing with a subject of high importance, Sinai and Palestine was the kind of writing the educated public wanted. The periodical press granted the success of Stanley's aspirations and allowed his book a place in the public literature of the day.

This appearance of public success was qualified by several criticisms. Timidity and indecisiveness, carelessness with the details and adapting facts to suit theories were among the alleged general and methodological shortcomings. Within the church press Stanley’s natural turn was seen generally to undermine the reverence due to the Bible as an authority given by inspiration of God (Anon. 1856d; Anon. 1857a & b). Of the particular misgivings, the first was Stanley’s sympathy with biblical criticism. His views were seen to rest on intellectual processes rather than on the inherent authority of Scripture, while his treatment of some biblical events was representative of ‘the profanation of neologian criticism’. Most prevalent was concern about Stanley’s treatment of the miracles of the Bible. His interest in natural causes was criticized as ‘deluded’, even ‘contemptible’, while one writer worried that attempting to find the relation between natural causation and the divine opened the way to eliminating the divine altogether. Even more disturbing to two reviewers were the Christological implications. One objected to the sense of limitation implicit in finding the influence of the setting on Christ’s mind. To the suggestion that the imminence of his death ‘dawned upon’ him, the other exclaimed:

What low ideas of the divinity of Christ does it not betray! What a debased and carnal creed does it not evince! What awful thoughts of the very eternal God (Anon. 1857c: 133-4).

With much in Sinai and Palestine offensive to received perspectives in contemporary Christianity, its wider program of reform commended itself to few.

Whatever the critical response, Stanley’s work boosted British topographical studies and encouraged further work on the historical geography of the biblical lands in the years to come. The connection between Sinai and Palestine and subsequent work is clearest in the case of George Grove, later to be knighted for his services as editor of the Dictionary of Music and Musicians and as founder of the Royal College of Music, but in the 1850s still an up and coming young man looking for opportunities to prove himself (Graves 1903; Young 1980: ch. 4; Young 2003). Stanley had engaged him to verify the details and help with the Appendix. The collaboration created in Grove a vision for what might yet be done and an incipient capacity for doing it. He found his opportunity in the Bible dictionary in preparation at the time under the direction of Sir William Smith, a work intended to ‘elucidate the antiquities, biography, geography, and natural history of the Old Testament, New Testament, and Apocrypha’ based ‘on a fresh examination of the original documents, and embodying the results of the most recent researches and discoveries’ (Smith 1863, I: vii). As well as writing for the project, Grove emerged as Smith’s principal assistant. The work induced him to go out to Egypt and Palestine in 1858 (and to the latter again in 1861) to see the region for himself. Among the results were substantial articles on such subjects as ‘Bethlehem’, ‘Oives, Mount of’, ‘Palestine’ and ‘Sea, The Salt’ as Grove became ‘the most voluminous and industrious contributor’ to the Dictionary (Smith 1863, I: 201-3, II: 623-9, 660-96; III: 1173-87). In 1864 Grove also agreed to play a supervisory part in the production of Smith’s Atlas of Ancient Geography, Biblical and Classical, while three years later he became the editor responsible for entries under ‘Sacred Places, Art, and Furniture, AD 50-850’ for the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. Inclusion of topographical approaches through the work of men like Groves in works institutionalizing verifiable biblical knowledge was a marker of the success of Stanley’s enterprise. From this establishment of ‘sacred topography’ in biblical studies there could be no turning back.

Sinai and Palestine was also rapidly absorbed into the genre. Its immediate impact is reflected in the reviews, some of which, essays on the Holy Land in their own right, drew on it as a source (eg. Bonar 1857). Its importance is also shown by the editor’s special mention of Stanley’s book with Robinson’s Biblical Researches ‘as works of constant reference in the geographical articles’ in the
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new Bible dictionary (Smith 1863, I: ix-x). Thereafter *Sinai and Palestine* continued as a basis for subsequent topographical surveys and the model for the thousands of books on the Holy Land published in the last third of the 19th century (Ben-Arieh 1989: 74). Almost forty years after its appearance, the method was taken to its high point of achievement by George Adam Smith’s *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (Smith 1931).26 Like *Sinai and Palestine*, it was grounded in a direct encounter with the Holy Land, Smith having visited in 1880 and 1891. But two changes in the intervening decades gave rise to the need for a new account. One was the considerable progress in exploration and discovery. The other was the impact of biblical criticism. Smith observed: ‘The relation of the geographical materials at our disposal and the methods of historical reconstruction have been altered by Old Testament science, since, for instance, Dean Stanley wrote *Sinai and Palestine.*’ (Smith 1931: xiv) To those who doubted its value, Smith replied ‘that there is no sphere in which the helpfulness of criticism, in removing difficulties and explaining contradictions, has been more apparent than in biblical Geography’ (Smith 1931: xv). Had he still been alive, Stanley would have supported Smith’s bringing the approach up to the knowledge of the age, but the credit for ensuring the material evidence was considered in the British attempt to interpret the Bible in the modern world remained with Stanley.

*Sinai and Palestine* was likewise very enabling for the larger task of interpreting the Old Testament historically. Regarding illustrations from geography as his ‘special contribution to the subject’, Stanley drew extensively on his earlier work as he prepared his *Lectures on the Jewish Church* as Professor of Ecclesiastical History (Stanley 1885, I: 23). John Rogerson has noted that the Lectures are not particularly critical in aspiration or content (Rogerson 1984: 238-42), but in the theologially turbulent 1860s this was their great value. In the wake of *Essays and Reviews* and the controversial works of Bishop Colenso, the Lectures mediated an historical approach to the Old Testament that, a generation after Milman’s *History of the Jews*, was still a shock to the Hebrew sensibility of the Victorians. The vividness of Stanley’s depictions of the background and scenes of the history was reckoned as one of its particular strengths. To that extent they provided a measure of reassurance and contributed to acceptance of an historical standpoint. *Sinai and Palestine* had been the beginning of a reputation in an important and increasingly contested domain of cultural authority.

*Sinai and Palestine* also left Stanley as the recognized British authority on travel and exploration in the Holy Land through the mid-Victorian years. This status became evident at the level of the leadership elite when he was asked to accompany the Prince of Wales on a tour to the Middle East in 1862. The Prince Consort had selected Stanley as the best person for the task after reading *Sinai and Palestine*, and when he died the Queen persisted with his choice. This not only gave Stanley a second tour; it also opened doors and provided opportunities he had not had ten years previously (Bolitho 1930: ch. VI-IX). One result was a delineation of the spiritual and national implications of the region for the British in response to the Prince’s need of guidance and instruction (Stanley 1863). The second tour was also the basis of a corrected and enlarged edition of *Sinai and Palestine*. Association with the royal tour was no doubt one reason for its continuing appeal.

At a more popular level Stanley emerged as something of a senior statesman in a rapidly burgeoning field of interest. As the Holy Land opened up in the 1860s he was asked to write letters of introduction for various travellers (eg. Stoughton 1894: 145). More seriously, having recognized from the first the need for further discovery and excavation, he supported efforts to finance serious exploration of the region through the foundation of the Palestine Exploration Fund (Moscrop 2000: 64-72; Graves 1903: 117-23, 275-6). Not only did he allow the use of his name, but he also made available the Jerusalem Chamber at the Abbey for meetings and subsequently served on the Executive when the Fund was set up. Once underway it sponsored archaeological excavations and extensive mapping that transformed British knowledge of the Holy Land. But the Fund was always strapped for cash. When it reported on its activities in 1871, Stanley was asked to write a commendatory ‘Introduction’ (Morrison 1871). A word from the author of *Sinai and Palestine* in matters relating to travel and exploration in the Holy Land was considered a great help to the cause.

**Conclusion**

By this point the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund, the advent of photography and the beginning of Cook’s Tours to the Holy Land changed the situation Stanley had addressed in the early 1850s (Larsen 2004). These developments both reflected and contributed to a wide acceptance of the need for a realistic apprehension of the Holy Land (Rule 1871). That *Sinai and Palestine* dated rapidly against this background of advancing knowledge and a greater general awareness of the physical reality of the biblical landscape was a sign of its success in engaging Britain with the world ‘out there’. Its purpose ‘at home’ was more contested. Written in part to promote a non-dogmatic, inclusive, morally directed Christianity based on free and open enquiry, *Sinai and Palestine* ran into the strident conservatism of early Victorian Christianity. That the historical geographical approach was a great help to understanding the world of the Bible was admitted on all sides. But the inferences for the shaping of a truly biblical Christianity in Britain were resisted by representatives of the supernaturalistic and dogmatic popular Protestantism that found its strength partly in the metaphorical apprehension of the Holy Land. While his book did become the British authority on the region for the early Victorian generation, at the second level of encounter the biblical landscape did not carry the day for Stanley’s liberal
Anglican project. Important as it was for contemporary academic discourse, *Sinai and Palestine* achieved only part of its author’s purpose.

Geoffrey R. Treloar
Basser College,
University of New South Wales

### Appendix

**Periodicals Examined for the Reception of *Sinai and Palestine***

- British and Foreign Evangelical Review
- British Quarterly Review
- Christian Observer
- Christian Remembrancer
- Christian Witness and Church Members Magazine
- Church of England Magazine
- Church of England Monthly Review
- Church of England Quarterly Review
- Dublin Review
- Ecclesiastic and Theologian
- Edinburgh Review
- Evangelical Repository: *A Quarterly Journal of Theological Literature*
- Fraser’s Magazine for Town and Country
- General Baptist Repository and Missionary Observer
- Journal of Sacred Literature
- London Quarterly Review
- National Review
- North British Review
- Wesleyan Methodist Magazine
- Westminster Review
- Quarterly Review

**Selected Bibliography of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley**

- 1854a ‘Sacred Geography,’ *Quarterly Review* 94: 353-84.
- 1856 *Sinai and Palestine in Connection With Their History*, London, John Murray.
- 1885 *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church*, London, John Murray, 3 vols [originally published between 1863 and 1876].
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Endnotes

1 The principal biographical source is Prothero & Bradley 1893. See also Bolitho 1930; & Hammond 1987, the basis of his entry in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, consulted on-line.

2 Stanley and Gladstone are compared in Edwards 1971, ch. 5.

3 The book was substantially revised after the second visit. I have used the ‘New Edition’ of 1896 for Stanley’s more considered account.

4 The main accounts are Ben-Arieh 1979, Silberman 1982 & Shepherd 1987. Sinai and Palestine is not considered in the older accounts of Bliss 1906 & Hilprecht 1903.

5 Stanley 1880 is an act of filial piety that provides an account of the home in which Stanley was raised and the ecclesiastical ideals he made his own.

6 Stanley’s articles included 1847b, 1850a, 1853a, 1854b & 1855.


8 On landscape in general, I have been informed by Matthew Johnson 2007.

9 Other letters from the Holy Land are included in Prothero 1895: 183-245.

10 For an account of how the letters were written and then received at home, see Hare 1895: 49, 62-3.

11 On which see Stafford 1999 & Kennedy 2007.

12 Stanley 1850a & 1850b evince his admiration for Niebuhr and the ‘scientific investigations’ of George Grote.

13 See further below for Stanley’s treatment of ‘the Holy Places’.

14 This interest is even stronger in later editions. See 123-6 in the ‘New Edition’ of 1896.
The maps and sections become increasingly sophisticated in successive editions.

See below on Stanley’s treatment of the biblical prophecy. In this respect it is a significant development from Stanley 1853b which was written just after his return from the East. Given classic expression in Forbes 1952. See also Bowler 1989 & Parker 1990.

In a later edition he read this same relation into the countryside: ‘In the localities as in the events and in the teaching of the Sacred History, the saying is true—Vetus Testamentum in Nove patet; Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet.’ See the 1896 edition, 416.

John Fairfax to Edward Knox, 11 November 1857, Knox Family Papers, 1835-1928, Mitchell Library MSS 98/142. I owe this reference to my friend Dr Stuart Johnson.

Timothy Larsen, ‘Austen Henry Layard’s Nineveh: The Bible and Archaeology in Victorian Britain,’ forthcoming in the Journal of Religious History. I am grateful to Professor Larsen for supplying me with an advance copy of this article.

Cf. Smith 1859. Earlier attitudes are touched on in Gange 2006.

Stanley to Mrs Arnold, 20 February 1856, in Prothero 1895: 246-7. The date assigned to this letter is incorrect. Sinai and Palestine was published in March.

Keble to Stanley, 8 July 1856, and Stanley to Keble, 10 July 1856, in Prothero & Bradley 1893, I: 481-4.

Shattock & Wolff 1982, esp. the Introduction and the first two essays. The periodicals examined to gauge the reception of Sinai and Palestine are listed in the Appendix above.

Smith’s Historical Geography of the Holy Land was first published in 1894.