

# In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts

A History of Classical Archaeology in the  
Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries



Stephen L. Dyson





## In Pursuit of Ancient Past



Stephen L. Dyson

---

# In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts

A History of Classical Archaeology in the  
Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS NEW HAVEN & LONDON

Copyright © 2006 by Yale University.

All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publishers.

Set in Linotype Fairfield by Duke & Company, Devon, Pennsylvania.  
Printed in the United States of America by Sheridan Books.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dyson, Stephen L.

In pursuit of ancient pasts : a history of classical archaeology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries / Stephen L. Dyson.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-0-300-11097-5 (alk. paper)

ISBN-10: 0-300-11097-9 (alk. paper)

1. Archaeology—History—19th century. 2. Archaeology—History—20th century.
3. Classical antiquities. 4. Archaeology and history—Mediterranean Region.
5. Mediterranean Region—Antiquities. I. Title.

CC100.D97 2006

930.1—dc22

2006017553

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

*For*

*Abigail*

*Daniel*

*Jacob*

*Jonathan*

*Peter*

*Simona*





# Contents

Preface	ix
Acknowledgments	xv
Chapter 1. The Protohistory of Classical Archaeology	1
Chapter 2. The Foundations of Classical Archaeology	20
Chapter 3. The Opening of Greece	65
Chapter 4. Nationalism and National Traditions Before the Great War	86
Chapter 5. The Emergence of the Great Museums in Europe and America	133
Chapter 6. Political Ideology and Colonial Opportunism During the Interwar Period	172
Chapter 7. After World War II: Capitalism, Corporatism, and Marxism	214
Afterword	249
Notes	255
Bibliography	279
Index	305



# Preface

This is a book about classical archaeology in the past two centuries. It explores the changes in the modern age to a field of study that by then was already old. This was the period in which an avocational interest became an academic discipline. But classical archaeology had many other faces during this period. The expansion of the educated middle class created new rosters of amateurs who identified with the Greek and Roman past. These amateurs formed the legions of new tourists who replaced the Grand Tour aristocrats at Rome and Pompeii. Histories and myths associated with ancient Greece and Rome became caught up with national histories in an imperialist age. A French emperor sponsored the excavation of the hill fort where Julius Caesar defeated the Gallic chieftain Vercingetorix. An Italian dictator demanded that archaeologists clear the fora of the Caesars to provide an appropriate backdrop to his military parades. A history of classical archaeology during the past two hundred years, then, must be a history of professionalization and the advancement of knowledge, but it must also be a cultural, social, and even political history.

Much has been written about the history of classical archaeology from the Renaissance to the early years of the nineteenth century. These were the centuries when classical antiquity was rediscovered, when the arts developed in close connection with classical models, when the collecting of ancient sculpture, coins, and other antiquities was central to humanists. Education still included the classics, and most cultivated people had more than a passing knowledge of Greek and Roman authors. The antiquarians who dominated archaeological study in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries laid foundations on which we still build today through their methodical marshaling of information in a number of archaeological fields. Many who once mocked those dusty pedants and their quaint ways have developed an admiration for these scholars' persistent hard work and their impressive accumulation of knowledge.

In the eighteenth century archaeology moved in many directions.

The discoveries at Herculaneum and Pompeii made more immediate the Roman past. The French turned to Rome as they shaped their evolving ideologies of the prerevolutionary, revolutionary, and Napoleonic eras. The youth of the ruling class of that emerging power England experienced ancient Rome first through the classical curricula of Oxford and Cambridge and then on the Grand Tour. The collecting mania associated with the Grand Tour helped create the international antiquities market and laid the foundations of many great collections north of the Alps. A neoclassical revival in the arts spread throughout Europe, and the first small expeditions were dispatched to Greece to study classical art at what the classical humanist Johann Winckelmann proclaimed was its source.

After the defeat of Napoleon the history of classical archaeology seemed to grow progressively duller, as the study attracted the interest only of specialists. The ephemeral brilliance of Napoleon was replaced by a succession of pedantic German professors, and the decadent young aristocrats of the Grand Tour by earnest tourists, Baedekers in hand, who invaded every gallery determined to study every statue. Neoclassical art, considered cutting edge in the eighteenth century, moved to an increasingly marginalized backwater in the nineteenth, represented by Henry James's "white marmorean flock" of American women sculptors carving marble nymphs in Rome. Even the archaeological adventurers like the Englishman Charles Newton, who filled the museums of Europe with original Greek art, have attracted relatively little attention.

While it is true that the classical has not dominated the cultural world in the past two centuries in the way it did the previous three, it was hardly a minor presence. Greece and Rome remained central not only to elite but also to middle-class education in Europe and America during the nineteenth century and much of the twentieth. The nineteenth-century phenomenon of middle-class American women gazing appreciatively at the *Apollo Belvedere* while their husbands commissioned Greek Revival houses shows the hold the classical aesthetic still had on educated society. If its characteristic archaeological manifestation in the mid-eighteenth century was a British Grand Tourist visiting the Vatican galleries, in the late twentieth century it was *Archaeology* magazine in the dentist's office.

Writing the more recent history of classical archaeology is a complicated task. During this period classical archaeology became a profes-

sional discipline with more than its share of the institutions devoted to its study, and disciplinary and institutional development from professorships in Berlin to museums in Munich to research and study centers in Athens and Rome have to be considered. So do the major research projects, especially that late-nineteenth-century archaeological innovation, the “big dig.”

But there is danger in an institutional approach to the history of classical archaeology, where an emphasis on the professional may lead to little more than a parade of dead academics, dusty excavations, and silent libraries. Certainly, university seminars, scholarly libraries, research institutes, and well-organized and well-funded excavations laid the foundations of a modern, professional, classical archaeology. But these instruments of disciplinary professionalism developed at a very uneven pace.

The Germans led the way, and, ironically, it was in the raw land of America that German classical scholarship probably had its greatest formative influence. Many of the founding generation of American classicists had studied in Germany. The French always looked skeptically on things German, although they paid more attention to German scholarly accomplishments in the 1870s after the German victory in the Franco-Prussian War. The British universities retained a solid classical curriculum into which archaeology penetrated only marginally up until World War I. In the British Museum they had access to the best collection of original Greek sculpture in the world, but the museum classical archaeologists were few in number and amateur in education. In Rome, the capital of a newly united Italy, classical archaeology did not enter the university as a formal field of study until the last years of the nineteenth century, although after that German scholarship had a dominant—some would have said too dominant—position there.

To focus simply on professional classical archaeology and archaeologists in the nineteenth century would be too limiting. Field archaeology had originated with the amateur antiquaries, and for much of Europe the antiquary remained the principal source of archaeological research well into the twentieth century. These parochial savants, with their dusty collections of antiquities and querulous meetings, where they argued over the location of some Roman town mentioned by Tacitus, became an object of fun and even of derision. However, many were deeply learned and knew much of the world outside their local areas; they played a vital role

in recording information on sites that have now been destroyed and in saving antiquities that would almost certainly have been lost. Important fields of archaeological study like Roman Britain remained until the 1960s largely the domain of the amateur. It is one of the aims of this book to give these often-underappreciated scholars their due, both for their role in the advancement of knowledge and for their preservation of an interest in the subject outside the increasingly isolated world of the academies.

Yet classical archaeology continued to appeal to large segments of the educated public beyond the professors and the antiquaries. This interest reflected the ongoing importance of Greece and Rome in the political and cultural ideologies of Europe and America. The newly emerging middle classes responded to the new publications and institutions like guidebooks and public museums that aimed to bring the latest discoveries and theories to an educated but more bourgeois public. Recent inventions like photography were soon harnessed to the cause of archaeological popularization. This new world of archaeological communication deserves as much attention as the history of the scholarly monograph, for it sustained a broad base of support for what was often an arcane activity.

Many of the new professionals appreciated the importance of this emerging educated class and sought new ways to communicate with the wider public. The nineteenth century produced a surge of activity directed toward this public, including the foundation of new museums and the reevaluation of the role of older museums. A booming industry in casts arose, enabling museums and colleges to have their own collections of life-size copies of the great works of Greek and Roman art. Photographs served as research tools; first came individual photograph prints, then books illustrated with photographs, and finally lantern slides.

During the nineteenth century classics and classical archaeology were also enlisted in the service of Western colonialism. The Oxbridge elite were taught that they were the new Platonic guardians and Roman proconsuls in a neo-Roman Empire. French and Italian military officers excavated Roman sites in North Africa not only out of intellectual curiosity but also to establish a visual and ideological link between past and present colonialism. These empires often interacted in complex and fruitful ways. The Oxford ancient historian Francis Haverfield reconstructed a Roman Britain that clearly owed much to his contemporary experience of British imperialism.

I have tried to incorporate these themes and more into this book,

yet it is a very personal history of classical archaeology. It has to be. A history of classical archaeology that attempted to discuss all significant individuals, institutions, and events in detail would probably never get written and, if written, would be ponderous and unreadable. I have selected subjects and themes that I think are important and have illustrated them with what I consider the most pertinent examples. In addition, certain important national histories of the study of classical archaeology have received little attention, owing to limitations of both space and competence. I would have liked to have said more about classical archaeology in both Russia and the Soviet Union, a tradition that produced the important figure Michael Rostovtzeff. But doing so would have required a mastery of the Russian language that I do not have, so I have only touched briefly upon Rostovtzeff. Similar problems arose with the history of classical archaeology in Scandinavia. As well, classical archaeology has a long and interesting history in the Iberian peninsula, but I do not consider it central to the development of the discipline and therefore omitted it here.

Readers expecting to encounter the exploits of Heinrich Schliemann may be disappointed, for I have not considered the archaeology of the Minoan-Mycenaean world, even though it is closely linked to classical archaeology. Schliemann appears only briefly in my account. In part this is because a good historical account of the development of the archaeology of Bronze Age Greece already exists: William McDonald and Carol Thomas's *Progress into the Past* (1990). In addition, to examine the topic of the development of the archaeology of pre-Classical Greece and Rome would require consideration of Near Eastern archaeology and the prehistoric archaeology of the Mediterranean and even that of Western Europe, making the study so large as to risk becoming unmanageable. Those are all topics worthy of investigation, but not here.

I end the narrative with the 1970s. Although important archaeological discoveries took place after this time, the discipline in my view generally continued to move along paths established by the 1970s. I have written elsewhere about what I see as the problems of contemporary classical archaeology, especially in the United States, and don't need to repeat those arguments here. (It is also difficult to write *sine ira et studio* about the generation of which you are a part.) Many will disagree with what I say here, and I hope that this exercise in archaeological history inspires or outrages others to write their own.





## Acknowledgments

In writing this book I have picked the brains and sought the assistance of many colleagues. Special thanks are due to Marcello Barbanera of the University of Rome, Richard Hingley of Durham University, and Nancy Ramage of Ithaca College. Help obtaining illustrations came from, among others, Lindsay Allasan-Jones, Lyn Bailey, Susan Barker, Véronique Blanc-Bijon, Jacklyn Burns, Debbie Challis, Michelle Chmelar, Lavinia Ciuffa, Megan Doyon, Diane Hudson, Adrian James, Jan Jordan, Patrick Joy, Eva Karlsson, Donna Kurtz, Daniele Manacorda, Paul Martineau, Robin Meador-Woodruff, Kate Perry, Jennifer Riley, Christiana Unwin, Luisa Veneziano, and Bailey Young.

Much of the preliminary work for this book was done at the library of the American Academy at Rome. Thanks as always are due to Christine Huemer and Denise Gavio of the library staff. Special appreciation is also due to the library staff of Lockwood Library at the University at Buffalo and especially to the Interlibrary Loan Office, which met many requests that I regarded as nearly impossible. Many aspects of the research were financed by the research funds of the Park professorship, provided by the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences, University at Buffalo. My wife, Pauline, made a number of suggestions for improving the manuscript. At Yale University Press, I thank editors Harry Haskell and Michelle Komie for helping get the manuscript accepted and then sent on its way to publication. Susan Laity did a thoughtful and careful job of manuscript editing and saved me from many errors. Those that remain are my own.

This book is dedicated to my grandchildren. Watching them grow and change has been a wonderful diversion as I wrote this book.



## CHAPTER 1

# The Protohistory of Classical Archaeology

European artists and intellectuals have engaged in continuous dialogue with the classical past since the Renaissance. In the seventeenth century that dialogue was enriched by the growth of a strong antiquarian tradition but also complicated by the cultural and political wars of religion that pitted Protestant against Catholic. The Continent was often unsafe for travel, and the international scholarly community that had flourished during the Renaissance was often riven by bitter religious and ideological divisions. By the eighteenth century peace had largely returned to Europe. New demands were placed on the classical past in part as a result of the triumph of the values of the Enlightenment, which involved a more direct communication with the world of Greece and Rome, unmediated by the debates of the Renaissance and Counter-Reformation. A new stress was placed on the physical recovery of the past, and this stimulated the emerging field of classical archaeology.

During the 1760s two developments arose in the states and smaller political entities of what became Germany that would profoundly shape the development of classical archaeology. One flowered on German soil; the other was the work of a German expatriate who spent his most productive years in Rome. The first involved the foundation of a “scientific” study of classics at the University of Göttingen. Its aim was to take classical studies out of the hands of the humanists and savants and center it in an academic environment with well-trained scholars, specialized teaching programs, and extensive scholarly resources, especially libraries. This new classical scholarship focused on philology, but its vision of antiquity was broad and included material culture as well as books. By 1767 Göttingen had the first collection of casts in Europe. Significantly, it was housed in the library rather than a separate museum.<sup>1</sup> An unbroken,

if at times tenuous, tradition stretched from Göttingen to the great German scholarly “factories” of the later nineteenth century.

No history of classical archaeology can bypass Johann Winckelmann (1717–68), for his legacy continues to shape and influence the field down to the present.<sup>2</sup> This learned North German worked himself up from relatively humble circumstances and, after an excellent classical education in Germany, made his way to Rome. He ultimately attained the position of librarian to Cardinal Alessandro Albani (1692–1779), one of the most powerful humanistic clerics of the day. As such Winckelmann had at his disposal one of the best private collections of antiquities in Rome and was the resident savant at one of the most brilliant cultural gathering places in the city.<sup>3</sup> His violent death in Trieste in 1768 cut short his life but added another romantic aspect to an archaeological figure whose image belongs as much to the early nineteenth century as the eighteenth.<sup>4</sup>

In 1763 Winckelmann was appointed papal antiquary, the chief archaeological arbiter in Rome. He spent his remaining years establishing his preeminence on the Roman archaeological scene and mastering the great classical collections of that city. But his goals were more than antiquarian. He sought to synthesize and theorize, creating new paradigms for understanding ancient art. His prime contribution was to make the study of classical art both historical and evolutionary, examining ancient written sources in conjunction with the classical art in the Roman collections. He established the centrality of the Hellenic aesthetic and sought to reconstruct the historical development of ancient art. Much of what classical archaeologists still do follows in the path established by Winckelmann.<sup>5</sup>

Winckelmann was interested in more than historical reconstruction. As one would expect from an Enlightenment figure, he sought truth in abstraction, paradigms of absolute beauty that were embodied in ancient works like the *Apollo Belvedere*. Winckelmann profoundly influenced the last great era of neoclassicism in the visual arts, and the Italian Antonio Canova, the Englishman John Flaxman, the Swiss Angelica Kauffmann, and the Dane Bertel Thorvaldsen—artists with an interest in classical archaeology who played important roles in the classical revival—were all shaped by his aesthetic values. Winckelmann’s effort to find ideal beauty in high classical art provided one of the ideological underpinnings of classical archaeology throughout its history.

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Anton Raphael Mengs, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann*, c. 1758 (The Metropolitan  
Museum of Art, Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1948. All rights reserved, The  
Metropolitan Museum of Art.)

Winckelmann also began to shift the focus of classical archaeological research from Rome, where it had been positioned since the Renaissance, to Greece. Winckelmann never visited Greece and actually saw little in the way of genuine Greek art. He based his reconstruction of the history of Greek art almost totally on the ancient written sources and on Roman statues that purported to be copies of Greek originals. However, the high point of his evolutionary art history was placed in classical Greece and its years of decline in the Hellenistic and Roman eras. This was both a historical and a value judgment, and it was to have a profound impact on the course of classical archaeology.

Winckelmann's interest was primarily in the visual arts, especially sculpture. He became not just a model for future classical archaeologists but almost a tutelary deity, especially in Germany, where the new, scientific classical scholarship was developing by the late eighteenth century and where the classical in art retained a strong hold. His devotion to the "classical" combined with the romantic qualities of his solitary intellectual quests and violent death only enhanced his appeal. (His birthday, December 10, has long been celebrated in a variety of German archaeological forums.) Winckelmann's "historical" approach to Greek sculpture inspired a scholarship that combined the typological study of Roman copies of Greek originals with the careful analysis of Greek and Latin texts on ancient art in an empirical history of classical archaeology.

Along with other key figures like Gotthold Efraim Lessing and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Winckelmann helped lay the foundations for the long tradition of passionate German involvement with the classical Mediterranean.<sup>6</sup> At the same time other developments were more closely linking the increasingly rich and powerful kingdom of Great Britain with the classical remains of Greece and Rome. Key to this was the phenomenon of the Grand Tour, which started in earnest following the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 and the relative peace and security that Europe enjoyed after the Battle of Blenheim (1704) and the Peace of Utrecht (1713) concluded the War of Spanish Succession and put a temporary halt to French imperialist expansion. Although not all "Grand Tourists" were British, the majority came from England. Almost all were members of the aristocracy, but they included a large and diverse segment of that group, a representation unmatched by that of any other European nobility.

The phenomenon of the Grand Tour has been well studied and need only be summarized here.<sup>7</sup> It began in the early years of the eighteenth century. Thomas Coke, an early Grand Tourist who laid the foundation of the great collection of Holkham Hall, was in Rome at various times from 1712 to 1718. Generations of young Britishers followed in the years leading up to the outbreak of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars. The tour could take several years, and the young nobleman was accompanied by an entourage that often included some hapless Oxbridge tutor known as his “bear leader.” While a variety of countries were visited, the focus was on Italy, especially Rome. The elite youth were expected to visit famous architectural monuments, galleries, and archaeological sites, have their portraits painted in a Roman setting by an artist like Pompeo Batoni, and collect antiquities.<sup>8</sup> Most of these young Grand Tourists never returned to the Mediterranean, but the memories and souvenirs of those journeys left their impress and shaped the young men’s cultural outlook for the rest of their lives. Many joined the Society of Dilettanti, founded in 1734, of which Horace Walpole remarked that “the nominal qualification [for membership] is having been in Italy and the real one [is] being drunk.”<sup>9</sup> It was true that bibulous festivities were associated with the Dilettanti, but they also made important contributions in this formative period to classical archaeology. For both architecture and the visual arts the Grand Tour phenomenon, including later manifestations like the Dilettanti, had important archaeological implications.

European architects had followed classical models since the Renaissance, and the classical text by the Augustan architect Vitruvius had been their handbook. Such influences had come more slowly and cautiously to England, but the two great English architects of the seventeenth century, Inigo Jones and Christopher Wren, employed the forms and traditions of classical architecture in complex, creative ways.<sup>10</sup> Now the Grand Tour brought the English elite into immediate contact not only with classical ruins but also with the architecture, especially the villa architecture, of that great neoclassicist Andrea Palladio. Styles and values associated both with the “new” Venetian rural elite of the Terra Firma and with the villa aristocracy of ancient Rome well suited the emerging ideology of the increasingly rich and powerful British country-house elite, who sought to express their rural hegemony through dominating buildings.<sup>11</sup>

Early in the eighteenth century Lord Burlington, a wealthy veteran



of the Grand Tour, reasserted the primacy of the Palladian in English architecture.<sup>12</sup> During the middle and later years of the eighteenth century the English countryside became populated by a splendid array of country houses built by architects like Colin Campbell, author of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, whose designs reflected strong classical influence.<sup>13</sup> Even more than the late Renaissance and Roman-baroque styles that had shaped English architecture previously, this new classicism called for a rigorous adherence to “true” classical forms and thus required more extensive archaeological scholarship. Handbooks, as well as studies of Palladio, Vitruvius, and Greek and Roman remains in Italy and the Mediterranean, appeared in increasing numbers. Classical exteriors were matched by classical interiors as designers like the Adam brothers created living spaces that echoed and reinterpreted the taste of Greece and Rome in the same way that entrance porticoes and columned facades did.

This increasingly sophisticated architectural scholarship created a growing consciousness of the importance of Greek contributions to Roman aesthetic achievements. In turn, this led scholars to recognize that a true understanding of classical architecture required a knowledge of the Hellenic originals, especially the works of mainland Greece. To provide that knowledge the Society of Dilettanti sponsored an expedition to Greece in the 1750s led by two young architects, James Stuart and Nicholas Revett.<sup>14</sup> Their program was to study, measure, and draw the best examples of Greek architecture from life so that through later publications they could provide architects and patrons in Britain with the best examples of pure Greek architecture. Stuart and Revett executed their commission admirably, and their publications, especially the early volumes, played a major role in promoting neoclassical taste in both Britain and America. Their picturesque sketches of the ruins in contemporary context enhanced viewers’ romantic desire to experience Greece directly while their measured drawings, intended for architectural professionals, provided the templates for a more pure and true classical architecture.

Not all the new travelers went to Turkish-controlled Greece, however. Greek ruins could be found closer to home. South Italy and Sicily possessed some of the best-preserved classical ruins in the world. While not as distant or exotic as Greece, the world of Magna Graecia posed its own problems for any but the most intrepid tourist. The temples of Paestum were close to Naples but located in a bandit- and malarial-infested

coastal marsh. The great temples of Segesta, Selinus, and Agrigento were in more inaccessible parts of Sicily. Nonetheless, Grand Tour classicists gradually began to extend their pilgrimages south. The discoveries at Pompeii and Herculaneum made Naples a favorite stopping point, and from there Paestum was accessible. In 1768 Thomas Major published his *Ruins of Paestum*, providing the British public with detailed studies of those monuments. By the 1770s Englishmen like Richard Payne Knight and John Soane were visiting the temples of Sicily.<sup>15</sup>

This greater familiarity with these Doric masterpieces produced an increased respect for the order. The architect James Adam on his visit to Paestum had dismissed these temples as “of an early, inelegant, and unenriched Doric that afford[s] no details.”<sup>16</sup> The simplicity that Adam found unappealing now was seen as an expression of a simple, pure Greek primitive strength that had been lost with the dominance of the ornamental, flaccid Ionic and Corinthian orders.<sup>17</sup> The last creative phase of neoclassical architecture that emerged in the early nineteenth century was strongly shaped by this respect for the Doric, and concern for its history and aesthetic principles influenced architectural archaeology long after Greek aesthetics had been marginalized in creative architecture. Significantly, when the Americans in the late nineteenth century launched their first excavations at Assos, they were financed in part by conservative Boston architects who wished to learn more about the origins of the Doric order.<sup>18</sup>

These neoclassical townhouses and villas built throughout the British Isles often became the setting for the display of the archaeological treasures, especially classical sculpture, brought back from the Grand Tour. It is not possible to quantify the number of pieces from the Mediterranean that made their way to Britain, but they certainly represented the largest transfer of classical art since the Roman looting of Greece. In addition to originals, often heavily restored, British tourists also acquired large numbers of casts of famous works that could not be exported. They intermingled the casts with the originals in displays that enhanced their overall presentation and heralded the taste and antiquarian knowledge of their owners.<sup>19</sup> British scholars began publishing catalogues of these private collections, and England became the object of its own “Grand Tour” as classicists from the Continent began showing up at these stately homes to view the antiquities. In 1809 Richard Payne Knight published his *Specimens of Ancient Sculpture Selected from Different Collections in*

*Great Britain* while in 1833 the count de Clarac, curator of the Antiquities Department at the Louvre, visited Holkham Hall.<sup>20</sup>

We can obtain a good understanding of the extent and diversity of the British private collections from Adolf Michaelis's pathbreaking 1882 study of classical marbles in British collections, produced after the end of the Grand Tour era but before many of the collections had been dispersed either to museums or to a new generation of collectors in America.<sup>21</sup> A professor of archaeology at Strasbourg, Michaelis made several trips to England and came to know and love the collections. However, for Michaelis, a product of the new, scientific German classical archaeology, this scattering of so much important classical art in often inaccessible private collections violated the spirit of the new museum mentality, with its emphasis on the massing of material for scientific study.<sup>22</sup>

The presence of the classical in those stately homes varied tremendously, from a handful of mediocre pieces of marble that were soon relegated to the attic to major assemblages of important works set in beautiful gallery spaces designed by artists like Robert Adam. But the ubiquity of classical marbles in town- and country houses imbued the landed elite with an appreciation of Greek and Roman art in the same way the new art museums with their mixture of casts and originals were to do for the expanding bourgeoisie and new rich of the nineteenth century.

The mania for collecting that began with the Grand Tour helped create the international antiquities market that is still with us today. As with today's market, questions of adequate supply drove the enterprise. In the early days available works of art came from two major sources: old Italian collections and new excavations at ancient sites. The Italian nobility, both ecclesiastical and secular, had been acquiring ancient art since the Renaissance. Changes in political and economic fortunes had already led to the dissolution and reconstitution of many important collections within Italy, and this recycling continued in the eighteenth century.<sup>23</sup> Even the powerful Cardinal Alessandro Albani, Winckelmann's patron, was forced to sell part of his collection to the pope, who used the material to form the basis of the Capitoline Museum. (Albani quickly built a new collection from recently discovered antiquities.)<sup>24</sup> The English became the principal beneficiaries of this Italian instability. Usually their purchases were small and the works mediocre. However, massive transfers could also take place: in 1720 the earl of Pembroke acquired 1,300 pieces from the Giustiniani collection in Rome.<sup>25</sup> The recycling of

existing collections could not satisfy the burgeoning market, however. Fortunately, the soil of Italy was still packed with statues. Some appeared as chance discoveries during the cultivation of fields or the planting of vineyards. Others were the product of more systematic excavations at sites like Ostia Antica and Hadrian's villa at Tivoli.

The Grand Tour and its associated collecting mania stimulated the creation of a service community in Rome. Since the British preferred to deal with their co-nationals, English and Scottish artists who had settled in Rome especially benefited. They served as hosts and ciceroni for the Grand Tour visitors and sometimes arranged for financial assistance. They negotiated with Italians wishing to sell antiquities, and even conducted their own excavations. They copied famous paintings and helped arrange for the export of the originals. Three of the most prominent such *négociants* were Gavin Hamilton (1723–98), James Byres (1734–1817), and Thomas Jenkins (1721–98).

Gavin Hamilton was an established neoclassical painter appreciated by both the English and the Italians. He conducted excavations at Hadrian's villa and elsewhere to supply sculpture to compatriots like Charles Townley as well as noble Italians like the Borghese family.<sup>26</sup> James Byres came from a Scottish family that had fled to Europe after the defeat of the Stuarts. He established himself as an artist, a guide, and an art facilitator in Rome. (The historian Edward Gibbon used his services as a cicerone.) Byres was also one of the first to appreciate Etruscan art.<sup>27</sup> Thomas Jenkins was the most complex of the three. He was a respected artist in the Roman community who also used his connections to spy on Jacobites in Rome. He was an active if unscrupulous antiquities dealer known for his extensive restorations—and sometimes the production of outright fakes.<sup>28</sup>

Jenkins's activities were part of a major trade that grew out of the Grand Tour art market: a combination of restoration, cast making, and forgery. The neoclassical aesthetic of the age favored the reconstructed whole statue over the suggestive fragment. The challenging craft of successfully restoring statues already had a long history in Italy, and a number of the great artists had tried their hand at it. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries major figures like Canova and Thorvaldsen were called in when the restoration of a major collection like the Elgin or Aegina marbles was being considered. The increased demands of the Grand Tour turned restoration into an industry. One of

the most important of those restorers was Bartolomeo Cavaceppi (1716–99), a shrewd businessman who turned a good profit from his trade. Illustrations of his workshop show an array of statues in various stages of reconstitution.<sup>29</sup> But Cavaceppi was an artist as well as a restorer and a friend of Winckelmann, who probably helped shape his aesthetic. Cavaceppi, in turn, through his highly classicizing restorations, made a major contribution to the dominance of the neoclassic aesthetic.<sup>30</sup>

The challenges faced by the restorer varied. In many cases all a statue needed was a new nose or ear. In other instances the craftsman started with a fragmentary torso and re-created the entire statue. In such an environment it was easy to move from the heavily restored to the totally forged, passed off as a genuine antique. The sculptor-copiers and the cast makers also flourished. Collectors also wanted copies of famous statues to complement their less important original pieces. Adam's famous gallery at Syon House was decorated with copies of the *Dying Gaul* and the *Apollo Belvedere*.<sup>31</sup>

These archaeological enthusiasms provoked increasingly heated debates among the savants about the relative worth of Greek and Roman culture. Winckelmann had stressed the dependence of the Roman visual arts, especially sculpture, on the Greeks. Horace and Vergil had admitted as much. However, architecture was different. The great ruins and monuments of Rome showed a level of power and creativity that could not be ignored.

The artist and antiquarian who best asserted the architectural primacy of ancient Rome was Giovanni Battista Piranesi (1720–78), a Venetian who migrated to Rome and established himself as a respected draftsman and engraver of Roman scenes.<sup>32</sup> Piranesi was also a scholarly antiquarian who moved in the circle of Jenkins, Byres, and Hamilton. Much of his production was centered on the fashionable *veduti* (views) of both ancient and modern monuments aimed at the elite tourist market. These could be acquired individually as well as in sets and helped pioneer the popularization of archaeology. But Piranesi also produced serious, professional studies of Roman architecture, which he incorporated into his *Antichità romane* (1756). Piranesi, a staunch Romanist in the early 1760s, was an artist-architect deeply involved in the culture wars between advocates of Greece and Rome, contesting the claims of savants like Julien-David LeRoy (1728–1803) that the architecture of the Greeks was superior to that of the Romans.<sup>33</sup>

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The sculpture studio of Bartolomeo Cavaceppi. Cavaceppi specialized in restored statues for Grand Tour visitors in Rome (From B. Cavaceppi, *Raccolta d'antiche statue*, 1769. Photo courtesy Nancy Ramage.)

Piranesi's engravings of Rome, especially of its brooding ruins, were intended as an assertion of the overwhelming power and creativity of the ancient Romans and a reminder of the decadence of their descendants.<sup>34</sup> The massive architectural ruins were peopled by "pygmy" moderns engaged in the most banal of daily activities. His work linked the values of his own baroque to those of the romantics; his interest in ruin anticipated the romantic obsession with structural decay. The romantic movement in turn helped foster the cult of ruins that was one of the driving forces behind the development of classical archaeology in the nineteenth century.<sup>35</sup>

The Italians were not simply passive observers of the North European mania for antiquity. The popes and most of their high officials were educated clerics with the same neoclassical sensibilities found in Winckelmann and Lord Burlington. They were increasingly conscious of the importance of archaeological sites and ancient art not only to foster the elite tourist business that so benefited the Papal States but also to promote a humanistic image of the papacy in order to counter the Enlightenment attacks on the church. Well aware of the breakup of old collections and the mining of major archaeological sites, they wanted to stem the flow of antiquities from papal lands. At the same time they sought to articulate their own classical values and identities, using the treasures in the Vatican collections as their principal instrument.<sup>36</sup>

A key figure in this new papal cultural policy was Giannangelo Braschi, who served as papal treasurer under Clement XIV (1705–74) and then in 1775 became Pope Pius VI.<sup>37</sup> Under his guidance and patronage the papal classical collections were expanded with new works acquired from existing collections or excavated on papal lands. More important, new museum spaces were added and the collections rearranged to highlight their greatest works and provide visitors with a carefully articulated vision of how classical art should be viewed and understood.

That new museology was best expressed in the complex known as the Pio-Clementino Museum, whose name still commemorates the two popes who brought it into being.<sup>38</sup> Central to the new exhibition complex was the Belvedere courtyard, a space originally conceived by Donato Bramante and redesigned by Michelangelo Simonetti (1731–83). Simonetti created one of the few neoclassical buildings in Rome, blending Renaissance and eighteenth-century values. The Bramante courtyard had four dominant niches designed as showplaces for the most prestigious

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Felice Polanzani, Jean Barbault, and Girolamo Rossi II, *Giovanni Battista Piranesi*, 1750. This portrait was published as the frontispiece to Piranesi's 1756 *Antichità romane*. (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Gift of Miss A. E. Ticknor. Photograph © 2006 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.)



sculptures in the Vatican collections, such as the *Apollo Belvedere*, and the *Laocoön*. The courtyard was the centerpiece of a complex of galleries added by Simonetti. The rotunda formed another focus and again highlighted choice pieces in the papal collection. Much of the rest of the exhibition was arranged thematically. With its emphasis on highlighting and on orderly display the Pio-Clementino represents one of the most creative stages in the development of the museum of classical archaeology.

The new museum became both a tourist attraction and a symbolic showplace for the papacy. By the 1770s it was being featured in general guides to Rome. In 1792 the cicerone Vasi rated it among the most important tourist attractions in the city.<sup>39</sup> When King Gustavus III of Sweden, who had archaeological interests himself, visited Rome in 1785, the pope personally showed him through the new galleries. The visit certainly influenced the new archaeological museum Gustavus was building in Stockholm.<sup>40</sup>

Key to the development of papal archaeological policy during the eighteenth century were the manifold contributions of the Visconti family. Giovanni Battista Visconti (1722–84) came to Rome around 1736 from a small town near La Spezia. He worked as Winckelmann's assistant and established a reputation as a learned antiquarian, eventually succeeding Winckelmann in the post of commissioner of antiquities.<sup>41</sup> Visconti was followed in that position by his son Filippo Aurelio. It was during Giovanni Battista's administration that the Pio-Clementino was founded. He was papal antiquarian during the height of the English Grand Tour and the expansion of the antiquities export market that it fostered.<sup>42</sup>

Most important in the second generation of Visconti family antiquarians was Ennio Quirino (1751–1818).<sup>43</sup> Like Winckelmann he used the position of librarian to a noble Roman family (in his case the Chigi) to pursue his own antiquarian interests. He established his reputation as a scholarly cataloguer with his seven-volume study of the Pio-Clementino, a work that highlighted the importance of the new papal cultural institution. In spite—or perhaps because—of generations of family service to the papal government, he was sympathetic to the French Revolution and joined the short-lived 1799 republican government at Rome. After its failure he was forced to move to Paris. There he was deeply involved in establishing the Napoleon Museum, a new type of “universal” museum whose core collection was built on works of art taken from Rome. One

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Bénigne Gagneraux, *Pope Pius VI Showing King Gustavus III the Vatican Galleries*, 1785 (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm)

of his final services to the study of ancient art was to travel to Britain and support those who argued that the British government should purchase the Elgin marbles.<sup>44</sup>

While Englishmen sketched monuments, purchased antiquities, and caroused in the tavernas of Rome and erudite clerics sought new ways to identify the popes with classical values, discoveries in the South were transforming the archaeological geography of Italy and knowledge of antiquity. The major archaeological milestones of the eighteenth century were the discovery of Herculaneum and Pompeii. The initial excavations were started in 1738 at Herculaneum under the patronage of the Bourbon king Charles III and his wife, Maria Amalia of Saxony, who had been reared in the cultured court of Dresden. Charles developed a great interest in the excavations and followed their progress even after he moved to Madrid in 1765. The work also enjoyed the important support of his chief minister, Bernardo Tanucci.<sup>45</sup> The emphasis in the excavations was on the recovery of art objects, especially sculpture and painting, which soon filled the royal museum at Portici to enhance the cultural prestige of the Neapolitan dynasty.<sup>46</sup> At Herculaneum the congealed mud forced the excavators to use mining techniques like tunneling to recover antiquities. Not surprisingly, the most respected director of those

often dubious mid-eighteenth-century excavations was a Swiss mining engineer named Karl Weber (1712–64).<sup>47</sup> Under his guidance a number of the major public and private buildings such as the theater and the Villa of the Papyri were explored. Weber made plans so precise that they were later used by modern architects to design the Getty Museum in Malibu, California, as a reproduction of the villa.

It is often forgotten that during the years when the initial discoveries at Herculaneum and Pompeii were being made Naples was one of the great cultural centers of Europe, with rulers who sought to be major players on the European scene.<sup>48</sup> The city boasted savants and antiquarians aplenty, gentlemen and clerics proud of their learning. The English traveler Lady Blessington later described the tribe of Neapolitan antiquaries: “It is amusing to observe how deeply engrossed each antiquary is by his own peculiar studies: one talks of nothing but Nola vases, seeming to think that they alone are worthy of attention; another confines his observation to antique gems, and will spend hours with a magnifying-glass, examining some microscopic engraving on a precious stone; hazarding innumerable conjectures relating to the subject, and founding some fanciful hypotheses on each. Then comes the lover of mutilated sculpture, who raves of some antique horse, as if it had acquired value by the loss of its limbs; and who admires half a Venus more than an entire one.”<sup>49</sup>

The local antiquarians appreciated the unique nature of what the royal archaeologists were finding, but they, like their counterparts throughout Europe, lacked the technical expertise to deal adequately with the discoveries. Archaeology to this moment had consisted largely of the collection of ancient fragments, the documentation of ruins, and attempts to write cultural histories using that material. Instead of ruins that had crumbled for centuries the explorers of Herculaneum and Pompeii encountered an ancient world frozen in time. Forms of ancient art such as painting, previously known only from writers like Pliny the Elder and fragmentary finds at Rome, were now recovered in abundance, while a range of items of daily life gave a new reality to the ordinary people of antiquity. Carbonized papyri found in the ruins of the Herculaneum luxury villa fueled hopes that lost literary works might be recovered.

The museum at Portici soon became overcrowded. In addition, it was not easily accessible to the cultured international society found at

Naples. Ferdinand IV decided to move the Herculaneum material to a new museum established in the Palazzo dei Vecchi Studi. The Herculaneum statues were carried in a triumphal procession from Portici to the new museum in Naples.<sup>50</sup> There they were joined by one of the great Roman collections, that of the Farnese family, which the Bourbons had acquired by dynastic marriage. Visitors to the Naples Museum could now study great examples of the eighteenth-century art canon such as the Farnese Hercules and the Farnese Bull as well as the latest discoveries from the buried cities and villas of Campania.<sup>51</sup>

Almost immediately controversies broke out related to three topics that have haunted “Pompeian” studies ever since: conservation, accessibility, and publication. The conditions of excavation at Herculaneum were extremely difficult, and the practice of the time was to mine the site for objects, much as had been done for generations at places like Tivoli or Ostia. We should be surprised not by the poor standards of Weber’s rival excavator Rocque Joachin de Alcubierre (1702–80) but by the skill and the careful recording of Weber.<sup>52</sup> Nor were other excavators as unenlightened as is now sometimes thought. It is not often appreciated that the excavators at Herculaneum and Pompeii with their *giornali di scavi* (excavation notebooks) pioneered the archaeological notebook and compiled documents that can still profitably be used by archaeologists today.<sup>53</sup> Early in the excavations, the architects established the practice of removing the best paintings from the original walls and installing them in the Naples Museum. The methods used to cut the paintings out and redisplay them were primitive: often the original find spots were not recorded and context information was lost. Nonetheless, many paintings were preserved in the Naples Museum in reasonably good condition that would have either been destroyed or allowed to fade beyond recognition.

The realities of tunnel excavations at Herculaneum severely limited tourist access. Nor was viewing the Pompeii and Herculaneum antiquities in the royal collection that easy. A privileged few obtained special permission to study the growing body of sculptures and paintings, but policies on access varied. Those who were denied were often annoyed and used the rebuff as an occasion to criticize the excavators, the authorities, and the local savants who controlled the collections.<sup>54</sup> The most famous complaint can be found in Winckelmann’s letters criticizing the Bourbon efforts at Herculaneum.<sup>55</sup> It was true that the

local antiquarians guarded zealously what they saw as their possessions, and they could be obstructionist. However, the savants of Naples were respectable scholars, and such rivalries as the one with Winckelmann were normal in the scholarly world of the period. Winckelmann was not a processual archaeologist but a rival antiquarian seeking to use the material for his own purposes.

The slow pace of publication aroused particular criticism. This delay was especially annoying to European savants, since sketching and drawing were prohibited at the excavations, and the only way most could come to know the finds was through official publications. In 1755 Charles III established the Reale Accademia Ercolanese, modeled on the Etruscan Academy of Cortona. Its central aim was to publish new discoveries.<sup>56</sup> Between 1757 and 1792 the savants of the Accademia published eight richly illustrated folio volumes, which are still regularly consulted by scholars. The works have their limits, but they must be compared to similar publications of the mid- to late eighteenth centuries and not to modern archaeological reports. In that context they stand up very well. But they focused on painting and other works of “high art,” neglecting the objects from daily life that were one of the most fascinating aspects of the Herculaneum excavations. And they were distributed through royal patronage, which again limited scholarly access.<sup>57</sup>

By the middle years of the century excavation efforts had shifted to the site that was identified as ancient Pompeii. In the eruption of A.D. 79 Pompeii had been covered in loose ash that made excavation much easier than in the hardened mud of Herculaneum. Mass clearing led to the exposure of large blocks of ruins, a primitive anticipation of the open-area excavations of today. Visitors no longer needed to stumble through torchlit tunnels but could wander along ancient streets and visit intact ancient buildings. Pompeii was much better suited than Herculaneum to both the middle-class tourism that emerged in the next century and the romantic desire to empathize with peoples of the past.

An important milestone in these new Pompeian excavations was the discovery and clearing of the remains of the Temple of Isis that took place in 1764–66. Architecture, paintings, and inscriptions were recovered in abundance. Prints of the period show the entire complex emerging from the ash while tourists look on in fascination. In a period in which interest in things Egyptian was growing but there was as yet little direct knowledge of Egyptian civilization, the Isis temple held special

appeal; and it became a regular stop for visitors to Pompeii.<sup>58</sup> By the early nineteenth century Napoleon's expedition to Egypt and Champollion's decipherment of hieroglyphics had made real Egyptian materials better known. But the romantic sensibility endowed the remains of the Temple of Isis with new mysterious, sinister qualities, which were to make it the setting of Edward Bulwer-Lytton's early historical novel *The Last Days of Pompeii* (1834).<sup>59</sup>

In 1796 Napoleon descended on Italy and with a series of brilliant victories brought the peninsula into the French sphere of influence, ending the Grand Tour. For nearly a generation Rome was closed off to the English elite. The network of English artist-agents who had played such a major role in nurturing the Grand Tour and facilitating the flow of antiquities to Britain broke up. James Byres left Rome in 1790; Gavin Hamilton died in 1798. The last of the group, Thomas Jenkins, was expelled by the French in 1798 and died shortly thereafter.

By the time Waterloo ended the French hegemony on the Continent in 1815, and Italy once again was open to the English and the Germans who had opposed Napoleon, European society, culture, and scholarship had changed greatly. The classicists had discovered Greece, and the nobility had developed other interests and tastes. A new breed of antiquarians and scholars replaced the aristocratic dilettantes as visitors to the sites, generated by the Industrial Revolution and the emergence of the middle class.

## CHAPTER 2

# The Foundations of Classical Archaeology

**F**or much of the period from 1796 to 1816 French armies, first of the revolution and then of the emperor, dominated Italy. They defeated the Austrians and the Bourbons and humiliated the popes. They also had a major cultural and archaeological impact. They hauled off some of the great papal treasures to France yet also undertook important archaeological work in both Rome and Pompeii. At one time they held one famous archaeological figure of the period, Lord Elgin, captive and forced another, William Hamilton, to flee from Naples to Sicily under the protection of Lord Nelson, who was more interested in Hamilton's wife than in his antiquities.

To understand Napoleon's archaeological ambitions we have to remember the central role that Roman classicism had played in the events leading up to the French Revolution and to the various postrevolutionary governments that preceded his. The French Academy in Rome had been founded in 1666 by Louis XIV as a study center where artists could work creatively in the presence of great classical masterpieces. The academy that had operated under royal patronage was dissolved in 1793, but the institution was reborn and its traditions continued.<sup>1</sup> By the eighteenth century the Roman classicism that under Louis had been used to reinforce the French monarchy was put to the service of republican values. Jacques-Louis David had set the stage with a series of paintings that represented great moments in early Roman history, such as *The Oath of the Horatii*, which combined republican affirmation with archaeological accuracy.<sup>2</sup> It was in the service of a French republic that was drawing heavily on the mystique of the Roman republic that Napoleon Bonaparte won his first victories in Italy. After his coup d'état he became one more figure in a long line of imperial rulers who cast on themselves

the mantle of Rome. The French thought in terms of not only military dominance but also cultural superiority, and any hegemonic culture of that period had to be shaped by classical values. This meant not only the production of plays and paintings that drew on Roman themes but the possession and propagandistic use of the physical remains of the civilization of the Caesars.

In 1793 the Central Museum of Arts was established in Paris to house classical antiquities. The archaeological ambitions of the new French Empire became clear in 1797 with the Treaty of Tolentino, which provided, among other things, for the shipment to France of such Vatican archaeological treasures as the *Laocoön* and the *Apollo Belvedere* as well as artworks like Florence's Medici Venus from other Italian cities.<sup>3</sup> Pressure was also put on leading Roman families to sell their collections to the French, usually at prices well below market value. Count Borghese, though married to Napoleon's sister, was one such victim. The antiquities were to be among the featured pieces of the new Napoleon Museum (the old Louvre), redesigned as a palace of universal culture.<sup>4</sup> This was a new type of museum, not the product of local finds like the Capitoline or Vatican museums or the private cabinet of the king of Sweden, but rather a representative collection of the best of Western art, located in the newly proclaimed center of world civilization, Paris. In conception it was clearly influenced in part by the new Pio-Clementino Museum, and it is significant that Ennio Visconti played an important role in the development of both. Short-lived in itself the Napoleon Museum provided the model for a series of other museums in both established and ascendant imperial capitals in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The papacy faced more serious crises than the transportation of Rome's archaeological treasures to Paris. The short-lived Roman republic was followed by long periods of French occupation. That grand patron of classicism Pius VI died in captivity in France. His successor, Luigi Barnaba Chiaramonti (1740–1823), was elected pope in 1800 and as Pius VII had to steer a delicate course until Wellington's victory at Waterloo removed Napoleon from the scene. In 1804 he was forced to participate in the ceremonies that crowned Napoleon emperor and from 1809 to 1814 was exiled from Rome.<sup>5</sup> For Rome and the papacy the implementation of the Treaty of Tolentino meant the loss of many of the city's greatest treasures and undermined its position as a center for cultured



tourism. That latter problem was compounded by the disappearance of the aristocratic British and most other northern European tourists.

Papal officials responded in a variety of ways. An increased effort was made through excavation and purchases to acquire classical art objects that could at least temporarily fill the gaps left by the French confiscations. Ostia became an important site for these new excavations. Among the “archaeological paintings” commissioned for the Vatican library is a work showing Pope Pius VII accompanied by an officious and obsequious Carlo Fea, his papal antiquarian, visiting the Ostian excavations.<sup>6</sup> The words *in urbem avectae* (carried into the city) stress the degree to which object recovery was the principal aim of the archaeological enterprise.<sup>7</sup>

The papal government realized that the new excavations would not be sufficient to replace their losses and that the export trade in antiquities that was drawing objects from both the great noble collections and the private excavations was threatening a major cultural heritage of Rome. In 1802 the papal government issued a decree that attempted to protect ancient monuments from looting and vandalism and to limit the export of antiquities. As a means of stopping the outward flow of antiquities it had severe limitations. But it represented the most comprehensive archaeological protection law up to that point and was an important step in the battle to protect a nation’s cultural patrimony that continues today.

The 1802 mandate was followed in 1820 by the so-called Pacca decree, named for Cardinal Bartolomeo Pacca.<sup>8</sup> The Vatican official in whose domain the preservation of antiquities rested was given first choice of all artifacts for the papal collections. Only after he had refused an artifact could it be exported. At least on paper this was the best provision for protecting classical archaeological antiquities to be found in Europe or the Mediterranean. It preceded the pioneering efforts of the Greek government to protect national antiquities and was the precursor of the Italian government decrees of 1909 and 1939 protecting archaeological sites and objects.

Yet for much of this period the pope had no real control, as French armies occupied Rome, and Napoleon, who called his son and heir the “king of Rome,” wanted to put his impress on the capital and benefit from the ideological identification with ancient Rome. His administration in Rome was headed for much of the time by Camille de Tournon, who in

cooperation with architects and restorers like Giuseppe Valadier (1762–1839) developed ambitious plans to clear and restore the principal Roman monuments in the city.<sup>9</sup> In some cases—for example, Trajan’s Column—the area around the monument was cleared to enhance its visibility.<sup>10</sup> In others, such as the Arch of Titus, major restorations were undertaken to free the structure from later accretions, restore its physical integrity, and present it in something like its original form.<sup>11</sup> The procedures anticipated by a century many of the policies and approaches adopted by Benito Mussolini. Like those of Mussolini they aroused controversy, especially with regard to the destruction of later buildings that blocked access to the classical monuments. Around the Forum of Trajan, Napoleon’s officials sought to remove one of the twin baroque churches that they felt blocked the view of the column. It took a determined effort led by Canova to save the structure that for so long had been part of the aesthetics of the area.<sup>12</sup>

The final defeat of Napoleon did not end the influence of France in Rome. The French Academy remained the major foreign cultural institution in the city, and painters like Jean-Auguste Ingres kept alive the classical tradition in the arts. For classical archaeology the most important activities connected with the academy were the research and design projects of the architectural *pensionnaires*: promising young architectural students who were supported for several years in Rome while they studied the monuments. For their final project pensionnaires would make detailed studies of a particular building, such as the Baths of Diocletian. Their completed dossiers included views of the structure in its actual state and detailed colored reconstructions of its appearance in the Roman period. The studies were elegant works of art whose technical and artistic qualities have only recently been recognized.<sup>13</sup> They were also as accurate archaeologically as the evidence then available allowed. Done to scale and peopled with classical figures, they captured the built environment of antiquity in a way that virtual-reality images have only recently rivaled.

The tradition of historical reconstruction by fledgling architects working in Rome continued into the twentieth century.<sup>14</sup> Although the impact of such historical studies on contemporary architecture became increasingly marginal, the student architects created a range of graphic reconstructions of classical monuments that appeared in guidebooks and studies of ancient architecture and helped bring antiquity to life. Like

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The Arch of Titus as restored in the 1820s by Giuseppe Valadier (photo courtesy  
the author)

the casts of ancient sculpture, the drawings were important means of bringing the discoveries of classical archaeology to a wider public.

While international events were changing the archaeological face of Rome, a diverse group of artists and antiquarians were gathering there who would help make the city an archaeological center. The Grand Tour did not resume in full force, and soon the aristocrats had been largely replaced by more bourgeois tourists. However, not all the collectors disappeared, and Romans both native and foreign kept alive the market in ancient art. The Italian antiquities dealer Ignazio Vescovali (1770–1850) was especially active in this trade, providing the English with favored items like ancient portraits.<sup>15</sup> The sculpture gallery at Woburn Abbey particularly reflects this period of collecting.<sup>16</sup>

Both change and continuity characterized the art market of early-nineteenth-century Rome. Most of the painters of the Grand Tour days were gone. Romantic trends in art would bring painters with a new vision, such as the neomedieval German Nazarenes, to Rome. Yet the art community, especially the sculptors, remained strongly neoclassical. Gradually the Europeans were joined by Americans, women as well as men. Indeed, it was Americans like William Wetmore Storey and Harriet Hosmer, the most famous representative of Henry James's "white marmorean flock," who kept the neoclassical ideal alive well into the nineteenth century.<sup>17</sup> The leading figure in the community, important not only to art but also to archaeology, was an Italian, the sculptor Antonio Canova (1757–1822).

Canova was at the end of his distinguished career when the pope returned from exile. Originally from the Veneto, he distinguished himself as the most talented and productive neoclassical artist in Rome. Both his aesthetic values and his intellectual curiosity stimulated in him a great interest in archaeology. From 1802 he was in effect head of the Vatican museums and an important papal adviser on art and archaeology. So highly was his sculpture regarded by the pope that his *Perseus* was used to fill one of the niches in the Belvedere vacated by the removal of papal antiquities to Paris. Canova also was a cosmopolitan whose friends in Rome included the English artists Gavin Hamilton and John Flaxman. His artistic and diplomatic skills made him friends on both sides in the Napoleonic struggle; he executed a number of works at Napoleon's court, the most famous of which were the nude *Paolina Bonaparte* now in the Borghese Gallery and the nude, more than life-size, statue of Napoleon

as Mars that was given to the duke of Wellington after Waterloo and is now housed in Apsley House in London. At the same time he remained an artistic and archaeological adviser to Pius VII, masterminding, among other things, the series of paintings glorifying the pope as a patron of art and archaeology that decorated the Chiaramonti Library in the Vatican. He also cultivated the English, visiting their country, advising the nobility on the development and display of their collections, and filling commissions for his own creations to complement their holdings of antiquities.<sup>18</sup>

It was Canova who successfully negotiated the return of Italian masterpieces seized by Napoleon, especially antique sculptures such as the *Laocoön* and the *Apollo Belvedere*.<sup>19</sup> The task was not an easy one, for not only were the French vehemently opposed to the return, but certain members of the anti-Napoleonic coalition were reluctant to weaken the newly reestablished monarchy by stripping the museum collections of Paris. In his diplomatic quest, Canova had two important allies, the Frenchman Antoine-Chrysostome Quatremère de Quincy (1755–1849) and the Englishman William Richard Hamilton (1777–1859). Quatremère de Quincy was one of the leading antiquarian savants of his day. A strong proponent of the importance of historical and cultural context for giving meaning to art and enemy of universal museums like the Napoleon Museum, he had spoken out against the original decision to bring the masterpieces from Italy to Paris.<sup>20</sup>

Hamilton was a British diplomat who provided Canova with important support within the British delegation.<sup>21</sup> He also had a strong interest in ancient art and archaeology, and, ironically, in his new role as a protector of cultural property he had served as Lord Elgin's diplomatic secretary in Istanbul when the Parthenon marbles were exported from Greece. He had provided another major archaeological service to England by obtaining the Rosetta Stone. Canova, using his own diplomatic skills and his prestige as an artist and benefiting from English and Austrian support, was able to win him over, and most of the great ancient pieces returned to the Vatican.

Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770–1844) was a generation younger than Canova and belonged to the last great era of neoclassical artists.<sup>22</sup> Thorvaldsen was raised in Copenhagen in a humble artisan family, but his artistic talents won him a place in the Danish Academy of Fine Arts. He first came to Rome in 1797 and spent much of the rest of his life

there. His neoclassicism was reinforced by his friendship with his fellow countryman, the antiquary Jörgen Zoëga (1755–1809). During his long productive career Thorvaldsen produced a mass of sculpture, much of it based on classical themes. Unlike Canova he was active as a restorer; the Aegina marbles was the most famous of his commissions.

The foreign community in Rome revived after the defeat of Napoleon and included a number of archaeological savants. A succession of Prussian ambassadors to the Holy See from Wilhelm von Humboldt through Berthold Niebuhr to Christian von Bunsen were interested in classical scholarship and supported the local archaeological community. Rome again hosted a lively English literary and artistic circle. Some, like the poet John Keats, came to the city for their health, but others sought inspiration from its monuments and the company of the international community of artists. Certain English settled permanently in Rome, where, joined by expatriates of other nationalities, especially Americans, they kept the classical traditions in the arts alive. Other visitors, like William Turner and Thomas Cole, spent a limited period in Italy, painting the landscape and monuments and taking the images back to England and America, where they fostered the romantic cult of classical landscapes with ruins.

Rome nourished an active antiquarian community even in the midst of the political turmoil. Most important among the foreigners in that transitional world from the last years of the Grand Tour to the new generation of antiquarians was Zoëga.<sup>23</sup> He came to Rome in 1783 on what was intended to be a short archaeological mission and never left. Like Winckelmann he mastered the museum collections and became a learned cicerone for those seriously interested in the archaeology of Rome, although much of his published scholarship was in Egyptology. More than Winckelmann, he sought to develop a “scientific” archaeology, involving precise descriptions of individual objects. This methodology was embodied in his major work in classical studies, *Li bassirilievi antichi di Roma* (The ancient bas-reliefs of Rome), published in 1808. Zoëga’s influence on the next generation of archaeologists, especially the Germans, was considerable.

The leading figure among the Italian antiquarians was Carlo Fea (1753–1836). He was a priest whose initial education was in the law, but his archaeological interests and talents led to his appointment as papal antiquary for Rome. He succeeded Winckelmann in that office,

an appropriate succession, for Fea was a great admirer of the German savant and translated his works into Italian. Fea used his office as papal antiquary to undertake such important works as the clearing of the Colosseum, the excavation of parts of the Forum, and the architectural study of the Pantheon. He published extensively and participated with great vigor in the epigraphic, topographical, and archaeological controversies that embroiled the world of Roman antiquarian savants.<sup>24</sup>

The greatest rival to Fea's antiquarian preeminence was Antonio Nibby (1792–1839), who from 1820 was professor of archaeology at the University of Rome.<sup>25</sup> Nibby excavated in various parts of the city and engaged vigorously in the various topographical battles, producing a variety of important scholarly works. In 1820 he published, with the British antiquarian William Gell, *Le mure di Roma* (The walls of Rome), and just before his death he completed a four-volume study, *Roma nell'anno 1838*. His pioneering *Topography of Rome and Its Vicinity*, written with Gell, was the first of a long succession of guidebooks to the city and remained in print for many years. By 1894 it had entered into its eleventh edition. Nibby's hard work and scholarly publications brought little material reward. He died in poverty, and a collection had to be taken to support his widow and children.

More important figures than eccentric clerics and impoverished foreign savants shaped the Roman archaeological community in the early nineteenth century. The European states, big and small, were almost all represented in the Vatican diplomatic corps, which included not only the major powers like France but also a host of smaller German and Central European political entities. Diplomats with a strong interest in the classics were natural choices for Rome postings. Their salons became gathering places for savants while their diplomatic status and the support of their home states brought them archaeological concessions from the Vatican. The German representatives, especially diplomats from Prussia, coming as they did from states where a new professional world of classical studies was emerging, played an important transformative role in the Roman archaeological community during the first third of the nineteenth century.

The first and in many ways the most important of those cultured German diplomats was Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), who served as Prussian representative to the papal court from 1802 to 1808, at the height of the Napoleonic Wars. He was a classical romantic of the gen-

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Portrait bust of Carlo Fea, papal antiquarian from 1800 to 1836 (German Archaeological Institute, Rome)

eration of Goethe, a patron of neoclassical artists, and a collector of ancient art, which graced his Prussian villa outside Berlin. His diplomatic residence in Rome became the meeting place for artists like Angelica Kauffmann and Thorvaldsen and for antiquarians like Zoëga.

In 1809 Napoleon ended the Vatican's status as an independent state, and von Humboldt returned to Prussia. He found his homeland engaged in profound self-examination caused by the defeats inflicted by the French. The Prussians sought a cultural and societal renovation that would also enhance the prestige of Berlin, the state capital. Von Humboldt led the



way in the foundation of a new university there to rival old intellectual centers like Göttingen.<sup>26</sup> The university curriculum stressed a combination of cultural development (*Bildung*) and scholarship (*Wissenschaft*). With von Humboldt as the driving force, the study of classical antiquity was certain to be at the center of the curriculum. In attracting professors the new university benefited from the growing prestige of the Prussian state but also from insecurity elsewhere in Germany. The famous classical philologist Friedrich August Wolf, who was driven out of Halle by the French, accepted an appointment at Berlin.

When papal power was restored after Waterloo, Berthold Niebuhr (1776–1831) was appointed Prussian ambassador to Rome. Niebuhr, who served from 1816 to 1823, was the most distinguished Roman historian of his day, an advocate of the new scientific history who moved easily in Roman scholarly circles.<sup>27</sup> His successor in 1827 was another scholar-diplomat, Christian von Bunsen (1791–1860).<sup>28</sup> During his ten years in Rome, Bunsen maintained one of the most cultured diplomatic residences in the city and played a key role in the foundation of a new type of scholarly organization in the city.

The defeat of Napoleon once again opened up Rome to Europeans. This especially benefited the Germans, who resumed their Winckelmann- and Goethe-inspired love affair with the city and its ruins. While the English had dominated the foreign community during the age of the Grand Tour, the young Germans and Danes predominated in the early to mid-nineteenth century. Some were part of an active artist colony that gathered regularly in the shadow of the Spanish Steps. Others were more serious students of antiquity, products of the archaeological and ancient-historical seminars of the German universities.

In 1823 four of these “new Germans”—Eduard Gerhard, Theodor Panofka, August Kestner, and Otto von Stackelberg—formed an informal group of classical enthusiasts called the Hyperboreans,<sup>29</sup> meeting regularly to study the classical authors and discuss the latest archaeological finds. The four had different backgrounds and came to Rome by various routes. Theodor Panofka (1800–1858) had studied at Berlin, traveled widely in Italy and Sicily, and established good relations with French savants like the duke of Luynes and the duke de Blacas that would soon serve him well at the fledgling Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica (Institute for Archaeological Correspondence).<sup>30</sup> Otto von Stackelberg (1787–1837) had traveled extensively in Greece, where he had been in-

volved in the excavations at Bassae. He was an excellent draftsman, and he soon proved his talents and commitment at the painted tombs in Tarquinia.<sup>31</sup> August Kestner (1777–1853) was a diplomat representing the state of Hanover in Rome.

Eduard Gerhard (1795–1867) was the most serious and professional of the group. He had studied classics with Friedrich August Wolf (1759–1824) and August Boeckh (1785–1867) at von Humboldt's new Berlin University. From Boeckh he learned the importance of the *Totalitatideal* of *Altertumswissenschaft* (total mastery of the knowledge of antiquity), the twin concepts that focused on the mastery of all categories of evidence related to classical antiquity. Boeckh appreciated the potential of material culture and especially of inscriptions in expanding our knowledge of antiquity. He was the driving force behind the preparation of one of the pioneering scholarly corpora, *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum* (1828–59).

Gerhard had first come to Italy for reasons of health in 1820 and returned in 1822, partly at the behest of the Prussian ambassador Niebuhr. In Rome he became part of the antiquarian circle of Fea, Nibby, and Filippo Visconti and made an important homeland connection when in 1828 he guided the Prussian crown prince, later Friedrich Wilhelm IV, through the archaeological sites of Rome. Gerhard's interests early focused on Greek vases. He studied private collections and recorded the latest discoveries in both Etruria and the south of Italy. He appreciated the accomplishments of the great contemporary antiquarians but also acknowledged the limits of his archaeological world, especially in the dissemination of information on the ever increasing archaeological discoveries.

Gerhard had learned from his German mentors the role that structured institutions could play in advancing systematic scholarship. His time in Rome had made him understand the positive part played by an international community of scholars and savants who shared intellectual interests and pooled information. He decided to found an international archaeological organization in Rome that would collect reports on the latest discoveries and disseminate their findings through public lectures and regular publications. In 1829 he spearheaded the transformation of the Hyperboreans into a more "scientific" international archaeological society, which played a key role in the creation of a more scholarly brand of classical archaeology. Named the Istituto di corrispondenza

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Eduard Gerhard, founder of the Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica in Rome (German Archaeological Institute, Berlin)

archeologica, the society combined the three faces of contemporary archaeology: the aesthetics of Winckelmann, the new scholarly philology, and the tradition of the learned travelers and collectors.<sup>32</sup>

Gerhard's proposed society faced a number of problems, the most serious of which was rivalry with the Pontifical Roman Academy of Archaeology. The original Pontifical Academy had been founded in 1740 by

Benedict XIV but had not survived his death. It had been refounded in 1810 when Pope Pius VII was in exile and the French controlled the city. However, the academy had made a smooth adjustment from the Rome of Napoleon to that of the papal restoration, aided by the selection in 1816 of Antonio Canova as president. He not only lent his energies and prestige to its development but also provided the credentials of a highly respected papal loyalist. In 1821 the academy started its first publication series.<sup>33</sup> The first volume included a dedication to Pius VII, the bylaws, a list of members, living and dead, and the text of a discourse pronounced by Canova. Initial contributors included such distinguished antiquaries as Fea, Nibby, and Niebuhr. Well established and well supported, the academy viewed its new, largely foreign rival with skepticism.

The project for the creation of the Institute gained the support of two prominent Roman scholar-diplomats, Bunsen and Kestner.<sup>34</sup> It had as its first chief patron and “protector” Friedrich William, crown prince of Prussia, and as the first president the duke de Blacas (1771–1839), French ambassador to the court at Naples and another antiquarian diplomat. De Blacas, along with the duke of Luynes (1802–67), had made pioneering explorations of the Greek sites of South Italy.<sup>35</sup> English interests were represented by James Millingen (1774–1845), who now occupied the role of cicerone and collections facilitator that individuals like Gavin Hamilton had played before Napoleon.<sup>36</sup> Secretary of the Italian section was the famed epigrapher Bartolomeo Borghesi (1781–1860).<sup>37</sup>

The Institute’s Prussian associations were a mixed blessing since the Vatican was engaged in tense negotiations with the Prussian government over the status of the Roman Catholic Church in Prussia. When the duke de Blacas died, the promoters of the Institute prudently asked the Austrian conservative Prince Metternich, who was much more popular with the Vatican, to assume the presidency. After prolonged negotiations, the Institute achieved official organizational status in the Papal States.<sup>38</sup>

The Institute used various grades of membership to advance its mission. Associate and honorary members ranged from potentially important patrons like Elena, grandduchess of Russia, to Roman antiquarians such as Fea and Nibby. The foundation stones of the new society were the *soci corrispondenti*, savants located throughout the Italian mainland and Sicily who provided Gerhard with information on recent archaeological discoveries.<sup>39</sup> During his travels in Italy, Gerhard had made the

acquaintance of Neapolitan antiquarians like Michele Arditi (1746–1838) and Francesco Avellino (1788–1850) and their Tuscan counterparts such as Francesco Inghirami (1772–1846) and Antonio Zannoni (1833–1910).<sup>40</sup> He appreciated their great knowledge of local archaeology and access to information, and their reports appeared regularly in the publications of the Institute. While many of its activities were focused on Rome and Italy the Institute was not just a gathering of local antiquarians. In addition it disseminated archaeological information gathered from the whole world of classical antiquity. The extent of this intended reach was indicated in 1840 by the publication of a long report on recent finds from the Kertch in the Crimea.

The international union of savants, artists, and archaeologists in the Institute was an expression of the cosmopolitan quality of the Roman archaeological community. The Institute's initial meeting was held on April 21, the symbolic birthday of ancient Rome. As an important concession to the host country, meetings were conducted in Italian. However, the organization soon became an instrument of German scholarship and Prussian cultural politics. While the first president was French, the driving force was the German Gerhard, who held the position of first secretary, and early meetings were held in properties of the Prussian embassy. In 1835 the Prussian crown prince financed the construction of new headquarters on the Campidoglio—a neoclassical building whose entrance was framed by busts of Goethe and Winckelmann known as the Casa Tarpeia—that served the Institute until 1877.<sup>41</sup>

In the Institute's early years its publications included articles on many subjects, but among the most important were publications on the new discoveries in the tombs at Vulci. Etruscan archaeology was not new, but the field had long been the domain of local and regional antiquarians who wished in part to advance local Etruscan civilization as a counterforce to Roman imperialism and its modern political and cultural associations. Now important new discoveries brought Etruscan archaeology to center stage. In 1827 painted tombs were discovered at Tarquinia. Interest initially centered less on what they told about Etruscan culture than on the information that they provided about ancient painting, that third great art of antiquity (after sculpture and architecture), of which the literary sources said much but archaeology had yielded little. The paintings from Pompeii were of Roman date, and it was uncertain how much they reflected the Greek originals. The same problems arose from

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The Casa Tarpeia, the headquarters of the Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica on the Capitoline Hill in Rome (German Archaeological Institute, Rome)

finds like the Alexander mosaic unearthed at Pompeii by 1832 or the *Odyssey* frieze found on the Esquiline in 1848.<sup>42</sup> Now the archaeologists had paintings that dated from the Classical period, though again filtered through another culture.

Classical vases provided another important source of information on Greek painting. The third volume of the annals of the Institute was devoted almost entirely to a long illustrated article by Gerhard on the Greek vases found at Vulci. Although material found there had long provided the foundations for public and private collections of Greek vases in Italy and beyond, Lucien Bonaparte, prince of Canino and the new owner of much of the land in the area, was interested in realizing its fuller archaeological potential. Starting in 1828, he commissioned the local antiquarian Vincenzo Campanari (1772–1840) and his associates, in cooperation with the papal government, to open a new campaign of tomb exploration, which brought important new discoveries.<sup>43</sup>

It was this material that formed the basis of Gerhard's long report. He was mainly interested in the scenes depicted on the vases and saw this massive new body of visual material as having enormous potential for understanding the full visual world of Greek mythology. Gerhard's approach also lent itself best to the illustrative technology available at that

time. Improved drawing and printing techniques allowed scenes to be rendered more accurately but could not provide the full detail necessary for the type of attribution studies that later dominated vase studies.

This new interest in the Etruscan sites also served papal cultural and political interests. The defeat of Napoleon had restored the territorial integrity of the core Papal States. But it was already clear that new regional and nationalistic forces were developing that would threaten the papal temporal power. Because some of these centered on Tuscany, the popes believed that by supporting archaeology in south Etruria they could strengthen their historical and ideological connections with the regions that bordered Tuscany. Papal support of excavations at Vulci admirably suited all of those objectives.

In 1831 Gregory XVI became pope. Although many aspects of his reign were reactionary, he did have a well-developed interest in archaeology and appreciated its potential as an instrument for cultural propaganda.<sup>44</sup> New archaeological materials acquired through the excavation and the enforcement of the 1820 Pacca decree increasingly filled the Vatican storerooms. In 1844 Gregory founded the Gregorian Secular Museum in the Lateran Palace to provide a new display venue for many of those finds.

The new excavations at sites like Vulci provided many new objects for the papal Etruscan collection, and in 1837 the Gregorian Etruscan Museum was created in the Vatican complex. Vases naturally formed a major part of the collection, and the exhibitions were organized according to typologies that reflected the latest scholarship in Greek vase studies. The most famous exhibit was the superb vase by the Attic painter Exekias showing Ajax and Achilles playing draughts. Its display case in the new museum bore a dedicatory inscription to the pope. There was also an evocative reconstruction of an Etruscan tomb in one of the small rooms. By focusing on territories of the Papal States outside Rome, the Gregorian Etruscan Museum helped promote an identity with those regions and their culture at a time when the papacy's temporal power was increasingly threatened.

In founding these two museums (as well as the Egyptian Museum) Gregory became one of the great museum patrons in papal history. Appropriately, his achievements were celebrated in an 1842 cantata written by none other than the papal commissioner of antiquities, Pietro Ercole Visconti.<sup>45</sup> The work's central theme is the importance of archaeology,

especially the museum-building activities of Gregory, in rescuing the genius of Rome from the devastating effects of time.

Archaeological activity in the papacy of Gregory XVI extended well beyond tomb excavation and museum foundation. A prolonged European peace meant an increase in tourists to Rome. (After 1819 an average of seven tour books a year were published on Italy.)<sup>46</sup> That market had to be served. Collectors renewed their activities, and the local antiquarian community remained thriving. Excavations continued, if in a somewhat haphazard manner.

Two archaeological figures in particular, Luigi Canina (1795–1856) and Giovanni Pietro Campana (1808–80), capture key elements of the archaeological world of the early nineteenth century. Canina was the most important Italian archaeological figure in the generation after Fea.<sup>47</sup> He was by training an architect, and his early commissions for the Borghese family included designing neoclassical structures for their Roman gardens. Canina shared Piranesi's affirmation of the Roman roots of classical architecture, though he was closer in design philosophy and ideology to more neoclassical English contemporaries, such as C. R. Cockerell and Thomas L. Donaldson, sharing their views that archaeological research should be used to improve the contemporary arts. Ironically, it was on a commission to England for the duke of Northumberland that he was struck down by his last, fatal illness.<sup>48</sup>

Canina combined his archaeological knowledge and his skills as an architectural draftsman to create reconstructions of ancient monuments, and his prints did much to bring to life the visual world of Roman antiquity. His archaeological work combined both architectural and antiquarian interests, and he was a faithful member of the *Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica* as well as a pioneer in the use of the fragments of the Severan marble plan to reconstruct the topographical plan of ancient Rome, while his 1830 *Pianta topografica di Roma* (Topographical plan of Rome) was the first modern reconstruction of the ancient city.<sup>49</sup> Canina inherited some of the monumental restoration projects of Valadier including repairs to the Colosseum. He was also an active excavator both in Rome and in the surrounding areas. His digging on the Esquiline produced the paintings known as the *Odyssey Landscapes*, while the pope himself visited his excavations at Tusculum, conducted under the patronage of Queen Maria Cristina of Savoy.<sup>50</sup> A tablet at the site still commemorates that event. In many ways Canina's most important



[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The tomb monument of the Roman architect and archaeologist Luigi Canina in the Church of SS. Luca and Martino in Rome (German Archaeological Institute, Rome)

archaeological achievement was the excavation, consolidation, and presentation of the Roman remains along the *via Appia* from the tomb of Caecilia Metella to Bovillae. Canina's rendering of the *via Appia*, both archaeologically and in print reconstructions, established the evocative image of that road for the romantic age.<sup>51</sup> But even here the modern was soon to intrude. When the British archaeologist Charles Newton visited the *via Appia* in 1856, he praised Canina's restoration but also noted the presence of a new telegraph line beside the road.<sup>52</sup>

The Roman world of mid-nineteenth-century collecting by the new papal rich was most flamboyantly represented by Giovanni Pietro Campana. Because of his position as director of the papal financial lending institution, Monte di Pietà, he was often referred to as the "pope's pawnbroker."<sup>53</sup> Campana did well by his position and became an assiduous

art collector with a special interest in Roman and Etruscan antiquities. Many of his objects came from his own excavations, undertaken through his connections with the papal court. These began in 1831 with the clearing of the columbarium of Pomponius Hylas on the *via Latina* and then extended to work in Ostia, Cerveteri, and Tarquinia. At the height of his success Campana's collections included 531 sculptures, 4,000 Etruscan and Italo-Greek vases, 600 ancient bronzes, 2,000 classical terra-cottas, and a plethora of other archaeological material including glassware, jewelry, and coins.<sup>54</sup> These were prominently displayed in his villa on the Caelian Hill, which included re-created archaeological complexes, such as the columbarium of Pomponius Hylas and an Etruscan tomb. The villa-museum also included thematic displays of Roman sculpture in the grand tradition of the Roman aristocrats, whom the *nouveau riche* Campana was attempting to imitate.<sup>55</sup>

Papal politics was treacherous, however, and by the late 1850s Campana was in disgrace. His collection was confiscated by papal officials and, in violation of the aims of the *Pacca* decree, placed on the antiquities market. The international competition for the material was ferocious, but ultimately much of it was purchased by Napoleon III for his Paris museums, one of the largest exports of antiquities from Italy during the nineteenth century.<sup>56</sup>

Less ephemeral was the success of the Torlonia family, the last of the great Roman families who used archaeology and antiquities display as an assertion of legitimacy. The family, which was of French origin, built up a large banking fortune in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, benefiting from its French connections and from the financial problems of many of the great Roman families under French occupation. Giovanni Torlonia (1754–1829) accelerated the process of social climbing by refurbishing a palace on the *piazza Venezia* and acquiring a villa on the *via Nomentina*, entrusting its renovation to Valadier, the most fashionable architect of the day. At Giovanni's death in 1829, his son Alessandro took over the bank as well the palace and villa. He continued the program of physical improvement and social advancement, which culminated in 1842 with the presence of both King Ludwig of Bavaria and Pope Gregory XVI at the dedication of an obelisk to the memory of his parents.<sup>57</sup>

The Torlonia properties, especially the palace and villa, reflected the prevailing neoclassical taste in their architecture, sculpture, and

painting.<sup>58</sup> The frescoes and paintings included allegorical representations and mythological subjects but also scenes from the life of Alexander the Great, an obvious reference to the owner.<sup>59</sup> The grounds of the villa were dotted with imitations of classical temples, fake ruins, and partially reconstructed statues. As one would expect from such ambitious patrons, the Torlonias became involved in archaeology, especially antiquities collecting. The foundation of their collection was laid in 1800 with the purchase of massive holdings from the estate of the recently deceased restorer Bartolomeo Cavaceppi.<sup>60</sup> They then acquired significant additions from the classical artworks belonging to the Giustiniani family. When they added the Villa Albani and its collection to their holdings in 1866, the Torlonias were able to boast one of the most extensive collections of classical antiquities in the world.

The Torlonias cultivated the Roman archaeological community, and its leading lights could be seen at their social events.<sup>61</sup> They also used their own estates for archaeological exploration, especially the search for ancient marbles to add to their collection. The vast project for the draining of Lake Fucine yielded enough artifacts to stock the antiquarium at the Palazzo Torlonia in Avezzano.<sup>62</sup> The most important of those ventures were the excavations undertaken from 1856 to 1860 and in 1864 at Portus, the artificial harbor for the city of Rome constructed by the emperors Claudius and Trajan. It was these excavations that launched the archaeological career of a young engineer named Rodolfo Lanciani, who became one of the foremost scholars on Roman topography.

In 1846 Pope Gregory died, and Pius IX assumed the papacy. His initial openness to new ideas raised hopes for a new era of modernity in the Papal States—hopes that were dashed by the tumultuous events of 1848 and the establishment of the Roman republic in 1849. Briefly exiled, Pius was restored to Rome by French arms, and from 1849 to 1870 he held the city through a French army of occupation. After united Italian forces under King Victor Emmanuel II captured Rome in September 1870, proclaiming the city the capital of the new united Italy and annexing the Papal States, Pius IX continued to reign for eight more years, holed up in the Vatican, where he preached against the secular monarchy installed on his doorstep.

Not surprisingly, Pius IX was particularly interested in the advancement of Christian archaeology at Rome. This subfield of classical archaeology had its roots in the Renaissance and to a certain degree always

operated as an intellectual protest against the excessive secular humanism associated with classical archaeology. Early research in Christian archaeology had centered on catacomb studies.<sup>63</sup> Pius returned to these archaeological roots, encouraging renewed investigations of early Christian burial places. In 1849 the catacomb of Saint Callistus, containing the tombs of several early popes, was discovered on the via Appia. The importance of these finds for the “renewal” of the church was emphasized by well-documented papal visits to newly discovered or reopened catacombs. The Christian emphasis was also reflected in another expansion of the Vatican museum complex. In 1851 Pius sponsored the creation of the Pio Cristiano Museum at the Lateran and in 1852 gave official sanction to the Commission of Sacred Archaeology.<sup>64</sup>

The archaeologist most representative of the papacy of Pius IX and in many ways the most impressive Roman archaeological figure of the era was Giovanni Battista de Rossi (1822–94), who distinguished himself in both classical and Christian archaeology.<sup>65</sup> De Rossi was a respected student of Latin inscriptions, a close friend of the classical historian Theodor Mommsen, and one of the founding editors of the *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* (*CIL*). His reputation was even greater in Christian archaeology, and he played a major role in bringing the standards of that discipline up to those of nineteenth-century classical scholarship. Much of his research was epigraphical, and he brought the professional standards of an editor of the *CIL* to the study of Christian inscriptions. He also spearheaded both the study of the known catacombs and the exploration and excavation of newly discovered ones such as that of Saint Callistus.

Although the pope was no longer a major sponsor of classical archaeology, Rome remained the major center for archaeological research. Secular Italians continued to make important contributions, but developments in international scholarship and the changing power relations not only in Rome but in Europe generally resulted in foreigners, especially French and German, dominating the archaeological scene.

During the years of Napoleon III’s occupation of Rome, when his army maintained the temporal power of the pope, the emperor reaffirmed the Bonapartes’ dynastic identification with ancient, especially imperial, Rome. He was fascinated by Julius Caesar and wrote a biography of the populist dictator. Napoleon was also interested in archaeology both as a scholarly discipline and as an instrument for French imperial propaganda. In 1861 he purchased the Farnese Gardens on the Palatine Hill

from Francesco II of Naples and commissioned Pietro Rosa to excavate the palace of the Caesars and other famous monuments on the hill.<sup>66</sup>

If de Rossi best exemplified the archaeologists of Pius's French period, Pietro Rosa (1810–91) was probably the best representative of the transitional generation between the world of the Papal States and that of the new, unified Italy.<sup>67</sup> Trained as a painter and to a limited degree as an architect he attracted the attention of Canina, who brought him into the employ of the Borghese family. The Borghese connection ended abruptly when Rosa enthusiastically embraced the cause of the 1849 republic. Canina rescued him from penury, exploiting Rosa's architectural and artistic skills for his work on the via Appia. Archaeology now became central to Rosa's life. He pioneered in exploring the archaeological remains in the Roman Campagna and laid the foundation for the *Carta archaeologica di Lazio* (Archaeological map of Lazio). His archaeological experience on the Palatine under Napoleon III led to his later appointment as director of excavations in the new capital. He conducted the first national archaeological projects in the Forum after 1870. However, he soon ran afoul of Giuseppe Fiorelli, the director of the new national archaeological service, and the archaeologists who represented the Comune of Rome, and by 1874 he had been ousted from his position.

The German role in Roman archaeology was also changing. In part this reflected the political evolution of Germany itself, where the Prussian state was consolidating power preparatory to creating a new German empire. Expressions of Prussia's increased power appeared in the frequent conflicts between its government and the papacy over Catholic policies and practices in Prussia. These tensions at times produced serious handicaps for German scholars trying to work in the Papal States. Yet as German scholars rose to a position of dominance in classical archaeology, their influence was strongly felt in Rome.

The Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica mirrored many of those changes. When Eduard Gerhard returned to Germany in 1834, he left a flourishing institution, whose lectures brought together the brightest lights in the Roman archaeological community and whose publications had become a major source for classical scholars. He laid the foundations of a library that quickly became one of the most important in Rome and remains one of the principal strengths of what is now the German Archaeological Institute.

He also left a handpicked successor in the young Emil Braun (1809–56), a student of, among others, the classicist and archaeologist Karl Otfried Müller at Göttingen.<sup>68</sup> Gerhard brought Braun to Rome in 1833 and by 1840 he was first secretary of the Institute, a position he held until his death in 1856. His first years were promising, as he continued the traditions of Gerhard in scholarly research and publication and applied new scholarly tools such as cast making and photography to archaeology. In his later years his scholarship became less impressive and he was away for long periods pursuing his own interests in northern Europe, leaving the Institute to drift.

Fortunately he had prepared his own successor in Wilhelm Henzen (1816–87), who in many respects became the second founder of the Institute.<sup>69</sup> Henzen was a student of Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker, one of the leading classical philologists at the University of Bonn, but he came late to the study of Roman history and archaeology. When he finally settled in Rome in 1842, the city—and the Institute—became his lifelong home. Henzen was particularly interested in the newly emerging “scientific” discipline of Latin epigraphy. He had studied with the “sage of San Marino,” Bartolomeo Borghesi, and he soon joined with his young contemporaries de Rossi and Theodor Mommsen in laying the foundations of the *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*.<sup>70</sup> When Henzen succeeded Braun as first secretary, a new era began for the Institute.

The Institute faced severe financial problems, especially after 1848, and its existence as a private organization supported by donations and sales of publications was threatened. The only viable alternative was to turn to the Prussian government, even though this meant that the Institute would take on the character of a government body.<sup>71</sup> The support from the Prussian government allowed the Institute to establish a more stable organization. In 1857 Heinrich von Brunn (1822–94) joined Henzen as second secretary. He was one of a succession of capable assistants, the most important of whom were to be another second secretary, Wolfgang Helbig (1839–1915), and the librarian August Mau (1840–1909), a pioneering student of Pompeian painting. German students, nicknamed the “Capitoline ragazzi,” flocked to the Institute.

Henzen’s genial manner, diplomatic skills, and international spirit were all needed since the Institute itself was changing character as Germany centralized and came to dominate continental politics. It had been founded in 1829 as a cosmopolitan organization where German, French,

Italian, and other scholars could work closely together. Now increased Prussian support meant a closer Prussian identity, a development not pleasing to all in Rome. However, the change was inevitable, and did bring with it a level of financing not previously possible. By the 1850s the Institute was able to offer students formal travel scholarships that allowed young archaeologists to explore not only Italy but also Greece and the Aegean islands. These scholarships introduced a new German generation to the potential of Greek archaeology and laid the foundations for the great German excavations of the later century.<sup>72</sup> In 1871 the Institute became a Prussian, and then in 1873 a German, imperial institution, part of the Berlin Academy. Even Henzen could not make other nationals, especially the French, feel comfortable. In 1875 the French founded their own school in Rome.<sup>73</sup>

Focus on the archaeology of Rome and its monuments can make us forget the early investigations of the rich and diverse archaeological culture to be found in the rest of Italy. Much of that archaeology still focused on the antiquarian, as scholars used the physical past as a weapon in local and regional historical, political, and cultural battles. Many of the local savants, however, had great knowledge of local antiquities, had accumulated impressive private collections, and were the first to know about discoveries in their territories. Certainly the founders and early promoters of the *Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica* knew the savants' worth and cultivated them. Scholars like Bartolomeo Borghesi of San Marino had achieved international status. This antiquarian world shaped and even dominated Italian archaeology well into the twentieth century, particularly two spheres of the Bourbon realm, South Italy and Sicily.

Except for the relatively short Napoleonic interlude, the rich archaeological lands of South Italy and Sicily were until the mid-nineteenth century controlled by the Bourbons. It has been customary to regard the Bourbon years as benighted from an archaeological as well as from a political, social, or economic perspective, but that judgment is overly harsh. The eighteenth-century ruler Charles III should be regarded as an enlightened archaeological monarch. Not only did he make important contributions to the explorations of Pompeii and Herculaneum, but he played an impressive role in developing the museum at Portici.<sup>74</sup> The foundation of the Naples Museum was another important Bourbon contribution to archaeology. Even though the slow process of arranging

the museum was not completed until 1821, the accomplishment was celebrated by the commissioning of a statue of Ferdinand IV as Minerva by no less an artist than Canova.<sup>75</sup>

While the intellectual culture of early-nineteenth-century Naples was not what it had been in the previous century, still it was a major center for scholarship and antiquarian learning.<sup>76</sup> Important archaeological amateurs like Francesco Avellino tried to expand the horizon and increase the intellectual rigor of the Neapolitan antiquarian world.<sup>77</sup> Avellino had a European reputation and was friends with figures like Welcker and Gerhard. In 1842 he founded the journal *Bullettino archeologico napoletano* and from 1839 to 1850 was superintendent of excavations at Pompeii, where in 1847 he hired the young Giuseppe Fiorelli, who later became one of the premier archaeologists of the region.<sup>78</sup>

The complicated archaeological history of the Bourbon regime in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is best approached through its three major geographical divisions, the Bay of Naples (especially Pompeii), Magna Graecia, and Sicily. Each had a different ancient history, each had a different social, economic, and cultural place in the Bourbon regime, and each underwent a different archaeological development.

The archaeology of the Vesuvian cities during this period became largely focused on Pompeii. The relative ease of digging there made it more attractive than Herculaneum, which required complicated mining operations. As we have seen, the excavation of certain key monuments, such as the Temple of Isis, made the site popular and added it to repertoire of the eighteenth-century Grand Tour. Following the French invasion, especially during the period when Murat and his wife, Caroline, sister of Napoleon, controlled the kingdom of Naples, excavations at Pompeii accelerated. Considerable financial and human resources were devoted to them, and Queen Caroline in particular took a special interest in their discoveries. Archaeology slowed down with the Bourbon restoration in 1816, but had resumed again by the 1820s and continued until the Bourbons were replaced by the new government of the unified Italy.

It was during those years that extensive clearing made the site comprehensible as an urban entity rather than a series of discrete buildings.<sup>79</sup> A major advance was made with the plotting of the line of the walls that helped define the extent and nature of the site. Further public buildings were cleared, especially in the area of the forum, giving both specialists and casual visitors a better sense of daily life in Pompeii. Perhaps most



important was the excavation of a number of the houses that provided tourists with a real sense of the domestic life of the city just before its destruction. Most spectacular was the House of the Faun, with its sumptuous layout and large and beautiful Alexander mosaic. More intimate, but also more suggestive, was the jewel of domestic architecture and decoration known as the House of the Tragic Poet.<sup>80</sup>

These discoveries attracted the new middle-class tourists, who found it increasingly easy to travel down from Naples.<sup>81</sup> The new market stimulated new approaches toward making the discoveries comprehensible through publications and fresh modes of visual presentation. The most important pioneer in this area was the Frenchman François Mazois (1783–1826), who applied the archaeological reconstruction approach of the French Academy in Rome to the discoveries at Pompeii.<sup>82</sup> His first interests were focused on the antiquities of Gaul, but in 1808 he left for Naples, where he initially benefited from French influence in that city. Starting in 1809 he undertook a series of detailed studies of the monuments of Pompeii in the manner of the French pensionaires in Rome. In 1825 he published his *Palais di Scaurus*, subtitled “fragment of a voyage of Merovir to Rome near the end of the republic,” the fictional account of a young Gaul’s experience of Roman domestic architecture in the age of Cicero. His Pompeian studies were first published in 1824 as the first volume of his *Les ruines de Pompeii*. At the time of his early death Mazois left 454 completed but unpublished plates, many of which appeared in posthumous volumes of *Les ruines* (the last in 1838). His views and reconstructions were increasingly reproduced in popular books and guides on Pompeii and were important contributions to the process of making Pompeii visible to cultivated audiences in Europe and America.

This new interest in Pompeii was also reflected in literature, best exemplified by the 1834 novel by the English writer Edward Bulwer-Lytton, *The Last Days of Pompeii*, set in the city at the moment of its destruction. Bulwer-Lytton had done his homework. The residence of the aesthete Glaukos, one of the central characters in the novel, was modeled on the recently discovered House of the Tragic Poet. The arch-villain was a Jesuitical priest of Isis who operated from the now-famous temple. This tale of British sentimentality set in ancient Rome was enormously popular in both England and America, where the sculptor Randolph Rogers created a statue of the self-sacrificing slave girl Nydia that was widely copied.<sup>83</sup> A young Englishman named Walter Pater, inspired by

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Early-nineteenth-century tourists at Pompeii as depicted in a print by François Mazois, c. 1812 (Department of Classics, Cambridge University)

the figure of Glaukos, published his own classical romance, *Marius the Epicurean* (1885), laying the foundation for a new generation of aesthetes who would play an important role in art history and archaeology at the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>84</sup>

The bulk of the tourists going to Pompeii from mid-century on were not aesthetes, but earnest Europeans and Americans. They were looking for information as well as inspiration, and often found it hard to obtain. The traditional guides would tell them amusing stories but could not satisfy their Victorian desire to know. It was to fill this gap that the young German archaeologist Johannes Overbeck (1826–95), who believed that an archaeologist should be *nützlich* (useful) as well as scholarly, produced in 1856 his famous guide to Pompeii. It went through several editions during this lifetime and after his death was reworked by another great German Pompeian scholar, August Mau, into his *Pompeii in Leben und Kunst* (Pompeii in life and art; 1900), which long remained the standard introduction to the site.<sup>85</sup>

Given its inherent interest and importance to tourism, it is not surprising that Pompeii became an early locus for experiments in archaeological photography. The first known photographs of the ruins at Pompeii, done by the Englishmen Calvert Jones and George Bridges, date

to between 1845 and 1847.<sup>86</sup> In 1851 Alfred-Nicholas Normad, a student at the French Academy, experimented with photography at Pompeii.<sup>87</sup> In 1857 Giorgio Sommer (1834–1914) opened his photographic studio in Naples, gearing his business to archaeological tourists.<sup>88</sup> He was especially interested in Pompeii. By 1873 his catalogue included one hundred images of the site. In 1863 he photographed one of the first casts of bodies from Pompeii, a technique of vivid archaeology that Fiorelli was just developing. However, he also took photographs of sculptures in the Naples Museum and was a pioneer in the creation of stereopticon photos.<sup>89</sup>

Pompeii was just one of a number of major archaeological sites where photographs were being produced for both scholarly study and tourist amusement. Soon file cabinets filled with photographs became a central research instrument, while fading photographs of Pompeii, the Roman Forum, or the Acropolis provided “inspiration” in Latin classrooms. Indeed, archaeological print photographs complemented by lantern slides, and stereopticon images, with their greater compactness, variety, and flexibility, soon became a serious threat to the cast gallery.<sup>90</sup> Scholarly institutions and enterprising businessmen made an increasing selection available to scholars and amateurs. The Hellenic Society commissioned the American photographer William J. Stillman to prepare a set of monuments of Rome. These influenced not only archaeology but also the neoclassical taste in the arts. The painter Lawrence Alma-Tadema used the extensive holdings of Pompeian photographs that he obtained on his honeymoon to endow the classical settings of his historical paintings with archaeological accuracy.<sup>91</sup>

No figure represents better the complexities and contradictions of the Bourbon archaeological scene than Giuseppe Fiorelli (1823–96), the founding father of modern Pompeian archaeology and a central figure in the early national period of Italian archaeology.<sup>92</sup> Born in Naples of a cultured family from Lucera, Fiorelli was reared in the liberal circles of the Bourbon capital. He was largely self-taught in archaeology, although he was a beneficiary of the rich Neapolitan antiquarian tradition.<sup>93</sup> His early archaeological interests were indicated by his 1843 publications in the bulletin of the *Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica*. His special passion was numismatics, which gave him a link with the Naples antiquarian world. He learned the systematic study of coins from a Neapolitan amateur, Don Benigno Tuzzi, who belonged to the long tradition of

Italian savants in the numismatic arts, and coins remained a centerpiece of Fiorelli's research throughout his life.

Fiorelli received his first appointment at Pompeii from Francesco Avellino, but his promising archaeological career was interrupted by the events of 1848. Fiorelli was a political liberal and hence ran afoul of the restored Bourbon government. He was briefly jailed and removed from his position at Pompeii, and his publications and research notes were confiscated by the police.<sup>94</sup> His lot improved when he found an important patron in Leopold, count of Syracuse, brother of the Bourbon king Ferdinand II, and an amateur archaeological enthusiast.

Fiorelli's fortunes further increased with the annexation of Naples to the kingdom of Italy in 1860. His appointment as both archaeological superintendent and director of the Naples Museum made him the foremost archaeological power in Campania, and his daily walk from home to museum to restaurant took on the aura of the *passgiato* of a Neapolitan grandee. Fiorelli was a major force at the museum, especially active in the publication of its vast collections. His ordering of the excavations at Pompeii is probably best represented by the creation of the scheme of regional divisions within the city, still in force today.<sup>95</sup> He also implemented a program of making casts of bodies recovered from the ash, and began regular publication of a journal of the excavations. Fiorelli brilliantly combined scientific and romantic archaeology, preserving information on dress and physical type but also making vivid the suffering of the people in their last hours.<sup>96</sup> In 1875 Ruggiero Bonghi, the minister for public instruction, called him to Rome to apply his organizational abilities to the national archaeological scene as director of the newly created Direzione generale dei musei e degli scavi di antichità (Department of Museums and Excavations of Antiquities). A new phase in Fiorelli's life began.

One of the most innovative but also the most controversial of Fiorelli's projects was his attempt in 1866 to establish a school of archaeology at Pompeii. Its aim was to provide young Italians with the full range of archaeological experience in the hands-on context of the excavations at Pompeii and to create a new cadre of professionals for the archaeological service of the new national state. Unfortunately, few Italian students were able to pass the entrance exam; in 1871 there was one student, Edoardo Brizio (1846–1906), who went on to a distinguished career in classical and Italic archaeology at Bologna.<sup>97</sup> The school's failure to enroll

qualified students provoked debate over the preparation offered in the secondary schools and the universities. Fiorelli's proposal also raised concern among those who felt that archaeological education should be focused in the universities.<sup>98</sup> Although Fiorelli's school is often cited as a pioneering effort in archaeological education, its impact on the developing profession in Italy was limited.<sup>99</sup>

While the archaeology of Campania continued to be central to European archaeological activities, much of the territory of the old Magna Graecia in South Italy remained little known and poorly explored. The brooding, malarial ruins of Paestum had been part of the archaeological Grand Tour since the mid-eighteenth century, but the important sites to the south in Calabria and Apulia remained largely unexplored. Communications in South Italy were poor, and many areas were either invested by bandits or made even more dangerous by disease. As late as 1825 a young English couple on their way back from Paestum was murdered by brigands.<sup>100</sup> Even the growing interest in Greek architecture during the nineteenth century did not bring much recognition to important ruins such as those of Metaponto. The sites of the south remained largely the preserve of the antiquarians. These learned locals won the respect of scholars like François Lenormant and Paolo Orsi for their industry and great local knowledge, but they generally lacked a wider vision and mastery of the scholarship outside their own regions.<sup>101</sup>

Few major works of archaeological scholarship treated the region. The abbé Jean Claude Richard de Saint Non (1727–91) had published his illustrated *Picturesque Voyages with Descriptions of the Kingdoms of Sicily and Naples* from 1779 to 1786,<sup>102</sup> and in 1807 William Wilkins (1778–1839) produced *Antiquities of Magna Graecia*, but it was the publication by François Lenormant in 1881–83 of *La Grande Grèce* that opened up new interest in the archaeology of South Italy.<sup>103</sup> Lenormant (1837–83) was the son of the archaeologist Charles Lenormant (1802–59), who had accompanied Champollion on his famous expedition to Egypt. A professor of archaeology at the Collège de France, Charles Lenormant in 1844 founded the *Revue archéologique*. Like many of his generation the younger Lenormant received his introduction to scientific archaeology through study of the collection in the Parisian Cabinet des médailles. A controversial figure whose later reputation was tarnished by charges of forgery, Lenormant ranged widely, publishing important works on Near Eastern archaeology and numismatics, but he did not turn to the

archaeology of South Italy until 1879.<sup>104</sup> His publications were based on extensive travels made in that insalubrious land during the following years, exertions that probably contributed to his early death.

Much different was the archaeological culture of Sicily. Palermo remained a major cultural center in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the Sicilian nobility were proud of their learning and amateur scholarly accomplishments, especially in archaeology.<sup>105</sup> Representative of that class was Ignazio Paterno, prince of Biscari (1719–86), who was hailed as the wealthiest, but also the most learned, man in Sicily. The Englishman Richard Payne Knight described a visit in 1777 to the prince's private museum: "We found the Prince in his Museum which is very rich and always open for the use of the Studious. In the first Apartment are the Marbles, among which are some excellent Busts and a torso of Jupiter, which appears to have been the true original of that now in the *Museum Clementinum* at Rome. . . . The Prince has besides a noble collection of Bronzes, Etruscan Vases and natural curiosities and more particularly of Medals. His Sicilian ones are very numerous and well preserved and form an agreeable study even to those, who are not well versed in Antiquities."<sup>106</sup>

In Sicily the Bourbon royal family and their local supporters promoted archaeological investigations and also sought to protect classical monuments. Charles III, who had sponsored the excavations at Herculaneum, also promoted publications of the antiquities of Sicily. The younger nobility were stimulated in their antiquarian research by scholars imported from the mainland and by regular correspondence with antiquarians in Italy and the rest of Europe. Bourbon and local aristocratic interest in the study and preservation of the antiquities of Sicily came together in 1779 when Gabriele Lancellotto Castello, prince of Torremuzza (1727–92), and the prince of Biscari were appointed guardians of the antiquities of Sicily with responsibility for the control of excavation, monument restoration, and even the export of antiquities.<sup>107</sup> Both men had distinguished themselves by their archaeological research on the island. Torremuzza was a lifelong antiquarian; his passion had been stimulated by a youthful discovery of coins on the family estate. Biscari not only developed his famous museum but also founded the Etna Academy in 1744 and in 1781 published *Viaggio per tutte le antichità di Sicilia*, an archaeological guidebook to the island.

Foreigners also found their way to Sicily. In 1777 the German

painter Jakob Philipp Hackert and the British dilettantes Charles Gore and Richard Payne Knight (1751–1824) made an expedition into Sicily. Knight, who later became one of the most influential connoisseurs of his generation, was a young amateur classicist. He soon was to gain notoriety by his publication for Lord Hamilton of the votive wax phal-luses from Isernia in the Molise, and later was to oppose the acquisition by the British Museum of the Elgin marbles.<sup>108</sup> Baron J. H. Riedesel went to Sicily in the 1770s and published a travel account in the form of letters to his friend Winckelmann that praised the architecture of the Hellenic monuments.<sup>109</sup> In 1787 the great Goethe himself visited the island.<sup>110</sup>

Interest in Sicily and its antiquities was heightened by the protectorate that the British established there during the years 1796–1815. Like Greece, Sicily became a place Englishmen could visit while they were excluded by the French from the Italian mainland. Important neoclassical architects like Sydney Smirke (1798–1877) and C. R. Cockerell (1788–1863) had the opportunity to study the great classical temples of the island, an experience that helped launch the popularity of the Doric order in contemporary British architecture.<sup>111</sup>

English interests were not limited to observation and artistic rendition. The English consul at Palermo, Robert Fagan, had undertaken excavations at Tindari with the permission of the Sicilian officials. In 1823 two English architectural students, Samuel Angell and William Harris, started digging at Selinute and recovered some striking architectural sculptures. However, when they attempted to export metopes from two of the Selinute temples, they were stopped, and the reliefs removed to the Palermo museum.<sup>112</sup>

The Selinus episode, with its demonstrated threat to the archaeological patrimony of Sicily, helped stimulate the establishment in 1827 of the Commission of Antiquities and Fine Arts, led by the dynamic duke of Serradifalco (1783–1863).<sup>113</sup> The duke had spent many years in Milan, where he had cultivated his archaeological interests. He now inaugurated an ambitious program of study and publication of the Sicilian archaeological monuments; among other results was the multivolume *Antiquities of Sicily* (1843). Unfortunately for archaeology in Sicily, the duke was forced into exile after the revolution of 1848. His mantle passed to Francesco Saverio Cavallari (1809–96), who served in the early 1850s as professor of architecture at the University of Palermo. He too left

Sicily for ten years in 1854, returning to become director of antiquities on the island for the government of the unified Italy.<sup>114</sup>

Even in the reactionary world of post-1848 Sicily a new political and intellectual generation was emerging that would help shape the Risorgimento and lay the cultural foundations for the unified Italy. One such figure of the new order was Antonino Salinas (1841–1914), who fought with Garibaldi before traveling in 1861–65 first to Germany to study contemporary archaeological practice and then to Greece to take part in pioneering Italian excavations. In 1865 he was appointed professor of classical archaeology at the University of Palermo, and in 1873 he was made director of the Palermo Archaeological Museum. His approach to classical archaeology blended the early German influences with that of the Sicilian antiquarian tradition, and it was his writings, along with those of his elder colleague Domenico Cavallari, that helped create the picture of the retrograde Bourbon archaeological tradition that has dominated the history of Italian archaeology up to the present.<sup>115</sup>

Meanwhile, changes of a different nature were taking place on the German archaeological scene. In 1833 Gerhard had returned to Berlin, where he pursued a distinguished museum career and in 1844 became professor at the new university that von Humboldt had created in that city. There he educated some of the leading figures of the next generation of classical studies including Otto Jahn; Ernst Curtius, the future excavator of Olympia; Alexander Conze, the archaeologist of Samothrace; and Adolf Michaelis, one of the first archaeological historians. Michaelis published extensively himself as an archaeologist: in 1840 he produced his first collection of Greek vases with 330 color plates, and between 1845 and 1867 published a series of works on Etruscan mirrors.

In 1843 Gerhard took another step toward placing archaeology on a scientific basis when he founded the journal *Archäologische Zeitung*. In the same year the *Archaeological Journal* started in London, and in 1844, the *Revue archéologique* in France. In the first issue of the *Revue archéologique*, Charles Lenormant distinguished the new scientific archaeologists from the ancient historians by their knowledge of the figural monuments, and from the antiquarians by their wider perspective, which was based on their mastery of critical techniques, especially those of art history.<sup>116</sup>

When Gerhard returned to Germany, Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker, the “Nestor” of German archaeology professors, was still active. Welcker,



who served as professor of classical philology at Bonn from 1819 to 1868, represented a strong link with the previous generation of German classical archaeology. He was a friend and protégé of Wilhelm von Humboldt<sup>117</sup> and had known the exciting archaeological world of early-nineteenth-century Rome. His model for both precise scholarship and the integration of literary and archaeological sources remained the great Danish archaeologist Jørgen Zoëga.<sup>118</sup> Welcker was also a scholarly humanist who stressed the important role that classical archaeology could play in educating cultured citizens.<sup>119</sup> His approach to the classical past also centered on the Totalitätsideal, in which all the evidence, both material and written, was mustered to reconstruct antiquity. In his later years that view lost popularity, gradually replaced by the more scientific attitude toward classical archaeology as the systematic study of material culture. Welcker was also a pioneer in the use of casts as a teaching and display tool. The Bonn museum whose organization he shaped and whose catalogue he published in 1827 looked back to classical ideals of Wincklemann, but its presentation reflected the new desire to use museum resources to teach ancient art as a branch of art history.<sup>120</sup>

Gerhard played an important role as a teacher at the Berlin University. His most gifted student, Otto Jahn (1813–68), was one of the most fascinating cultural figures of the epoch.<sup>121</sup> He was politically active and, along with Theodor Mommsen, he was dismissed from his position at the university at Leipzig in the aftermath of the 1848 uprising. His interests extended from the cataloging of Greek vases to the life of Goethe and the music of Mozart and Beethoven. His devotion to Winckelmann took him back to the eighteenth century. (It was Jahn who first established a festival to celebrate Winckelmann's birthday.) At the same time his interest in the scientific study of archaeology recalled the generation of Goethe. He was conscious of the strong dilettante element in classical archaeology and stressed the need for greater rigor. He believed in developing corpora of key archaeological materials and helped conceive the comprehensive publication of Latin inscriptions that Mommsen, one of his first students, brought to fruition.

Jahn appreciated Gerhard's dictum that "to see one work of art was to see nothing and to see thousands of them was to see only one," and he sought to apply the new archaeological philology especially to vase studies. His methodological sophistication can be seen in the 1854 publication of the vase collection of Ludwig I in Munich. Jahn's long

introduction to the work included not only precise dating, regional attributions, and the identification of schools of vase painters but also the consideration of mythological themes employed on vases.<sup>122</sup> As he experimented with the more historically oriented arrangements of Welcker's cast museum at Bonn, he contemplated producing a catalogue of Greek art, but he never wrote it. Yet Jahn, with all of his emphasis on the development of scholarly methodology, remained to the end a devotee of the eighteenth-century master Winckelmann.<sup>123</sup>

Often forgotten in studies that emphasize the growing professionalism of archaeology during the nineteenth century was the continuing role played by amateur savants in collecting archaeological information, forming collections of recovered objects, and preserving archaeological sites. The body of professional archaeological academics was small, and almost none held positions strictly devoted to the new discipline. They depended on the network of amateurs that had developed in almost every country of Europe. One of the important roles of the early *Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica* had been to harness the resources of these amateurs to the merging professionalism of classical archaeology.

The archaeological savants of the local societies were especially important in France during this period. With the exception of Paris and a few university centers, it was the local societies that maintained the learned traditions. By the start of the twentieth century, around 120,000 people in the French provinces belonged to savant societies.<sup>124</sup> The core membership consisted of clerics, professionals like doctors and lawyers, and local administrators. Archaeology was usually only one of several areas of knowledge that interested them; presentations at their meetings ranged from agricultural improvement to the reconstruction of medieval monastic property holdings based on research in municipal archives. Nonetheless, many of the papers were about local antiquities.

Early on, savants with a wider intellectual perspective sensed the danger that this work might become overly parochial, and they sought to bring these local groups into a regional and national discourse. By 1833 the *Congrès archéologique* had begun meeting in various French cities. Although the proceedings generally focused on medieval archaeology, the meetings did represent the first real national archaeological assemblies. In 1834 the Norman antiquarian and pioneer in Roman rural archaeology Arcisse de Caumont (1801–73) helped reinforce the sense of national identity for the French antiquarian societies by forming

the Société française pour le conservation des monuments nationaux (French Society for the Preservation of National Monuments), which later became the Société française d'archéologie (French Archaeological Society).<sup>125</sup>

The French local and regional societies played an important role in disseminating information on archaeological discoveries. Many sponsored publication series in which local sites and finds were described. A network of journal exchanges ensured that news of discoveries received wide dissemination. The extent of the phenomenon can be appreciated by the fact that by 1885 more than 84,000 articles had appeared in local journals, a large percentage on topics related to archaeology and antiquarian studies.<sup>126</sup> Since most of the classical reports focused on Roman-Gallic discoveries, they played an important role in starting serious study of Roman Gaul.

The local societies also established and maintained museums, antiquaria, and lapidaria. Their collections usually focused on local material, although they occasionally housed antiquities from Greece and Italy brought back by some local savant. Some of these museums were founded before the French Revolution, although many were suppressed in the revolutionary period. New ones began being established in the late eighteenth century, and the process accelerated in the early and mid-nineteenth century. By 1848 France had two hundred local museums.<sup>127</sup> Their collections had diverse origins. Much of the material represented random finds and sporadic donations. Local patrons, often artists, gave their collections to the municipality. Mid-nineteenth-century urban expansion and improvements in many French cities enriched local museum collections with new finds. In cities like Saintes, Sens, and Bourges the late Roman and medieval city walls were demolished. From their rubble emerged tomb monuments and other antiquities that had been built into the fortifications as early as the third century A.D.

Not all these collections received equal care. In some cases an official conservator was appointed, but in other instances a local antiquarian took on responsibility for the care of the collection. Some of those caretakers were helpful to outsiders, while others took a secretive pride in hindering access to material. Often no one had real responsibility for the local collections. The antiquities gathered dust, and the casual scholarly visitor who came to the town had difficulty finding either custodian or key. Still the study of Roman provincial archaeology owes a great deal

to these amateur curators, who gathered and conserved a vast quantity of archaeological evidence related to ancient Gaul.

The cumulative result of this collection enthusiasm was that in almost every town of France the citizens could see displays related to their Roman origins. Even to nonprofessionals their style and content displayed a complex mix of the indigenous and the imperial, providing important testimonies in the historiographical debate that dominated the nineteenth and twentieth centuries over the Celtic versus Roman identity of Gaul and the role the Gallic provincial experience had played in the later development of France.<sup>128</sup>

A similar network of antiquarian societies and antiquaria developed in the neighboring states of Germany, especially in regions close to the Rhine where Gallic cultural influences had been strong and the French had at certain periods controlled the territory. Such institutions played an important role in cultivating a sense of both local history and national identity. In the Roman center of Trier on the Moselle, the *Société des recherches utiles du département de la Sarre* (Society for Useful Research of the Sarre Department); later the *Gesellschaft für nützliche Forschungen* (Society for Useful Research) was founded in 1801.<sup>129</sup> By the 1840s, like many local antiquarian societies, the society at Trier had begun to concentrate on antiquities. A gymnasium instructor named Gerhard Schneemann (1796–1864) took over the operation of the society and started reporting local finds and developing a network of informants around the city. In 1852 the society started to publish a journal. Through the efforts of Schneemann and his collaborators, a great deal of information about one of the most important cities of the Roman Empire was preserved.<sup>130</sup>

It was the Germans who took provincial museums to a new stage of development, using them not just as a collection point for local antiquities but also as a regional center for the study and display of Roman art and archaeology. A key role in this development was played by the painter Ludwig Lindenschmidt (1809–93) when in the early 1850s he spearheaded the foundation of the Roman-German Central Museum at Mainz.<sup>131</sup> While the Mainz museum built on a tradition of antiquarian collection that went back to the sixteenth century, its new mission was to display antiquities gathered from throughout Germany, enhancing a sense of cultural wholeness at a time when German nationalism was gathering force. The displays were pioneering in their use of the Three Age system,

a classification of prehistoric objects based on their materials developed by the Dane C. J. Thomsen as the basis of their organization.<sup>132</sup> When originals could not be obtained from often reluctant collectors and local museums, casts were used. The museum also went into business producing and distributing casts, and its cast workshop provided examples of Roman-German provincial art to museums throughout Europe.<sup>133</sup>

Meanwhile, in France one of the most archaeologically oriented emperors in modern European history had seized power. Napoleon III was the nephew of the great conqueror and sought to capitalize on his uncle's legacy in the tumultuous and insecure days that followed the 1848 uprisings. Among the dynastic themes he developed was a strong identification with the Roman Empire, as well as with Julius Caesar, about whom he produced a long and learned biography. We have seen that while his army invested Rome, Napoleon conducted excavations on the Palatine.<sup>134</sup> In addition, French archaeologists working in Greece and Asia Minor received special subsidies if they were willing to research topographical problems related to Caesar's civil war battles.

Napoleon's key archaeological undertaking was the excavations conducted between 1860 and 1865 at Alésia, the site of the climactic battle between Caesar and Vercingetorix in 51 B.C.<sup>135</sup> The site merged the Celtic and Romano-Gallic strains in early French myth-history as well as French archaeology, for while Napoleon worshiped the legend of Caesar, he also had to cater to the growing French identity with Vercingetorix as the first French national hero.<sup>136</sup> When Napoleon had completed his excavations at the site that symbolically marked the transition from Celtic to Roman Gaul, he commemorated that historical moment with a massive bronze statue of Vercingetorix.<sup>137</sup>

Napoleon's excavations produced other, more important archaeological accomplishments. Long-standing antiquarian disputes on the exact location of the battle were resolved to most scholars' satisfaction. Army officers like Colonel Eugène Stoffel, who were involved in the excavations, ensured that in areas like topographical mapping, the work represented the best standards of the day. Alésia was an important pioneering project in military archaeology. Major Celtic finds were also made, and the precise dating of the site provided chronological indicators in Iron Age archaeology.<sup>138</sup>

The museum at Mainz offered an inspiration and a model for another Napoleonic project, the Museum of National Antiquities, established in

1867 at Saint-Germain-en-Laye, just outside Paris, the first national museum devoted to the antiquities of France.<sup>139</sup> Napoleon was instrumental in its creation and provided major donations to its collections. He had been contemplating such a national museum as early as 1860, when he had established a working relationship with Ludwig Lindenschmidt of the Mainz museum.<sup>140</sup> The German artist-archaeologist was received with honor at Paris and a program of cast exchanges was established between Mainz and the French museums.

Another participant in developing the Paris-Mainz connection and in the cultural and museological debates of the period was Hortense Cornu (1809–75).<sup>141</sup> Her friendship with Napoleon went back a long way, and her salon was an intellectual and cultural gathering place in mid-nineteenth-century Paris. Her strong republican views had soured her relations with Napoleon immediately after his seizure of power, but by 1860 they had improved. Her husband, Sébastien Cornu, was deeply involved in the acquisition of the Campana collection from Rome and in the development of the short-lived Napoleon III Museum. Hortense was fluent in German and had contacts in Germany; in 1860 she visited the museum at Mainz to help promote cultural exchange.

The new Saint-Germain museum covered French antiquity from early prehistory to the early Christian Middle Ages, uniting the interests of Celtic enthusiasts, classicists, and medievalists, the three strands of antiquarian research dominant in nineteenth-century France. It was intended to be a serious research center as well as an instrument of archaeological nationalism, and was equipped with a cast workshop and a research library.<sup>142</sup> Unlike the museum established by Napoleon I and the other archaeology museum of Napoleon III, it survived and prospered, becoming the most important cultural legacy of that archaeological emperor.

The driving force behind the Saint-Germain museum was its first director, Alexandre Bertrand (1820–1902). Bertrand trained as a Hellenist, studying at the French School in Athens. However, he devoted much of his scholarly career to national antiquities. From 1859 he edited the *Revue archéologique* and from 1860 was one of the directors of the excavations at Alésia.<sup>143</sup> He also taught French prehistory at the Ecole du Louvre. For Bertrand history and archaeology were complementary tools that could be employed in the scholarly enterprise of reconstructing early French history. His teaching helped shape a new generation of

historians of Gaul like Camille Jullian, who strove to integrate physical remains and written texts.<sup>144</sup>

By 1898 the museum had thirty-five thousand objects displayed in thirty-eight galleries. The collection grew not only through official patronage but also through the generosity of a now aging generation of antiquarians who willed their collections to the new museum. A good example was Frédéric Moreau (1798–1898), who in his retirement assembled a superb collection of antiquities largely through his own excavations from the Aisne-Marne area of northern France. Moreau displayed his finds at international exhibitions and in his home, but in his will he left his collection to the national museum at Saint-Germain-en-Laye.<sup>145</sup>

While French antiquarians in the homeland were living in a world worthy of commemoration in a Balzac novel, renewed French colonialism was creating a setting appropriate to *Beau Geste*. In 1830 the last Bourbon king, Charles X, launched the invasion of Algeria.<sup>146</sup> He was shortly thereafter overthrown and replaced by Louis Philippe, but the French conquest of Algeria continued. Although the coastal cities fell quickly, domination of the interior proved more difficult. It was not until 1847 that much of Algeria was considered secure.<sup>147</sup>

The French goals in Algeria represented more than just military conquest. Both urban and rural settlements were undertaken with the intention of turning the region not only politically but also culturally into an extension of France.<sup>148</sup> Schoolteachers as well as farmers were to join in this colonial enterprise. It is understandable that these classically educated European colonists saw themselves as continuators of the Roman tradition. North Africa, with its rich Roman remains, provided an ideal territory for the establishment of that historical identity. The novelist and historian Louis Bertrand observed when he visited the Roman ruins at Tipasa that he had rediscovered “the men who spoke his language and believed in his gods. He was no longer a lost Rumi in an Islamic land.”<sup>149</sup>

The French army officers saw themselves as the reincarnation of the ancient Roman legionaries and sought to use that identity to strengthen their position in Algeria. As early as 1833 the military called for collaboration between the army and organizations engaged in archaeological research such as the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres. In 1837 the French army established a commission to explore the archaeological resources of the new colony.

Individual officers identified with their Roman counterparts of many centuries before. Representative of this type of French soldier-archaeologist was Colonel Jean-Luc Carbuccia (1808–54).<sup>150</sup> Carbuccia had no formal archaeological background, but contact with the abundant Roman monuments of Algeria stimulated his interest in military antiquities. He began recording Roman remains discovered during his various military expeditions. He was especially interested in the great legionary base at Lambaesis, where he undertook the excavation of the shrine of Aesculapius. Ironically, archaeological work at the site was facilitated by the presence of deported political prisoners who had been sent to the wastes of North Africa after their participation in the uprisings of 1848.<sup>151</sup> The French military used the skills of these educated men in their informal archaeological research.

Carbuccia felt a special identity with the soldiers and officers of the Roman Third Legion, which had been based at Lambaesis. He discovered the tomb of his “predecessor” T. Flavius Maximus, commander of the Third Legion, and reerected the funerary monument to the man he regarded as a fellow commanding officer, celebrating the event with his own dedicatory inscription and holding a military parade at the tomb site to honor the long dead Roman officer.<sup>152</sup>

The archaeological involvement of the military continued throughout the history of French North Africa and expanded with the incorporation of Tunisia and Morocco into France’s colonial empire. The Topographical Brigades engaged in mapping and border delineation kept careful records on Roman archaeological discoveries. Reports of finds were regularly reported not only in provincial but also in national journals as military officers tried to impress the homeland academics with their intellectual seriousness.

As French educators and professionals established themselves in Algeria, they sought to create the same antiquarian structures they had known in mainland France. Local savants in 1852 organized the *Société archéologique, historique et géographique de Constantine* (Archaeological, Historical, and Geographical Society of Constantine), where local professionals and military officers joined in discussions of the latest discoveries. “Grand amateurs” like the medical doctor Louis Carton (1861–1924) conducted excavations at sites like the tophet at Carthage and the Roman city of Bulla Regia.<sup>153</sup>

A key figure among the North African savants was Louis Adrien



Berbrugger (1801–69),<sup>154</sup> a graduate of the Ecole des Chartes, the best historical training school in France, who came to North Africa as secretary to General Clauzel. For thirty-five years he researched all aspects of the archaeology of Algeria. He played an important role in creating a scholarly infrastructure and publishing discoveries. He also led the fight to preserve major sites and keep antiquities from being exported from North Africa to France. One of his major accomplishments was the foundation of the Algerian Museum.

Not all Algerian archaeology was left to local savants and military officers. As early as 1850 the pioneering epigrapher Léon Renier (1809–85) had started laying the basis for his great published collection of Latin inscriptions from North Africa.<sup>155</sup> By 1880 a Historical Monuments Service as well as a training school had been established at Algiers. Close links were formed between North Africa and the new Ecole française de Rome (the French School of Rome), and young “Farnesiens” (so called because the school was housed in the Farnese Palace, the site of the French embassy in Rome) were encouraged to conduct their research in the French colonies. For some it was a stepping stone for greater accomplishments in Italy and France. Others made North Africa their scholarly home. The most distinguished of these latter was Stéphane Gsell (1864–1932).<sup>156</sup> After a university education in France he had gone to the French School in Rome and excavated at Etruscan Vulci. Father Louis Duchesne, then director of the French School, interested him in both Christian archaeology and North Africa, where he made his career. By 1900 Gsell had established a system of antiquities inspectors in Algeria, a generation before the office existed in mainland France. His great legacy for Roman provincial archaeology was the *Atlas archéologique de l'Algérie*, the first volume of which appeared in 1902.<sup>157</sup>

The French colonial agenda also involved Christian archaeology. Roman North Africa had been one of the seedbeds of early Christianity and had produced some of the most important early Christian fathers, including Augustine. Carthage had also once been a great Christian center. The French Catholics now sought to make North Africa a Christian land again, and archaeology was part of their colonialist agenda as excavations made visible pre-Islamic Christian churches as well as Roman military camps. In 1867 Allemand Lavigerie (1825–92) was made bishop of Algiers. He had a long-standing interest in early church history and encouraged archaeological research in his new Christian domain, which

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The French archaeologist Father Delattre (extreme right) showing the American classical archaeologist Francis Kelsey (second from right) the Punic burial ground at Carthage, 1925 (photograph George R. Swain; Kelsey Museum Archives, University of Michigan)

he wanted to restore to its Augustinian glory.<sup>158</sup> After French intervention in Tunisia in 1881, he had expanded his ecclesiastical base at Carthage, and in 1877 he appointed Father Alfred-Louis Delattre (1850–1932) head of the mission, setting in motion one of the most important archaeological careers in North African history.<sup>159</sup> In 1884 Lavigerie moved his archbishopric from Algiers to Tunis and spearheaded a program that combined archaeological research with missionary activity and church construction.

It was Delattre who directly undertook or guided most of the archaeological research that focused on church and cemetery sites as well as Punic sites, and he continued to excavate after Lavigerie's death. The importance of his discoveries in the reconstruction of Roman Christianity in North Africa was tempered, however, by deficiencies in his archaeological method. He did not have formal archaeological training, used destructive methods, and kept poor records. In the words of one French colleague he had "good will, energy, and persistence, but lacked any truly scientific concern and professional rigour."<sup>160</sup>

The first seven decades of the nineteenth century had seen many changes in classical archaeology. Most historians have focused on the

growing professionalism of the discipline: German professors were now doing archaeology as a formal study, and archaeological schools had been founded in Rome and Athens. Such a focus obscures the growing complexity of classical archaeology and its penetration into new realms of nineteenth-century society. In fact, during the nineteenth century there was little increase in the number of “pure” archaeological teaching and research positions. By contrast, the number of the local societies populated by middle-class savants expanded enormously. Nor should the new scientific missions of the archaeological schools be exaggerated. The *Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica* was strongly embedded in the antiquarian culture of the previous century, while the French School in Athens was more devoted to romantic notions associating French and Hellenic culture than it was to scientific archaeology. The two Napoleons and the French colonialists in North Africa had demonstrated the efficacy of archaeology in advancing nationalistic and colonialist agendas. In the meantime a new archaeological world was emerging in Greece with its own mythic agenda that continues to shape classical archaeology to the present day.

## CHAPTER 3

# The Opening of Greece

One of the most important changes in classical archaeology during the nineteenth century was the emergence of Greece at archaeological center stage. At the start of the century Greece represented a still little-known and rarely studied archaeological culture. By its end the country was the focus of much of the best archaeological research. What the advocacy of Winckelmann and Stuart and Revett had not been able to accomplish, a combination of political, cultural, and scholarly developments in Europe and America brought about.

Heightened archaeological interest in Greece was reinforced by two often contradictory cultural movements within Europe, neoclassicism and romanticism. Neoclassicism remained strong in the major European centers well into the early decades of the nineteenth century. In France the imperial classicism of Napoleon was complemented by the more austere version of artists like Ingres. In England, while the generation of classical representational artists such as John Flaxman was passing from the scene, neoclassical architects like Sydney Smirke and C. R. Cockerell held their own against neomedieval romantics. In Germany, neoclassicism in all the arts remained strong, with architects like Karl Friedrich Schinkel forging new links with archaeologists.

At the same time the romantics, especially in Germany, had created a new vision of Greece not as the repository of rational classicism but as a *Völkland* that embodied core elemental values of European culture. Affirmation of the neoclassical blended with growing sympathies for the oppressed Greeks and their nationalistic aspiration to create a new Greece, a construct that focused as much on gallant evzones resisting Turkish oppression as on the cool rationalism of Thucydides

and Socrates. This was the Greece of Friedrich Hölderlin, who, never having seen it, went mad dreaming of a pure Hellas, or of Lord Byron, who died at Messolonghi, where he was fighting in a Balkan war whose brutality and ambiguity had alienated more-worldly diplomats. Byron's romantic vision of Greece was also to be seen in his attacks on Lord Elgin for "looting" Greek antiquities. Ironically, Elgin, who wished to use the marbles to improve British artistic taste, was a holdover from the eighteenth century caught up in this new cultural politics of the nineteenth.

The romantic identity with Greece, especially its landscape, history, and people, began drawing a generation of travelers who were inspired by this Byronic vision. At a time when traditional rural worlds were being transformed in many parts of Europe and cultivated people were increasingly seeking an escape into the picturesque, rural Greece was seen as a place where links with the rustic virtues of a glorious past were preserved. The country was primitive and the Ottoman administration often capricious, but Greece was not central to the titanic struggles of continental Europe. During the period of the French wars it offered access to ancient monuments undisturbed by politics not always to be found in Italy.

As often happened in the romantic period, a work of fiction helped inspire interest and also shaped what the traveler saw. The book was *Voyage of Anacharsis the Younger in Greece*, published in 1788 by the abbé Jean-Jacques Barthélemy (1716–95), an orientalist, antiquarian savant, and Keeper of the King's Medals before the French Revolution. The work was a labor of love for the abbé, who started it some thirteen years before publication. The narrative developed around the fictional experiences of a Scythian visiting Greece in the fourth century B.C.<sup>1</sup> It became enormously popular, going through forty editions and being translated into all the major European languages.<sup>2</sup>

One of the pioneering romantic-age travelers who was influenced by the adventures of Anacharsis was Marie-Gabriel Florent August, count de Choiseul-Gouffier, who between 1782 and 1802 published *Voyage pittoresque de la Grèce*.<sup>3</sup> Choiseul-Gouffier (1752–1817) had long experience with the eastern Mediterranean and had first visited Greece in 1776. From 1784 to 1792 he was Louis XVI's last ambassador to Constantinople, and he used his position to promote antiquarian and topographical studies in classical lands, including Troy. After a short exile in Russia during

the revolutionary era, he returned to France to live out his life in Napoleonic Paris. Ironically, he used his contacts in the French government to secure the release of Lord Elgin, who had been detained on his way back to Britain. His suburban villa was filled with antiquities collected during his years of travel and service in the eastern Mediterranean.

Choiseul-Gouffier's account of Greece was impressionistic, with little of the scientific descriptive rigor that characterized the next generation of topographers. It was an impressively printed volume richly illustrated by the artist Jean-Baptiste Hilaire, who had accompanied him on his travels through the Greek islands. The spirit of the work and the age were captured by the frontispiece of volume 1 entitled "Greece Expiring Among Classical Ruins," which shows a chained female allegorical figure lying in the midst of fragmentary inscriptions and architectural elements with a ruined temple in the background.<sup>4</sup>

One of the most important contributions Choiseul-Gouffier made to early-nineteenth-century classical archaeology was the introduction of the young artist Louis-François-Sébastien Fauvel (1753–1838) to Greece.<sup>5</sup> Fauvel first visited the country in 1780 to collect illustrative material for Choiseul-Gouffier and to make casts of some of the monuments. He remained in the ambassador's retinue in Istanbul until the diplomat's ouster in 1793. Fauvel then settled in Athens, where, except for a short break during the Napoleonic troubles, he remained. From 1803 he was French vice-consul in Athens, but he was suspected of pro-Turkish sympathies during the Greek Wars of Independence and found it prudent to move to Smyrna.

Fauvel proved an amiable cicerone, guiding visitors through Athens and describing the latest discoveries. It was Fauvel who provided the Bavarian agent Martin von Wagner with vital information regarding the worth of the newly discovered Aegina marbles and hence facilitated their acquisition by the king of Bavaria. A sense of his cultural aspirations and lifestyle is conveyed by an 1819 painting by Louis Dupré that shows him seated before an easel in his picturesque Athenian residence, located on the site of the ancient Agora with a splendid view of the Acropolis. A fragment from the metopes of the Parthenon is prominently displayed to his left, part of the extensive collection of antiquities that made his house a private museum.<sup>6</sup>

Fauvel was the first of a series of archaeologically oriented consuls who were to play an important role in Mediterranean archaeology in the

nineteenth century. Other prominent officials included the Englishman Charles Newton, the American William J. Stillman, and Baron Luigi Palma di Cesnola, the future director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Increases in European American tourism and business activity necessitated the extension of low-level diplomatic representation to more Mediterranean localities. Consular posts became a way of rewarding cultural figures. The posts were often ill compensated, but usually the duties were not arduous, and the incumbents received diplomatic protection. It was an ideal place for the promotion of archaeological activities and antiquities exportation.

Not all of the travelers in Greece viewed the country through the often fuzzy lenses of Choiseul-Gouffier's romanticism. In the generation before the outbreak of the Greek Wars of Independence four Englishmen undertook topographical explorations that combined mastery of the ancient sources with serious landscape studies and made the classical topography of both ancient and modern Greece more familiar to Europeans and Americans. They were Edward Dodwell (1767–1832), William Gell (1777–1836), E. D. Clarke (1769–1822), and William Martin Leake (1777–1860). Inspired by different motives they traveled widely in Greece during the early years of the nineteenth century. While only some collected antiquities, all had as their main purposes the documentation of surviving monuments, the identification of these monuments through the ancient sources, and the description of the current peoples, customs, and conditions of Greece. None of the four came from the aristocratic world of Elgin and Choiseul-Gouffier. They were middle-class pioneers in the development of what became a distinctive Victorian antiquarian ethnography. Despite the importance of their visits, none of them remained in Greece: for Clarke and Leake the involvement with Greece was a passing phase, while for Dodwell and Gell, Italy became the center for their life work.

Edward Dodwell, a Cambridge graduate, traveled extensively in Greece in the years 1801 and 1805–6. Part of the time he was on parole from the French, having been caught in the wrong place at the wrong time during one of the French-Anglo wars. He was a pioneer in using the second-century A.D. topographical writer Pausanias to identify the surviving ruins with classical monuments and to relate ancient and modern topography.<sup>7</sup> He also acquired Attic vases for a collection that ultimately ended up with Ludwig I of Bavaria. Dodwell was an energetic

artist. He claimed to have executed some four hundred drawings himself and collected six hundred more by the Italian artist Pomardi. The colored engravings in his *Views of Greece*, published in 1821, offered vivid representations of the landscape and monuments and made important additions to the then thin visual repertoire on Greece.

William Gell was already an experienced topographer of Greece and Asia Minor when in 1811 he was sent by the Society of Dilettanti to lead their new expedition to explore and publish the antiquities of Ionia.<sup>8</sup> He had published one of the pioneering archaeological studies of the Troad in 1804, and his important works on Attica and some of those on Ionia appeared a few years later. Byron had immortalized him in a couplet of *Don Juan*:

Of Dardan tours let Dilettanti tell  
I leave topography to classic Gell.<sup>9</sup>

By 1814, however, Gell had transferred his archaeological interests to Italy, concentrating on Rome, Naples, and Pompeii.

Gell made Naples his principal residence from 1820 to 1836, where he was a much-loved member of international society. His research focused on Pompeii. He pioneered in the use of the camera lucida to prepare the preliminaries for the illustrations and reconstruction that his friend and collaborator J. P. Gandy prepared for his Pompeii publications.<sup>10</sup> He also became a much-sought-after guide, a person whom an acquaintance described as a “gouty but ebullient cicerone.”<sup>11</sup> He was also active in Rome, where he shared a neo-Gothic villa on the Palatine with the eccentric Englishman Charles Mills. He worked closely with Antonio Nibby on the topography of both the Campagna and the walls of Rome.

E. D. Clarke brought a very different perspective to his topographical research during his eastern Mediterranean tour in 1800–1801, a viewpoint that captures a new spirit in the early nineteenth century. He was a clergyman, serving as a bear leader to English noblemen on the Grand Tour. At the same time he became professor of mineralogy at Cambridge. The subject was in the process of changing from the savant speculations of William Hamilton to a hard science linked to mining and canal building in industrializing England. Clarke traveled extensively in Greece, collecting antiquities as well as describing sites.<sup>12</sup> A battered caryatid that he removed from Eleusis is now housed in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge. He published his *Travels* in 1810 and ultimately made the



enormous sum of £7,000 from the sales, an indication of the popularity of these often dry and scholarly works among the expanding, classically educated British middle class.<sup>13</sup>

William Martin Leake has come to be regarded as the greatest of that generation of British topographers.<sup>14</sup> Beginning in 1805 Leake, a British military officer, began travels in Greece that combined representing British interests at the court of the renegade Ottoman ruler Ali Pasha at Joanina, military topographical exploration, and the identification of ancient remains. By the time he had completed his explorations in 1810, he had traversed much of the country. In his Attica studies he provided precise descriptions of the antiquities that complemented and updated Pausanias.<sup>15</sup> In other travels, such as those in the Morea, he combined archaeology with ethnographic description. The crisp precision of his accounts, which included specific times in his daily itinerary, reflect the mind of the army officer.

When Leake's volumes were published many years later they became a bible of Greek archaeological topographers working in Greece. The revised 1841 edition of his *Topography of Athens*, for instance, remained the standard work until the publication in 1905 of Walther Judeich's *Topographie von Athen*.<sup>16</sup> The delay in Leake's publication (the first volume appeared in 1821 and the last in 1835), however, meant that Leake's impact on the English literary public was limited.

Greece and Magna Graecia during this period attracted not only topographers and antiquarians but also architects. Detailed site and monument studies in the tradition of Stuart and Revett remained popular. These two had inspired and even produced a more refined and archaeologically correct neoclassical architecture that reached the height of its popularity in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.<sup>17</sup> In England a new generation of young Hellas-inspired architects arose who felt that they must travel to Greece and drink inspiration at the source. Four who went on to distinguished careers and continued the spirit of classicism in contemporary British architecture were William Wilkins (1778–1839), Robert Smirke (1781–1867), C. R. Cockerell (1788–1863), and Thomas L. Donaldson (1795–1885).

William Wilkins has already been mentioned in connection with the rediscovery of Magna Graecia, but he also traveled to Greece and Asia Minor between 1801 and 1805. He played a leading role in bringing the neoclassical style to England and applied his great knowledge of

Greek architecture to such buildings as the National Gallery in London and Downing College in Cambridge.<sup>18</sup> Smirke also traveled to Greece, arriving in Athens as Lord Elgin's agents were dismantling the Parthenon. Ironically, his most famous building is the British Museum, which housed Elgin's exported treasure.<sup>19</sup>

C. R. Cockerell and Thomas Donaldson represented a slightly later generation, one shaped by the latest archaeological discoveries. Cockerell traveled to both Sicily and Greece in 1810–11, focusing his attention on the great classical temples.<sup>20</sup> He was involved in the new discoveries at both Bassae and Aegina. His detailed and sensitive studies of Greek architecture led, among other things, to his discovery of the use of entasis in classical Greek columns. He returned to England to become one of the most important neoclassical architects of his generation; the 1845 Ashmolean Museum building in Oxford is a testimony to his blend of archaeological and neoclassical architectural taste. He was also a friend of William Leake, preparing the drawings of Athens that were used as illustrations in Leake's *Topography of Athens*.

Thomas Donaldson was the last of the four, and his work in both archaeology and architecture lasted into the late nineteenth century.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, by the time of his death, interest in Doric-inspired neoclassical architecture had largely passed. On a trip in 1819–20, Donaldson discovered another Greek architectural refinement, the inward inclination of the columns of the Parthenon. Like most of his contemporaries, he found access to Greece severed in 1823 by the outbreak of the Wars of Independence; it was not reestablished until 1834. However, Donaldson established a friendship with Kyriakos Pittakis, who kept him informed of the latest archaeological discoveries relevant to Greek architecture, some of which—such as the curvature of the foundations of the Parthenon—he incorporated into buildings he designed for Cambridge.

The conjuncture of travel in Greece and the spread of the neoclassical style in architecture was not limited to Europe. The newly established American republic sought to create a cultural identity based heavily on ancient Hellas. In 1806 Nicholas Biddle of Philadelphia (1786–1844) became one of the first Americans to explore Greece. His journals and letters, published later, provide a vivid if often jaundiced view of early-nineteenth-century Greece.<sup>22</sup> After his travels Biddle returned to the United States, where he took up a career in banking and finance, culminating in his controversial presidency of the Bank of the United

States. An important cultural figure, Biddle used public and private architectural patronage to become one of the great promoters of Hellenic neoclassicism in the new republic.

By the early 1820s the sporadic banditry and unorganized resistance against Ottoman rule in Greece had expanded into the Greek Wars of Independence. What was in reality a complex and morally ambivalent conflict came to be regarded among cultured circles in both Europe and America as a moral crusade of Western civilization against orientalism.<sup>23</sup> Military and humanitarian volunteers from both Europe and America traveled to Greece to support the cause of independence. The most prominent of those was Lord Byron, who died at Messolonghi in 1824. The advantage shifted to the Greeks after the European navies defeated the Turks at Navarino in 1827, and a small independent republic was established in 1829. After the assassination of the Greek leader John Capodistria, the Western powers in 1832 imposed as ruler Otto of Bavaria, the younger son of Ludwig I, and in 1834 he ascended the throne of the newly created Greek nation, with Athens as its capital.

Classicism and classical archaeology played an important role in shaping Greek identity during this formative national period. The country had been a Turkish province for more than three centuries and before that, a long-standing dependency of Byzantium. Its contemporary culture had few links with the classical past; even the language bore little resemblance to its Attic ancestor. Scholars like the German Jakob Philipp Fallmerayer (1790–1861) claimed that the modern Greeks were largely descendents of barbarian invaders who arrived long after the glory days of Hellas.<sup>24</sup> Many travelers to Greece in the early nineteenth century were not impressed by the modern Greeks.<sup>25</sup>

Greek intellectuals formulating the ideology of the independence movement often tried to promote a new secular identity that extended Hellenism beyond the Greek Orthodox religious culture and established an identity with their glorious past. A key figure in that movement was Adamantios Korais (1748–1833), a Greek from Chios and Smyrna who spent most of his adult life in France. In the Asia Minor town of Smyrna, Korais was early exposed to Western ideas, while in France he had been influenced by the emerging revolutionary ideology with its strong philhellenism.<sup>26</sup> He preached a doctrine of Hellenic purification in both language and culture that would once again link the modern Greeks with their glorious classical past; the study of the great artistic produc-

tions of the Greek past would contribute to that national resurrection. Korais's dreams included a museum that would keep the country's cultural treasures within Greece itself.

His ideas helped inspire the creation in 1813 of the Athenian Philomousos Hetaireia (Society of Lovers of the Muses), an antiquarian society whose members were encouraged to collect antiquities and sponsor publications related to antiquity. Both Greeks and foreigners were accepted as members. The latter group included such prominent archaeological figures as Cockerell, Carl Haller von Hallerstein (1774–1817), and Otto von Stackelberg.<sup>27</sup> While the Hetaireia anticipated in some respects the *Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica* in Rome, it is significant that here native Greeks rather than foreigners were the driving force behind its creation.

Archaeology would become a key element in the new government's attempt to establish a purified national identity closely linked with the classical past. As the politician and historian Andreas Moustoxidis put it, "the preservation and excavation of whatever survived the years under barbarian rule" was essential to the nation's self-respect.<sup>28</sup> Even before Athens became the nation's capital, the Greek leader John Capodistria (1776–1831) worked for the creation of an archaeological museum at the provisional capital of Aegina.

Two important events in the early 1830s further reinforced the role of archaeology in the new Greek state. The first was the designation of Athens as the Greek capital. Sieges and countersieges during the Wars of Independence had devastated the city; by 1832 only some sixty houses remained intact. Nonetheless, the great monuments of classical Hellenism were there to provide an appropriate backdrop to the new Greek state. The second event was the designation of Otto of Bavaria as king of Greece after the turmoil that had followed the assassination of Capodistria. Otto's father had a strong interest in classical archaeology and had done much to bring the classical heritage to Bavaria. Now the family had the opportunity not just to classicize a remote German city but also to revitalize the greatest city in ancient Greece. Their agenda included the protection of the ancient remains but also the creation of a new neoclassical capital suitable for a refounded and revitalized Greece.

It was natural, given both the Bavarian origins of the Greek royal family and the emerging prestige of German classical scholarship, that

the first official appointed to guide Greek archaeological policy would be a “German,” Ludwig Ross (1806–59).<sup>29</sup> Ross actually was born in Holstein, then part of Denmark, and educated at Kiel. He received a traveling fellowship from the king of Denmark that took him to Greece for the first time in 1832. In 1833 he was appointed ephor (director) of antiquities for the Peloponnese and in 1834 ephor for all Greece. Closely associated with the Bavarian court, Ross served as King Ludwig’s guide to the archaeological sites when the monarch visited Greece, while his plans for the Acropolis received the support of the influential Bavarian court architect Leo von Klenze. Ross began the process of clearing the Acropolis, where his most important contribution was the discovery of the remains of the Temple of Athena Nike in the rubble of the fortification and its reconstruction on its original dramatic site overlooking the entrance.

But, Greek politicians and intellectuals were not willing to have a German in charge of their archaeological world, and Ross was forced out of the ephorite in 1836. From 1837 he was a professor at the University of Athens, teaching in modern Greek the “new” classical archaeology based on the textbook by Karl Otfried Müller. There he again ran afoul of Greek nationalism: the Greeks wanted to control their cultural heritage and were increasingly suspicious of the Bavarians. The constitution promulgated in the wake of the 1843 political reaction against the arbitrary actions of the king prohibited foreigners from holding public office in Greece. Ross was forced out of his position, and in 1845 he returned to Germany to teach archaeology and mythology at the University of Halle. He published extensively from research based on his travels in Greece, the islands, and Asia Minor.

Ross was replaced as ephor of antiquities by Kyriakos Pittakis (1798–1863).<sup>30</sup> Pittakis’s interest in antiquities had developed early, and he was aided in those endeavors by Fauvel and the Philomousos Hetaireia. Part of the founding generation of Greek nationalists, Pittakis had been a friend of Byron and fought in the Wars of Independence. During the war he had used his knowledge of the topography of the ancient Acropolis to help the besieged Athenians find water. He now continued Ross’s archaeological investigation on that site. He was a respectable researcher and a passionate protector of Greek antiquities at a time when Westerners found looting an amusing and acceptable pastime. He was also a strong archaeological nationalist, who argued that archaeological discoveries

represented “material to be used to demonstrate that the inhabitants of Greece are descendents of the ancient Greeks.” Pittakis’s methods on the Acropolis, especially his lack of attention to postclassical remains, have been criticized, but they were a product of their time, and he did help preserve much for posterity.<sup>31</sup>

The early rise of Pittakis to a position of supreme authority in the antiquities service meant that the emerging field of archaeology in Greece was shaped to a great degree by the Greeks themselves. Laws were quickly passed protecting antiquities and controlling excavations. The complex negotiations and severe restrictions faced by the Germans as they attempted to excavate at Olympia were a reflection of this new Hellenic archaeological reality. The Greek situation makes an interesting contrast with that in Italy, where the major archaeological organization, the Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica, was dominated by foreigners, and the development of a strong indigenous archaeological service was not possible in the waning days of the Papal States. Ironically, after unification the Italian government reacted by banning all foreign excavations, and restrictive Greece rather than prohibitive Italy became the scene of most European and American excavation in the days when archaeology was emerging as a professional field.

The position of Pittakis and the Greek archaeological nationalists was strengthened by the creation of the Archaeological Society of Athens in 1837. Spearheading the foundation of the organization were Pittakis, the scholar and diplomat Alexander Rizos-Rangabe (1810–92), and the rich merchant Konstantinos Bellios. The society, which received its charter from King Otto, was inaugurated with great fanfare in a ceremony on the Acropolis. Its purpose was to assist financially strapped official archaeologists in carrying out excavations at sites like the Acropolis and to publish their results. In 1837 it started publishing the *Proceedings of the Archaeological Society* (Praktika tes Archaialogikes Hetaireia).

However, the society depended on private contributions for its activities, and its early years were financially rocky. Indeed, it collapsed in 1854 but was refounded in 1858. Under the dynamic leadership of Stephanos Koumanoudis (1818–99), who served as secretary until 1894, the society became the major force in Greek archaeology that it has remained down to the present. Among other achievements, Koumanoudis directed a series of excavations in Athens and other territories of Greece.<sup>32</sup>

In the meantime the war-torn Turkish provincial settlement had to

be turned into a national capital. King Ludwig of Bavaria ensured that his son would receive the assistance of the best neoclassical architects working in Germany. Soon the demands of the old and the new Athens came into conflict when the Bavarian architects began planning a new capital suitable to a northern European monarchy. The danger arose that the development necessarily associated with the creation of the new city would destroy the cultural—especially the archaeological—treasures that had led to the selection of Athens in the first place. The conflicts between archaeological conservation and modern needs that emerged at Athens anticipated by half a century what was to happen when Rome was made into the capital of modern Italy in 1870.

These contrasting goals came into especially stark conflict with the plans for the symbolic and practical uses of the Acropolis. Under the Turks the Acropolis had served as a garrison. Ottoman and even earlier buildings were interspersed among the classical ruins, a picturesque scene captured by the sketches of Stuart and Revett and other artists who visited Athens before independence. From a distance the most visible monuments were the Parthenon and the so-called Frankish tower located near the fifth-century B.C. Propylaia,<sup>33</sup> making the Acropolis a palimpsest of Athenian medieval and early modern history.

The decision was made almost immediately to begin the removal of all postclassical remains. The motives were partly archaeological and partly ideological.<sup>34</sup> Scholars and antiquarians sought more information on the classical buildings that were encumbered by the later structures, while classically oriented nationalists wanted to obliterate the reminders of centuries of foreign domination and to make plain and clear the links to the glorious period of Hellenic civilization. The long program of clearing the Acropolis concluded in 1875 with the removal of the Frankish tower, a project that was paid for by Heinrich Schliemann. By that time attitudes toward the preservation of postclassical monuments had begun to change, and protests were raised about the removal of what had now become a famous landmark memorialized in paintings, sketches, and finally photographs. To these critics Lyssandros Kaftanzoglou of the Archaeological Society of Athens countered, “In such a sacred place we believe that it is impious and improper to maintain the dark relics of the passing waves of barbarity.”<sup>35</sup>

As the most visible archaeological complex in the city, the cleared Acropolis was bound to play an important role in the new formation of

the classical ideology of modern Greece.<sup>36</sup> The question was what that role should be. One early plan advanced by the Bavarians proposed that a new royal palace be built on the Acropolis, and the great German neoclassical architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel (1781–1841) prepared a design that included a reconstruction of Pheidias's massive statue of Athena Promachos. The proposal was not insensitive, as one would expect from that great architect, and it showed considerable respect for the setting.<sup>37</sup> Nonetheless, the palace complex would have done great damage to the archaeological remains and hindered the development of the Acropolis as a tourist mecca and classical shrine. A combination of architectural politics and financial limitations resulted in a much more prosaic palace elsewhere in the city.

In the meantime excavations and restorations continued on the Acropolis. Most were conducted by Greeks, often with the support of the Archaeological Society of Athens, but occasionally a foreigner like the young French archaeologist Emil Beulé was permitted to dig there. Most work involved the clearing and rebuilding of remains close to the surface. It was not until the 1880s that deeper soundings took place, and they yielded one of the most important collections of material in Greek archaeological history, the debris from the Persian destruction. (When the Persians had sacked the city in 480–479 B.C., the damaged sculptural and architectural fragments were buried.) This was not the earliest deposit of this type: the archaeologists also found remains of architectural building materials dating to the late sixth century B.C.

The later deposit, the so-called *Perserschutt* (Persian debris), became even more famous than the earlier one largely because it yielded large quantities of fragmentary sculpture from the late sixth to early fifth centuries B.C. The majority of the statues represented females clad in rich garments whose painted colors had been preserved because of their early burial. The *Perserschutt* was the largest collection of pre-Hellenistic Greek sculpture that had ever been recovered, and it provided new insights into the transition of Attic art from the Archaic to the Classical period. However, these elegant ladies with their multicolored garments reflected the world of decadent Ionia rather than manly Doris, and were only slowly accepted into the canon of Greek art.<sup>38</sup>

The proposals for the Acropolis were just part of much-debated master plans for the city that aimed at providing needed facilities for the government, an ambiance of architectural elegance for the new monarchy,



and an ideological link of past and present. This proposed construction had the potential of threatening the antiquities, especially if construction took place in central urban areas with major archaeological remains. In the end most official development centered in the more peripheral parts of the city. Quarters like the Plaka, which covered the remains of the classical Agora and had been severely damaged during the struggle for independence, were reinhabited, but with residential buildings that did relatively little damage to the archaeological remains.

Museum development was slow and inadequate to the many finds of new antiquities made in the reviving city. There already existed a museum at Aegina, and a Central Archaeological Museum in Athens was established on paper by royal decree in 1834. But in the early years of independence the increasing number of newly discovered objects were scattered in haphazard fashion in buildings like the Library of Hadrian, the Tower of the Winds, and the Theseion. Others were stored in cisterns or rebuilt into walls. Pittakis controlled the keys to these storage areas and often denied access.<sup>39</sup> The Acropolis naturally became the focus of its own museum development. As early as 1824 plans were afoot to establish a museum in the Acropolis, and by 1834 many artifacts were on display in the Propylaia. In 1837 antiquities were transferred to the Acropolis from the Aegina Museum and scattered in various buildings. The Archaeological Society of Athens provided another initiative with the establishment of a cast gallery in 1848. Among other art reproductions it displayed a set of casts of the Elgin Marbles and other Acropolis sculpture now located in the British Museum.<sup>40</sup> It was not until 1874 that a proper museum was opened that housed material not just from the Acropolis but from other places within Athens.<sup>41</sup>

In spite of the philhellenic enthusiasm generated by the Wars of Independence, Athens developed slowly as a tourist center. German artists arrived to pursue official commissions and to record the picturesque and the romantic in the landscape. They were joined by French, English, and a number of other nationalities. The city was still primitive, however, with a limited range of attractions, much discomfort, and danger from endemic banditry and political turmoil. Athens never developed a major artist colony to match Rome. For many it was a stopover on the way to Constantinople and the Holy Land. It is true that in 1834 John Murray published *A Handbook for Travellers in Greece*, but it was not until 1876 that the first Baedeker guide to Greece appeared. Travelers took their

guidance more from impressionistic accounts of voyages to Greece than from scholarly sources.<sup>42</sup>

The slowly changing Athens of the post-independence period was captured by the emerging craft of photography.<sup>43</sup> As early as 1841 the French photographer Pierre-Gustave Joly de Lotbinière (1798–1865) produced a daguerreotype of the Parthenon. Pride of place among the early photographers of Athens belongs to the Greek Philippos Margaritis (1810–92), who had studied painting in Rome and thus brought that world of traditional art to the emerging discipline. His earliest known daguerreotype dates to 1846 or 1847. By the early 1850s he had a studio in Athens, where he mastered the transition to negative-based photography. He also taught at the Polytechnic and was a collector of antiquities.

Especially important among the early photographers of Greece was the American William J. Stillman. He too came to photography via painting (he was a minor figure in the Hudson River School) and art criticism. His background and education gave him a practical orientation, and he became fascinated with the technical side of photography. Service as U.S. consul took him to Crete and from there in 1869 he went to Athens to undertake his first campaign of photography. Striking are his images of the Acropolis, where his use of foreground, background, and light capture the stark lines of the ancient buildings. He also conveys the sense of a community that was still small and underdeveloped, surrounded by desolate countryside.<sup>44</sup>

Meanwhile, the presence of a Bavarian monarch with neoclassical tastes on the throne of Greece meant that German scholars had special access to Greece. The moment was opportune, for in Germany itself interest in Greek archaeology was strengthening. Classical archaeology was becoming a part of more academic curricula; Greek vases and Greek sculpture were filling the new museums. Now German scholars could realize Winckelmann's vision and visit the great Hellenic sites. Eighteenth-century classicism and early-nineteenth-century romanticism were combined with the scholarly ideals of *Totalwissenschaft* (complete scholarship). The new generation of scholars wanted to visit the places mentioned by Pausanias, read the inscriptions, and study the ruined monuments. At times they remained longer than they planned.

One such early scholarly traveler was Karl Otfried Müller (1797–1840),<sup>45</sup> who owed his love of Greece and his appreciation of new disciplines like epigraphy to his study with August Boeckh at Berlin. His

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The Athenian Acropolis in 1869, photographed by William J. Stillman  
(© The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles)

appointment as a professor at Göttingen in 1819 and his impressive scholarship made him at a relatively young age one of the most important Hellenists of his generation. Like his mentor Boeckh he was a firm believer in the comprehensive mastery of all of the evidence from classical antiquity. His *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst* (Handbook of cultural archaeology), published in 1830, was in many respects the first archaeological textbook.<sup>46</sup> His travels in Greece combined romantic enthusiasm for the ancient land with a more serious historical interest in human geography and the scientific study of monuments, especially inscriptions.<sup>47</sup> While in Greece, he became ill and died at Athens, nursed by his pupil Ernst Curtius, who later distinguished himself as the excavator of Olympia.

In the international contest to shape the new Greece politically and culturally the French were determined to compete as equals with the Germans. French warships had played an important part in the victory of the allied fleet over the Ottomans at Navarino, and shortly afterward the French government dispatched to Greece the *Expédition scientifique de Morée*, an exercise in scientific and cultural imperialism modeled

on Napoleon's 1798 multidisciplinary expedition to Egypt.<sup>48</sup> The new expedition's chief antiquarian was Guillaume-Abel Blouet (1795–1859), an architect who had won the Prix de Rome and refined his knowledge of ancient architecture by studying the Baths of Caracalla in Rome.<sup>49</sup> From 1829 to 1831 French scientists and antiquarians systematically explored the Peloponnese and the Cyclades. Blouet organized the archaeological studies, which included excavations at Olympia, and played a major role in publishing the results in a series of elegant volumes, all the while pursuing a distinguished career as a Parisian architect.

The French institutionalized their cultural presence in the new Greek capital by founding the French School in Athens in 1846.<sup>50</sup> It was the first foreign institution established in that city and owed its creation largely to the scholarly interests and cultural politics of the French ambassador in Athens, Théobald Piscatory, who saw the school as an important weapon in France's political rivalry with England for influence in Greece. During its first years, the French School was an odd combination of a French cultural center in what was still "barbarian" Greece and a hostel for romantic young French students, many of whom came from the French Academy in Rome. Known as the Argonauts, they were more interested in reading Sophocles while visiting Colonnus than in undertaking systematic scholarship.<sup>51</sup>

That relaxed attitude changed in the early 1850s. Louis Philippe, the school's royal founder, had been overthrown. The short-lived republic gave way to the empire of Napoleon III, a serious amateur student of archaeology. German-style *Wissenschaft* spread its influence and helped reshape the mission of the school. Students took examinations and were expected to be serious young scholars, undertaking more systematic historical and archaeological research. Instead of mooning over Sophocles in some romantic landscape, they were expected to carry the serious topographical works of Leake, Ross, and Müller in their packs and start scholarly investigations.

A pioneer in this new generation was Charles Beulé (1826–74). In a concession rare to a foreigner at that period he received permission in 1852–53 to excavate on the Acropolis. There he uncovered and restored the west entrance to the Propylaea, a monumental approach that still bears his name. His 1853 book on the Acropolis became required reading of young scholars like Ernest Renan on their Greek pilgrimages. On his return to France, Beulé became professor of archaeology at the

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Frontispiece from *Expédition scientifique de Morée*, 1831. The antiquarian and architect Guillaume Blouet was the chief archaeologist in this pioneering research project. (German Archaeological Institute, Rome)

Bibliothèque impérial and secretary of the Académie des beaux-arts. In 1868 he published his synthetic work *Histoire de l'art grec avant Périclès*. He continued his archaeological field career in Carthage, where he excavated on the Byrsa, in the port, and in the cemeteries. There he committed suicide in 1874.<sup>52</sup>

The project that captured best the Greek archaeological world in transition was the German archaeological excavation at Olympia.<sup>53</sup> As early as Winckelmann, Germans had dreamed of excavating there, and

the French Morea (Peloponnese) excavations had demonstrated the feasibility, if also the difficulties, of work at the site. The German dream was given reality through the lifelong efforts of Ernst Curtius (1814–96), a rising star in the new generation of German classical archaeologists and a man who combined romantic Hellenism with scientific archaeological rigor.<sup>54</sup> His teachers had included F. G. Welcker of Bonn, Karl Otfried Müller of Göttingen, and August Boeckh and Eduard Gerhard of Berlin. Curtius worked in Greece from 1837 to 1840 as a private tutor and accompanied Müller on his last, fatal travels. He then returned to Germany, where he established a reputation as a charismatic lecturer. It was at a packed lecture in 1852 at the Singakademie in Berlin that he articulated the importance of Olympia as an archaeological site. As he expressed it, “What lies buried there in darkness is life of our life. Other divine ordinances may have descended upon earth, foreshadowing a deeper peace than the Olympian truce; yet for us too Olympia is holy ground. Into our world, lit by a purer light, we may welcome the enthusiasm, the patriotic devotion . . . and that overmastering joy which outlasts all the trials of life.”<sup>55</sup>

In 1844 Curtius became tutor to Friedrich, the crown prince of Prussia and future Kaiser Friedrich III, and inspired him with his own love of classical archaeology. Curtius also imparted to his royal student the great importance of Olympia as an archaeological site.<sup>56</sup>

The complexities of the negotiations and the vagaries of both Prussian and international politics delayed the start of the project until 1875. The Prussian government and the imperial family were distracted by wars and the problems of creating a new German imperial state. Chancellor Otto von Bismarck was less than enthusiastic about the scheme of excavation at a remote Greek archaeological site, and ultimately much of the funding had to come from the kaiser. Fortunately for the future of Olympia, Curtius returned to Berlin in 1868 to assume Gerhard’s old chair at the university, a position that provided him with better, more regular contacts with the sources of power in the capital. In October 1869 Crown Prince Friedrich spoke in support of the Olympia project on a state visit to Athens, but it was not until the fall of 1875 that excavations actually started. The work at Olympia was an archaeological excavation undertaken for the pure love of science and culture; and the excavators respected Greece’s antiquities laws. In an era when the export of antiquities from the weakening Ottoman Empire was still commonplace, the

Olympia excavators were allowed to bring only casts and a few duplicates back to Germany.

The excavations, which continued until 1881, were pursued with a rigor that set a high standard for the future. Key to their success was the involvement of the architect Johann Friedrich Adler (1827–1908). Adler had a busy practice with a specialty in church design, but also a deep interest in classical architecture. The two sides of Adler's interests came together in his design for the museum built at Olympia. He guided the architectural side of the excavations, training a generation of archaeological architects including Karl Bötticher and his son-in-law Wilhelm Dörpfeld, and his work set the precedent for placing architectural research at the center of modern classical archaeology that has dominated the field down to the present day.<sup>57</sup>

The German excavations yielded such important works of classical art as the mid-fifth-century B.C. pedimental sculptures from the temple of Zeus Olympios, the Hermes of Praxiteles, and the statue of Nike by Paionius. However, the general quality of excavation and the recovery and recording of large quantities of smaller finds such as bronzes and terra-cottas made it a milestone in the history of classical archaeology. It was in the study and publication of those small finds that a great archaeologist of the next generation, Adolf Furtwängler, first made his reputation. In his publication Furtwängler catalogued some 14,000 small bronzes and 4,600 terra-cottas. Such research not only represented positivism triumphant, it also demonstrated how the study of such "minor arts" provided insights into the overall development of the plastic arts in Greece, information that the very incomplete series of ancient sculpture could not hope to supply.<sup>58</sup>

One final aspect of the archaeology at Olympia that is worthy of note was the decision to keep such major discoveries such as the Hermes and the pedimental sculptures at the site itself rather than ship them to Athens. Adler designed an elegant museum to house them, a bold decision at a time when transportation within Greece was still primitive, and only a limited number of visitors were likely to make their way to Olympia. Concentration of major new archaeological finds in the capital remained an important operating principle in both Greece and Italy, and good arguments could be made for the practice on grounds of scholarly accessibility.<sup>59</sup> However, much can also be said for keeping the objects in the context of the site where they were found. Local pride and the

potential for tourist development needed to be considered as well as the problems associated with the flow of objects into a few central museums, creating mastodonic institutions that could neither curate nor display the materials. Such tensions between local and national interests have continued to be part of Mediterranean archaeological politics down to the present. A dramatic manifestation of the struggle was the action of Italian locals shortly after World War II, when they blocked the removal of the Odysseus sculptures from the Roman villa site at Sperlonga.<sup>60</sup>

Classical archaeology had changed greatly during the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century. It had become an accepted, even respected academic discipline, at least in Germany. The informal community of the eighteenth-century antiquarians had been given institutional form by such bodies as the *Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica*, while publications were increasing in both quantity and quality. The founding of local archaeological societies throughout the period showed the growing popularity of the subject with the ever increasing middle class. The examples of Greece and France showed that the new archaeology could serve as an effective instrument both for nationalism and for colonialism. Most important for the future was the fact that classical archaeologists had learned to work in Greece. The pioneers of Olympia changed the epicenter of the emerging profession, and the implications of that change remain in effect today.



## CHAPTER 4

# Nationalism and National Traditions Before the Great War

**T**he defeat of Napoleon III by the Prussians at the Battle of the Sedan in 1870 ended the reign of one of the most archaeologically enthusiastic rulers in European history. It also set off a succession of events that led to the creation of two new nations, the kingdom of Italy and the German Reich, and produced an intellectual and cultural crisis in France. Meanwhile, the United States had recently emerged from the bloodiest war in its history endowed with new vigor, and was slowly trying to find its place on the world scene. Throughout the West an expanding capitalist class was accumulating massive new wealth, some of which would be expended in the foundation of cultural institutions and the accumulation of artistic treasures. Throughout the changing Western world the ruling elites were united by a common classical education and the belief that much was to be learned from the ancient civilizations of Greece and Rome. Each of these developments played a significant role in shaping the course of classical archaeology down to World War I.

The victory of Bismarck over Napoleon III completed the long, complicated process that culminated in the creation of a German nation with imperial ambitions. The king of the Prussians, Wilhelm I, now became the German emperor, and Berlin was proclaimed the capital of one of the most dynamic and powerful nations in Europe. While Bismarck had his reservations about the worth of classical archaeology, the emperor remained sympathetic. The new Germany desired to build on the legacy of leadership in scientific archaeology that it had pioneered in the first two-thirds of the century.

Three actions captured this new reality of Teutonic power and self-confidence. In Rome the venerable Istituto di corrispondenza archeo-

logica, founded as a cosmopolitan gathering place, now became a branch of the Imperial Archaeological Institute headquartered in Berlin.<sup>1</sup> That change was in many respects the culmination of a process that had started years before with Gerhard's arrival in Berlin. More and more the decision making for the Institute had taken place in the Prussian capital, and in 1859 the general administration had been transferred to Berlin. The close interactions of Rome and Berlin can be seen in the detailed correspondence that passed between Henzen and Gerhard during these years.<sup>2</sup> The leadership in Rome did try to respect local sensitivities. Wilhelm Henzen (1816–87), who served as the Institute's first secretary during much of this transitional period, was a respected and beloved figure in the Roman archaeological community.<sup>3</sup> The Institute's new headquarters opened on the Campidoglio in 1877, replacing the Casa Tarpeia; it housed the best archaeological library in the city and drew scholars of all nationalities. Nonetheless, the old international spirit gradually eroded. The process of Germanization culminated in 1885 when Bismarck decreed that German rather than Italian would be the official language of the Institute.

The Imperial Archaeological Institute in Berlin saw itself as the headquarters that would coordinate German archaeology. With the foundation of a new branch, the Archaeological Institute, in Athens in 1874, the Germans showed that they were preparing to challenge the French in other classical lands. The Archaeological Institute got off to a slow start, especially after Ernst Curtius arranged that the activities of the Olympia excavations would largely bypass the new organization. However, things changed in the 1880s with the arrival of Wilhelm Dörpfeld (1853–1940), first as architect, then as secretary, and finally as director, a post he held from 1887 to 1912.<sup>4</sup> Dörpfeld was an architect and a veteran of the Olympia excavations as well as of Schliemann's work at Troy, and he helped establish the strong architectural archaeological tradition at the Athens school.

As a result of the peace treaty imposed on France after Sedan, Germany acquired Alsace and Lorraine and immediately set out to turn this disputed ground into German territory with a German cultural base, a program in which classical archaeology was to play its role. A new German university was established at Strasbourg, and Adolf Michaelis, a nephew of Otto Jahn, was appointed professor of classical archaeology. Michaelis (1835–1910) remained in the post until his death and did much

to turn Strasbourg into a center of Teutonic scholarship. His budget was generous, and he was able to create the appropriate infrastructure, including one of the best cast collections in any German university.<sup>5</sup>

Michaelis also became a pioneer in investigating the historical development of the discipline of archaeology, publishing in 1882 his *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*. Ever since the days of the Grand Tour scholars and savants had expressed concern about how many ancient sculptures were disappearing into the relative obscurity of English country houses, and Michaelis joined the clamor, adding to the fear the facts that Grand Tour classicism had widely disappeared from the cultural horizons of the British rural aristocracy and that the growing enthusiasm for Greek originals was leading to the denigration of holdings largely composed of Roman copies, many of them heavily restored.<sup>6</sup> As a result many private collections were in his day sadly neglected. Michaelis also believed strongly in the “wider and higher mission of culture, to exercise a refining and ennobling influence on the public at large” and argued for the transfer of private collections to public museums.<sup>7</sup>

Michaelis’s *Ancient Marbles* is not a scholarly catalogue but rather a study of the history of collecting, especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. His interest in how the discipline had developed led to his 1906 book, *Die Archäologischen Entdeckungen des 19 Jahrhunderts* (Archaeological discoveries of the nineteenth century).<sup>8</sup> It is an impressive and balanced work. Through his kinship with Otto Jahn, Michaelis could tap personal reminiscences that went back almost to the founding fathers of collecting. Naturally, Germans dominated the narrative, but Michaelis was fair in his assessments of other nations’ contributions. The Englishman Charles Newton, who did so much to develop the classical collections of the British Museum, was clearly one of his heroes, and he had high praise for the recent discoveries of Flinders Petrie at Naukratis. Criticisms are few, centered mainly on failure of method or care in curating objects or sites. At the end, Michaelis, who was more of an art historian than a digging archaeologist, returned almost to the beginning, concluding with his own judgment on the long-standing debate on the relation between form and content in classical archaeology: “The form is only the robe, which the content creates for itself. Content and form are inseparable and one. It is only their relation to one another which determines the value of a work of art, and is the true object of research. May the young archaeologists of the new century for whom the old cen-

tury has acquired so rich a heritage, not pass unheeded these warnings of a veteran. Our science, I am convinced, will reward them.”<sup>9</sup>

The impact of Sedan was devastating for France. The defeat on the battlefield was followed by the German siege of Paris, the humiliating peace that lost France control of Alsace and Lorraine, and the uprising and savage suppression of the Paris workers' Commune. The costs and indemnities of the war left the country nearly bankrupt. In addition, these military and political disasters produced a spiritual malaise: Why had such a once great and proud nation been brought so low? The French looked into themselves for spiritual answers but also looked to Germany for reasons why one nation had done so well and the other so badly. Important studies centered on education, especially the shape of the universities and the national sponsorship of research. Scientific rigor and the massive government support of higher education were important factors in the success of Germany. The French dispatched various commissions across the Rhine to study how the Germans did things.

The initial post-Sedan account balance for French classical archaeology was negative. Napoleon III had disappeared into exile. The newly proclaimed republic had many demands placed on it and few resources to meet even basic needs. But its leaders were interested in improving French education and research in the wake of the disaster, and some of their reforms directly affected classical archaeology. Indeed, one of the leaders in implementing those reforms was a former director of the French School in Athens, Albert Dumont (1842–84). Important as a scholar, he was also one of the most significant administrative figures in French classical archaeology. Not only did he carry out major reforms at the Athens school, he played a key role in the foundation of the French School of Rome and in expanding the teaching of archaeology in the French universities.<sup>10</sup>

The French readily acknowledged the higher level of archaeological professionalism in German universities and institutions of research. It is not accidental that the word *savant* (amateur scholar) still characterized the French approach to learning, while *Wissenschaft* (scholarship) was associated with the Germans. The French government now sought to remake the country's higher education in the Teutonic mold. In 1882 the young archaeologist Camille Jullian was sent to sit at the feet of the great Theodor Mommsen and learn what made the Berlin research seminars work so successfully.<sup>11</sup> Funding for universities was

significantly increased, and more professorships in archaeology were established.

One of the first steps in the direction of this new professionalism—and a bold one so soon after Sedan and the Commune—was the establishment in 1875 of the French School in Rome. France had long had an art academy in the eternal city, but that was only indirectly involved in archaeological research through its architects. The French had been closely associated with the early history of the *Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica*, but after 1870 this became a Berlin satellite. Students on their way to Athens had spent a preliminary period of study in Rome, but the arrangement had not proved satisfactory. Now a new French school devoted solely to ancient studies was founded. By 1875 it was housed in the Farnese Palace, the seat of the French embassy, and the director had quasi-diplomatic status. His salons became a favorite meeting place for the elite in politically divided post-unification Rome. The school developed into a strong study center for archaeological, epigraphical, and ancient historical research with the young “Farnesiens” working not only in Italy but also in Spain and North Africa.<sup>12</sup>

Gradually classical archaeology gained a more secure place in the French universities. In 1876 Georges Perrot (1832–1914) was appointed the first professor of archaeology at the Sorbonne, while Léon-Maxime Collignon (1849–1917) was selected to head the new program at Bordeaux.<sup>13</sup> The two were similar in their education and their approach to archaeology. They had cut their archaeological teeth in the eastern Mediterranean, traveling the Greek isles and collecting inscriptions. Both were sympathetic to the German approach and maintained good relations with their German counterparts.

Perrot was a product of the *Ecole normale supérieure* in Paris and the French School in Athens.<sup>14</sup> He had established his research reputation through archaeological explorations in the Greek isles and Asia Minor. His time spent in the East made him appreciate the role of Eastern civilizations in shaping that of Greece. When he was appointed to the Sorbonne he faced a formidable task: to assert the place of classical archaeology in a world that had traditionally been dominated by philology. At the same time he began to create an infrastructure of cast and study collections, which by this time were a standard feature of the great German programs.

Collignon had also received his education at the *Ecole normale supé-*

rieure (where he was a student of Perrot's), studied at the French School in Athens, and spent time in Rome. He had a special interest in Greek ceramics; one of his earliest works of scholarship was a catalogue of the vases in the Archaeological Society of Athens. However, his interests were much wider than Perrot's. His second major work was on the myth of Psyche in Greek and Roman art,<sup>15</sup> while his survey of Greek sculpture, a "scientific" approach to classical archaeology with careful description and classification of objects, was considered the grand summary of the positivist school of archaeological research.<sup>16</sup> Through his teaching and his "archaeological laboratories" he inculcated his vision of archaeology in his students, first at Bordeaux and then in Paris,<sup>17</sup> where he succeeded Perrot at the Sorbonne when the former was elevated to the directorship of the *Ecole normale supérieure*.

The different approaches to classical archaeology in Germany and France can be appreciated also in the way the two countries developed the study of their own Roman provincial archaeology in the late nineteenth century. For both countries that archaeology was shaped by an ideological agenda as well as by scientific concerns. The downfall of Napoleon III did not end the desire of the French to stress their close historical associations with ancient Rome. The Germans, on the other hand, were always more culturally and archaeologically schizophrenic. A strong element among their cultural elite stressed Germany's heroic and partly successful resistance to Rome.<sup>18</sup> Yet no country had a greater tradition of classical scholarship, and powerful figures wanted Germans to study and honor the classical remains to be found on the soil of the Reich.

Naturally it was Germany that led the way in organization and expenditure. Here Theodor Mommsen made one of his last great contributions to classical studies. In the research leading up to the publication of his book on the Roman provinces in 1885, Mommsen had come to appreciate the importance of archaeology in documenting those outposts of the Roman Empire, where written sources were sparse.<sup>19</sup> He began pushing for an organization that would sponsor research on the archaeology of Roman Germany and unite the efforts of professionals and amateurs. Initially, the Reichslimeskommission (Imperial Frontier Commission) had been founded to sponsor this research, but it provided inadequate support, and classicists and archaeologists including Mommsen demanded a stronger organization. The plans became caught

up in the complex cultural politics of late-nineteenth-century Germany, as localists vied with nationalists, classicists with prehistorians, and Foreign Ministry bureaucrats with Interior Ministry bureaucrats for the control of the proposed archaeological center. Finally, in 1902, shortly before Mommsen's death, the Römische-Germanische Limeskommission (Roman-German Frontier Commission) was established.<sup>20</sup>

The first director was Hans Dragendorff (1870–1941), a classical archaeologist who had studied at Berlin and Bonn. The time spent at Bonn, where he studied with Georg Loeschcke, stimulated his interest in the archaeology of Roman Germany and also in the study of Roman pottery, especially terra sigillata.<sup>21</sup> He brought the rigor of the new classical archaeology to the often informal, amateurish world of Roman provincial studies. The early fieldwork of the Limeskommission focused on the study of Roman camps and fortifications in the Rhineland. One of the most important of those started by the original commission in 1899 and continued until the outbreak of World War I at the fort of Haltern on the Lippe River. Haltern had briefly been occupied as part of the shifting frontier policy of the Augustan period. It preserved the plan of a Roman fort during the formative period of Augustus's new professional army. Since the site was occupied only briefly, the objects found could be placed within a specific dating context and thus were able to anchor the chronologies for artifacts like ceramics. It was not coincidental that Dragendorff became one of the founding fathers of the study of Roman ceramics.<sup>22</sup>

While the Germans were creating bureaucratic structures and funding more professional excavations for the study of Roman Germany, Roman Gaul remained pretty much the domain of the savant, whose work still centered on the local society and the local museum. Again it is important to give those figures their due, and for that nothing is better than a reflection on the career of Emile Espérandieu.<sup>23</sup> Espérandieu (1857–1939) came from Provence and early entered into the military, where service in North Africa helped stimulate his archaeological interests. After his return from North Africa and retirement from the army, he pursued his interests in the Roman antiquities of his native land. He was involved in the excavations at Alésia and in his later years served as conservator of antiquities at Nîmes. During that time he laid the groundwork for his monumental catalogue of all the Roman sculptures in the museums and collections of France. The great corpora of the later

nineteenth century like Mommsen's *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* provided the model, while improvements in printing techniques allowed him to include the numerous photographic illustrations essential to a work of that nature.

For years Espérandieu traversed France, documenting the holdings of the small local museums and savant societies. He published the first volume of his *Receuil général des bas-reliefs, statues et bustes de la Gaule romaine* in 1907 and by the time of his death the series had expanded to eleven volumes.<sup>24</sup> Most striking about the work is its comprehensiveness, for it included not only the fine pieces of high art but also the works generally regarded as primitive and ugly that captured the world of the ordinary semi-Romanized Celt. Long before the Italian scholar Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli popularized the concept of "popular" art, Espérandieu provided a document for the study of the Roman visual world outside of the realm of the elite.

Not all research on Gaul was left to amateurs. Geographers and historians like Paul Vidal de la Blache (1845–1918) and Numa-Denis Fustel de Coulanges (1830–89) had investigated aspects of pre-Roman France. Modern histories of Gaul, however, were expected to combine archaeological mastery with standard historical research. This was especially important in the decades after Sedan, when stress was placed on a French historical continuity that embraced both Celts and Romans. It is significant that the classicist Alexandre Bertrand began teaching Celtic antiquities at the Ecole du Louvre.

Three figures with very different perspectives played important creative roles in this new historiography of Gaul.<sup>25</sup> The first was Camille Jullian (1859–1933).<sup>26</sup> He received a traditional classical archaeological education and studied in Rome. In 1883 he succeeded Collignon at Bordeaux, a position that brought him into more direct contact with the Roman antiquities of France. He brought to the study of local antiquities the rigors of the new scientific archaeology, especially epigraphy. Jullian's more synthetic study of Roman Gaul led to the publication in 1908 of the first volume of his *Histoire de la Gaule*. He was strongly influenced by the institutional approach of Fustel de Coulanges but also by the almost mystical attachment to the land characteristic of the geographical school of Vidal de la Blache. He also appreciated the importance of prehistory in understanding the roots of Gallic culture. In his nationalism and patriotism he was very much a post-1870 Frenchman. Like many



French scholars he had complex and changing views about the Roman conquest of Celtic civilization.<sup>27</sup>

The work of Jullian on Gaul should be paired with the very different research of Joseph Déchelette (1862–1914). He was in some respects the last of the great amateurs, for he did his archaeology in his spare time while managing the family business. He used the opportunity provided by business travels throughout Europe to familiarize himself with sites and museums, and even found time to conduct excavations at Bibracte. Déchelette worked in the evolutionary tradition that went back to the great Scandinavian prehistorians of the early nineteenth century. He began preparing his massive archaeological synthesis, *Manuel d'archéologie préhistorique, celtique et gallo-romaine*, which would reconstruct French prehistory and place it in its European context, at the same time that Jullian was working on his study of Gaul; Déchelette's first volume appeared in the same year as Jullian's. Subsequent volumes took the study into the Iron Age, but the project was suspended when Déchelette was killed in combat early in World War I.<sup>28</sup>

The final scholar who played a major role in the foundation of a new archaeological study of Roman Gaul was Albert Grenier (1878–1961).<sup>29</sup> His early teachers included Collignon and Edmond Pottier, who had excavated at Myrina. Grenier's early research focused on the villas of Roman Gaul, continuing the nationalist tradition of Arcisse de Caumont. However, he also spent time at the Farnese Palace and produced a classic study on Villanovan and Etruscan Bologna. He taught for a while at a lycée in Algeria, where he discovered the antiquities of Roman North Africa. After service in World War I he was appointed to the chair of Roman Gallic archaeology at Strasbourg, a position he held until 1936. His role was the reverse of Michaelis's, for now Alsace-Lorraine had returned to France, and teachers of Roman Gallic archaeology had to stress the French connections of that disputed border territory. The centerpiece of Grenier's research became the continuation and completion of Déchelette's great manual of Gallic archaeology. The first volume of his *Manuel d'archéologie gallo-romaine* appeared in 1931. After World War II he became director of the French School in Rome, where he set the course of French field archaeology in Italy by excavating the Greek city of Megara Hyblaea in Sicily and the Etruscan-Roman city of Bolsena in Etruria.

Also during the late nineteenth century the impact of events in

France and Germany was felt in Italy. The fall of Napoleon III led to the removal of the French garrison in Rome that had since 1848 shielded papal Rome from the ambitions of the expanding Italian state. On September 20, 1870, the soldiers of the king of Italy stormed through Porta Pia on the eastern edge of the city, ending centuries of papal rule. Rome, a city associated since the fourth century with Catholic Christianity, now became the capital of a fully united Italian state that aimed to be a European power. Following the traditions of the Piedmontese royal family and French-inspired ruling elite, the Italians set about the creation of a centralized bureaucratic state that would control many aspects of government and society, including the administration of archaeological resources. The new government sought not only to protect monuments but also to use the archaeological materials for its own propagandistic ends.

The creation of Rome as the national capital had other, less fortunate consequences for the archaeological record. The city expanded rapidly as bureaucrats, diplomats, and the great variety of people who served their needs flooded into the capital. The delightful villa zone that had since the Renaissance graced the periphery of the small papal city was largely destroyed, and its pleasant gardens replaced by pretentious government buildings and blocks of apartments built to house the new Roman bourgeoisie. Almost every turn of the spade and blow of the pick uncovered some new reminder of the past. Much was discovered, even more destroyed, and the first of many debates on the conservation of the archaeological record in the new city began.

These changes were accompanied by the growth of a culture of nostalgia and efforts through literature and art to capture the appearance, mood, and charm of the sleepy papal city before it disappeared. In addition to the Italian essays of Henry James and the evocative watercolors of Ettore Roesler Franz, the camera began its stark documentation of the changing city and its archaeological monuments.<sup>30</sup> Whereas a Roesler Franz watercolor attempted to reproduce the subtle complexity of Roman light and the interaction of people and monuments, a photograph had to deal in sharp contrasts of white and black in an environment devoid of human presence (which could not be captured by the slow shutter) and dominated by monument and ruin. These early images were for the changing urban environment of Rome what Mathew Brady's photographs were for the Civil War battlefields.

The new medium of photography played an important role in promoting archaeology and the classical vision. The recent growth of interest in the history of photography has led not only to a greater appreciation of the contributions of the early archaeological photographers but also to the understanding of the intersection of the availability of their veristic images and the growth of a middle-class tourism. The new travelers brought the past visibly back to homes and classrooms and helped support archaeological interests among the educated people of both Europe and America. Although years later the faded sepia photographs of the Roman Forum or the Pantheon decorating Latin classrooms in European and American schools conveyed an air of dusty antiquarianism, when they were first acquired they represented a contemporary approach to an ancient discipline.

The earliest photographers began operating in Rome in the late 1840s.<sup>31</sup> An 1843 calotype by the Frenchman Victor Prévost reproduced the Colosseum. One of the most important pioneers was the Italian Giacomo Caneva (1813–65), who started as a “perspective painter” but early appreciated the future of photography, especially the calotype.<sup>32</sup> He has left us an extraordinary series of photographs of ancient monuments, museums, and ruins of Rome and the towns of the Roman Campagna, all from the last days of the papal city. A few years younger than Caneva was Ludovico Tuminello (1824–1907), whose photographs bridged the eras of late papal and early national Rome.<sup>33</sup> Tuminello participated in the ill-fated uprising of the 1849 Roman Republic and had to flee the papal city; he did not return until 1869. The importance of his photography lies in the record he left of the changes in the city and of the archaeological discoveries that took place in the decades immediately after Rome became the capital.

Of the foreign pioneers in photography the most important was the Englishman John Henry Parker (1806–84).<sup>34</sup> He came from a family of Oxford booksellers and early developed an interest in Gothic architecture and the Gothic revival. Concern for his health led him to spend the winter of 1864 in Rome, where he became interested in classical and Christian archaeology. Parker was one of the founders of the British and American Archaeological Society, a group of expatriate savants who met regularly to hear lectures on archaeological topics and even undertook their own excavations in the more permissive atmosphere of late papal Rome. His interest in archaeology led him to begin a project of

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The Colosseum in 1852, photographed by Giacomo Caneva. In the right foreground is the so-called Meta Sudans, the remains of an ancient Roman fountain that was destroyed during Mussolini's dictatorship. (Istituto centrale per il catalogo e la documentazione, ministero per i beni e le attività culturali)

systematically recording the monuments of Rome in photographs. Unlike Caneva and Tuminello, Parker did not do his own photography but hired a succession of photographers, mainly Italian, to produce his images.

Parker put his experience in the book business to work and made his photographs readily available to interested buyers. He produced catalogues similar to the cast catalogues that were circulating at that time, publishing in 1879 *A Catalogue of Three Thousand Three Hundred Photographs of Antiquities in Rome and Italy* and noting in the introduction that a complete set of his work was available at the British and American Archaeological Society in Rome; copies of the photographs could be purchased at shops in London and Rome. When Parker left Rome in 1877 he disposed of his collection of negatives. In 1893 a fire in the house of the photographer Pompeo Molins, who had acquired the Parker archive, destroyed most of the negatives. Fortunately some negatives and a few fairly complete albums of prints survived.

While the photographers produced their images showing continuity and change in late-nineteenth-century Rome, the new government sought to use the ancient monuments for new purposes. The ideology of Risorgimento nationalism had always nourished strong secular, even anticlerical, elements, and the military attack on papal Rome in 1870 had hardened the division between church and state. From his self-imposed exile in the Vatican the pope had condemned the new government. In the quest for new identities the Italian leaders turned back to the glories of ancient Rome. They also charged that the indolence, corruption, and inefficiency of the Papal States had led to the neglect and degradation of the archaeological treasures. Like the Greeks two generations earlier, the Italian nationalists identified with the universal values of a great ancient civilization and took unto themselves the official tutelage of that heritage.

This attitude toward the use of antiquities for nationalistic goals was articulated by Ruggiero Bonghi (1826–95), who as the minister of public instruction was charged with overseeing archaeology.<sup>35</sup> Bonghi was trained in classics and philosophy, and had long been involved in liberal politics. He sought a national archaeology that would also be modern and scientific. In the October 3, 1870, issue of the newspaper *La perseveranza* (Perseverance) he explained, “This earth should be sacred. We need to seek in it the memories, the traces of the most glorious era in the history of Italy, to investigate it not as has been done up to this point, with the aim not of using the stones and columns to ornament other palaces and temples, according to the custom of past centuries . . . but for the love of science and art, for that refines historical sentiment that is appropriate for our century.”<sup>36</sup> It was Bonghi who took the first steps toward turning the Risorgimento dream of a modern archaeology in the service of the new state into reality. He established the Direzione generale per le antichità (Department of Antiquities), the national governing council for archaeological research, and helped found the National Library.

One of the first and most important manifestations of this new attitude was the passage of laws that virtually prohibited foreign excavations in the Italian state or its colonies. The papal laws limiting the export of antiquities remained in effect, although enforcement was often poor. Now, the Italian government went beyond the policy of the Greeks, who had prohibited the export of antiquities but allowed limited, controlled

foreign excavations. The immediate impact was not great, for in 1870 there were few foreign excavations anywhere in the Mediterranean. That situation was about to change, however, and the regulation was to prove important for the future emphases of the discipline. The epicenter of classical archaeology was already shifting from Rome to Greece. Now the realities of the new laws for field archaeology reinforced that shift, and classical archaeology became an overwhelmingly Hellenic discipline. By making archaeology an exclusively national archaeological enterprise, the Italians risked disciplinary parochialism and increased the potential for the misuse of archaeology for national propaganda. To a certain degree both these problems came to pass.

With foreigners excluded from fieldwork in Italy, that country had to create its own archaeological system and traditions. For this they needed an archaeological bureaucracy, museums, and university teaching programs, none of which proved easy to accomplish. Local antiquarian traditions in Italy were strong, and a great suspicion of the new national government existed throughout the peninsula. Rome, where the most important archaeological monuments and greatest archaeological collections were located, had long been papal territory. The most famous of the collections, that in the Vatican museums, was now part of the exiled world of the pope. Others, like the collections on the Capitoline, were under the jurisdiction of the city of Rome, which sought to preserve its own archaeological privileges and treasures against the national bureaucracy. In 1873 the state did acquire the Kircher Museum, a diverse collection of archaeological and natural history objects that was largely the creation of the Jesuit Athanasius Kircher (1601–80).<sup>37</sup> However, no one knew how to turn this seventeenth-century collection of mechanical marvels into a modern museum, and ultimately the Kircher collection was divided and absorbed into other museums.

The national government moved relatively quickly to create a basic archaeological service. It was placed under the Ministry of Public Instruction, and its fate during the next decades depended on the interest, dynamism, and political influence of the ministers, who were also responsible for most other aspects of education in Italy. The obvious man to lead this new archaeological service was Giuseppe Fiorelli, director of the Pompeii excavations, who had solid credentials as an Italian nationalist and had even served jail time for the cause. Fiorelli already had a wealth of bureaucratic experience, both with the Bourbons and with

the Piedmontese government that had controlled Naples since the early 1860s.<sup>38</sup> In 1875 he was appointed head of the newly created *Direzione generale dei musei e degli scavi di antichità* (Department of Museums and Excavations of Antiquities).<sup>39</sup>

Fiorelli was a worldly, sophisticated man who operated well in the salons and the corridors of political power. His actions in politically charged Rome were bound to be criticized, but the balance for the emerging Italian national archaeological structure was positive. He helped lay the foundation of a national archaeological administration and played a key role in the establishment in 1876 of the journal *Notizie degli Scavi* (Excavation reports), which published new archaeological discoveries. Unlike many of his contemporaries and successors, he was open to cooperation with non-Italian research organizations in Rome as long as they respected the guidelines of Italian archaeological policy. Of special importance was his work with the German archaeologists, whose institutional academic power was strengthened during those years, when they found working with the new national government preferable to dealing with the Papal States. That pro-Teutonic policy of Fiorelli was not universally appreciated, especially after the Germans completed the transformation of the old *Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica* from an international scholarly body into a branch of the new German Archaeological Institute.<sup>40</sup>

His chief protégé was Felice Barnabei (1842–1922), the son of a potter from the Abruzzi who had worked with Fiorelli during the Naples years and followed him to Rome.<sup>41</sup> Barnabei was more energetic than the now aging Fiorelli, and he took the lead in the consolidation of the antiquities service and the founding of the two national archaeological museums in Rome. He was a hard-liner when it came to the defense of Italy's control over its archaeological patrimony and was unsympathetic to foreign involvement in Italian archaeology, as the fledgling Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) discovered when in 1887 it attempted to start a small excavation on private land at the site of the ancient Greek colony of Croton.<sup>42</sup> The AIA project was quickly stopped. Barnabei's strong nationalist archaeological goals as well as his hostility toward what he regarded as German archaeological hegemony at Rome fueled a bitter and prolonged conflict with the archaeologist and antiquities dealer Wolfgang Helbig.

It soon became clear that the archaeological administration required

updated information on the resources within the kingdom. In 1874 Bonghi initiated a program to create an inventory of archaeological sites that would in turn provide the information for a series of archaeological maps. The pioneering field studies for this *Carta archeologica* were begun in 1881 in the territory of Viterbo by Adolfo Cozzo and Gian Francesco Gamurrini.<sup>43</sup> The project represented one of the first systematic efforts in Europe to map in detail the archaeological resources of a particular territory.

Not only did the new state need to create archaeological administrative and legal structures; it also had to establish museums. The Vatican collections belonged to the pope and those in the Capitoline Museum belonged to the city of Rome. Both these bodies were highly suspicious of the national government. However, Fiorelli needed museum facilities to house the vast quantities of material that the rapid development in the city and its suburbs were unearthing as well as the private collections like the material in the Kircher Museum that were coming into the possession of the state.<sup>44</sup> Conflicts also developed with the *Comune* (city government), which had its own museum ambitions. Ambitious plans for museum facilities were launched by both city and state, and several temporary museums were created at places like the Palatine and locations on the Tiber banks. However, it was not until 1889 that an official decree was passed creating two new national museums, at the Baths of Diocletian and the Villa Giulia.

In 1890 the most important of the new national museums was inaugurated in the old monastery that had been built into the Baths of Diocletian near the railroad station on the eastern edge of the city. Felice Barnabei was the driving force behind its creation. Its collection was to focus on Roman antiquities from the city and its immediate hinterland, although development of the museum went very slowly owing to both bureaucratic inertia and the resistance of local property owners. Only when the museum was designated the center of a major exhibition on Roman archaeology for the 1911 International Exhibition was an adequate display structure completed.<sup>45</sup>

The Villa Giulia National Museum derived its name from the suburban villa of Pope Julius III located just off the *via Flaminia* to the north of the city. In that space between 1888 and 1890 Barnabei established a museum to display material from southern Etruria and the suburban areas of Lazio (*Latium*) near Rome.<sup>46</sup> His efforts were spurred by important



finds at places like Falerii, Narce, and Palestrina. In an innovation that would soon bring him considerable grief, Barnabei decided to display the material on a topographical basis, with all of the finds from a particular place, such as *Ager Faliscus*, grouped together.

This museum, more than the one in the Baths of Diocletian, was soon surrounded by controversy. Part of the dispute was territorial, for the Florentines regarded all the ancient Etruscan land as their domain. By the 1880s Luigi Milani (1854–1914), the leading Etruscan archaeologist in Tuscany, was in the process of incorporating Florence's Etruscan, Egyptian, and classical collections into a modern archaeological museum,<sup>47</sup> while Domenico Comparetti (1835–1927), a philologist with strong archaeological interests, had succeeded in implementing a course of study in Etruscan archaeology, the first in Italy.<sup>48</sup> These two opposed the Etruscan territorial ambitions of the new establishment, which claimed all the Etruscan materials found in the vicinity of Rome, a domain that included important Etruscan centers like Cerveteri and Tarquinia.<sup>49</sup> After much bickering the national government brokered an agreement that made the Lazio-Tuscany border the dividing point between the two authorities. That agreement remains in effect today.

More inflammatory and disruptive for the peaceful development of the Villa Giulia museum were the charges made by Wolfgang Helbig and others that in his displays of certain Latium sites Barnabei had deliberately mingled objects that Helbig claimed to be from distinct tomb groups. The charges had more than a purely archaeological origin. The Germans, Helbig in particular, resented the new Italian archaeological assertiveness personified in Barnabei. Barnabei was also making special efforts to control the clandestine antiquities market in Rome, a market in which Helbig was deeply involved, and Barnabei countered that Helbig had based his charges on testimony provided by his contacts among the clandestine excavators.<sup>50</sup> After much polemic and an official inquiry Barnabei was cleared, but in 1900 he resigned from the museum.<sup>51</sup>

The application of the new archaeological structure throughout the kingdom of Italy was very irregular. Fiorelli initially had only a staff of four to deal with sixty-eight provinces.<sup>52</sup> His difficulties were compounded by the fact that real estate development was not limited to Rome but affected most of the major cities of Italy. The problems he faced can be seen in the story of one of the richest archaeological centers in Italy, the southern Italian city of Taranto. Because of its potential as a

port and naval base, this important Greek and Roman city experienced massive development during the 1880s, which led to numerous archaeological discoveries but also to the massive illegal export of artifacts and to the destruction of archaeological sites. In 1880 Fiorelli sent Luigi Viola (1851–1924) to Taranto as director of excavations.<sup>53</sup> Viola was then and still remains a figure of controversy. He did make an important contribution in spearheading the foundation of the national museum in Taranto, but he lacked the energy and topographical abilities of an archaeologist like Rodolfo Lanciani in Rome or Paolo Orsi in Syracuse. Viola's position was further compromised when he married the daughter of Carlo Cacace, a major Tarantine property developer, who was also funneling local archaeological discoveries into the national and international antiquities market.

In addition to bureaucracies and museums, the new nation of Italy began to develop a modern, secular university structure. As it slowly came into being, programs in archaeology did not receive high priority. Pietro Ercole Visconti, who had taught archaeology at the old papal university, was regarded as too closely tied to the Vatican to keep on. Ettore DeRuggiero (1839–1926), an old associate of Fiorelli's from Naples, was given the archaeology position and in 1874 he was made head of the Kircher Museum.<sup>54</sup> However, the Italians increasingly realized that the university needed a more professional archaeologist, preferably someone trained in the German methods of archaeological scholarship. It was not until 1889 that a professorship of archaeology was created at the University of Rome. A competition for the position was held and the finalists were Paolo Orsi and Emanuel Löwy, an Austrian. Löwy (1857–1938) was selected because he could teach the young Italians the best Germanic approaches to classical archaeology.<sup>55</sup> In this he succeeded brilliantly. Until he was ousted in the anti-German fervor of World War I he educated several generations of archaeologists who shaped the discipline in Italy well into the twentieth century. He himself was an active scholar with a special interest in Greek sculpture. Like any good archaeologist working in the Germanic mode he sought to create a research infrastructure in Rome. The most visible expression of that legacy today is the newly renovated cast museum at the University of Rome.

The new museums, especially the archaeological museum at the Baths of Diocletian, were soon filled with newly discovered archaeological materials. Most of these represented chance discoveries made in the

course of urban development. This mainly took place on the outskirts of the papal city, where the villas and gardens of the aristocracy were sacrificed to the land speculators. In other parts of the city, major public works, such as the Tiber flood embankments and various government ministry buildings, were built. Even the areas beyond the city were affected as the army constructed a series of forts on land that had once belonged to the villas of the ancient Roman elite.<sup>56</sup> Disputes arose immediately over which architectural sites would be protected and which sacrificed. A series of master plans were prepared that included extensive protected archaeological zones, including the Forum, the Palatine, and the via Appia.<sup>57</sup> At best these were only partially implemented. Moreover, most of the new discoveries were made outside of those zones, in areas like the Esquiline and Caelian Hills. In the end most remains were destroyed, with small pockets of ruins like the Trophies of Marius and the Auditorium of Maecenas on the Esquiline preserved to remind later visitors of how much had been lost.

Most of the finds were made within the city itself, which exacerbated jurisdictional tensions between the national government and that of the Comune. City officials were anxious to defend their rights and privileges on questions related to archaeology and also to lay claim to their share of the treasures being unearthed. Some monuments came under the control of the city and others of the state, while portable objects flowed into the museums and warehouses of both entities. The foundations were laid for rivalries and tensions that still persist today.

The figure most representative of this era of urban growth and discovery was an engineer turned archaeologist named Rodolfo Lanciani (1845–1929).<sup>58</sup> He had established his antiquarian reputation in the last years of papal Rome, undertaking excavations for the Torlonia family at the ancient Roman harbor of Portus near Ostia.<sup>59</sup> In 1872 he was appointed secretary to the newly founded Commissione archeologica comunale (Civic Archaeological Commission), the city of Rome's response to the great number of archaeological discoveries that were taking place in central and suburban Rome.<sup>60</sup> In this position, he began his lifelong pursuit of information on the archaeology and topography of ancient Rome. He assiduously monitored the many construction projects, recording invaluable and soon to be destroyed information on the finds. Some have criticized Lanciani for not being more proactive in fighting the often wanton destruction of the archaeological record, but we must

be thankful for what he was able to accomplish. Not only was much information preserved in his many notes, now in the Vatican, but more was published in such scholarly works as *Forma urbis Romae*, an archaeological map of the city at a 1:240 scale that recorded all past and recent finds, and in *Storia degli scavi di Roma* (History of Roman excavations), which documented earlier archaeological discoveries. Lanciani further encouraged scholarly publication by starting in 1872 the *Bullettino della commissione archeologica comunale di Roma*. From 1882 to 1927 he was professor of Roman topography at the University of Rome.

Lanciani also did much to publicize the new Roman archaeological discoveries to a wider international audience. A dapper, urbane man, fluent in English and equally at home in Italian, British, and American society, he contributed regularly to British publications and wrote a number of popular books, such as *Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries* (1894) and *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome* (1897), that brought the latest discoveries to an English-speaking audience.<sup>61</sup> His career in archaeological education and propaganda culminated with the 1911 International Exhibition, for which he organized the section on Roman art and archaeology.

Another figure closely associated with the archaeology of the new Rome was Augusto Castellani (1829–1914).<sup>62</sup> He came from a family of goldsmiths, collectors, and antiquities dealers. His father, Fortunato Pio (1794–1865), had pioneered in the production of gold jewelry in an antique style. His brother Alessandro (1823–83), whose political activities had sent him into exile under the papal regime, had developed the family antiquities business, operating out of Paris and later Naples. In that endeavor he was a close associate of the omnipresent German Wolfgang Helbig.<sup>63</sup>

Augusto operated in many antiquarian and archaeological circles in both the old and the new Rome.<sup>64</sup> By 1870 he was already a collector; he had done some selling abroad and given a substantial body of material to the Capitoline Museum. He benefited personally from discoveries in the massive building projects in and around the city, creating his own large collection, which ultimately made its way into the new Villa Giulia museum. However, he was also active in the public arena of archaeology in Rome. In 1873 he was appointed honorary director of the Capitoline Museum, where he worked hard to defend its prerogatives against the national government. Finally, he worked vigorously to provide

the Comune with its own archaeological institutions and services. He was a driving force behind the foundation of both the Commissione archeologica comunale (for which Lanciani served as secretary) and its official publication, the *Bullettino*.

The late-nineteenth-century archaeological community in Rome was overwhelmed by this mass of new material. Most of the finds that were saved for the state went into inaccessible storage areas, where they remained hidden until recently. Public archaeological attention was focused on the excavation of major monuments in areas like the Forum and the Palatine. The new secular Italian government was interested in using classical archaeology to counter the overwhelming Christian presence in Rome. Much of the new excavation effort was concentrated in the Forum, where the clearing projects started under the papal government were massively expanded. By the 1870s Pietro Rosa was excavating around the Basilica Julia, while from 1878 to 1883 Lanciani was clearing the House of the Vestals. By the end of the century much of the heart of the Roman Forum had been cleared down to the late republican to early imperial levels. Linked with the excavations on the Palatine started by Napoleon III, these discoveries provided visitors to Rome with a sense of both the classical presence in the city and the energy of modern Italian archaeology.

Fortunately, the excavations during some of these key periods were directed by one of the pioneers of modern archaeological field technique. Giacomo Boni (1859–1925) was a Venetian with a background in restoration architecture. His persona was a complex blend of scientist and romantic shaped by the writings of William Morris and John Ruskin.<sup>65</sup> A strong nationalist who later turned to fascism, Boni aroused controversy among his contemporaries, and he still arouses it today. For some he was a man ahead of his time who, because he was not trained in the classical academic tradition, could pursue field archaeology in new, creative ways. Others have seen him as a romantic who liked vegetation growing on ruins and a nationalist who helped lay the foundations for fascist archaeology.<sup>66</sup>

Boni arrived in Rome in 1888, and in 1898 he began work in the Forum. By that time much of the Forum had been cleared down to the early imperial levels. Boni's excavations shifted to the earlier levels, where he distinguished himself as a sensitive observer of stratigraphy and a meticulous recorder who used the full range of contemporary

technologies, including photography, to preserve information on his discoveries.<sup>67</sup> His excavations uncovered a series of prehistoric monuments that have become key to our understanding of early Rome. For the regal period of Rome his most important find was the Lapis Niger, a boundary marker of the mid-sixth century B.C. that inscribes the designation *king*. Boni also illuminated even earlier epochs, finding a cemetery in a patch of land adjoining the Temple of Antoninus and Faustinus that took Roman history back to the early first millennium B.C. and documented the simple settlement that was the community of Romulus. Boni's efforts in the Forum culminated in his creation of a "didactic" museum where finds were displayed in context, accompanied by a full range of documentation.<sup>68</sup>

One important competing archaeological community in late-nineteenth-century Rome was that of the Christian archaeologists. Pope Pius IX had demonstrated an interest in early Christian archaeology well before 1870 and his break with the new secular state. While Christian archaeologists were often seen as tools of the Vatican and advocates for a Catholic view of the classical past, the community also included distinguished archaeological scholars, and none was more respected than Giovanni Battista de Rossi, the epigrapher who worked with Mommsen on the *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* and at the same time became the most serious catacomb archaeologist since Antonio Bosio and the Counter Reformation antiquarians of the early seventeenth century. De Rossi's *Roma sottoteranea* (Subterranean Rome), which first appeared in 1864, became one of the classics of Christian archaeology, and in 1863 he founded the *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana* (Journal of Christian archaeology). In his thirty years as the journal's editor, de Rossi demonstrated his determination to raise a branch of archaeology often associated with ideological antiquarianism to the status of a serious discipline.<sup>69</sup>

We cannot leave the archaeological culture of late-nineteenth-century Rome without considering the world of the great salons. In a city divided by religious rivalries, national competitions, and social, political, and economic tensions, they served as neutral meeting grounds where gossip, information on the latest discoveries, and hints on hot antiquities were exchanged. Hosts ranged from the Anglo-American reporter and amateur archaeologist, photographer, and journalist William J. Stillman to the antiquities agent Wolfgang Helbig.<sup>70</sup> One of the most prestigious

of those Roman cultural salons was sponsored by the most important female archaeologist of the era, Ersilia Caetani Lovatelli (1840–1925), the daughter of an enlightened noble Roman family that had encouraged her obvious talents and intellectual interests.<sup>71</sup> Lovatelli was befriended by de Rossi, who involved her in his researches in early Christian archaeology. She was also a serious ancient historian and classical archaeologist who drew figures like Theodor Mommsen to her famous salons, which were major cultural gathering places.<sup>72</sup>

Another great salon of the epoch was that of Wolfgang Helbig. The controversial German archaeologist had married a Russian princess, who provided him with the income that allowed an elegant lifestyle. The couple acquired the beautiful suburban Villa Lante on the crest of the Gianicolo Hill overlooking the city. Frau Helbig had strong musical interests and drew in famous artists. Her husband, in spite of his connections with the antiquities dealers, retained the respect of the German classical community, and Mommsen, among others, was a regular at their soirees.<sup>73</sup>

It would be a mistake to look at the archaeology of Italy in the later nineteenth century only through the perspective of Rome. The forced unification of Italy did not end local traditions of historical and archaeological research. Florence had long been the center for Etruscan research and had benefited from its brief status as capital of Italy in the 1860s. The Florence Archaeological Museum was inaugurated in 1881, created from the Medici and other collections in Florence.<sup>74</sup> Other northern cities, such as Bologna, also developed important archaeological museums and became centers for archaeological research.<sup>75</sup> However, the number of professors and professionals throughout Italy was small, and archaeology remained largely in the hands of local inspectors, who were doctors, priests, schoolmasters, and other educated amateurs. They possessed both great local pride and considerable knowledge of local history and archaeology. Many were consumed with parochial antiquarian controversies. Others had a broader perspective and a great sense of professionalism and made contributions on the national as well as local scene. Such a figure was Isidoro Falchi (1838–1914), a medical doctor in a small town in Tuscany, who identified the site of the Etruscan city of Vetulonia and carried out important excavations in its necropolis.<sup>76</sup>

Especially complicated were archaeological relations with the former territories of Bourbon South Italy and Sicily. The elites of those areas had

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

William Helbig (seated at left), archaeologist and antiquities consultant, with family and colleagues in Rome, 1884–85 (German Archaeological Institute, Rome)

little love for the Piedmontese bureaucrats who came to dominate the new Roman government. The representatives of the national government regarded the south of Italy as feudal and backward, much in need of the rational bureaucracy they were attempting to provide. The proud aristocrats of the South, however, conscious of their long history, resented any state interference in activities on their vast estates. Their antiquarians already had a distinguished tradition of archaeological research in territories with deep Greek and Roman histories. The situation was complicated by the fact that in many areas the Bourbon power structure and even the laws related to antiquities remained in place.<sup>77</sup>

Ironically, it was a functionary from the north who became one of the great students of the south of Italy's cultural heritage and one of the most important archaeologists of the early national period. Paolo Orsi (1859–1935) was born in Rovereto and learned archaeology from the epigrapher Federico Halbherr in Crete.<sup>78</sup> He arrived in Syracuse in 1888 and spent the rest of his career in Sicily and South Italy. A tireless excavator, museum organizer, and publisher, Orsi devoted his life to archaeological scholarship. He fought hard against the looting of antiquities in Sicily. However, limited resources and the demands of a vast, rich



territory forced him to work with the educated nobility of the region, the archaeological equivalents of the learned amateur astronomer in Giuseppe Lampedusa's *The Leopard*. These relations were sometimes fruitful and sometimes tense, as Orsi found himself forced to make severe compromises to save a minimum of the archaeological record.<sup>79</sup>

The long, complex history of Sicily and Magna Graecia compelled Orsi to become more than just a classical archaeologist. Today he is best known for his discoveries in Sicilian prehistory, especially in the rich countryside around Syracuse. However, his work at early Greek colonial sites was of equal importance. Orsi had a competency as a field archaeologist that rivaled Boni's, and his record of publication was much better. He preserved large quantities of archaeological material that now form the core of the collections of the great museum at Syracuse that bears his name.

Italian classical archaeologists naturally wanted to extend their research outside the peninsula, for they saw themselves as the heirs of the Roman Empire. Like any nation with a great classical past and imperial ambitions, Italy was drawn into the wider Mediterranean. By the 1870s and 1880s major powers were expected to host foreign schools and foreign excavations. But in the immediate postunification period the Italian government had to move cautiously. Resources for archaeological research were few and internal demands great.<sup>80</sup> Moreover, the Italians had to operate in the interstices of the power domains created by the French and the British in the Mediterranean.

The key figure in advancing an Italian imperial archaeological vision was Federico Halbherr (1857–1930), a student of the learned Florentine linguist and epigrapher Domenico Comparetti. In 1884 Comparetti had dispatched him on an epigraphical expedition to Crete that led to the discovery of the famous Gortyn Law Code, one of the earliest extant Greek legal documents,<sup>81</sup> and started a long Italian archaeological association with that island.<sup>82</sup> Halbherr returned to the island a number of times, sometimes with the support of the Archaeological Institute of America, and in 1899 he established the first Italian archaeological mission on Crete.<sup>83</sup> As elsewhere, the Italian involvement in Crete was not just archaeological. In 1899 Italy became one of the four powers administering Crete after the expulsion of the Ottomans, and the archaeological activities served to enhance the country's position on the island.<sup>84</sup> Halbherr also played a major role in the founding in 1909 of the Italian

School of Archaeology at Athens.<sup>85</sup> He became a leading patron for the next generation of classical archaeologists, placing protégés like Luigi Pernier and Amadeo Maiuri in key positions in the emerging Italian archaeological empire.

Halbherr's activities were not limited to Greece, nor were they purely archaeological. Italy had economic and political imperialistic interests in different parts of the Mediterranean, and archaeology could serve as a cover for other types of ventures. Significantly, Halbherr did much of his work for the Foreign Ministry, and both archaeological and imperialistic agendas involved him in Cyrene and Tripolitania.<sup>86</sup> These were the last North African territories still under the control of the weakening Ottoman Empire, and they were ripe for picking by an ambitious new imperial power like Italy. Halbherr was dispatched on a prospecting expedition, and Italian consuls in the area were alerted to the potential of Italian economic and political involvement.

The Libyan scene was suddenly complicated by the arrival of an American archaeological expedition at Cyrene led by Richard Norton and sponsored by the Archaeological Institute of America. This was an innocent enterprise, the last effort of the AIA to launch an independent excavation. Halbherr, who had earlier enjoyed AIA patronage, saw the expedition as the forerunner of wider American imperialism. The situation became further charged in 1911 when an American staff member, Herbert Fletcher De Cou, was murdered by local Arabs.<sup>87</sup> While a variety of motives were advanced for the crime, Norton was convinced that the Italians were behind it. The murder was followed closely by the Italian invasion of North Africa. In the wake of that invasion Halbherr took steps to ensure that the Italian prohibition against foreign excavations on national soil was extended to the colonies. The Americans were not able to return to Cyrene until after World War II.<sup>88</sup>

The somewhat hapless American efforts to establish a major excavation in classical lands were an expression of one of the most important changes taking place in classical and especially Greek archaeology in the forty years leading up to World War I. This was the increasing association of archaeology with the excavation of major urban or religious centers. These excavations were generally sponsored by national governments and were long-term commitments that involved increasingly diverse staffs and large budgets. The emphasis was on the recovery of architectural remains, and the directors were often architectural archaeologists. *Scientific*

was the word increasingly applied to those enterprises, as greater care was taken to refine the techniques of both excavation and artifact study. Excavations became strongly hierarchical operations, in which the mavericks who had played so important a role in early archaeology had much less of a presence. These national excavations have remained the dominant field enterprise for classical archaeology down to the present. Their conservative operational structures have not always worked in the best interests of the discipline, especially as the intellectual, social, and economic worlds of archaeology have changed.

While Ernst Curtius established the big dig paradigm in classical archaeology at Olympia, the Austrians also made major contributions in the decades before World War I. The Austro-Hungarian Empire was still an important power, and its capital, Vienna, remained one of the major intellectual and cultural centers of Europe. Classical art historical studies owed much to the fertile interaction between the classicists and the vibrant art community in fin-de-siècle Vienna,<sup>89</sup> and it was natural that the Austrians would become involved in these large, well-organized Mediterranean excavations, which could enhance their cultural prestige and enrich their museum collections.

The first name associated with this new Austrian archaeology was that of Alexander Conze (1831–1914),<sup>90</sup> who came from Hanover and completed his classical archaeological education under Gerhard in Berlin. This was still the world of the *Reisejahren* (travel years), in which promising students received travel stipends to visit classical lands. In 1856–57 Conze traveled extensively in Greece and the Greek islands. He was especially attracted by the archaeological potential of the sanctuary site of Samothrace. The discovery by Charles Champoiseau in 1863 of the famous *Winged Victory* there (ultimately acquired by the Louvre) further focused attention on the island.<sup>91</sup> Conze was appointed professor of archaeology at Vienna in 1869 and along with the epigrapher Otto Hirschfeld founded the archaeological and epigraphical seminar at the university. He used his new position to launch further excavations at Samothrace, the first northern European excavations in the Mediterranean. From 1873 to 1875 he cleared and studied a number of the major Hellenistic architectural monuments at the site.<sup>92</sup> The quality of his detailed studies and publications from that excavation, including the use of photographs to illustrate the text, was impressive by the standards of the time. The excavation was also an “export” dig: finds were divided

between the Ottomans and the Austrians, and important architectural and sculptural pieces found their way to the Kunsthistorische Museum in Vienna.<sup>93</sup> And it was at Samothrace that the great German archaeological architect Georg Niemann (1841–1912) got his start.<sup>94</sup> Conze's Austrian sojourn was relatively short; in 1877 he returned to Berlin and began his career as an archaeological administrator for the Reich.<sup>95</sup> More important to the long-term development of Austrian classical archaeology was Otto Benndorf (1838–1907).<sup>96</sup> Benndorf too had received his archaeological education in Germany, and before succeeding Conze at Vienna he had held a variety of posts in Germany, Zurich, and Prague. Unlike Conze, who returned relatively quickly to Germany, Benndorf spent the rest of his career in Vienna. He trained a cadre of young archaeological professionals who staffed the Austrian museums and conducted research both in the Mediterranean and in various provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. His early archaeological activity focused on topographical survey and was centered in Asia Minor. At the same time, however, the Germans were making headlines with their productive excavations at Pergamon, and the French were involved at Delos and Delphi. The Austrians felt that as a major power they too needed a highly visible excavation.

Benndorf decided to take on Ephesus, one of the great cities of the early Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman worlds.<sup>97</sup> The Temple of Diana at Ephesus, first constructed in the sixth century B.C., was one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. (The Englishman Robert Wood had located the temple site in the 1860s and sent some of its sculptured columns back to the British Museum.)<sup>98</sup> Saint Paul had also spent time in the city, an association bound to please potential patrons in Roman Catholic Austria. The work of Wood and other earlier explorers had demonstrated that the site would yield impressive architectural and epigraphical remains. Carl Humann, the excavator of Pergamon, endorsed Benndorf's proposal to dig there, and in 1895 he started his excavation, an Austrian archaeological commitment to Ephesus that, with some interruptions, has continued to the present day.<sup>99</sup>

In the almost twenty years between Benndorf's first season and the outbreak of World War I, the Austrians uncovered many public buildings in the center of Ephesus. The excavation emphasized the recovery of ground plans and enough architectural elements to allow architects like Georg Niemann and Wilhelm Wilberg (1839–1907) to produce plans

and reconstructions.<sup>100</sup> As was to be the case with most of the great Asia Minor sites, most of the buildings discovered were Hellenistic and Roman, something of a disappointment to archaeologists living in an era still fixated on classical architecture. Benndorf stressed prompt, detailed publication. Preliminary reports appeared in the annual publication of the Austrian Archaeological Institute, an organization that Benndorf had founded in 1898, and in 1906 the first volume of *Forschungen in Ephesus* (Investigations in Ephesus), the final excavation reports, was published. The Austrians also benefited from a generous Ottoman export policy, fueled in part by the desire of the Ottomans to cultivate Austrian diplomatic support. A number of important finds from Ephesus came to grace the museums of Vienna.<sup>101</sup>

While Austrian scholars through excavations like Ephesus affirmed the Hellenic and Hellenistic in classical archaeology, two Viennese art historians reasserted the creative importance of Rome in the development of ancient art. In 1895 Franz Wickhoff (1853–1909), a student of Conze's and a professor at the university, published with Wilhelm Ritter von Hartel *Die Wiener Genesis*. In the preface he highlighted the importance of the Romans in developing such stylistic approaches to pictorial art as illusionism and continuous narrative. In this claim Wickhoff and Hartel offered a challenge to Winckelmann, who had denied the creative contributions of Rome. Wickhoff's introduction was translated into English by the British architect Eugenie Sellers Strong in 1900 and helped launch a limited, but still important, reappraisal of the worth of Roman art.<sup>102</sup>

Alois Riegl (1858–1905) came to Roman culture from the arts and crafts of late antiquity. He had a keen interest in the Arts and Crafts movement and was for a long time textile curator at the Osterreichischen Museum für angewandte Kunst (Austrian Imperial Museum for Applied Art), Vienna's equivalent of London's Victoria and Albert Museum. His focus on folk art led him to seek underlying processes that shaped the art of the era. He advanced the concept of *Kunstwollen* (cultural identification), the notion that the artistic expressions of an age were closely interrelated with other cultural manifestations and combined to form its characteristic expression.<sup>103</sup> The idea represented a major move away from nineteenth-century emphasis on artistic individuality toward a concentration on the Volk, a development that would have mixed consequences in the next generation.

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Austrian excavations at the early Christian basilica of Saint John at Ephesus,  
1928 (Austrian Archaeological Institute)

As important as the Austrian contribution was, pride of place in this new world of major excavations still lay with the Germans. The work at Olympia in 1875 started the process, but that dig was followed by other important projects that ensured German domination of field archaeology until the outbreak of war in 1914. First in importance after Olympia was Pergamon. The initial discoveries of Hellenistic sculptures from the Great Altar by the engineer Carl Humann and the export of the marbles to Berlin will be considered in the next chapter. But the German archaeological involvement at Pergamon moved from the extraction and export of sculpture to the systematic exploration of the great Hellenistic urban complex, a focus that continues to the present day. Humann excavated there from 1878 to 1886 with the support of Alexander Conze and the assistance of the young architect Wilhelm Dörpfeld, who had learned his craft at the Olympia excavations. Much of the plan of that largely new Hellenistic city has been recovered, and a number of important architectural remains were unearthed and studied.<sup>104</sup>

The Pergamon project was also important for the promptness and detail of its publications. Its great monographs set the format and standard for successive generations of final archaeological reports. The first volume

of *Die Altertümer von Pergamon* (The antiquities of Pergamon) (1885) focused on the temple of Athena Polias and included high-quality heliographic photographs. It was followed in 1895 by the study of the Temple of the Divine Trajan and in 1896 by two volumes on the theater complex. The first volume of inscriptions appeared in 1890. The sculptures found there were not published until 1908. Emphasis in the early volumes was on detailed architectural description with little consideration of other types of material culture found in the same contexts. Such a separation suited the typological mentality of the period, where the architect was king and archaeologists would study the evolution of specific categories of objects rather than consider the intersection of evidence from different types of objects in a specific archaeological context.

The other great urban excavation undertaken by the Germans was at Miletus. The excavations were started in 1899 under the direction of Theodor Wiegand. Wiegand (1864–1936) had studied at such major German universities as Munich and Berlin, and mastered classical architecture under Dörpfeld in Athens.<sup>105</sup> He had married well and could work as a field archaeologist freed from many of the constraints of a university career. From 1899 to 1911 he was based in Turkey, excavating at Miletus and serving as director of the Royal Prussian Museum in Constantinople. Miletus was a city whose history stretched from the Minoan era, and it was of special interest to students of urban planning, for it had been the home of Hippodamos, the father of ancient Greek city planning. It was the creations of the Hellenistic and Roman era that dominated the architectural remains recovered by the German archaeologists, however. In 1899 Wiegand had helped negotiate an especially generous agreement with the Ottomans on the export of antiquities to Germany. As a result some of the most impressive of the finds, such as the Market Gate, made their way back to Berlin.

Wiegand had also excavated at the small Greek city of Priene from 1895 to 1898.<sup>106</sup> Located south of Ephesus, Priene had been founded as a planned city in the mid-fourth century B.C., and thus provided a pristine example of classic Greek urban design. Its public and private architecture mainly dated to the fourth to second centuries B.C., and its most famous architectural monument was the Temple of Athena, an important example of the later-fourth-century Ionic style. This was the monument that had attracted the attention of the Society of Dilettanti when they sponsored their Ionian mission from 1764 to 1765 headed by

Richard Chandler and including Nicholas Revett. The first volume of *Antiquities of Ionia* (1769) featured the temple and because of the information it provided on the Ionic order and the interest of architects like Revett, it helped launch the Ionian craze in British neoclassical architecture.<sup>107</sup>

In 1868 the Dilettanti sent Richard Popplewell Pullan, a protégé of Charles Newton's, back to the site to clear and study the remains of the Athena temple.<sup>108</sup> Pullan was the first to apply a grid system so that he could record the location of finds at the site; he was also an early proponent of photography, whose importance he had learned from Newton. He recovered much information on the architecture and decoration of the temple, and with Newton's assistance shipped considerable quantities of sculpture and architectural fragments back to the British Museum.

Our knowledge of the rest of the site is mostly due to the excavations conducted by Wiegand.<sup>109</sup> He unearthed large sections of the planned city and many intact houses. The information on Greek domestic architecture was especially important, for until that time most of the information on Greek houses came from literary sources. The 1904 volume *Priene* by Wiegand and Hans Schrader was exceptional not only in the precision of its description but also in its early use of geology and geography and its efforts to set the site in its settlement context.

The French naturally wanted to match the Germans in this new international archaeological competition, especially now that their school in Athens had become a more serious scholarly enterprise. They began to seek a major site whose finds would fit into the triad of major late-nineteenth-century archaeological interests: architecture, sculpture, and inscriptions. While the Germans and Austrians had turned increasingly to excavation in the Ottoman Empire, where more liberal export rules allowed them to enrich their museums, the French chose to remain in Greece, where their efforts would yield monuments of a purer classicism. In the end they focused on two famous Hellenic sanctuary sites: Delos and Delphi.

Delos was famous in Greek myth as the birthplace of Apollo and Artemis, an association that had stimulated the growth of one of the most famous shrines in the Hellenic world. Delos was a small, barren island, lacking even an adequate water supply, but its ruins and their associations had attracted antiquarians since the fifteenth century. The French decided that the potential finds would justify the logistical problems of



conducting archaeological excavations there. The island had been partly explored as early as 1864 by Léon Terrier, and in 1873 the French School in Athens started excavations under Albert Lebeque (1845–94).<sup>110</sup>

In 1876 Lebeque was replaced by Théophile Homolle (1848–1925). He was one of the new breed of more formally educated French archaeologists, a product of the *Ecole normale supérieure* who had studied in both Rome and Athens,<sup>111</sup> and during his career was associated with both the major French excavations in Greece. His early years at Delos had mixed archaeological results: quantities of inscriptions and architectural remains were recovered, but the quality of recording, especially of the architectural remains, was not up to the standards being set by the Germans and the Austrians. Significantly, the excavation did not have its own architect until 1880; it was not until 1902, when the distinguished epigrapher Maurice Holleaux (1861–1932) assumed the directorship of the excavations, that the techniques of excavating and recording became comparable to those long employed by the Germans.<sup>112</sup>

While the Delos site did provide many rewards for the archaeologists looking for Greek remains, some of the most interesting discoveries related to Roman history. In the later second century B.C., Delos had become a major Roman commercial center, containing one of the biggest slave markets in the Mediterranean. A symbol of Roman commercial imperialism, it was assaulted and sacked by King Mithridates of Pontus in the early first century B.C. The French unearthed substantial evidence for this late republican commercial phase, and the architectural, sculptural, and epigraphical remains provided insight into the social and economic life of a Roman-Italic community during the late Roman republic.<sup>113</sup>

One small French excavation of this period deserves mention both for its association with two of the most important French archaeologists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and for the information it provided on a type of artifact that would figure increasingly in the antiquities market and the forgery business. In 1880 Salomon Reinach (1858–1932) and Edmond Pottier (1855–1934), two young students from the Athens school, undertook excavations at the small eastern Greek city of Myrina, work that continued into 1882. Their focus was on the necropolis, and their major discovery was large numbers of small terracotta figurines. Dated mainly to the fourth and third centuries B.C., these charming works of the ancient choroplasts depicted figures from daily life and resembled figurines excavated at Tanagra in Boeotia that

had appeared on the Athenian antiquities market in the early 1870s. The Tanagra figures had mainly been clandestinely excavated, though official excavations were undertaken in 1874–79 by the Archaeological Society of Athens to provide objects for its Athens museum.

The Tanagra figurines, with their representations of ordinary men and especially women as well as actors and divinities, had immediately attracted the attention of antiquarians and connoisseurs and sold handily on the antiquities market. Major museums like the Louvre, the British Museum, and the Staatliches Museum in Berlin as well as prominent private collectors all began purchasing Tanagras. The British Museum acquired most of its figurines through the services of another of Great Britain's archaeologically oriented diplomats, C. L. W. Merlin, the British consul at Piraeus.<sup>114</sup>

The figurines also appealed to artists attempting to reproduce with archaeological accuracy the world of classical antiquity. Jean-Léon Gérôme's 1893 painting *Atelier of Tanagra* shows a shop in Tanagra with a young woman decorating the molded figurines. And their relative abundance and relatively modest selling prices also made the figurines accessible to the growing Hellenophile middle class of Europe and America—so much so that the finds of genuine objects could not satisfy the market, and by 1876 forgeries as well as heavily restored pieces began to appear.<sup>115</sup> Soon these flooded the market, often tricking the experts and regularly deceiving the gullible. Some were detected by the standard techniques of connoisseurship, but most could only definitively be identified as fakes after the advent of scientific dating techniques like thermoluminescence.

Meanwhile, a secondary market for both originals and fakes grew up in Smyrna, drawing on Athenian sources but also on Asia Minor sites including Myrina, where Reinach and Pottier were excavating.<sup>116</sup> The terra-cottas excavated at Myrina under relatively controlled conditions thus assumed special importance, and care was taken that the French obtain a significant share of the figures, which for the most part ultimately made their way to the Louvre.<sup>117</sup>

Of all the sites excavated by the French at this period, the most visible expression of French archaeological involvement in Greece has become Delphi. Although the French had undertaken preliminary explorations there in the early 1860s, the expulsion of King Otto by the Greeks in 1862, and the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, had placed

plans for a more ambitious project on hold.<sup>118</sup> In the 1880s the French government again expressed interest in the site, but now diplomatic and commercial factors came to the fore. Although France was the leading candidate for the excavation permit, Greece and France were caught up in an imbroglio related to trade policy, centering on the importation of Greek currants into France. The Greeks let it be known that they would welcome applications from archaeologists of other nations, encouraging the Americans, in particular, to apply. The possibility of working at such a famous site stirred up great enthusiasm in the emerging American archaeological community;<sup>119</sup> funds for the excavations were raised, and diplomatic support was sought. But in the end the Greeks were more interested in cultivating France than the United States, and the French were granted the permit to excavate at Delphi.

In 1891 Théophile Homolle of the French School in Athens negotiated a ten-year concession from the Greek government. Hence began one of the most important—if often criticized—excavations in the history of classical archaeology.<sup>120</sup> The site from the start posed massive technical problems. The modern village of Kastri had grown up over the ancient sanctuary, although a recent earthquake had damaged it and thus facilitated the task of moving the community to a new location. Landslides had deeply buried much of ancient Delphi, requiring a major operation in earthmoving before the classical remains were even reached.

The French had substantial financial support, however, which allowed them to undertake this complicated enterprise. The results of the excavations conducted from 1892 to 1903 justified the investment, for Delphi proved to be a classical site that had remained relatively unchanged in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.<sup>121</sup> Major monuments of late Archaic and Classical architecture were recovered relatively intact. The good preservation of many buildings eventually allowed the partial reconstruction of the sacred way, which in antiquity had led to the great oracular shrine of Apollo. The most famous sculpture found was the early-fifth-century B.C. bronze charioteer, but other important examples of architectural sculpture were also unearthed. French epigraphers were rewarded by a mass of new inscriptions.

Théophile Homolle had learned from the mistakes of Delos. He had from the start employed an engineer and an architect, who ensured the smooth functioning of the enterprise and the proper recording of structural remains. He made excellent use of photography. A museum

was built on the site similar to the German site museum at Olympia. Homolle's interest focused on the inscriptions, however; and he proved ineffective at post-excavation analysis and publication. It was not until the 1920s that Charles Picard developed an effective program of analysis and publication of the Delphi finds.<sup>122</sup>

The late nineteenth century was also the period in which Americans embraced classical archaeology. By the 1870s the United States had recovered from the Civil War, and a new energy and prosperity made ambitious scholarly projects feasible. The classics had deep roots in American education, and even in the late nineteenth century Greek and Latin dominated the curricula in secondary schools and colleges. A substantial number of Americans had studied in Germany and learned to appreciate the new scholarship practiced there.<sup>123</sup> While their scholarly interests were still mainly literary and historical, some Americans had learned the value of direct contact with the classical landscapes and monuments and the usefulness of material culture, especially inscriptions. Enthusiasm for ancient Greece replaced the interest in Rome in nineteenth-century America, and the first research enterprises were focused on Hellas.<sup>124</sup>

The central inspiration for this American engagement with classical archaeology and the man largely responsible for guiding Americans in the direction of Greece was the Boston Brahmin Charles Eliot Norton. Norton was a strong Hellenophile. Unlike many of his American contemporaries, Norton had not studied in Germany, and he approached the study of art more in the manner of a John Ruskin than of a Teutonic academic. But he did appreciate the importance of the new institutions of classical learning that the Germans were developing. In 1874 Norton was appointed professor of fine arts at Harvard University. (Although he spent long periods in Europe and taught classical archaeology for decades at Harvard he never visited Greece.)<sup>125</sup> His teaching was an odd mixture of Ruskinian aesthetics and laments on the state of the arts in the contemporary world. Nonetheless, his lectures became extremely popular, and through his teaching at America's premier university Norton inspired generations of students with his vision of the centrality of the Greek artistic experience. His protégés included art historians like Bernard Berenson and art collectors like E. P. Warren.<sup>126</sup>

Norton was also a vigorous organizer in the typical late-nineteenth-century manner. In 1879 he was the driving force behind the founding of

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Charles Eliot Norton, professor of fine arts at Harvard and a major founding figure in American classical archaeology, c. 1880 (photo courtesy of the Harvard University Archives)

the Archaeological Institute of America, which developed from a Boston savant society into a national organization that combined elements of the European local antiquarian societies with the French Congrès archéologique.<sup>127</sup> Its base became a network of local societies composed of both academics and interested amateurs that were linked to the national organization by annual meetings and a program of traveling lecturers.

The promotion of archaeological research, especially in the Mediterranean, was one of the key goals of this new organization. Practicing architects were among the strongest supporters of the AIA, so its emphasis was on Greek architecture. In 1881 the AIA dispatched an expedition to

the Greek urban site of Assos in western Turkey not far from Troy, led by two young disciples of Norton's, Joseph Thacher Clarke and Francis Bacon.<sup>128</sup> Assos was a small city that had flourished during the classical period, and it seemed to have relatively little in the way of Hellenistic or Roman overlays. The AIA hoped that excavations at such a relatively pristine Hellenic site would not only produce information on the formative periods of Greek architecture but also provide antiquities for the new art museum being created in Boston. But the undertaking was rather naive, and the inexperienced staff achieved mixed results. The final publications were much delayed, and American museums received little material. Nonetheless, the expedition started the tradition of American excavation in the eastern Mediterranean.

Soon after the creation of the AIA, Norton began work on the establishment of an American teaching and research center in Athens, the third foreign research center in that city. The Greeks, especially the reformist minister Charilaos Trikoupis, looked favorably on these schools, for they helped cultivate philohellenic policies in Europe and America without any loss of Greek cultural heritage.<sup>129</sup> The American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA), which opened in 1881, was a small, fragile organization with support derived largely from member colleges and a rotating faculty drawn from supporting institutions.<sup>130</sup> Nonetheless, it provided a venue where American students and professors could learn firsthand about Greece and its archaeology. The school slowly gathered strength from the patronage of the cultured elite of the Gilded Age, and by World War I it gave American archaeologists a strong presence in the Mediterranean.

Excavations proved more of a problem for the Americans. The AIA undertook a variety of abortive operations culminating in the 1911 fiasco at Cyrene in which Herbert Fletcher De Cou was murdered. Gradually the ASCSA took over the excavation functions of its parent organization. Several projects were attempted, including a major dig at the Argive Heraeum under the direction of Charles Waldstein, an American of German Jewish origins who was on the faculty at Cambridge.<sup>131</sup> Finally the ASCSA settled on the ancient city of Corinth as its major excavation site. Corinth had many attractions: it had a long history and had been one of the most famous cities of classical Greece. After the classical city was destroyed by the Romans in 146 B.C., it had been rebuilt by Julius Caesar and had flourished under the empire. Like Ephesus it

had connections with Saint Paul, a positive association for the religious culture of late-nineteenth-century America. Only a small village survived at the site, so the Americans did not face the costly process of relocating a major modern community or removing large quantities of material from later occupation.

The excavations started in 1896 under the direction of Rufus Richardson of Dartmouth College,<sup>132</sup> and the first series of seasons continued until 1916. It was not an expensive enterprise: costs from 1896 to 1916 were estimated at \$35,000. Corinth has, with a few interruptions, remained an active American site to the present day, and the list of young archaeologists who got their start there reads like a who's who of American classical archaeology in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. At the same time, the Corinth experience helped inculcate some rather conservative traditions among American fieldworkers that have left a mixed legacy.

Like a number of other major classical sites excavated at that time, Corinth was a multiperiod urban center whose classical and preclassical remains were largely buried under Hellenistic and Roman rebuilding. In keeping with contemporary interests, the Americans focused on the public buildings, especially those in the Agora, where they found evidence of a blending of Greek and Roman architectural styles mainly dating to the period of the Roman Empire. Such architectural complexities were not totally appreciated by American archaeologists looking for a purer classicism. Although prehistoric remains were respected, less attention was paid to the late Roman and Byzantine periods at Corinth. Only since the 1990s has archaeological research at Corinth embraced the full complexity and richness of this major commercial and cultural center, whose history extended from the Neolithic to the late Byzantine period.<sup>133</sup>

If little mention has been made of Britain in this discussion of the emergence of the "big dig" in classical archaeology, it is because British classical archaeologists played a relatively small role. Although Britain was at that time at the height of its imperial glory, arguably the most powerful country in the world and a place where classics had a strong hold among the elite, classical studies were still focused on the philological examination of literary texts. David Hogarth (1862–1927), who later became an important Mediterranean archaeologist, noted that while at Oxford, he never went into the Ashmolean Museum.<sup>134</sup>

Indeed, if he had he would have found it a rather moribund place,

an expression of the neglect of archaeology at one of England's two great university centers.<sup>135</sup> The diverse Ashmole collection that had been presented to Oxford in 1683 was neglected, and the archaeological holdings of the university were divided among a number of repositories. When Hogarth was at Oxford the keeper of the Ashmolean was John Henry Parker, a savant more interested in his archaeological photographs than in modernizing the museum. Hogarth largely missed the era of Arthur Evans, who was appointed keeper in 1884 and brought a new vitality to the Ashmolean operations.<sup>136</sup>

The ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge were reluctant to introduce classical archaeology into their academic programs, and their dons, who emphasized undergraduate education, were on the whole highly suspicious of the German research universities.<sup>137</sup> It is worth noting that the two most important British archaeologists who studied in Germany and Austria at that time were Eugenie Sellers Strong, a woman, and Duncan Mackenzie, a Scot from Edinburgh.<sup>138</sup> The Disney Professorship of Archaeology at Cambridge had been established in 1852, and the first chair holder, the Reverend John Howard Marsden, had tried to slant it toward classical archaeology, remarking of Athens that "the scantiest gleanings of her soil are superior to that which constitutes the pride and boast of others." But the classical association did not stick, and the Disney professors played little role in the development of classical archaeology at Cambridge.<sup>139</sup> The Lawrence Professorship of Classical Archaeology at Cambridge was not established until 1930, and the Oxford Chair of the Archaeology of the Roman Empire did not come along until 1956.

Classical scholars with a more international outlook, such as Richard Jebb and Charles Newton, pushed hard for the institutionalization of classical archaeology at the universities, but they met with stiff resistance.<sup>140</sup> Slowly, examination topics in classical archaeology were admitted at Oxford and Cambridge, but the archaeology faculty remained small and the support facilities limited. The problems of the classical archaeologists were compounded by the fact that the British government did not provide the support for educational and cultural institutions that was found in Germany and France, and private philanthropy was not well developed.

In 1886 a British School was finally established in Athens, across the street from the American School. The first director was Francis Cranmer



Penrose (1817–1903), an aged architect whose aesthetic values harked back to the neoclassical architectural world of John Soane and C. R. Cockerell.<sup>141</sup> Penrose's tenure as director was short-lived, and he was not in a position to pursue much field archaeology at the British School. He was succeeded by the young Ernest Gardner (1862–1939), who managed to scrape together a few pounds to undertake excavations in the theater at Megalopolis.<sup>142</sup> Late-nineteenth-century scholars were much interested in the history of Greek theater architecture, and Americans and Germans as well as the British were engaged in theater archaeology.<sup>143</sup> The Megalopolis excavation brought Gardner into controversy with the formidable Wilhelm Dörpfeld over the archaeological evidence for the development of the Greek theater. However, this was a minor affair compared with contemporary French and German efforts.<sup>144</sup>

The other face of classical archaeology in England was the study of Roman Britain. It seems appropriate at this point to leave the Mediterranean and consider briefly what was happening archaeologically at what had been one of the major western provinces of the Roman Empire. Like most fields of classical archaeology, Romano-British studies had their roots in the Renaissance, in the work of great antiquarian scholars like William Camden. A strong antiquarian tradition continued in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with scholars such as William Horsley and William Stukeley.<sup>145</sup> Antiquarianism was still strong in the nineteenth century. As in France antiquarian pursuits were centered in the local societies that combined archaeological with historical, natural historical, and even agricultural improvement goals. The period 1840–60 was a golden age for such organizations in England; some eighteen new societies were founded and their total membership reached more than fourteen thousand.<sup>146</sup> By 1886 there were forty-nine county and local societies in Britain. Their regular meetings, which often involved a high level of alcohol-fueled sociability, helped break down the image of the antiquarian as an isolated, somewhat misanthropic character,<sup>147</sup> but the movement did not lead to the foundation of local museums and lapidaria, as had been the case in France. It also did not initially involve a high level of interregional cooperation. The first Congress of Archaeological Societies in England, the equivalent of the French *Congrès archéologique*, did not take place until 1888.<sup>148</sup> The spirit of the men who belonged to these local societies is captured in the obituary of Robert Blair (1845–1923) of the Newcastle Society of Antiquaries:

“The outstanding feature of Mr. Blair’s career was the enthusiasm and energy he threw into his pursuit of antiquarian lore. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that no task was too onerous for him to undertake, no sacrifice of worldly advantage too great for him to make if the study of antiquaries were thereby assisted, or the prosperity of the Newcastle Society of Antiquaries enhanced.”<sup>149</sup>

England was changing rapidly in the nineteenth century. Towns were expanding, with taller buildings that had deeper foundations. In the countryside changes in agricultural technology and the construction of roads, railroads, and canals were tearing up the land and disturbing archaeological sites. Antiquities of all periods were being unearthed and destroyed. It was usually the amateurs who noted these discoveries, publishing an account in their local proceedings or leaving watercolors of a lost Roman villa mosaic in the archives of their county society.

Long-term excavations in Roman Britain were relatively rare at the time, and given the excavation standards of the day this was probably a good thing. One exception was the program of digging at Silchester that went on from 1890 to 1909. Silchester was a Roman town site with relatively little later occupation. It was possible to clear nearly the entire site and reveal the plan of the Romano-British town and its construction in the manner of a Mediterranean urban excavation. The extended excavations, conducted mainly by W. H. St. John Hope (1854–1919), provided a comprehensive picture of a Roman town that was rare for the time, allowing generalization about Roman provincial life that had not been possible from more sporadic and limited operations.<sup>150</sup> The excavators also did pioneering work in areas like the recovery and identification of faunal and floral remains.<sup>151</sup>

No city was expanding faster in nineteenth-century Britain than London, which had been the largest and richest city of both Roman and medieval Britain. The pace of archaeological destruction was accelerating, and no formal effort was made to record and recover the archaeological information. We owe much of what we know about Roman London before the advent of modern archaeological research to Charles Roach Smith (1807–90). Beginning in the 1830s, this patient Londoner, a pharmacist who was initially blackballed for admission to the Society of Antiquaries because he was in trade, explored construction sites, noted finds, and collected artifacts for his private Museum of London Antiquities, anticipating the work of Rodolfo Lanciani in

post-1870 Rome.<sup>152</sup> Smith helped found the British Archaeological Association and fought doggedly—if generally futilely—with the London authorities to preserve more of the city’s historical heritage. He finally sold his collection to the British Museum, taking a reduced price on the provision that it be kept intact.

While London was being transformed, and many of its archaeological remains destroyed, Hadrian’s Wall brooded in rural solitude, much as it had since the Roman legions left Britain in the fifth century A.D. Its remoteness in wild and often insecure country not far from the Scottish border had protected the wall from systematic destruction, and in the nineteenth century it remained one of the most impressive monuments of the Roman Empire. Because of that remoteness antiquarian interest developed slowly and sporadically; it was only in 1840 that the antiquarian John Hodgson demonstrated definitively that the wall was really the work of Hadrian and not of the later emperor Septimius Severus, as had been generally believed since the days of William Camden.<sup>153</sup> Eleven years later, in 1851, J. Collingwood Bruce, a clergyman from Newcastle-on-Tyne, published his guide *The Roman Wall*, a work that remained the standard reference work on Hadrian’s Wall through many revised editions.<sup>154</sup> Bruce also organized the first “pilgrimages,” hikes across the length of the wall that continue today, if in more sedentary form. The first took place in 1848, when revolution on the continent had prevented Bruce from taking the customary Italian tour and he turned to the wall instead.<sup>155</sup> As accessibility to the wall improved so did archaeological research about it. Locals banded together to form excavation committees, conduct digs at forts and mile castles, and publish the results in the *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Archaeological Society* and other north of England periodicals.

Among the “amateur” archaeologists who worked in Britain during the nineteenth century one man stands out: the retired British army general Augustus Henry Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers (1827–1900).<sup>156</sup> For much of his life Pitt-Rivers combined his military duties with interests in anthropology and prehistoric archaeology. In middle age he inherited an estate in southwest England called Cranborne Chase and became a country gentleman. At the same time he turned Cranborne Chase into a testing ground for improving archaeological fieldwork at both prehistoric and Roman sites. Pitt-Rivers set a standard of excavation and recording that was not well appreciated in his day. But his work was rediscovered

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The Roman commander's bathhouse at Chesters on Hadrian's Wall in the mid-nineteenth century (Museum of Antiquities of the University and Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne)

in the interwar period and helped inspire archaeologists like Mortimer Wheeler to bring a new rigor to British fieldwork.<sup>157</sup>

The man who almost single-handedly began the process of bringing Romano-British studies into the historical and archaeological mainstream was Francis Haverfield (1860–1919).<sup>158</sup> The Oxford-trained classicist was a disciple of Theodor Mommsen, who impressed on him the importance of epigraphy, but also stressed Roman provincial studies. Haverfield's exposure to the more scientific archaeology of the Limes school made him appreciate the potential of archaeological material for studying an otherwise poorly documented part of the Roman world. At the same time he had a broad perspective on classical archaeology and knew the Mediterranean. He did pioneering work on Pompeii and on Greek urban development, the latter inspired by contemporary theoretical work on urban planning.

In 1891, when Haverfield began teaching ancient history at Oxford, his interests were already focused on Roman Britain. The time was ripe. In 1886 Mommsen's *Provinces of the Roman Empire* had been published in English translation, giving the endorsement of the greatest living

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Francis Haverfield, professor of ancient history at Oxford and a major figure in early Roman British archaeology (Richard Hingley)

Roman historian to the study of the remote regions of the empire. Britain was at the height of its imperial age, and parallels were constantly being made between Roman Britain and the frontiers and civilizing mission of Victorian Britain.<sup>159</sup>

Haverfield stressed the need for a new professionalism in the study of Roman Britain, but he realized that he could succeed in his synthetic studies only if he maintained close contacts with the local amateurs, addressing their societies and corresponding with them about their finds. He was not very interested in the details of fieldwork. The archaeologist Leonard Woolley, who worked for Haverfield at Corbridge,

remembered that he looked in at the excavation only once a week and then only to see what had been found.<sup>160</sup> But he was the patron and supporter of many archaeological projects throughout the country. He published extensively, especially in the Victoria County Histories series, that monumental project of the late nineteenth century that became the focus for summaries of Roman finds in particular areas of the country.

Emphasis on the various national traditions in classical archaeology and the rivalries that developed before World War I should not obscure the growing international sense of community among scholars in fin-de-siècle Europe. Professional interdependence was fostered by collaborative projects like the *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* and by the increased international circulation of publications, photographs, casts, and other research and teaching materials. National and international meetings became more common. The French had long held their Congrès archéologique, but these gatherings had focused on medieval and postmedieval antiquities. The first congress of archaeological societies was held in Britain in 1888. In 1899 the young Archaeological Institute of America organized a national meeting for classical archaeologists in New Haven, Connecticut.

In 1905 the first International Congress of Classical Archaeology was held in Athens. More than 850 scholars and interested amateurs attended. The selection of Athens rather than Rome was an expression of the triumph of Hellas in classical archaeology. Appropriately, the inaugural session was held in the Parthenon, with speeches by the prince of the Hellenes, the Greek minister of instruction, and the director general of antiquities as well as the directors of the five foreign schools in Athens. Sessions were devoted to prehistoric, classical, and Byzantine archaeology, as well as to excavations, museums, the conservation of monuments, and the teaching of archaeology at both the secondary and college level. Calls were made for the more systematic circulation of reproductions, both photographic and physical (casts and electrotypes).

The 1905 International Congress in Athens marks a good stopping place for a study of the creation of a new world of classical archaeology in the forty years leading up to World War I. Much progress had been made in turning classical archaeology into a professional discipline suitable for the serious intellectual goals of the late nineteenth century. The archaeological structures created then are still in many ways those that dominate classical archaeology today.

This new professionalism had its drawbacks. The creation of the professionals was to lead inexorably to the marginalization of the amateurs who had done so much to develop the field from the Renaissance to the nineteenth century. The change came about gradually, as the survival of powerful amateur societies and honorary inspectors until well after World War II would demonstrate. But the foundation of the AIA, whose members listened to the lectures of the professionals and helped finance their work rather than dig, talk, and write themselves, anticipated that future.

Another long-term concern was the loss of connection between classical archaeology and the vital world of contemporary creative art. From the Renaissance to the early nineteenth century a complex dialogue had gone on between the artist and the archaeologist. Now this was largely over. It is significant that the shift of archaeological interest from Italy to Greece was not accompanied by similar shifts in the arts. No major art school was founded in later-nineteenth-century Athens, unlike what took place in Rome from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. Even the art institutions in Rome became bastions of cultural conservatism, as the history of the arts, especially architecture, at the American Academy in Rome between the wars demonstrated.<sup>161</sup> Classical, especially Hellenic, cultural myths have done much to sustain classical archaeology down to the present day. But they had less and less to do with artistic creativity. As all the arts rebelled against academic traditions and constraints, their practitioners found too restrictive the long-standing cultural identity with Greece and Rome.

## CHAPTER 5

# The Emergence of the Great Museums in Europe and America

**B**y the end of the eighteenth century many of the great classical art museums had come into existence, and the foundations of a museum tradition had been laid. Most of the major art museums traced their real or spiritual origins to the collecting impulses of the Renaissance; the oldest were the Capitoline and the Vatican Museums in Rome, the products of papal patronage. These had been followed by numerous royal and noble collections, one of the newest of which had been the museum of the king of Sweden in Stockholm. With the start of the nineteenth century new types of museums began to be created. As he did in so many things, Napoleon led the way, with the foundation of his Napoleon Museum, in which he attempted to bring the art treasures of Europe together in one place, Paris, and to create a new, universal art museum designed to educate the public and glorify the new French empire. As we have seen, the most affected by this new policy of centralization were the papal galleries of Rome, which had to yield up some of their greatest treasures. The Napoleon Museum was short-lived, however, and with Napoleon's defeat his international museum was dissolved and most of the works of art returned to their home museums. Ironically, Antonio Canova, a key figure in the transfer of the works home, had been one of Napoleon's favorite artists; but now he represented the pope and cultivated the friendship of the British as he pushed for the return of the art to Rome.

Until the early years of the nineteenth century, museums added to their collections mainly by purchasing works from established collections or by obtaining pieces recently excavated in Italy. Almost all these works were Roman, mainly presumed copies of Greek originals. Now two major acquisitions of classical art by European museums, the Aegina marbles



acquired by the Munich Glyptothek and the Elgin marbles purchased for the British Museum, opened up the world of genuine Greek art, highlighted the emergence of new stars in the museum world, and called attention to the potential of excavation in the eastern Mediterranean for providing new treasures of Greek art. Although neither of these acquisitions was the result of the looting of conquered territory in the manner of Napoleon, they both reflected the growing, indirect power exercised by the Europeans over the decaying Ottoman Empire. The history of the acquisition, treatment, and “afterlife” of the two sets of marbles says a great deal about collecting, museums, and archaeological ideology in the early nineteenth century.

The Aegina marbles had decorated the pediments of the Temple of Athena Aphaia on the small island of Aegina not far from Athens. The history of their discovery, export, sale, restoration, and display is extremely complex. In 1811 an international party of young antiquarians, including the Englishmen C. R. Cockerell and John Foster and the Germans Carl Haller von Hallerstein and Jacob Linckh, went to the island to study the remains of a temple that was then identified with the cult of Zeus Panhellenius. They soon turned from architectural observations and sketching to excavation and unearthed a substantial collection of original, if fragmentary, Greek sculptures. Export of the sculptures to Athens and then to Zakynthos and Malta proved surprisingly easy, but the ultimate disposition of the pieces was not. French, German, and British antiquities collectors all wanted to bid on them. In the end King Ludwig of Bavaria’s agent, the German painter and antiquarian Johann Martin von Wagner (1777–1858), purchased the sculptures for the Munich collection of that ambitious neoclassical monarch. They were shipped to Rome for restoration under the direction of Bertel Thorvaldsen and by 1828 were on display in the Munich Glyptothek.<sup>1</sup>

The history of the restoration of the Aegina marbles has raised its own controversies. In the era when they were excavated it was standard practice to restore damaged ancient sculptures. In Thorvaldsen, Ludwig had selected the leading neoclassical sculptor of his day. But tastes and practices were changing, and the Aegina marbles were one of the last examples of major archaeological materials that were subjected to such radical restoration. To modern tastes the restorations appear artificial, due in part to the fact that Thorvaldsen and his fellow artists and antiquarians had only a limited sense of the stylistic development of early

Greek sculpture.<sup>2</sup> The restorations remained in place until the 1970s, when the decision was made to remove them. This was partly due to changes in taste that now favored battered, incomplete originals over sleek neoclassical restorations, but it was also due to the association with Nazi archaeological ideology that the Munich museum and its exhibits had acquired during the 1930s.<sup>3</sup> Even so, the removal of the restorations raised its own objections among art historians, who stressed that such work, especially by so famous an artist as Thorvaldsen, is part of the cultural history of the object and should be respected.

The export of the Aegina marbles from Greece did not produce anything like the controversy associated with removal of the Elgin marbles, even though Aegina was for a short time to be the capital of Greece and was the site of Greece's first archaeological museum. In part this is because Bavaria was never an imperial power on the scale of Britain, and the episode did not carry the same historical burden as the Elgin removals. In addition, the Aegina marbles were earlier in date, came from a small island, and did not have the same associations with the golden age of Periclean Athens. Indeed, the initial aesthetic reaction to them was mixed, for, restorations aside, they represented a phase of development in Greek sculpture between the Archaic and the Classical periods that at the time was little understood or appreciated by connoisseurs raised in a tradition of Roman copies or who had seen the Elgin originals.

The museum where the Aegina marbles ultimately found their home was the brainchild of Ludwig, whose love of classical art had been stimulated by the Grand Tour. One of the great collectors of Europe, Ludwig commissioned his favorite architect, Leo von Klenze, to design a museum worthy of his collection.<sup>4</sup> Both the museum and its holdings were shrines to neoclassical taste. The Munich Glyptothek was also the first public classical archaeology museum. The Aegina marbles were its centerpiece, but agents of Ludwig like Wagner and Friedrich Thiersch purchased widely on the international art market, and in 1841 Ludwig laid the foundations there of what became one of the great European vase collections by acquiring choice examples of Greek vases from Lucien Bonaparte, the prince of Canino, who owned the site of Etruscan Vulci and was actively mining it for artifacts.<sup>5</sup>

The story of the Elgin marbles has often been told, and it need not be repeated in detail here.<sup>6</sup> Briefly, Thomas Bruce, Lord Elgin (1766–1841), used his position as British ambassador to Constantinople to first study

and then remove sculptures from the Parthenon. After various adventures, including the wreck of one of the transport vessels, the marbles made it safely to London. Elgin himself fell into French hands on his way home and was detained for three years. His plan to sell the marbles to the British government was delayed owing to both financial concerns and aesthetic debates, but the government finally purchased the pieces in 1816, when they became part of the collection of the British Museum. There they remain today, a continuing source of controversy between the British and the Greek government, which seeks their return. Some key issues are, however, worth emphasizing. First, the Elgin marbles did not undergo restoration in the manner of the Aegina sculptures. Elgin had wanted to have this done, but he was dissuaded by influential artists like Canova. The romantic worship of ruins and the cult of the genuine entered into this new attitude toward Greek sculpture. As a result of that restraint, artists, archaeologists, and the general public could now study a large and important body of classical Greek art in its original form. The process was begun by which the restored Roman copies would lose their primacy in the study of classical art.

The acquisition of the Elgin marbles also changed the history of the relatively new British Museum, which had opened in 1759 as the first public museum in Europe with collections of “curiosities” willed to the nation by Sir Hans Sloane.<sup>7</sup> In 1772 the British Museum made a major classical acquisition, Lord Hamilton’s first collection of Greek vases.<sup>8</sup> In 1805 the so-called Townley marbles were purchased.<sup>9</sup> These were a classic Grand Tour assemblage. Charles Townley (1737–1805) was an English Roman Catholic with Stuart sympathies who found it convenient to spend long stretches in Rome during the troubles between the Stuart royal claimants and the British monarchy. There, with the assistance of Gavin Hamilton, he assembled a large antiquities collection,<sup>10</sup> later supplementing his Italian marbles with pieces acquired from older British collections. The Townley acquisition gave the British Museum a significant position in the world of traditional “Roman copy of Greek originals” collections. So important was the purchase considered that a special wing was designed to house it. The arrival of the Townley collection also stimulated the British Museum to establish its own antiquities department.<sup>11</sup>

The acquisition of the massive Elgin collection in 1816 helped change the direction of museum archaeology not only in Britain but also in Eu-

rope generally. Roman copies gradually lost favor and more emphasis was placed on the acquisition of Greek originals. Even the Townley collection was marginalized over time, largely disappearing from public view until a revived interest in the history of collecting led to its recent reinstallation in its own room in the museum.<sup>12</sup>

The Elgin marbles became part of the largest collection of original Greek sculpture assembled since the fall of the Roman Empire. Even before the Elgin marbles were put on display the British Museum had acquired the frieze and metope sculptures from the Temple of Apollo at Bassae. This beautifully preserved temple in remote Arcadia was the work of Ictinus, one of the architects of the Parthenon. The sculptures had been excavated by a party of young archaeological explorers led by Cockerell and Haller von Hallerstein (the explorers of Aegina), had made their way out of Greece through bribery and sleight of hand, and were in 1814 acquired for the British Museum.<sup>13</sup>

The Greek Wars of Independence and the foundation of the Greek state ended the large-scale exports of antiquities from the Greek mainland. Now the hunt switched to mainland Turkey, where rich Greek-period sites were abundant. The Ottoman government was only marginally interested in classical antiquities and was increasingly limited in its ability to defend its imperial interests and antiquities against the European powers. The British were represented by effective ambassadors like Stratford Canning, men with classical educations and archaeological interests, who could combine diplomatic pressure with the support of the Royal Navy to bring home important collections of ancient marbles.<sup>14</sup>

No person was more important in advancing British collecting in the Ottoman Empire than Charles Newton (1816–94), who formed a key link between the romantics and the new scientific archaeologists.<sup>15</sup> He had become a friend of John Ruskin at Oxford and later married the daughter of John Keats's close companion John Severn. Newton joined the staff of the British Museum in 1840 with a good education in Greek and Latin philology but no training in archaeology. He learned on the job, mainly through cataloging the museum's extensive coin collection.

Then in 1846 a large new collection of Greek sculpture from Ottoman Turkey arrived at the British Museum. It was the gift of the British ambassador to the Sublime Port, Stratford Canning, who had extracted the marbles from the walls of the castle of the Knights of Saint John in Bodrum. They had once been part of the decoration of the tomb of the

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Edward Lear, *The Temple of Apollo at Bassae*, 1854–55 (photo © Fitzwilliam Museum, University of Cambridge)

fourth-century B.C. satrap Mausolos and his wife. The sculptures on the tomb, which was designated one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, had been executed by some of the greatest artists of mid-fourth-century B.C. Greece.

More marbles remained at Bodrum, and other sites in the area offered the possibility of major finds of Greek art. What was needed was an ambitious British agent with archaeological expertise in the area. In 1852 Newton left the British Museum to become British consul on the island of Mytilene, just off the coast of Turkey.<sup>16</sup> His appointment had been supported by Canning and was clearly a cover for antiquities exploration. Newton went to Bodrum, identified the mausoleum site, and recovered more sculptures from the walls of the castle, including the great portrait statues of Mausolos and his wife. He also worked at the Apollo shrine at Didyma near Miletus (where in the ruins of the sacred way he excavated statues of the priestesses known as the Branchidae) and at the island of Knidos, whence came the statue of Aphrodite now also in the British Museum.

However, Newton was more than just an archaeological adventurer.<sup>17</sup> While his major goal was the recovery of artifacts for export, and his methods were often crude, he was open to new research techniques and

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Joseph Edgar Boehm, Portrait bust of Charles Newton, keeper of Greek and Roman antiquities at the British Museum, 1863 (National Portrait Gallery, London)

to the concept of scientific archaeology. At Halicarnassus he was one of the first to use photography for archaeological purposes.<sup>18</sup> He was more open to the scholars of the continent than most of his British contemporaries and kept abreast of the archaeological professionalism that was developing there. He visited the German excavations at Olympia during the first (1874–75) season, and praised the new scientific archaeology that they embodied. He was also an early advocate of the importance of Heinrich Schliemann's discoveries at Troy. As a mature scholar he

concentrated on epigraphy, which he felt embodied a scientific rigor not always found in art historical analysis.<sup>19</sup> He pushed hard for the formalization of the teaching of classical archaeology at Oxford and Cambridge. He provided important support for the foundation of such institutions as the cast museum at Cambridge and the British School in Athens.

Newton was first of all a curator, serving in the position of Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum from 1861 to 1888. His aim was to make the British Museum's classical collection one of the greatest in the world, and he was regularly able to obtain sizable grants from Parliament at a time when the British government was not overly generous toward cultural ventures. By the time he retired he had been granted impressive sums, totaling £100,000, that were used in part to assist the research of scholars like John Turtle Wood (1821–90), who from 1869 to 1874 excavated at the Temple of Diana at Ephesus (another of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World) and brought back sculptures to the British Museum.<sup>20</sup> Newton also purchased in the antiquities market, availing himself of items from important collections like those of the Blacas and Castellani families.<sup>21</sup>

By the time Newton retired the British Museum had the largest and most representative collection of original Greek sculpture in the world. The fundamental changes in the understanding of ancient art that had started with the display of the Elgin marbles had now moved forward in a major way. Newton himself articulated that revolution in taste in a paper that he presented in 1849 to the Oxford Art Society, in which he stressed the centrality of the Parthenon marbles to this new understanding, arguing that when students had mastered the aesthetics of the Elgin sculptures all ancient art would be placed in a new perspective. With increased knowledge of Greek originals from sites like Athens, Aegina, and Halicarnassus, the great Italian collections of Roman copies would have to be relegated to secondary status, for they could provide only a defective vision of the development of ancient sculpture. Although research by a new generation of German scholars like Adolf Furtwängler was about to render this obituary for Roman copies premature, Newton did capture the long-term trajectory of the study of classical sculpture.

Not all the new acquisitions at the British Museum fitted easily into Newton's Athens-centered view of the evolution of Greek art. One major addition to the corpus of Greek works receiving new attention was the

large body of sculptural and architectural fragments from Lycia, especially Xanthus, collected in the 1840s by Charles Fellows.<sup>22</sup> The Fellows expedition was another instance in which an antiquarian adventurer employed British diplomatic pressure and the services of the Royal Navy to bring home large quantities of archaeological material from the Ottoman Empire. Like the Halicarnassus sculptures, these were works that had been commissioned from Greek artisans by non-Greek elites in the Persian Empire.

The Lycian sculptures raised interesting questions about the role of such “liminal” areas in the development of Greek civilization and in the canonical reconstruction of the evolution of Greek sculpture. They provided important insight into the interactions of Greek culture with indigenous cultures in Asia Minor and further highlighted the importance of that region to the intersection of these cultures. Such interconnections also interested continental scholars like Ludwig Ross and George Perrot, who saw in Asia Minor the ancient passageway between the civilizations of East and West.<sup>23</sup> But at the same time this was a period when many European scholars were seeking to deny the Near Eastern roots of Greek civilization, arguing for Hellenic autochthony or even its Aryan connections with northern Europe. Those who embraced the theory we would call today orientalism portrayed the Near East as an exotic but corrupted world, one with Semitic associations, not fit to be associated with pure Hellenism.<sup>24</sup> Their view would triumph, narrowing the cultural and historical perspectives on the study of Greek art well into the twentieth century.

As the British Museum filled its rooms with incomparable collections of classical originals and still-valued Roman copies, finding display space became an urgent priority. The museum had been as much a home of natural history and anthropology as a temple of classical art, and the Elgin marbles had to compete with stuffed giraffes. The same imperialism that had enhanced the classical collections also expanded the zoological and ethnographic holdings, heightening the competition for space.

In 1852 a new museum building, designed by the neoclassical architect Robert Smirke, was completed.<sup>25</sup> Questions immediately arose over the organization of the classical displays and the priorities to be given to particular parts of the collections. The Elgin marbles naturally received their own dedicated space. Other important groups, such as the Xanthus marbles, did not. Disputes about the approach to the displays



also developed. Traditionalists wanted “aesthetic” displays in keeping with eighteenth-century classicism, presentations that would address eternal values present in the ancient works of art. Others were more contemporary in their thinking and argued for the historical and evolutionary approaches that were being taken in the German museums. The disjointed nature of the British Museum’s collections and the limits of its physical structure led to compromises that achieved neither goal.<sup>26</sup>

While the British Museum was expanding during the nineteenth century, acquiring the greatest collection of Greek art in the world, the Greek collection at the Louvre was languishing. In the aftermath of Waterloo most of the antiquities seized by Napoleon were returned to Italy, and the corridors of the once grand Napoleon Museum looked bare. In such circumstances a few sporadic acquisitions acquired greater significance than perhaps they deserved. In 1821 the *Venus de Milo* arrived, spirited out of Ottoman territory by French diplomatic and military personnel.<sup>27</sup> In spite of its somewhat battered condition the statue was immediately proclaimed a masterpiece. Since classical sculpture was more highly valued than Hellenistic works, desperate efforts were made to place it in the fifth to fourth century B.C. Unfortunately for the purists, improved knowledge of the stylistic development of Greek art forced most experts to date the piece to the second century B.C., a period that had been since Winckelmann associated with Hellenic decadence. The same scenario was acted out in 1843, when the Louvre acquired large sections of an Amazon frieze from the temple of Artemis on the Magnesia in Thessaly. The reliefs were first praised as classical and then downgraded as their date was moved into the Hellenistic period.<sup>28</sup>

The most spectacular of these “export” pieces acquired by the Louvre during this period was the *Winged Victory* of Samothrace. It came to the museum because of the activities of another of the “archaeological” consuls in the Mediterranean, Charles Champoiseau (1830–1909), who in 1863 excavated the famous statue and exported it to France.<sup>29</sup> A great debate immediately developed about both the restoration and the proper mode of display of the statue. Although the era had long passed when statues were extensively restored, some traditionalists wanted the *Victory* to be made whole. Fortunately their arguments were rejected. Questions of the proper display of the statue were less easy to resolve, since the rather clandestine circumstances of its excavation and export meant that little was known about its original setting. Excavations by Alexan-

der Conze and the Austrians at Samothrace and a second expedition by Champoiseau in 1879 uncovered remains of the structure in which the statue had been set, including the fragment of the ship's prow on which it had originally been placed. Its current placement on the stairway at the Louvre captures something of the drama of its original setting.

In the meantime new problems had arisen for the museum at the Louvre, when a new art and archaeological museum opened in 1862. Conceived by the emperor Napoleon III to resurrect the museological legacy of his famous uncle,<sup>30</sup> the Napoleon III Museum displayed archaeological materials from recent French expeditions in Phoenicia, Macedonia, and Asia Minor, as well as such other collections as the emperor saw fit to acquire and give to his new creation.

The Napoleon III Museum had been conceived as a response to London's Great Exhibition of 1851 and the establishment of the South Kensington Museum (later the Victoria and Albert). Both stressed the necessity of drawing upon arts and crafts traditions to improve product designs in the industrial age. The South Kensington Museum aimed at a broader audience than traditional museums did, and it displayed items like casts as well as original objects in its educational efforts. The Napoleon III Museum followed the British example and used many of the same devices. The emperor gave the museum a special boost when he decided to house there the Campana antiquities from Rome, recently purchased for the large sum of 4.8 million francs. The decision was a logical one, since the Campana collection had extensive holdings in ceramics and metalwork and would provide examples for contemporary craft producers.

The Napoleon III Museum opened to large crowds and a generally favorable reception, but it turned out to be short-lived. The new museum aroused the fears of the Louvre administrators and their powerful political supporters, and its administration was soon embroiled in court politics as well as salon politics. In the same year that the new museum opened the decree was promulgated that led to its dissolution. In the end most of the Campana collection was given to the Louvre, with less valuable pieces distributed among various provincial museums.<sup>31</sup>

The Louvre, like many other French cultural institutions, was forced to rethink its role in the aftermath of Sedan, when resources were more limited and comparisons with German museums became inevitable. The Germans spent twice what the French did on museums and saw their

museums' role in a very different light. As one contemporary noted, for Parisians, "a museum is a palace designed to offer persons of taste from time to time an agreeable stroll in a setting of beautiful things" while for Germans, it was "above all a great establishment of learning."<sup>32</sup> Again the French savant was pitted against the German professional.

Steps were taken to bring the Louvre into line with Teutonic ideas without losing its appealing French qualities. One of the favorite projects of the new conservator of antiquities, Félix Ravaisson-Molliet (1813–1900), appointed in 1870 after the abdication of Napoleon III, was the creation of a major cast collection, now the standard German scientific instrument for the study of classical sculpture.<sup>33</sup> Another result of the push toward museum professionalism was the establishment in 1882 of the *Ecole du Louvre*, whose aim was to train professional museum curators; the study of archaeology was central to the new institution. Part of the curriculum was a course offered by Alexandre Bertrand on "archéologie nationale" that demonstrated the importance of archaeology for uncovering the history of France in the period before extensive written records.<sup>34</sup>

The German museums that the French now sought to emulate were the products of the rise of the Prussian state and the creation of the consolidated Reich. Frederick II had laid the foundation for Berlin's archaeological preeminence by acquiring several foreign collections, and these holdings continued to expand in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Wilhelm von Humboldt's new university provided scholarly support for the growing collections, while Eduard Gerhard's arrival in Berlin from Rome in 1834 helped make Berlin one of the centers for archaeological teaching and research. Both the prestige of being the Prussian capital and the pressures generated by the growing collections meant that the city needed a new museum complex, and Karl Friedrich Schinkel, the architect responsible for so many of the monuments of the new Berlin, received the commission.

The so-called *Altes Museum* opened in 1830. It was one of the great neoclassical buildings of nineteenth-century Berlin, yet also one of the last expressions of the museum as a temple of the Muses. The center and focal point of the structure was a great circular hall modeled on the Pantheon in Rome. Here on two levels were displayed the major pieces of classical sculpture, framed between columns on the lower floor and placed in niches on the upper.<sup>35</sup> The ultimate reference of the architecture is to the Belvedere courtyard and rotunda in the Vatican.

Next the king of Prussia in 1841 acquired what was later known as Museum Island in the middle of the Spay River. There in 1859 the Neues Museum opened; it housed more of the state's increasing archaeology holdings, including major vase collections and the expanding cast collection. But by the end of the nineteenth century even these facilities were becoming inadequate. Starting in 1876 Carl Humann began excavating a large collection of Hellenistic masterpieces at Pergamon, which he and the German government shipped back to Berlin. Other German excavations in Turkey also yielded prizes for the museum, such as the massive second-century A.D. Miletus market gate. The classical collections were not the only ones that were expanding, and plans had to be made for yet another museum building.

The museum director, Richard Schone (1840–1922), one of the most prestigious figures in the museum world, wanted to make his museums as popular as possible. By means of extended hours, museum tours, and accessible labeling and free admissions, he was able to increase attendance to 20,000 by 1902.<sup>36</sup>

Central to these ambitious development plans was the Pergamon Museum. The first Pergamon Museum structure opened on Museum Island in 1906. The centerpiece of its collection was the reconstructed Great Altar.<sup>37</sup> After only six years the museum was razed to prepare the ground for a new, grander Pergamon Museum. World War I and the economic and political chaos that followed delayed the opening of that new museum until 1930; it was not completed until 1936. This museum housed the sculpture and architecture from the great excavations in Asia Minor, as well as the Near Eastern and other collections. But bitter disputes developed over the allocation of display space, especially as the powerful Theodor Wiegand pushed successfully for such expensive projects as the full-scale reconstruction of the Miletus gate—a tribute to architectural classicism that seemed somewhat anachronistic in the Weimar world of the Bauhaus.<sup>38</sup> Ironically, this architectural nostalgia for Hellenism was to have one more dubious manifestation in the Hellenic-inspired architecture of the Third Reich.

The new classical museum culture of the nineteenth century was almost totally based on the export of classical antiquities from the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans viewed these Western antiquities “raids” with mixed feelings. On one level classical representational art had little meaning for an Islamic society. At the same time the Ottoman administration

was trying to learn from the West and identify with Western values. An appreciation of Greek and Roman art came with changes in dress, the construction of railroads, and the purchase of steam warships. But there were also issues of status and pride, as the once mighty Ottoman Empire had to yield again and again to Western demands in both political and cultural matters. The loss of so many of its antiquities to Anglo-American imperial powers was bound to be galling.<sup>39</sup>

As early as 1846 Fethi Ahmet Pasa had begun gathering antiquities from all over the empire. This collection in 1868 became the basis of the Ottoman Imperial Museum.<sup>40</sup> In 1869 an Englishman, Edward Goold, was appointed the museum's first director and commissioned to prepare its first catalogue. In 1872 Goold was replaced by Philip Anton Dethier (1803–81), a Frenchman who had received his archaeological education in Germany. But Heinrich Schliemann's blatant export of the Troy treasure in 1873 aroused great anger in Istanbul.<sup>41</sup> Even so, Dethier continued to preside over his archaeological empire with a staff made up entirely of foreigners. In 1880 a new archaeological museum opened in Istanbul to house new finds.

A new era started with the appointment of Osman Hamdi (1842–1910) to the directorship of the museum.<sup>42</sup> Hamdi was one of the new Turkish intellectuals who identified with Europe and the West. He had been educated abroad, spent time in Vienna and Paris, and had artistic as well as archaeological interests. Indeed his devotion to Western styles in painting (he had studied under the French artists Gérôme and Boulangier) partly explained his interest in classical art.

Hamdi's mission for the museum was twofold. He wanted to protect Ottoman antiquities and at the same time to be more proactive in archaeological research and museum development. When Hamdi began his appointment the antiquities law passed in 1874 in the wake of Schliemann's export of the Troy treasure was already in effect; it allowed the division of antiquities between the excavator, the landowner, and the Ottoman government and had done little to stop the flow of antiquities into the museums of Western Europe and America. In 1884 he helped draft a much stiffer law, which did much to halt the large-scale export of antiquities. It remained in effect until 1972.

Hamdi also began his own excavations to enlarge the museum collections at Istanbul. The most important of those were at the Sidon cemetery in modern Lebanon that yielded the so-called Alexander sar-

cophagus: a coffin of a Hellenistic client-ruler decorated with scenes of Alexander the Great hunting. Its discovery and shipment to the Istanbul Museum served as a reminder that while Hamdi had developed his archaeology program as a reaction to European archaeological imperialism, he himself was also an archaeological imperialist, gathering to the capital objects from diverse areas of what was still an extended, multicultural empire. The arrival of the Alexander sarcophagus also increased pressure for the construction of a new museum, which opened in 1891 and was expanded in 1902 and 1908, becoming one of the largest archaeological museum complexes in the world.<sup>43</sup>

Osman Hamdi's successor as director of the Istanbul Museum was his brother Halil Edhem Eldem, who remained in the director's post until his own death in 1931. Halil Edhem Eldem's tenure coincided with a difficult period in Turkish history, one that very much affected archaeology and antiquities. The defeat of the Ottomans in World War I increased the pressure on the authorities to allow archaeologists of the Western powers to remove antiquities from Turkish soil, pressures that were on the whole successfully resisted. Meanwhile, Kemal Atatürk's rise to power and the symbolic move of the capital from Istanbul to Ankara led to increased emphasis on the archaeology of the Anatolian heartland. Atatürk appreciated the role archaeology could play in shaping national identity, but he was more interested in the native Hittites and questions of Turkish origins than in the study of colonialist Greeks and Romans.<sup>44</sup> Turkish archaeology, however, remained closely linked to Germany, and during the 1930s Atatürk recruited distinguished German archaeologists to his universities who were fleeing Hitler's regime.<sup>45</sup>

As the countries of Western Europe and Asia Minor developed their museums during the nineteenth century, they relied on a number of sources for their collections. Major acquisitions like the Pergamon altar or the Miletus gate were impressive and captured headlines, but they did not represent the norm for museum collection development. Most museums built their collections on the old standbys of Roman copies, Greek vases, and the occasional original Greek sculpture that appeared in a dealer's shop. The stiffened antiquities laws of Greece, Italy, and the Ottoman Empire limited the export of large sculptural and architectural complexes but did little to stem the flow of illegally excavated and exported statues and vases. The smuggled objects were complemented by works put on the market through the sale of established collections,

as well as by an increasing number of fakes and forgeries. All of these came together to create an antiquities market that recalled the days of the Grand Tour.

One of the ironies of postunification Italy was that the country that worked so hard to restrict archaeological access to foreigners became once again the center of a network of dealers, collectors, and forgers who supplied the growing collections of museums and private owners in Europe and America. German scholarship, Anglo-American money and connoisseurship, and Italian craftsmanship all united in Rome.

Two other factors helped center the world antiquities market on Rome. The expansion of the new city, especially into the villa properties, had led to the discovery of many art pieces. Some were impounded for the museum collections of the Comune and the state. But many found their way into the hands of dealers and hence into the antiquities market. In addition, the period between 1870 and World War I was one of great social and economic stress, and the nobility suffered along with the rest of Italy.<sup>46</sup> Financial pressures forced many aristocrats to sell their collections, both antiquities and works of art. Some struck deals with the state. Others looked to the international antiquities market, thinking that the rewards would be greater and that the powerful foreigners would be able to get the works exported from Italy.

The market prospered on a complex network of suppliers, dealers, restorer-forgers, and “experts.” Central scholarly figures in this new antiquities commerce were Wolfgang Helbig, Paul Hartwig (1859–1919), and Friedrich Hauser (1859–1917). Wolfgang Helbig we have already met. He was one of the most complex and ambiguous, but also the most important, Roman archaeological figures of the period.<sup>47</sup> In addition to his work as a private scholar and to the salon he hosted with his wife, Helbig was active as an adviser to collectors. His most important Roman connection was Baron Giovanni Barracco (1829–1914). Barracco came from Magna Graecia, and throughout his life he cultivated a serious scholarly interest in ancient art, especially sculpture. He benefited both from the general art market and from the many finds of antiquities unearthed during the development of late-nineteenth-century Rome, creating one of the finest antiquities collections in the city, a collection that he gave to the Comune of Rome in 1902.<sup>48</sup> In addition, he built a delightful neoclassical museum designed by Gaetano Koch for the collection on the corso Vittorio Emauele. The museum was torn down

when the road was widened during the fascist era, but the collection was relocated nearby.

Helbig's most important international collaboration was with the Danish beer brewer Carl Jacobsen (1842–1914), a partnership that led to the formation of the superb classical collection at the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek in Copenhagen. Jacobsen was especially interested in classical portraits, and Helbig helped him acquire both individual pieces and entire collections, like that of the Polish count Michel Tyszkiewicz in Rome. Jacobsen's classical materials were added to the Glyptothek in 1906.<sup>49</sup>

Helbig did not work alone, for he was an adviser, not a dealer or restorer. His main Roman collaborator was the Italian restorer and dealer Francesco Martinetti (1833–95).<sup>50</sup> Martinetti had opened his first antiquities shop in 1853 and by the 1880s he was one of the richest and most successful dealers in Rome. He was involved in every aspect of the trade from excavations to cleaning, restoring, and appraising.

Here enters one of the most controversial aspects of Helbig's career, for the Italian scholar Margueritta Guarducci has argued that Helbig and Martinetti were involved in a long history of forgery, creating among other things the Praenestine fibula, a gold pin found in a tomb at Praeneste near Rome and long considered to have one of the oldest Latin inscriptions. Guarducci (1902–2000), one of the pioneering women in Italian classical archaeology, had an excellent reputation as an epigrapher, and though German scholars have vigorously defended Helbig's reputation, she backed up her charges with solid research, and they have considerable plausibility.<sup>51</sup> Helbig remains an ambiguous figure.<sup>52</sup>

Paul Hartwig and Friedrich Hauser were also trained archaeologists involved in the antiquities trade. Both were private scholars with excellent archaeological educations and sufficient personal means to live for long periods in Rome without other obvious sources of support. The two were for a time close friends, members of the homosexual society that was part of the elite expatriate life in pre–World War I Rome. Later they became bitter personal enemies. Hartwig was especially interested in Attic vases and did pioneering research on the subject, stressing the importance of stylistic analysis of individual objects.<sup>53</sup> Hauser combined solid scholarship with a good eye and had an impressive knowledge of both Greek sculpture and Greek vases; Ludwig Curtius praised his aesthetic sensibilities.<sup>54</sup> Both moved in collecting circles and knew the



world of dealers and forgers well. Scandal eventually forced Hartwig to flee Rome in 1915.<sup>55</sup>

The new players in the antiquities market who appeared on the scene in the last years of the nineteenth century were the Americans. Their museums were still small and poorly furnished, but increasingly boasted rich patrons, many of whom had learned the new classical aesthetic from Charles Eliot Norton at Harvard.<sup>56</sup> They now moved to expand their collections through purchases on the antiquities market. Some operated through agents in England, others through connections in Rome.

As was to be expected in America in the late nineteenth century, Boston led the way, as the cultural elite of America's Athens sought to enrich the city's new Museum of Fine Arts (MFA).<sup>57</sup> The museum's classical collections benefited especially from the patronage and expertise of E. P. Warren (1860–1928), the scion of a New England industrial family with considerable private means and a protégé of Norton's.<sup>58</sup> By the end of the nineteenth century Warren had established a homosexual commune near Oxford as his base of operations, though many of his most significant purchases were made in Rome. Friedrich Hauser was his agent for a while, but the person most influential in advising Warren was John Marshall, an Englishman who was a close personal friend of Warren's and a member of his Lewes House circle.

By the turn of the nineteenth century, however, American financial power had shifted decisively from Boston to New York, a move that was reflected in museum collecting. While the fortunes of the Museum of Fine Arts waned, those of New York's Metropolitan Museum waxed.<sup>59</sup> Expressive of the change was the move in 1905 of Edward Robinson (1858–1931), probably the best classical archaeologist in an American museum, from the MFA to the Metropolitan.<sup>60</sup> When Robinson arrived in New York, the core of the Met's classical holdings was the collection of Cypriote sculptures and vases that Baron Luigi Palma di Cesnola (1832–1904), Italian expatriate, civil war general, and later director of the Metropolitan, had brought into the museum. The collection was the product of the years of excavations he conducted when he was American consul in Cyprus.<sup>61</sup> Such material, coming from the margins of the Greek world and executed in styles that reflected contacts with the Orient, was becoming less and less appealing to museum curators seeking the pure Greek and Roman in ancient art.

Robinson had the mandate and the means to build up the Metropoli-

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Luigi Palma di Cesnola, collector of Cypriote antiquities and the first director of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, c. 1880 (All rights reserved, The Metropolitan Museum of Art)

tan's classical collection, and he employed Warren's friend and associate John Marshall as his Roman agent. Marshall operated out of an elegant apartment near the Spanish Steps that was for years a major focus of the collecting scene in Rome. During the first decades of the twentieth century classical art flowed out of Italy to New York. Much of it was standard statuary and vases, but the Met was even able to arrange the export of the villa wall paintings from Boscoreale near Pompeii.<sup>62</sup>

In 1906 Robinson brought onto the staff of the classical department a young Englishwoman named Gisela Richter (1882–1972), the daughter of the distinguished art historian Jean-Paul Richter, a classicist educated

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Gisela Richter, classical curator at The Metropolitan Museum of Art and one of the few women of her generation to make a career in classical archaeology, in 1952 (All rights reserved, The Metropolitan Museum of Art)

at Girton College, Cambridge, and a disciple of the Roman art historian Eugenie Sellers Strong.<sup>63</sup> From 1925 to 1948 she was curator of Greek and Roman art at the Met. Between the wars she guided the vigorous acquisition policy of the Metropolitan and was a regular presence on the Roman antiquities scene. She was also an assiduous publisher, whose catalogues and guidebooks in particular provided excellent introductions to the ordered world of the museum classical archaeologist.

The career of Gisela Richter provides an appropriate opportunity to look at the place of women in classical archaeology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Most countries strong in classical archae-

ology, like France, Germany, and Italy, made little or no provision for the higher education of women. A woman like Ersilia Caetani Lovatelli could rise to the rank of respected archaeological scholar only through private tutelage and the connections that came from being a member of the Roman aristocracy.

In contrast, advanced educational programs for women were being established in England and the United States. Places like Girton and Newnham Colleges at Cambridge by the 1870s were turning out female archaeologists such as Jane Harrison and Eugenie Sellers Strong.<sup>64</sup> In the United States both the public universities of the Midwest and such private women's colleges as Mount Holyoke, Wellesley, and Bryn Mawr provided strong classical educations. Both the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and the British School at Athens accepted a number of women in their early decades.<sup>65</sup>

The greatest problems for aspiring female classical archaeologists were getting first excavation experience and then employment. Almost all the early Anglo-American excavations barred women from any meaningful participation. J. P. Droop, a former student at the British School in Athens, warned in his 1915 *Archaeological Excavation* against the participation of women on mixed-sex digs. His reasons ranged from the potential of offending local proprieties to the harmful effect a female presence had on the special male bonding that took place during an excavation.<sup>66</sup> Someone like Harriet Boyd Hawes could strike out on her own in the more marginal world of Minoan archaeology in Crete, but she was a rare success in the story of female archaeologists at this time.<sup>67</sup> The women's colleges in England and America did provide careers for female classicists, some of whom had solid archaeological backgrounds. However, even at such a bastion of women's education as Bryn Mawr, the teaching of archaeology remained largely a male preserve until after World War II.<sup>68</sup> The post held by Gisela Richter at the Met was also rare for a woman. Museums were willing to use the services and skills of women in volunteer, secretarial, and honorary curatorial capacities, but they were less willing to give them significant paid positions. The women who became prominent in classical archaeology in the early decades of the twentieth century like Strong and Esther Van Deman (1862–1937) survived and even succeeded in part because they occupied special niches. Strong was from 1909 to 1925 assistant director of the British School at Rome, while special funding allowed Van Deman to remain

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Harriet Boyd Hawes, pioneering archaeologist in Crete and the first American woman excavator in Greece, at Herakleion in 1902 (Smith College Archives)

at the American Academy in Rome for several years.<sup>69</sup> For most of the rest of the promising young female classical archaeologists the realities were marriage, teaching school, or low-level administrative work.

At the Met, Gisela Richter successfully continued the work of Robinson and Marshall. She also faced the problems and perils of operating in a marginally legitimate world, where objects suddenly appeared and were purchased with few questions asked or answered. Indeed the world of the dealer still partook of that of the restorer and even the forger. While “restorers” did not play the same central role they had in the days of the Grand Tour, their services were still important if objects were to be made acceptable to the museum trade. The development of scientific connoisseurship had made the task of the forger more difficult. However, as prices for choice pieces increased and greed clouded scholarly judgment, a new breed of expert forger prospered. Two famous pieces associated with American museums show the complexities and ambiguities of this changing world.

The first of these was the so-called Boston Throne that was acquired by E. P. Warren in 1896 and added to the MFA's collection in 1908. It consisted of three sculpted reliefs, a central section that depicted a winged male figure and two side pieces with seated figures, one of whom plays the lyre.<sup>70</sup> It was regarded as a companion piece to another sculptural set known as the Ludovisi Throne that had been unearthed in 1887 on the grounds of the Ludovisi Villa near the present-day via Veneto and was later acquired by the National Archaeological Museum of Rome.<sup>71</sup> The Boston reliefs appeared on the Roman art market in the mid-1890s under the sponsorship of Hartwig and Martinetti. Helbig and Rodolfo Lanciani were also involved in the sale. The pieces were supposed to have come from the same general area as the Ludovisi Throne. Indeed, the two groups came to be regarded as companion pieces: important Greek originals of the mid-fifth century B.C. While the authenticity of the Ludovisi Throne has generally been accepted, the experts have long been divided on the Boston Throne. Margueritta Guarducci, who tended to suspect any object associated with Helbig and Martinetti, declared it a fake, while other, equally distinguished archaeologists such as Bernard Ashmole regarded it as genuine.<sup>72</sup> Naturally, the curators of the Museum of Fine Arts would like it to be a genuine treasure. However, scientific tests to demonstrate the authenticity of marble sculptures are unreliable, and the jury must remain out on the Boston Throne.

More provable turned out to be the forgery of the Met's Etruscan terra-cotta warriors. During the 1910s Gisela Richter made what she regarded as a major coup in the Roman art market when she acquired through John Marshall a terra-cotta warrior, a larger than life-size statue of Mars and an even bigger helmeted head done in terra-cotta. These had purportedly been found at a site near Orvieto, north of Rome, and were classified as Etruscan works of the late sixth century B.C. As examples of terra-cotta work the warriors were more impressive than such famous Etruscan pieces as the recumbent couples on sarcophagus lids now in the Villa Giulia and the Louvre. Richter triumphantly brought them back to New York, where they assumed pride of place in the Metropolitan Museum's burgeoning classical collection.<sup>73</sup>

Suspicious about their authenticity circulated from the start, but the impressive authority of Gisela Richter long silenced the doubters. Nonetheless, questions about the style and the lack of parallels in authenticated Etruscan sculpture continued to be raised, especially as more genuine Etruscan terra-cotta sculptures became known and the understanding of Etruscan art improved. Finally, in 1960, science was brought into play. Laboratory tests demonstrated that some of the material used in the glazes was postclassical. Some sleuthing in Rome actually turned up the identity of the forger, and in 1961 the Metropolitan conceded that the Etruscan warriors were fakes. They were assigned to an oblivion so deep that it is almost impossible to see them today.<sup>74</sup>

The years from the mid-nineteenth century to World War I saw a massive reshaping of European and American museum collections. In addition, great changes were made in museum archaeology, and fierce debates arose over the nature and purpose of museums of classical archaeology. Museums went from being displays of neoclassical aesthetics in the tradition of Wincklemann to being laboratories for the scientific study of classical art and archaeology to being institutions for public education to being shrines to Hellenic purity. Indeed over less than a century more changes occurred in the nature and function of classical museums than at any other time.

During the course of the mid- to late nineteenth century German scholars gave new life and purpose to the Roman copies of Greek sculpture that the worship of Greek originals had threatened to marginalize. These copies were no longer regarded as objects of aesthetic contemplation but rather as artifacts that the new, empirical archaeologists could

study in combination with literary texts to reconstruct a more credible history of the development of Greek sculpture. It was to be the last great scholarly period in what the Germans call *Kopienkritik* until the late twentieth century brought revived interest in the place of Roman copies in the history of collecting from the Renaissance through the eighteenth century.

In 1853 the German scholar Heinrich von Brunn (1822–94) reconstructed from several Roman copies the prototype of the famous statue of the satyr Marsyas created by the Greek sculptor Myron in the middle years of the fifth century B.C. In the same year he published the first volume of his highly influential *Geschichte der griechischen Künstler*. What Brunn launched was a systematic effort to unite the two types of art historical evidence from antiquity and write a new history of ancient art.<sup>75</sup> He collected and analyzed the great body of references to art and artists in the Greek and Roman authors. At the same time he sought to classify and order the masses of copies in such a way that specific works could be associated with the sculptures of specific Greek artists. For the later study he built up large cast collections that served as the archaeological equivalent of the body of printed texts used for his literary studies. Combining those two types of evidence both the oeuvre and the artistic personality of an ancient artist like Myron could be reconstructed. Brunn's method met both the requirements of an ever more scientific discipline as well as the sentiments of the postromantic world, for which the history of art was the history of artistic personalities.

In 1865 Brunn moved to Munich, where he taught for thirty years and trained some of the greatest archaeologists of the next generation. Of these the most impressive was Adolf Furtwängler (1853–1907), who in 1894 succeeded him in the chair of classical archaeology at Munich.<sup>76</sup> Furtwängler was a charismatic scholar of vast energy and erudition, who ranged over the entire spectrum of classical archaeology. He had excavated with the pioneers at Olympia, catalogued in the museums of Berlin and Munich, and written on topics ranging from humble terracottas to the great works of Greek sculpture.

His *Meisterwerke griechischer Plastik*, published in 1893, was one of the most successful and influential efforts to apply the Brunn method to the history of Greek sculpture. It was translated into English in 1895 by the young Eugenie Sellers Strong and had a considerable impact on the Anglo-American scholarly world.<sup>77</sup> Furtwängler appreciated the importance



[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Adolf Furtwängler, shown here with his daughter, c. 1895, was the leading German classical archaeologist of the late nineteenth century and a pioneer in the efforts to attribute the originals of Roman copies to specific Greek sculptors (Girton College Archives, Cambridge University)

of the great cast collections such as that developed by Brunn. He also saw the potential of photography for precise stylistic research. The kind of detailed comparison that the Brunn school sought to employ was almost impossible if the scholar had to rely on the impressionistic world of drawings and watercolors and the imprecise information stored in the brains of individual scholars. The photographer created a much more "real" image than the artist. Moreover, photographs of individual objects could be collected, stored, and arranged and rearranged much more easily than the bulky casts. File cabinets filled with large black-and-white photographs became part of the equipment of individual scholars much as the cast gallery was part of the research facilities of universities and museums. In fact, it was the efficiency and compactness of photograph collections that helped lead to the demise of the cast gallery.

Photographs were not the only new instruments that Furtwängler had in his library as he pursued his research. The printed monographs, excavation reports, and catalogues had also changed dramatically in format and content. Perhaps most important for the archaeologists were the improvements in printing technology that allowed reproductions of photographs. Originally the publications had relied on etchings based directly on photographs. Then they found ways to reproduce photographs separately and insert them into the text. Finally printing technology allowed the reproduction of text and photograph together.

Another significant change was the appearance of more professional journals sponsored by the new foreign schools or professional societies that not only printed scholarly articles but also reported and even illustrated recent finds. In 1876 the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* was founded; and the *Athenische Mitteilungen* followed shortly thereafter. The British began producing *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* in 1880, and in 1885 the Americans got into the act with the *American Journal of Archaeology*.

Classical sculpture had stood at the center of museum and private collections since the Renaissance. For much of that period the collection of antique vases played only a secondary role. In the mid-eighteenth century this began to change. Classical collecting interests were extending beyond the aristocracy, and the acquisition of vases was economically more feasible for that expanding world of potential collectors. These collectors did not just acquire originals. As entrepreneurs like Josiah Wedgwood sought to combine new ceramic production techniques with the

stylistic identification with classical artistic values, Britain became the greatest producer of ceramics in the world. It is significant that Wedgwood named his production center Etruria at a time when the painted vases that we now know to be Greek were regarded as Etruscan.<sup>78</sup>

A very different collector was Lord William Hamilton, another formative figure in the study of Greek vases. Hamilton was British ambassador to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies from 1764 to 1800, a time when Britain was engaged in deadly struggle for the control of the Mediterranean. To most Hamilton is best known as the tolerant husband whose young wife was the mistress of Lord Nelson. But Hamilton was also an eighteenth-century man of science, much interested in volcanoes, and a formidable collector, who during his period as ambassador had access to the rich sites of Campania.<sup>79</sup>

Hamilton's collecting interests focused on classical vases, which frequently appeared in the tombs that were the principal objects of Neapolitan excavations during that period. He built up two substantial collections of vases as well as other objects during the course of his lifetime. The first he sold to the British Museum in 1772, one of the major early additions to that museum. He soon started gathering a second collection, much of which was lost in a shipwreck in 1798. He also published catalogues of the two collections. The first appeared in 1767–68 with much aesthetic commentary by the antiquarian, adventurer, and pornographer Count d'Hancarville.<sup>80</sup> The first volume of the second collection appeared in 1791 with illustrations by the neoclassical artist Wilhelm Tischbein.

Two important archaeological issues are associated with Hamilton's collections and publications. The first is the Greekness of what we know today as Greek vases. Since many of the early finds had been made in Tuscany, the antiquarian world had tended to see the vases as Etruscan artistic productions. Now large numbers of finds were being made in Magna Graecia, far away from the Etruscan lands. Even before significant evidence emerged from Greece itself, scholars came to see that they were dealing with Hellenic work that had been exported to Etruria.

The second issue was the place of Greek vase studies in understanding Greek art. The ancient authors had identified painting, sculpture, and architecture as the three great art forms developed in ancient Greece. However, in the eighteenth century ancient painting was known only through examples from Rome and the Roman centers of Campania.

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

C. H. Kniep, *Lord and Lady Hamilton Observe the Excavations at Nola*, 1790  
(German Archaeological Institute, Rome)

These were much later works, copies done by artisans rather than works by original artists. Antiquarians like d'Hancarville argued that the vases provided the missing link into the world of ancient painting. They were to be seen not as artisan products but as works of art, the product of the best Greek design.

That position has been attacked since the 1990s on two fronts. The first is that the vases were not actually products for elite consumption but rather items made available to people who could not afford the true luxury of metalwork.<sup>81</sup> The other objection is that d'Hancarville and

Hamilton glorified the Greek vases in their publications as part of a scheme to enhance the market value of Hamilton's first vase collection before it went on sale.<sup>82</sup> It is certainly the case that a long, elite tradition of Greek vase studies has made the works into cult objects. The basic arguments made by the aesthete-antiquarians about the aesthetic value of the vases for the ancient Greeks have been accepted by a wider cultural community whose attitudes toward antiquity hovered between classicism and romanticism. That view received its best articulation in John Keats's "Ode on a Grecian Urn." However, there is no doubt that the vases provide us with invaluable insight into the innovative development of the Greek graphic arts as well as important information on many aspects of Greek life and culture.

The next major phase in Greek vase studies takes us back to Etruria, specifically to the site of Vulci. The excavations that the prince of Canino conducted there starting in the late 1820s flooded the antiquities markets with Greek pottery. The material attracted the attention of Gerhard, who published much of it in the reports of his fledgling *Instituto di corrispondenza archeologica*. It was he who finally demonstrated definitively that the vessels were of Attic production. European museums like the one in Munich began to buy vases in quantity, and they came to rival sculpture in the holdings of the great classical collections.

In the nineteenth century those expanding collections became the object of more systematic scholarly study. In 1853 Otto Jahn published his great pioneering catalogue of the Munich collection. Gradually scholarship moved forward from the cataloging phase to the consideration of a variety of issues that would dominate vase studies until the age of John Beazley. The first of these involved the identification of ceramic production centers. Athens was identified as the major source for most of the vases found in Etruria. But other workshop centers were clearly providing vases to the Etruscan markets. Gradually scholars realized that places like Corinth had been in the pottery business before Athens, while various South Italian communities and even Etruria had their own workshops.

A chronological scheme of vase evolution had also to be reconstructed, and the vases related to broader questions of Greek historical and cultural developments. Some vases bore personal names accompanied by the Greek word *kalos*, "beautiful." Clearly these reflected the man-youth erotic relationships that were common among the elite of clas-

sical Athens. Some of the “beautiful” youths could be identified as known Athenian political figures. By dating the vases back to the early years of those politicians, it was possible to assign them a relatively secure date.<sup>83</sup>

Other vases bore personal names accompanied by words like *epoiesen* or *egrapsen*. These identified artisans who had formed or painted the pot, although the precise meaning, especially of the word *epoiesen*, remained uncertain. The names offered the possibility of identifying Greek artists in vase painting in the same way that archaeologists like Furtwängler were attempting to do for sculpture. In 1879 Wilhelm Klein (1850–1924), who had published some of the first collections of signatures on Greek vases, produced a study of the Attic potter Euphronios that attempted to consider him as an artistic personality.<sup>84</sup>

Another approach stressed iconography, as archaeologists used the scenes and images depicted on the vases to illuminate a variety of topics from dress to religion. The visual repertoire of the sculptors was limited, circumscribed by religious and funerary custom. Compared to sculpture, the pictorial world of the vase painters seemed almost infinite. Much of the vase scholarship of the late nineteenth century focused on questions of images and iconography. Sidelined by Beazley and his followers in the twentieth century, this approach has been revived in recent years by scholars like Herbert Hoffman, Claude Bérard, and François Lissarrague.<sup>85</sup>

By the late nineteenth century the holdings of Greek ceramics in private and public collections were enormous. Making sense of that vast body of material became more and more difficult. The increased availability of photographic images helped, but many collections had been neither photographed nor published. The late-nineteenth-century scholarly response to the problem of synthesizing a huge body of material was to publish catalogues that would bring the information together in published form, like the famous corpora of Greek and Latin inscriptions. Undertaking such a project for Greek vases was much more complicated, for their proper study required detailed descriptions and many high-quality photographic images. It required a major international undertaking led by a person of energy and vision. Such a scholar was Edmond Pottier, who was on the curatorial staff of the Louvre from 1884 to 1924.<sup>86</sup> He was an energetic, wide-ranging archaeologist who wanted to demonstrate that French classical scholarship was as good as that of Germany. He was also an excellent organizer. Much of his own

scholarship had focused on ceramics, with an emphasis on broad stylistic developments and interconnection rather than the artistic personalities of specific potters.<sup>87</sup>

Gradually Pottier conceived the idea of a great international project that would produce a catalogue of all known ancient ceramic vessels. World War I delayed its organization, but in 1919 the *Corpus vasorum antiquorum* (CVA) came into existence as a research undertaking of the Union académique internationale.<sup>88</sup> Reflecting the international tensions after World War I, scholars from Germany and Austria were initially excluded from the project, in spite of their distinguished traditions of vase research. The first fascicle of the Louvre collection appeared in 1922. An originally more comprehensive ceramics program that would have included much of ancient pottery soon narrowed to a concentration on Greek vases. Still the organizers aimed to publish all the collections of all the museums of the world. Every serious archaeology library today has shelves groaning under the weight of CVA fascicles. They now number some three hundred from fifty countries. New additions are regularly made as old museums complete the publication of their collections, and new museums advertise their recently acquired archaeological treasures. The CVA volumes, with their standard format and generous photographic illustrations, have become the central reference tool for ceramics studies.

If the CVA provided the systematic presentation of the evidence, one English scholar, John Beazley (1885–1970), provided the ordering principles and methodologies that still shape this field of archaeological scholarship.<sup>89</sup> Beazley was the son of a late-nineteenth-century Arts and Crafts artisan, and in his early years he was something of an aesthete in the Walter Pater–Aubrey Beardsley mode. Attic vases were enjoying a vogue in those artistic circles, where their linear style enhanced by the drawings used in many archaeological publications appealed to artists like Beardsley and Walter Crane.<sup>90</sup>

Beazley studied classical philology at Oxford and as a youth explored his vocation as a poet. Lawrence of Arabia, who moved in his circle, remarked, “Beazley is a very wonderful fellow, who has written almost the best poems that ever came out of Oxford: but his shell was always hard, and with time he seems to curl himself tighter and tighter into it.”<sup>91</sup>

However, what Lawrence described as “that accursed Greek art” came to dominate Beazley’s life.<sup>92</sup> He studied Greek sculpture with the

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Sir John Beazley, the leading twentieth-century scholar of Greek vases, c. 1960  
(Beazley Archive, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University)



classical archaeologist Percy Gardner (1846–1937), but most of his classical archaeology was self-taught, the result of his exploration of collections in England and on the Continent. He became fascinated with the Attic vases of the Archaic and Classical periods and the rich insight they provided into ancient artistic and cultural life. He also began seeking a methodology that would bring order to the field and explain the artistic interconnections within this vast and still rather inchoate body of material. He found it in the “scientific” connoisseurship represented particularly by the Italian scholar Giovanni Morelli, who attributed unsigned Renaissance paintings to individual artists and schools on the basis of minor, idiosyncratic stylistic quirks expressed, for example, in the rendering of ears and eyes.<sup>93</sup> The American Bernard Berenson was just beginning to make his name using the Morellian method to distinguish the real from the fraudulent in Renaissance painting. Beazley decided to apply the approach to the study of Greek vases.<sup>94</sup>

Beazley spent the rest of his life of scholarly semi-monasticism bringing order to the world of Athenian red-and-black-figure vases. Using his own acute visual memory and his ever growing collection of photographs (he had over 100,000 at his death), books, and reprints, as well as making regular pilgrimages to the museums of Europe and America, he created a framework for understanding the vast world of Attic vases, organizing the material into schools and identifying individual artistic personalities.<sup>95</sup> Some of the artists were named on the basis of painted inscriptions on the vases. Others became known by conventional names like the “Berlin Painter” or the “Stippled Nipple Painter.” By now some one thousand of these painters have been identified.<sup>96</sup>

We should not underestimate the monumental achievement of Beazley.<sup>97</sup> He gave order and coherence to a vast body of important classical material. But he has been turned into a cult figure, complete with acolytes and a pilgrimage shrine, the Beazley Archive at Oxford.<sup>98</sup> One obvious question is whether his followers have kept his approach to vase scholarship going too long after its most important possibilities have been exhausted. Critics of the Beazley method also ask whether this concentration on archaeological style and syntax has not operated to the exclusion of other approaches to Greek studies. The late-twentieth-century revival of interest in iconographical studies and the use of that material for a range of cultural studies indicate that a better balance is being sought.

Critics of the Beazley legacy have raised a more fundamental question about the position vases held in ancient culture. Did the aesthete tradition that ran from Hamilton and d'Hancarville to Beazley overvalue the Greek vase as an expression of Hellenic high culture? Does identifying vases as works of art and displaying them along with sculpture in the high culture shrines that are modern museums distort their place in ancient society? Shouldn't we rather look at them as artisan products and objects of trade, more important for the study of trade and consumer culture, than as high art? Many of these questions relate not only to the historical development of classical art museums but also to the changing role and self-definition of the classical collections within them. The classical art museum had its origins in the Renaissance as an elite temple of the Muses, and it maintained that role well into the nineteenth century. The continuity in this attitude can be seen by comparing the design of the Belvedere courtyard with the central rotunda of Schinkel's Altes Museum in Berlin.<sup>99</sup> Both spaces were intended as elegant displays for ancient sculptures that would express the eternal values of classical art. The ghost of Winckelmann could haunt each place equally comfortably.

However, both the world of archaeological scholarship and the society of cultured collectors were changing, and the museums slowly responded to these changes. Collections expanded; but more than that, scholars came to view and use them in different ways. Pure aesthetic displays became less fashionable. Objects were increasingly arranged typologically or in a manner that reflected the current understanding of the historical development of Greek and Roman art. The nature of the visitors was also changing. An educated and increasingly affluent middle class was expanding in both Europe and America, and its members were increasingly shaping the local and international tourist market. Earnest women who desired education and information made up an increasing share of the museum audience. Guidebooks needed to be improved, tours made more serious, and exhibitions made more comprehensible and educational.<sup>100</sup>

By the mid-nineteenth century traditional art museums faced competition from international exhibitions and from the new types of museums like the South Kensington with their arts-and-crafts emphasis and more popular appeal that were founded in their wake. No longer was the issue one of improving the taste of the elite, the concern of an Elgin or a Lord

Hamilton. Nations within the internationalized industrial society were highly competitive, and design was increasingly part of that competition. Good design involved not just old elites and the captains of the new industry but also the artisans and craftsmen who helped design the products that competed in the world economy. Art education for a broad sector of society became one of the major goals of museums.

These changes in the mission of the museums were reflected in the treatment of the cast collections. Today only a few museums have preserved any part of their cast galleries. Most of those plaster images have been relegated to the storerooms or ground into dust. But in the nineteenth century all major museums in Europe and America gave central billing to their cast collections. We have already seen how the German scholars used their cast collections as large, three-dimensional laboratories. Curators like Welcker and Jahn in Bonn or later Brunn in Munich could arrange and rearrange their extensive cast collections to reflect their changing views on the historical development of classical sculpture.<sup>101</sup> They could experiment with different hypothetical reconstructions of statues, including the use of paint, without damaging originals.<sup>102</sup>

For the major museums the cast gallery had a strong educational function. The 1928 guide to the Greek and Roman antiquities of the British Museum describes the separate cast gallery, which had three hundred pieces.<sup>103</sup> Casts were also used in the regular galleries to fill lacunae and to make the wider cultural and artistic context of the fragmentary originals clearer. In the 1920s some 40 percent of the material on display in the Elgin marble gallery consisted of plaster casts, many of them gathered by Charles Newton in his quest to provide the British Museum with a complete set of copies of those Parthenon marbles that were not part of the original Elgin collection.<sup>104</sup>

The use of casts extended beyond the great museums and research departments to smaller archaeological worlds. Even for small local museums and university archaeology departments casts were vital teaching and learning tools. The patenting in 1844 of a process whereby casts could be produced at a reduced scale allowed even wider diffusion of these images. Three examples, one from Italy, one from England, and one from America, show the pervasive and diverse universe of casts. When Emanuel Löwy was brought from Vienna to Rome to teach classical archaeology at the University of Rome, he was coming to a city with

the greatest collection of classical art museums in the world. However, that richness was not sufficient for a nineteenth-century German professor. He needed a cast gallery at the university so that he could teach directly from the great works, add the latest discoveries, and play visually with objects in three dimensions. Because of his demands the university created a cast gallery that has miraculously survived the destruction visited on many other cast collections and after a period in storage has been reinstalled.<sup>105</sup>

The second illustration of the world of nineteenth-century casts comes from Cambridge. In the 1880s Sidney Colvin, the director of the Fitzwilliam Museum, was pushing to institutionalize classical archaeology at the university. The Fitzwilliam had opened in 1848, but it had expanded slowly in a university where classical archaeology played only a limited role.<sup>106</sup> But by the 1880s papers on classical archaeology were being included in the tripos exams, and courses of lectures were offered on the subject. In 1880 Charles Waldstein was brought to Cambridge to teach classical archaeology. He demanded a standard archaeological laboratory, and Colvin provided it. The Cambridge cast gallery opened with great ceremony in 1884 in the presence of such dignitaries as the Prince of Wales and the American ambassador James Russell Lowell.<sup>107</sup>

Four years later a similar ceremony took place in a small mill town in eastern Connecticut. The Slater Museum in Norwich was opening its own cast gallery. The Norwich gallery was inspired by the example of the London Exhibition of 1851 and the South Kensington Museum. The diverse display of copies of great works of art in plaster assembled in the small museum was intended not only to inspire the small local elite but also to improve the taste of the factory designers who created the new manufactured products that Norwich sent into the international markets. As at Cambridge a great gathering of notables assembled to honor the new cultural institution. They included the founder of American classical archaeology, Charles Eliot Norton; Edward Robinson, the rising classical curator of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts; and Daniel Gilman, the president of Johns Hopkins, the first research university in America. The cast gallery of the Slater Museum escaped later changes in museum taste and survives today as one of the best examples of that nineteenth-century genre.<sup>108</sup>

The great demand for casts generated a reproduction industry. It was possible by the late nineteenth century to build a cast collection that

included copies of most of the major surviving works of Greek and Roman art. Commercial production and distribution of casts was centered in Germany, but important firms were located in other centers. For years the British Museum maintained its own cast production facilities,<sup>109</sup> while by the 1870s Napoleon Martinelli was operating an important cast shop in Athens.<sup>110</sup> Not only standard works could be acquired but also new discoveries, which were rapidly added to the list of casts available. Museums published catalogues of their cast collections much in the same way they catalogued their collections of originals.

However, changes in European American aesthetic values and in the museum world gradually doomed the pseudo-marble world of the cast collection. Museums acquired more original ancient works, especially in America, and vicious competitions for control of space broke out between the advocates of the casts and those interested in the exclusive display of real archaeological objects. Museums like the MFA had veritable battles of the casts, in which the plaster reproductions were generally the losers.<sup>111</sup> In many cases the casts were becoming damaged and dirty, requiring a level of curation and restoration that the museums were unwilling to undertake.

Elitist attitudes were also reasserting themselves in museum culture, especially in the classical galleries. The educational role of the museum was relegated to back corridors and special school programs, while the main galleries were devoted to the display of genuine works of art.<sup>112</sup> Restorations were often removed from sculptures, and labeling was kept to a minimum. To paraphrase the director of one major American gallery, if you needed a label you shouldn't be in the museum. Within the classical galleries, the hierarchy of values that had come to shape the profession in general came to dominate acquisition and display. Greek marbles and Greek vases received pride of place. Battered hunks of Greek marble were honored because they exuded the Hellenic spirit. Roman portraits retained some status because at least they were genuine, but they were lower down in the hierarchy because they were Roman. The ancient copies that had played such an important role in the rediscovery of classical art were relegated to the margins, and the casts were removed entirely.

This changing scenario was acted out at the British Museum when the famous art dealer Lord Duveen agreed to finance a new gallery for the Elgin marbles.<sup>113</sup> In the design of the new display the advisory com-

mittee of three distinguished classical art historians—Bernard Ashmole, Donald Robertson, and John Beazley—pushed for an exhibit in which only the original pieces would be featured. Casts were banished, as were models and other “instructional” material that would distract from the appreciation of the “pure beauty” of the battered but legendary marbles. In another, more anachronistic gesture toward classical purity, the Elgin marbles were harshly cleaned to remove the golden patina that Lord Duveen among others found displeasing and to restore their “classic” whiteness, an ironical outcome since in their original setting the sculptures would have been brightly colored.<sup>114</sup>

By the 1930s the classical art museum had come full circle and was once again a temple of the Muses, where the elite could contemplate eternal aesthetic values. But a significant difference divided the past from the present. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries common neoclassical values unified the aesthetics of the objects inside the museum and the art being created outside. Canova and Thorvaldsen could move comfortably from contemplation of the classical art in the Roman galleries to creation of it in their own studios. This was not the case in 1930s Paris, London, or New York. The classical aesthetic had little hold on the creative artists. Classical art collections had more to do with elitism and cultural exclusion than with creativity, a problem that to a certain degree has persisted down to the present day.

## CHAPTER 6

# Political Ideology and Colonial Opportunism During the Interwar Period

**T**he guns of August 1914 quickly destroyed the late-nineteenth-century international order on which the foundations of modern classical archaeology had been laid. Soon Britain, France, Italy, Austria, and Germany were locked in a death struggle. Violence spread from Europe to the eastern Mediterranean. As war engulfed the collapsing Ottoman Empire, archaeologists were called on to put their knowledge of Arab and Turkish lands at the service of different powers. Theodor Wiegand combined intelligence and archaeological activities as a liaison with the Ottoman army.<sup>1</sup> David Hogarth, archaeologist and former director of the British School at Athens and keeper at the Ashmolean Museum, directed British naval intelligence out of Cairo. His most famous protégé was Lawrence of Arabia, who had been an active archaeologist in the Near East in the years immediately before the war.<sup>2</sup>

Most of the major archaeological sites came through the war relatively intact, but several promising young classical archaeologists from all nations, as well as some who were not so young, like Joseph Déchelette, fell in the slaughter. The French School in Athens alone listed seven dead on its roll of honor.<sup>3</sup> The European powers emerged exhausted from the struggle; Germany, which had been the greatest contributor to classical archaeology, the most so. In contrast the United States survived largely unscathed and was soon to become a major archaeological power. The creation of colonial mandates, especially out of fragments of the Ottoman Empire like Syria, provided new archaeological opportunities, and archaeology became increasingly harnessed to nationalist ideology. Fascist Italy provided the prime example of the trend, but other nations used the material past for their own political ends.

The war did produce acts of vengeance in the archaeological world, especially in Italy, where professors of Germanic origins like Emanuel Löwy, who had served the country faithfully for decades, were removed from their academic posts. Löwy returned to Vienna, and the venerable headquarters of the German Archaeological Institute on the Capitoline was seized by the Italian government.<sup>4</sup>

France made certain territorial gains in the aftermath of the Treaty of Versailles that were to have an important impact on archaeology. Alsace and Lorraine were recovered and with them the city of Strasbourg and the university that the Germans had tried to make into a showplace of Teutonic scholarship. To help reassert a sense of French identity in that disputed territory a new chair in the archaeology of Roman Gaul and the Rhine area was created at the University of Strasbourg with Albert Grenier (1878–1946), a disciple of Camille Jullian, as the first holder.<sup>5</sup> The end of the Ottoman Empire also provided France with opportunities in the Near East. After complex military and diplomatic maneuvering France was granted mandate control over the archaeologically rich territory of Syria. In 1920 a French-dominated Antiquities Service was created there on the model of those established in North Africa and in British-dominated Egypt. New museums were established in Beirut and Damascus.<sup>6</sup>

The French also used the interwar period to advance both their colonial and their archaeological agenda in North Africa. Ideological connections between ancient Rome and the new “Latin” society that was being fostered in North Africa were reinforced by pro-imperial intellectuals like the novelist and historian Louis Bertrand.<sup>7</sup> The archaeological administrative structure was improved and the laws protecting antiquities strengthened, actions that were necessary because the expansion of French colonial settlement, especially in the countryside, was threatening archaeological sites.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, it was his experience in North Africa that inspired Jérôme Carcopino (1881–1970) to strengthen the national government’s involvement in antiquities protection in the homeland after 1940.<sup>9</sup>

The program of excavation that had started just before the war at Roman urban sites like Timgad, Dougga, and Thuburbo Majus in the interior was now accelerated, and amateur savants were still very much involved. A local physician named Dolcemascolo conducted the excavations that cleared large sections of Ammaedara between 1925 and 1940.<sup>10</sup>



When Morocco became a protectorate of France in 1912, the governor, General Hubert Lyautey, began applying the lessons learned in Algeria and Tunisia on the use of Roman archaeology as an instrument of colonialist policy. One result was the start in 1916 of excavations at Volubilis.<sup>11</sup> The remains of impoverished villages built over the Roman ruins were swept away. Large areas of the ancient urban cores were cleared, and key structures such as triumphal arches were restored. The archaeologists also explored the farms and smaller villages of the Roman period as well as traces of water control projects. Parallels were noted between the efforts of the Romans and those of the contemporary French to make a desolate countryside bloom. What one writer described as “le témoignage d’une volonté de romanisation” (the witness of an impulse toward Romanization) was made visible in the land, especially in the interior, where the French sought to assert not only their physical and economic domination but also their ideological control.<sup>12</sup>

In the aftermath of technical developments in World War I the French began applying aerial photography to their study of the countryside. They were especially interested in detecting evidence of centuriation, the land division system that best expressed the Roman sense of rural organization and control. Centuriation was much discussed in the Latin land survey literature but very difficult to detect on the ground. A few antiquarians, such as the Danish consul at Tunis, Christian Kalbe, had discovered traces of the divisions, but only the perspective provided by aerial photography allowed full-scale reconstruction.<sup>13</sup> By 1931 extensive areas of centuriation had been detected by aerial studies in the areas around El Djem, and the utility of the method for investigating Roman land use patterns had been demonstrated.<sup>14</sup> The foundations were laid for one of the major French contributions to classical archaeology.

French involvement in North Africa had previously stimulated an interest in frontier studies, especially as French army officers tended to identify with their Roman predecessors. Now, in Syria, the French found themselves in another situation where ancient and modern frontiers were overlaid. But the geographic realities of the Roman frontiers in both Syria and North Africa were very different from those of the Rhine, the Danube, and north Britain and did not lend themselves to investigation by hearty walkers or weekend excavators. Here the airplane came to play a key role. Between 1924 and 1928 the flying priest Antoine Poidebard (1878–1955) applied to Syrian archaeological sites the technical knowl-

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Aerial view of the Roman site of Timgad in Algeria. The massive clearing of the site was part of the French policy of making the Roman remains highly visible in the landscape of North Africa. (CNRS-Centre Camille Jullian)

edge of air reconnaissance he had learned as an aviator in World War I. He undertook numerous overflights along the Syrian frontier, discovering new sites and making important contributions to the understanding of the eastern Roman frontier system.<sup>15</sup> In North Africa, Jérôme Carcopino and Louis Leschi (1893–1954), director of antiquities in Algeria, mobilized military resources to investigate Roman border areas.<sup>16</sup> It was Air Force colonel Jean Baradez (1895–1969) who made the most systematic aerial explorations of the North African frontier, research summarized in his 1949 book *Fossatum Africae*.<sup>17</sup> His aerial reconnaissance revealed a range of sites and features of the Roman period in the rough country of the interior, archaeological remains that would have been almost impossible to detect by traditional surface exploration.

Italy emerged a battered victor from World War I. Political, social, and economic turmoil followed, until in 1922 the fascists under Benito Mussolini seized power. Fascism was a complex movement, part revolutionary, part conservative. Important to the fascist ideological message were the identification with ancient Rome and the use of ancient Roman examples to create a new sense of discipline, militarism, and order. This identification was achieved in part by the pervasive manipulation

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Benito Mussolini visits excavations near the Colosseum in Rome, 1930s  
(Daniele Manacorda)

of the visual environment, through new construction, urban renewal, the physical isolation of ideologically important monuments, and archaeological excavation.<sup>18</sup>

Most of these ideas were not new to the fascists. Napoleon had begun the process known later as *sventramento*, whereby a monument of historical and ideological importance such as the Column of Trajan or the Arch of Titus was cleared of surrounding structures to enhance its visual prominence.<sup>19</sup> The intellectual and political shapers of the Risorgimento drew heavily on ancient Rome, while the post-1870 archaeological excavations in areas like the Forum were driven by a strong desire to make the city more Roman and less papal. Monumental restoration had long been shaped by ideological considerations; both Roman monuments and

early Christian churches were restored to a “pristine” shape. Architects like Antonio Muñoz had sought to return the early Christian churches of Rome to their original form, removing baroque features associated with Counterreformation decadence.<sup>20</sup> It is not surprising therefore that conservative, nationalistic scholars like Muñoz and Giacomo Boni made an easy transition to the fascist ideology with regard to architecture.

What was different in the fascist use of classical archaeology was the scale of the use of ancient monuments and archaeology for propaganda in both Italy and the colonies.<sup>21</sup> What Mussolini referred to as “la parola al piccono” (the discourse of the pickax) was heard throughout Rome, and the effects of the program were widespread. There were many reasons for this. First, Mussolini’s government was a dictatorship, and in spite of its inefficiency and corruption it could make changes that would have been more difficult for a more democratic administration. The fascists were also in power for a long time. (One of the projects that was in the planning stage when World War II broke out was the *Esposizione universale romana*, a universal exposition slated for 1942 to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the fascist seizure of power.) Finally and perhaps most important, using archaeology as propaganda stood at the top of the fascist agenda, and especially in Rome archaeological-propagandistic projects received top political and financial support.

Rome was the showpiece of a multifaceted program of ideological archaeology that involved the clearing, isolation, and restoration of certain key monuments such as the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Ara Pacis. It also included projects that coordinated archaeology with new construction, such as the creation of the parade route of the *via dell’Impero* (now the *via dei Fori Imperiali*) through the fora of the Caesars.<sup>22</sup> The government financed exhibitions and the creation of museums that highlighted the new discoveries and strengthened the connection between *romanità* and fascist policy. Finally, the ambitious fascist construction and urban renewal program led to chance archaeological discoveries, such as the republican temples of the Largo Argentina in central Rome, that the regime was flexible enough to preserve and fit into its propaganda program.

Mussolini had stated that “I monumenti millenari della nostra storia devono giganteggiare nella necessaria solitudine [The thousands-of-years-old monuments of our history must grow more magnificent in their required isolation].”<sup>23</sup> Important Roman structures were thus cleaned

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The area of the Ara Pacis and the Mausoleum of Augustus as reconstructed under Mussolini during the 1930s. The fascist pavilion for the Ara Pacis was demolished in 2002. (Photo courtesy of the author.)

of later “accretions” as part of the notorious *sventramento* that is now criticized by urban historians for its destruction of the later historical context of the Roman monuments. The most ambitious of these projects was the clearing of the Mausoleum of Augustus near the Tiber. All post-Roman remains were removed from the tomb itself, and the postclassical buildings that surrounded it were leveled to create a new piazza framed by buildings replete with fascist visual and verbal propaganda. The importance of the tomb was enhanced by the reconstruction of the Augustan Ara Pacis at a new location between the mausoleum and the Tiber. Mussolini closely identified with Augustus, and the dedication of the complex in 1938 became one of the great propaganda events in the history of his regime.

The excavations that expressed most clearly the aims and deficiencies of fascist archaeology were those in the imperial fora. Mussolini decided to construct a parade route between his residence in the Palazzo Venezia and the Colosseum. It would pass by the ruins of the fora erected by Julius Caesar, Augustus, and Trajan, monuments that had been buried under centuries of debris and obscured by later building additions. These ancient structures were rapidly cleared down to their imperial levels and

restored in such a way as to provide an appropriate backdrop to fascist martial displays. In the process more than five thousand housing units were destroyed, and 214,000 cubic feet of earth were removed.<sup>24</sup> The excavations were conducted in great haste, few records were kept, and in most cases no publications of the finds ever appeared. Some of the remains were reburied as the parade way and surrounding parks—complete with statues of “good” emperors—were built over them. The example of the imperial fora would return as a major source of controversy in the postwar years.

Outside Rome, fascist archaeological theories were applied most comprehensively at the site of Ostia, the seaport of ancient Rome. Ostia as a port had declined during the late empire, and the site was largely abandoned in the early Middle Ages. A few excavations had been conducted there since the Renaissance, especially in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The papal archaeologist Pietro Ercole Visconti (1802–90) had done important research in the mid-nineteenth century, although his work was largely driven by a desire to find art objects for the papal collections.<sup>25</sup> Dante Vaglieri (1865–1913) of the National Museum in Rome started a new era of systematic exploration at Ostia in 1907. After his death his assistant Guido Calza (1888–1946) took over the Ostia excavations. Working closely with the architect Italo Gismondi (1887–1974), Calza slowly continued the clearing of the city. Nonetheless, in 1938 much of Ostia still remained undisturbed.<sup>26</sup>

The fascist archaeologists undertook a massive clearing operation to make as much of the city as possible visible as a tourist attraction. The stimulus was again the planned 1942 universal exposition. Mussolini wanted it to showcase an evocative, visually comprehensible archaeological site like Pompeii but one that was closer to Rome and more easily accessible to visitors to the exposition. Ostia filled the bill. Teams of workmen were turned loose on the site, and within five years the excavated area had been doubled. Emphasis was placed on the clearing and superficial restoration of as many buildings as possible. Only artifacts of artistic value were saved, and large quantities of pottery were dumped into the Tiber. The outbreak of the war stopped the excavations, but it also limited even minimal study, conservation, and publication.

In addition to archaeological restorations and excavations, the fascists sponsored special archaeological exhibitions and new archaeological museums. In 1938 Mussolini opened the *Mostra Augustea della romanità*

(Augustan Exhibition of Roman Civilization), a massive exhibition that celebrated the bimillennium of the birth of the emperor whom the Duce saw as his great historical model. It replicated many aspects of Lanciani's 1911 exhibition, which had aimed through the use of models and reproductions rather than original works to highlight the glories of Roman achievements. The exhibit stretched over eighty-one rooms and attracted 700,000 people.<sup>27</sup>

This approach was repeated with the foundation of the Museum of the Empire, which drew some of its inspiration from its French predecessor, the short-lived Napoleon III Museum.<sup>28</sup> However, rather than looking to antiquity as an inspiration for the arts, this museum used the repertoire of Roman monuments represented in casts as an inspiration for Italian imperialism. As war broke out preparations were being made for the greatest of these exhibitions, to be held in connection with the 1942 celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the fascist seizure of power. The centerpiece of this exhibition was going to be a model of imperial Rome at a scale of 1:250, realized by the meticulous efforts of Italo Gismondi.<sup>29</sup> Both the model and the didactic exhibitions finally found their place in the Museum of Roman Civilization, which opened in the early 1950s in one of the buildings planned for Mussolini's aborted celebration of fascism.<sup>30</sup> A second museum founded during this period, the Mussolini Museum, was devoted to recent archaeological finds made in Rome.<sup>31</sup>

The archaeologist most closely associated with these fascist projects was Giulio Giglioli (1886–1957), whose career linked the earlier national period with the fascist era and the quietism of the immediate postwar years. Giglioli had been a pupil of Löwy and a protégé of Lanciani and served as the chief assistant for the 1911 archaeological exhibition. He became involved with the fascists soon after they came to power in 1922 and became Mussolini's chief archaeological spokesman in Rome. It was Giglioli who organized the massive *Mostra Augustea*. He was sufficiently tainted by his association with the fascist regime to be interned briefly after the fall of Mussolini. But he soon returned to his professorship at the University of Rome, where he quietly completed his career.<sup>32</sup>

Three other important figures in this fascist archaeological remaking of Rome were Antonio Muñoz, Corrado Ricci, and Antonio Maria Colini. Muñoz (1884–1960) had a strong background in art history, ironically with a special interest in the baroque architecture he did much to destroy in Rome.<sup>33</sup> For Muñoz these clearings and restorations repre-

sented a continuation of his own “improvement” activities, going back to the beginning of the century, that had focused on restoring Roman churches to their early Christian form. When he was put directly in charge of Mussolini’s urban renewal program in Rome, he pursued with a vengeance the destruction of old Rome.

Corrado Ricci (1858–1934) is the person most closely associated with the *via dell’Impero* excavations.<sup>34</sup> He came from an art historical background and for much of his early career had been more involved with libraries and galleries than with archaeology. Much of his early restoration work took place in his native Ravenna. Indeed, his background in the practice of archaeology was very limited, which in part explains his lack of care for the archaeological record. One would have expected a greater respect for historic Rome from a man of his education and sensibilities, but he like Muñoz was eager to have the great classical monuments available for study and much caught up in fascist notions of progress.

Colini (1900–1990) was a student and protégé of Giglioli, with whom he had worked on several museum projects. He was in charge of major restorations in the city, such as the Mausoleum of Augustus, and he did his best under the circumstances to follow some sort of program of scientific excavation and keep new excavations like the one at Saint Omobono from being covered by concrete. Although he was a fascist and an enthusiast for many of the fascist cultural programs, Colini also was the most serious scholar of the three regime archaeologists;<sup>35</sup> he was criticized by Muñoz for devoting too much time to his own research.<sup>36</sup> To do these individuals justice, they were not totally insensitive to the problems of clearing and restoration in a complex urban environment like Rome.<sup>37</sup> However, they did have their historical priorities in which the classical monuments came first; they got caught up in the enthusiasms of the moment; and they worked under tremendous political pressure.

The archaeological work of Mussolini, in spite of its attendant destruction, was received with enthusiasm by most non-Italian as well as Italian archaeologists. The English archaeologist Eugenie Sellers Strong is often cited as one of its supporters, but she was joined by the German Ludwig Curtius, who saw much to praise in Mussolini’s identification with Roman imperial history.<sup>38</sup> Many European and American archaeologists were generally sympathetic to Mussolini and his social and political goals.<sup>39</sup> As classical archaeologists they could not help but be excited by the many new discoveries and the better understanding of the ancient



monuments made possible by the sventramento. The loss of so much of picturesque Rome was a small price to pay for such progress.

The fascists extended this use of archaeology as propaganda to their North African colonies. There they learned from the French about how to employ classical archaeology as a tool for justifying modern colonialism.<sup>40</sup> The Italians had seized Libya, with its rich Greek, Punic, and Roman sites, from the Ottomans in 1911. In 1912 Salvatore Aurigemma (1885–1969), a *Halbherr* protégé, was sent out to Tripoli as inspector of antiquities.<sup>41</sup> One of his first acts was to restore the triumphal arch of Marcus Aurelius at Cyrene. He also began collecting materials for a museum at Tripoli; it opened in 1919. However, native resistance and the outbreak of World War I limited the exploitation of Libyan archaeological resources. While the Italian archaeologists often faced a losing battle in trying to protect archaeological sites from the military, some important discoveries—such as the statue of Diana of Ephesus at Leptis and the villa at Zliten, with its impressive mosaics—were preserved. A year after the annexation of Libya, Italy moved into the Aegean and seized the Dodecanese Islands, including Rhodes, from the Turks.

These two new colonial acquisitions required basically similar but also subtly different archaeological policies. In both, an antiquities administration modeled on that of Italy was imposed.<sup>42</sup> Foreign archaeologists were allowed no place in either colony. The Americans were forced out of Libya, and the Danes had to abandon their excavations at Lindos on Rhodes. Italian excavations were conducted, Italian museums founded, and Italian journals created.

However, history and specific colonial policy made different demands. Libya was divided into two parts. To the east Cyrenaica, which had the former Greek colony of Cyrene at its center, had striking Greek and Roman remains, such as the Temple of Apollo, that were worth excavating and restoring. There archaeologists like the Cretan expert Luigi Pernier (1874–1937) did important work.<sup>43</sup> Tripolitania to the west had a Punic origin, but that phase of its history was of relatively little interest to the Italians, especially as political anti-Semitism became more pervasive.<sup>44</sup> It was the *romanità*, and especially the great Roman cities of Tripolitania, that interested the Italians. Starting in the twenties and expanding into the thirties Italian archaeologists like Pietro Romanelli, Renato Bartoccini, and Giacomo Guido excavated intensely at sites like Leptis Magna and Sabratha.<sup>45</sup>

The archaeologists in different ways and to different degrees accepted the fascist ideology. Pietro Romanelli (1889–1981) bridged the transition from prefascist to fascist administration and like many of the older generation of nationalists adjusted easily to the Roman-centered rhetoric. He also accepted the increasing anti-Semitism as war approached, as well as the comparisons between the mercantile English and the Semites of Carthage.<sup>46</sup> He worked with Giglioli on the *Mostra Augustea* and transferred many of the ideas and ideological concepts to the postwar Museum of Roman Civilization.<sup>47</sup>

Renato Bartoccini (1893–1963), superintendent of excavations in Tripolitania from 1923 to 1929 and excavator at Leptis Magna, was one of the most enthusiastic followers of Mussolini, even serving the ultra-right-wing Salò Republic in the last days of fascist Italy. After the war he received amnesty for his fascist activities and returned in 1952 to excavate at Leptis and Sabratha.<sup>48</sup> Giacomo Caputo (1901–94) was a Sicilian who studied with Biagio Pace, Paolo Orsi, and Alessandro della Seta. By the time he became superintendent in Libya, the fascist rhetoric had become embedded in North African archaeological policy, and he followed the line. Stress was placed on spectacular projects that cleared major sites like Leptis and Sabratha for archaeological tourism. However, along with his assistant Gennaro Pesce, Caputo performed impressive service in protecting the archaeological monuments, staying at his post after the outbreak of hostilities and returning after the war to aid the British administration.<sup>49</sup>

In the course of the Italian North African excavations, entire cities, with their theaters, baths, fora, and elegant houses were unearthed. Museums were created and guidebooks published. During the 1930s the governor of Libya, Italo Balbo, created a tourist infrastructure that brought European and American travelers to the North African archaeological sites.<sup>50</sup> The civilizing accomplishments of the Romans were made visible, both to the new Italian colonists transplanted to Cyrene and to the nationalists at home. While the archaeological emphasis was on the great urban sites, the rural areas were not ignored. The authorities sought to learn from the Roman use of land and water as they established new settlements. The Italians sent into Libya could find inspiration in the Roman ruins as they worked to create a new *imperium romanum* on the North African shores.

The situation on Rhodes was very different.<sup>51</sup> A small, well-populated

island, Rhodes offered few possibilities for new colonial foundations. Its great classical heritage was Greek, not Roman. The Italian archaeologists found sites for important work, but Rhodes did not offer the opportunities for pro-Roman propaganda that North Africa did. However, during the Middle Ages, the Knights of Rhodes and others had turned the island into a Christian bastion against the march of Islam, and the Italian colonialists sought to emphasize this Western phase of the island's history. To do so they applied their skills at historical restoration learned on the buildings of Rome. Structures like the former headquarters of the Knights of Rhodes were restored to their medieval form and used as museums and administrative headquarters.

The archaeologist most closely associated with Rhodes was Amadeo Maiuri (1886–1963), who was even better than Giglioli at surviving in prefascist, fascist, and postfascist Italy.<sup>52</sup> He attended the University of Rome and became a protégé of Federico Halbherr, working with him on Crete. In 1914 he was sent to Rhodes, where he found a chaotic archaeological scene with poor administration and a lively trade in antiquities. He remained for ten years, excavating, working with the architect Giuseppe Gerola to restore buildings, and founding the archaeological museum at Rhodes.<sup>53</sup> He was succeeded by the strongly profascist archaeologist Giulio Jacopi.<sup>54</sup>

Maiuri's reward for his successful operations in Rhodes was appointment as superintendent of excavations for Campania, the richest archaeological plum outside of Rome,<sup>55</sup> a post he held until 1961. He arrived at Pompeii at a controversial moment in its archaeological history. When Giuseppe Fiorelli had departed for Rome in 1875, he had been succeeded by Michele Ruggiero (1811–1900), who remained as superintendent until 1893. It was Ruggiero who initiated a major program of restoration designed to preserve structures and works of art that had been exposed to the elements for centuries.<sup>56</sup> He was succeeded by Giulio DePetra (1841–1925), who was forced out of office because of the controversies that arose over the export of the Boscoreale silver to the Louvre and paintings to France (they ultimately ended up in the United States).<sup>57</sup>

Maiuri's immediate predecessor was Vittorio Spinazzola (1863–1943), a well-connected archaeologist who enjoyed solid political support in pre-World War I Rome.<sup>58</sup> Spinazzola did important work at Pompeii, especially in the excavations along the via dell'Abbondanza, where he elected to leave paintings and objects in place rather than transfer them

to the Naples Museum.<sup>59</sup> But he was dismissed following an investigation of alleged administrative misbehavior in 1923, shortly after the fascists came to power. Scholars are divided on whether the charges were true, some arguing that minor lapses were blown out of proportion—that the fascists made him one of their first victims because they considered him to be too closely associated with the previous, liberal regime.<sup>60</sup>

At that time the Campanian archaeological district was one of the largest and richest in Italy, embracing Naples and its surrounding territories, with sites like Pompeii, Herculaneum, Paestum, and much of the interior of south central Italy.<sup>61</sup> Upon his arrival Maiuri launched a vigorous excavation policy, which he continued until his retirement. For the first time since the 1870s digging was resumed in 1927 at the technically challenging site of Herculaneum. The bimillennium of the birth of Vergil inspired fascist-oriented historical nostalgia excavations at places with Vergilian associations such as Cumae.<sup>62</sup> However, Maiuri's major archaeological legacy was at Pompeii, where he undertook one of the most ambitious programs in the history of the site. He continued Spinazzola's excavations on the via dell'Abbondanza, moving beyond street and facade excavation to the clearing of entire houses. The diggers found important new residences, including the House of Menander, which contained a treasure of silver plate. Maiuri also resumed and largely completed the excavations of the Villa of the Mysteries on the outskirts of the city. He took many sounding digs in different parts of the city to recover information on the earlier history of Pompeii and pursued a vigorous program of displaying art and objects in situ. His productivity as a publishing scholar was equally impressive.

Maiuri was committed to the fascist regime, but as a realistic Neapolitan he understood that no political order lasts forever, and he kept lines of communication open to colleagues who were less enthusiastic about Mussolini. His continuing friendship with Benedetto Croce, the Neapolitan intellectual who symbolized cultural resistance to the fascists, proved useful after the war, when Maiuri faced sanctions for his association with the fallen political order.<sup>63</sup>

As superintendent he was involved in one of the most illuminating examples of both the oppressiveness and the flexibility of the fascist regime. It was the policy of the government to send political opponents into house arrest in remote areas of South Italy. (The most famous of these was Carlo Levi, author of *Christ Stopped at Eboli*.) One of the

exiles dispatched to the malarial areas of the South was Umberto Zanotti Bianchi (1889–1963), an aristocratic intellectual with a strong interest in the social, cultural, and political problems of South Italy.<sup>64</sup> He was also an archaeologist who in 1920 had founded the Society for Magna Graecia to promote research in the region. It was he who identified the ancient site of Sybaris. In the mid-1930s he began collaborating with another antifascist exile, the young archaeologist Paola Zancani Montuoro (1901–87), a student of Paolo Orsi.<sup>65</sup> Together they discovered and excavated an important Archaic sanctuary at the mouth of the Sele River near Paestum. Since Zanotti Bianchi was willing to use his own funds for archaeology, Maiuri helped arrange for him to excavate even though he was technically under house arrest.<sup>66</sup>

While nationalists and fascists were pursuing their imperial archaeological dreams in Italy and the colonies, the Greeks were using archaeology in pursuit of their *megali idea* (grand vision), the long-standing vision of a greater Greece that would reproduce elements of classical Hellas and the Byzantine Empire. As we have seen, archaeology had played an important role in the shaping of Greek national identity in the nineteenth century. Archaeology also was used for political purposes as the Greeks expanded beyond their original borders to the north and east. In 1912, fifteen days after the occupation of Thessaloniki, the Greek government began archaeological research in order to affirm the “Greekness” of that part of Macedonia.<sup>67</sup> Similar uses were made of archaeology in disputed regions of Albania in an effort to demonstrate Hellenic and Byzantine cultural identity and reinforce arguments for political control.<sup>68</sup>

Short-lived but ambitious were the similar cultural efforts made in western Turkey in the aftermath of World War I. Greek control of considerable areas of western Anatolia centered on Smyrna was confirmed by the 1920 Treaty of Sèvres, and a Greek antiquities administration was established in the territory. A museum was established at Smyrna, and Greek excavations were begun at Ephesus and Klazomenai.<sup>69</sup>

The Greek occupation led to an American excavation at the Greek city of Colophon that makes an interesting comparison with the work being done at Cyrene. The project received support from the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (some of whose directors were sympathetic to the goals of the *megali idea*) and the Fogg Art Museum of Harvard University, which had already sponsored excavations at Sardis

and wanted to profit from the legal liminal status of the occupied territories to export antiquities back to the United States.<sup>70</sup> Hetty Goldman, one of the few female archaeologists of her generation, was placed in charge of the Colophon excavations. However, the Greek dreams of a new Byzantine Empire withered under the assault of Atatürk's forces, Smyrna was burned, and its Greek population fled to the mainland. Hopes of extending the American classical archaeological empire to the shores of Anatolia died in the same way that they had in Libya in 1911.

Hetty Goldman (1881–1972) represented in many ways the pinnacle of American female involvement in field archaeology. She had degrees from Bryn Mawr and Radcliffe Colleges, two of the institutions that had done much to foster intellectual self-identity in American women after the Civil War. She had studied at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, a center that had been relatively open to women in the late nineteenth century, and spent most of her academic career at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey. Goldman followed in the footsteps of the Minoan archaeologist Harriet Boyd Hawes in doing fieldwork; in 1911 she and Alice Walker (1885–1954) became two of the first women to excavate at Corinth. Her later excavation career included Eutresis, Starcevo, and Tarsus. All her projects operated geographically or chronologically at margins of the core areas of classical archaeology, which were still elite male domains.<sup>71</sup>

Most women of the interwar generation were not as successful as Goldman, although they continued to receive good educations and win fellowships at the British and American foreign schools. Piet de Joong's collection of portraits of scholars associated with the American and British Schools in Athens between the wars included seven women out of twenty-three students at the British School and nine out of fourteen at the American.<sup>72</sup> Many found positions at the women's colleges in Britain and America. A good example of the kind of careers open to these academic women is that of Hilda Lorimer (1873–1954), a graduate of Girton College who studied at the British School in 1901–2.<sup>73</sup> She returned to Greece in 1911 to excavate with Richard Dawkins at Phylakopi, then became a fellow of Somerville College at Oxford, where she remained until 1939; from 1929 she was also university lecturer. Lorimer became an expert on Protogeometric pottery and Homeric archaeology and excavated at Mycenae, Ithaca, and Zakynthos. Her 1950 *Homer and the Monuments* was in its day a classic on Homeric archaeology.

The younger Winifred Lamb (1894–1963) had an even more uneven career. She studied at Newnham College, attended the British School at Athens, and excavated at Thermi and Antissa on Lesbos and Chios, establishing an excellent reputation as an Aegean prehistorian. She published widely and was highly respected as an archaeological scholar. But her only official position was as honorary keeper at the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge.<sup>74</sup> In both England and America, the major professorships, the first-line museum curatorships, and the directorships of the “big digs” remained almost exclusively male preserves.

The Americans’ disastrous experience at Smyrna nonetheless brought them some important benefits. The military failures of the Greeks in Turkey led to the expulsion in the early 1930s of the large, well-established Greek community in Asia Minor, creating a massive refugee crisis in Greece. Many of the displaced persons settled in Athens. Housing demands led to pressure to intensify development of certain parts of the city. One of the areas threatened was the Plaka, below the Acropolis, which was thought to be the location of the ancient Athenian Agora. Archaeological investigation of the area became imperative, but the Greek government lacked the funds.

This was an opportunity that the archaeologists of the American School of Classical Studies had to seize. The United States was the only country with the financial resources to undertake such a massive project. Since it was not technically a colonial power and had a long history of philhellenism, the presence of U.S. archaeologists at such a culturally sensitive site as the ancient Agora was palatable to the Greeks. Prominent patrons of the ASCSA like Edward Capps of Princeton had close contacts with the government, and they were able to facilitate the permit process.<sup>75</sup>

By the time that American archaeologists came to Greece in the late nineteenth century most of the major sites available for foreigners had already been taken. The finds and visibility of Corinth, the site they were assigned, did not match those of Delos, Olympia, or Knossos. Now the Americans were being given the opportunity to excavate at a major classical site in the center of Athens. Wealthy patrons like John D. Rockefeller were tapped for support. The organization and execution of the excavations was entrusted to Theodore Leslie Shear, whose Princeton and American School connections guaranteed not only the best classical archaeological talent available in America but also long-term access to the financial and cultural elite of the United States.<sup>76</sup>

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The Athenian Agora excavations, 1931 (American School of Classical Studies at Athens—Agora Excavations)

Other, political implications of that excavation came into play as well. At the same time that Mussolini's archaeologists were glorifying the connections between the totalitarian state and ancient Rome, the world's most dynamic modern democracy was being given the chance to explore the roots of its own political system in the heart of ancient Athens. But the ideological differences between American democrats and Italian fascists should not mask the similarities of the two archaeological projects. The American excavations in Athens were also to be exercises in sventramento: here, too, large urban populations were displaced and historic neighborhoods destroyed. The American popular archaeology magazine *Art and Archaeology* portrayed the clearances as the necessary prelude to scientific progress and the local inhabitants who resisted displacement as obstructionists trying to preserve an unsavory section of old Athens.<sup>77</sup> Ironically, the Plaka area had earlier been devastated during the Greek Wars of Independence (only 80 of 1,200 buildings retained intact roofs), and the urban development plans formulated in the 1830s had destined it for clearing and archaeological excavation.<sup>78</sup> But as in 1930, the Greek government had lacked resources for the work, and during the course of the mid-nineteenth century the Plaka had returned to its position as a vibrant quarter of traditional Mediterranean urban life. Today the importance of preserving such urban



neighborhoods is better appreciated, but that was not the attitude of the 1930s.

What did distinguish the Agora excavations from those of Mussolini's from the start was the quality of the work. While the driving forces behind both were the recovery of architectural remains and topographical information, the Americans were, especially for the period when the work started, conscious of the importance of recording and preserving the full archaeological record. Although less attention was paid to post-classical remains, and areas like environmental archaeology received little attention, this was the case for most archaeology of the period. What is striking is the degree to which materials like ceramics were recorded and studied. The establishment of the journal *Hesperia* in 1929 ensured the prompt and full publication of the excavation results.

The Agora excavations, with their ample resources and ties to the classical archaeological establishments of Princeton and the ASCSA, can be contrasted with the other major American excavation of the period, that at Olynthos (1928–38).<sup>79</sup> That project was the brainchild of David Moore Robinson (1880–1958), longtime chair of the influential program in classical archaeology at Johns Hopkins University.<sup>80</sup> Robinson was seeking an excavation to train his students, who included some of the most important American classical archaeologists of the next generation, and he selected Olynthos, the northern Greek city destroyed by Philip of Macedon in 348 B.C. Since the small city had been sacked and had no significant later occupation, Robinson thought that it had the potential to be a Greek Pompeii. The excavation was a massive operation with large numbers of workers and a small supervisory staff. Initially recordkeeping was poor, but by the early 1930s a young Hopkins graduate student, Walter Graham (1906–91), had introduced a system that allowed objects to be assigned to individual houses, even, occasionally, to individual rooms.

The results have been praised for the information they provided on ancient Greek housing but criticized for the rapidity of the excavation. But in a period when the emphasis was on the archaeology of public buildings, the excavation of more than a hundred private houses provided the best understanding available of Greek domestic architecture. Robinson was an energetic publisher, and the range of his reports, including studies of objects like lamps, that came out of Olynthos contrasts favorably with the work being done at other American excavations at that

time.<sup>81</sup> In the light of both the publications and the original field records, the archaeological finds from Olynthos can now be reread in the light of contemporary archaeological approaches.<sup>82</sup>

Unlike the Athenian Agora, Olynthos did not become the center for research or an archaeological school. The golden age of Johns Hopkins archaeology ended with the departure of Robinson for the University of Mississippi. In contrast the Agora excavations continue down to the present, tightly linked to the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and Princeton University. The power of the ASCSA was enhanced in 1932 when the Greeks passed an antiquities law that limited foreign nations to three excavations. The ASCSA made sure that it controlled American access to the permits, and American archaeology in Greece became confined to urban, classical sites with an approach and aims that were approved by the elite who directed policy at the school.<sup>83</sup> The results have often been brilliant, but the dominant vision was a conservative one at a time when the United States was leading the field in classical archaeology.<sup>84</sup>

British classical archaeology in the Mediterranean, especially field archaeology, remained a small and impoverished operation in the first half of the twentieth century. The British did not have the financial resources to undertake the major excavations launched by the Italians, the Americans, or even the Germans and the French. However, through imaginative deployment of limited resources and the presence of some dynamic young scholars, the British managed to make a significant impact on Mediterranean archaeology.

One of the most appealing figures in the history of British classical archaeology was Humfry Payne (1902–36). Brilliant, handsome, and dashing, with a golden career ahead of him, he died young and left a legend, enhanced by a touching memoir written by his adoring widow. He was in many ways the Rupert Brooke of British classical archaeology.<sup>85</sup> His art historical researches focused on the beautiful youthful images of the Archaic marbles from Persian debris on the Acropolis, reflecting his interest in Archaic Greek art stimulated by new trends in contemporary arts like the Secession movement in Vienna. These interests were shared by other contemporary archaeologists, such as the German Ernst Buschor (1886–1961), the scholar who revived the German Archaeological Institute in Athens.<sup>86</sup> For Buschor and Payne this formative phase of Greek art captured “the youth of the world.”<sup>87</sup> Payne

saw the Acropolis marbles as “the work, not only of individuals, but of a civilization.” For him “above all this the sculpture of the Acropolis is the expression of a purely aesthetic point of view, a point of view towards that which is the ultimate essential of all sculpture—the creation of three-dimensional form.”<sup>88</sup>

Payne collaborated with the archaeologist-photographer Gerard Mackworth-Young in a classic work of photographic archaeology, *Archaic Marble Sculptures from the Acropolis* (1936, 2d ed. 1950). The statues were photographed with carefully controlled light and wherever possible in the open air. The British work paralleled and probably drew inspiration from a growing interest of German archaeologists and photographers like Gerhart Rodenwaldt and Walter Hege in using art photography to capture the beauty and clarity of classical art. For Rodenwaldt, Greek art could be appreciated only in the “clear light of Attica.”<sup>89</sup> Hege produced a series of images in which the monuments stood out crisp and clean against a filtered, dark, usually almost cloudless, sky.

Payne’s focus on Greek artistic ideals and to a certain degree the myth of a pure Hellas fitted well the aesthetic and cultural vision of someone who was a student of John Beazley, recalling the days when Sir John embraced the ideals of the Shropshire Lad rather than the obscurities of the CVA. Payne was also caught up in the romantic vision of the sturdy peasants of modern Greece and echoed the idealization of ancient Greece in the tradition of Winckelmann and Goethe then being advanced by such members of the contemporary German neoclassical school of the *Dritte Humanismus* (third humanism) as the archaeologist Ludwig Curtius and the philologist Werner Jaeger.<sup>90</sup>

Payne was more than just another neoclassical idealist, for he was interested in field archaeology and in the widening of the horizons of Greek archaeology in both time and space. In particular, he sought to look back to the roots of Greek civilization. Ceramicists had by this time developed a reasonably reliable chronology that stretched from the Mycenaean to the Classical era, and Payne made an important contribution to the refining of the chronology with his 1931 *Necrocorinthia*.<sup>91</sup> What was now needed were more excavations focused on the preclassical period that would place the various types of archaeological material in context, improve the dating, and relate it to the dynamic interactions of cultures in the Mediterranean during the early centuries of the first millennium B.C.

British archaeologists had already pioneered in the study of that formative period of Greek civilization. David Hogarth (1862–1927) had excavated the Archaic temple of Diana at Ephesus in 1904 and 1905. Using relatively sophisticated field techniques he had recovered ivories and other materials from the Archaic period.<sup>92</sup> The excavations by Richard Dawkins (1871–1955) of the shrine of Artemis Orthia at Sparta in the early years of the century produced rich deposits of ivories, bronzes, ceramics, and other votive materials that among other things demonstrated that the legend of an austere Sparta was exaggerated and that in the Archaic period it had been a center of artistic production and international contact. The international contact was made especially vivid by a large number of clay masks that seem to have their closest parallels on the Levantine coast. Dorian Sparta may even have hosted Phoenician traders.<sup>93</sup>

In 1930 Payne started excavations at Perachora, an isolated headland near Corinth. He unearthed architectural, ivory, and ceramic remains at the Sanctuary of Hera Akraia that dated to the mid-ninth century B.C.<sup>94</sup> The site also yielded large numbers of scarabs and other objects that showed interactions between Perachora and the Levantine coast.<sup>95</sup> It was a classic British dig, undertaken with slender resources and carried out under primitive conditions. It also reflected a flexibility and openness to opportunity that the more rigid structures of the better-endowed institutions would not have allowed.

This extension of archaeological interests back to the formative period of Greek civilization raised new questions about the roots of that civilization, as well as about its early interconnections with the cultures of the Near East. Such debates took on ideological and even racial tones, for with the rise of the Nazis the Aryan explanation for the origins of Greek civilization was becoming more popular. Many still held to visions of Dorians coming down from the North, bringing the ordered, disciplined mentality that expressed itself in the Geometric style and underlay later Greek art. Near Eastern influences remained suspect, since they were considered soft, decadent, and—most damning for many Teutonic scholars of the 1930s—Semitic.

Still, the literary sources said much about the Greek, Phoenician, and Egyptian interactions in the formative period of Greek civilization. The Greek-Egyptian connections had been demonstrated archaeologically by one of the most important early British excavations, at Naukratis

in the Nile Delta. Naukratis was famous in the literary sources as the place where the sixth-century B.C. pharaoh Amasis allowed the Greeks to establish a trading community. Flinders Petrie had excavated the site in the 1880s, finding quantities of Greek ceramics that took trading contacts back into the late seventh century B.C.<sup>96</sup> Ernest Gardner continued the excavations in 1886; they were resumed by David Hogarth in 1899 and 1903.<sup>97</sup>

While the importance of the Naukratis excavations for certain technical problems like the dating of early Greek ceramics was recognized, the larger implications of the site were not appreciated. That was due in part to the fact that Petrie was an Egyptologist and even Hogarth was out of the mainstream of British classical archaeology. The key issues concerned economic activities that did not interest idealists seeking the essence of Hellenic civilization. And the Greeks active at early Naukratis were from Ionia and the islands, regarded as "soft Greeks" by those who extolled Doric vigor.

Just before the outbreak of World War II the British Mesopotamian archaeologist Leonard Woolley excavated another probable emporion (trading center) site at Al Mina on the northwest Syrian coast. Greek traders, probably from Euboea, had come there during the early eighth century B.C. and continued to trade there with the various peoples of the Near East until the fourth century B.C. The initial pottery finds were almost all Euboean Greek, but with time the number of non-Euboean and non-Greek wares increased.<sup>98</sup> Like Naukratis, Al Mina provided an example of the complexity of Greek and Near Eastern economic and presumably cultural interaction.

From the eighth to the fourth century B.C., the city-states of Greece had been in intensive contact with Sicily and South Italy, founding colonies and fighting, supporting, and reinforcing them as power relationships shifted. The neo-Hellenists of the late eighteenth century had begun to discover the Doric splendors of Magna Graecia and Sicily. Then interests had shifted to Greece, and classical archaeologists outside Italy had lost interest in the rich Greek cities of the West. If the world of the eastern Mediterranean was viewed as corrupted by oriental Semitism, the West was characterized as a vulgar, ancient Hellenic version of America.

These attitudes began to change as archaeological attention focused on the orientalizing and Archaic periods, and the young British archae-

ologists who excavated at Perachora realized the extent of Corinthian economic power not only in mainland Greece but also in the West. Dilys Powell, Humfry Payne's widow, described the ferocious debates between her husband and his young contemporary Alan Blakeway on the significance of Greek trade in the West.<sup>99</sup> Blakeway (1898–1936) appreciated the importance of the ceramic evidence for understanding the complex processes of trade and colonization in the West. While his “trade before the flag” view of merchants preparing the way for imperial expansion reflected contemporary colonialist perspectives, and he was unwilling to accept the importance of the Phoenicians in the movement westward, Blakeway did make his contemporaries appreciate the complex processes that linked Greece and the West in the eighth through sixth centuries B.C., and the importance of the new evidence from both Greece and Italy for understanding these developments.<sup>100</sup> Unfortunately Blakeway, like Payne, died young, and it was left to others to develop his ideas.

Blakeway's student Thomas Dunbabin (1911–55) picked up the challenge.<sup>101</sup> Dunbabin was an Australian who received his university education in England and studied at the British School in Athens. He became interested in mainland–western Greek connections and spent considerable time in Italy, especially Sicily, mastering the Greek archaeological material that had been discovered there. In 1937 he completed his Oxford doctoral dissertation, which was published in 1948 as *The Western Greeks*. It highlighted the perspective of an Australian colonial who identified with the Anglo-Saxon mother country. He emphasized the connection of colony and mother city, downplaying the cultural initiatives of the colonies. He was reluctant to acknowledge much interaction between the Greeks and the indigenous peoples (cultural and, even more, biological mingling made most colonials uncomfortable at the time), and could not come to grips with the probable importance of the role played by the Semitic Phoenicians in shaping Sicily at that period.<sup>102</sup> Nevertheless, the publication of his book after World War II at a time when Italy was opening up to foreign archaeologists might have stimulated some of the British archaeological work that was done in Sicily. Sadly, Dunbabin, like Payne and Blakeway, died relatively young.

Like Columbus with the New World, so Blakeway and Dunbabin with the Greek West: they hardly discovered something new but merely called the attention of the Anglophones to a world that Italians like Paolo Orsi had long been exploring. Indeed, Orsi, working as both a prehistoric

and a classical archaeologist, had emphasized interpretative models that examined the developments on the island from an indigenous perspective. Both Italian nationalism, especially under the fascists, and Sicilian regionalism reinforced such views of the island's history. That can be seen in Biagio Pace's *Arte e civiltà nella Sicilia antica* (Art and civilization in ancient Sicily), the first volume of which appeared in 1935. Pace (1899–1955) was a Sicilian who studied at the University of Palermo and throughout his life remained devoted to his native region, though he worked with the classical archaeologist and art historian Carlo Anti (1889–1961) in Asia Minor.<sup>103</sup> He was also an enthusiastic fascist, who was a deputy in the Italian Parliament during most of the regime.<sup>104</sup> Pace's intellectual approach blended the positivism of the antiquarian tradition with a desire to assert the distinctiveness, continuity, and creativity of Sicilian culture.<sup>105</sup> He was reacting against the negative view of the Western Greeks embodied in the dismissal by the more traditional architectural archaeologist William Dinsmoor (1886–1973): "As we proceed westward among the colonies we find even more emphasis on the tendency toward ostentation, accompanied, however, by a certain amount of provincialism or 'cultural lag' and also, by barbaric distortions resulting from the intermixture not only of colonists of various origins but also of native taste."<sup>106</sup>

He was obviously also sympathetic to the currently popular Italian nationalistic approach that stressed not only *romanità* but also the more basic Italic roots that were seen as underlying Greek and Roman accretions. This perspective differed sharply from that of Thomas Dunbabin.

The 1920s and the 1930s proved to be a highly stressful if at times a dynamic period for German classical archaeology. The bloodbath of World War I was followed by the economic, political, and social chaos of Weimar, and then the rise and triumph of Nazism. Since classical archaeology did not have the central ideological role under the Nazis that it enjoyed in Mussolini's Italy, the turf battles fought out in Berlin have less relevance here. What was important were the various intellectual and cultural debates, which ranged from the often unenlightened defense of the nineteenth-century positivistic status quo to nostalgic efforts to revive the mental world of Winckelmann and Goethe to formulations of classical archaeology that accepted and tried to use creatively, if at times perversely, the paradigms of race and culture that had long

underpinned German thought, but which Nazism brought to the fore. This complex world of intellect, ideology, and politics can best be seen in the German universities and in the activities of the German schools in Greece and Rome.

The German Archaeological Institute at Athens resumed full operations in 1920 under the brief directorship of Franz Studniczka (1860–1929).<sup>107</sup> He was succeeded by Ernest Buschor, the last student of Adolf Furtwängler. Buschor's scholarship was pivotal in defining the importance of the Archaic period for the development of Greek art. That archaeological interest found expression in the German excavations on Samos, a site key for understanding the early periods of Greek civilization.<sup>108</sup> In 1930 Georg Karo (1872–1963) took over as first secretary of the Institute until 1936, when he was forced to resign because of his Jewish parentage.<sup>109</sup>

The excavations of the German School at Athens resumed in the ancient Athens cemetery of the Kerameikos. Excavation had been started there in 1863 by the Archaeological Society of Athens and had continued for many years under the direction of the German scholar Alfred Brückner (1861–1936).<sup>110</sup> The digs had provided much topographical information and recovered considerable amounts of classical sculpture. The concession had been transferred to the Germans in 1913, but it was not until 1926 that German excavations could be undertaken on a regular basis.<sup>111</sup> The Kerameikos, with its long occupation history and complex problems of both vertical stratigraphy and horizontal extension, posed many challenges for the field archaeologist. The German field director Karl Kubler met the challenge well and provided important new insight into the development of the cemetery that is vital for an understanding of classical Athens.

The German excavations were especially focused on the formative period of Greek civilization known as the Geometric. The pioneering ceramic archaeologists of the 1870s had recognized a distinct class of Greek pots decorated with abstract patterns as occurring very early in the history of Greek ceramics.<sup>112</sup> The Kerameikos yielded an impressive series of these, including the massive Dipylon grave markers, named for their find spot near one of the major gates of the ancient city.

The Geometric pots with their ordered patterns were soon interpreted as an expression of the logical Indo-European mind, signs of the northern mentality brought into Greece by the Dorians. As early as 1870



Alexander Conze had linked the geometric patterns to primitive designs brought into Greece by the Indo-Germans.<sup>113</sup> German archaeologists in particular continued to develop this theme in spite of the increasing typological evidence linking Mycenaean to Geometric pottery and the fact that the finest examples of Geometric ceramics, such as the Dipylon style, came from Athens, a city that the ancients regarded as having been bypassed by the Dorian invasion. Needless to say, traditional Dorian invasion models were strengthened during the Nazi era.<sup>114</sup> The Nazis saw the Dorians from the north as the true heart of Greece. Stylistic analyses were complemented by physical anthropological studies of the Kerameikos burials by Emil Breitingner. Skeletal analysis was joined to stylistic analysis to Aryanize the Greeks.<sup>115</sup>

The Nazi government provided money starting in 1936 to resume the excavations at Olympia. The project was part of the propaganda buildup leading to the Berlin Olympics, and Hitler, like the kaiser before him, provided the funds from his personal accounts.<sup>116</sup> Excavations continued until 1943, when war conditions made fieldwork impossible. A principal in the new undertaking was Hans Schleif (1902–45), a classical archaeologist who had excavated with the *Ahenenerbe*, the archaeological branch of the SS in Germany, before going to Olympia. Schleif committed suicide when the imminent defeat of the Nazis became clear.<sup>117</sup>

The German Archaeological Institute in Rome enjoyed one of its great periods between the wars. Initial conditions were hardly auspicious, for its headquarters on the Capitoline, the scene of so many important events in the history of classical archaeology, had been confiscated by the Italians during the war. German scholars had been expelled from their positions in Italian universities, and even the future of the Institute's great library was in doubt. However, both German and international support was too great to let such an important institution die. Italian intellectuals led by Benedetto Croce rallied to the Institute, a new building was found, and the German Archaeological Institute came back to life.<sup>118</sup>

The Institute was fortunate to have as directors for much of the interwar period two great scholars and friends of Rome. The first was Walter Amelung (1865–1927), a student of Heinrich von Brunn. He was a wealthy bachelor who did not need to pursue the usual German academic professional path and had settled in Rome in 1895. He spent his time as an independent scholar cataloging the Vatican collection and

producing one of the most important guidebooks to the Roman museums.<sup>119</sup> Forced back to Germany at the outbreak of the war, he returned to Rome in 1921 to undertake the difficult task of reestablishing the Institute. It reopened at its new quarters in 1924 and remained the most important foreign archaeological center in Rome until the outbreak of World War II.<sup>120</sup>

Following Amelung's death, in 1928 the post of first secretary was awarded to Ludwig Curtius (1874–1954).<sup>121</sup> Curtius was a student of Furtwängler and preserved the spirit more than the strict scholarly method of his Munich master. His scholarly interests were wide-ranging, with specialties in sculpture and Roman painting. He was a humanist in the grand German tradition whose love of music can be traced back to time spent at the Furtwängler household, where his mentor's son, the great conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler, was spending his formative years. Curtius was an admirer of Goethe and helped reawaken interest in Winckelmann's views on the inspirational qualities of Greek sculpture.<sup>122</sup> He joined with other intellectuals like the writer Stefan George and the classicist Werner Jaeger in creating a new humanism based in part on the values of eighteenth-century classicism, but also reflecting deep, if not always savory, currents of German nationalism.<sup>123</sup>

A romanticizing neoclassicism and theories of racial determinism were part of a complex dialogue in interwar Germany that included traditional positivistic/historicist scholarship and efforts to find a new art historical methodology that would be both scientific and universal in its application. An example of this was the critical method favored by certain German archaeologists during the interwar years called *Strukturforschung* (structural analysis).<sup>124</sup> Through *Strukturforschung* archaeologists sought to define the underlying mental and visual structures that shaped the works of individual artists at different time periods. The approach had its roots in *Kunstwollen* (artistic volition) concepts developed by Viennese art historians like Alois Riegl in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Viennese scholars had emphasized general cultural factors that shaped both art and crafts in antiquity as a counter to the emphasis on artists and schools that had dominated much of late-nineteenth-century Germanic scholarship.

Among the most talented of the advocates of *Strukturforschung* was the young Austrian art historian Guido von Kaschnitz-Weinberg (1890–1958).<sup>125</sup> Kaschnitz-Weinberg was a rising star in the German

archaeological community of the interwar period. He was married to the highly respected poet Marie-Luise Kaschnitz and moved easily in humanistic circles, but his career continued under the Nazis. In the climate of the times such an approach as *Strukturforschung*, which in some respects anticipated structuralism, could easily take on a racist tone. In 1944 Kaschnitz-Weinberg published *Mittelmeerischen Grundlagen* (Mediterranean foundations), which was concerned among other things with *Rassenpsychologische Grundlagen* (foundations of racial psychology).<sup>126</sup> His involvement with the Nazi regime and sympathy for certain aspects of its ideology were not considered sufficiently damaging to prevent him from becoming a leader in the postwar German classical archaeological establishment, and he led the German Archaeological Institute in Rome from 1952 to 1955.

The archaeologist who in many respects best represented the hopes, failures, and tragedies of German archaeology in the interwar period was Gerhart Rodenwaldt (1886–1945).<sup>127</sup> He was a student of Carl Robert (1850–1922), the professor of classical archaeology at Halle, whose research on sarcophagi he continued.<sup>128</sup> He was a skilled administrator who served as president of the German Archaeological Institute in Berlin from 1922 to 1932, a post he left to become a professor at the Berlin University.<sup>129</sup> During his years at the Institute, he used his position to reestablish ties with scholars in other countries and renew the international community of classical archaeology. His efforts culminated in the widely attended celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the Institute.<sup>130</sup> Rodenwaldt was a distinguished art historical scholar who worked in both Greek and Roman archaeology and was selected to succeed Eugenie Sellers Strong as the author of the chapters on Roman art in the *Cambridge Ancient History*. His research on elements of “popular art” in Roman sculpture anticipated the postwar contributions of the Italian Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli.<sup>131</sup> He had a romantic, idealist vision of Greek art that rejected the “classicism” of the Roman copies and sought the spirit of the originals, preferably under “their luminous Attic sky.” For him “the best classical art demands for its appreciation an inner harmony which must be attained before one can approach it in the right spirit,” and his vision was best captured in the texts he wrote for books of photographs by the Walter Hege.<sup>132</sup>

Rodenwaldt joined with Theodor Wiegand in organizing special exhibitions on athletic sculpture in Greek art for the 1936 Olympics. At

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Gerhart Rodenwaldt, historian of Roman art and archaeology and president of the German Archaeological Institute in Berlin during the interwar period (German Archaeological Institute, Berlin)

the same time he republished the picture book on Olympia that he had prepared with the Hege.<sup>133</sup> His devotion to the classical ideal persisted to the end. On January 25, 1945, he presented to the Archaeological Institute an essay on neoclassical architecture in Berlin at a time when Allied bombers were devastating the old city.<sup>134</sup> Rodenwaldt and his wife, depressed by the loss of their son during the war and fearing what the

new regime would bring, committed suicide in 1945 just as the Soviet army was fighting its way into Berlin.

The seizure of power by the Nazis in 1933 affected German classical archaeology in a variety of ways. The Nazi ideology, with its emphasis on the German Volk, naturally favored the type of Aryan racist archaeology propounded by the prehistorian Gustaf Kossinna and used these theories to justify German conquests in Eastern Europe.<sup>135</sup> However, Hitler himself had practiced as an artist and had considerable sympathy for Hellenic aesthetic values. Albert Speer, who did much to promote yet another revival of neoclassical art at the expense of Bauhaus, records in his diary Hitler's skepticism about the archaeological claims for the German Volk made by Nazi leaders like Heinrich Himmler.<sup>136</sup>

The most immediate and dramatic result of the Nazi regime was the expulsion from academic positions of Jewish scholars, including a number of classical archaeologists. Germany's loss was America's gain as distinguished scholars like Margarete Bieber, Richard Krautheimer, and Karl Lehmann emigrated to America. Others, like Otto Brendel, migrated because they could not tolerate life and work under the tyrannical regime.<sup>137</sup> In the United States these émigrés not only revitalized the links between German and American classical archaeology that had characterized the profession in the late nineteenth century, but they provided a strong infusion of Hellenistic and Roman archaeology into a profession that had been dominated by classical Hellas.

The fate of Karl Lehmann (1894–1960) captures the uncertainties of the era.<sup>138</sup> Lehmann was a student of the Berlin archaeologist Ferdinand Noack (1865–1931) and the Hellenist Ulrich von Wilamowitz Moellendorf (1848–1931), who was interested in both Hellenistic and Roman architecture. In 1933 he had just settled into a professorship at Munster and launched an important program of research at Pompeii, when he was ousted from his Munster position both for his Jewish ancestry (although he was at the time a practicing Lutheran) and for his liberal political views. He passed two years of exile in Italy, completing his research at Pompeii, and then emigrated to the United States, taking up a professorship at the New York University Institute of Fine Arts. In 1938 he returned to the Mediterranean to start a long-term program of excavations at Samothrace.<sup>139</sup>

Margarete Bieber (1879–1978) also deserves a special mention for she had to overcome the twin obstacles of being Jewish and a female

to become a distinguished academic before the Nazis came to power.<sup>140</sup> She was one of the first women to study classical archaeology at the university level and the second woman to become an associate at the German Archaeological Institute in Rome. She had to wait until the more open days of the Weimar Republic to do her advanced study, and it was under Weimar that, in 1931, she was named professor at the University of Giessen. Expelled from her post by the Nazis, she found a new home and a successful career at Columbia University.

More complicated was the fate of the Austrian German Jewish scholar Peter Kahane (1904–74). He left Germany in 1933 for Athens, where he hoped to continue his dissertation research. However, as a Jew he found himself barred from the library of the German Archaeological Institute. The Austrian institute was more hospitable, but the Anschluss of 1938 forced him to flee once again. This time he went to Palestine, where he remained and had a distinguished career in the Israeli museum service.<sup>141</sup>

Institutions were also reorganized to reflect the new order. Complicated power struggles in the archaeological community led to changes that generally did not favor the older classical archaeology institutions or Roman studies, which were seen as being in direct competition with the glorification of “*Germania libera*.”<sup>142</sup> After the Anschluss, Austria became part of Germany, and from 1938 to 1945 the Austrian Archaeological Institute was merged with the German Institute. Hitler took special care to continue important Austrian excavations like those at the Roman center of Carnuntum.<sup>143</sup>

The Nazi era in German classical archaeology culminated with the International Congress of Classical Archaeology held in late August 1939, just as war was about to break out again in Europe. Given the realities of the time, the attendees were overwhelmingly German. Only eleven British and eight Americans were scheduled to attend, and in the end several of these did not come. (While at the Congress one of the British participants, Eric Birley, received a coded message to return to London to begin his war-related intelligence work.)<sup>144</sup> The program was on the whole conservative and apolitical, a tribute to the empirical tradition that German scholarship had created. Stress was placed on the German cultural traditions of the past, complete with performances of Handel and Schiller.

However, new myths and realities intruded. The Congress was opened

with greetings from Adolf Hitler, while Giulio Giglioli spoke about the *Mostra Augustea della romanità* and the planned *Mostra della romanità* scheduled to open on April 21, 1942. An omen for the future was Spyridon Marinatos's paper on the protection of monuments during wartime. Marinatos was present as a representative of the Antiquities Service of the Greek dictator Ioannis Metaxos, whose authoritarian regime would soon defend Greece and, ironically, Greek democratic values, against the Axis.<sup>145</sup> (When Marinatos returned to power under the colonels in the late 1960s, he purged the Antiquities Service of his political opponents.)<sup>146</sup> Walter Wrede of Athens and Siegfried Fuchs of Rome gave presentations, the latter on the German presence in early medieval Italy. Both speakers were closely allied with the Nazis and were to play an important role in German cultural politics in their respective centers during the war.

Among the other foreign schools active in Rome in the interwar period the British deserve special mention. The British School of Archaeology had been founded in the late nineteenth century and became part of a combined British School at Rome during World War I.<sup>147</sup> It always suffered from underfunding, but it also had to deal with the Italian legal restrictions on foreign excavations. The school rose above those handicaps by defining as its special areas of research topographical survey and Roman art history. The great topographer Thomas Ashby (1874–1931) concentrated on the location, mapping, and description of Roman remains in the hinterland of the city, laying the foundation for the tradition of archaeological survey that remains at the center of the school's research program today.<sup>148</sup> Eugenie Sellers Strong used her art historical talents to advocate the importance of Roman art to an Anglo-American world obsessed with classical Greece.<sup>149</sup> Strong was also a brilliant hostess, whose regular salons made the British School into one of the favored cultural gathering places in post-World War I Rome. Sadly, internal politics at the school led to the dismissal of both Ashby and Strong in 1925, and left the school a marginal force in classical archaeology until after World War II.<sup>150</sup> The same was true for the American Academy in Rome during the 1920s and the 1930s.<sup>151</sup>

Roman provincial archaeology in northwest Europe did not change significantly during the interwar period. In Germany the discipline was weakened by the Nazi interest in prehistoric archaeology, but its basic structure and emphases remained intact. While Romano-Gallic studies

were given more attention in the universities, the archaeology of Roman France was still left mainly in the hands of amateur savants. The study of Roman Britain also remained the responsibility of a small core of professionals and a large body of avocational archaeologists. Three figures from those two worlds of Romano-British archaeology between the wars deserve more notice.

When Francis Haverfield died in 1919, broken by the loss of so many promising students in the Great War, his successor as the academic doyen of Romano-British archaeology was Robin Collingwood (1889–1943), also of Oxford, but a professor of philosophy.<sup>152</sup> Collingwood's father was an antiquarian and had served as John Ruskin's secretary. For the young Collingwood, Romano-British archaeology was a secondary interest, which he pursued in part out of loyalty toward Haverfield and a desire to keep the discipline alive at Oxford. It was also a proving ground for the application of his historiographical ideas.<sup>153</sup> He was an interpreter more than an excavator, who saw the study of Roman Britain as "a sort of live laboratory," which, in his own words, was "necessary for the advancement of my philosophical work."<sup>154</sup> As a philosopher of history he argued for the need to move beyond digging sites because they were there to a Baconian approach, in which excavations aimed at resolving problems that had been articulated in advance and archaeologists tried to get into the "minds" of people in the past. Collingwood's vision of the proper conceptual preparation for archaeology has led to a revival of interest in his work among post-processualists like Ian Hodder.<sup>155</sup>

British archaeology had never been as divided as it was in Germany by conflicts between prehistoric and Roman archaeology. Indeed, pioneers like Pitt-Rivers moved readily between the two time periods. The fruitful potential of such links were also seen during those years in the archaeological research of Mortimer Wheeler.<sup>156</sup> Wheeler (1890–1976) had received most of his formal archaeological education at the University of London from Ernest Gardner, a formalist student of Greek art. However, he was drawn to fieldwork and sought to revive the rigorous methodology practiced by Pitt-Rivers in the middle years of the nineteenth century. After World War I he started a series of excavations at Iron Age and Romano-British sites in England and Wales that were to establish his reputation as the finest field archaeologist of his generation. The sites that best represented Wheeler's fieldwork in the immediate prewar period were the Roman city of Verulamium and the Iron Age



[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Aerial photograph of the Iron Age hill fort of Maiden Castle in southwest England. Mortimer Wheeler developed his new, more “scientific” excavation techniques on the site. (Society of Antiquaries of London)

hill fort of Maiden Castle.<sup>157</sup> At those sites he developed the so-called Wheeler method of site work, which stresses careful excavation and the use of rigid grid systems to facilitate full and accurate recording. The Wheeler grid method dominated the best field archaeology until open-area archaeology became popular in the 1970s. Wheeler’s 1954 *Archaeology from the Earth* summarized the results of his work and captured the spirit of his career as a field archaeologist. Wheeler was a forceful personality who was not shy about castigating what he saw as the sloppy archaeology of his colleagues, especially those working in the Mediterranean and the Near East. His vision of a broader, interdisciplinary archaeology was realized in his Institute of Archaeology, which was founded at the University of London in 1934.

The third important British figure is Frank Gerald Simpson (1882–1955), who bridged the worlds of the amateur and professional in the still-unformed discipline of Romano-British archaeology. He came from a well-to-do family in the north of England and could devote his life to archaeology without worrying about making a living. Simpson learned ar-

chaeology not in the classroom but in that great teaching lab of Romano-British archaeology, Hadrian's Wall. He established a reputation as a superb field technician, and for many years was the director of field studies at the University of Durham. He played an important role in developing a more scientific approach to Romano-British archaeology.<sup>158</sup>

Some of the most lavish and important archaeological research during this interwar period took place in territories that came under the control of the colonial powers after World War I. The major attraction of these mandate territories was the fact that a portion of the objects excavated could be exported to the institutions that sponsored the excavations. This appealed especially to American museums, which still had limited collections of ancient art and large purses. The 1920s through the 1930s was the greatest period of American museum archaeology in the Mediterranean, focusing particularly on Egypt and Syria.

Two American excavations were launched in French-controlled Syria. The first started at ancient Antioch in 1932 and continued until 1939. It was sponsored by Princeton University and a consortium of French and American museums.<sup>159</sup> Antioch had been one of the largest and wealthiest cities of the Hellenistic and Roman worlds, but unlike comparable cities such as Alexandria and Rome, it did not have a history of continuous occupation. The site had long been abandoned, and the archaeologists hoped that the remains of the Classical period would be largely intact. It was anticipated that the Antioch site would enable archaeologists to study one of the major planned cities founded in the wake of Alexander the Great's conquests.

Those hopes were not fulfilled, for the ruins lay too deeply buried by the silts of the Orontes River for systematic exploration. However, sites on the urban fringe, especially in rich suburbs like Daphnae, were accessible. They yielded numerous elite residences with an impressive collection of mosaics that documented the changing visual culture of the Roman East from the early empire to late antiquity.<sup>160</sup> These mosaics were lifted and now grace the collections of several American museums.

More successful were the excavations at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates.<sup>161</sup> The site had been discovered by British soldiers just after World War I. The French started excavations in 1922 under the distinguished scholar of ancient religions Franz Cumont (1868–1947) and were joined by American archaeologists from Yale University in 1928.<sup>162</sup>

Digging continued until 1938. The city had been founded by the Seleucids and had experienced Parthian and Roman periods of occupation. The Russian émigré ancient historian Michael Rostovtzeff (1870–1952), who had a broader and more complex vision of the ancient world than almost any of his contemporaries, recognized the importance of the site not only for its superb preservation but also for the insight it provided into the interaction of cultures on the eastern frontiers of the Roman Empire.<sup>163</sup> That preservation was due both to the dry desert environment, which allowed the recovery of textiles, leather, and papyri, and to the fact that the city had been permanently abandoned after a short Sassanian Persian siege. Rostovtzeff called it the “Pompeii of the East.”

The excavations produced impressive material on the multicultural world of the Roman East.<sup>164</sup> Among the most important finds were the remains of a synagogue with painted biblical scenes and an early Christian baptistery. Papyri found there provided detailed insight into military and civilian life in that garrison town. The excavation itself was performed in the standard Middle Eastern manner that Mortimer Wheeler castigated. Large work crews were employed, little attention was paid to stratigraphy, and key material like ceramics was rarely collected and poorly studied. Like Antioch, Dura-Europos was an excavation where key finds were exported, in this case to the Yale University Art Gallery. The outbreak of the war ended the American excavations. Rostovtzeff’s health broke down, the field directors scattered, and few of the results of the excavation were ever published.

In fact, the outbreak of war ended most archaeological activities in Europe and the Mediterranean. The archaeologists headed home, often to join the military or aid their governments in other ways. But even as the bombs fell and armies marched back and forth across Europe and the Mediterranean, some members of the archaeological community tried to maintain the visions and values of a world that was being destroyed both physically and morally. Almost pathetic was the meeting Carl Weickert organized of the Archaeology Society that was held on June 8, 1943, to celebrate the memory of Friedrich Hölderlin and Johann Winckelmann, two of the founding spirits of German classicism, on the centenary and the 175th anniversary, respectively, of their deaths.<sup>165</sup>

A few archaeologists remained in Italy and Greece to do clandestine intelligence work or aid partisans. The British Minoan archaeologist John Pendlebury (1904–41) was captured by the Germans on Crete

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The ancient historian Michael Rostovtzeff of Yale University (center) at Dura-Europos, 1934. The paintings from the Dura synagogue are visible in the background. (Yale University Art Gallery)

and shot.<sup>166</sup> Other British archaeologists, such as Nicholas Hammond (1907–2001), John Cook (1910–94), and V. R. D. Desborough (1914–78), were sent to northern Greece to coordinate resistance to the Germans.<sup>167</sup> The war, of course, took its hecatomb of young archaeologists who might have had long and brilliant careers, people like the American Erling Olsen, who fell in Normandy; the German Walter Technau, who died on the Russian front; and the Frenchman Michel Feyel, who perished in a German prison camp.<sup>168</sup> Civilians were not spared either. Martin Schede (1883–1947), who in 1938 had become president of the German Archaeological Institute, died in Russian captivity.<sup>169</sup>

Archaeological activities did not entirely stop during the war. The Italians continued excavations in their North African colonies, even as the battle lines moved through Libya and Tripolitania.<sup>170</sup> Greece was occupied by German forces in 1941. The Athens section of the German Archaeological Institute already had a long history of sympathy for the Nazi regime. Georg Karo, though of Jewish parentage, early lent his

support to the regime and enthusiastically greeted the prospects of renewed excavations at Olympia.<sup>171</sup> When Karo was forced out for racial reasons, he was succeeded as first secretary by his deputy Walter Wrede, an enthusiastic Nazi. It was Wrede who warmly welcomed the conquering German army to Athens in April 1941 and gave Field Marshall von Brauchitsch and his staff a special tour of the Acropolis dressed in full Nazi uniform.<sup>172</sup> Another archaeologist, Erich Boehringer (1897–1971), was the German cultural attaché in Greece from 1940 to 1943.<sup>173</sup> He was a follower of the poet Stefan George and had been strongly influenced by George's elitist Hellenic enthusiasm.<sup>174</sup> Some of the German archaeologists urged that a less oppressive policy be followed in occupied Greece, partly out of Hellenic sentiment and partly because they argued that the Greeks represented "the only people of non-Slavic stock able to fulfill the European mission against the Slavs."<sup>175</sup>

The German Archaeological Institute in Athens under Wrede and Karl Kubler continued to operate during the war, although it had to engage in power struggles with the more ideologically driven Service Rosenberg, which established an archaeological Sonderkommando Griechenland in the country.<sup>176</sup> Work at the Kerameikos and at remote Olympia continued. One of the most ideologically committed of the German archaeologists was Otto Von Vacano (1910–97), who conducted excavations at the "Dorian" (by which he meant Aryan) site of Sparta.<sup>177</sup> The Italians, who shared power in Greece with the Germans, also continued their archaeological projects: Luciano Laurenzi of the Italian School worked at the Roman Agora in Athens. Even Roland Martin of the French School was able to continue excavating on the Acropolis.<sup>178</sup>

In Rome the situation was much more complicated, since the fascists retained power in the city until late 1943, and some Italian archaeological activity continued during the early years of the war. The German Archaeological Institute operated under the direction of Armin von Gerkan (1884–1969), a distinguished architectural historian who spent much of his career in the administration of the German Institutes in Rome and Athens.<sup>179</sup> Von Gerkan went to Rome as second secretary in 1924, then was appointed first secretary in Athens in 1936 as successor to Karo. But he was soon replaced by Wrede, who used his connections with Goebbels to obtain the position. When Ludwig Curtius resigned as first secretary in Rome because of his unwillingness to work any longer with the Nazis, von Gerkan replaced him.<sup>180</sup> He remained in the

directorship until the coming of the war to the Italian mainland forced the closing of the Institute. One of his tasks during his tenure was to prepare archaeological guides for distribution to German soldiers fighting in North Africa.<sup>181</sup>

In 1938 anti-Semitic laws had been passed in Italy that removed a number of important classical archaeologists from their positions. The most important of those was Alessandro della Seta (1879–1944), for many years the director of the Italian School in Athens.<sup>182</sup> Della Seta was a wide-ranging and highly respected archaeologist, whose research focused on stylistic analysis of classical art. His early years at the Villa Giulia had also stimulated an interest in the Etruscans, and at the Athens School he sponsored work on the island of Lesbos that was inspired by its Etruscan origins. These studies led, largely by chance, to important prehistoric excavations at Poliochini (1931–36), where della Seta trained some of the best younger Italian prehistorians, including the Sicilian specialist Luigi Bernabo Brea (1910–99).<sup>183</sup> Della Seta was also a strong nationalist and imperialist who had easily accepted fascism and had done well under the regime.<sup>184</sup> However, he was forced out after 1938 and died in obscurity during the war. Other Jewish archaeologists, like Doro Levi (1898–1991), a rising scholar who worked in both Minoan and Etruscan archaeology, fled to the United States.<sup>185</sup>

The situation for the Italian Jews became really dangerous when the fascist government collapsed in 1943, and the Germans occupied Rome. The tragedy of the new situation is captured well in the history of the young Italian Jewish epigrapher Mario Segre.<sup>186</sup> Segre had established a promising reputation for himself as a scholar in spite of the anti-Semitic restrictions and was hoping to escape to an academic post in America. But in order to increase the number of his publications he needed the resources of the library of the German Archaeological Institute. The library was barred to Jews, but von Gerkan appears to have been flexible in his enforcement of the policy. Others, more sympathetic to the Nazi racial policy, were not so decent. One scholar, probably the hard-line Italian fascist Giulio Jacopi, threatened to denounce von Gerkan to the German authorities if Segre continued to be admitted to the library. In that threat he was supported by the Institute's second secretary, Siegfried Fuchs, who was also an SS official.<sup>187</sup> Segre was barred. His inability to advance his scholarly research and publication ruined his chance to find an American position. He took refuge in the Swedish Institute, a

protected neutral oasis. In a rare foray outside of those protected walls to enjoy the Villa Borghese gardens, he was seized, and he and his family perished in the concentration camps.<sup>188</sup>

Siegfried Fuchs is, like Wrede, a good example of the “conveniently forgotten” among the German classical archaeologists of the war period.<sup>189</sup> He was involved with the Nazi Party from his student days, and his rise to the position of second director of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome certainly was owing to his standing with the party and later with the SS. It also helped that his archaeological interests focused on “Indo-Germanic” influences in both Greece and Rome and on the early medieval migration period in Italy. During the early years of the war he was able to carry out research at various Gothic and Longobard sites in Italy. He was arrested at the end of the war but then freed and returned to Germany. Little was said or known about him after the war.

French archaeology benefited in odd ways from that country’s military debacle at the start of the war. The distinguished ancient historian Jérôme Carcopino agreed to serve as education minister under the Vichy regime.<sup>190</sup> Carcopino had twice been director of the French School in Rome, and through that association he had been involved with the archaeology of French North Africa. He came to appreciate the efficiency of the Antiquities Service operating there, something sorely lacking in prewar France. In 1941 the French government enacted the *loi Carcopino*, which put in place a system of regional amateur archaeological inspectors. The professionalization of Romano-Gallic archaeology was further advanced when in 1942 Albert Grenier founded the journal *Gallia*, a national review of Roman archaeology in France, designed to complement the many regional and local journals.<sup>191</sup> However, the resources of the regional inspectors were limited, and they were expected to work closely with the amateur savants, who remained a major force in French archaeology. The continued importance of the savants is demonstrated by the fact that the only classical “training dig” in France in the 1940s, conducted at Glanum (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence), was under the direction of an amateur antiquarian, Henri Rolland (1886–1970).<sup>192</sup>

The war did not spare the archaeological sites and monuments. Pompeii and Rome were both hit, and historic cities in Britain and Germany were heavily damaged. The initial fighting in North Africa, with its rapid changes in control, produced looting and destruction at archaeological sites for which both sides were responsible.<sup>193</sup> But increasing efforts were

made by all parties to save the artistic and archaeological patrimony. Special military and civilian units recruited archaeologists and art historians to the cause.<sup>194</sup> As the Allies moved across North Africa, the major sites like Leptis and Sabratha passed with relatively little damage from Italian to British and American hands. The transition was due in part to the vigorous, if at times improvised, efforts of Mortimer Wheeler, who was by that time an officer in the British army.<sup>195</sup> Mobile archaeological units attempted salvage work at threatened sites. The excavation of the Italian chalcolithic cemetery at Gaudo near Salerno, which was unearthed during the construction of an airfield, was a good example of the attention paid to such sites. One of Wheeler's chief assistants in this archaeological rescue work was a young excavator named John Ward-Perkins, who was to become one of the most innovative and energetic archaeologists of the postwar period.



## CHAPTER 7

# After World War II: Capitalism, Corporatism, and Marxism

**I**n May 1945 the war in Europe came to an end. Once more the continent had been ravaged, and the European powers bled dry. Germany, the country that between the wars had been the greatest center for classical archaeology, was not only devastated but discredited by the crimes of the Nazis. In Italy the regime that had used classical archaeology for self-promotion was defeated and disgraced. France had been occupied and demoralized, only restored to freedom by Anglo-American forces. For England, the war had been a Pyrrhic victory. All but bankrupt, the country could play only a limited role in postwar archaeology.

The two principal victors, the Soviet Union and the United States, looked very differently at the classical past. Though their land had had only limited contact with the Greco-Roman world through the Black Sea, the Russians had long been interested in classical archaeology, an expression of Russia's desire to identify with Western European culture.<sup>1</sup> Those interests diminished markedly under the communist state, in which antiquity was studied mainly as a precapitalist social system that relied on the slave mode of production. Moreover, the Soviet Union had suffered more war damage than any other country and had to devote all its energies to reconstruction and securing a position of dominance in the postwar world.

The situation in the United States was different. In spite of considerable loss of life and material, America had come through the war relatively unscathed. Its economy was strong, and its spirit high. Moreover, the country saw itself as the bastion of freedom and democracy, fighting first against the Axis powers and then the communists. Since freedom and democracy had their roots in the classical, especially the Greek, world, there was a revival of interest in the classics in the post-

war universities, fueled both by the massive influx of students through such programs as the G.I. Bill and by the enormous outpouring of philanthropy directed at university programs. America soon became the dominant archaeological power.

Another movement that gradually developed momentum in the years after the war was decolonization, and this was to have a significant, if little discussed, impact on classical archaeology. The colonial powers might have thought they would return to the prewar status quo, but the world had changed. Mandate territories like Syria were the first to gain independence, and with that independence came the end of European and American archaeological administrators there. Excavations from which foreign expeditions could bring home significant quantities of their finds also stopped. This change especially affected the American museum world.

Gradually decolonization spread across North Africa. After a confused period, the former Italian territories were in 1953 turned into a pro-Western monarchy, which allowed some British and American excavations.<sup>2</sup> Then Muammar Qaddafi established an Islamic state in Libya in 1969 that was hostile to the West in general and to America in particular. For a long time it was almost impossible for Westerners to excavate there. Only with the turn of the millennium has that situation begun to change.

The French reasserted control over their colonial territories in North Africa and soon began a vigorous program of excavation, restoration, and museum building at sites like Hippo and Thebesa. Slight changes in archaeological rhetoric could be detected as the French faced the growing reality of discontent among the colonists. Albert Grenier, speaking of the archaeological work at Roman Tiddis at the border of the Berber country, could emphasize that “the two civilizations live together in an entirely typical way, like a concrete symbol of the powerful yet intelligent politics of Rome in Africa,”<sup>3</sup> but the core policy of treating Roman archaeology as an instrument of French colonial policy had changed little, and indeed the French archaeological administration in Algeria was expanded and strengthened. Resistance within the colony intensified, however, and after a bloody civil war, Algeria became independent in 1962. Morocco and Tunisia also became independent nations. Not only were these countries freed from colonial control, but their governments were now Islamic, with different historical emphases in which

the cultures of Greece and Rome were no longer central.<sup>4</sup> Twenty years were to pass before classical archaeologists returned in force.

One pressing need in the aftermath of the war was for the Axis powers and those that had collaborated with them to come to grips with their past and deal with officials, including archaeologists, who had been associated with the now discredited regimes. Passions ran high for justice and revenge, but there was also an appreciation of the need for administrative continuity and for putting the past behind, especially as Western Europe and America squared off against the Soviet Union.

The situation in Italy was especially complicated. The fascist regime had been in power since 1922, and almost everyone in the archaeological service and the universities had at least nominal fascist associations. Even those who had not been enthusiastic fascists tended to be politically and intellectually conservative. After a routine investigation of their fascist pasts, most classical archaeologists were restored to their old posts in the antiquities administration or as editors of journals. The roster of Italian classical archaeologists in 1950 reads like a continuation of that of 1940.<sup>5</sup> Most had learned to avoid mixing politics and archaeology. In the postwar world, the emphasis of Italian archaeology was on technical studies that carried no ideological baggage.

Certain key personnel in the regime were picked out for more thorough investigation. Giulio Giglioli had been the most prominent figure in fascist archaeology, although by all accounts a decent person. Giglioli was interned briefly, but ultimately resumed his professorship at the University of Rome.<sup>6</sup> Giulio Jacopi represented a different case, for not only was he an enthusiastic fascist, but he had been associated with some nasty political activities against such professional opponents as Mario Segre. He had the effrontery to petition the Allied administration for an appointment at the University of Bologna. But Amadeo Maiuri, whom he had succeeded in Rhodes, refused to write a recommendation for him, and he did not get that or any other university post. Nonetheless, he remained in the state archaeological service, rising to the position of superintendent.<sup>7</sup>

One of the most complex and interesting of the postwar fascist archaeologists was Nino Lamboglia (1912–77).<sup>8</sup> Lamboglia came from the northwest of Italy near the French border, and he was enthusiastic when the Italians annexed the area around Nice at the start of World War II. His attitudes changed little after the war. As late as 1963 he was

advocating a program of Italian excavation in Spain. In part the idea was inspired by the desire to expose Italian archaeologists to the better field methods of Roman provincial archaeology. But he also wanted to promote a “Roman” archaeology unsullied by contacts with the Greek East in the one fascist country left in Europe.<sup>9</sup>

Lamboglia was destined to spend his career in relative isolation at his Istituto di studi Liguri at Ventimiglia next to the French border. But he proved to be an innovative field archaeologist, ahead of most Italians of his generation. He conducted pioneering stratigraphic excavations at Roman sites in the Ventimiglia area, characterized not only by meticulous methodology but also by attention to much-neglected material like Roman utilitarian pottery. He also early realized the potential of underwater archaeology and was the Italian pioneer in that field. Largely neglected during most of his career, the fascist Lamboglia became something of an archaeological hero to the rebel Marxist archaeologists of the 1970s.<sup>10</sup>

While political power in postwar Italy remained in the hands of conservatives, the intellectual dynamic was on the left. The communists had dominated the resistance, and the Italian Communist Party continued that legacy, attracting many young intellectuals. The hierarchy was loyal to the Soviet Union, but the party’s ideology was strongly influenced by the writings of Antonio Gramsci, a young communist intellectual who had perished at the hands of the fascists. Gramsci stressed the importance of controlling cultural as well as economic forces, an ideology that appealed to the Italian cultural community.

The most important Italian Marxist classical archaeologist was Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli (1900–1975), a member of the Sienese nobility who had not been active politically before the war. Indeed, he was considered sufficiently “safe” ideologically to serve as Hitler’s cultural guide when he visited Rome. He was intellectually a disciple of Benedetto Croce and embraced Croce’s idealistic approach to art, which stressed the creative contribution of individual artists.<sup>11</sup> During the war he joined the communists, and his intellectual orientation became increasingly Gramscian Marxist. The influence of that approach can best be seen in his work on what he called *arte plebea* (proletarian art): the visual productions of the lower social and economic classes.<sup>12</sup> Bianchi Bandinelli became one of the cultural advocates of the party at a time when the leadership was embracing intellectual social involvement. From 1957 to 1970 he directed the influential Istituto Gramsci, the center of much

of the debate and discussion about applying Marxism to the study of antiquity.<sup>13</sup> While Bianchi Bandinelli was never popular with his fellow professors of classical archaeology, he was a dynamic teacher and drew to himself a cadre of young students who reshaped Italian archaeology from the 1970s onward.<sup>14</sup>

Germany faced similar dilemmas concerning its archaeological personnel and was equally ambivalent about dealing with them. The Nazi racial laws had forced most Jewish and many non-Jewish scholars into exile, mostly to America. Although the Nazis, unlike the fascists, were not in power long enough to create their own generation of regime archaeologists, the German classical archaeological establishment was conservative and compliant enough to fit their ideological agenda. As in Italy, most of the archaeologists returned to positions of power and influence after the war.<sup>15</sup> Also as in Italy, these archaeologists learned to avoid politics and pursue “safe scholarship.” The discipline remained fairly static until the 1960s, when the older generation was replaced and student rebellions sparked some change.<sup>16</sup>

The national and international scholarly infrastructure also had to be restored, even if some of the institutions had been tainted. The situation in Germany was especially complicated. The bombing and urban warfare had destroyed many cultural centers. While most of the collections had been removed to safety, the museums and libraries themselves had often been damaged or destroyed. In addition, the country had been divided by the victorious powers and a Soviet puppet regime installed in East Germany. The division also affected cultural resources. The Russians and East Germans, for instance, controlled the Berlin collections, including the Pergamon marbles.

Restoration was slow and often accompanied by ideological disputes. The Munich Glyptothek provides a good example of the kinds of problems faced in these years. The collection was intact, but the building badly damaged. Debates arose over whether the building should be restored to its original state, with its splendid neorococo decorations, or rebuilt in a more stark manner that reflected modernist sensibilities and the desire to highlight the original sculptures. The latter mode was selected.<sup>17</sup> At the same time, as we have seen, the decision was made to remove the Thorvaldsen restorations from the Aegina marbles, and they now were displayed in their battered purity and simplicity.

In Rome the institutes of the ultimately victorious powers had been

under the protection of neutrals like Sweden and Switzerland, and they were restored to activity relatively quickly and without major problems. Not so simple was the disposition of the German facilities. The fate of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome and the Art Historical Institute (the *Herziana*) and their splendid libraries created major conflict. In the last days of the war the Institute's library had been packed up by direct orders of Hitler and shipped back to Germany and Austria. Now it was to be returned to Italy, but some administrators proposed that it be incorporated into the Italian Archaeological Institute. Concern for the fate of this splendid collection produced some of the first cooperative scholarly efforts in postwar Rome. The International Association of Classical Archaeology (FIAC) was formed, made up of representatives from the foreign schools and led by the new British School director John Ward-Perkins, to protect the library as an independent entity. Incipient Cold War politics led the Americans to throw their key support for the restitution of the library to the Germans. The library was eventually restored to the German Archaeological Institute when it reopened.<sup>18</sup>

Central to postwar classical archaeological work in the United States was Greece. Americans had a tradition of philohellenism stretching back to the early days of the nineteenth century. In addition, Greece's heroic resistance during the war, first to the Italians and then the Germans, had inspired admiration, evoking comparisons to the spirit of ancient Hellas, while the suffering the civilian population endured during and immediately after the war aroused great sympathy. Finally, the outbreak of civil war between the Anglo-American-installed government and its communist-supported opponents fed the anxieties of Americans in the early years of the Cold War. Britain's collapsing economy and its commitments elsewhere forced it to withdraw as the principal Allied supporter of Greece. The Americans stepped into the breach to provide economic aid and military support in the civil war. This turmoil affected the American School of Classical Studies, which had never been totally removed from Greek politics, and which now stood as a symbol of American humanistic culture.

The ASCSA reopened as soon as possible after the war to provide a base for American scholarly operations. The excavations in the Athenian Agora, the most visible American archaeological project in Greece, and the one most closely associated with Greek and American democracy, were resumed.<sup>19</sup> Homer Thompson (1906–2000), a Canadian on the faculty

of the University of Toronto, was appointed the new director of the excavations, replacing Theodore Leslie Shear, who had died during the war.<sup>20</sup> Thompson remained director until 1967. Not only did the reopening of the Agora excavations provide American visibility during key moments during the civil war, it also gave much-needed economic assistance to the local population.

During the late 1940s and the 1950s the Agora excavations moved relentlessly onward, turning a large portion of the central city into an archaeological zone. The massive effort culminated in 1957 with the opening of the restored Stoa of Attalos as a museum and research center. The Stoa of Attalos had been built in the middle of the second century B.C. as a gesture of philhellenism on the part of a minor Hellenistic despot, and after the ruins had been cleared the decision was made to reconstruct the building.<sup>21</sup> John Travlos, the Agora architect, oversaw the design and construction. Even though only about 5 percent of the building survived, the restorers were able to reproduce the original design to make the reconstruction as accurate as possible. Some scholars have criticized the juxtaposition of Athenian ruins with a largely modern reproduction. Others have commented on the irony of an American democracy restoring the gift of a monarch, especially after the Americans supported the dictatorship of the colonels that was installed by coup in 1967. But the Stoa serves an important research and tourist function and is a visual anchor in the dusty plain of the Agora.

The permanent and semipermanent staff of the Agora excavations expanded, and the best-connected American graduate students passed through the ASCSA and received their formative archaeological training at the Agora. The annual reports in *Hesperia* and the growing series of final site reports testified to the care that the excavators took in recovering an impressive range of evidence and their diligence in bringing that research to publication. An appealing series of more popular publications made the results of Agora research accessible to a wider public.

The Agora alone could not satisfy the expanding ambitions of American classical archaeologists, however. By 1960 much of the area had been cleared, and even the ASCSA began looking for other projects. In 1960 the school resumed work at Corinth. By this time most of the traditional graduate departments had established their own excavations, and newer programs sought to emulate them.<sup>22</sup> Carl Blegen at the University of Cincinnati continued his Bronze Age researches at Pylos. Oscar Broneer

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The Athenian Agora excavations in 1959. A major new feature is the Stoa of Attalos, restored in the 1950s to serve as museum and excavation laboratory. (American School of Classical Studies at Athens—Agora Excavations)

of the University of Chicago started work at Corinth's Isthmian sanctuary of Poseidon, while Robert Scranton, also of Chicago, excavated the Corinthian port of Kenchreae.<sup>23</sup> Archaeologists from New York University returned to Samothrace, while teams from Indiana University excavated at Halieis and then at Franchthi Cave. Each new director of the ASCSA would focus on a new site, where excavations might continue after he stepped down.

Work in Greece was still limited by a policy that allowed only four permits to an individual country, though by this time the diplomatic clout of the United States could facilitate a broad definition of an individual permit, as it did at Corinth and its adjacent territories. As an archaeological alternative Turkey beckoned. It had splendid, important classical sites and a tradition of American excavation that went back to the nineteenth century, while its excavation costs were even lower than those of Greece. The pioneering postwar project in Turkey centered on the Phrygian-classical site of Gordion, the home of the legendary King Minos. It was sponsored by the University Museum of the University



of Pennsylvania, probably the most dynamic American archaeological institution in the years immediately following World War II. Froelich Rainey, the museum director, emphasized excavation and the application of new technologies to a variety of projects. He himself was closely involved in the pioneering use of remote sensing to the search for the South Italian Greek city of Sybaris.<sup>24</sup>

The field director of the project for the Gordion excavation was Rodney Young (1907–74). He was an Agora veteran and, ironically considering the innovations of the University Museum, a conservative classical archaeologist. His excavations focused on the Phrygian period, especially the tombs of the Phrygian dynasts, for which the University Museum employed some of its latest technology.<sup>25</sup>

Harvard, the oldest and richest of the American universities, though without much of a classical archaeological field tradition, had to join this rivalry. The professor of classical archaeology at Harvard was George Hanfmann (1911–86), a distinguished German refugee but not a field person.<sup>26</sup> Among his interests were the origins of the Etruscans and the contacts between the Greeks and contemporary Near Eastern societies. These led him to Lydia, in southwest Turkey, in particular Sardis, where the American Howard Crosby Butler (1872–1922) had excavated just before World War I.<sup>27</sup> Digging started in 1958.<sup>28</sup> Harvard settled in for the long haul, joined by archaeologists from Cornell University. Elaborate field facilities were constructed, and the Sardis staff began a long-term operation that combined the field methodology of the Agora excavations with genteel archaeological traditions of the nineteenth century.

The Harvard-Cornell archaeologists soon discovered that the Sardis they were destined to investigate was a Roman-Byzantine city. The Lydian levels were buried deep below the later fill, though some Lydian remains were uncovered. Important architectural structures of the Roman and early Byzantine period were excavated, and Sardis became one of the first sites where physical reconstruction of major buildings became part of the excavation strategy. Reconstructive efforts focused on the gymnasium complex, which included one of the earliest synagogues in the Mediterranean world.<sup>29</sup>

The dominance of the “big digs” did little to improve the role of women in American classical archaeology. Modeled in many respects on American corporations, these digs were male-dominated enterprises in which women were largely relegated to secretarial, conservation, and

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The reconstructed facade of the bath-gymnasium complex at Sardis. Such reconstructions to enhance the tourist appeal of archaeological sites are becoming an increasingly important aspect of postexcavation research. (Photo courtesy of the author.)

specialized study positions. The only American woman directing field-work in the Mediterranean was Machteld Mellink, and her sites were not strictly classical. More representative was Virginia Grace (1901–94), who for decades lived in Athens and carried out specialized amphora studies for the Agora excavations.<sup>30</sup> Her knowledge and control of key material gave her a certain power in the profession, but it was a limited one.

The record on women in all areas of classical archaeology in both Europe and America was mixed. There were significant breakthroughs—for example, in 1951 Jocelyn Toynbee was appointed Laurence Professor of Classical Archaeology at Cambridge, the first woman to hold a post in classical archaeology in England.<sup>31</sup> Toynbee (1897–1985) had studied with Percy Gardner at Oxford, but her real mentor and role model was Eugenie Sellers Strong. The two shared an interest in the then-unfashionable topic of Roman art, and both were devout Roman Catholics. In her research Toynbee ranged from Roman Britain to the Tomb of St. Peter. While sympathetic to the goals of field archaeology, she specialized in art history, a branch of the discipline in which women could find more scope.

The same year Toynbee became a professor at Cambridge, Luisa Banti (1894–1978) became professor of Etruscan studies and archaeology at the University of Florence.<sup>32</sup> Italy had offered opportunities for advanced education for women much later than Britain or the United States, but Banti managed to study with archaeologists like Luigi Pareti and Luigi Pernier. Her early years in the field were difficult, but she distinguished herself in both Etruscan and Minoan studies and became involved in fieldwork on Crete. Only after World War II could she find permanent academic positions, yet by the time of her death she was recognized as one of the most important Italian archaeologists of her generation.

In Greece the comparable example was Semni Papaspyridi Karouzou (1898–1994). She came from an educated family that encouraged her interests in archaeology. She was a student of the Mycenaean archaeologist Christos Tsountas (1857–1934) at the University of Athens, where she also met her husband, the archaeologist Christos Karouzos (1900–1967). She entered the museum branch of the antiquities service, an area that offered more possibilities for women, and won the respect of scholars like Buschor, Beazley, and Karo. During the war she and her husband were the only Greek archaeologists to resign from the German Archaeological Institute. When the colonels seized power and Spyridon Marinatos became head of the antiquities service, she became *persona non grata*, was barred from the National Museum, and was even forced into exile for a while.<sup>33</sup>

Women such as Toynbee, Banti, and Karouzou remained the exceptions. Not only were almost all the major excavations run by men, but men held almost all the professorships as well. Key graduate programs like the one at Princeton were long reluctant to admit women. The American School of Classical Studies had a number of women working in the library and the laboratories, but it has never had a female director. The attitude from the late 1940s through the early 1960s was that women should marry, have children, and pursue careers on the side. Those who did not follow that path usually were consigned to the women's colleges or second-level co-educational colleges and universities. Bryn Mawr College was again exceptional in having two women, Machteld Mellink and Brunhilde Ridgway, running their graduate archaeology program.

The massive change that occurred in American big dig archaeology in the decades after the war was that it no longer received the support of

the art museums. The ending of the colonial mandates meant that field archaeology would not yield objects that could be brought back to the United States; for the most part, therefore, the museums pulled out of field archaeology. Established art museums like the Metropolitan did remain dynamic and ambitious places for museum archaeologists, and new museums like the Getty in Malibu, California, also offered exciting jobs for archaeologists. All the museums desired to expand their collections, and many had the money for significant purchases. Once again they turned to antiquities markets, which were happy to meet their needs.

The sources for this burgeoning market were familiar. Once again the social and economic disruptions in Europe forced families to break up their collections and offer them for sale. This “legitimate” material was welcome, but it was not enough to fill the museums. Here the illegal market came into play. Increased urban and rural development in the Mediterranean led to the chance discovery of many antiquities suitable for museum display. The prices paid for these finds stimulated a more systematic search for objects. The network of clandestine excavators, facilitators, exporters, experts, restorers, and even forgers came to exceed anything that had existed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Wolfgang Helbig even returned in the person of Robert Hecht, an American who learned archaeology at the American Academy excavations at Cosa, then settled in Europe to deal in antiquities.<sup>34</sup> By 1990 it was estimated that 80 percent of all antiquities on the market had been excavated and exported illegally according to the laws of the host countries.<sup>35</sup>

Some of the American players were familiar, others new. The Boston Museum of Fine Arts no longer had the financial resources to compete with the richest museums, but its classical curator, Cornelius Vermeule, was one of the most knowledgeable, clever, and cynical museum collectors around. Preeminent among the established museums was the Metropolitan, whose curator of Greek and Roman art, Dietrich Von Bothmer, continued the tradition of Gisela Richter, taking a special interest in expanding the Met’s already impressive collection of Attic vases. The most flamboyant new player was the Getty Museum, whose vast endowment allowed it to outbid all but the richest museums. The Getty was looking to fill its proposed new building, which would resemble a Roman villa. The museum’s main curator-agent was Jiri Freil, a Czech art historian who had started out at the Met. He had superb connections

in the shadow world of antiquities dealing in Europe and could arrange the types of acquisitions the Getty needed.<sup>36</sup>

The expanding world of museum classical art purchases was complemented by a growth in private collecting. That community was highly diverse. Many made small purchases out of interest or because antiquities had appeared in some interior decoration featured in *Architectural Digest*. Others collected in a big way, sometimes for investment but often out of love of art and antiquity. These collectors, often well educated and philanthropic, were naturally cultivated by the museums, which placed them on their boards and hoped to receive either their financial support or donations from their collections.

This frenzied museum acquisition circus peaked in 1972, when The Metropolitan Museum of Art announced that it had paid a million dollars for a late-sixth-century B.C. Athenian krater painted by Euphronios.<sup>37</sup> The vessel was beautiful, but what garnered the publicity was the price. Curiosity was piqued about its origins. The Met claimed that the ultimate source was a box of potsherds in an attic in Beirut. Others were skeptical, especially when Italian antiquities authorities claimed that the pot had actually been excavated at an Etruscan site north of Rome. The Italians were not able to document their case sufficiently to force the Met to return the krater. However, the controversy connected with the “million dollar pot” did focus attention on the antiquities trade and the need for professional archaeologists to respond to its abuses. Before examining the changes made in the trade, a few words are needed about the post–World War II world of fakes.

Another quality that this new postwar market shared with that of Helbig was the intermingling of genuine objects of dubious provenance, Roman copies posing as Greek works, and downright fakes. The eye of the connoisseur had now been reinforced by machines of the scientific laboratory. Materials analysis and physical-chemical dating sometimes allowed the absolute determination of authenticity, especially in organic and ceramic materials. The Etruscan warriors at the Met fell victim to scientific detection. Stone, on the other hand, especially marble, did not lend itself to such secure determinations. Experts could analyze style and even determine whether an ancient chisel had been used to carve a piece. However, as prices and profits rose, the experts also worked for the forgers, and the quality of the fakes improved. In some cases the jury is still out on important pieces.

Again it was museums like the Getty, which were desperate to expand their collections with outstanding pieces, that got caught up in this gray world. Two examples will suffice. In 1979 Freil acquired from Europe a larger-than-life-size head that he claimed was a masterwork by the fourth-century B.C. Greek sculptor Skopas. The leading expert on Skopas in America confirmed Freil's judgment. Yet less than a decade later a German scholar demonstrated to the satisfaction of most experts that the head was a nineteenth-century reproduction.<sup>38</sup>

The authenticity of the second piece is less certain. In 1983 the Getty acquired another larger-than-life-size piece, a kouros (nude male statue) purporting to be from the sixth century B.C.<sup>39</sup> As was always the case with such objects, the provenance was hazy, but the Getty claimed it had long been in a Swiss collection. Some experts hailed the piece as genuine and an important contribution to the understanding of Archaic Greek art. Other experts said it was a fake. Some claimed that scientific tests proved it to be a genuine antiquity; others said the tests proved nothing. The Getty itself seems to be ambivalent, displaying the piece more as a problem in connoisseurship than as a major work of ancient art.<sup>40</sup>

The rapid expansion of the antiquities market in the late 1960s and early 1970s finally produced a reaction from the archaeological community. The problems were manifold. Archaeological sites are a finite resource, and the looters were destroying them at a rapid rate. Nor was the issue just the abstract desire to conserve archaeological remains in a more environmentally conscious age. Modern archaeologists stress the importance of context. The artifact is a social object. To understand the cultural place of an object one has to know where it was found and how it relates to other objects. An Attic pot carries one set of meanings if it is found in a pottery dump in the Kerameikos, another if it is found in a shipwreck off the coast of Sicily or in the tomb of an Etruscan nobleman. The attitude of museum curators and private collectors, on the other hand, reflects that of the nineteenth, even the eighteenth, century, in which works of art were contemplated in isolation as expressions of the Hellenic spirit.

The archaeological community has tried to stem the antiquities flow by several means. The first has been the creation of international agreements to bar the trade in antiquities. In 1970 the UNESCO convention for the protection of cultural property and the control of the antiquities trade was ready for ratification, although the United States did not sign

the key implementing legislation of the agreement until 1983.<sup>41</sup> Nonetheless, the convention did provide the reference point for other actions. For instance, the Archaeological Institute of America decided, partly as a result of the controversy over the Met vase, that it would not allow scholars to publish in their journals or report at their meetings the initial reports on objects acquired after December 30, 1970, that were not legally exported from their countries of origins. Those efforts have been reinforced by the policy of a growing number of museums not to buy objects of uncertain provenance.

Italy remains one of the major centers for the antiquities market. It also has become since World War II a showplace for international archaeological excavation. One major shift in the Mediterranean has been the opening up of Italy to foreign excavation. Laws that excluded non-Italian excavations had been in effect since the creation of the Italian state, but these were modified after World War II as the Italians were pressured to put their supranationalistic past behind them.

The political and economic realities of the late 1940s dictated that the Americans would be among the first to take advantage of this new openness. While the American Academy in Rome had no excavation tradition, its officials seized the opportunity. In 1948 the American Academy began excavations at Ansedonia, the site of the third-century B.C. Roman colony of Cosa on a headland overlooking the Tyrrhenian Sea a hundred miles north of Rome. These excavations were placed under the direction of Frank E. Brown (1908–88), a veteran of the Dura-Europos excavations. Cosa was believed to have experienced an Etruscan phase before the Roman, and the Americans hoped that the site would document the little-understood Etruscan town life.<sup>42</sup>

The selection of Cosa for this first American excavation was a daring and imaginative one. It had been in antiquity a minor center with no great historical significance, and it flourished during times that were marginal to the interests of most classical archaeologists. However, Brown's experience at Dura had taught him what could be learned from "different" sites. The Cosa dig was conceived as a problem-oriented excavation: Brown was especially interested in the origins of Roman republican architecture, and the archaeological evidence in Rome itself had long since been destroyed. Since Roman colonies like Cosa copied many political and architectural elements from Rome, and it clearly had not been extensively changed during imperial times, the American

[To view this image, refer to the print version of this title.]

Frank Brown guiding visitors at the site of Cosa, 1950s. The American Academy was among the first to benefit from the Italians' openness to foreign excavations after World War II. (American Academy in Rome)

archaeologists hoped that it would provide architectural remains dated to key formative periods of the third and second centuries B.C.

The initial phases of excavation were conducted in the late 1940s and the 1950s, suspended, and then resumed in the late 1960s and the 1970s, with some activity at the site continuing into the 1990s.<sup>43</sup> Like most major excavations of the period, emphasis was placed on the investigation of public buildings, first the temples and then the civic and religious structures of the forum. No domestic structures were excavated until the 1960s, and it was not until the 1970s that much research was conducted in the surrounding countryside, where most of the inhabitants lived. While the site produced no evidence for an Etruscan presence, the excavations did yield a great deal of material about the history of the Roman colony. By the time Brown and his colleagues were finished they had created an excellent picture of the physical development of a Roman town.

Brown had also learned from the mistakes and deficiencies of the Dura excavations, especially on the need to make better records and to preserve and study a greater range of artifactual material.<sup>44</sup> The retention of deposits of humble artifacts like utilitarian pottery meant that the



material and its context information were available when their importance was finally realized and serious research begun in this area. Still, Cosa was a dig of its time. The emphasis was on architectural history, and until quite late no effort was made to reconstruct the overall development of the town, to document the postrepublican phases, or to collect data on human remains or faunal and floral material.

Two other nations moved early to take advantage of the new archaeological opportunities by focusing on early urbanism in Italy. The French were anxious to make their scholarly presence felt after the dismal events of the war. The French School of Rome reopened in 1945 under the direction of Albert Grenier. Grenier was the best archaeologist of any of the directors up to that point, and as a student of the Roman provinces he was interested in pursuing the new excavation opportunities in Italy. In 1946 the French received a concession to excavate the Etruscan-Roman site of Bolsena. During the first years, they concentrated on the Etruscan remains, then in 1962 they turned to the systematic excavation of the Roman town.<sup>45</sup> The Belgians in 1949 began their own excavations at the late-fourth-century B.C. Roman colonial site of Alba Fucens, located in the western Abruzzi some sixty-eight miles southeast of Rome. Like the Americans at Cosa, the Belgians focused on the colonial urban center, again providing important information about the development of town planning and public architecture in the middle republic.<sup>46</sup>

The new openness of the Italians also encouraged Europeans and Americans to investigate Greek colonial sites in Magna Graecia and Sicily. There the French led the way. They had a tradition of antiquarian research in the area; the duke of Luynes had conducted excavations at Metaponto in 1820 and François Lenormant had provided one of the first archaeological syntheses of the region in his 1881–83 *Grande Grèce*. The arrival of François Villard at the French School of Rome marked a new commitment to the archaeology of the western Greeks.<sup>47</sup> He began seeking a Greek colonial site that could be paired with the excavations starting at Bolsena. In 1949 the French started excavations at the eighth-century B.C. colony of Megara Hyblaea, located on the east coast of Sicily just north of Syracuse, one of the earliest Greek settlements in the West. The original city had been destroyed by Syracuse in 483 B.C., so chances were good that a large part of the Archaic city would have been preserved beneath the settlement refounded in the fourth century B.C. The French hoped that Megara would yield architectural remains

that would illustrate early Greek urban development and ceramics that would document Greek trade with the West.<sup>48</sup>

The excavations at Megara were part of a new spurt of interest in a variety of aspects of the Greek colonies in the West. Some research focused on the dates and origins of the earliest colonies and their connections with the mainland. Thomas Dunbabin's 1948 *The Western Greeks*, the most influential work in English on the Greeks in Sicily and Magna Graecia, reflected the colonialist paradigm that regarded the Greeks as the primary force bringing civilization to the western Mediterranean and paid little attention to the indigenous cultures or even the Phoenicians.<sup>49</sup> Because the classically trained Dunbabin did not know much about the Sicilian Iron Age material, he could not appreciate the complexity of interaction between the native and the colonial worlds.

Important new perspectives on the initial contacts between Greeks and indigenous peoples began to emerge in 1952 when Giorgio Buchner (1914–2005) started his excavations at the site of Pithekousai on the island of Ischia. What he discovered was the earliest Greek settlement in the West, a Euboean trading emporion with an extensive cemetery whose origins dated back to the eighth century B.C.<sup>50</sup> Pithekousai was not a large planned urban center, but a small trading post built in the protective isolation of an offshore island rather like the earliest Phoenician colonies in the West. Along with Al Mina, the eighth-century B.C. emporion site on the coast of Syria, it demonstrated the importance of the Euboeans in opening up the Mediterranean to Greek traders.<sup>51</sup> Archaeologists began talking about a complex “precolonial” phase that had preceded the formal settlements for several centuries and laid the foundations for the later colonies. The discoveries on Ischia helped restore better exchanges between Italian classical archaeologists and those working in prehistory.<sup>52</sup>

The Greek colonists' penetration into the interior was best documented archaeologically by the American excavations at Morgantina. The work at this site also represents one of the American postwar “power” excavations in which a generation of graduate students was trained in a distinctive approach to field archaeology. The site is located in central Sicily not far from Piazza Armerina. It originated as a native Sikel settlement, but had by the fifth century B.C. become a planned Greek city. It went through an important Hellenistic phase and was then sacked by

the Romans in 212 B.C. Some occupation continued, but Morgantina never regained its former glory.

In 1955 Princeton University decided to start excavations at the then nameless classical site. The senior director was Richard Stillwell (1899–1982), an architectural archaeologist who had worked at both Corinth and the Athenian Agora.<sup>53</sup> He approached Morgantina as an example of “mature” Greek colonization and urban planning, and focused the excavations on the public buildings, especially those in the agora. His codirector, Erik Sjoqvist (1903–74), was Swedish and had worked on Cyprus, which had a long history of cultural interactions among the indigenous peoples, Greeks, and merchants from the Near East. Sjoqvist’s 1973 *Sicily and the Greeks* reflected his awareness of the role of interaction between the Greeks and various indigenous peoples, especially in the early history of Morgantina, although it is probably fair to say that even Sjoqvist’s narrative is basically colonialist.<sup>54</sup>

The excavations at Morgantina played an important role in the social history of postwar American classical archaeology.<sup>55</sup> It was undertaken at a time when the Princeton graduate program in classical archaeology was the most prestigious in the United States, and it followed in the big dig tradition of the Athenian Agora, importing many of the methods and attitudes of the Agora excavations into Sicily. Many American classical archaeologists of the 1970s and the 1980s learned their archaeology at Morgantina, and they learned it in a very conservative tradition.

Early Greek colonization in the East did not receive the same attention in the early postwar period. Big dig archaeology was too well established on the shores of Turkey to admit new perspectives. The Germans resumed their traditional excavations at places like Pergamon, and the Americans sought bigger sites and had other problems. Politics and research priorities kept American archaeologists from seeking out other sites like Al Mina that would further document early Greek contacts with the Near East. The Cold War and the Soviet domination of much of the Black Sea coast prevented Western exploration of Milesian colonization in that area.

However, one modest project of the British School at Athens did provide important insight into the earliest Greek settlement on the Turkish coast. In 1948 John Cook of the British School and the Turkish archaeologist Ekrem Akurgal started excavation at Old Smyrna near modern Izmir. The site yielded evidence for long prehistoric habitation, but of

most interest to the archaeologists was the small peninsular settlement dating to the ninth–seventh centuries B.C. The Greeks appeared to have moved into a native settlement and as early as the late ninth century had established a walled settlement with well-built houses that recall some of the Phoenician trading emporia in the western Mediterranean.<sup>56</sup>

The Roman and the Greek colonies had created not only new cities but also new landscapes. The pioneering aerial photographers of the interwar period had begun to identify centuriation patterns that had previously been known only from the literary sources, a few map notations, and the occasional surface observations. The aerial reconnaissance of World War II had provided enormous documentation of the landscape of northwest Europe and the Mediterranean. Those combat air photos from Italy and the Mediterranean were saved mainly through the efforts of the new British School director John Ward-Perkins and made available to archaeologists. They revealed a range of archaeological features from Neolithic settlements to medieval town plans, but they were especially rich in the documentation of the organization of the landscape around the Roman colonies of the Po River plain. The English archaeologist John Bradford (1918–75) did important pioneering work in this new field, and his 1957 *Ancient Landscapes* provides a good review of the early discoveries and the evidence for centuriation.<sup>57</sup> Bradford was not the only archaeologist studying the Roman landscape. The Italian Fernandino Castagnoli identified centuriation systems at Cosa, and soon afterward the French began to focus their research on aerial landscape studies. Evidence for Greek and Roman rural planning emerged from diverse regions of the Mediterranean.<sup>58</sup>

The Romans were not the first to create an organized landscape, for the Greek colonists long before them had devised ways to define property boundaries and distribute in a rational and orderly fashion the farmland around their colonies. South Italy offered great potential for research in this area, potential that was first realized by Dinu Adamesteanu, a Romanian aviator who had remained in Italy after the war and joined the Antiquities Service. In 1964 he became director of the newly created archaeological division of Basilicata, which included important sectors of Magna Graecia, including the Greek colony of Metaponto. Adamesteanu began applying aerial photography and ground surveys to the settlement reconstruction of the hinterlands of the Greek colonies. His work at Metaponto has been continued and expanded by Americans

led by Joseph Carter of the University of Texas. By the combination of aerial photography, ground survey, and excavation at farm, sanctuary, and cemetery sites, the archaeologists working at Metaponto have provided us with a complex picture of the development of a Greek hinterland.<sup>59</sup>

Aerial photography was not limited to the Mediterranean. The plains of northern Europe provide an ideal environment for aerial photography, and they were extensively documented during World War II. The French archaeologist Roger Agache carried out model studies on the development of the Roman rural settlement system in the plains of Picardy.<sup>60</sup> However, it was in England that aerial photography received some of its most imaginative and successful application. Experiments before the war by early aerial photographers like O. G. S. Crawford (1886–1957) had been promising, but tentative.<sup>61</sup> Now the experience, improved equipment, and information gained during the war laid the foundation for major new advances. The most important in this new study was Kenneth St. Joseph (1912–94), a geologist and Royal Air Force veteran.<sup>62</sup> His interest in aerial photography had been stimulated by meetings with Crawford before the war. He started with informal support from the RAF, but by 1948 he had been appointed curator of aerial photography at Cambridge. In 1962 the university acquired a plane and appointed a pilot to its staff. The university could now begin more systematic coverage, taking advantage of optimal flying and environmental conditions.

St. Joseph teamed up with Ian Richmond (1902–65), who was emerging as the premier Romano-British archaeologist of his generation, and the two began coordinated research on the Roman landscape, concentrating on the military terrain. In the period from 1945 to 1990 St. Joseph added 40 garrison forts and 185 temporary camps to the ordnance survey maps of Roman Britain. Military historians were obliged to digest a massive quantity of new information and rethink the Roman military history of the island.

Aerial photography only located the sites. They then had to be surveyed and excavated on the ground to analyze their dates and development history. Here St. Joseph's collaboration with Richmond proved invaluable, for Richmond was the ideal man to undertake these new studies. Richmond's career captures the continuity and change in Romano-British archaeology during the postwar period.<sup>63</sup> His interest in Roman archaeology had been stimulated during his boyhood in the north of England, and he remained in many ways a "Wall" archaeologist throughout

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

Aerial photograph of Roman villa remains in northern France taken by Patrick Joy. Aerial reconnaissance in both France and England has transformed our understanding of the Roman countryside. (Patrick Joy)

his life. But he had also dug with Mortimer Wheeler in Wales and learned the new Wheeler approach to excavation. His vision of the Roman world extended outside the island province: Richmond studied at the British School in Rome, where he was influenced by Thomas Ashby and did a short stint as director. His 1930 *The City Wall of Imperial Rome* is still a classic study of Roman military archaeology.

He returned to Britain and taught for many years at the University of Durham, Newcastle, before his appointment in 1958 as the first professor of the archaeology of the Roman Empire at Oxford. Most of his digging took place at military sites, the area of Romano-British archaeology that dominated fieldwork from the 1920s into the 1990s.<sup>64</sup> At the time of his death in 1965 he was excavating the fort at Inchtuthil in Scotland, a perfectly preserved legionary camp of the late first century A.D. that had been discovered by St. Joseph and his aerial surveying.

Richmond's death marked in many ways the end of a tradition in Romano-British archaeology. In a highly controversial review in *Antiquity*, Wheeler had criticized Richmond's delays in publication, attributing them in part to Richmond's tendency to "spend an evening with the Much-Binding-in-the-Marsh Field Club."<sup>65</sup> It was true that Richmond spent a lot of time traversing the country, meeting with local excavation committees, and lecturing before local societies. However, those efforts reflected the still balkanized, largely amateur nature of archaeology in Britain. Not only was such guidance necessary to help the amateurs do effective work, but the personal contacts were essential for keeping track of recent discoveries. Britain still did not have an official Antiquities Service, and much knowledge was held by local savants and published in county journals. The situation was beginning to change in the 1960s but it was not until the 1970s that Romano-British archaeology entered a new era of professionalism.<sup>66</sup>

While the aerial photographers were opening up new frontiers in landscape archaeology, equally important contributions were being made on the ground. The British School at Rome, like the American Academy, wanted to take advantage of the new openness of the Italians toward foreign archaeological research. Director John Ward-Perkins (1912–81), a protégé of Mortimer Wheeler and an experienced field archaeologist, had excavated in Britain and France and worked in the London Museum under Wheeler before the war.<sup>67</sup> Field experience that had ranged from Iron Age to medieval sites gave him a diachronic vision that was

to serve him well in Italy. During the war he had worked as a military archaeologist in North Africa and Italy. When he took over the directorship of the British School his main problem was that with the depressed postwar British economy the school had few funds for archaeological research and could not undertake a major excavation in Italy like that of the Americans at Cosa. Ward-Perkins did important postwar work in Libya, but logistics and politics made British research in that area of the Mediterranean increasingly problematic.<sup>68</sup>

Ward-Perkins saw the solution to his dilemma in a patch of countryside north of Rome.<sup>69</sup> This was the territory of the ancient Etruscan and Roman city of Veii. Like much of the farm- and pastureland around Rome it had changed little since the Middle Ages, but any archaeological work that might be done there was now facing a major threat from deep plow cultivation and the expansion of settlement on the outskirts of Rome. Lands that had been uncultivated or plowed by oxen for centuries were now subject to mechanized plowing that disturbed deeply buried archaeological layers. Hundreds of new sites were suddenly made visible on the surface, but their artifactual evidence was being rapidly dispersed and destroyed.

Ward-Perkins began in 1954 to dispatch teams of young archaeologists into the Veian countryside to locate and map sites and collect surface material. Their approach was shaped by a long topographical tradition best represented by the work of Ashby. However, the work also reflected a more holistic approach to the archaeology of landscape that fieldworkers like Cyril Fox (1882–1967) were beginning to use in Britain.<sup>70</sup> At first the surveyors concentrated on the road system, but then they fanned out to cover the entire landscape. Such vigorous field walking was very much in the British archaeological tradition. So was the diachronic approach to settlement history that did not privilege a particular period. Ward-Perkins directed his fieldworkers to gather material from early prehistoric to medieval times.

Ward-Perkins's teams documented hundreds of sites.<sup>71</sup> For the first time the settlement history of an important region of Italy could be reconstructed. Moreover the Veii project trained generations of young British archaeologists to appreciate systematic surveying as an important archaeological tool. They have carried those lessons to other regions of Italy and to other places in the Mediterranean like Tunisia and Libya.<sup>72</sup> While ancient historians and classical archaeologists were slow to appreciate



the significance of these survey data, a new generation of social and economic historians with more sophisticated training would come to see its potential. When Ward-Perkins stepped down as director of the British School in 1974 he left a legacy that would transform research and interpretation of the Roman countryside.

The Americans, in particular, resisted the new survey technique. They were still wedded to the big dig tradition, as can be seen in the experience of William McDonald (1913–2000) of the University of Minnesota.<sup>73</sup> He was trained in the standard field traditions of American classical archaeology, but during his work at the Mycenaean site of Pylos in the southwestern Peloponnese he conceived a project for a systematic survey of the rural hinterland of the Mycenaean center. By the standards of modern surveys the project, carried out in Messenia, has an old-fashioned quality, and it is sometimes criticized by contemporary archaeologists enamored of overrefined survey techniques. But McDonald performed a wide-ranging, multiperiod survey that yielded interesting results.<sup>74</sup> The American archaeologists in Greece were not impressed with the project, however, and McDonald's efforts received little attention or appreciation. Only when these archaeologists were replaced by a younger generation did Americans make survey a significant part of Greek archaeology.<sup>75</sup>

The countryside was not the only archaeological environment that was changing dramatically as a result of World War II. The bombing and ground fighting had devastated many historic cities, especially in Britain and Germany. Economic problems limited immediate development, but by the 1950s the historic core of many of these damaged cities was beginning to be redeveloped. And in the years immediately after the war, other cities suffered a mass influx of people from the rural areas seeking a better life. Cities like Rome and Naples spread outward, devouring the countryside and destroying the archaeological environment.

The archaeologists were not prepared to meet the challenge. Until World War II most urban archaeology in Europe had been sporadic and antiquarian in its methods. Institutions like the London Museum might have skilled archaeologists on their staffs, but their budgets were small and their ability to investigate and preserve archaeological sites was limited. Urban archaeology had generally involved major clearing projects, like the work of the fascists in central Rome and to a certain degree that of the Americans in Athens, that ripped up the urban fabric

to highlight certain periods, largely ignoring the complex, often seamless web that makes up the urban archaeological record. Moreover, most urban archaeology had been focused on public buildings, with little attention to the social and economic life of the cities.

A proper urban archaeology requires time, money, and large, multi-disciplinary teams with expertise in a variety of periods and a range of material objects. Few of these were available in postwar Europe, as could be seen in the archaeology of central London in the years immediately after the war. German bombing had destroyed much of London's historical core, including the Roman city. Fifty of 350 acres within the Roman-medieval walls had been leveled. This presented an excellent opportunity for extensive archaeological exploration of London's past. In 1946 the Society of Antiquaries established the Roman and Medieval London Excavation Council to coordinate archaeological efforts. Archaeologists like W. F. Grimes (1905–88), who had succeeded Wheeler as director of the London Museum, did yeoman service trying to dig some of the most important sites and recover vital information. A few major sites, such as the Roman fort at Cripplegate and the Walbrook Mithraeum, were systematically excavated, but others were destroyed during rebuilding without adequate archaeological investigation.<sup>76</sup>

Financial constraints slowed redevelopment in London in the late 1940s and early 1950s. By the late 1950s the situation began to change. As high-rise structures went up whose basements extended deep into the soil, destroying the archaeological record, alarm began to spread within the archaeological community. In 1973 Martin Biddle, Daphne Hudson, and Carolyn Heighway published *The Future of London's Past*, which used detailed maps of central London to demonstrate how much of the city's archaeological record had been lost or was immediately threatened.<sup>77</sup> Their call for action helped rally support for a more programmatic approach to urban archaeology. The Department of Urban Archaeology was created that same year, and a new Museum of the City of London was built. Much of London's past is still being destroyed, but more has been preserved or at least been studied before it disappears.

Each historic city in Europe could tell a similar story. While Rome was not significantly damaged in the war, it did experience the massive demographic explosion that caused the suburbs to expand and devour more and more of the Roman *campagna*, with its rich archaeological treasures. Italian archaeologists both in the universities and in the

archaeological division worked valiantly to excavate or at least record archaeological sites before they disappeared. Fortunately the Italian topographical tradition was still flourishing, and archaeologists like Lorenzo and Stefania Quilici continued the work of Lanciani and Ashby in documenting the fast-disappearing ancient remains around Rome.<sup>78</sup>

Archaeologists working within the city abandoned the mega-projects of the Mussolini era, and concentrated on either smaller rescue projects or explorations of archaeological zones like the Forum and the Palatine. It was not until the early 1980s that Rome underwent a major modern urban excavation. The opportunity came when a young archaeologist named Daniele Manacorda was granted permission to dig in a convent garden in the historical core of the city. Manacorda had been a strong critic of the fascist excavations in Rome, and he used this opportunity to do a modern urban excavation.<sup>79</sup> The Crypta Balbi excavation (the name derived from the Roman theatrical complex that had once stood on the site) systematically cleared the area of the convent garden, investigating each level from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries down through the Middle Ages into the Roman levels.<sup>80</sup> The full range of artifactual and environmental materials was recovered and studied. As a result visitors to the museum built on the site can experience the social and economic history of Rome reconstructed through the archaeological record.

One of the most important subdisciplines of classical archaeology that emerged after the war was underwater archaeology. For decades fishermen and sponge divers had brought up illuminating but chance finds from the Mediterranean, especially of bronze sculpture. Two of the most important of those discoveries had been the Antikythera youth found in 1901 and the Poseidon of Artemision, discovered in 1926. Some systematic diving had been done, but the cumbersome equipment necessary at the time limited its effectiveness.<sup>81</sup> When Mussolini ordered that the Roman ships be recovered from Lake Nemi, engineers drained the lake, after which the archaeologists conducted a standard land excavation.<sup>82</sup> During World War II the French naval officer Jacques Cousteau had developed the aqualung, which allowed the prolonged and mobile exploration of underwater archaeological sites, especially ancient shipwrecks.

The emerging field was transformed from an adventure to a true subdiscipline of archaeology by George Bass.<sup>83</sup> The story of Bass's career, in which a traditional graduate student at the University of Pennsylvania is

[To view this image, refer to  
the print version of this title.]

The Crypta Balbi excavations, 1980s. Remains of the Roman-period theater complex are visible at the bottom. This was one of the first projects to explore the remains of all periods of urban occupation on a site. (Daniele Manacorda)

sent by the imperious Rodney Young to learn scuba diving at the YMCA, has become one of the legends of archaeology. More central to his success, however, was the interest of the University Museum in technical experimentation and the availability of ample funding during that era of American affluence.<sup>84</sup> Bass garnered the support that allowed him to apply many of the techniques of modern archaeology to the undersea

environment and conduct an underwater excavation that would meet even the rigorous standards of Mortimer Wheeler.

The sea that linked the whole of Mediterranean culture was now opened up to systematic archaeological exploration. Much of the work was focused in more shallow waters near shore, where many ships through the ages had come to grief. The type site of this new archaeological world was the wreck, for the Mediterranean had been the graveyard of ships for millennia, and the wrecks were ideal for discovery and exploration. Bass himself has investigated wrecks from the Bronze Age to the Byzantine period. While special attention has always focused on the occasional discoveries of major art objects, and looting of underwater sites has become a problem, underwater archaeology has evolved into a serious discipline with a number of important modern archaeological goals.<sup>85</sup>

Both ships and cargoes were studied. Before the advent of underwater research, information on ancient shipbuilding had mainly come from literary descriptions and artistic representations. Neither source reflected the real world of the mariners. Now the student of ancient ship design and building could work with original materials. While most wrecks had only been partially preserved because of the destructive actions of the sea and marine life, they provided important new information about how the ancients made ships. Much of this material has been amassed in the long series of publications by the American student of ancient shipping Lionel Casson.<sup>86</sup> Moreover, the seas yielded a range of ship remains, from fishing skiffs and river boats to long-haul cargo vessels. This variety is reflected in the boats found at the Claudian harbor of Ostia and in the 1990s discovery of a fleet of eleven Roman ships at Pisa and highlights the complexity of ancient maritime traffic.<sup>87</sup>

The artifacts recovered from the wrecks provided insight into the daily life of the ancient mariners.<sup>88</sup> More important, they provided massive quantities of new information on maritime trade in both the Greek and the Roman periods at a time when both archaeologists and ancient historians were becoming more interested in the ancient economy. Key to a reconstruction of ancient trade was the humble cargo vessel of antiquity, the transport amphora. Amphora studies had long been a rather specialized aspect of land excavation. German archaeologists such as Heinrich Dressel (1845–1920) had by the late nineteenth century developed a classification and dating system for Roman amphorae that could be applied both to the Roman frontier and to urban sites like Monte Tes-

[To view this image, refer to the print version of this title.]

Remains of a late Roman-period ship under the Mediterranean. Visible is the cargo of transport amphorae. Improved techniques of underwater archaeology developed after World War II revolutionized archaeological understanding of ancient ships and trade. (Institute of Nautical Archaeology, Texas A&M University)

taccio in Rome.<sup>89</sup> Virginia Grace used the vast quantities of new materials produced by the Athenian Agora excavations to develop new dating sequences for amphorae of the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

The potential of the combination of underwater archaeology and amphora studies to provide economic information was demonstrated early by the recovery in 1955 of the Roman shipwrecks at a site dubbed Grand Congloué off the south coast of France.<sup>90</sup> One of the wrecks was packed with transport amphorae, many stamped with the seal of a Roman named Sestius. The Sestius amphorae could be linked to discoveries made on land in both France and Italy and used to reconstruct the trade network of a prominent late republican wine merchant. Sestius was also associated with Cosa, where concentrations of his amphorae were found at the harbor site, and it is likely that the villas that produced his wine were located in the Ager Cosanus and that the kilns that fired his amphorae were built on the shore.<sup>91</sup>

Underwater research further stimulated studies of amphorae, and refined typologies and dating sequences were developed. The growing body of shipwrecks recorded in the Mediterranean allowed the reconstruction of evolving nautical trade patterns. Sourced and dated amphorae from the Iberian peninsula, North Africa, and Italy were used to document shifts in wine and olive oil production. At the other end of the economic cycle, the amphorae documented consumption. Renewed studies of the great amphora mound at Monte Testaccio provided insight

into olive oil consumption in the capital. Greek and Roman amphorae discovered at hill fort sites in southern and central Gaul and even as far as Britain illuminated the importance of wine and wine rituals in the Iron Age societies of northwest Europe.

While the amphorae are the main surviving evidence for ancient bulk transport, other commercial items were transported as supercargo, intended for secondary sale when the ship reached port. One important trade good shipped on the North Africa to Rome routes was a red-orange glazed ceramic known to the archaeologists as African red-slipped ware or *terra sigillata chiara*. Archaeologists had long been aware of this pottery as the upscale ceramic successor to the well-studied *terra sigillatas* of Italy and Africa, but they did not fully appreciate both the lengthy period of its use or the extent of its distribution. Important preliminary studies had been done by ceramics experts like Nino Lamboglia, but it was the Englishman John Hayes who provided the systematic research that culminated in his 1972 synthesis of the African red-slipped pottery.<sup>92</sup> Much of his preliminary research was based on materials from the Veii survey, but it was refined by travels to museums and excavations throughout the Mediterranean.

The red-slipped pottery produced in North Africa was by the early second century A.D. penetrating Mediterranean markets, gradually replacing the *terra sigillatas*. At the height of its popularity the quantities in circulation certainly exceeded those of the earlier red ware. Its distinctive red-orange fabric and glaze made it easily identifiable during both survey and excavation. The African red-slipped wares continued in use for a long period; they have been found at sites of the late sixth and early seventh centuries A.D. and are thus an important dating tool for the late Roman Empire and the transition to the early Middle Ages.

These studies of commercial ceramics like amphorae and African red-slipped pottery were a boon to both ancient historians and classical archaeologists interested in the ancient economy. The American exile Moses Finley (1912–86) had made Cambridge a center for ancient economic studies, attracting a generation of the best classics students from Europe and America. Finley was a Marxist, who was naturally interested in the economic processes that drove ancient society, but reluctant to credit ancient societies with complex economies.<sup>93</sup> Moreover, as an ancient historian with limited archaeological experience, he was skeptical about the role archaeology could play in ancient historical research.

Some of his followers were not so reluctant to work with material culture. In a field like Roman economic history, where most of the literary sources are close to worthless, the enormous data pools provided by amphorae and ceramic studies were appreciated and used.

A number of these developments, both technical and theoretical, came together in the new round of excavations that started in and around Cosa during the 1960s and 1970s. Excavations in the central town had resumed in the mid-1960s after a considerable hiatus. At first the goals remained the same: excavation focused on the forum, the arx (citadel), and a small selection of residential complexes. Little interest was manifested in the area outside the city walls.

The project soon developed a different focus. Starting in 1968 Anna Margherita McCann organized a team of land archaeologists and divers who explored the port of Roman Cosa. Ancient harbors were key to the history of both ancient engineering and ancient Mediterranean trade. When the flying priest, Antoine Poidebard, took aerial photographs of the harbor at Tyre, he tried to supplement his photographic research by diving in the cumbersome equipment available before the war.<sup>94</sup> Now the combination of new diving technology, aerial photography, and increased interest in ancient seaborne commerce stimulated a greater interest in port and harbor studies.<sup>95</sup>

The Mediterranean is not blessed with a great number of good natural harbors, and many of the ones it had were not near important power and population centers. Ancient Rome itself lacked a natural harbor. The silted, artificial harbors at Ostia built by Claudius and Trajan had long attracted archaeological attention. Postwar archaeological work at Caesarea and Carthage also offered insight into the development of artificial harbors in antiquity.

The Cosa harbor was small, hardly more than a roadstead. However, it was regarded as sufficiently important to Roman communications with Gaul and Spain that it had been made more secure from storms by the construction of cement breakwaters. The invention of a cement that could harden underwater was one of the major Roman technological developments of antiquity. The port of Cosa was not only a stopping place on the coastal route but also an export center for the agricultural produce of the Ager Cosanus, especially wine, and a production, processing, and export center for an active fish-farming industry. At Cosa harbor archaeologists recovered important information on Roman harbor



construction and were able to learn a great deal about the history of the port.<sup>96</sup> Evidence for fish farming was recovered as well as material about amphora production associated with the family of Sestius.

Since the port had served as the outlet for the products of the Cosan farmers, the harbor excavations fitted well with the growing interest in the Cosa countryside. This countryside had experienced agricultural reforms similar to those in Veii, including the introduction of mechanical agriculture. It had enormous survey potential, but it was also undergoing massive site destruction. In the 1970s two surveys, one American and one Anglo-Italian, documented hundreds of sites and provided the database for the reconstruction of the rural history of the *Ager Cosanus*.<sup>97</sup>

The most important project at Cosa during the 1970s was the excavation at the late republican–early imperial villa site of *Settefinestre*, an elegant rural residence with considerable evidence for agricultural production some ten miles from the city. The director was Andrea Carandini. Carandini was a student of Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, the Marxist art historian, who though not a field archaeologist himself, encouraged such research as well as theoretical debate among his students.<sup>98</sup>

Carandini shared his mentor's elite social background and Marxist politics. As a young archaeologist he had undertaken some of the first stratigraphic excavations at Ostia. He had also been with the Italian team at Carthage and seen how archaeologists from other countries operated. He was looking for a site where he could conduct a model operation in which the techniques of British archaeology that he had observed at Carthage could be applied. *Settefinestre* could provide information not only on Roman rural architecture but also on the history of production in the countryside.<sup>99</sup> One of the most important innovations in Italian archaeology, borrowed from the British, was using students rather than hired workers, and a new generation of young Italian archaeologists was trained at *Settefinestre*. They went on to apply their experience to their own sites and produced a revolution in Italian field archaeology.

The inspiration for the *Settefinestre* excavations was the UNESCO Carthage project. Europeans and Americans had long been interested in the city that had played such an important role in ancient pagan and Christian history. Early in the nineteenth century the Danish consul in Tunis, Christian Falbe (1791–1849), had collected and made archaeological observations at Carthage and in the interior of Tunisia.<sup>100</sup> The White

Fathers, a group of African missionaries, had always been interested in excavation, especially at Christian sites. In the 1920s, American archaeologists from the University of Michigan briefly joined the Fathers in the exploration of the tophet, the Carthaginian infant burial ground.<sup>101</sup> Years of French occupation had led to many archaeological discoveries. Yet the site of the Carthaginian and Roman city had never been systematically explored.

In the 1970s a new international initiative opened an important era in both the exploration of Carthage and cooperative Mediterranean archaeology. The suburbs of the modern city of Tunis were expanding onto the site of ancient Carthage. Tunisian archaeologists, led by Abdelmajid Ennabli, appreciated the seriousness of the threat, but they realized that a major salvage project was beyond the resources of the new Tunisian Antiquities Service.<sup>102</sup> A call went out for international assistance. UNESCO mounted an operation (*Campagne internationale de sauvegarde de Carthage*) that enlisted teams from the United States, Britain, France, Poland, Italy, Canada, Bulgaria, Denmark, and Tunisia. Each team was assigned one or more sectors at Carthage. While they worked individually, there was a great deal of contact among the various groups. Since each national team had its distinctive way of doing archaeology, it was possible to see the full range of approaches to classical archaeology in the late twentieth century. A considerable amount of cross-fertilization resulted.

The project had several important implications for classical archaeology. Since this was a salvage excavation at a long-lived urban center, all periods of the city's history and all types of sites and structures had to be studied. The remains investigated stretched from the foundation of the Punic city in the mid-eighth century B.C. to its decline and fall in the late sixth or seventh century A.D.<sup>103</sup> Deep cuts in certain areas provided evidence for the earliest phase of Punic occupation. Much was learned about the Punic city, especially in its last phase just before the destruction by the Romans in 146 B.C. The remains of Roman Carthage, one of the largest urban centers in the empire, shaped much of the work. Masses of Roman artifacts, especially ceramics, were recovered. They reinforced the importance of Carthage as a pottery production and export center that the researches of John Hayes had already highlighted. Pioneering research was done on the Roman/Byzantine city and on the decline of Carthage as an urban entity. The Carthage excavations also

heightened interest in the rural hinterland that provided the grain and olive oil that passed through the city on the way to Rome. American, British, and Danish teams undertook important work in the Tunisian countryside, reconstructing the complex evolution of agricultural and pastoral economies required to feed Rome.

The Carthage project embodied many of the best developments in postwar classical archaeology. The archaeologists from a newly independent state and several former colonial powers worked together to salvage information on one of the great cities of antiquity. The full range of new archaeological approaches, from field survey to nautical archaeology, were applied. While some of the undertakings were massive, others, like the field surveys, showed that modest operations could bring important results. Carthage provided opportunities for a new generation of archaeologists to learn about the best in modern archaeology, make important contacts with their peers in other countries, and, it is hoped, continue innovative classical archaeology in the new millennium.

## Afterword

The UNESCO excavations at Carthage make a good place to end this study, for they capture many elements of the changing world of classical archaeology as the discipline moved into the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. The fact that the Carthage dig was a rescue excavation is significant, for it is rescue and salvage work that has come to dominate archaeology in both northwestern Europe and the Mediterranean. The countries of Europe and the classical Mediterranean are undergoing massive, rapid development both in urban and rural areas. Although all the countries have laws protecting sites and antiquities and requiring rescue archaeology before sites are destroyed, these laws are variously enforced, and even minimal efforts at archaeological excavation and conservation at threatened sites are coming to consume most of the financial and personnel resources of individual countries. In most countries the official Antiquities Service has now been supplemented by archaeological contract units, some private and some connected with universities. Much of the time of civil service, university, and private archaeologists is taken up with this emergency work. While a large amount of archaeological evidence is saved, the constant press of new work means that relatively little is studied and published.

Both nationalism and internationalism in Europe continue to shape the archaeological-political landscape. Some of the most strident nationalism came out of Greece when the dictatorship of the colonels was overthrown in 1974. For the first time since the ending of the Greek civil war, the political left had a major voice in Greek politics, and it took up the causes of nationalism, anti-imperialism, and anticolonialism. The two colonialist-imperialist powers, Britain and the United States, bore the brunt of this fervor. The Elgin marbles once more became a focal point

for controversy, as Melina Mercouri led a vocal, if so far unsuccessful, campaign to force Britain to return them.<sup>1</sup>

The new era of archaeological cooperation is best represented by the European Union. For the first time since the fall of the Roman Empire, most of the old classical lands are now part of a single administrative entity. This has and will have multiple implications. The European Union is working to create common regulation, which will gradually result in a unilateral archaeology policy. But the virtual ending of national customs borders will also mean that illegal antiquities can more easily flow from one country to another.

The most positive development for archaeology in this European unity is not the probable series of new rules, but the interchange that the new order will foster. This is already apparent in organizations like the ERASMUS project, which sponsors research, conferences, and other forms of scholarly exchange.<sup>2</sup> Other exchanges are more informal, found mainly in the constant movement of younger archaeologists among the countries of the European Union. Brits dig in Spain, Italians attend seminars in Germany, the French do postgraduate work in the Netherlands. The fertile interchange that grew out of the Carthage project has continued and expanded. The result has been a dynamic, superior archaeology across the whole of Europe.

The evolution of the European Union was accompanied by historical and ideological debates that affected archaeology. A common classical heritage draws many of the core nations together, something that Greece, for example, can use to its political, economic, and cultural advantage. But there are other common heritages. Celtic culture brings nonclassical lands like Ireland into the archaeological limelight. The pan-Celtic revival recalls in certain respects the romantic developments of the early nineteenth century.<sup>3</sup>

Today's archaeological community understands the need to engage the public if it is going to continue to receive political, economic, and even social support. The bureaucratization of archaeology in Europe has marginalized the amateur savants who so long sustained the discipline throughout the continent. Many of the old archaeological societies are dying. At the same time, conscious efforts are being made to engage the public, and especially to involve the young, in the archaeological enterprise. The success of the American popular magazine *Archaeology* has spawned imitations in most of the countries of Europe. Archaeological

youth groups have been formed, and excavations still depend heavily on volunteers for their labor. Excavators try to show the public what they are doing in the form of on-site poster displays, while museums are moving beyond exhibits of pots and statues arranged in decorous, discrete, and uninformative displays to exhibitions that better relate artifacts to social and cultural history.

The United States is the only major classical archaeology power that is outside this new European order, and the implications for U.S. archaeology are serious. U.S. archaeologists are no longer needed and, indeed, have little to teach. The European countries have an expanded cadre of young archaeologists who generally have more field training than their American counterparts. American field archaeology in the Mediterranean remains largely limited to fewer and fewer big digs. Today the American School of Classical Studies at Athens is extremely limited in the archaeology it can do, especially in the restrictive political climate of Greece. The American Academy in Rome has almost no archaeological opportunities at all. Americans no longer can even offer funding for projects since their resources have been cut, and the cost of doing archaeological work in Europe has risen dramatically.

The debate over the best training for a classical archaeologist in the United States continues. The hopes raised in the 1970s by interdisciplinary archaeology programs like those at Boston University, the University of Minnesota, and Indiana University have largely been dashed.<sup>4</sup> In Europe most students are trained in archaeology programs, where they learn through both theory and practice the best contemporary approaches. American classical archaeologists are generally educated in art history and classics departments. In the first they may learn new theoretical and conceptual approaches that have some relevance to the study of the material culture of antiquity. Significantly, much of the most interesting work in American classical archaeology is being done by ancient art historians. Classics departments are generally dominated by philologists, and there graduate students in archaeology receive a more limited education in an atmosphere that is often hostile to the field.

The world of museum archaeology has not changed much. The collecting of elite material and its presentation in an elite way still seems to be the driving force for most classical art curators. Important museums like the Getty have gotten out of the undocumented antiquities trade, and there is evidence that a combination of high prices and the adverse

publicity of “antiquities scandals” have caused other museums to press for better provenance information.<sup>5</sup> However, many institutions still make only token gestures toward verification. Private collecting, the “farm team” system for the big classical art museums, flourishes. Some of its more egregious activities have been limited by recent court actions, but large markets like the one in illegal antiquities ultimately find ways of avoiding or shaping the law.

Ironically, the best chance for museums to reenter into the mainstream of classical archaeology is through the world of ideas. As the field tradition withers, the art historians who work with the objects most often found in the museums will come to dominate classical archaeology. Although they will draw their materials from museums, they will be in a position to shake the elitist, nineteenth-century-aesthete paradigms that dominate classical museum display today. Healthy, theory-driven debates go on about the history and purpose of the museum, and it would be good to see those reflected in the way museums present the Greek and Roman past to the public.

Public engagement still remains a matter of concern for classical archaeologists. *Archaeology* magazine continues to be popular, and archaeology shows pull respectable audiences on educational television. The Archaeological Institute of America sponsors an active national lecture program, although the audiences are increasingly graying. Most Greek and Roman field archaeology takes place in distant lands at sites that are mainly visited by wealthy Americans on posh tours.

The final question is what will remain for future generations to study. Archaeological sites, like crude oil reserves, are finite resources. No more ancient Greek cemeteries or Roman villas are being created. Meanwhile, the major forces of destruction, development, looting, and environmental degradation move relentlessly on. Public archaeology flourishes because in both city and countryside archaeological sites are constantly being discovered in the process of construction, road and dam development, and agricultural improvement. The archaeologists can save only a small amount of the record. Once the high-rise foundations are excavated, the highway is completed, and the land behind the dam is flooded, the archaeological environment is gone forever.

Poorly monitored development projects contribute to the antiquities market, but it is even more indebted to the numerous clandestine excavations taking place throughout Europe. Changes in taste and fashion are

leading to the destruction of new types of sites. Red-figure vases from the south of Italy have recently become fashionable, and thousands have appeared on the market. Almost none have known provenances, which means that they probably came from looted cemeteries.<sup>6</sup> Objects stolen from cemeteries are joined by objects stolen from museums to feed what still appears to be an expanding market for antiquities. More vigorous enforcement by source countries like Greece, Italy, and Turkey, and greater international cooperation by receiving countries like the United States have helped stem the flow.<sup>7</sup> Even so, new countries are constantly entering the market, while rising prices for the goods provide greater incentives for the illegal trade.

This looting is not limited to individuals engaged in the antiquities trade. Interested amateurs still dig for the fun of it. This avocational archaeology has recently been enhanced by the popularity of metal detectors in countries like Britain. On weekends the countryside is filled with amateurs seeking Roman coins and a range of other metal objects. Most professional archaeologists are outraged and have launched campaigns against the practice. Others have sought cooperation between professionals and amateurs in site preservation and investigation.<sup>8</sup> The controversies over metal detectors are another expression of the decline of formally organized amateur archaeology and the loss of communication between amateurs and professionals. The care that an Ian Richmond took to bond with local societies, condemned by Mortimer Wheeler, is a practice that archaeologists might seek to revive today.

Environmental degradation affects archaeological sites in a variety of ways. Coastal erosion eats away at Roman seaside villas. Deforestation opens up ancient settlements to the destructive forces of nature. Human beings pose the greatest threat, however, not only through development, but in the ways they change the environment. Air pollution provides a vivid example. Many of the buildings of classical Greece were constructed from stone, which is readily subject to the type of acid rain degradation that comes from automobile exhaust. As automobile usage expanded rapidly in Athens, the buildings of the Acropolis began to crumble. Works like the caryatids of the Erechtheum that managed to survive not only the Ottomans but Lord Elgin have had to be moved inside. Even at remote Bassae in Arcadia, the beautifully preserved temple built by one of the architects of the Parthenon has had to be covered by a protective bubble.



Ironically, our love of the past has posed a new type of menace. Archaeological tourism has expanded rapidly in recent years. On the whole this is a good thing, because it brings money to impoverished areas and provides public support for the archaeologists' work. But the passage of tens of thousands of even well-behaved tourists (and not all are well-behaved) through an archaeological site creates its own destructive forces.

At some point, probably in the not too distant future, the last Greek farmstead, the last Roman urban neighborhood, and the last Romano-Celtic shrine will have been excavated or destroyed.<sup>9</sup> Classical archaeologists will not be out of business. The quantities of unstudied material in museums and warehouses will keep generations of graduate students and professionals busy. The art and archaeology of Greece and Rome will continue to be taught, and the ever larger tour ships will disgorge their passengers at protected archaeological sites. However, a key element in classical archaeology will have been lost. The discipline that developed in the past two centuries was a result of the dialogue between the known and that which could be discovered by exploring new sites and collecting previously unknown objects. This vision of archaeology has always united the most parochial amateur antiquarian and the most sophisticated professional. Archaeology students are taught that it is never wise to excavate an entire site, because each generation develops new techniques and poses new questions. Now we face the real possibility that our successors in the not too distant future will lack that laboratory in the earth that has sustained classical archaeology since the Renaissance.

# Notes

## Chapter 1. The Protohistory of Classical Archaeology

1. Barbanera 2000a: 59.
2. Leppmann 1970; Potts 1994; Brilliant 2000.
3. Howard 1990: 151–52, 155–56.
4. Howard 1990: 162–73.
5. Morris 1994: 16–18.
6. Butler 1958.
7. Hibbert 1987; Black 2003.
8. Belsey 1982; A. M. Clark 1985.
9. Cust 1914: 36.
10. Tinniswood 2002.
11. Bentmann and Muller 1992.
12. Arnold 1994.
13. Girouard 1978: 163–212.
14. Cust 1914: 77–78, 101–4.
15. Knight 1986; Darley 1999.
16. Honour 1968: 126.
17. Honour 1968: 126–27; Serra 1986.
18. Dyson 1998: 69.
19. Angelicoussis 2001: 48.
20. Angelicoussis 2001: 19.
21. Michaelis 1882.
22. Ernst 1992: 155–56. Another major study that examined the collections in British country houses was F. Poulsen, *Greek and Roman Portraits in English Country Houses* (1923).
23. Scoppola and Vordemann 1997.
24. Howard 1970: 125–26.
25. Springer 1987: 23.
26. *EHCA*: 562–65; Irwin 1962.
27. *EHCA*: 211–13; Ridgway 1989.
28. *EHCA*: 619–20.
29. Howard 1990: 149–50.
30. Howard 1970.
31. Honour 1968: 124–25.
32. Murray 1971.

33. Wilton-Ely 1994: 3; Margiotta 1996; for Le Roy, see *EHCA*: 677.
34. Yourcenar 1985: 88–128; Wilton-Ely 1994.
35. Macaulay 1953; see esp. 191–204.
36. Labus 1818: xxvi–xxvii.
37. *EHCA*: 902–4.
38. Springer 1987: 21–38; Howard 1990: 142–43; Consoli 1996.
39. Johns 1998: 25.
40. *EHCA*: 556–57.
41. *EHCA*: 1176–77.
42. Howard 1990: 145–49.
43. Labus 1818.
44. St. Clair 1998: 215–19, 223–24.
45. Mozzillo 1964: 162–67.
46. Allroggen-Bedel 1993.
47. Parslow 1995.
48. Haskell and Penny 1981.
49. Clay 1979: 108.
50. Haskell and Penny 1981: 77, fig. 40.
51. Haskell and Penny 1981: 165–67, 229–32.
52. Parslow 1995.
53. This influence can be seen in the scholarship of Penelope Allison. See, e.g., Allison 2004.
54. Ramage 1992.
55. Parslow 1995: 215–32.
56. Mozzillo 1964: 165–66; Grant 1984: 165–67.
57. Allroggen-Bedel 1993: 36–37.
58. De Caro et al. 1992: 2–7, 13–18; D’Ambrosio 2002: 96–101.
59. *EHCA*: 207–8.

## Chapter 2. The Foundations of Classical Archaeology

1. *EHCA*: 467–68; Cassanelli et al. 2002.
2. Lee 1999: 81–95.
3. Ridley 1997.
4. Chatelain 1973: 103–214.
5. *EHCA*: 905.
6. Springer 1987: 86–88; Ridley 2000: 96–99, fig. 18.
7. Ridley 2000: 97, fig. 18.
8. Ridley 2000: 221–30.
9. Ridley 1992: 47–93.
10. Ridley 1992: 152–66.
11. Ridley 1992: 95–99.
12. Johns 1998: 11.
13. *Roma antiqua* 1992; *Italia antiqua* 2002.

14. Yegul 1991.
15. Angelicoussis 1992: 31–33.
16. Angelicoussis 1992.
17. Brooks 1958; Gerdts 1973.
18. Angelicoussis 1992: 25–26.
19. Johns 1998: 171–94; Eustace et al. 1997.
20. Sherman 1994; Johns 1998: 36–38, 92, 173; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 553.
21. Johns 1998: 174–77; St. Clair 1998: 5, 25–27, 223.
22. *Thorvaldsen's Museum* 1961.
23. *EHCA*: 1210–11; Mejer 1986.
24. Ridley 2000.
25. *EHCA*: 803–4.
26. Sweet 1980: 14, 24–27, 53–62, 66–71; Wohlleben 1992: 194–200.
27. A. D. Momigliano 1994b: 229–36; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 487–88.
28. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 122.
29. *EHCA*: 601.
30. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 25–26.
31. Michaelis 1908: 57–61.
32. Schnapp 1982: 767–70.
33. *EHCA*: 915–16; Magi 1940.
34. Ridley 1996. The Prussian support for the Institute proved a mixed blessing. Prussian disputes with the Vatican often left Bunsen marginalized within Roman society, and the Italians stopped coming to the meetings (Bendinelli 1953: 132–33).
35. Collignon 1915: 13–14; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 80–81.
36. Penny 1982: 72; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 460–61.
37. Andreae 1993: 18.
38. Andreae 1993: 6–9.
39. For the role played by the correspondents from Perugia, see Pickert 1963.
40. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 41, 357, 736–38.
41. Rodenwaldt 1931: 67–69; Andreae 1993: p. 7, abb. 1.
42. *EHCA*: 33–34, 821–22.
43. *EHCA*: 224–25; Buranelli 1991.
44. Springer 1987: 57.
45. Springer 1987: 57–63.
46. Cubberly and Hermann 1992: 14.
47. Bendinelli 1953.
48. Bendinelli 1953: 418–23.
49. Bendinelli 1953: 260.
50. Bendinelli 1953: 136–37, 140–41. Canina succeeded the antiquarian Luigi Biondi as the director of those excavations. The initial excavations were started by Lucien Bonaparte; see Pasqualini 1992.
51. Negro 1943: 263.
52. B. F. Cook 1998: 154.
53. Borowitz and Borowitz 1991.

54. Negro 1943: 255–58; Borowitz and Borowitz 1991: 13.  
 55. Nadalini 1996.  
 56. Negro 1943: 257; Magagnini 1994: 10.  
 57. Armeni et al. 2000.  
 58. Armeni et al. 2000; Campitelli 1997.  
 59. Steindl 1993.  
 60. Von Hulsen 1940; Gasparri and Giandoni 1994.  
 61. Negro 1943: 250.  
 62. Campanelli et al. 2003.  
 63. Frend 1996: 1–40.  
 64. Bisconti et al. 1994.  
 65. *EHCA*: 360–61; Marucchi 1921–22; Frend 1996: 77–81.  
 66. Negro 1943: 264; Tomei 1999.  
 67. Bendinelli 1953: 316–23; Tomei 1999: 1–18.  
 68. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 31–32.  
 69. Michaelis 1879; Kolbe 1984.  
 70. Michaelis 1879: 3–6.  
 71. Deichmann 1986: 1–18.  
 72. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 179.  
 73. Motte 1990: 80–232.  
 74. Parslow 1995.  
 75. De Caro 1994: 10–15.  
 76. For a good evaluation of the antiquarian tradition in classical archaeology, see A. D. Momigliano 1950; Ferone 1988.  
 77. Horicht 1987: 825–44.  
 78. Ferone 1988; d'Ambrosio 2002: 20–21.  
 79. Etienne 1992: 22–28.  
 80. d'Ambrosio 2002: 58–67, 76–79.  
 81. Reinhold 1984: 265–79.  
 82. Etienne 1992: 25; Goalen 1995: 186–90; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 450–51.  
 83. Gerds 1973: 120–21; Dyson 1998: 24.  
 84. Benson 1907: 89–116; Lubbock 1983.  
 85. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 51–52, 78–79.  
 86. Falzone del Barbaro 1990: 31.  
 87. Horicht 1987: 856; Maffioli 1990; Cassanelli et al. 2002: 33.  
 88. Miraglia and Pohlmann 1993.  
 89. Becchetti 1978: 265; Palazzoli 1981; Kurtz 2000: 222. The Fratelli Alinari studio opened in Florence in 1852.  
 90. Anti 1966: 101–3 stresses the importance for teaching and research of the fact that photographic records could be made of complete collections, rather than just a selection of the best work, which tended to be the practice for casts and engravings. See also Beard 2000a: 159–60.  
 91. Dyson 2004: 42.  
 92. Fiorelli 1994; de Angelis 1993.

93. Barnabei 1991: 16.
94. Fiorelli 1994: 65–76. Another archaeological victim of that Bourbon repression after 1848 was the Jesuit epigrapher Raffaele Garrucci: see Ferone 1988.
95. De Angelis 1993.
96. Bracco 1979: 197–200.
97. Article in *Athenaeum*, Feb. 25, 1871; for Brizio see Gran-Aymerich 2001: 111–13.
98. Barbanera 2000b: 45–48.
99. Barbanera 1998: 21–34.
100. Clay 1979: 125–127.
101. Belli 1974: 26 n. 8.
102. Saint-Non 1781–86; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 607–9; Cassanelli et al. 2002: 12.
103. Belli 1974.
104. *EHCA*: 672.
105. A. D. Momigliano 1978.
106. Knight 1986: 54.
107. Pace 1935: 28–33; Ceserani 2000: 182–89; A. D. Momigliano 1978.
108. Cust 1914: 119–24; Funnell 1982: 50–64; Knight 1986; St. Clair 1998: 167–72.
109. Butler 1958: 31–39; Ceserani 2000: 188–89.
110. Chiusano 1988.
111. Watkin 1974: 14; Marconi 1996: 10; Ferguson 2001.
112. Marconi 1996.
113. Pace 1935: 42–44.
114. Marconi 1996: 6–7.
115. Pace 1935: 56; Barbanera 1998: 16–19.
116. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 135–36.
117. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 707–8.
118. Mejer 1986.
119. *EHCA*: 1189.
120. Barbanera 2000a: 60–61. The first academic cast collection had been established in Göttingen in 1767; see Kurtz 2000: 126.
121. *EHCA*: 616–18; Calder, Cancik, and Kytzler 1991; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 360–61.
122. Bazant 1991.
123. Cancik 1991: 38–41.
124. Chaline 1995: 93–94.
125. Pinon 1991: 72–73; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 112–14; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 148–49.
126. Chaline 1995: 181.
127. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 133. This process of local museum development can be traced in the volumes of Espérandieu 1907–38.
128. Pavan 1977; Dietler 1994.
129. *EHCA*: 1128–29.
130. Mertens 1998.
131. Marchand 1996: 168–70.

132. Schnapp 1982: 772–73.
133. Espérandieu 1907–38: 6: 261–62; Reinach 1931: 435.
134. Barnabei 1991: 129–32.
135. Pinon 1991: 84–89.
136. Simon 1989: 43–47; King 2001.
137. Pingeot 1982; Dietler 1994.
138. Le Gall 1990; *Vercingétorix et Alésie* 1994; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 152, 222, 445.
139. Reinach 1931: 439–41.
140. Von Hase 2000.
141. Borowitz and Borowitz 1991: 83–84, 116–20, 135–45.
142. Reinach 1931: 439–40; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 222.
143. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 16.
144. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 218–22.
145. Stead et al. n.d.: 12.
146. Berthier 1951: 178–87.
147. Frend 1996: 51–55.
148. Lorcin 1995.
149. Bertrand, quoted in Lorcin 1995: 200.
150. Dondin-Payre 1997.
151. Janon 1973: 193–96.
152. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 148–49.
153. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 327, 391.
154. Frend 1996: 57–58; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 66.
155. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 154–65; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 576–78.
156. Frend 1996: 115–18; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 315–16.
157. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 327.
158. Lorcin 1995: 177–81.
159. Frend 1996: 67–73; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 211.
160. Noel Duval, quoted in Frend 1996: 184.

### Chapter 3. The Opening of Greece

1. Barthélemy 1816; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 52–53.
2. Malakis 1925: 40–41; Tsigakou 1981: 20.
3. *EHCA*: 279–80; Malakis 1925: 35–38; Stoneman 1987: 136–40; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 174–75.
4. Tsigakou 1981: 43, 194.
5. *EHCA*: 433–34; Tregaskis 1979: 12–20; Stoneman 1987: 165–68; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 257–58.
6. *EHCA*: 433–34; Tsigakou 1981: frontispiece; Barbanera 2000a: 59.
7. *EHCA*: 365; Tregaskis 1979: 57–65; Stoneman 1987: 147–48.
8. *EHCA*: 483–84; T. Spencer 1954: 208–9; Stoneman 1987: 147–51; Plouviez 2001.
9. T. Spencer 1954: 208.

10. Clay 1976: 30; Vaughan 1998: 67–68.
11. Clay 1976: 18; Clay 1979: 14–16, 69–70, 75–76, 136–37.
12. *EHCA*: 289–90; Clarke 1809; Tregaskis 1979: 51–56; Stoneman 1987: 151–55.
13. T. Spencer 1954: 208.
14. *DBC*: 569–70; *EHCA*: 666; Stoneman 1987: 155–60; Wagstaff 2001a, 2001b.
15. Tregaskis 1979: 72–73; Wagstaff 2001a.
16. Ferguson 2001: 31–32.
17. Hitchens 1987: 97–120.
18. Watkin 1968: 64–69; Ferguson 2001: 20–21.
19. Ferguson 2001: 19–20.
20. *EHCA*: 295–96; Watkin 1974: 5–17; Ferguson 2001: 21–26.
21. Ferguson 2001: 27–30.
22. McNeal 1993; Dyson 1998: 9–10, 19–20.
23. The complex and often brutal reality of this period in Greek history was well captured by George Finlay in his 1861 *History of the Greek Revolution*.
24. Herzfeld 1982: 74–81.
25. Leake 1968: 271–72; McNeal 1993: 145–46.
26. Malakis 1925: 24–27; Chaconas 1942; Dimaras 1992: 216–19; Gourgouris 1996: 90–118.
27. Stoneman 1987: 248.
28. Peckham 2001: 120.
29. *EHCA*: 983–84; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 29–30; Stoneman 1987: 240–46; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 596.
30. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 536.
31. Pittakis, quoted in Peckham 2001: 117; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994: 229–30.
32. *EHCA*: 536–37; Stoneman 1987: 249–50; Tine and Traverso 2001: 81–82.
33. Tsigakou 1981: 31, 41 pl. VII.
34. McNeal 1991.
35. Kaftanzoglou, quoted in Hamilakis and Yalouri 1999.
36. Yalouri 2001.
37. R. Carter 1979; Tsigakou 1981: 64.
38. Dickins 1912: 1–9.
39. *EHCA*: 796–97; Jenkins 1991: 106.
40. Stoneman 1987: 250; Jenkins 1991: 106–8.
41. *EHCA*: 18–19.
42. Tsigakou 1981: 68–72.
43. Ritter 1999.
44. Szegedy-Maszak 1987; Stillman 1988: 46–61.
45. *EHCA*: 773–74; Settis 1984; A. D. Momigliano 1994c; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 479.
46. Kurtz 2000: 221.
47. Peckham 2001: 115.
48. *EHCA*: 420–21.
49. *EHCA*: 163–64; *Roma antiqua* 1992: 237–49; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 85.



50. Radet 1901: 18–99; Picard 1948.
51. Radet 1901: 4–99; Basch 1995: 49–56.
52. *EHCA*: 158; Basch 1995: 85, 146; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 157; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 71.
53. Marchand 1997.
54. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 39–40; Marchand 1996: 77–92; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 200–201.
55. Curtius, quoted in Rodenwaldt 1936: 9–10.
56. *EHCA*: 341–42.
57. *EHCA*: 7; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 53–54; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 25–26.
58. Whitley 2001: 34; Marchand 2002.
59. Michaelis 1908: 132–33.
60. *EHCA*: 1043.

#### Chapter 4. Nationalism and National Traditions Before the Great War

1. Rodenwaldt 1929.
2. Kolbe 1984.
3. Andreae 1993: 21–23.
4. *EHCA*: 372.
5. *EHCA*: 752; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 61–62.
6. Michaelis 1882: 179–84.
7. Michaelis 1882: 181.
8. This appeared in English in 1908 as *A Century of Archaeological Discoveries*.
9. Michaelis 1908: 339–40.
10. Amandry 1976; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 233–35.
11. Schnapp 1996b: 57–58; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 213–14.
12. *EHCA*: 470–71; *Ecole* 1975.
13. *EHCA*: 304; Bruneau 1992.
14. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 147–49, 171, 177, 180, 207, 213; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 521–23.
15. *EHCA*: 304.
16. Collignon 1892–97.
17. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 207, fig. 90; 213; 229.
18. Wiwjorra 1996: 166–69.
19. Pavan 1977: 283–88.
20. Krämer 1979: 6–8; Marchand 1996: 172–80.
21. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 179–80; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 228–29.
22. Wells 1972: 163–70.
23. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 248–49.
24. Espérandieu 1907–38; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 385–86 n. 123.
25. Pavan 1977.
26. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 369–70.
27. Grenier 1944; Motte 1990; Pinon 1991: 99–101.

28. Daniel 1950: 228, 241; Schnapp 1996b: 59; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 354; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 206–8.
29. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 321–23, 383–85; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 312–13.
30. S. Cartocci and G. Cartocci 1977; H. James 1992; Testi 2004.
31. Abbamondi 1993.
32. Becchetti 1978: 15–28; Romano 1994: 17–22.
33. Romano 1994.
34. Keller and Breisch 1980; Cavazzi et al. 1989.
35. Barbanera 1998: 43–45, 200 n. 125.
36. Bonghi, quoted in Bruni 1991: 379.
37. *EHCA*: 636–38; Bruni 1991: 380–82.
38. Guzzo 1993: 55–82.
39. Arias 1995: 238–39.
40. De Angelis 1993: 11–12; Guzzo 1993: 68–69, quotes the art historian Leopold Venturi, who complained that Fiorelli had made his office into an appendage of the German Archaeological Institute.
41. Illuminati 1922; Barnabei 1991; Arias 1995: 239–43.
42. Dyson 1998: 74–75.
43. Sgubini 2000a: 38–40.
44. Bruni 1991.
45. *EHCA*: 1089–90; Tagliamonte 1998: 23–25.
46. Sgubini 2000b: 35–52.
47. Barbanera 1998: 65, 212 n. 77.
48. *EHCA*: 445–46; Capecchi 1989–90; Barbanera 1998: 14, 60; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 189–90.
49. Barnabei 1991: 197–207.
50. Barnabei 1991: 21–25.
51. Sgubini 2000b: 42–44.
52. Barnabei 1991: 177.
53. Lippolis 1983; D'Angela 2000.
54. Barbanera 1998: 59–60, 210 n. 39.
55. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 120–21; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 420–21.
56. Cassanelli et al. 2002: 39.
57. Kostof 1973.
58. Giglioli 1928–29; Barbanera 1998: 86–90; Lanciani 1988: xi–xiv.
59. *EHCA*: 657–58.
60. This initial charge and organization was laid out in the first issue of *Bullettino Comunale* 1872: 3–4. The original commission consisted of Lanciani, Augusto Castellani, Pietro Rosa, Giovanni Battista de Rossi, Verginio Vespignani, Carlo Ludovico Visconti, Pietro Ercole Visconti, and Nobili Vitelleschi.
61. The articles that appeared in English journals have been collected and published in Lanciani 1988.
62. *EHCA*: 255–56; Magagnini 1994.
63. Sgubini 2000a: 10–12.

64. Sgubini 2000a: 12–21.  
 65. Tea 1932; Augenti 2000; Capodiferro and Fortini 2003.  
 66. Bracco 1979: 232–36; Guzzo 1993: 86–88, 92–93; Barbanera 1998: 82–86.  
 67. Beltrami 1926; Tea 1932: 122–67.  
 68. Iacopi 2003: 23–25.  
 69. *EHCA*: 360–61; Frensdorff 1996: 77–81.  
 70. Dyson 2004: 54–55.  
 71. Rizzo 1926; Dyson 2004: 56–57.  
 72. Barnabei 1991: 17.  
 73. *EHCA*: 577 illustrates a group gathered for such a soirée at the Helbig's.  
 74. *EHCA*: 445–46.  
 75. Govi and Vitali 1988: 1–15; Barbanera 1998: 61–62.  
 76. Bruni 1995.  
 77. D'Angela 2000: 39–40.  
 78. *EHCA*: 829–30; Leighton 1986; Guzzo 1993: 89–93.  
 79. Arias 1991.  
 80. Guzzo 1993: 84–86.  
 81. *EHCA*: 527–29; Barbanera 1998: 78–80; 216 n. 134; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 322–
- 23.
82. For the history of Italian archaeology in Crete, see *Creta antica* 1984.  
 83. La Rosa 1986: 53–72; Dyson 1998: 72.  
 84. Accame 1984: 2–3.  
 85. *EHCA*: 611–12; Petricioli 1990: 3–89.  
 86. Petricioli 1990: 91–126; see Ghirardini 1913 for Italian archaeological imperialism during this period.  
 87. Petricioli 1990: 126–49; Dyson 1998: 76–82.  
 88. Di Vita 1986: 80–85; Dyson 1998: 76–82.  
 89. Dyson 2004: 94–96.  
 90. *EHCA*: 324; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 59–60; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 192–93.  
 91. Curtis 2003.  
 92. *EHCA*: 1002–3.  
 93. *EHCA*: 653–54.  
 94. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 80.  
 95. Marchand 1996: 93–103.  
 96. *EHCA*: 150–51; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 67–68; Reinach 1907; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 60–61.  
 97. Koester 1995.  
 98. Walters 1928: 67–70.  
 99. Wiplinger and Wlach 1996.  
 100. *EHCA*: 805–6.  
 101. Wiplinger and Wlach 1996: 175–81.  
 102. Brendel 1979: 27–50; Bianchi Bandinelli 1995: 23; Dyson 2004: 94–96.  
 103. Brendel 1979: 31–37; Dyson 2004: 96–97.  
 104. *EHCA*: 873–74; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 69–70; Radt 1999: 309–23.

105. *EHCA*: 1193–94; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 154–55; Watzinger 1944; Marchand 1996: 202–3; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 712–13.
106. *EHCA*: 935–36; Watzinger 1944: 61–97.
107. J. C. Carter 1983: 1–2.
108. Cust 1914: 201; J. C. Carter 1983.
109. Michaelis 1908: 176, 181–84.
110. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 183, 233–37, 305.
111. *EHCA*: 596; Radet 1901: 196; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 347–48.
112. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 305; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 345–46.
113. Rauh 1993.
114. Higgins 1986: 172–76.
115. Higgins 1986: 72, 163–78.
116. Higgins 1986: 172–73; Duchêne 2002: 387–88.
117. Duchêne 2002.
118. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 182.
119. Dyson 1998: 73–74.
120. Michaelis 1908: 148–54; Bommelaer 1992.
121. *EHCA*: 353–57.
122. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 306.
123. Diehl 1978.
124. Dyson 1998: 1–27.
125. Dyson 1998: 33–37; J. Turner 1999.
126. Samuels 1979: 32–35.
127. Dyson 1998: 37–46; Allen 2002b; Will 2002.
128. Dyson 1998: 64–65; Allen 2002b.
129. Whitley 2001: 31.
130. Lord 1947.
131. Dyson 1998: 82–85.
132. Lord 1947: 89–108; Dyson 1998: 85–87.
133. Williams and Zervos 1996.
134. Hogarth 1910: 3.
135. Ovenell 1986.
136. Myres 1941: 329–31.
137. Engel 1983: 149–50, 231–35, 267–68.
138. Eugenie Sellers Strong studied with Adolf Furtwängler at Munich (Dyson 2004: 63–73). Mackenzie studied in Berlin and obtained a doctorate from the University of Vienna under Otto Benndorf (N. Momigliano 1999: 16–17).
139. Levine 1986: 97.
140. Beard 1993.
141. Waterhouse 1986: 7–9.
142. *DBC*: 352–54; Waterhouse 1986: 9–10.
143. Dyson 1998: 82–83.
144. Dyson 2004: 53–54.
145. Daniel 1950: 16–25.

146. Unsigned report, *British Archaeological News* (May 1987): 29–30.
147. Levine 1986: 1–69.
148. Levine 1986, esp. 49–54, 63–65.
149. Oxberry 1923.
150. Wheeler 1954: 127; Boon 1974; Hingley 2000: 118–19.
151. Fulford and Clarke 2002: 286–87, 300–303.
152. Smith 1854; Evans 1956: 263; MacGregor 1998: 134–36.
153. E. Birley 1961: 3–24; Breeze 2003: 3.
154. E. Birley 1961: 25–47; Breeze 2003.
155. A. Birley 2002: 1.
156. M. W. Thompson 1977; Bowden 1991.
157. Wheeler 1954: 9–14. For the relations between Pitt-River and British archaeological societies, see Chapman 1989.
158. Hingley 2000: 12–14.
159. Hingley 2000.
160. Woolley 1953b: 15.
161. Yegul 1991.

#### Chapter 5: The Emergence of the Great Museums in Europe and America

1. *EHCA*: 12–14; Stoneman 1987: 179–98; Barbanera 2000b: 58–59.
2. Michaelis 1908: 143–44.
3. Diebold 1995.
4. Baumstark 1999: 14–19.
5. *EHCA*: 231–32, 513–15.
6. St. Clair 1998.
7. Crook 1972: 39–71; Alexander 1983: 21–42; Fara 1997.
8. Rouet 2001: 14.
9. B. F. Cook 1985.
10. *Townley Gallery* 1836.
11. Crook 1972: 67–69.
12. Ernst 1992: 159–67.
13. *EHCA*: 127–29; Stoneman 1987: 187–92.
14. Poole 1888, 2: 137–59.
15. Colvin 1921: 209–23.
16. Stoneman 1987: 216–24.
17. Morris 1994: 28–29.
18. B. F. Cook 1998: 144. Cockerell also became interested in photography, helping to found the Architectural Photographic Association. Roger Fenton, who photographed the Crimean War, in 1856–57 made a series of photographs entitled *Art Treasures of the British Museum*. See J. C. Carter 1983: 346 n. 15.
19. Colvin 1921: 212; Dyson 2004: 33–36.
20. *DBC*: 1072–73; B. F. Cook 1998: 146–50.
21. Jebb 1895: 83; Stoneman 1987: 230–36.

22. Slatter 1994; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 260–61.
23. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 180; Bruneau 1992: 37–38.
24. For Orientalism, see Said 1979. For the background to the Greek–Near Eastern disjuncture, see Bernal 1987.
25. Crook 1972: 73–150.
26. Ernst 1992.
27. Curtis 2003.
28. Michaelis 1908: 179–80.
29. Hamiaux 2001.
30. Borowitz and Borowitz 1991: 71–133.
31. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 168–77; Nadalini 1998.
32. As quoted in Gran-Aymerich 1998: 218.
33. Hamiaux 2001: 191–93.
34. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 218–20.
35. Snodin 1991: 27–35, 125–31.
36. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 75–77.
37. *EHCA*: 874–75.
38. Marchand 1996: 288–94.
39. Shaw 2003.
40. Pasinli 2001.
41. Traill 1995: 102–35.
42. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 324–25; Shaw 2003: 98–171.
43. Shaw 2003: 157–66.
44. Shaw 2004.
45. Ozdogan 1998.
46. Bolton 1971: 123–62.
47. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 71–72; Moltesen 1987.
48. Pollak 1919; Santi and Cimino 1993; Kurtz 2000: 275.
49. *EHCA*: 815–16; Froehner 1898; Messineo 1992.
50. Hoving 1997: 259–63.
51. Guarducci 1980; Guarducci 1992. For arguments against those charges see Lehmann 1989.
52. *EHCA*: 934.
53. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 130–31.
54. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 132–33.
55. Pollak 1994: 99.
56. Dyson 1998: 122–28.
57. Whitehill 1970: 1–100, 142–71.
58. Sox 1991; Dyson 1998: 136–39.
59. Hibbard 1980: 7–26.
60. Dyson 1998: 133–34, 139–44.
61. *EHCA*: 267–68; Cesnola 1878; Myres 1914; Goring 1988: 7–15; Masson 1992; Dyson 1998: 130–35.
62. Dyson 1998: 142–44.

63. *EHCA*: 968; Dyson 1998: 145–50; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 581–82.
64. Beard 2000b; Dyson 2004.
65. Dyson 1998: 59–60, 98–100; Gill 2002.
66. Droop 1915: 63–64. For Droop as an archaeologist and his handbook, see Hood 1998: 129–34; Lock 1990: 178.
67. Allsebrook 1992.
68. At Bryn Mawr classical archaeology was taught mainly by Rhys Carpenter from 1913 to 1955 and by Valentin Muller from 1931 to 1945. See *EHCA*: 245–46; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 244–45.
69. For Strong, see Dyson 2004: 111–60; for Van Deman, see Geffcken 1991; Dyson 1998: 116–19.
70. Whitehill 1970: 150–57.
71. *EHCA*: 700.
72. Whitehill 1970: 154–55; Ashmole 1994: 152–54; Hoving 1997: 256–78.
73. Richter 1937.
74. Von Bothmer and Noble 1961; Sox 1987: 103–13; Hoving 1997: 88–100.
75. *EHCA*: 202–3; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 47–48; Flasch 1902.
76. *EHCA* 475–76; Schuchardt 1956; Dyson 2004: 64–67.
77. Dyson 2004: 63–74.
78. *EHCA*: 1186–87.
79. Ramage 1990; Jenkins and Sloan 1996. For an appealing fictional account of the Neapolitan world of Lord Hamilton, see Susan Sontag's 1992 novel *The Volcano Lover*.
80. *EHCA*: 567–68; Haskell 1984.
81. Vickers 1985; Gill and Vickers 1990; Gill 1991, 1993; Shanks 1996: 59–65; Whitley 2001: 39–41.
82. Vickers 1987.
83. R. M. Cook 1960: 258.
84. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 98–99; Rouet 2001: 25–29.
85. Hoffman 1979; Bérard 1989; Lisarrague 1990; Whitley 2001: 52–55.
86. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 543–44.
87. Rouet 2001: 2–3, 108–18, 124–28, 134–35.
88. Rouet 2001: 134–41.
89. *EHCA* 135–36; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 54–55; Ashmole 1970.
90. Calloway 1998: 52–53; Rouet 2001: 60–80.
91. Sherwood 1973: 146. The poetic side of Beazley was highlighted by his youthful friendship with the poet James Elroy Flecker. A number of Beazley's poems provided the inspiration for works by Flecker.
92. Sherwood 1973: 35.
93. Anti 1966: 106–9 also notes the influence of Morelli on Furtwängler.
94. Morris 2000: 62–64. The scholarly relation between Morelli and Berenson on the one hand and Morelli and Beazley on the other is a complicated one. Beazley did not mention either Morelli or Berenson in his work, and Berenson was equally silent on Beazley. However, the use of scholarly techniques like the compilation of

lists is common to both, and it seems clear that some interconnection existed. See Cherry 1992; Rouet 2001: 70–73.

95. Kurtz 1985; Whitley 2001: 36–39; Shanks 1996: 30–41.
96. Rouet 2001: 1.
97. Morris 2000: 36–38.
98. Kurtz 1985.
99. Snodin 1991: 130–32.
100. Baker 1964: 20–45.
101. Ehrhardt 1982.
102. Barbanera 2000a: 65–69.
103. Walters 1928: 77–82.
104. Jenkins 1990: 90–101.
105. Barbanera 1993.
106. *EHCA*: 442–43.
107. Colvin 1921: 221–22; Beard 1993.
108. Dyson 1998: 140–41.
109. Jenkins 1991: 101–10.
110. Barbanera 1995.
111. Whitehill 1970: 210–17; Dyson 1998: 139–42.
112. Dyson 1998: 149–50.
113. St. Clair 1998: 293–302.
114. Epstein 1940: 167–71; Beard 1993: 21; Ashmole 1994: 69–71; Jenkins 1994: 203–5.

### Chapter 6. Political Ideology and Colonial Opportunism During the Interwar Period

1. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 713.
2. *DBC*: 464–66; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 344–45, 396–97.
3. Picard 1920; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 323.
4. Dyson 2004: 125, 187.
5. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 384.
6. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 387, 405–8.
7. Lorcin 1995: 198–213.
8. Lantier 1931: 462.
9. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 140–41.
10. *Ecole* 1975: 119–20.
11. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 394.
12. Lantier 1931: 468.
13. *Misurare la terra* 1989: 166–85.
14. Lantier 1931: 564–65.
15. Poidebard 1934; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 393–94, 433–34.
16. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 411–12.
17. Carcopino 1949; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 392–94; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 48.



18. MacDonald 1982; Aicher 2000.
19. Ridley 1992.
20. See Bellanca 2003 for a balanced and sensitive discussion of Muñoz and his work.
21. Ridley 1986.
22. Longhi 1934.
23. As cited in Bellanca 2003: 146.
24. Kostoff 1973: 60–63.
25. Meiggs 1973: 106–7.
26. Meiggs 1973: 109–10; for Calza, see Becatti 1946.
27. Pallottino 1937; Giglioli 1938; Strong 1939; Visser 1992; Stone 1993; Scriba 1995.
28. For the Museum of the Empire (Museo dell'Impero), see Giglioli 1928.
29. Cianfarani 1975–76; Sartorio 1991.
30. La Rocca 1997–98: 25.
31. Mustillo 1939.
32. *EHCA*: 502; Maggi 1974: 48–49.
33. Martinelli 1960; Cederna 1981: xix–xx.
34. Giglioli 1935; Mazzotti 1954; Cederna 1981: xxii–xxiii.
35. Colini 1982.
36. La Rocca 1997–98: 20–23.
37. Bellanca 1997–98. This can be seen in Muñoz 1934, his obituary of Ricci.
38. Dyson 2004: 179–87.
39. Diggins 1972.
40. Calza 1921; Mattingly 1996; Munzi 2004: 73–74.
41. Calza 1925; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 40–41; Munzi 2001: 42–43.
42. Altekamp 1995.
43. Anti 1966: 59; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 520–21.
44. Munzi 2001: 66–69.
45. Squarciapino 1966: 35–36; Altekamp 2004; Munzi 2004.
46. Altekamp 2004: 62; Munzi 2004: 82.
47. Colini 1982; Munzi 2001: 42–43; Altekamp 2004: 59.
48. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 53; Munzi 2001: 44–46; Altekamp 2004: 60.
49. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 139–40; Munzi 2001: 50–51.
50. Goodchild 1976: 315–16; Munzi 2001: 79–80; Munzi 2004: 85–95.
51. Petricioli 1990: 167–84.
52. *EHCA*: 712; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 434–35.
53. Maggi 1974: 53–64.
54. Petricioli 1990: 200–202; Barbanera 1998: 126–28.
55. Maggi 1974: 67–195; Zevi 2001.
56. De Carolis 1990: 15–17.
57. De Carolis 1990: 17; Barbanera 1998: 59–61, 211 n. 42; Dyson 1998: 143.
58. Delphino 2001.
59. Calza 1924.

60. Maggi 1974: 106–9; Barbanera 1998: 153, 225 n. 113.  
 61. *EHCA*: 712.  
 62. Maggi 1974: 70–77.  
 63. Zevi 2001: 74.  
 64. Von Hase 1989; d'Agostino 1991: 55; Guzzo 1993: 95–96; Barbanera 1998: 143–44, 224 n. 85; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 738–39.  
 65. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 735–36.  
 66. Maggi 1974: 81.  
 67. Davis 2000: 77.  
 68. Davis 2000: 79–82.  
 69. Davis 2000: 83–87.  
 70. Dyson 1998: 92–93; Davis 2003.  
 71. *EHCA*: 519; Dyson 1998: 92–94; Hood 1998: 48–51.  
 72. Hood 1998: xxii–xxiii.  
 73. *DBC*: 590–91; Hartley 1954.  
 74. *DBC*: 556–57; Hood 1998: 71–75.  
 75. Dyson 1998: 179–84; Davis 2003.  
 76. Hood 1998: 171–76; Morris 2000: 60–62.  
 77. Dyson 1998: 181.  
 78. Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994: 8, 249.  
 79. *EHCA*: 828; Cahill 2002: 52–73.  
 80. Dyson 1998: 193–95.  
 81. Dyson 1998: 193–95.  
 82. Cahill 2002.  
 83. Davis 2003: 161–66.  
 84. Dyson 1998: 152–216.  
 85. *DBC*: 751–53; *EHCA*: 866; Powell 1943; Zarmati 1990; Hood 1998: 135–42.
- It is ironic that both Brooke and Payne died of blood poisoning.
86. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 124–25.  
 87. Basch 1995: 498.  
 88. Payne and Mackworth-Young 1950: xi.  
 89. Rodenwaldt 1936; Rodenwaldt 1957: 8–9; Marchand 1996: 338–40.  
 90. Marchand 1996: 302–40.  
 91. R. M. Cook 1960: 301–22.  
 92. Lock 1990.  
 93. Dawkins 1929; Mackridge 1990: 204; J. Carter 1987.  
 94. Waterhouse 1986: 31, 101–13.  
 95. Payne 1962.  
 96. *EHCA*: 798; Petrie 1886.  
 97. E. Gardner 1888; Hogarth 1898–99.  
 98. Woolley 1953a: 179–82; Winstone 1990: 204–13; Möller 2000: 50, 65; Boardman 2002.  
 99. Powell 1943: 100–101; Ridgway 1990.  
 100. *DBC*: 88–89; Blakeway 1932–33; Ridgway 1990; Snodgrass 2002. It is

interesting to note that Blakeway in his seminal article acknowledges no Italian archaeologists.

101. *DBC*: 266–67.
102. De Angelis 1998; Snodgrass 2002.
103. Settis 1988: 154–55; Giuliano 2001.
104. Arias 1976: 101–2; Barbanera 1998: 138–39, 223 n. 70; Servadio 2000: 140, 155, 105. Ceserani 2000: 191.
106. Dinsmoor 1927: 75; Settis 1988: 140–44 on the prevalence of the preconceptions about the lack of originality in Western Greek culture and the importance of the scholarship of Pace in countering that.
107. *EHCA*: 1063; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 139.
108. *EHCA*: 210; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 234–35.
109. *EHCA*: 629; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 374.
110. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 144–45.
111. *EHCA*: 635–36; Knigge 1991.
112. R. M. Cook 1960: 301–5.
113. R. M. Cook 1960: 301–2.
114. Marchand 1996: 349.
115. Breitingner 1939; Junker 1998; Whitley 2001: 35–36.
116. Marchand 1996: 350–52; Junker 1998: 288.
117. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 285–86.
118. Deichmann 1986: 17.
119. *EHCA*: 40–41; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 160–61; Amelung and Holtzinger 1906; Rodenwaldt 1927.
120. Andreae 1993: 28–32.
121. *EHCA*: 342; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 186–87; Curtius 1950; Bieber 1955; Kaschnitz-Weinberg 1956; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 202. For a more ambivalent picture of Curtius, see Faber 1995.
122. Curtius 1927.
123. Faber 1995; Marchand 1996: 335–37, 355–56.
124. Brendel 1979: 109–20.
125. *EHCA*: 629–30; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 248–49; Bieber 1967. Kaschnitz-Weinberg's unchanged support for formal analysis as an approach to art is clearly expressed in his 1956 obituary of his mentor Ludwig Curtius (Kaschnitz-Weinberg 1956).
126. Coarelli 1976: 429–32. It should not be forgotten that concepts that one would today consider racist were in common usage throughout German intellectual discourse. Margarete Bieber, a German Jew who had to flee Hitler, employed concepts like “Nordic” regularly in her 1967 memorial for Kaschnitz-Weinberg.
127. *EHCA*: 965–66; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 236–37; Marchand 1996: 337–39.
128. *EHCA*: 962.
129. Junker 1998: 283–84.
130. Ducati 1929; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 589–91.
131. Barbanera 2003: 114–16, 155–57.

132. Rodenwaldt 1957: 8–9.
133. Rodenwaldt 1936; Marchand 1996: 351–52.
134. Weickert 1949.
135. B. Arnold 1990; B. Arnold 1992; Hassmann 2000; Veit 2000.
136. Speer 1970: 94–97.
137. Dyson 1998: 223–28.
138. *EHCA*: 669–70; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 262–63; Seiler 2001.
139. Dyson 1998: 227.
140. *EHCA*: 159–60; Lullies and Schiering 1988: 196–97; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 75–76.
141. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 291–92.
142. Marchand 1996: 343–54.
143. The Annual Report in the *Jahresberichte des Archäologisch Instituts* (1939–40): ix, describes the excavations at Carnuntum outside Vienna as being carried out under the “direction” of the Führer.
144. A. Birley 2002: 2.
145. Carabott 2003.
146. “Spyridon Marinatos, a Reader of History,” *New York Times*, January 11, 1971; Nikolaidou and Kokkinidou 1998: 250; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 441–42; Kokkinidou and Nikolaidou 2004: 167.
147. Wallace-Hadrill 2001: 10–54.
148. Hodges 2000.
149. Dyson 2004.
150. Wallace-Hadrill 2001: 55–96.
151. Dyson 1998: 210–15.
152. Collingwood 1939: 120.
153. *DBC*: 192–93; Collingwood 1939: 120–46; Couse 1990; Hingley 2000: 131–38.
154. Breeze 2003: 12.
155. Hodder 1991: 95–106.
156. *DBC*: 1050–53; Wheeler 1956; Hawkes 1982.
157. Hawkes 1977; Hawkes 1982: 150–77.
158. Richmond 1956.
159. Kondoleon 2000: 5–8.
160. Morey 1938; Levi 1947.
161. Hopkins 1979.
162. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 198–200.
163. A. D. Momigliano 1994a; Dyson 1998: 196–99, 262–64.
164. Rostovtzeff 1938; Perkins 1973; Wharton 1995: 15–33.
165. Annual report in *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1944–45): 116–17.
166. *DBC*: 761–63; *EHCA*: 872; Powell 1999: 131–48.
167. *DBC*: 413; Coldstream and Rodewald 1980: 442–43.
168. For Olsen, see K. Lehmann 1945; for Technau, see Lullies and Schiering 1988: 287–88; for Feyel, see Demangel 1944–45.
169. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 220–21.

170. Goodchild 1976: 318–35; Munzi 2004: 95–97.  
 171. Marchand 1996: 344–46, 353–54; Hood 1998: 35–41.  
 172. Mazower 1993: 5–8; Marchand 1996: 345–46.  
 173. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 272–73.  
 174. Marchand 1996: 335–36.  
 175. Mazower 1993: 46.  
 176. Schnapp 1980: 22–23.  
 177. Schnapp 1980: 23.  
 178. Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994: 298–99; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 444–45.  
 179. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 227–27.  
 180. F.W.D. 1970; Jantzen 1986: 47–50.  
 181. Munzi 2001: 114–15. Van Gerkan created the guide for Leptis Magna, while his assistant Siegfried Fuchs prepared the one for Cyrene.  
 182. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 212.  
 183. Torelli 1986: 196; Accame 1988: 9–12; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 67–68; Tine and Traverso 2001.  
 184. Barbanera 1998: 112–16, 131–33, 220 n. 87.  
 185. *EHCA*: 679–80; Triantaphyllopoulos 1991; Barbanera 1998: 136–37; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 413–14.  
 186. Accame 1988: 9.  
 187. Jacopi had a long career in fascist archaeology. In 1924 he was appointed chief archaeological administrator of the Dodecanese (Petricioli 1990: 200–202). He also served as a government agent to explore archaeological opportunities in Turkey (Petricioli 1986: 24–25; Petricioli 1990: 339–60).  
 188. Barbanera 2003: 218–21.  
 189. Junker 1998: 286, 290; Maischberger 2002: 212–15.  
 190. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 140–41.  
 191. Boyance 1961–63: 34–35; Schnapp 1996b: 61–63.  
 192. Gran-Aymerich 1998: 329, 386, 458–62, 465; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 593.  
 193. Goodchild 1976: 320–35.  
 194. Winstone 1990: 225–39.  
 195. Wheeler 1956: 152–61; Hawkes 1982: 216–19.

## Chapter 7. After World War II

1. Shnirelman 1996.
2. Reynolds 1976: xiii–xiv; Munzi 2004: 96–103.
3. Grenier 1955: 46.
4. Mattingly 1996: 57–64.
5. Guarducci 1992: 322–25.
6. *EHCA*: 502.
7. Barbanera 1998: 126–27, 156–57.
8. De Angelis d'Ossat 1977: 399–400; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 388–89.
9. Torelli 1986: 190.

10. Barbanera 1998: 154, 157, 168, 172; Carandini 2000: 37, 129.
11. Bianchi Bandinelli 1943; De Sanctis 1943.
12. Arias 1976: 75–76; La Penna 1979: 240–43; La Penna 1994.
13. Ajello 1979.
14. Coarelli 1976: 437–38; Carandini 1979: 121–62. Coarelli notes that a number of emerging German scholars like Zanker and Fitchen also participated in Bianchi Bandinelli's seminars.
15. Lullies and Schiering 1988: 256–57; Marchand 1996: 354–68.
16. Marchand 1996: 368–71; Maischberger 2000: 59.
17. Marchand 1996: 363–68.
18. Guarducci 1992: 314–27.
19. Dyson 1998: 257–59.
20. McCredie 2002.
21. *EHCA*: 1055–56; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994: 239–45.
22. Dyson 1998: 231–47.
23. Gebhard 1990; H. Williams 1990.
24. Bullitt 1969.
25. Rainey 1992: 144–50; Dyson 1998: 236–42.
26. Mitten 1987; Dyson 1998: 224–26, 234–36.
27. Hanfmann 1972: 6–8.
28. Hanfmann 1972.
29. Yegul 1986.
30. Hood 1998: 201–3.
31. *DBC*: 981–83; Reynolds 1993.
32. Gran-Aymerich 2001: 47–48.
33. Nikolaidou and Kokkinidou 1998; Kokkinidou and Nikolaidou 2004; 166–68, 176–79.
34. Hoving 1997: 308–30.
35. Skeates 2000: 40.
36. Hoving 1997: 281–89.
37. Hess 1974: 141–51; Hoving 1993: 307–40.
38. Hoving 1997: 313–18.
39. Hoving 1997: 279–310.
40. True 1993.
41. Skeates 2000: 44–45; Coggins 2002.
42. *EHCA*: 330–31; Valentine and Valentine 1973: 132–41.
43. Brown 1980; Brown, Richardson, and Richardson 1960, 1983; Bruno and Scott 1993; Fentress 2003.
44. MacKendrick 1960: 98–109.
45. *Ecole* 1975: 117–18; Gros 1981.
46. MacKendrick 1960: 95–98; Mertens 1969.
47. Nobecourt 1991: 27.
48. *EHCA*: 742–43; *Ecole* 1975: 118–19.
49. Nobecourt 1991: 80–82; De Angelis 1998.

50. *EHCA*: 899–900.
51. *EHCA*: 899–900.
52. Ridgway 1990; d'Agostino 1991: 58.
53. *EHCA*: 1054–55; Dyson 1998: 232–33.
54. Sjoqvist 1973.
55. Dyson 1998: 232–33.
56. *EHCA*: 1035; Boardman 1964: 49–50; Waterhouse 1986: 114–16.
57. Bradford 1957: 145–216.
58. Chouquer et al. 1987.
59. J. C. Carter 1990.
60. Agache 1978.
61. G. Clark 1958.
62. G. Clark 1989: 64–66; Wilson 1995.
63. *DBC*: 815–17; E. Birley 1966.
64. See Hingley 2000: 150, table 10.3, which shows that throughout this period excavations at military sites surpassed those at villa or town sites by a substantial margin; S. James 2002: 5–6.
65. Hawkes 1982: 353–56.
66. Jones 1987.
67. *DBC*: 1026–28; H. Thompson 1981; Wilkes 1983; Hodges 1990: 87–90; Cotton 1992; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 703–6.
68. Wallace-Hadrill 2001: 105–6.
69. Potter 1979; Wallace-Hadrill 2001: 106–11.
70. Piggott 1967.
71. Ward-Perkins et al. 1968.
72. Barker 1985.
73. Dyson 1998: 248–52.
74. N. Spencer 1998: 35–41; Whitley 2001: 47–50.
75. Keller and Rupp 1983 summarizes the results of the first generation of survey archaeology in the Mediterranean.
76. Grimes 1968; Thomas 2003: 10–13.
77. Biddle 1974; Biddle, Hudson, and Heighway 1973.
78. Quilici and Quilici Gigli 2001.
79. Manacorda and Tamassia 1985.
80. Manacorda 1982a; Manacorda et al. 2000.
81. Blot 1996: 18–35.
82. MacKendrick 1960: 178–82; Blot 1996: 38–41.
83. Bass 1966; Blot 1996: 61–65.
84. Rainey 1992: 267–69.
85. Droomgoole 2002; O'Keefe 2002.
86. Casson 1971.
87. Bruni et al. 2000.
88. Gould 2000: 170–73.
89. De Angelis d'Ossat 1977; Gran-Aymerich 2001: 229–30.

90. Blot 1996: 49–51.
91. Manacorda 1978; Will 1987.
92. Hayes 1972.
93. *DBC*: 320–23; Finley 1973.
94. Poidebard 1939.
95. McCann et al. 1987: 3–11.
96. McCann et al. 1987; McCann 2002.
97. Dyson 1978.
98. Carandini 1979: 121–62.
99. Carandini and Ricci 1985.
100. Lund 2000.
101. Dyson 1998: 187–88.
102. Ennabli 1992.
103. Frend 1996: 313–17.

#### Afterword

1. Morris 1994: 38–39.
2. Hodges 1990.
3. Dietler 1994; Champion 1996: 140–42.
4. Dyson 1998: 247–54.
5. Noskov 2002.
6. Elia 2001.
7. Marthari 2001; Pastore 2002.
8. Skeates 2000: 55–56; Addyman and Brodie 2002.
9. Brodie and Tubb 2002: 3–4.





# Bibliography

## Abbreviations

- DBC Todd, R. B., gen. ed. 2004. *The Dictionary of British Classicists*. Bristol, England.
- EHCA de Grummond, N. T., ed. 1996. *An Encyclopedia of the History of Classical Archaeology*. Westport, Conn.

## Works Cited

- Abbamondi, L. 1993. "Per una storia della fotografia archeologica a Roma dalle origini agli albori del novecento." *Archeologia in posa: cento anni di fotografia del Foro Romano*, xiii–xix. Rome.
- Accame, S. 1984. "F. Halbherr e G. De Sanctis." *Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto italiano per la storia antica* 34: 1–20.
- . 1988. "Convegno di studi l'archeologia italiana nel Mediterraneo fino alla Seconda Guerra Mondiale." *Miscellanea Grece e Romana* 13: 1–15.
- Adamesteanu, D. 1985. *I greci sul Basento*. Como, Italy.
- Addyman, P., and N. Brodie. 2002. "Metal Detecting in Britain: Catastrophe or Compromise?" In *Illicit Antiquities: The Theft of Culture and the Extinction of Archaeology*, ed. N. Brodie and K. W. Tubb, 179–84. London.
- Agache, R. 1978. *La Somme pré-romaine et romaine*. Amiens, France.
- Aicher, P. 2000. "Mussolini's Forum and the Myth of Augustan Rome." *Classical Bulletin* 76 (2): 117–39.
- Ajello, N. 1979. *Intellettuali e PCI, 1944–1958*. Bari, Italy.
- Alexander, E. 1983. *Museum Masters*. Nashville, Tenn.
- Alexandri, A. 2002. "Names and Emblems: Greek Archaeology, Regional Identities and National Narratives at the Turn of the Twentieth Century." *Antiquity* 76: 191–99.
- Allen, S. H., ed. 2002a. "'Americans in the East': Francis Henry Bacon, Joseph Thacher Clarke and the AIA at Assos." In *Excavating Our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America*, ed. S. H. Allen, 63–92. Boston.
- , ed. 2002b. *Excavating Our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America*. Boston.
- Allison, P. 2004. *Pompeian Households*. Los Angeles.
- Allroggen-Bedel, A. 1993. "Gli scavi di Ercolano nella politica culturale dei Borboni." In *Ercolano, 1738–1988*, ed. L. F. dell'Orto. Rome.

- Allsebrook, M. 1992. *Born to Rebel: The Life of Harriet Boyd Hawes*. Oxford.
- Altekamp, S. 1995. "L'azione archeologica fra indirizzo scientifico e intervento politico: il caso dell'archeologia libica, 1911–1943." *Quaderni di Storia* 41: 101–13.
- . 2004. "Italian Colonial Archaeology in Libya, 1912–1942." In *Archaeology Under Dictatorship*, ed. M. L. Galaty and C. Watkinson, 55–72. New York.
- Amandry, P. 1976. "Albert Dumont et les transformations de l'enseignement supérieur au début de la troisième république." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 100: 1–5.
- Amelung, W. 1903–8. *Die Skulpturen des Vatikanischen Museums*. Berlin.
- Amelung, W., and H. Holtzinger. 1906. *The Museums and Ruins of Rome*. London.
- Andreae, B. 1993. "Kurze Geschichte des deutschen archäologischen Instituts in Rom dargestellt im Wirken seiner leitenden Gelehrten." *Römische Mitteilungen* 100: 5–40.
- Angelicoussis, E. 1992. *The Woburn Abbey Collection of Classical Antiquities*. Mainz am Rhein, Germany.
- . 2001. *The Holkham Collection of Classical Sculpture*. Mainz am Rhein, Germany.
- Anti, C. 1966. *Propedeutica archeologica: a cura di Luigi Polacco*. Padua, Italy.
- Arias, P. 1976. *Quattro archeologi del nostro secolo*. Pisa, Italy.
- . 1991. "Politica e cultura nel attività di Paolo Orsi." *Annuario del Museo civico di Rovereto: sezione archeologica, studi di scienze naturali* 6 (suppl): 17–28.
- . 1995. "Il mito dell'archeologia italiana: due 'patres conscripti' all'inizio delle leggi sulla antichità dopo il 1870." *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Classi di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 8 (6): 237–45.
- Armeni, C., et al. 2000. *Villa Torlonia*. Rome.
- Arnold, B. 1990. "The Past as Propaganda: Totalitarian Archaeology in Nazi Germany." *Antiquity* 64: 464–78.
- . 1992. "The Past as Propaganda." *Archaeology* July–August: 30–36.
- Arnold, D., ed. 1994. *Belov'd by Ev'ry Muse*. London.
- Ashmole, B. 1970. "Sir John Beazley, 1885–1970." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 56: 443–61.
- . 1994. *Bernard Ashmole, 1894–1988: An Autobiography*. Ed. D. Kurtz. Malibu, Calif.
- Augenti, A. 2000. "Giacomo Boni, gli scavi di Santa Maria Antiqua e l'archeologia medievale a Roma all'inizio del novecento." *Archeologia medievale* 27: 39–46.
- Baker, P. 1964. *The Fortunate Pilgrims*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Baradez, J. 1949. *Fossatum Africae*. Paris.
- Barbanera, M. 1993. *Il Museo dell'arte classica*. Rome.
- . 1995. *Il Museo dell'arte classica: Gipsoteca*. Vol. 1. Rome.
- . 1998. *L'archeologia degli italiani: storia, metodi e orientamenti dell'archeologia classica in Italia*. Rome.
- . 2000a. "Les collections de moulages au XIXe siècle: étapes d'un parcours entre idéalisme, positivisme et esthétisme." In *Les moulages de sculptures antiques et l'histoire de l'archéologie*, ed. H. Lavagne and F. Queyrel, 57–73. Paris.

- . 2000b. "Idee per una storia dell'archeologia classica in Italia dalla fine del settecento al dopoguerra." In *Archeologia teorica*, ed. N. Terrenato, 39–56. Siena, Italy.
- , ed. 2000c. *Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli e il suo mondo*. Bari, Italy.
- . 2003. *Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli: biografia ed epistolario di un grande archeologo*. Milan.
- Barker, G., ed. 1985. *Cyrenaica in Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Barnabei, F. 1991. *Le "memorie di un archeologo,"* ed. M. Barnabei and F. Delfino. Rome.
- Barthélemy, J.-J. 1816. *Travels of Anacharsis the Younger in Greece*. London.
- Basch, S. 1995. *Le mirage grecque*. Paris.
- Basch, G. 1966. *Archaeology Under Water*. London.
- . 1975. *Archaeology Beneath the Sea*. New York.
- Baumstark, R. 1999. *Das neue Hellas: Griechen und Bayern zur Zeit Ludwigs I.* Munich.
- Bazant, J. 1991. "Otto Jahn's 'Griechische Kunstgeschichte' Today." In *Otto Jahn (1813–1868)*, ed. W. Calder III, H. Cancik, and B. Kytzler, 11–28. Stuttgart.
- Beard, M. 1993. "Casts and Cast-offs: The Origins of the Museum of Classical Archaeology." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39: 1–29.
- . 2000a. "Cast: Between Art and Science." In *Les moulages de sculpture antiques et l'histoire de l'archéologie*, ed. H. Lavagne and F. Queyrel. Paris.
- . 2000b. *The Invention of Jane Harrison*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Becatti, G. 1946. "Commemorazione di Guido Calza." *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 22: 23–30.
- Becchetti, P. 1978. *Fotografi e fotografia in Italia, 1839–1889*. Rome.
- Bellanca, C. 1997–98. "Antonio Maria Colini, Antonio Muñoz e il Governatorato." *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 70: 27–34.
- . 2003. *Antonio Muñoz: la politica di tutela dei monumenti di Roma durante il Governatorato*. Rome.
- Belli, C. 1974. "François Lenormant, archeologo avventuroso." *Atti del tredicesimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia*, 7–41. Taranto, Italy.
- Belsey, H. 1982. "Cameos from the Grand Tour: The Paintings of Pompeo Batoni." *History Today*, August 1982: 46–49.
- Beltrami, L. 1926. *Giacomo Boni*. Milan.
- Bandinelli, G. 1953. *Luigi Canina (1795–1856): le opere, i tempi*. Alessandria, Italy.
- Bennett, T. 1995. *The Birth of the Museum*. London.
- Benson, A. C. 1907. *Walter Pater*. London.
- Bentmann, R., and M. Muller. 1992. *The Villa as Hegemonic Architecture*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.
- Bérard, C., ed. 1989. *A City of Images: Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece*. Princeton, N.J.
- Bernal, M. 1987. *Black Athena*. Vol. 1. New Brunswick, N.J.
- Berthier, A. 1951. *L'Algérie et son passé*. Paris.
- Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 1943. *Storicità dell'arte classica*. Florence.

- . 1995. *Introduzione all'archeologia classica come storia dell'arte antica*. Bari, Italy.
- . 1996. *Dal diario di un borghese*. Rome.
- Biddle, M. 1974. "The Future of the Urban Past." In *Rescue Archaeology*, ed. P. Rahtz, 95–111. Harmondsworth, England.
- Biddle, M., and D. M. Hudson, with C. M. Heighway. 1973. *The Future of London's Past: A Survey of the Archaeological Implications of Planning and Development in the Nation's Capital*. Worcester.
- Bieber, M. 1955. "Ludwig Curtius." *American Journal of Archaeology* 59: 64–65.
- . 1967. "A Monument for Guido Kaschnitz von Weinberg." *American Journal of Archaeology* 71: 361–86.
- Birley, A. 2002. "Fifty Years of Roman Frontier Studies." In *Limes 18: Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies Held in Amman, Jordan (September 2000)*, ed. P. Freeman, J. Bennett, Z. Fiema, and B. Hoffmann, 1–11. Oxford.
- Birley, E. 1961. *Research on Hadrian's Wall*. Kendal, England.
- . 1966. "Sir Ian Archibald Richmond, 1902–1965." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 52: 292–302.
- Bisconti, F., et al. 1994. *Giovanni Battista de Rossi e le catacombe romane*. Vatican City, Rome.
- Black, J. 2003. *Italy and the Grand Tour*. New Haven, Conn.
- Blakeway, A. 1932–33. "Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Commerce with the West, 800–600 B.C." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 33: 170–208.
- Blanchet, A., ed. 1931. *Carte archéologique de la Gaule romaine*. Paris.
- Blot, J.-V. 1996. *Underwater Archaeology*. New York.
- Boardman, J. 1964. *The Greeks Overseas*. Harmondsworth, England.
- . 1985. "One Hundred Years of Classical Archaeology in Oxford." In *Beazley and Oxford*, ed. D. C. Kurtz, 43–55. Oxford.
- . 2002. "Al Mina: The Study of a Site." *Ancient West and East* 1 (2): 315–31.
- Bolton, G. 1971. *Roman Century*. New York.
- Bommelaer, J.-F. 1992. *La redécouverte de Delphes*. Paris.
- Bonamici, M. 1980. "Sui primi scavi di Luciano Bonaparte a Vulci." *Prospettiva*: 6–24.
- Boon, G. C. 1974. *Silchester: The Roman Town of Calleva*. Newton Abbot, England.
- Borowitz, H., and A. Borowitz. 1991. *Pawnshop and Palaces: The Fall and Rise of the Campana Art Museum*. Washington, D.C.
- Bowden, M. 1991. *Pitt Rivers: The Life and Archaeological Work of Lieutenant-General Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt Rivers, DCL, FRS, FSA*. Cambridge.
- Boyance, P. 1961–63. "Commémoration du membre Albert Grenier." *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 34: 27–36.
- Bracco, V. 1979. *L'archeologia classica nella cultura occidentale*. Rome.
- Bradford, J. 1957. *Ancient Landscapes*. London.
- Brand, V., ed. 1998. *The Study of the Past in the Victorian Age*. Oxford.
- Breeze, D. J. 2003. "John Collingwood Bruce and the Study of Hadrian's Wall." *Britannia* 34: 1–18.

- Breitinger, E. 1939. "Die Skelette aus dem submykenischen Gräbern." In *Die Nekropolen des 12 bis 10 Jahrhunderts. Kerameikos*, ed. W. Kraiker and K. Kubler, 223–61. Berlin.
- Brendel, O. 1979. *Prolegomena to the Study of Roman Art*. New Haven, Conn.
- Brilliant, R. 2000. "Winckelmann and Warburg." In *Antiquity and Its Interpreters*, ed. A. Payne, A. Kuttner, and R. Smick, 269–75. Cambridge.
- Brodie, N., J. Doole, and C. Renfrew, eds. 2001. *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: The Destruction of the World's Archaeological Heritage*. Cambridge.
- Brodie, N., and K. W. Tubb. 2002. *Illicit Antiquities: The Theft of Culture and the Extinction of Archaeology*. London.
- Brooks, V. W. 1958. *The Dream of Arcadia*. New York.
- Brown, F. E. 1980. *Cosa: The Making of a Roman Town*. Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Brown, F. E., E. H. Richardson, and L. Richardson, Jr. 1960. *Cosa II: The Temples of the Arx*. Rome.
- . 1993. *Cosa III: The Buildings of the Forum*. University Park, Pa.
- Bruneau, P., ed. 1992. *Georges Perrot, Maxime Collignon: "Etudes d'archéologie grecque"; précédé de l'archéologie grecque en Sorbonne de 1876 à 1914*. Paris.
- Bruni, S. 1991. "I musei archeologici di Roma capitale." *Rivista dell'istituto nazionale d'archeologia e storia d'arte*, ser. 3, 14–15: 379–92.
- . 1995. *Isidoro Falchi, un medico al servizio dell'archeologia*. Campiglia Marittima, Italy.
- Bruni, S., et al. 2000. *Le navi antiche di Pisa*. Florence.
- Bruno, V. J., and R. T. Scott. 1993. *Cosa IV: The Houses*. University Park, Pa.
- Bullitt, O. 1969. *Search for Sybaris*. Philadelphia.
- Buranelli, F. 1991. *Gli scavi della società V. Campanari e Governo Pontificio (1835–1837)*. Rome.
- Butler, E. M. 1958. *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany*. Boston.
- Cahill, N. 2002. *Household and City Organization at Olynthus*. New Haven, Conn.
- Calder, W. M. III, H. Cancik, and B. Kytzler, eds. 1991. *Otto Jahn (1813–1868)*. Stuttgart.
- Calloway, S. 1998. *Aubrey Beardsley*. London.
- Calza, G. 1921. "The Memorials of Rome in the Italian Colonies." *Art and Archaeology* 11 (4): 131–44.
- . 1924. "Pompeii Is Born Again." *Art and Archaeology* 17: 161–68.
- . 1925. "Sabratha and Leptis: The Glories of Roman Tripolitania." *Art and Archaeology* 20: 211–21.
- Campanelli, A., et al., eds. 2003. *La collezione Torlonia di Antichità del Fucino*. Pescara, Italy.
- Campitelli, A., ed. 1997. *Villa Torlonia: l'ultima impresa del mecenatismo romano*. Rome.
- Cancik, H. 1991. "Vorlesung 'Grundzüge der Archäologie' (Bonn, Sommer 1865) in den Mitschriften von Eduard Hiller." In *Otto Jahn (1813–1868)*, ed. W. M. Calder III, H. Cancik, and B. Kytzler. Stuttgart.
- Capecchi, G. 1989–90. "Un catalogo mai edito, un disegno archiviato: Vittorio Poggi

- e la nascita del museo archeologico di Firenze." *Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università degli studi di Perugia* 37: 198–230.
- Capodiferro, A., and P. Fortini, eds. 2003. *Gli scavi di Giacomo Boni al Foro Romano*. Rome.
- Carabott, P. 2003. "Monumental Visions: The Past in Metaxos." In *The Usable Past*, ed. K. Brown and Y. Hamilakos, 23–27. Lanham, Md.
- Carandini, A. 1979. *Archeologia e cultura materiale*. Bari, Italy.
- . 2000. *Giornale di scavo*. Turin, Italy.
- Carandini, A., and F. Cambi. 2002. *Paesaggi d'Etruria*. Rome.
- Carandini, A., and A. Ricci. 1985. *Settefinestre: una villa schiavistica nell'Etruria romana*. Modena, Italy.
- Carcopino, J. 1949. "La prospection aérienne de limes de Numide." *Journal des savants*: 133–53.
- . 1968. *Souvenirs romains*. Paris.
- Carter, J. 1987. "The Masks of Orthia." *American Journal of Archaeology* 91: 355–84.
- Carter, J. C. 1983. *The Sculpture of the Sanctuary of Athena Polias at Priene*. London.
- . 1990. "Metapontum: Land, Wealth, Population." In *Essays in Honour of A. D. Trendall*, 405–41. Canberra, ACT.
- Carter, R. 1979. "Karl Friedrich Schinkel's Project for a Royal Palace on the Acropolis." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 9: 34–46.
- Cartocci, S., and G. Cartocci. 1977. *Yesterday's Rome*. Rome.
- Cassanelli, R., et al. 2002. *Ruins of Rome*. Los Angeles.
- Casson, L. 1971. *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World*. Princeton, N.J.
- Cavazzi, L., et al. 1989. *Un inglese a Roma*. Rome.
- Cederna, A. 1981. *Mussolini urbanista*. Bari, Italy.
- Ceserani, G. 2000. "The Charm of the Siren." In *Sicily from Aeneas to Augustus*, ed. C. Smith and J. Serrati, 174–93. Edinburgh.
- Cesnola, L. P. di. 1878. *Cyprus: Its Ancient Cities, Tombs and Temples*. New York.
- Chaconas, S. 1942. *Adamantios Korais*. New York.
- Chaline, J.-P. 1995. *Sociabilité et érudition: les sociétés savantes en France, XIXe–XXe siècles*. Paris.
- Champion, T. 1996. "Three Nations or One? Britain and the National Use of the Past." In *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, ed. M. Diaz-Andreu and T. Champion, 119–45. Boulder, Colo.
- Chaney, E. 1984. "The Grand Tour and Beyond: British and American Travellers in Southern Italy, 1545–1960." In *Oxford, China and Italy*, ed. E. Chaney and N. Ritchie, 133–60. London.
- . 1998. *The Evolution of the Grand Tour*. London.
- Chapman, W. 1989. "The Organizational Context in the History of Archaeology: Pitt-Rivers and Other British Archaeologists in the 1860s." *Antiquaries Journal* 69: 23–42.
- Chatelain, J. 1973. *Dominique Vivant Denon et le Louvre de Napoléon*. Paris.
- Cherry, J. 1992. "Beazley in the Bronze Age? Reflections on Attributions Studies in Aegean Prehistory." *Aegaeum* 8: 123–41.
- Chiusano, I. A. 1988. *Goethe in Italia*. Milan.

- Chouquer, G., et al. 1987. *Structures agraires en Italie centro-méridionale: cadastres et paysages ruraux*. Rome.
- Cianfarani, V. 1975–76. “Italo Gismondi.” *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 48: 15–16.
- Clark, A. M. 1985. *Pompeo Batoni*. Oxford.
- Clark, G. 1958. “O. G. S. Crawford, 1886–1957.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 44: 280–96.
- . 1989. *Prehistory at Cambridge and Beyond*. Cambridge.
- Clarke, E. 1809. *Greek Marbles Brought from the Shores of the Euxine, Archipelago, and Mediterranean: And Deposited in the Vestibule of the Public Library of the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge.
- Clarke, M., and N. Penny. 1982. *The Arrogant Connoisseur: Richard Payne Knight, 1751–1824*. Manchester, England.
- Clay, E., ed. 1976. *Sir William Gell in Italy: Letters to the Society of Dilettanti, 1831–1835*. London.
- . 1979. *Lady Blessington at Naples*. London.
- Coarelli, F. 1976. “Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli.” *Belfagor* 31: 415–46.
- Coggins, C. 2002. “The Great Divides: The AIA and Professional Responsibility in Archaeology.” In *Excavating Our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America*, ed. S. H. Allen, 169–88. Boston.
- Coldstream, J. N., and C. A. Rodewald. 1980. “Vincent Robin D’Arba Desborough, 1914–1978.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 67: 439–53.
- Colini, A. 1982. “Ricordo di Pietro Romanelli.” *Studi romani* 15: 358–65.
- Collignon, M. 1892–97. *L’histoire de la sculpture grecque*. Paris.
- . 1915. *L’archéologie classique*. Paris.
- Collingwood, R. 1939. *An Autobiography*. Oxford.
- Colonna, G. 1978. “Archeologia etrusca nell’età romantica.” *Studi etrusci* 46: 81–117.
- Colvin, S. 1921. *Memories and Notes of Persons and Places, 1852–1912*. New York.
- Colvin, S., and L. Cust. 1914. *A History of the Society of Dilettanti*. London.
- Connor, P. 1989. “Cast-Collecting in the Nineteenth Century.” In *Rediscovering Hellenism*, ed. G. W. Clarke, 187–235. Cambridge.
- Consoli, G. P. 1996. *Il museo Pio-Clementino*. Modena, Italy.
- Conze, A., A. Hauser, and G. Niemann. 1875–80. *Archäologische Untersuchungen auf Samothrake*. Vienna.
- Cook, B. F. 1985. *The Townley Marbles*. London.
- . 1998. “British Archaeologists in the Aegean.” In *The Study of the Past in the Victorian Age*, ed. V. Brand, 139–54. Oxford.
- Cook, R. M. 1960. *Greek Painted Pottery*. London.
- Cotton, M. 1992. “John Bryan Ward-Perkins: An Appreciation.” In *Marble in Antiquity: Collected Papers of J. B. Ward-Perkins*, ed. H. Dodge and B. Ward-Perkins, 3–6. London.
- Couse, G. G. 1990. “Collingwood’s Detective Image of the Historian and the Study of Hadrian’s Wall.” In *Reassessing Collingwood*. Middletown, Conn.
- Creta antica*. 1984. *Creta antica: Cento anni di archeologia italiana (1884–1984)*. Rome.



- Crook, J. M. 1972. *The British Museum*. London.
- Cubberly, T., and L. Hermann. 1992. *Twilight of the Grand Tour*. Rome.
- Curtis, G. 2003. *Disarmed: The Story of the Venus de Milo*. New York.
- Curtius, L. 1927. *Die antike Kunst und der moderne Humanismus*. Berlin.
- . 1950. *Deutsche und antike Welt: Lebenserinnerungen*. Stuttgart.
- Cust, L. 1914. *History of the Society of the Dilettanti*. London.
- d'Agostino, B. 1991. "The Italian Perspective on Theoretical Archaeology." In *Archaeological Theory in Europe*, ed. I. Hodder, 52–64. London.
- d'Ambrosio, A. 2002. *Pompeii: gli scavi dal 1748 al 1860*. Milan.
- D'Angela, C. 2000. *Il museo negato (Taranto, 1878–1989)*. Taranto, Italy.
- Daniel, G. 1950. *A Hundred Years of Archaeology*. London.
- Darley, G. 1999. *John Soane: An Accidental Romantic*. New Haven, Conn.
- Davis, J., ed. 1998. *Sandy Pylos*. Austin, Tex.
- . 2000. "Warriors for the Fatherland: National Consciousness and Archaeology in 'Barbarian' Epirus and 'Verdant' Ionia, 1912–22." *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 13: 76–98.
- . 2003. "A Foreign School of Archaeology and the Politics of Archaeological Practice: Anatolia, 1922." *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 16: 145–72.
- Dawkins, R. 1929. *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta*. London.
- De Angelis, F. 1993. "Giuseppe Fiorelli: la 'vecchia' antiquaria di fronte allo scavo." *Ricerche di storia dell'arte* 50: 6–16.
- . 1998. "Ancient Past, Imperial Present: The British Empire in T. J. Dunbabin's *The Western Greeks*." *Antiquity* 72: 539–49.
- De Angelis d'Ossat, G. 1977. "Nino Lamboglia." *Studi romani* 25: 399–400.
- De Caro, S., et al. 1992. *Alla ricerca di Iside*. Rome.
- De Caro, S. 1994. *Il museo archeologico nazionale di Napoli*. Naples.
- De Carolis, E. 1990. "Gli sviluppi dell'archeologia pompeiana, 1748–1900." In *Fotografia a Pompei nell'800 dalle collezioni del Museo Alinari*. Florence.
- Déchelette, J. 1908–14. *Manuel d'archéologie préhistorique, celtique et gallo-romaine*. Paris.
- Deichmann, F. W. 1986. *Von internationalen Privatvereinen zur preussischen Staatsanstalt*. Mainz.
- Delphino, F. 2001. "Vittorio Spinazzola: tra Napoli e Pompeii, fra scandali e scavi." In *Pompeii: Scienza e società*, ed. P. Guzzo, 51–61. Naples.
- Demangel, R. 1944–45. "Michel Feyel (8 Juin 1911–24 avril 1945)." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 68–69: x–xi.
- De Rossi, J. B. 1861–77. *Roma sotterranea*. Rome.
- De Sanctis, G. 1943. "R. Bianchi Bandinelli: *Storicità dell'arte classica*." *Rivista filologica* 71: 81–84.
- De Witte, J. 1871. "Notes sur Edoard Gerhard." *Annales de l'académie royal de Belgique*: 1–38.
- Diaz-Andreu, M., and T. Champion. 1996. *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. Boulder, Colo.
- Dickins, G. 1912. *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum*. Vol. 1. Cambridge.

- Diebold, W. J. 1995. "The Politics of Derestoration." *Art Journal* 54: 60–66.
- Diehl, C. 1978. *Americans and German Scholarship, 1770–1870*. New Haven, Conn.
- Dietler, M. 1994. "'Our Ancestors the Gauls': Archaeology, Ethnic Nationalism and the Manipulation of Celtic Identity in Modern Europe." *American Anthropologist* 96: 584–605.
- Diggins, J. P. 1972. *Mussolini and Fascism: The View from America*. Princeton, N.J.
- Dimaras, C. 1992. "Greece, 1750–1850." In *Perceptions of the Ancient Greeks*, ed. K. J. Dover, 203–24. Oxford.
- Dinsmoor, W. 1927. *Architecture of Ancient Greece*. London.
- Di Vita, A. 1986. "Tripolitania e Cirenaica nel carteggio Halbherr: fra politica e archeologia." In *L'archeologia italiana nel mediterraneo*, ed. V. La Rosa, 73–92. Catania, Italy.
- Dodwell, E. 1819. *A Classical and Topographical Tour Through Greece During the Years 1801, 1805, and 1806*. London.
- Dondin-Payre, M. 1991. "L'exercitus Africae inspiratrice de l'armée française d'Afrique: ense et aratro." *Antiquités africaines* 27: 141–49.
- . 1997. "Réussite et déboires d'une oeuvre archéologique unique: le colonel Carbuccia au nord de l'Aurès (1848–1850)." *Antiquités africaines* 32: 145–74.
- Droomgoole, S. 2002. "Law and Underwater Cultural Heritage: A Question of Balancing Interests." In *Illicit Antiquities: The Theft of Culture and the Extinction of Archaeology*, ed. N. Brodie and K. W. Tubb, 109–36. London.
- Droop, J. P. 1915. *Archaeological Excavation*. Cambridge.
- Ducati, P. 1929. "Dallo 'Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica' all'Istituto archeologico germanico." *Nuova antologia*: 487–506.
- Duchêne, H. 2002. "Aventure archéologique et amitié épistolaire: Edmond Pottier, Salomon Reinach et les fouilles de Myrna." *Journal des savants*: 379–440.
- Dunbabin, T. J. 1948. *The Western Greeks*. Oxford.
- Duncan, C. 1995. *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London.
- Dyson, S. L. 1978. "Settlement Patterns in the Ager Cosanus: The Wesleyan University Survey." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 5: 251–68.
- . 1998. *Ancient Marbles to American Shores*. Philadelphia.
- . 2004. *Portrait of an Archaeologist: A Biography of Eugenie Sellers Strong*. London.
- Ecole. 1975. *L'école française de Rome, 1875–1975*. Rome.
- Ehrenkranz, A., et al. 1988. *William J. Stillman, Poetic Localities*. New York.
- Ehrhardt, W. 1982. *Das Akademische Kunstmuseum der Universität Bonn unter der Direktion von Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker und Otto Jahn*. Opladen, Germany.
- Elia, R. 2001. "Analysis of the Looting, Selling, and Collecting of Apulian Red-Figure Vases: A Quantitative Approach." In *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: The Destruction of the World's Archaeological Heritage*, ed. N. Brodie, J. Doole, and C. Renfrew, 145–53. Cambridge.
- Engel, A. J. 1983. *Oxford from Clergyman to Don: The Rise of the Academic Profession in Nineteenth-Century Oxford*. Oxford.
- Engels, D. 1990. *Roman Corinth*. Chicago.

- Ennabli, A. 1992. *Pour sauver Carthage*. Paris.
- Epstein, J. 1940. *Let There Be Sculpture*. New York.
- Ernst, W. 1992. "La transition des galeries privées au musée public et l'imagination muséale: l'exemple du British Museum." In *Anticomanie*, ed. A.-F. Laurens and K. Pomian, 155–67. Paris.
- Espérandieu, E. 1907–38. *Recueil général des bas-reliefs, statues et bustes de la Gaul romaine*. Paris.
- Etienne, R. 1992. *Pompeii: The Day a City Died*. New York.
- Eustace, K., et al. 1997. *Canova: Ideal Heads*. Oxford.
- Evans, J. 1956. *A History of the Society of Antiquaries*. Oxford.
- Faber, R. 1995. "Humanistische und faschistische Welt über Ludwig Curtius (1874–1954)." *Hephaistos* 13: 137–86.
- Falzone del Barbaro, M. 1990. "Guida all'iconografia fotografica di Pompei." In *Fotografi a Pompei nell'800 dalle collezioni del Museo Alinari*, 31–32. Florence.
- Fara, P. 1997. "The Appliance of Science: The Georgian British Museum." *History Today* 47 (8): 39–45.
- Fentress, L., et al. 2003. *Cosa V: An Intermittent Town; Excavations, 1991–1997*. Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Ferguson, H. 2001. "William Martin Leake and the Greek Revival." In *Travellers in the Levant: Voyagers and Visionaries*, ed. S. Searight and M. Wagstaff, 17–34. Durham, England.
- Ferone, C. 1988. "Per lo studio della figura e dell'opera di Raffaele Garrucci (1812–1885)." *13th Misc. Greco and Roman*: 17–32.
- Février, P. A. 1989–90. *Approches du Maghreb romain: pouvoirs, différences et conflits*. Aix-en-Provence, France.
- Finley, M. I. 1973. *The Ancient Economy*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Fiorelli, G. 1994. *Appunti autobiografici*. Sorrento, Italy.
- Fiori, G. 1989. *Vita di Antonio Gramsci*. Bari, Italy.
- Fittschen, K. 1990. *Verzeichnis der Gipsabgüsse des Archäologischen Instituts der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 1767–1989*. Göttingen, Germany.
- Flasch, A. 1902. *Heinrich von Brunn*. Munich.
- Fleming, J. 1962. *Robert Adam and His Circle*. London.
- Frend, W. H. C. 1996. *The Archaeology of Early Christianity*. London.
- Froehner, W. 1898. *Collection d'antiquités du Comte Michel Tyszkiewicz*. Paris.
- Fulford, M., and A. Clarke. 2002. "Victorian Excavation Methodology: The Society of Antiquaries at Silchester in 1893." *Antiquaries Journal* 82: 285–306.
- Funnell, P. 1982. "The Symbolic Language of Antiquity." In *The Arrogant Connoisseur: Richard Payne Knight, 1751–1824*, ed. M. Clarke and N. Penny, 50–64. Manchester, England.
- Furtwängler, A. 1890. *Die Bronzen und die ubrigen kleineren Funde von Olympia*. Berlin.
- . 1895. *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture*. Trans. Eugenie Sellers. London.
- F.W.D. 1970. "Armin von Gerkan, 1884–1969." *Römische Mitteilungen* 77: vii–xvi.
- Galaty, M. L., and C. Watkinson, eds. 2004. *Archaeology Under Dictatorship*. New York.

- Gardner, E. 1888. *Naukratis*. Vol. 2. London.
- Gardner, P. 1894–95. “Sir Charles Newton, K.C.B.” *Annual of the British School at Athens* 1: 67–77.
- . 1902. *Classical Archaeology in Schools*. Oxford.
- . 1933. *Autobiographica*. Oxford.
- Gasparri, C. 1980. *Materiali per servire allo studio del Museo Torlonia di scultura antica*. Rome.
- Gasparri, C., and O. Giandoni. 1994. *Lo studio Calvaceppi e le collezioni Torlonia*. Rome.
- Gebhard, E. 1990. “Excavations at Isthmia and the Work of Oscar Broneer.” In *The Ancient Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. Eleanor Guralnik, 43–48. Chicago.
- Geffcken, K. 1991. “Esther Van Deman: A Profile.” In *Esther B. Van Deman*, ed. K. Einaudi, 7–13. Rome.
- Gell, W. 1810. *The Itinerary of Greece*. London.
- . 1823. *Narrative of a Journal in the Morea*. London.
- . 1832. *Pompeiana: The Topography, Edifices, and Ornaments of Pompeii: The Results of Excavations since 1819*. London.
- . 1846. *The Topography of Rome and Its Vicinity*. London.
- . 1975. *Sir William Gell in Italy: Letters to the Society of Dilettanti, 1831–1835*, ed. E. Clay with M. Fredericksen. London.
- Gell, W., and J. P. Gandy. 1824. *Pompeiana: The Topography, Edifices, and Ornaments of Pompeii*. London.
- Gerdtz, W. 1973. *American Neo-Classical Sculpture*. New York.
- Gerhard, O. 1831. “Rapporto intorno i vasi volcenti.” *Annali dell' Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica* 3: 5–21.
- Ghirardini, G. 1913. *Speranze e conquiste dell' archeologia italiana a Crete e nell' Africa*. Rome.
- Giglioli, G. 1928. “Origine e sviluppo del Museo dell' impero di Roma.” *Capitolium* 4: 303–12.
- . 1928–29. “Rodolfo Lanciani.” *Bullettino Comunale* 56–57: 367–84.
- . 1935. “Corrado Ricci e l' archeologia romana.” In *In Memoriam di Corrado Ricci*, 247–50. Rome.
- . 1938. “La Mostra augustea della romanità.” *Bullettino Comunale* 66: 55–59.
- Gill, D. 1991. “Pots and Trade: Spacefillers or *Objets d' Art*.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111: 29–47.
- . 1993. “Art and Vases vs. Craft and Pots.” *Antiquity* 67: 452–55.
- . 2002. “‘The Passion of Hazard’: Women at the British School at Athens Before the First World War.” *Annual of the British School at Athens* 97: 491–510.
- Gill, D., and M. Vickers. 1990. “Reflected Glory: Pottery and Precious Metal in Classical Greece.” *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 105: 1–30.
- Girouard, M. 1978. *Life in the English Country House*. New Haven, Conn.
- Giuliano, A. 2001. “Ricordo di Biagio Pace.” *Xenia* 9: 239–42.
- Goalen, M. 1995. “The Idea of the City and the Excavations at Pompeii.” In *Urban Society in Roman Italy*, ed. T. Cornell and K. Lomas, 181–202. New York.

- Goodchild, R. G. 1976. *Libyan Studies: Select Papers of the Late R. G. Goodchild*, ed. J. Reynolds. London.
- Goring, E. 1988. *A Mischievous Pastime*. Edinburgh.
- Gould, R. A. 2000. *Archaeology and the Social History of Ships*. Cambridge.
- Gourgouris, S. 1996. *Dream Nation*. Stanford, Calif.
- Govi, C. M., and D. Vitali, eds. 1988. *Il museo civico archeologico di Bologna*. Bologna, Italy.
- Gramsci, A. 1959. *The Modern Prince and Other Writings*. New York.
- Gran-Aymerich, E. 1998. *Naissance de l'archéologie moderne, 1798–1945*. Paris.
- . 2001. *Dictionnaire biographique d'archéologie, 1798–1945*. Paris.
- Grant, M. 1984. "Bourbon Patronage and Foreign Investment at Pompeii and Herculaneum." In *Oxford, China, and Italy*, ed. E. Chaney and N. Ritchie, 161–68. London.
- Grenier, A. 1931. *Manuel d'archéologie gallo-romaine*. Paris.
- . 1944. *Camille Jullian*. Paris.
- . 1955. *Deuxième note sur l'ethnographie, la préhistoire, l'archéologie, l'art musulman, les beaux arts en Algérie*. Algiers.
- Grimes, W. F. 1968. *The Excavation of Roman and Medieval London*. New York.
- Gros, P. 1981. *Bolsena: guide des fouilles*. Rome.
- Gsell, S. 1901. *Les monuments antiques de l'Algérie*. Paris.
- . 1911. *Atlas archéologique de l'Algérie*. Paris.
- Guarducci, M. 1980. "La cosiddetta fibula prenestina: antiquari, eruditi, falsari nella Roma dell'ottocento." *Memorie dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 24: 415–574.
- . 1992. "Per la storia dell'Istituto Archeologico Germanico." *Römische Mitteilungen* 99: 307–27.
- Guide. 1928. *A Guide to the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum*. London.
- Guralnik, E. 1990. *The Ancient Mediterranean*. Chicago.
- Guzzo, P. G. 1993. *Antico e archeologia*. Bologna, Italy.
- Hamiaux, C. 2001. "La Victoire de Samothrace: découverte et restauration." *Journal des savants*: 153–223.
- Hamilakis, Y., and E. Yalouri. 1999. "Sacralising the Past." *Archaeological Dialogues* 6 (2): 115–35.
- Hanfmann, G. 1972. *Letters from Sardis*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Harcourt-Smith, C. 1932. *The Society of Dilettanti*. London.
- Harke, H. 2000. *Archaeology, Ideology and Society: The German Experience*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany.
- Hartley, M. 1954. "In Memoriam: H. L. Lorimer." *Girton Review*, Easter Term: 26–29.
- Haskell, F. 1984. "The Baron d'Hancarville: An Adventurer and Art Historian in Eighteenth-Century England." In *Oxford, China, and Italy*, ed. E. Chaney and N. Ritchie, 177–91. London.
- Haskell, F., and N. Penny. 1981. *Taste and the Antique*. New Haven, Conn.
- Hassmann, H. 2000. "Archaeology in the Third Reich." In *Archaeology, Ideology*

- and Society: *The German Experience*, ed. H. Harke, 65–139. Frankfurt am Main, Germany.
- Hawkes, J. 1977. "Robert Eric Mortimer Wheeler, 1890–1976." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 77: 482–507.
- . 1982. *Adventurer in Archaeology: The Biography of Sir Mortimer Wheeler*. New York.
- Hayes, J. W. 1972. *Late Roman Pottery*. Rome.
- Haynes, D. E. L. 1975. *The Arundel Marbles*. Oxford.
- Helmberger, W., and V. Kockel. 1993. *Rom über die Alpen tragen*. Munich.
- Herzfeld, M. 1982. *Ours Once More*. Austin, Tex.
- Hess, J. L. 1974. *The Grand Acquisitors*. Boston.
- Hibbard, H. 1980. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York.
- Hibbert, C. 1987. *The Grand Tour*. London.
- Higgins, R. 1986. *Tanagra and the Figurines*. London.
- Hingley, R. 2000. *Roman Officers and English Gentlemen*. London.
- Hitchens, C. 1987. *The Elgin Marbles: Should They Be Returned to Greece*. London.
- Hodder, I. 1991. *Reading the Past*. 2d ed. Cambridge.
- Hodges, R. 1990. "Glyn Daniel, the Great Divide, and the British Contribution to Italian Archaeology." *Journal of the Accordia Research Center* 1: 83–93.
- . 2000. *Visions of Rome: Thomas Ashby, Archaeologist*. London.
- Hoffman, H. 1979. "In the Wake of Beazley: Prolegomena to an Anthropological Study of Greek Vase Painting." *Hephaistos* 1: 61–70.
- Hogarth, D. G. 1898–99. "Excavations at Naukratis." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 5: 26–97.
- . 1910. *Accidents of an Antiquary's Life*. London.
- Honour, H. 1968. *Neo-Classicism*. Harmondsworth, England.
- Hood, R. 1998. *Faces of Archaeology in Greece*. Oxford.
- Hopkins, C. 1979. *The Discovery of Dura-Europos*, ed. B. Goldman. New Haven, Conn.
- Horicht, L. 1987. "Gli studi archeologici." In *La cultura classica a Napoli nell'ottocento*, ed. M. Gigante, 815–902. Naples.
- Hoving, T. 1993. *Making the Mummies Dance*. New York.
- . 1997. *False Impressions*. New York.
- Howard, S. 1970. "Bartolomeo Cavaceppi and the Origins of Neo-Classic Sculpture." *Art Quarterly* 33: 120–33.
- . 1990. *Antiquity Restored*. Vienna.
- . 1991. "Ancient Busts and the Cavaceppi and Albacini Casts." *Journal of the History of Collecting* 3: 199–217.
- Iacopi, I. 2003. "Giacomo Boni." In *Gli scavi di Giacomo Boni al Foro Romano*, ed. A. Capidiferro and P. Fortini, 9–29. Rome.
- Illuminati, L. 1922. *In memoria di Felice Barnabei*. Rome.
- Irwin, D. 1962. "Gavin Hamilton: Archaeologist, Painter, Dealer." *Art Bulletin* 44: 87–102.
- Italia antiqua*. 2002. *Italia antiqua*. Paris.

- Jahn, O. 1854. *Beschreibung der Vasensammlung Königs Ludwigs in der Pinakothek zu München*. Munich.
- James, H. 1992. *Italian Hours*. Harmondsworth, England.
- James, S. 2002. "Writing the Legions: The Development and Future of Roman Military Studies in Britain." *Archaeological Journal* 159: 1–58.
- Janon, M. 1973. "Recherches à Lambèse." *Antiquités africaines* 7: 193–254.
- . 1985. "Recherches à Lambèse III: essais sur le temple d'Esculape." *Antiquités africaines* 21: 35–102.
- Janzen, U. 1986. *Einhundert Jahre Athener Institut, 1874–1974*. Mainz am Rhein, Germany.
- Jebb, R. C. 1895. "Sir C. T. Newton." *Classical Review* 9: 81–85.
- Jenkins, I. 1990. "Acquisition and Supply of Casts of the Parthenon Sculptures by the British Museum, 1835–1939." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 85: 89–114.
- . 1991. "Casts and the Drawing School of the Royal Academy and British Museum." *Journal of the History of Collecting* 3: 293–94.
- . 1992. *Archaeologists and Aesthetes in the Sculpture Galleries of the British Museum*. London.
- . 1994. "Bernard Ashmole and the British Museum." In B. Ashmole, *Bernard Ashmole, 1894–1988: An Autobiography*, 203–9. Malibu, Calif.
- Jenkins, I., and K. Sloan. 1996. *Vases and Volcanoes*. London.
- Johns, C. 1998. *Antonio Canova and the Politics of Patronage in Revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Jones, R. 1987. "The Archaeologists of Roman Britain." *Bulletin of Institute of Archaeology* 24: 85–98.
- Jullian, C. 1908–26. *Histoire de la Gaule*. Paris.
- Junker, K. 1998. "Research Under Dictatorship: The German Archaeological Institute, 1929–1945." *Antiquity* 72: 282–92.
- Kaschnitz-Weinberg, G. 1956. "Commemorazione del socio Ludwig Curtius." *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 29: 155–64.
- Keller, D. P., and D. W. Rupp. 1983. *Archaeological Survey in the Mediterranean*. Oxford.
- Keller, J., and K. A. Breisch. 1980. *A Victorian View of Ancient Rome*. Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Kenworthy-Brown, J. 1993. "Designing Around the Statues: Matthew Brettingham's Casts at Kedelston." *Apollo* 137: 248–52.
- King, A. 2001. "Vercingetorix, Astérix and the Gauls: Gallic Symbols in French Politics and Culture." In *Images of Rome: Perceptions of Ancient Rome in Europe and the United States in the Modern Age*, ed. R. Hingley, 113–25. Portsmouth, R.I.
- Knigge, U. 1991. *The Athenian Kerameikos*. Athens.
- Knight, R. P. 1986. *Expedition into Sicily*, ed. C. Stumpf. London.
- Koester, H. 1995. *Ephesus: Metropolis of Asia*. Valley Forge, Pa.
- Kokkinidou, D., and M. Nikolaidou. 2004. "On the Stage and Behind the Scenes: Greek Archaeology in Times of Dictatorship." In *Archaeology and Dictatorship*, ed. M. Galaty and C. Watkinson. New York.

- Kolbe, H.-G. 1984. *Wilhelm Henzen und das Institut auf dem Kapitol*. Mainz am Rhein, Germany.
- Kondoleon, C. 2000. *Antioch, the Lost City*. Princeton, N.J.
- Kostof, S. 1973. *The Third Rome, 1870–1950: Traffic and Glory*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Krämer, W. 1979. "Fünfundsiebzig Jahre römisch-germanisch Kommission." In *Festschrift zum 75. Jahrestag der römisch-germanisch Kommission*, 5–23. Frankfurt am Main.
- Kurtz, D., ed. 1985. *Beazley and Oxford*. Oxford.
- . 2000. *The Reception of Classical Art in Britain*. Oxford.
- Labus, G. 1818. "Notizie intorno la vita di Ennio Quirino Visconti." In *Il Museo Pio Clementino illustrato e descritto da Giambattista ed Ennio Quirino Visconti*. Vol. 1. Milan.
- Lamboglia, N. 1950. *Gli scavi di Albintimilium e la cronologia della ceramica romana*. Bordighera, Italy.
- Lanciani, R. 1889. *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*. Boston.
- . 1988. *Notes from Rome*, ed. A. L. Cubberley. Rome.
- Lantier, R. 1931. "Les grand champs de fouilles de l'Afrique du Nord (1915–1930)." *Archäologische Anzeiger* 46: 461–572.
- La Penna, A. 1979. *Fra teatro, poesia e politica romana*. Turin, Italy.
- . 1994. "Dalla storicità dell'arte al Marxismo." In *Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli: archeologo curioso del futuro*, ed. R. Barzanti and M. Brignali, 189–230. Siena, Italy.
- La Rocca, E. 1997–98. "Gli anni di Antonio Maria Colini tra governatorato e comune di Roma." *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 70: 13–26.
- La Rosa, V., ed. 1986. *L'archeologia italiana nel Mediterraneo fino alla seconda guerra mondiale*. Catania, Italy.
- Leake, W. M. 1968. *Travels in the Morea*. Amsterdam.
- Lee, S. 1999. *David*. London.
- Le Gall, J. 1990. *Alésia, archéologie et histoire*. Paris.
- Lehmann, H. 1989. "Wolfgang Helbig (1839–1915)." *Römische Mitteilungen* 96: 7–65.
- Lehmann, K. 1945. "Erling C. Olsen." *College Art Journal* 4: 107.
- Leighton, R. 1986. "Paolo Orsi (1859–1935) and the Prehistory of Sicily." *Antiquity* 60: 15–20.
- Leppmann, W. 1970. *Winckelmann*. New York.
- Levi, D. 1947. *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*. Princeton, N.J.
- Levine, P. 1986. *The Amateur and the Professional*. Cambridge.
- Lewis, L. 1961. *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents in Eighteenth-Century Rome*. London.
- Lippolis, E. 1983. "Luigi Viola e le prime ricerche archeologiche." In *Il museo di Taranto: centi anni di archeologia*, ed. A. Alessio et al., 9–24. Taranto, Italy.
- Lissarrague, F. 1990. *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet: Images of Wine and Ritual*. Princeton, N.J.
- Lock, P. 1990. "D. G. Hogarth (1862–1927): '... A Specialist in the Science of Archaeology.'" *Annual of the British School at Athens* 85: 175–200.
- Longhi, G. M. 1934. "La via dell'impero." *Capitolium* 10: 53–84.



- Lorcin, P. 1995. *Imperial Identities: Stereotyping, Prejudice and Race in Colonial Algeria*. London.
- Lord, L. 1947. *A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1882–1942*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Lubbock, J. 1983. “Walter Pater’s *Marius the Epicurean*: The Imaginary Portrait as Cultural History.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 46: 106–90.
- Lugli, G. 1943–46. “Rodolfo Lanciani.” *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 21: 33–37.
- Lullies, R., and W. Schiering. 1988. *Archäologenbildnisse: Porträts und Kurzbiographien von klassischen Archäologen deutscher Sprache*. Mainz am Rhein, Germany.
- Lund, J. 1986. “The Archaeological Activities of C. T. Falbe in Carthage in 1838.” *Cahiers des études anciennes* 18: 8–24.
- . 2000. “Falbe’s Visit to Segermes in 1838.” In *Africa Proconsularis*, ed. P. Orsted et al., 35–42. Århus, Denmark.
- Macaulay, R. 1953. *Pleasure of Ruins*. New York.
- MacDonald, W. 1982. “Excavation, Restoration, and Italian Architecture of the 1930’s.” In *In Search of Modern Architecture*, ed. H. Searing, 298–320. New York.
- MacGregor, A. 1998. “Antiquity Inventoried: Museums and ‘National Antiquities’ in the Mid-Nineteenth Century.” In *The Study of the Past in the Victorian Age*, ed. V. Brand, 125–38. Oxford.
- MacKendrick, P. 1960. *The Mute Stones Speak*. New York.
- Mackridge, P. 1990. “‘Some Pamphlets on Dead Greek Dialects’: R. M. Dawkins and Modern Greek Dialectology.” *Annual of the British School at Athens* 85: 201–12.
- Maffioli, M. 1990. “Il ‘corpus’ fotografico pompeiano nel museo di storia della fotografia fratelli Alinari.” In *Fotografi a Pompei nell’800 dalle collezioni del Museo Alinari*, 33–36. Florence.
- Magagnini, A. 1994. *I Musei Capitolini e il collezionista Augusto Castellani*. Rome.
- Maggi, G. 1974. *L’archeologia magica di Maiuri*. Naples.
- Magi, F. 1940. “Per la storia della pontificia academia romana di archeologia.” *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 3 (16): 113–30.
- Maischberger, M. 2000. “L’archeologia classica tedesca dal 1945 ad oggi: linee generali, personaggi, contesti istituzioni.” In *Archeologia teorica*, ed. N. Terrenato, 57–92. Siena, Italy.
- . 2002. “German Archaeology During the Third Reich, 1933–45: A Case Study Based on Archival Evidence.” *Antiquity* 76: 209–18.
- Malakis, E. 1925. *French Travellers in Greece (1770–1820)*. Philadelphia.
- Manacorda, D. 1978. “The Ager Cosanus and the Production of the Amphorae of Sestius: New Evidence and a Reassessment.” *Journal of Roman Studies* 68: 121–31.
- . 1982a. *Archeologia urbana: il progetto della Crypta Balbi*. Florence.
- . 1982b. “Centi anni di ricerche archeologiche italiane: il dibattito sul metodo.” *Quaderni di storia* 16: 85–119.
- Manacorda, D., et al. 2000. *Museo Nazionale Romano Crypta Balbi*. Milan.
- Manacorda, D., and R. Tamassia. 1985. *Il piccone del regime*. Rome.
- Marchand, S. 1996. *Down from Olympus*. Princeton, N.J.

- . 1997. "The Excavations at Olympia, 1868–1881: An Episode in Greco-German Cultural Relations." In *Greek Society in the Making, 1863–1913: Realities, Symbols, and Invasions*, ed. P. Carabott, 73–85. London.
- . 2002. "Adolf Furtwängler in Olympia." In *Olympia, 1875–2000*, ed. H. Kyrieleis, 147–62. Mainz am Rhein, Germany.
- Marconi, C. 1996. "Due studi sulle metope figurate dei templi 'C' e 'F' a Selinunte." *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte* 3 (18): 5–68.
- Margiotta, A. 1996. "Il mito di Roma in Giovan Battista Piranesi." *Forma Urbis* 1 (12): 30–35.
- Marthari, M. 2001. "Altering Information from the Past: Illegal Excavations in Greece and the Case of the Early Bronze Age Cyclades." In *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: The Destruction of the World's Archaeological Heritage*, ed. N. Brodie, J. Doole, and C. Renfrew, 161–72. Cambridge.
- Martinelli, V. 1960. "Antonio Muñoz." *Studi Romani* 21: 195–96.
- Marucchi, O. 1921–22. "In memoria del nostro maestro Giovanni Battista de Rossi." *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 1: 52–62.
- Masson, O. 1992. "Diplomates et amateurs d'antiquités à Chypre vers 1866–1878." *Journal des savants*: 124–54.
- Mattingly, D. J. 1996. "From One Colonialism to Another: Imperialism and the Maghreb." In *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives*, ed. J. Webster and N. Cooper, 49–70. Leicester, England.
- Mazois, F. 1829. *Les ruines de Pompei*. Paris.
- Mazower, M. 1993. *Inside Hitler's Greece: The Experience of Occupation, 1941–1944*. New Haven, Conn.
- Mazzotti, M. 1954. "Corrado Ricci." *Studi romani* 15: 305–10.
- McCann, A. M. 2002. *The Roman Port and Fishery of Cosa*. Rome.
- McCann, A. M., et al. 1987. *The Roman Port and Fishery of Cosa: A Center of Ancient Trade*. Princeton, N.J.
- McCredie, J. 2002. "Homer Armstrong Thompson." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 146 (4): 412–14.
- McDonald, W. A., and C. G. Thomas. 1990. *Progress into the Past: The Rediscovery of Mycenaean Civilization*. 2d ed. Bloomington, Ind.
- McNeal, R. A. 1991. "Archaeology and the Destruction of the Later Athenian Acropolis." *Antiquity* 65: 49–63.
- . 1993. *Nicholas Biddle in Greece*. University Park, Pa.
- Medwid, L. 2000. *The Makers of Classical Archaeology*. Amherst, N.Y.
- Meiggs, R. 1973. *Roman Ostia*. Oxford.
- Meister, K. 1989. "Un secolo di ricerca in Magna Graecia: la storiografia e la storia politica." In *Un secolo di ricerche in Magna Graecia*, 33–50. Taranto, Italy.
- Mejer, J. 1986. "Welcker und Zoëga." In *Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker und Wirkung*, ed. W. M. Calder III et al. *Hermes Einzelschriften* 49: 53–78.
- Mertens, J. 1969. *Alba Fucens I: rapports et études*. Brussels.
- . 1998. "Vis unita fortior: Gerhard Schneemann (1796–1864) und die Trierer Altumsforschung." *Funde und Ausgrabungen im Bezirk Trier* 29: 76–88.

- Messineo, G. 1992. "Un ultimo 'dono' del conte Tyszkiewicz." *Xenia* 1: 187–94.
- Meyer, K. E. 1973. *The Plundered Past*. New York.
- Michaelis, A. 1879. *Geschichte des deutsche archäologische Instituts, 1829–1879*. Berlin.
- . 1882. *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*. Cambridge.
- . 1908. *A Century of Archaeological Discoveries*. London.
- Miraglia, M., and U. Pohlmann, eds. 1993. *Un viaggio fra mito e realtà: Giorgio Sommer fotografo in Italia, 1875–1891*. Rome.
- Misurare la terra. 1989. *Misurare la terra: centurazione e coloni nel mondo romano*. Modena, Italy.
- Mitten, D. G. 1987. "George Maxim Anossov Hanfmann, 1911–1986." *American Journal of Archaeology* 91: 259–63.
- Möller, A. 2000. *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece*. Oxford.
- Moltesen, M. 1987. *Wolfgang Helbig*. Copenhagen.
- Momigliano, A. D. 1950. "Ancient History and the Antiquarian." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13: 285–313.
- . 1978. "La riscoperta della Sicilia antica da T. Fazello a P. Orsi." In *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, 115–32. Rome.
- . 1990. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley, Calif.
- . 1994a. "M. I. Rostovtzeff." In *A. D. Momigliano: Studies on Modern Scholarship*, ed. G. W. Bowersock and T. J. Cornell, 32–43. Berkeley, Calif.
- . 1994b. "New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century." In *A. D. Momigliano: Studies on Modern Scholarship*, ed. G. W. Bowersock and T. J. Cornell, 223–85. Berkeley, Calif.
- . 1994c. "A Return to Eighteenth Century 'Etruscheria': K. O. Müller." In *A. D. Momigliano: Studies on Modern Scholarship*, ed. G. W. Bowersock and T. J. Cornell, 302–14. Berkeley, Calif.
- Momigliano, N. 1999. *Duncan Mackenzie*. London.
- Morey, C. F. 1938. *The Mosaics of Antioch*. New York.
- Morris, I. 1994. "Archaeologies of Greece." In *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies*, ed. I. Morris, 8–47. Cambridge.
- . 2000. *Archaeology as Cultural History*. Oxford.
- Motte, O. 1990. *Camille Jullian: les années de formation*. Rome.
- Mozzillo, A. 1964. *Viaggiatori stranieri nel Sud*. Milan.
- Muñoz, A. 1934. "Ricordo di Corrado Ricci." *Capitolium* 10: 326–31.
- Munzi, M. 2001. *L'epoca del ritorno: archeologia e politica nella Tripolitania italiana*. Rome.
- . 2004. "Italian Archaeology in Libya: From Colonial Romanità to Decolonization of the Past." In *Archaeology Under Dictatorship*, ed. M. L. Galaty and C. Watkinson, 73–108. New York.
- Murray, P. 1971. *Piranesi and the Grandeur of Ancient Rome*. London.
- Mustillo, D. 1939. *Il museo Mussolini*. Rome.
- Myres, J. L. 1914. *Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus*. New York.

- . 1941. "Sir Arthur Evans, 1851–1941." *Proceedings of the British Academy*: 322–57.
- Nadalini, G. 1996. "La villa-musée du Marquis Campana à Rome au milieu du XIXe siècle." *Journal des savants*: 419–54.
- . 1998. "La collection Campana au Musée Napoléon III et sa première dispersion dans les musées français (1862–1863)." *Journal des savants*: 213.
- Negro, S. 1943. *Seconda Roma, 1850–1870*. Milan.
- Newton, C. 1850. *On the Method of the Study of Ancient Art*. Oxford.
- Nicotra, L. 2000–2001. *Archeologia al femminile: storia di archeologia della metà dell'ottocento ad oggi*. Rome.
- Nikolaïdou, M., and D. Kokkinidou. 1998. "Greek Women in Archaeology: An Untold Story." In *Excavating Women: A History of Women in European Archaeology*, ed. M. Diaz-Andreu and M. L. Stig Sørensen, 235–65. London.
- Nobecourt, J. 1991. *Un archeologo nel suo tempo: Georges Vallet*. Syracuse.
- Noskov, V. 2002. "Greek vases for Sale: Some Statistical Evidence." In *Illicit Antiquities: The Theft of Culture and the Extinction of Archaeology*, ed. N. Brodie and K. W. Tubb, 23–37. London.
- Ohly, D. N.d. *Guide to the Munich Antikensammlungen*. Waldsassen, Germany.
- O'Keefe, P. J. 2002. "Negotiating the Future of the Underwater Cultural Heritage." In *Illicit Antiquities: The Theft of Culture and the Extinction of Archaeology*, ed. N. Brodie and K. W. Tubb, 137–61. London.
- Ostenberg, C. E. 1976–77. "Erik Sjoqvist." *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia* 49: 11–16.
- Ovenell, R. F. 1986. *The Ashmolean Museum, 1683–1894*. Oxford.
- Oxberry, J. 1923. "Robert Blair, M.A., F.S.A.: An Obituary Notice." *Archeologia Aeliana* ser. 3, vol. 20: 187–204.
- Ozdogan, M. 1998. "Ideology and Archaeology in Turkey." In *Archaeology Under Fire*, ed. L. Meskell, 111–23. London.
- Pace, B. 1935. *Arte e civiltà della Sicilia Antica*. Vol. 1. Milan.
- Packer, J. 1989. "Politics, Urbanism and Archaeology in 'Roma capitale': A Troubled Past and a Controversial Future." *American Journal of Archaeology* 93: 137–41.
- Palazzoli, D. 1981. *Giorgio Sommer: fotografo a Napoli*. Milan.
- Pallottino, M. 1937. "La mostra augustea della Romanità." *Capitolium* 12: 519–28.
- Papageorgiou-Venetas, A. 1994. *Athens: The Ancient Heritage and the Historic Cityscape in a Modern Metropolis*. Athens.
- Parslow, C. 1995. *Rediscovering Antiquity: Karl Weber and the Excavation of Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Stabiae*. Cambridge.
- Pasinli, A. 1995. *Istanbul Archaeological Museum*. Istanbul.
- . 2001. "The Istanbul Archaeological Museum." In *Sculpted for Eternity*, ed. R. R. R. Smith and A. Ertug, 9–15. Istanbul.
- Pasqualini, A. 1992. "Gli scavi di Luciano Bonaparte alla Rufinella e la scoperta dell'antica Tusculum." *Xenia* 1: 163–86.
- Pastore, G. 2002. "The Looting of Archaeological Sites in Italy." In *Trade in Illicit Antiquities: The Destruction of the World's Archaeological Heritage*, ed. N. Brodie, J. Doole, and C. Renfrew, 155–60. Cambridge.

- Pavan, M. 1977. *Antichità classica e pensiero moderno*. Florence.
- Payne, H. 1962. *Perachora: The Sanctuaries of Hera Akraia and Limenia II*, ed. T. J. Dunbabin. Oxford.
- Payne, H., and G. Mackworth-Young. 1936, 1950. *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis*. London.
- Peckham, R. S. 2001. *National Histories, Natural States*. London.
- Penny, N. 1982. "Collecting, Interpreting, and Imitating Ancient Art." In *The Arrogant Connoisseur: Richard Payne Knight, 1751–1824*, ed. M. Clarke and N. Penny, 65–81. Manchester, England.
- Perkins, A. 1973. *The Art of Dura Europos*. Oxford.
- Petricioli, M. 1986. "Le missione archeologiche italiane nei paesi del Mediterraneo: uno strumento di politica internazionale." In *L'archeologia italiana nel Mediterraneo*, ed. V. La Rosa, 9–32. Catania, Italy.
- . 1990. *Archeologia e Mare Nostrum*. Rome.
- Petrie, F. 1886. *Naukratis*. London.
- Picard, C. 1920. "L'école française d'Athènes de 1914 à 1919." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 44: i–xxvi.
- . 1948. "L'oeuvre de l'école française d'Athènes." *Revue historique* 199: 1–21, 189–207.
- Pickert, L. C. 1963. "Relazioni fra archeologi italiani e tedeschi nell'ottocento." *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 8 (18): 5–6.
- Piggott, S. 1967. "Sir Cyril Fox, 1882–1967." *Proceedings of the British Academy*: 399–407.
- Pingeot, A. 1982. "Les Gaulois sculpté (1850–1914)." In *Nos ancêtres les Gaulois*, ed. P. Viallaneix and J. Ehrard, 255–82. Clermont-Ferrand, France.
- Pinon, P. 1991. *La Gaule retrouvée*. Paris.
- Plouviez, C. 2001. "Straddling the Aegean: William Gell, 1811–1813." In *Travellers in the Levant: Voyagers and Visionaries*, ed. S. Searight and M. Wagstaff, 42–56. Durham, England.
- Poidebard, A. 1934. *La trace de Rome dans le désert de Syrie*. Paris.
- . 1939. *Un grand port disparu*, Tyr. Paris.
- Pollak, L. 1919. "In memoria di Giovanni Barracco, il dono di un museo a Roma." *Capitolium* 5: 334–46.
- . 1994. *Römische Memoiren*. Rome.
- Poole, S. 1888. *The Life of the Right Honorable Stratford Canning*. London.
- Potter, T. 1979. *The Changing Landscape of South Etruria*. New York.
- Pottier, E. 1896–1906. *Catalogue des vases antiques de terre cuite du Louvre*. Paris.
- Potts, A. 1994. *Flesh and the Ideal*. New Haven, Conn.
- Powell, D. 1943. *The Traveller's Journey Is Done*. London.
- . 1999. *The Villa Adriana*. Pleasantville, N.Y.
- Quilici, L., and S. Quilici Gigli, eds. 2001. *Urbanizzazione delle campagne nell'Italia antica*. Rome.
- Radet, G. 1901. *L'histoire et l'oeuvre de l'école français d'Athènes*. Paris.

- Radt, W. 1999. *Pergamon: Geschichte und Bauten*. Berlin.
- Rahtz, P., ed. 1974. *Rescue Archaeology*. Harmondsworth, England.
- Rainey, F. 1992. *Reflections of a Digger*. Philadelphia.
- Ramage, N. 1990. "Sir William Hamilton as Collector, Explorer and Dealer: The Acquisition and Dispersal of His Collections." *American Journal of Archaeology* 94: 469–80.
- . 1992. "Goods, Graves and Scholars: Eighteenth-Century Archaeologists in Britain and Italy." *American Journal of Archaeology* 96: 653–61.
- Rauh, N. 1993. *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce*. Amsterdam.
- Reinach, S. 1907. "Otto Bendorf." *Revue archéologique*: 170–72.
- . 1931. "Esquisse d'une histoire de l'archéologie de la Gaule des origins à 1895." *Amalthea*. Vol. 3: 407–44. Paris.
- Reinhold, M. 1984. "American Visitors to Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Paestum in the Nineteenth Century." In M. Reinhold, *Classica Americana*, 265–76. Detroit.
- Reynolds, J., ed. 1976. *Libyan Studies: Select Papers of the Late R. G. Goodchild*. London.
- . 1993. "Jocelyn Mary Catherine Toynbee, 1897–1985." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 80: 499–508.
- Richmond, I. A. 1956. "Frank Gerald Simpson." *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 4th ser., vol. 34: 219–21.
- Richter, G. 1937. *Etruscan Terracotta Warriors in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York.
- Ridgway, D. 1989. "James Byres and the Ancient State of Italy: Unpublished Documents in Edinburgh." *Atti del Secondo congresso internazionale etrusco*: 213–29. Rome.
- . 1990. "The First Western Greeks and Their Neighbours, 1935–1985." In *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, ed. J.-P. Descoedres, 61–72. Oxford.
- Ridley, R. T. 1986. "'Augusti manes voltant per aures': The Archaeology of Rome Under the Fascists." *Xenia* 11: 19–46.
- . 1992. *The Eagle and the Spade*. Cambridge.
- . 1996. "The Founding of the German Archaeological Institute: Unpublished Documents." *Römische Mitteilungen* 103: 275–87.
- . 1997. "An Unpleasant Bicentenary: The Treaty of Tolentino." *Xenia* 6: 175–94.
- . 2000. *The Pope's Archaeologist*. Rome.
- Ritter, D. 1999. *Im Lichte des Helios: Griechenland in frühen Photographien aus der Sammlung Siegert*. Heidelberg, Germany.
- Rizzo, G. E. 1926. *Ersilia Caetani Lovatelli*. Rome.
- Rodenwaldt, G. 1927. "Walter Amelung." *Römische Mitteilungen* 42: v–xix.
- . 1929. *Archäologisches Institut des deutschen Reiches, 1829–1929*. Berlin.
- . 1931. "The Archaeological Institute of Germany." *Art and Archaeology* 31: 67–76.
- . 1936. *Olympia*. Photographed by W. Hege. New York.
- . 1957. *The Acropolis*. Photography by W. Hege. 1930; rpt.: Norman, Okla.
- Roma antiqua*. 1992. *Roma antiqua: grandi edifici pubblici*. Paris.

- Romano, S., ed. 1994. *L'immagine di Roma, 1848–1895*. Naples.
- Rossen, S., and C. Caroselli. 1981. *The Golden Age of Naples*. Detroit.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1938. *Dura Europos and Its Art*. Oxford.
- Rothenberg, J. 1977. "Descensus ad Terram": *The Acquisition and Reception of the Elgin Marbles*. New York.
- Rouet, P. 2001. *Approaches to the Study of Attic Vases: Beazley and Pottier*. Oxford.
- Said, E. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York.
- Saint-Non, J.-C. 1781–86. *Voyage pittoresque, ou, description du Royaume de Naples et de Sicile*. Paris.
- Samuels, E. 1979. *Bernard Berenson: The Making of a Connoisseur*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Santi, M., and M. Cimino. 1993. *Barracco Museum, Rome*. Rome.
- Sartorio, G. P. 1991. "Le plan-relief d'Italo Gismondi." In *Rome: l'espace urbain et ses représentations*, ed. F. Hinard and M. Royo, 257–77. Paris.
- Schaer, R. 1993. *Il museo, tempio della memoria*. Paris.
- Schmidt, H. 1986. *Goethe in Italien*. Mainz am Rhein, Germany.
- Schnapp, A. 1977. "Archéologie et nazisme (I)." *Quaderni di storia* 3: 1–26.
- . 1980. "Archéologie et nazisme (II)." *Quaderni di storia* 6: 19–33.
- . 1982. "Archéologie et la tradition académique en Europe aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles." *Annales* 37: 760–77.
- . 1996a. *The Discovery of the Past*. London.
- . 1996b. "French Archaeology: Between National Identity and Cultural Identity." In *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, ed. M. Diaz-Andreu and T. Champion, 48–67. Boulder, Colo.
- Schroder, S. F. 1993. *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen des Museo del Prado in Madrid*. Mainz am Rhein, Germany.
- Schuchhardt, W.-H. 1956. *Adolf Furtwängler*. Freiberg im Breisgau, Germany.
- Scoppola, F., and S. Vordemann. 1997. *Museo Nazionale Romano, Palazzo Altemps*. Milan.
- Scriba, F. 1995. "Il mito di Roma, l'estetica e gli intellettuali negli anni del Consenso: La Mostra Augustea dell'romanità, 1937–38." *Quaderni di storia* 41: 67–84.
- Searight, S., and M. Wagstaff, eds. 2001. *Travellers in the Levant: Voyagers and Visionaries*. Durham, England.
- Seiler, F. 2001. "Karl Lehmann-Hartleben e la 'nuova' ricerca su Pompeii." In *Scienza e società*, ed. P. Guzzo, 63–71. Naples.
- Serra, J., ed. 1986. *Paestum and the Doric Revival, 1750–1830*. Florence.
- Servadio, G. 2000. *Motya*. London.
- Settis, S. 1984. "Del sistema all'autopsia: l'archeologia di C. O. Müller." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia* 3, no. 14: 1070–96.
- . 1988. "Idea dell'arte greca d'occidente fra otto e novecento: Germania e Italia." In *Un secolo di ricerche in Magna Grecia: Atti del ventottesimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 7–12 ottobre 1988*, 135–76. Taranto, Italy.
- Sgubini, A. M. 2000a. *La collezione Augusto Castellani*. Rome.
- . 2000b. *Villa Giulia dalle Origine al 2000*. Rome.

- Shanks, M. 1996. *Classical Archaeology of Greece*. London.
- Shaw, W. 2003. *Possessors and Possessed*. Berkeley, Calif.
- . 2004. "Whose Hittites and Why? Language, Archaeology and the Quest for Original Turks." In *Archaeology Under Dictatorship*, ed. M. L. Galaty and C. Watkinson, 131–54. New York.
- Sherman, D. J. 1994. "Quatremère/Benjamin/Marx: Art Museums, Aura, and Commodity Fetishism." In *Museum Culture*, ed. D. J. Sherman and I. Rogoff, 123–43. London.
- Sherwood, J. 1973. *No Golden Journey*. London.
- Shnirelman, V. 1996. "The Faces of National Archaeology in Russia." In *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, ed. M. Diaz-Andreu and T. Champion, 218–42. Boulder, Colo.
- Sichterman, H. 1996. *Kulturgeschichte der klassischen Archäologie*. Munich.
- Siebert, G. 1996. "Michaelis et l'archéologie française." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 120: 261–71.
- Simon, A. 1989. *Vercingetorix et l'idéologie française*. Paris.
- Sjoqvist, E. 1973. *Sicily and the Greeks*. Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Skeates, R. 2000. *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*. London.
- Slatter, E. 1994. *Xanthus: Travels of Discovery in Turkey*. London.
- Smith, C. R. 1854. *Catalogue of the Museum of London Antiquities*. London.
- Snodgrass, A. 2002. "The History of a False Analogy." *Ancient West and East* 1: 19–23.
- Snodin, M. 1991. *Karl Friedrich Schinkel: A Universal Man*. New Haven, Conn.
- Sox, D. 1987. *Unmasking the Forger*. New York.
- . 1991. *Bachelors of Art*. London.
- Speer, A. 1970. *Inside the Third Reich*. New York.
- Spencer, N. 1998. "The History of Archaeological Investigations in Messenia." In *Sandy Pylos*, ed. Jack L. Davis, 35–41. Austin, Tex.
- Spencer, T. 1954. *Fair Greece, Sad Relic*. London.
- Springer, C. 1987. *The Marble Wilderness*. Cambridge.
- Squarciapino, M. 1966. *Leptis Magna*. Basel.
- St. Clair, W. 1998. *Lord Elgin and the Marbles*. Oxford.
- Stead, I., et al. N.d. *The Gauls: Celtic Antiquities from France*. London.
- Steindl, B. 1993. *Mazenatentum in Rom des 19 Jahrhundert: Die Familie Torlonia*. Heidelberg.
- Stillman, W. J. 1988. *Poetic Localities*. New York.
- Stone, M. 1993. "Staging Fascism." *Journal of Contemporary History* 28: 215–43.
- Stoneman, R. 1987. *Land of Lost Gods*. Norman, Okla.
- . 1998. *A Luminous Land*. Los Angeles.
- Strong, E. 1939. "'Romanità' Through the Ages." *Journal of Roman Studies* 29: 137–66.
- Sweet, P. R. 1980. *Wilhelm von Humboldt: A Biography*. Columbus, Ohio.
- Szegedy-Maszak, A. 1987. "True Illusions: Early Photographs of Athens." *J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 15: 125–38.
- Tagliamonte, G. 1998. *Terme di Diocleziano con le sculture dell'aulua ottagonata*. Milan.



- Tea, G. 1932. *Giacomo Boni*. Milan.
- Testi, M. 2004. *Un vedutista di fine ottocento a Tivoli e nel Lazio*. Rome.
- Thomas, Chris. 2003. *London's Archaeological Secrets*. New Haven, Conn.
- Thompson, H. 1981. "John Bryan Ward-Perkins (1912–1981)." *Yearbook of the American Philosophical Society*: 523–27.
- Thompson, M. W. 1977. *General Pitt-Rivers: Evolution and Archaeology in the Nineteenth Century*. Bradford-on-Avon, England.
- Thorvaldsen's Museum*. 1961. Copenhagen.
- Tine, S., and A. Traverso. 2001. *Poliochini: The Earliest Town in Europe*. Athens.
- Tinniswood, A. 2002. *His Invention So Fertile*. London.
- Tomei, M. A. 1999. *Scavi francesi sul Palatino*. Rome.
- Tomkins, C. 1970. *Merchants and Masterpieces*. New York.
- Torelli, M. 1986. "Archeologia italiana in patria e all'estero. Appunti per una storia della politica della ricerca." In *L'archeologia italiana nel Mediterraneo*, ed. V. La Rosa, 189–202. Catania, Italy.
- Townley Gallery*. 1836. *The British Museum: The Townley Gallery*. The Library of Entertaining Knowledge. London.
- Traill, D. A. 1995. *Schliemann of Troy*. New York.
- Tregaskis, H. 1979. *Beyond the Grand Tour*. London.
- Triantaphyllopoulos, J. 1991. "Doro Levi (Trieste 1898–Roma 1991)." *Rivista di storia antica* 21: 243–46.
- True, M. 1993. *The Getty Kouros Colloquium*. Athens.
- Tsigakou, F.-M. 1981. *The Rediscovery of Greece*. New Rochelle, N.Y.
- Turner, J. 1999. *The Liberal Education of Charles Eliot Norton*. Baltimore.
- Turner, V. 1981. *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain*. New Haven, Conn.
- Valentine, L., and A. Valentine. 1973. *The American Academy in Rome, 1894–1969*. Charlottesville, Va.
- Vance, W. L. 1989. *America's Rome*. Vol. 1: *Classical Rome*. New Haven, Conn.
- Vaughan, W. 1998. "Picturing the Past: Art and Architecture in Victorian England." In *The Study of the Past in the Victorian Age*, ed. V. Brand, 61–76. Oxford.
- Veit, U. 2000. "Gustaf Kossinna and His Concept of a National Archaeology." In *Archaeology, Ideology and Society: The German Experience*, ed. H. Harke, 40–64. Frankfurt am Main, Germany.
- Vercingétorix et Alésie*. 1994. Paris.
- Vickers, M. 1985. "Artful Crafts: The Influence of Metalwork on Athenian Painted Pottery." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 105: 108–28.
- . 1987. "Value and Simplicity: Eighteenth-Century Taste and the Study of Greek Vases." *Past and Present* 116: 98–137.
- Visconti, E. Q. 1784–1807. *Museum Pio-Clementinum*. Rome.
- Visser, R. 1992. "Fascist Doctrine and the Cult of Romanità." *Journal of Contemporary History* 27: 5–22.
- Von Bothmer, D., and J. Noble. 1961. *An Inquiry into the Forgery of the Terracotta Warrior in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New York.
- Von Hase, F.-W. 1989. "Storia delle esplorazione archeologiche nella Magna Grecia."

- In *Un secolo di ricerche in Magna Grecia, atti del ventottesimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia*, 53–85. Taranto, Italy.
- . 2000. “Ludwig Lindenschmidt et Napoléon III: un chapitre précoce de la coopération archéologique franco-allemande.” In *Aspects de l’archéologie française au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle: actes du colloque international tenu à la Diana à Montbrison les 14 et 15 octobre 1995*, 63–85. Montbrison, France.
- Von Hulsén, H. 1940. *Torlonia, Kroesus von Rome*. Munich.
- Wagstaff, J. M. 2001a. “Colonel Leake: Traveller and Scholar.” In *Travellers in the Levant: Voyagers and Visionaries*, ed. S. Searight and M. Wagstaff, 3–16. Durham, England.
- . 2001b. “Pausanias and the Topographers: The Case of Colonel Leake.” In *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, ed. S. Alcock, J. Cherry, and J. Elsner, 190–206. Oxford.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2001. *The British School at Rome: One Hundred Years*. Rome.
- Walters, H. B. 1928. *A Guide to the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum*. London.
- Ward-Perkins, J., et al. 1968. “The Ager Veiantanus North and East of Veii.” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 36: 1–218.
- Waterhouse, H. 1986. *The British School at Athens: The First Hundred Years*. London.
- Watkin, D. 1968. *Thomas Hope, 1769–1831, and the Neo-Classical Idea*. London.
- . 1974. *The Life and Work of C. R. Cockerell*. London.
- . 1982. *Athenian Stuart: Pioneer of the Greek Revival*. London.
- Watkin, D., and T. Mellinhoff. 1987. *German Architecture and the Classical Ideal*. London.
- Watzinger, C. 1944. *Theodor Wiegand, ein deutscher Archäologe, 1864–1936*. Berlin.
- Weickert, C. 1949. “Gerhart Rodenwaldt.” *Gnomon* 21: 82–87.
- Wells, C. 1972. *The German Policy of Augustus*. Oxford.
- Wharton, A. J. 1995. *Refiguring the Post-Classical City*. Cambridge.
- Wheeler, M. 1954. *Archaeology from the Earth*. Oxford.
- . 1956. *Still Digging*. London.
- Whitehill, W. M. 1970. *Boston Museum of Fine Arts: A Centennial History*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Whitley, J. 2001. *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Wiegand, G. 1970. *Halbmond im letzten Viertel*. Munich.
- Wilkes, J. J. 1983. “John Bryan Ward-Perkins, 1912–1981.” *Proceedings of the British Academy*: 630–55.
- Will, E. 1987. “The Roman Amphoras.” In *The Roman Port and Fishery of Cosa: A Center of Ancient Trade*, ed. A. M. McCann et al., 171–220. Princeton, N.J.
- . 2002. “Charles Eliot Norton and the Archaeological Institute of America.” In *Excavating Our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America*, ed. S. H. Allen, 49–62. Boston.
- Williams, C., and O. Zervos. 1996. “Franks at Corinth, 1995.” *Hesperia* 65: 1–55.
- Williams, H. 1990. “Kenchreai, Eastern Port of Corinth.” In *The Ancient Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. E. Guralnick, 49–54. Chicago.

- Wilson, D. R. 1995. "John Kenneth Sinclair St. Joseph, 1912–1994." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 87: 417–36.
- Wilton, A., and I. Bignamini. 1996. *Grand Tour: The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century*. London.
- Wilton-Ely, J. 1994. *Giovanni Battista Piranesi: The Complete Etchings*. San Francisco.
- Winstone, H. V. F. 1990. *Woolley of Ur*. London.
- Winterer, C. 2002. *The Culture of Classicism*. Baltimore.
- Wiplinger, G., and G. Wlach. 1996. *Ephesus: 100 Years of Austrian Research*. Vienna.
- Wiwjorra, I. 1996. "German Archaeology and Its Relation to Nationalism and Racism." In *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, ed. M. Diaz-Andreu and T. Champion, 164–88. Boulder, Colo.
- Wohlleben, J. 1992. "Germany, 1750–1830." In *Perceptions of the Ancient Greeks*, ed. K. J. Dover, 170–202. Oxford.
- Woolley, L. 1953a. *A Forgotten Kingdom*. London.
- . 1953b. *Spadework in Archaeology*. New York.
- Yalouri, E. 2001. *The Acropolis: Global Fame, Local Claim*. Oxford.
- Yegul, F. 1986. *The Bath-Gymnasium Complex at Sardis*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1991. *Gentlemen of Instinct and Breeding*. Oxford.
- Yourcenar, M. 1985. *The Dark Brain of Piranesi*. New York.
- Zarmati, L. 1990. "Mourning for Adonais." *Athenian* July 1990: 22–25.
- Zevi, F. 2001. "Aspetti dell'archeologia pompeiana nel novecento: gli scavi del Maiuri a Pompeii." In *Pompeii: scienza e società*, ed. P. Guzzo, 73–80. Naples.

# Index

Page numbers in *italics* refer to illustrations.

- Academy of Cortona, Teruria, 18  
accessibility issues, 17–18, 56, 78, 84, 128, 145  
Acropolis, Athens, 75, 76, 80, 252  
    Erechtheum, 253  
    excavations and clearing of, 74, 76, 81, 210  
    Persian debris on, 77, 191  
    Temple of Athena Nike, 74  
Adam, James, 7  
Adam, Robert, 8, 10  
Adamesteanu, Dinu, 233–34  
Adler, Johann Friedrich, 84  
Aegina, Greece, 71, 137  
    marbles, 9, 27, 67, 133–35, 140, 218  
Aegina Museum, 78, 135  
Agache, Roger, 234  
Ager Cosanus, Italy, 245, 246  
Agrigento temple, 7  
Akurgal, Ekrem, 232–33  
Alba Fucens, Italy, 230  
Albani, Cardinal Alessandro, 2, 8  
Alésia, France, 58, 59, 92  
Alexandria, Egypt, 207  
Algerian Museum, 62  
Alma-Tadema, Lawrence, 48  
Al Mina, Syria, 194, 231, 232  
Altes Museum, Berlin, 144, 167  
amateur archaeology, 45, 48–49, 51–52, 55–57, 61, 81, 85, 91, 93, 94, 122, 126–27, 131, 132, 173, 205–6, 212, 236, 250, 253–54  
    *See also* savants  
Amelung, Walter, 198–99  
American Academy, Rome, 132, 204, 228, 251  
American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA), 123, 153, 186, 188, 219, 221, 224, 251  
Angell, Samuel, 52  
Ansedonia, Italy, 228  
Anti, Carlo, 196  
Antioch, Syria, 207, 208  
Antiquities Service, 236, 249  
Antiquities Service, Greece, 204  
Antiquities Service, Italy, 233  
Antiquities Service, North Africa, 212  
Antiquities Service, Syria, 173  
Antiquities Service, Tunisia, 247  
Apsley House, London, 26  
Apulia, Italy, 50  
Ara Pacis, 177, 178  
Arcadia, 137  
Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), 100, 111, 122–23, 131, 132, 228, 252  
Archaeological Society of Athens, 77, 78, 91, 119, 197  
Archaeology Society, 208  
Arditi, Michele, 34  
Argive Heraeum, Greece, 123  
Art Historical Institute, Germany, 219  
art market  
    advisers and agents, 19, 25, 26, 67, 71, 107, 134, 135, 138, 148, 149, 150, 151, 225  
    Roman, 25  
    *See also* forgeries and fakes  
Ashby, Thomas, 204, 236, 237, 240  
Ashmole, Bernard, 155, 171  
Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University, 71, 124–25  
Asia Minor, 72, 113, 114, 141, 188  
    excavations, 58, 143, 145  
    museums, 147  
Assos, Turkey, 7, 123  
Athens, Greece, 138, 238–39  
    Agora, 188, 189, 191, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 232  
    archaeology education, 64  
    art market, 119  
    as capital of Greece, 73, 81  
    excavations, 189, 190, 197–98  
    Frankish tower, 76  
    Kerameikos cemetery, 197–98, 210, 227  
    museums, 78  
    Parthenon, 26, 27, 71, 76, 81, 131, 136, 137  
    Persian destruction of, 77  
    Plaka district, 188–89  
    pottery, 162

- Athens, Greece (*continued*)  
 Roman Agora, 210  
 tourism, 77, 78–79  
*See also* Acropolis
- Augustus, emperor of Rome, 178
- Aurigemma, Salvatore, 182
- Austrian Archaeological Institute, 114, 203
- Avellino, Francesco, 34, 45, 49
- Balbo, Italo, 183
- Banti, Luisa, 224
- Baracco, Baron Giovanni, 148
- Barnabei, Felice, 100, 101, 102
- Barthélemy, Abbé Jean-Jacques, 66
- Bartoccini, Renato, 183
- Bass, George, 240–41
- Bassae, Greece, 31, 71, 253  
 Temple of Apollo, 137, 138
- Batoni, Pompeo, 5
- Beardsley, Aubrey, 164
- Beazley, John, 162, 163, 164–67, 165, 171, 192, 224
- Benedict XIV, Pope, 33
- Benndorf, Otto, 113
- Bérard, Claude, 163
- Berbrugger, Louis Adrien, 61–62
- Berenson, Bernard, 121, 166
- Berlin, Germany, 29, 86, 87, 144, 196, 201, 202  
 museums and collections, 115, 116, 145, 157, 218  
 teaching and research, 89, 144  
 universities, 53, 83  
*See also specific museums*
- Berlin Academy, 44
- Berlin Olympics, 198
- Berlin University, 31, 54, 200
- Bertrand, Alexandre, 59–60
- Beulé, Charles, 81–82
- Bianchi Bandinelli, Ranuccio, 200, 217–18, 246
- Biddle, Martin, 239
- Biddle, Nicholas, 71–72
- Bieber, Margarete, 202–3
- Blair, Robert, 126–27
- Blakeway, Alan, 195
- Blegen, Carl, 220
- Blessington, Lady, 16
- Blouet, Guillaume-Abel, 81
- Bodrum, Turkey, 137–38
- Boeckh, August, 31, 79, 83
- Boehringer, Erich, 210
- Bolsena, Etruria, 94, 230
- Bonaparte, Lucien, prince of Canino, 135
- Bonghi, Ruggiero, 49, 98, 101
- Boni, Giacomo, 106–7, 177
- Borghese, Bartolomeo, 33, 43, 44
- Borghese family, 9, 21, 37, 42
- Borghese Gallery, Rome, 25
- Boscovale, Italy, 151, 184
- Boston, Massachusetts, 150  
 Boston Throne, 155
- Boston Museum of Fine Arts, 123, 225
- Bothmer, Dietrich von, 225
- Bourbons, 51, 53, 109  
 archaeological activity in Italy, 44–45, 48–49
- Bradford, John, 233
- Bramante, Donato, 12–13
- Braschi, Giannangelo. *See* Pius VI
- Braun, Emil, 43
- Brea, Luigi Bernabo, 211
- Breitlinger, Emil, 198
- Brendel, Otto, 202
- Bridges, George, 47
- British and American Archaeological Society, 96, 97
- British Archaeological Association, 128
- British Museum, 117, 128  
 cast production and collection, 168, 170  
 classical collection, 88, 113, 140  
 disputes over displays, 141–42  
 Greek sculpture at, 78, 137  
 new building, 141–42  
 Roman copies at, 141  
 Temple of Apollo at Bassae at, 137  
 vase collection, 160  
*See also* Elgin, Lord: Elgin marbles
- British School at Athens, 125–26, 153, 187, 232
- British School at Rome, 204, 236, 237, 238
- British School of Archaeology at Rome, 204
- Brizio, Edoardo, 49
- Broneer, Oscar, 220–21
- Brown, Frank E., 228, 229
- Brückner, Alfred, 197
- Brunn, Heinrich von, 43, 157, 168, 198
- Buchner, Giorgio, 231
- Bulla Regia, North Africa, 61
- Bulwer-Lytton, Edward, 19, 46
- Bunsen, Christian von, 27, 30, 33
- Burlington, Lord, 5–6
- Buschor, Ernst, 191, 197, 224
- Butler, Howard Crosby, 222
- Byres, James, 9, 10, 19
- Byron, Lord, 66, 69, 72
- Byzantium, 72

- Calabria, Italy, 50  
 Calza, Guido, 179  
 Cambridge University, 125, 140, 234, 244  
 Campana, Giovanni Pietro, 37, 38–39, 59, 143  
 Campanari, Vincenzo, 35  
 Campania, Italy, 17, 50, 160, 184, 185  
 Campbell, Colin, 6  
 Caneva, Giacomo, 96, 97  
 Canina, Luigi, 37–38, 38, 42  
 Canning, Stratford, 137, 138  
 Canova, Antonio, 2, 9, 23, 25–26, 27, 33, 45, 133, 137, 171  
 Capitoline Museum, Rome, 8, 21, 99, 101, 105, 133  
 Capodistria, John, 73  
 Caputo, Giacomo, 183  
 Carandini, Andrea, 246  
 Carbuccia, Jean-Luc, 61  
 Carcopino, Jérôme, 173, 211, 212  
 Carnuntum, Austria, 203  
 Carter, Joseph, 234  
 Carthage, North Africa, 61, 62–63, 63, 82, 183, 246–48, 249  
   UNESCO project, 245, 247–48, 249, 250  
 Carton, Louis, 61  
 Casson, Lionel, 242  
 cast(s), 1–2, 97, 103, 140, 159, 180  
   of bodies from Pompeii, 48, 49  
   collections, 88, 144, 145  
   collections in Germany, 1, 55, 59, 84, 88, 90, 144, 168, 170  
   collections in museums, 48, 58, 88, 145, 157, 159, 168, 169–70  
   displayed with originals, 7, 8, 143  
   as educational tool, 23–25, 54, 90, 131, 144, 168–69, 171  
   of Elgin marbles, 78, 168  
   exchanges, 59  
   of monuments, 67  
   production, 9, 10, 43, 58, 59, 170  
 Castagnoli, Ferdinando, 233  
 Castellani, Alessandro, 105  
 Castellani, Augusto, 105–6  
 Castello, Gabriele Lancellotto, 51  
 Caumont, Arcisse de, 55–56, 94  
 Cavaceppi, Bartolomeo, 10, 11, 40  
 Cavallari, Francesco Saverio, 52–53  
 Central Museum of Arts, Paris, 21  
 Cerveteri, Etruria, 39, 102  
 Champoiseau, Charles, 112, 142–43  
 Champollion, Jean-François, 50  
 Chandler, Richard, 117  
 Charles III, king of the Bourbons, 15, 18  
 Charles X, king of the Bourbons, 60  
 Chiaramonti, Luigi Barnaba. *See* Pius VII  
 Chiaramonti Library, Vatican, 26  
 Choiseul-Gouffier, count de, 66–67, 68  
 Christian archaeology, 62, 107, 108  
 Clarke, E. D., 68, 69–70  
 Claudius, emperor of Rome, 245  
 Clement XIV, Pope, 12  
 Cockerell, C. R., 37, 52, 65, 70, 71, 73, 126, 134, 137  
 coins, 39, 48–49, 137  
 Coke, Thomas, 5  
 Cole, Thomas, 27  
 Colini, Antonio Maria, 180, 181  
 Collignon, Léon-Maxime, 90–91, 94  
 Collingwood, Robin, 205  
 Colophon, Greece, 186–87  
 Colvin, Sidney, 169  
 Comparetti, Domenico, 102, 110  
 Comune of Rome, 42, 101, 104, 106, 148  
 Congrès archéologique, 55, 122, 126, 131  
 Congress of Archaeological Societies, Britain, 126  
 connoisseurship techniques, 119, 148  
 Conze, Alexander, 53, 112–13, 142–43, 198  
 Cook, John, 209, 232–33  
 copies, 4, 10, 161, 169–70  
   of Elgin marbles, 168  
   restoration of, 137  
   Roman, of Greek originals, 88, 133, 135, 136–37, 140, 141, 147, 156–57, 200, 226  
 Corinth, Greece, 123–24, 162, 187, 188, 193, 195, 220, 221  
   Isthmian sanctuary of Poseidon, 221  
 Cornu, Hortense, 59  
*Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*, 31  
*Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*, 41, 43, 93, 107, 131  
*Corpus vasorum antiquorum* (CVA), 164, 192  
 Cosa, Italy, 228, 229, 230, 233, 237, 243, 245–46  
 Crane, Walter, 164  
 Crawford, O. G. S., 234  
 Cripplegate fort, England, 239  
 Croce, Benedetto, 185, 198, 217  
 Crypta Balbi, Rome, 240, 241  
 cult of the genuine, 135, 136  
 Cumae, Italy, 185  
 Cumont, Franz, 207  
 Curtius, Ernst, 53, 80, 83, 87, 112  
 Curtius, Ludwig, 181, 192, 199, 210  
 Cyrene, North Africa, 111, 123, 182, 183, 186

- Cyrene, North Africa (*continued*)  
 Marcus Aurelius Arch, 182  
 Temple of Apollo, 182
- David, Jacques-Louis, 20  
 Dawkins, Richard, 187, 193  
 De Blacas, Duke, 30, 33  
 Déchelette, Joseph, 94, 172  
 De Cou, Herbert Fletcher, 111, 123  
 Delattre, Father Alfred-Louis, 63, 63  
 della Seta, Alessandro, 183, 211  
 Delos, Greece, 113, 117–18, 120, 188  
 Delphi, Greece, 113, 117, 119–21  
 bronze charioteer, 120  
 shrine of Apollo, 120  
 DePetra, Giulio, 184  
 de Rossi, Giovanni Battista, 41, 42, 43, 107, 108  
 DeRuggiero, Ettore, 103  
 Dethier, Philip Anton, 146  
 d'Hancarville, Count, 160, 161–62, 167  
 Dinsmoor, William, 196  
 Dodwell, Edward, 68–69  
 Donaldson, Thomas L., 37, 70, 71  
 Dörpfeld, Wilhelm, 84, 87, 115, 116, 126  
 Dragendorff, Hans, 92  
 Dressel, Heinrich, 242  
 Droop, J. P., 153  
 Dumont, Albert, 89  
 Dunbabin, Thomas, 195, 196, 231  
 Dura-Europos, Syria, 207–8, 209, 228, 229  
 Duveen, Lord, 170–71
- Egyptian Museum, Rome, 36  
 Elgin, Lord, 20, 26, 66, 67, 68, 135–36, 137, 167, 253  
 Elgin marbles, 9, 15, 52, 66, 71, 78, 134, 135–38, 141, 168, 170–71, 249–50  
 Ennabli, Abdelmajid, 247  
 Ephesus, Greece, 113–14, 115, 123–24, 186  
 Diana of Ephesus statue, 182  
 Temple of Diana, 113, 140, 193  
 Espérandieu, Emile, 92  
 Esposizione universale romana (planned for 1942), 177, 179  
 Euphronios, 163  
 Exekias, 36  
 Expédition scientifique de Morée, 80–81, 82
- Fagan, Robert, 52  
 Falbe, Christian, 246  
 Falchi, Isidoro, 108  
 Fallmerayer, Jakob Philipp, 72  
 Farnese family collection, 17  
 Farnese Gardens, 41–42  
 Fauvel, Louis-François-Sébastien, 67, 74  
 Fea, Carlo, 27–28, 29, 31, 33, 37  
 Ferdinand II, king of the Bourbons, 17, 49  
 Feyel, Michel, 209  
 field archaeology, 94, 106, 126, 187, 191–92, 206, 223, 231, 252  
 American, 251  
 in Britain, 128–29  
 German, 115  
 Italian, 246  
 laws, 99, 225  
 techniques, 106  
 Finley, Moses, 244  
 Fiorelli, Giuseppe, 42, 45, 48–49, 101, 102–3, 184  
 as director of national archaeological service in Italy, 99–100  
 Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge University, 69, 169  
 Flaxman, John, 2, 25, 65  
 Florence, Italy, 21, 108  
 Florence Archaeological Museum, 108  
 Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, 186–87  
 forgeries and fakes, 9, 40, 50, 118, 119, 148, 149, 155, 156, 226, 227  
 Foster, John, 134  
 Fox, Cyril, 237  
 Franchthi Cave, Greece, 221  
 Freil, Jiri, 225–26, 227  
 French Academy, Rome, 20, 23–25, 46, 48, 81  
 French Archaeological Society, 56  
 French School, Athens, 64, 81, 117, 118  
 French School of Rome, 62, 89, 212, 230  
 Friedrich Wilhelm IV, crown prince of Prussia, 31, 33, 83  
 Fuchs, Siegfried, 204, 211, 212  
 Furtwängler, Adolf, 84, 140, 157–59, 158, 163, 197, 199  
 Furtwängler, Wilhelm, 199  
 Fustel de Coulanges, Numa-Denis, 93
- Gardner, Ernest, 126, 194, 205  
 Gardner, Percy, 166, 223  
 Gell, William, 28, 68, 69  
 George, Stefan, 199, 210  
 Gerhard, Eduard, 30, 31, 32, 33–34, 45, 53, 83, 144, 162  
 article on Greek vases, 35–36  
 Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica and, 31–35, 42, 87

- German Archaeological Institute, Athens, 173, 191, 197, 203, 209, 210, 224  
 German Archaeological Institute, Berlin, 200  
 German Archaeological Institute, Rome, 42, 100, 198, 199, 200, 203, 210–11, 212, 219  
*See also* Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica  
 Gerola, Giuseppe, 184  
 Getty Museum, Malibu, California, 16, 225, 226, 227, 251  
 Gibbon, Edward, 9  
 Giglioli, Giulio, 180, 183, 184, 204, 216  
 Gilman, Daniel, 169  
 Gismondi, Italo, 179, 180  
 Giustiniani collection, Rome, 8  
 Glanum, France, 212  
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 4, 29, 30, 52, 54, 192, 196, 199  
 Goldman, Hetty, 187–88  
 Gordion, Turkey, 221–22  
 Gore, Charles, 52  
 Göttingen University, 1–2, 30  
 Grace, Virginia, 223, 243  
 Graham, Walter, 190  
 Gramsci, Antonio, 217  
 Grand Congloué, off the coast of France, 243  
 Grand Tour, 4–5, 6, 8, 9–10, 19, 25, 27, 45, 69, 135, 155  
   collecting and export of antiquities, 7, 8, 9, 14, 19, 88, 136, 148  
   focus on Italy, 5, 50  
 Great Exhibition, London (1851), 143, 169  
 Gregorian Etruscan Museum, Rome, 36  
 Gregorian Secular Museum, Lateran Palace, Rome, 36  
 Gregory XVI, Pope, 36–37, 39, 40  
 Grenier, Albert, 94, 173, 212, 215, 230  
 Grimes, W. F., 239  
 Gsell, Stéphane, 62  
 Guarducci, Marguerita, 149, 155  
 Guido, Giacomo, 182  
 Gustavus III, king of Sweden, 14, 15, 21  
  
 Hackert, Jakob Philipp, 52  
 Hadrian's villa, Tivoli, Italy, 9  
 Hadrian's Wall, 128, 129, 207  
 Halbherr, Federico, 110–11, 182, 184  
 Halicarnassus, Greece, 138, 139, 140, 141  
 Haliëis, Greece, 221  
 Haller von Hallerstein, Carl, 73, 134, 137  
 Haltern fort, Italy, 92  
  
 Hamdi, Osman, 146–47  
 Hamilton, Gavin, 9, 10, 19, 25, 33, 136  
 Hamilton, Lord William, 20, 52, 69, 160, 161, 162, 167, 168  
 Hamilton, William Richard, 26  
 Hammond, Nicholas, 209  
 Hanfmann, George, 222  
 Harris, William, 52  
 Harrison, Jane, 153  
 Hartwig, Paul, 148, 149–50, 155  
 Harvard University, 121, 222  
 Hauser, Friedrich, 148, 149–50  
 Haverfield, Francis, 129–31, 130, 205  
 Hawes, Harriet Boyd, 153, 154, 187  
 Hayes, John, 244, 247  
 Hecht, Robert, 225  
 Hege, Walter, 192, 200, 201  
 Heighway, Carolyn, 239  
 Helbig, Wolfgang, 43, 100, 102, 105, 107, 109, 148–49, 155, 225, 226  
   salon of, 108, 148  
 Hellenic Society, 48  
 Henzen, Wilhelm, 43–44, 87  
 Herculaneum, Italy, 7, 15–16, 17, 44, 45, 51, 185  
 Himmler, Heinrich, 202  
 Hippo, North Africa, 215  
 Hitler, Adolf, 147, 198, 202, 203, 204, 217, 219  
 Hodder, Ian, 205  
 Hoffman, Herbert, 163  
 Hogarth, David, 124–25, 172, 193, 194  
 Hölderlin, Friedrich, 66, 208  
 Holkham Hall collection, 5, 8  
 Holleaux, Maurice, 118  
 Homolle, Théophile, 118, 120–21  
 Hope, W. H. St. John, 127  
 Hosmer, Harriet, 25  
 Hudson, Daphne, 239  
 Humann, Carl, 113, 115, 145  
 Humboldt, Wilhelm von, 27, 28–30, 53, 144  
  
 Imperial Archaeological Institute, Berlin, 87  
 Inghirami, Francesco, 34  
 Ingres, Jean-Auguste-Dominique, 23, 65  
 inscriptions/epigraphy, 18, 31, 41, 67, 79, 93, 113, 117, 118, 119, 121, 129, 140  
   Christian, 41  
   Latin and Greek, 43, 54, 62, 110, 149, 163  
   on vases, 166  
 Institute of Archaeology, University of London, 206  
 Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica, Rome, 30, 31–35, 37, 55, 64, 73, 75, 85



- Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica,  
 Rome (*continued*)  
   based in Berlin, 86–87, 90, 100  
   as branch of the German Archaeological  
   Institute, 100  
   Prussian support for, 43–44  
   publications, 34, 43, 48, 162  
   studies and research, 42, 43  
   travel scholarships, 44  
 International Association of Classical  
   Archaeology (FIAC), 219  
 International Congress of Classical Archae-  
   ology, 131, 203–4  
 International Exhibition (1911), 101, 105  
 Ionia, 69  
 Isernia, Molise, 52  
 Istanbul Museum  
   Alexander sarcophagus, 146–47  
 Italian Archaeological Institute, 219  
 Italian School of Archaeology, Athens,  
   110–11  
  
 Jacobsen, Carl, 149  
 Jacopi, Giulio, 184, 211, 216  
 Jaeger, Werner, 199  
 Jahn, Otto, 53, 54–55, 87, 88, 162, 168  
 James, Henry, 25, 95  
 Jenkins, Thomas, 9, 10, 19  
 Joachin de Alcubierre, Rocque, 17  
 Joly de Lotbinière, Pierre-Gustave, 79  
 Jones, Calvert, 47  
 Julius Caesar, 41, 59, 123, 178  
 Julius III, Pope, 101  
 Jullian, Camille, 93–94, 173  
  
 Kahane, Peter, 203  
 Karo, Georg, 197, 209–10, 224  
 Karouzos, Christos, 224  
 Karouzou, Semni Papspyridi, 224  
 Kaschnitz-Weinberg, Guido von, 199–200  
 Kauffmann, Angelica, 2, 29  
 Keats, John, 27, 162  
 Kelsey, Francis, 63  
 Kenchreae, Greece, 221  
 Kertch, Crimea, 34  
 Kestner, August, 31, 33  
 Kircher, Athanasius, 99  
 Kircher Museum, Rome, 99, 101, 103  
 Klazomenai, Greece, 186  
 Klein, Wilhelm, 163  
 Knidos, Turkey  
   Aphrodite statue, 138  
 Knight, Richard Payne, 7–8, 51, 52  
  
 Knights of Saint John, Turkey, 137–38  
 Knossos, Crete, 188  
 Korais, Adamantios, 72–73  
 Kossinna, Gustaf, 202  
 Koumanoudis, Stephanos, 75  
 Krautheimer, Richard, 202  
 Kubler, Karl, 197, 210  
  
 Lamb, Winifred, 188  
 Lambaesis, Algeria, 61  
 Lamboglia, Nino, 216–17, 244  
 Lanciani, Rodolfo, 40, 103, 104–5, 106, 127–  
   28, 155, 180, 240  
*Last Days of Pompeii* (Bulwer-Lytton), 19, 46  
 Laurenzi, Luciano, 210  
 Lavigerie, Allemand, 62–63  
 Lawrence of Arabia, 164–65, 172  
 Lazio (Latium), Italy, 101, 102  
 Leake, William Martin, 68, 70, 71, 81  
 Lebeque, Albert, 118  
 Lehmann, Karl, 202  
 Lenormant, Charles, 53  
 Lenormant, François, 50–51, 230  
 Leopold, count of Syracuse, 49  
 Leptis Magna, North Africa, 182, 183, 213  
 Lesbos, Greece, 211  
 Leschi, Louis, 175  
 Lessing, Gotthold Efraim, 4  
 Levi, Carlo, 185  
 Levi, Doro, 211  
 Lindenschmidt, Ludwig, 57, 59  
 Lissarrague, François, 163  
 London, England, 127–28, 239  
 London Museum, 238  
 looting of antiquities, 7, 22, 66, 74, 109, 134,  
   212, 242, 252, 253  
 Lorimer, Hilda, 187  
 Louis XIV, king of France, 20  
 Louvre, Paris, 8, 21, 119, 143–44, 156, 164,  
   184  
   Amazon frieze, 142  
   Campana collection, 143  
   cast collection, 144  
   Ecole du Louvre, 59, 93, 144  
   Greek collection, 142, 143  
   *Winged Victory* of Samothrace, 112,  
   142–43  
 Lovatelli, Ersilia Caetani, 108, 153  
 Löwy, Emanuel, 103, 168, 173  
 Lucien Bonaparte, prince of Canino, 35  
 Ludwig I, king of Bavaria, 39, 54, 67, 68, 72,  
   73, 76, 134, 135  
 Luynes, duke of, 33, 230

- Lycia, Asia Minor, 141  
Lydia, Anatolia, 222
- Magna Graecia, Italy, 6, 45, 50, 110, 186, 230  
  architecture, 70, 194  
Maiden Castle fort, England, 205–6, 206  
Maiuri, Amadeo, 111, 184–86, 216  
Major, Thomas, 7  
Manacorda, Daniele, 240  
Margaritis, Philippos, 79  
Maria Cristina, queen of Savoy, 37  
Marinatos, Spyridon, 204, 224  
Marshall, John, 150, 151, 154, 156  
Martin, Roland, 210  
Martinetti, Francesco, 149, 155  
Mau, August, 43, 47  
Mazois, François, 46  
McCann, Anna Margherita, 245  
McDonald, William, 238  
Mediterranean, 4, 122–23  
  archaeology, 67–68, 99  
  natural harbors, 245  
  underwater excavations, 242, 243, 243, 249  
Megalopolis, Greece, 126  
Megara Hyblaea, Sicily, 94, 230–31  
Mellink, Machteld, 223, 224  
Mercouri, Melina, 250  
Messenia, Greece, 238  
Metaponto, Italy, 50, 230, 233–34  
Metaxos, Ioannis, 204  
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 68,  
  150–51, 153, 154, 155  
  Attic vase collection, 225  
  cast collection, 170  
  Etruscan terra-cotta warriors, 156, 226  
  krater painted by Euphronios, 226, 228  
Metternich, Prince, 33  
Michaelis, Adolf, 8, 53, 87–88, 94  
Milani, Luigi, 102  
Miletus, Greece, 116, 145  
  Miletus gate, 145, 147  
Millingen, James, 33  
Mommsen, Theodor, 41, 43, 54, 89, 91–92,  
  107, 108, 128–29  
Montuoro, Paola Zancani, 186  
Moreau, Frédéric, 60  
Morelli, Giovanni, 166  
Morgantina, Sicily, 231  
Mostra Augusta della romanità exhibition  
  (1938), 179–80, 183, 204  
Müller, Karl Otfried, 43, 74, 79–80, 81, 83  
Munich, Germany  
  museums, 54, 134, 135, 162  
  Munich Glyptothek, 134, 135, 218  
Muñoz, Antonio, 177, 180–81  
Museum of London Antiquities, 127  
Museum of National Antiquities, Saint-  
  Germain-en-Laye, 58–60  
Museum of Roman Civilization, 180, 183  
Museum of the City of London, 239  
Mussolini, Benito, 23, 175, 176, 177, 179–80,  
  181, 185, 196, 240  
  archaeological work, 181–82, 189, 190  
  identification with Roman imperial  
  history, 178, 181  
  urban renewal program in Rome, 181  
Mussolini Museum, 180  
Myrina, Asia Minor, 118  
Myron, 157
- Naples, Italy, 6, 7, 16, 44–45, 49, 160, 238  
Naples Museum, 17, 44–45, 48, 49, 185  
Napoleon Bonaparte, 19, 59, 65, 81  
  archaeological ambitions, 20–21, 22–23,  
  142  
  defeat of, 23, 27, 30, 36  
  statue of, 25–26  
Napoleon Museum, Paris, 14–15, 21, 26, 59,  
  133, 142  
Napoleon III, 39, 42, 81, 89  
  defeat of, 86, 91, 95, 144  
  interest in archaeology, 41, 81, 106  
  museums created by, 58–60, 143, 180  
  occupation of Rome, 41  
Napoleon III Museum, Paris, 69, 143, 180  
National Archaeological Museum of Rome  
  Ludovisi Throne, 155  
National Library, Rome, 98  
Naukratis, Egypt, 88, 193–94  
Nelson, Lord, 20  
Newton, Charles, 38, 68, 88, 117, 125, 137,  
  138–40, 139, 168  
New York City, 150, 151, 156, 171  
New York University, 221  
Nibby, Antonio, 28, 31, 33, 69  
Niebuhr, Berthold, 27, 30, 31, 33  
Niemann, Georg, 113–14  
Noack, Ferdinand, 202  
Normad, Alfred-Nicholas, 48  
North Africa, 60, 61–62, 63, 63, 64  
  Italian invasion of, 111  
  red-slipped pottery, 244  
  Roman, 94  
  *See also specific sites*  
Norton, Charles Eliot, 121–23, 122, 150, 169  
Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, Copenhagen, 149

- Old Smyrna, Turkey, 232–33
- Olsen, Erling, 209
- Olympia, Greece, 75, 81, 85, 115, 188, 210  
excavations, 82–84, 87, 112, 139, 198  
Great Altar, 115  
museum, 84–85, 121
- Olynthos, Greece, 190–91
- Orsi, Paolo, 50, 103, 109–10, 183, 186, 195–96
- Ostia, Italy, 17, 22, 39, 104, 179, 242, 245, 246  
Ostia Antica excavation, 9
- Ottoman Empire, 70, 137  
archaeological studies and research, 146  
decay and collapse, 83, 111, 134, 172, 173  
excavation in, 117, 137, 145  
export and loss of antiquities, 83–84, 114, 137, 141, 142, 145–46, 147  
rule in Greece, 66, 72, 76
- Ottoman Imperial Museum, Istanbul, 146
- Otto of Bavaria, king of Greece, 72, 73, 75, 79, 119
- Overbeck, Johannes, 47
- Oxford University, 125, 140
- Pacca, Cardinal Bartolomeo/Pacca decree, 22, 36, 39
- Pace, Biagio, 183, 196
- Paestum, Italy, 6–7, 50, 185, 186
- painting, ancient, 15, 16, 17, 18, 34, 37, 40, 160–61  
at Pompeii, 17, 18, 34, 151, 184  
portraits, 25  
on vases, 35, 163
- painting, modern, 20, 21, 22, 26, 48, 67, 76, 119, 138, 166  
of landscapes and monuments, 27
- painting, neoclassical, 39–40
- painting, Renaissance, 166
- Palazzo dei Vecchi Studi, Naples, 144
- Palermo museum, 52
- Palladio, Andrea, 5, 6
- Palma di Cesnola, Baron Luigi, 68, 150, 151
- Panofka, Theodor, 30
- Pareti, Luigi, 224
- Paris, France, 89, 143  
museums, 26  
*See also* Louvre; Napoleon Museum
- Paris Commune, 89, 90
- Parker, John Henry, 96–97
- Pater, Walter, 46–47, 164
- Paterno, Ignazio, 51
- Pausanias, 68, 70, 79
- Payne, Humphry, 191–93, 195
- Pendlebury, John, 208–9
- Penrose, Francis Cranmer, 125–26
- Perachora, Greece, 193, 195
- Pergamon, Greece, 113, 115–16, 232  
Great Altar, 115, 145, 147  
marbles, 218
- Pergamon Museum, Prussia, 145, 147
- Pericles, 135
- Pernier, Luigi, 111, 182, 224
- Perrot, Georges, 90, 91
- Persian Empire, 141
- Petri, Flinders, 88, 194
- Philomousos Hetaireia (Society of Lovers of the Muses), Athens, 73
- photography/photographs, 43, 107, 117, 131, 159, 192  
aerial, 174, 175, 233, 234, 245  
of Athens, 79  
as means of recording excavations, 120  
of Pompeii, 47–48  
printed, 93  
in publications, 112  
of Rome, 48, 95, 96–97, 97  
stereopticon, 48  
used to promote archaeology, 96, 139
- Picardy, 234
- Pio-Clementino Museum, Rome, 12–14, 21  
Belvedere courtyard, 12, 25, 144, 167
- Pio Cristiano Museum, Lateran Palace, Italy, 41
- Piranesi, Giovanni Battista, 10–12, 13, 37
- Pisa, Italy, 242
- Pithekoussai, Ischia, 231
- Pittakis, Kyriakos, 71, 74–75, 78
- Pitt-Rivers, Augustus Henry Lane-Fox, 128–29, 205
- Pius VI, Pope, 12, 15, 21
- Pius VII, Pope, 21–22, 26, 33
- Pius IX, Pope, 40–41, 42, 107
- Pliny the Elder, 16
- Poidebard, Antoine, 174–75, 245
- Poliochini, Italy, 211
- Pompeii, Italy, 7, 15, 47, 179, 184, 185  
Alexander mosaic, 35, 46  
casts of bodies, 48, 49  
display of antiquities in situ, 185  
documentation of excavations, 17  
excavations, 15, 18–19, 20, 44, 45–46, 49, 99  
House of Menander, 185  
House of the Faun, 46  
House of the Tragic Poet, 46  
monuments, 46  
paintings at, 34

- photography of, 47–48  
 proposed school of archaeology, 49–50  
 reconstruction of antiquities, 46  
 studies and research, 69  
 Temple of Isis, 18, 45  
 tourism, 18–19, 46, 47  
 via dell'Abbondanza, 185  
 Villa of the Mysteries, 185  
 Pontifical Roman Academy of Archaeology, 32–33  
 Portici, Italy, 17  
   museum, 15, 16–17, 44  
 Portus, Italy, 40  
 Pottier, Edmond, 94, 118, 119, 163–64  
 Priene, Greece, 116–17  
 Princeton University, 187, 188, 190, 191, 207, 224, 232  
 Pylos, Greece, 220, 221, 238  
  
 Qaddafi, Muammar, 215  
 Quatremère de Quincy, Antoine-Chrysostome, 26  
 Quilici, Lorenzo, 240  
 Quilici, Stephanía, 240  
  
 Rainey, Froelich, 222  
 Ravaisson-Mollient, Félix, 144  
 Reale Accademia Ercolanese, 18  
 Reinach, Salomon, 118, 119  
 Renaissance, 1, 6, 126, 133, 167  
 Renier, Léon, 62  
 restoration, 63, 142, 170, 171  
   of Aegina marbles, 134, 136  
   Bourbon, 45  
   of the Colosseum, 37–38  
   German, 218  
   Grand Tour and, 9, 11  
   of monuments and buildings, 23, 51, 176, 177, 179, 181, 182, 184  
   in North Africa, 215  
   papal, 33  
   *versus* preference for the genuine, 23, 135, 171  
   of Roman copies of Greek originals, 88  
 Revett, Nicholas, 6, 65, 70, 76, 117  
 Rhodes, Greece, 183–84  
 Ricci, Corrado, 180, 181  
 Richard de Saint Non, Abbé Jean Claude, 50  
 Richmond, Ian, 234–35  
 Richter, Gisela, 151–52, 152, 153, 154, 225  
 Richter, Jean-Paul, 151–52  
 Ridgway, Brunhilde, 224  
  
 Riegel, Alois, 114, 199  
 Rizos-Rangabe, Alexander, 75  
 Robert, Carl, 200  
 Robertson, Donald, 171  
 Robinson, David Moore, 190, 191  
 Robinson, Edward, 150, 154, 169  
 Rodenwaldt, Gerhart, 192, 200–202, 201  
 Rogers, Randolph, 46  
 Rolland, Henri, 212  
 Roman Campagna, 42  
 Romanelli, Pietro, 182, 183  
 Roman Gaul, 56, 57, 59, 92, 93–94  
 Roman-German Central Museum, Mainz, Germany, 57, 58–59  
 Rome, Italy, 9, 19–20, 23, 27, 93, 98, 100, 207, 238, 239, 240  
   antiquities taken from, 14–15, 20, 21  
   archaeological community, 2, 27, 28, 34, 40, 87  
   archaeological map of, 105  
   archaeology education, 64, 100  
   Arch of Titus, 23, 24  
   art institutions, 132  
   art market and collecting, 102, 151, 155  
   Baths of Diocletian, 23, 101, 102, 103–4  
   as capital of Italy, 76, 95  
   Capitoline Hill, 173, 198  
   Casa Tarpeia, 34, 35, 87  
   casts of monuments, 180  
   Christian archaeology at, 40–41  
   cleaning of later accretions to antiquities, 177–79  
   Colosseum, 28, 37, 96, 97, 176, 178  
   Comune (city government), 42, 101, 104, 106, 148  
   conservation debates, 95  
   Esquiline, 35, 37, 104  
   Farnese Palace, 62, 90, 94  
   fascist identification with, 175–76, 177, 179  
   Forum, 28, 42, 104, 106–7, 176, 240  
   Forum of Trajan, 23, 178  
   historical dating of, 107  
   looting of, 22  
   Mausoleum of Augustus, 177, 178, 178, 180  
   Monte Testaccio, 242–44  
   museums, 27, 100, 179–80  
   Mussolini's parade route, 177, 178  
   *Odyssey* frieze, 35  
   Palatine Hill, 41–42, 59, 101, 104, 106–7, 240  
   Pantheon, 28  
   Pomponius Hylas, columbarium of, 39  
   private collections, 2, 8

- Rome, Italy (*continued*)  
 provincial archaeology, 62, 91  
 return of antiquities to, 26, 133  
 salons, 107–8  
 topographical plan of, 37  
 tourism, 25, 37, 179  
 Trajan's Column, 23, 176  
 urban development and destruction of  
   antiquities, 96, 101, 103–5, 148  
   via Appia, 38, 41, 42, 104  
   via dell'Impero, 181  
   Villa Giulia, 211  
*See also* Vatican listings
- Rosa, Pietro, 42, 106  
 Rosetta Stone, 26  
 Ross, Ludwig, 74, 81  
 Rostovtzeff, Michael, 208, 209  
 Ruggiero, Michele, 184  
 Ruskin, John, 106, 121, 137, 205
- Sabratha, North Africa, 182, 183, 213  
 Saint Omobono excavation, Rome, 181  
 Saint Paul, 113, 123  
 Salerno, Italy, 213  
 Salinas, Antonio, 53  
 Samos, Greece, 197  
 Samothrace, 112–13, 142–43, 202, 221  
 Sardis, Turkey, 222, 223  
 savants (amateur scholars), 1, 26, 31, 33, 34,  
   49, 88, 96, 205, 236  
   local/parochial, 17, 44, 55, 61–62, 64, 173  
   in Naples and Rome, 16, 18, 27, 28  
   role of, 55, 212, 250
- Schede, Martin, 209  
 Schinkel, Karl Friedrich, 65, 77, 144, 167  
 Schlieff, Hans, 198  
 Schliemann, Heinrich, 76, 87, 139, 146  
 Schneemann, Gerhard, 57  
 Schone, Richard, 145  
 Scranton, Robert, 221  
 Segesta temple, Sicily, 7  
 Segre, Mario, 211–12, 216  
 Selinus temple, Sicily, 7  
 Selinute, Sicily, 52  
 Serradifalco, duke of, 52  
 Settefinestre villa, Italy, 246  
 Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, 113,  
   138, 140  
 Shear, Theodore Leslie, 188, 220  
 Silchester, England, 127  
 Simonetti, Michelangelo, 12–14  
 Simpson, Frank Gerald, 206–7  
 Sjoqvist, Erik, 232
- Skopas, 227  
 Slater Museum, Norwich, Connecticut,  
   169  
 Smirke, Robert, 141  
 Smirke, Sydney, 52, 65, 70, 71  
 Smith, Charles Roach, 127–28  
 Smyrna, Asia Minor, 119, 186, 187, 188  
 Society for Magna Graecia, 186  
 Society of Antiquaries, London, 239  
 Society of Dilettanti, 5, 6, 69, 116–17  
 Society of Lovers of the Muses, Athens.  
   *See* Philomousos Hetaireia  
 Sommer, Giorgio, 48  
 South Kensington Museum, 143, 169  
 Sparta, 210  
   Artemis Orthia shrine, 193  
 Speer, Albert, 202  
 Sperlonga Roman villa site, 85  
 Spinazzola, Vittorio, 184, 185  
 Staatliches Museum, Berlin, 119  
 Stackelberg, Otto von, 30–31, 73  
 Stillman, William J., 48, 68, 79, 107  
 Stillwell, Richard, 232  
 St. Joseph, Kenneth, 234, 236  
 Stoa of Attalos museum and research  
   center, Athens, 220, 221  
 Stockholm, Sweden, 133  
   museums, 14  
 Storey, William Wetmore, 25  
 Strong, Eugenie Sellers, 114, 125, 152, 153,  
   157, 181, 200, 204, 223  
 Stuart, James, 6, 65, 70, 76  
 Studniczka, Franz, 197  
 Sybaris, Italy, 186, 222  
 Syracuse, Italy, 103, 109, 110, 230
- Tanagra, Boeotia, figures, 118–19  
 Tanucci, Bernardo, 15  
 Taranto, Italy, 102–3  
 Tarquinia, Etruria, 31, 34, 39, 102  
 Technau, Walter, 209  
 Thebesa, North Africa, 215  
 Thessaloníki, Greece, 186  
 Thessaly, Greece, 142  
 Thompson, Homer, 219–20  
 Thorvaldsen, Bertel, 2, 9, 26–27, 29, 134–35,  
   171, 218  
 Tiddis, North Africa, 215  
 Timgad, Algeria, 175  
 Tindari, Sicily, 52  
 Tivoli, Italy, 9, 17  
*Topography of Athens* (Leake), 70, 71  
 Torlonia, Giovanni, 39

- Torlonia family, 39–40  
 Townley, Charles/Townley collection, 9, 136, 137  
 Toynbee, Jocelyn, 223–24  
 Trajan, emperor of Rome, 40, 116, 245  
 Travlos, John, 220  
 Tripoli, North Africa, 182  
 Tripolitania, North Africa, 111, 182, 183, 209  
 Troy, Asia Minor, 66, 87, 139, 146  
 Tsountas, Christos, 224  
 Tuminello, Ludovico, 96, 97  
 Tunis, Tunisia, 63, 174, 247  
 Turner, William, 27  
 Tuscany, Italy, 36, 102  
 Tusculum, Italy, 37  
 Tuzzi, Don Benigno, 48–49
- UNESCO  
   Carthage project, 245, 247–48, 249, 250  
   convention, 227–28  
 Union académique internationale, 164  
 University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 221–22, 241  
 University of Rome, 103  
 University of Strasbourg, 87–88, 173
- Vaglieri, Dante, 179  
 Valadier, Giuseppe, 23, 24, 37  
 Van Deman, Esther, 153–54  
 vases, 31, 136, 147  
   Attic, 68, 149, 164, 166, 225  
   black-figure, 166  
   Etruscan, 51, 160, 162  
   Greek painting and, 35  
   in museums and collections, 35, 36, 39, 53, 79, 91, 136, 150, 151, 159, 160, 162  
   mythological themes, 55  
   red-figure, 253
- Vatican archaeological interests, 98  
   acquisition of classical antiquities, 22  
   *Apollo Belvedere*, 2, 10, 14, 21, 26  
   excavations made by, 22  
   *Laocoön*, 14, 21, 26  
   libraries, 26  
   museums and collections, 12–14, 21, 22, 25, 36, 38, 41, 99, 101, 133  
   recognition of the Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica, 33  
   tourism, 12
- Vatican/Papal States, 12, 75  
   antiquities exported from, 12  
   cultural policy, 12  
   diplomatic corps, 28  
   end of papal rule, 29, 95, 96  
   military attack on (1870), 95, 98, 107  
   modernization of, 40  
   Prussia and, 33, 42  
   restoration of power to, 30  
   return of confiscated antiquities to, 26  
   tomb explorations, 35
- Veii, Italy, 237, 244, 246  
 Ventimiglia, Italy, 217  
 Vergil, 10, 185  
 Vermeule, Cornelius, 225  
 Verulamium, Italy, 205–6  
 Vescovali, Ignazio, 25  
 Vetulonia, Etruria, 108  
 Victor Emmanuel II, king of Italy, 40  
 Victoria and Albert Museum, London, 143  
 Vidal de la Blache, Paul, 93  
 Vienna museums, 113  
 Villa Giulia National Museum, Rome, 101–2, 105, 156  
 Villa of the Papyri, Herculaneum, 16  
 Villard, François, 230  
 Viola, Luigi, 103  
 Visconti, Ennio Quirino, 14, 21  
 Visconti, Filippo Aurelio, 14, 31  
 Visconti, Giovanni Battista, 14  
 Visconti, Pietro Ercole, 36, 103, 179  
 Vitruvius, 5, 6  
 Volubilis, Morocco, 174  
 von Gerkan, Armin, 210, 211  
 Von Vacano, Otto, 210  
 Vulci, Etruria, 34, 35, 36, 62, 135, 162
- Wagner, Johann Martin von, 134  
 Walbrook Mithraeum, England, 239  
 Waldstein, Charles, 169  
 Walker, Alice, 187  
 Walpole, Horace, 5  
 Ward-Perkins, John, 213, 219, 233, 236–38  
 Warren, E. P., 121, 150, 155  
 Weber, Karl, 16, 17  
 Wedgwood, Josiah, 159–60  
 Weickert, Carl, 208  
 Welcker, Friedrich Gottlieb, 43, 45, 53–54, 55, 83, 168  
 Wheeler, Mortimer, 205–6, 208, 213, 236, 239, 242, 253  
 Wickhoff, Franz, 114  
 Wiegand, Theodor, 116, 117, 145, 172, 200  
 Wilamovitz Moellendorf, Ulrich von, 202  
 Wilberg, Wilhelm, 113–14  
 Wilhelm I, king of Prussia, 86  
 Wilkins, William, 50, 70–71

- Winckelmann, Johann, 3, 12, 18, 27, 65, 82,  
114, 142  
  legacy and influence, 2–4, 3, 10, 32, 54, 55,  
  167, 192, 196, 208  
  and Roman archaeological scene, 2, 14
- Woburn Abbey, England, 25
- Wolf, Friedrich August, 30, 31
- Wood, John Turtle, 140
- Woolley, Leonard, 194
- Wrede, Walter, 204, 210, 212
- Wren, Christopher, 5
- Xanthus, Lycia, 141
- Yale University Art Gallery, 208
- Young, Rodney, 222, 241
- Zannoni, Antonio, 34
- Zanotti Bianchi, Umberto, 186
- Zeus Olympios temple, 84
- Zeus Panhellenius cult, 134
- Zoëga, Jörgen, 27, 29, 54