



## BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Baird, Jennifer (2024) Reading field diaries against the grain: the notable and the absent in Syrian archaeology. *Journal of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology and Heritage Studies* 12 (1), pp. 20-34. ISSN 21663548.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/51502/>

*Usage Guidelines:*

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>  
contact [lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk).

or alternatively

## **Reading Field Diaries against the Grain: The Notable and the Absent in Syrian Archaeology**

Abstract: Before standardised context forms, before section drawing, and before photography, archaeology was recorded in field notebooks. Field diaries are perhaps the archetypal archaeological document both in the field and in the archive, and they persist in various contemporary forms as a key means of recording. Drawing on archaeological field diaries made in Syria during the French Mandate, in particular those of Clark Hopkins at Dura-Europos and Harald Ingholt at Palmyra, this article looks to the inclusions, elisions, and absences in archaeological field notebooks, and asks whether it might be possible to re-examine the history of Mandate-era archaeology in Syria through them.

Keywords: Archaeological Field Diary; Notebooks; Dura-Europos; Palmyra; Syrian Archaeology; Archaeological Labour

### **Introduction**

If you were to encounter them entirely online, you perhaps wouldn't notice how nicely they fit in your hand. How easily they could have slipped into a jacket pocket. It's easy to forget that the words and images that became the authoritative accounts of Middle Eastern archaeology began in simple notebooks. The grand engravings of Robert Wood's book which introduced Palmyra to the West (Wood 1753) began as pencil sketches in Borra's slight 19cm wide sketchbook (Baird and Kamash 2019) (Fig. 1). Even much later notebooks are now yellowing: notebooks, like that of Clark Hopkins when he was field director of the Dura-Europos expedition in Mandate-era Syria, have been returned to again and again in the archives where

they are held at Yale (Fig. 2). Its bindings are finally starting to come loose, after almost a century. <Insert Figures 1 and 2 here>

Archaeological notebooks are worth looking to, alongside a trowel, as an archetypal signifier of archaeological fieldwork (if we need verification of that, we need of course need look no further than the archetypal archaeologist of popular culture, Indiana Jones, and his father's Grail diary). A type of recording used since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, they were long ubiquitous a means of archaeological documentation (Mickel 2015, 301–2). But more than an archetype, field notebooks are primary evidence. What I want to question is what we might consider them to be evidence *of*. That is, not only are they an archival source, being holders of overlooked archaeological data, but also places where different traces might be explored. I'll do this through two case studies of major archaeological projects undertaken in Syria during the time of the French Mandate: the field diaries of Clark Hopkins at Dura-Europos, now held in the Dura-Europos archive in the Yale University Art Gallery, and those of Harald Ingholt, made at Palmyra and now held in Copenhagen at the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, and recently published online and in print (Ingholt et al. 2021). I'll begin by looking at absences in the notebooks, before exploring whether reading against the grain of notebooks such as these can open up alternative geographies of archaeological sites which might allow us to consider different types of knowledge they contain.

Archaeological archives like those of Dura-Europos and Palmyra are often not treated and catalogued like more traditional or formal archives. Not carefully divided into fonds, not numbered with careful systems. Rather, they live in museums and galleries where they have a different status, that of documentation: documentation supporting collections material (Baird 2023). In both of the examples I examine here - archives from the Syrian archaeological sites

of Palmyra and Dura-Europos - that is the case, with the archives being secondary to the “real” material, the archaeological objects. Indeed, ‘archaeological archives’ is broadly a category which has been retrospectively invented, in part to deal with backlogged field data, although recent years have seen a shift in attention towards archaeological archives as a subject in their own right (Baird and McFadyen 2014; Riggs 2017; Hitchcock 2020; Ward 2022). Nonetheless, this status of archaeological records as secondary is one that should probably worry us, one among many crises to do with the storage of the vast amount of archaeological ‘stuff’ the discipline generates (Brusius, Singh, and Kersel 2017).

Most archaeological researchers are likely to have encountered institutions where archaeological documents are not treated properly as archives, institutions where no one knows whether the archive you’re looking for even exists, still less where it is, to say nothing of whether or not access will be permitted. But even in institutions where they keep good track of their archaeological archives and allow access to them, one of the consequences of this status of archaeological archives as supporting documentation rather than archival material itself, is that the *users* of such archives are rarely tracked. But, traces of those users are materially preserved in the wear on the documents. Among other things, those loosened bindings on Clark Hopkins’ notebooks record the wear of disappointment, the wear of many years’ worth of researchers hoping to find some forgotten or overlooked evidence for the synagogue of Dura-Europos (the site’s most studied monument), and failing to find it. But, in hope of discovering something others have overlooked, researchers keep returning to it.

That search, for facts jotted down in the field but not published, and broadly the extraction of archaeological data, is often what is invoked in the discourse surrounding preservation and digitisation of archaeological archives. Field notebooks are records of a primary encounter, so

they record primary archaeological data (Pavel 2010). Don't they? This presumed use of notebooks in preserving primary archaeological data is behind attempts, sometimes, to extract and preserve such information. It's behind digitization efforts, too. For an example we can look to the other, western, side of ancient Syria, to Antioch, whose excavation archive was made available online in 2021. The Antioch project is impressive, rightly boasting that its "rich archival holdings have the potential to provide wide-ranging insights into the history, life, and material culture of the ancient city..." (Antioch Archives Announcement, dated August 2021, <https://artandarchaeology.princeton.edu/news/major-new-online-resource-study-ancient-antioch-launched>, Accessed June 2022). But as can be seen in this example, it is another archaeological digitisation a project which is explicitly about allowing access to *ancient* Antioch rather than their role in contextualising the archaeology itself.

When I first went looking for the Dura-Europos notebooks in the archive of the Yale-French expedition, I was handed typescripts (Fig. 3). At some point, I think in the 1970s, some diligent soul working in the Yale Art Gallery typed up the notebooks of the expedition – this was done, I presume, for convenience. No more squinting at idiosyncratic handwriting or flipping through crumbling yellowed paper (Fig. 4). The typescripts did other things, though. While they are not explicit about doing so, they extracted information that was considered "pure" archaeology, and they left out other matters: in this case, the typed notes dutifully transcribed comments on pottery and architecture, but left out the text on the weather, or about the workmen, or the descriptions of instructions which had arrived in the post from the scientific directors of the expedition. Indeed, the typescripts for the 1928 field season start three days after the diary entries begin in the actual site notebook, because those first days are devoted entirely to setting up the excavation and arrangements with the workmen. The days that were cut from the typescripts include much detail about the physical nature of the work, about labour relations:

describing workmen who did not like having to wait to be paid, and the foreman daring to ask for time off to see his sister be married. For example, let's examine the following entry, which was not included in the typescript version of the diary:

Fri. Oct 26. At six there were no workmen. Almost thirty turned up by half past and work was begun. Rocks were carried all day. Friday didn't seem a sufficient reason for keeping the workmen away. It was suggested that they didn't like carrying rocks + that they didn't like not being paid every day. Joe [Jotham Johnson] spent the day at the gate with inscriptions, Dairaines went to Deir [Deir ez-Zor]. M. Pillet had fever + did not get up till noon. *Tout va mal* [Fr., 'everything is going wrong'] he said in the afternoon when Victor [Victor Assal, "first native overseer" (Pillet 1933, 1)] asked for time off to see his sister married in Aleppo.

This typescript is an instructive case of what can happen when decisions are made which are meant to make archives more accessible, decisions that those making them probably think are banal or benign. Typing up a notebook so it's easier to read is one such decision, but as we can see in this case, that recording decision is also about what is, or is not, important to preserve and record. These decisions, whether to do with adapting analogue typescripts or choosing what to digitise amongst archival material, are also about what is or is not considered to be archaeological data. It's those aspects – the matters not considered, perhaps, to be proper archaeology, but that are preserved in archaeological notebooks that I now turn to. That is, perhaps the notes which don't record any "proper" archaeology are the ones with more to tell us about our discipline than is usually assumed. <Insert Figure 3 and 4 near here>

### **Absences: "No Special Finds"**

Dura-Europos was not substantially reoccupied after its fall to the Sassanians in the third century AD, and so it is a site without a heavy overburden of fill concealing the archaeological layers (Baird 2012). Ancient objects glint on the surface after every rainfall: the ease of access to vast numbers of ancient objects is one of the reasons the site has been such a tragically fertile target for looters in the period since the start of the Syrian conflict (Baird and Almohamad 2023; Casana 2015; Brodie and Sabrine 2018; Gelin and Abdul Massih 2016). Given this bounty, it is remarkable just how often Clark Hopkins, who participated in the Dura

excavations for almost a decade, including leading them as field director for half that time, reported in his notebooks that they had not found anything special that day (Figure 5). Over and over, Hopkins records in his field diaries that he has nothing important to record. “No special finds” gestures towards the bulk of archaeology after all: fragmentary things, mundane things, pot sherds, beads and coins. Nothing special, nothing as noteworthy as the mail arriving, which was worth writing down. <Insert Figure 5>

Notes such as Hopkins allow us to understand the type of motivations and selectivity of our archaeological knowledge. There is a clear threshold for what Hopkins thinks is worth recording: things that are special include things with writing on them (this is a tradition that continues in some quarters, of course, but we tend to be a little more explicit about our collection methodologies these days). We also can gain insight into methodologies and interpretations which don’t make it into the publications but which were formative, and revealing. For instance looking again to Hopkins’ 1928 field diary, on October 29 he describes a find of pottery with Greek letters on it: in his diary, he notes this pottery is “interesting because it shows that we are down to the Greek level”. The idea that Greek language on pottery might be equated with the Greek era (by which he can only mean the Hellenistic period) in Syria is of course facile, with Greek being spoken and written long beyond this time, as Hopkins must have eventually learned, because this error doesn’t appear in the publications. And yet, there is equation of language and culture at Dura which has continued, to this day, to be pervasive in the site’s interpretation (Baird 2018, 85–86).

Other absences are material ones: if you’ve excavated in the field, you might wonder how these notebooks were kept quite so clean. The answer is often that the pen was the only tool archaeologists like Hopkins ever touched. Recently, histories of archaeological labour have

begun to be reconsidered, and in some cases credit is now being assigned where it has been long overdue (Mickel 2019; 2021). But in Hopkins' notebooks, the workers are almost entirely nameless (on nameless archaeological workers, Shepherd 2003, 335), usually appearing at the top of diary entries for each day only as numbers, or occasionally as lists or partial names (Figures 6, 7), in a contrast with Ingholt at Palmyra as will be discussed below. We can nonetheless get a clear sense from Hopkins' notes of the scale of labour, of how many men and boys were employed each day, and the way that archaeology relied heavily on very exploitative working practices including extensive use of child labour (Baird 2018, 42). In notations like Hopkins', the diaries at least give us a sense of what we're missing, that is, any credit for or attention to workers' experiences on expeditions like those at Dura. Similar working practices, if on a smaller scale, are also alluded to in Ingholt's work on the tombs at Palmyra at around the same time: short and precarious periods of employment, for instance with brief mentions of workers sent home without noting why: Ingholt's Diary for November 1928 (Figure 8) says only "Sent home: Ahmar Hamra, Mug. Agîl, Abdallah Haleî." Diary 4.20, 1928, (Ingholt et al. 2021, 928–29). Syrian workers and their bodies are instrumentalised in different ways in the two different contemporary sites, but in both they are a means to an end. <Insert Figure 6, 7, 8 near here>

Rubina Raja has pointed out that Ingholt has his own more glaring absences in what he mentions: for instance, that he must have witnessed the work of the clearance of the village from the temple of Bel in the late 1920, but he doesn't say anything about this (Raja in Ingholt et al. 2021, 29; Chevalier 312-313). Field diaries are not just a matter of the recording of archaeological data, they're an insight into the values and motivations and understandings of their authors. Across the Middle East, in archaeological projects conducted by colonial powers, contemporary inhabitants were treated as barriers to accessing the true past, and places like



Syria were treated as though antiquity was all that mattered. This continued after expeditions ceased due to the war, and one wartime headline in the *Illustrated London News* read “Ancient Syria, where France still clings to her mandate: A land of classic ruins newly threatened by the Axis powers” (Figure 9), and among the images that illustrating the headline was none other than a plate from Poidebard’s *Trace de Rome* (Poidebard 1934, pl. LXVII). Like the overburden they were employed to remove, local people themselves were considered to be in the way of recovering an antiquity which has been framed as European. The concern with ruins, and not people, during times of conflict in Syria has sadly continued until the present day. In the next section, I will argue that the paternalistic condescension towards local people at archaeological sites in Syria in such narratives is at odds with the situation on the ground as attested in the records of those very same archaeological sites, if we read between the lines.

<Insert Figure 9>

### **Alternative Geographies**

What can we glean from field notebooks, if we read between the absences left sometimes glaringly empty, and read into the notes which did not enter the authorised narratives of archaeological publications? I think we can begin to use Ingholt’s diaries to provide an alternative geography of 1920s Palmyra not as a ruin but as a living community. His diaries document many important Palmyrene inscriptions and finds, as the published commentary on those diaries demonstrates very well, including preserving a number of objects and inscriptions not otherwise known (Ingholt et al. 2021). But what they also show is the deep reliance of Ingholt on local knowledge without which he never would have found or recorded those inscriptions and objects.

In Ingholt’s second diary, sketched in between transcriptions of Palmyrene Aramaic texts, is a little map to part of the town (Diary 2.76, Ingholt et al. 2021, 652–53) in which he recovered the objects he documented (Figure 10). On one corner is Joseph’s shop, and on the other side of the street, the entrance to the military canteen. X marks the spot of a note that says “hic!”, probably meant to indicate the findspot of one of the inscriptions. In making memory aids for himself like this little sketch map, Ingholt incidentally tells us about the circumstances in which he obtains many of the inscriptions and tesserae which are the key documentation of ancient Palmyra: he’s in a living community, and he doesn’t excavate the objects and inscriptions but is *guided to them or sold them* by local people who knew the site, their home, much better than he did. People of the site, of course, had been providing such services to travellers for many years, with guidebooks advising foreigners on what to purchase there (Baedeker et al. 1912, 344) <Insert Figure 10>

There are dozens of examples of this in Ingholt’s diaries, and indeed aside from the tombs which he has cleared by workers, many if not most of the objects he “finds” are recovered this way: he records them explicitly as having been brought them, or having been shown to them, by local informants. From the first of Ingholt’s diaries, a few examples make the point (Table 1), but there are almost two hundred examples of Ingholt acquiring objects from or through local people in the diaries (Baird, Kamash, and Raja forthcoming). <Insert Table 1>

**Table 1. Finding Palmyrene objects in Ingholt’s Diary (1924): selected examples**

PAT=Hillers and Cussini 1996

Findspot	Object	Date	Informant	Reference (Ingholt et al 2021)
Chez Abdallah, nephew of the sheikh, west of the police station	Inscription (PAT 0396)	1924		Diary 1, p20
Chez Mohammed	Inscription	1924		Diary 1, p21

In the house of the interpreter, in a stone on the floor (taken from the north east side of the ancient town)	Inscription (Greek)	1924		Diary 1, p23
In a house in the temple [of Bel?]	Inscription (Bilingual)	March 27, 1924		Diary 1, p50
Bedouin Yard	Altar (PAT 0380)	March 29, 1924		Diary 1, p54
House no. 3 from "la popote" towards the east (house of Abdallah el-Fard?)	Relief	March 30, 1924	Jebbour and El-Moukdar	Diary 1, p54
In the henhouse	Relief	March 30, 1924		Diary 1 p55
	Inscription (PAT 1430)	March 30, 1924	Hadj. Houssain el Nesser el Bregheet	Diary 1 p56
Chez Ali Obeid?	Inscription (PAT 0369)	1924		Diary 1 p57
Chez Ali el-Houssain	Altar (PAT 0380)	1924		Diary 1 p57
Chez Zaher el-Khatib	Inscription on a bowl	1924		Diary 1 p58
In a house in the temple [of Bel?]	Greek inscription	1924		Diary 1 p59

As is clear in Table 1, inscriptions are often coming from people's houses or land (Ingholt notes these a source: just *chez* whomever); he names them, I think in part, so he remembers where on the site they are from, as a topographic locator. If there's no name given, he often uses other ways to spatially locate the findspot, for instance here, "house no. 3 from the *popote* [the military canteen]", or even, from "the henhouse". Sometimes, there's an amount of currency indicated, presumably the price he's paid for the object; other times, he transcribes the text of the inscription and notes having made a squeeze. There are exceptions that prove the rule, though, and when Ingholt finds things himself, without being guided to it by local informants, he's emphatic about it. This is the case on March 27, 1924, for example: "Fragment of an altar, found *by myself* in a garden near the house of the interpreter, to the right of the field of plaster objects..." (Diary 1.49 Ingholt et al. 2021, 192–93, emphasis added). With this information in the diaries, we get a sense of the kind of context that are left out of the epigraphic corpora where the inscriptions end up. Where Hopkins often finds "nothing special" at Dura-

Europos, Ingholt *only* finds special things at Palmyra: because someone else has usually found them first.

In the first Palmyra diary made by Ingholt, in 1924, one name, Jebbour, comes up repeatedly, not only guiding Ingholt to inscriptions but interpreting things Ingholt sees around him, such as an entry that records for a symbol which Ingholt notices on modern buildings, which Jebbour tells him is apotropaic, to ward off the evil eye (Diary 1.60 Ingholt et al. 2021, 214–15). Later in that diary is the appearance of a man named Hijjār, who similarly helps Ingholt find and purchase objects. For example, on April 27, 1924 he notes “Bought tesserae with Hijjār”, and “Went with Hijjār to the village, bought 2 lamps; 1/4 M and 1B, 4 tesserae at 1B each...” (Diary 1.79 Ingholt et al. 2021, 254–55). Jebbour and Hijjār are not the names that have made it into the history of Palmyra’s study, but from the diaries we can at least use Ingholt’s own writing to decentre him, to demonstrate clearly that he didn’t do it alone (Baird, Kamash, and Raja 2023). These same descriptions allow us to problematise the notion that sites like Palmyra were empty spaces whose archaeology was there waiting to be discovered, a notion that is I think deliberately created, first through drawings and engravings and then through photography, which generally crops out the local community (Fig. 11) (Baird 2011). While the images of Palmyra in our heads and on our book covers are familiar views of the monumental architecture, Ingholt’s own diaries show that these were not where the story of Palmyra comes from: the inscriptions and tesserae through which so much of Palmyra’s tale is known come from hen houses, from garden walls, the floors of contemporary buildings, and the inhabitants of the local community themselves (Fig.12). Palmyra was not an empty ruin, but a place full of people, people who provided Ingholt with just what he needed to become an authority on Palmyrene archaeology. <Insert Figures 11, 12>

The different encounters and relationships between Hopkins and Ingholt and the Syrians they worked with are partially due to the nature of the sites: at Dura, the site itself was uninhabited, with workers coming from the nearby villages. At Palmyra, Ingholt's closer relationships with a number of local people is partly a function of the lively inhabited town that Tadmor was at the time he was there. What the two sites share is that in the resultant academic publications, the local peoples and labourers are usually entirely invisible. Popular coverage, such as the *London Times*, however, describes how "good results have been obtained" by Ingholt through his skill at "extracting information from the Arabs", alluding to precisely the reliance on local knowledge that we see in the notebooks, if not in favourable or fair terms (Fig 13). <Insert Figure 13 here>

Palmyra is of course well known for its tombs and the remains from them, and among those people upon whom Ingholt relied were also the men who cleared the tombs. This work was sometimes reluctant, as the diaries record, (e.g. Diary 2, 35, Ingholt et al. 2021, 571), when Ingholt writes that "Hijjâr and Muh. did not dare work alone in the tomb for fear of 'burnâri'". We have incomplete names of Ingholt's workers who dug the tombs for him: some men are known only by their first name, such as Abderrahman, or Da'as, at least as far as Ingholt transcribed them. But, in his diaries, we do have their fingerprints (Fig. 14) (Diary 1, final pages (unpaginated) Ingholt et al. 2021, 374–85). As visible on these diary pages, inked fingerprints of workers were pressed into Ingholt's diaries, in receipt of their pay. Perhaps Ingholt's use of fingerprints was pragmatic because the workers couldn't sign their names. But there is no escaping the fact this is a colonial technology, developed by the British in India during the 19<sup>th</sup> century as a means of keeping track of the colonial population by creating "a link between an individual body and a paper record" (quote from Cole 2002, 4, see also 75-77; Weitzberg 2020; Asen 2020). But in Ingholt's diary, the fingerprints often overlap and

wouldn't have actually been useful as records which could be checked to authenticate an individual—indicating that it was the act of making the fingerprint, into the notebooks, which was important. Once again Syrian bodies are literally pressed into service. How long did the ink linger on their fingers? Longer than the meagre pay, the small change they received in return for their labour which these lists record? Much from this encounter is unrecoverable, but from archaeological notebooks and such traces as these it is possible to understand more about the labour on which our archaeological knowledge is contingent. That knowledge came through the extraction of local knowledge, sometimes through hard labour and through precarious employment, and often under varying degrees of duress. <Insert Figure 14 here>

### **Conclusion: Traces we can attend to**

Notebooks like those discussed in this article are small, personal items. Things that you hold in your hand, keep close in a jacket pocket. And the fingerprints of the people who not only cleared the earth from the tombs of Palmyra for Ingholt but who showed him where everything was, could have only gotten there with close physical encounters, too – the fingerprints pressed into Ingholt's notebooks are a direct physical trace of the people who were instrumental in our understanding of Palmyra, even if they're rarely credited. They are *impressions of people* just like the squeezes Ingholt took were impressions of inscriptions. Nonetheless, through Ingholt, we at least know some of their names.

Attending to traces like these impressions, things that are *not* the archaeological data which we are usually looking to extract from legacy data, provide an opportunity to read against the grain of the records of our discipline. Yes, those records hold absences – sometimes those absences speak volumes – but there are also presences which we can attend to. Hopkins and Ingholt, in their notebooks, write to their future selves. Indeed, Ingholt used his diaries for decades,

continuing to make notes on them. Both men deposited their notebooks in institutions – in New Haven and Copenhagen respectively – precisely because they wanted them to have a legacy. What I want to suggest is that we can use those notebooks to attend to the legacies of others, too. In Ingholt's diaries, we can read the transformation of ancient Palmyrene material culture from the fabric of a living community into cultural property with a specific price in Syrian piasters or French francs. But we can also look to the diaries to see *who really knew* where to find those things, and who might now be credited with the production of the archaeological knowledge we hold so dear (Mickel 2019, 17).

Archaeological archives are in their very existence a colonial instrument, but our use of them, as noted by Anne Laura Stoler in the context of colonial archives, has been extractive rather than ethnographic (Stoler 2002, 87). From Ingholt's diaries, we can read not only the extraction and reconfiguration of the Palmyrene past, its objects packed up and shipped to Copenhagen and elsewhere, but the reconfiguration of the local community as they negotiate their place in relation to Ingholt and other employers and authorities. This has implications not only for the history of archaeology (on dragomans and interpreters in this period, Mairs and Muratov 2015) but in the present, for how we think about archaeological recording (on diaries in contemporary recording, Mickel 2015) and information practices in archaeology (Olsson 2016), and perhaps, for the very existence of foreign archaeological expeditions in the Mediterranean and Middle East. At the very least we can decentre Ingholt, Hopkins, and others in the history we write of archaeology, a history which has long been *de facto* hagiographies of great men swashbuckling their way to treasures to fill grand museums. Instead, we can look to people like Jabbour and Hijjār, otherwise forgotten and names only partially known, but who were the ones who knew just where to find things.

## Works cited

- Asen, Daniel. 2020. 'Knowing Individuals: Fingerprinting, Policing, and the Limits of Professionalization in 1920s Beijing'. *Modern China* 46 (2): 161–92.
- Baedeker, Karl, A., Socin, I. Benzinger, and J. P. Peters. 1912. *Palestine and Syria, with Routes through Mesopotamia and Babylonia and the Island of Cyprus, Handbook for Travellers*. Leipzig, K. Baedeker; New York, C. Scribner's sons.
- Baird, J.A. 2011. 'Photographing Dura-Europos, 1928-1937. An Archaeology of the Archive'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 115 (3): 427–46.
- . 2012. 'Dura Deserta: The Death and Afterlife of Dura-Europos'. In *Urbes Extinctae: Archaeologies of Abandoned Classical Towns*, edited by Neil Christie and Andrea Augenti, 307–29. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- . 2018. *Dura-Europos*. Archaeological Histories. London: Bloomsbury.
- . Forthcoming. 'Unclassified: Structured Silences in the Archaeological Archive'. In *Shaping Archaeological Archives*, edited by Rubina Raja. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Baird, J. A., and Adnan Almohamad. Forthcoming 2023. 'The Ruins That Remain: Remembering Dura-Europos in Salhiyeh'. In *Dura-Europos Past, Present, Future*, edited by Anne Chen and Lisa Brody. Studies in Classical Archaeology. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Baird, J. A., Zena Kamash, and Rubina Raja. Forthcoming 2023. 'Knowing Palmyra: Mandatory Production of Archaeological Knowledge'. *Journal of Social Archaeology*
- Baird, J. A., and Lesley McFadyen. 2014. 'Towards an Archaeology of Archaeological Archives'. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 29 (2): 14–32.
- Baird, J.A., and Zena Kamash. 2019. 'Remembering Roman Syria: Valuing Tadmor-Palmyra, from "Discovery" to Destruction'. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 62 (2): 1–29.



- Brodie, Neil, and Isber Sabine. 2018. 'The Illegal Excavation and Trade of Syrian Cultural Objects: A View from the Ground'. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 43 (1): 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00934690.2017.1410919>.
- Brusius, Mirjam, Kavita Singh, and Morag Kersel, eds. 2017. 'Remnants of Past Lives -- Storing Archaeological Stuff'. In *Museum Storage and Meaning: Tales from the Crypt*, 273–84. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- Casana, Jesse. 2015. 'Satellite Imagery-Based Analysis of Archaeological Looting in Syria'. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 78 (3): 142–52.
- Chevalier, Nicole. 2002. *La Recherche Archéologique Française Au Moyen-Orient 1842-1947*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Cole, Simon A. 2002. *Suspect Identities: A History of Fingerprinting and Criminal Identification*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gelin, Mathilde, and Jeanine Abdul Massih. 2016. 'Doura-Europos Sur l'Euphrate, Une Cité Grecque Dévastée Par Les Pilleurs Clandestins'. In *La Syrie et Le Désastre Archéologique Du Proche-Orient "Palmyre Cité Martyre"*, edited by Eva Ishaq Michel Al-Maqdissi, 139–47. Beiteddine Art Festival.
- Hillers, Delbert R., and Eleonora Cussini. 1996. *Palmyrene Aramaic Texts*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hitchcock, Matthew William. 2020. 'Reflections in Shadow: Excavating the Personal Archives of Paul Jacobsthal and EM Jope'. *Journal of Material Culture* 26 (1): 25–42.
- Ingholt, Harald, Rubina Raja, Jean-Baptiste Yon, and Julia Steding. 2021. *Excavating Palmyra. Harald Ingholt's Excavation Diaries: A Transcript, Translation, and Commentary*. Turnhout: Brepols.

- Mairs, Rachel, and Maya Muratov. 2015. *Archaeologists, Tourists, Interpreters: Exploring Egypt and the Near East in the Late 19th–Early 20th Centuries*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Mickel, Allison. 2015. ‘Reasons for Redundancy in Reflexivity: The Role of Diaries in Archaeological Epistemology’. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 40 (3): 300–309.
- . 2019. ‘Essential Excavation Experts: Alienation and Agency in the History of Archaeological Labor’. *Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress*.
- . 2021. *Why Those Who Shovel Are Silent: A History of Local Archaeological Knowledge and Labor*. Louisville, CO: University Press of Colorado.
- Morgan, Colleen, and Holly Wright. 2018. ‘Pencils and Pixels: Drawing and Digital Media in Archaeological Field Recording’. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 43 (2): 136–51.
- Olsson, Michael. 2016. ‘Making Sense of the Past: The Embodied Information Practices of Field Archaeologists’. *Journal of Information Science* 42 (3): 410–19.
- Pavel, Cătălin. 2010. *Describing and Interpreting the Past: European and American Approaches to the Written Record of the Excavation*. București: Editura Universității din București.
- Pillet, M. 1933. ‘General Report on the Campaign of 1930-31’. In *The Excavations at Dura-Europos Conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Arts and Letters. Preliminary Report on the Fourth Season of Work, October 1930-March 1931*, 1–41. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Poidebard, A. 1934. *La Trace de Rome Dans Le Désert de Syrie. Le Limes de Trajan a La Conquête Arabe. Recherches Aériennes (1925-1932)*. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

- Riggs, Christina. 2017. 'Objects in the Photographic Archive: Between the Field and the Museum in Egyptian Archaeology'. *Museum History Journal* 10: 140–61.
- Shepherd, Nick. 2003. 'When the Hand That Holds the Trowel Is Black...': Disciplinary Practices of Self-Representation and the Issue of 'Native' Labour in Archaeology'. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3 (3): 334–52.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 2002. 'Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance'. *Archival Science* 2: 87–109.
- Ward, Chloë. 2022. 'Excavating the Archive / Archiving the Excavation: Archival Processes and Contexts in Archaeology'. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 10 (2): 160–76.
- Weitzberg, Keren. 2020. 'Biometrics, Race Making, and White Exceptionalism: The Controversy over Universal Fingerprinting in Kenya'. *The Journal of African History* 61 (1): 23–43.
- Wood, Robert. 1753. *The Ruins of Palmyra, Otherwise Tedmor in the Desert*. London.