

Conclusions

ἀποθανῶν ἔτι λαλεῖ

In this dissertation I attempted to demonstrate that, contrary to common perceptions, the period preceding the spectacular discoveries by Schliemann and Evans was not some kind of *tabula rasa* for Aegean archaeology, but was instead a period rich in important archaeological discoveries and intellectual movements, which affected the development of this discipline in many ways, albeit, so far, this has not been sufficiently recognised.

In order to show this, I attempted to examine systematically what was known about Greece's most distant past (and especially what is now referred to as the Aegean Bronze Age) before Schliemann's work in the 1870s, paying particular attention to chronological systems and periodisation, because these often reflect broader intellectual ideas and currents of thought, and influence the way in which one looks at the archaeological record.

The long period examined in this dissertation has been divided into four main phases: 1) from the Renaissance until ca. 1780, 2) from ca. 1780 until 1832, 3) from 1833 until 1865 and 4) from 1866 until 1875. Each phase is characterised by certain trends, developments and achievements, which are discussed in Chapters 2-6 and summarised below.

I. From the Renaissance until ca. 1780

Concerning the first phase, my examination started with the Renaissance, since it is in this period that one can witness an increased interest and revival of studies of the Classical past, which also extended to what is now considered Greece's prehistoric past, i.e. the subject of this dissertation. Regarding what we now call Aegean archaeology, the research conducted by Renaissance antiquarians was limited to textual analysis (unlike their work on Greek and Roman antiquities, which

already involved extensive use of material culture: cf. Schnapp 1993). In particular, I showed that the increasing interest in ancient Greek and Latin authors encouraged Renaissance and seventeenth – early eighteenth century scholars to revive two ancient chronological systems proposed by Ovid and Varro. Following Ovid's system, ancient times were divided into four periods: the Golden, the Silver, the Bronze and the Iron Age. Varro, however, described three ages: the 'unknown' or 'obscure' period (dated ca. before the nineteenth century BC in modern calendar dates), the mythical or fabulous period (ca. nineteenth century BC – 776 BC; and renamed to Heroic by Joseph Justus Scaliger in 1583), and lastly, the historical period (from the first Olympiad in 776 BC onwards) (see Chapter 2.1 and TABLES 2.3 and 2.4). In this way they established a terminology that is still used in contemporary scholarship, e.g. Hood's book *The Home of the Heroes* (1967).

Besides adopting and adapting Ovid's and Varro's broad periodisations, some scholars, such as Jacques Bénigne Bossuet, Isaac Newton and John Blair, attempted to construct chronological lists of the most important events that had occurred before the first Olympic games (776 BC). For this, they adapted to the Gregorian calendar the chronologies provided by ancient sources, especially Eratosthenes of Alexandria and the 'Parian marble'. This exercise, however, resulted in a series of rather discordant dates, since the ancient authors provided contradictory information even in regards to some of the major 'events' of Greece's most ancient past, such as the Trojan War or Homer's *floruit* (as shown on TABLES 2.1 and 2.7).

Although, as mentioned above, the chronological work of Renaissance scholars was essentially based on textual evidence, in this period one can already see the beginnings of 'archaeological' work in the journeys to the Aegean made by people such as Cristoforo Buondelmonti, Pierre Belon and Francesco Basilicata. The translations of the Homeric poems into Latin and vernacular languages, the publications of ancient texts such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Pausanias's *Periegesis*, as well as the appearance of humanist works like Boccaccio's *Il Filostrato* (ca. 1335-1340) and Raoul Lefèvre's *Le recueil des histoires de Troyes* (1464) stimulated interest in visiting Heroic sites. Thus, travellers who journeyed to Constantinople stopped at

the Dardanelles to search for the remains of Homer's Troy; however, until the seventeenth century most merely saw the remains of the Hellenistic and Roman city Alexandria Troas, since, according to Virgil, the celebrated city was 'in conspectu Tenedos'. Travellers to Crete visited the remains of Knossos, near the modern village of Makrytoichos, as well as a cave/quarry near the ancient city of Gortyn thought to be the Labyrinth of Minos. Concerning the Greek mainland, only a few visited the acropoleis of Mycenae and Tiryns, or other sites that were regarded as Heroic, e.g. the 'Cyclopia' near Palamidi, Menelaus's palace on Kythera, the Cadmea and the Katavothra.

II. From ca. 1780 until 1832

It is only in the period from the last quarter of the eighteenth century until the establishment of the Greek nation state in the 1830s (examined in Chapter 4) that the real *incunabula* of Aegean archaeology can be found. The Enlightenment, the emergence of *Altertumswissenschaft*, the Neoclassicist and Romantic movements as well as the Napoleonic Wars (which forced Grand Tourists to travel to Greece instead of Italy and France), all had significant and long-lasting effects on the development of Aegean archaeology. Arguably, the main achievements of this period, which provide the foundations of Aegean archaeology, can be summarised as follows: a) the creation of new periodisation and new theories concerning the pre-Dorian times, b) a renewed and more systematic interest in Heroic Greece, c) the identification or discovery of new Heroic sites (including the question *ubi Troia fuit?*), d) the desire for collecting and the first prehistoric excavations, and lastly e) the first descriptions of prehistoric finds.

a) The creation of new periodisation and new theories concerning the pre-Dorian times

Concerning the creation of new periodisations and theories for pre-Dorian times, during the Age of Enlightenment scholars such as Nicolas Fréret built upon Varro's (and Scaliger's) chronological system and divided the most distant Greek past into two large periods: the 'Heroic' and the 'historical': the former covered the period from ca. the twentieth-twelfth centuries BC, and the latter usually started with

the 'Return of the Heracleidae', which was dated to ca. 1104 BC on the basis of Eratosthenes. In addition, towards the end of the eighteenth century one can see an increasing interest in races and 'volkgeist'. This prompted some scholars, such as John Gillies and Connop Thirlwall, to subdivide the 'Heroic Age' into three periods, each characterised by a particular 'people' or ethnic group. The first was named 'Pelagic' and was usually dated from ca. the twentieth century BC until ca. 1600 BC. This was followed by the period of the 'foreign' or 'oriental colonies' (ca. seventeenth/sixteenth – fourteenth centuries BC), during which new settlers, such as Cadmus, Danaus and Pelops, brought superior civilisations from the East. The third and final sub-period was termed the 'Heroic Age' (not to be confused with Scaliger's more extensive 'Heroic' Age), and encompassed two centuries (ca. 1400-1200 BC). During this shorter 'Heroic' Age, the Greek 'races' were believed to have arrived on the Greek mainland, and many important developments and events were thought to have taken place, e.g. the Thalassocracy of Minos and the Trojan War.

Furthermore, the appearance in the 1790s of Friedrich Augustus Wolf's *Altertumswissenschaft* represents a new approach to the study of the past of ancient Greece and Rome. This in turn paved the way for later scholars whose work had a significant impact on Aegean archaeology, above all Wolf's pupil Karl Otfried Müller. In a series of books, of which the most important was *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie* (1825), Müller supported that all myths contained a kernel of historical truth, which historians must identify. Furthermore, Müller with his book *Die Dorier* (1830) and, above all, Karl Hoeck with his seminal *Kreta* (1823-1829), suggested that all ancient references to King Minos indicated a period during which the significant events attributed to this king occurred. In this way, Müller and Hoeck conceived the existence of a period that they named *minoisch*, during which a brilliant civilisation flourished for nearly two centuries. However, both scholars had fundamental differences concerning the ethnic affiliation of the people who developed the Minoan civilisation, which resulted from a different way of reading ancient myths and tradition. According to Müller, the 'Minoan Cretans' were Dorians, while Hoeck held that they were non-Hellenic Eteocretans. In later decades, Müller's Dorian theory was abandoned as nineteenth-century scholars were more in

favour of an 'Eastern miracle' (*ex oriente Lux*). As a result, Hoeck's non-Greek theory was not only fully adopted, but also elaborated upon by historians and philologists, such as Thirlwall and Gladstone, and, above all, by Evans himself.

Additionally, Wolf's refusal to accept the historical existence of Homer caused some scholars to suggest that the name 'Homer' reflected an age rather than a person. This in turn led to the concept of a 'Homeric Age', which came to embrace not only the period in which Homer was supposed to have lived, but also the period in which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were set, i.e. largely overlapping with the Heroic Age. Following this idea, many scholars endeavoured to describe the religion, politics, ethics, social organisation, and to reconstruct the material culture of the Homeric or Heroic age by meticulously examining the Homeric poems. Their work was largely used and developed by the pioneering archaeologists to interpret their recently discovered finds. For example, when Schliemann excavated on Hisarlik, he interpreted most of his finds in Homeric terms. Yet in a similar fashion, other scholars did not accept Schliemann's theories, because the 'Trojan' finds were too 'crude' and 'primitive', and did not resemble the superior material culture described in the Homeric poems.

b) A renewed and more systematic interest in Heroic Greece

Concerning the renewed and more systematic interest in Heroic Greece, this was in no small part due to Barthélemy's *Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce* (1788), one of the first historical novels and an immediate best-seller: during the period 1780-1832 the acropoleis of Mycenae and Tiryns became a common destination for travellers of the Grand Tour. In other words, it is largely thanks to Barthélemy's work that most travellers of the Grand Tour started to visit the acropoleis of Mycenae and Tiryns from 1790 onwards.

This new approach was initiated by the traveller Count Marie-Gabriel-Florent-Auguste de Choiseul-Gouffier, a pupil of Barthélemy. From 1780 until his death in 1817, Choiseul-Gouffier was engaged with the completion of his seminal *Voyage pittoresque de la Grèce*, which largely focused on the Troad and the location of Troy and New Ilium. This work received significant momentum when Choiseul-

Gouffier was ambassador of France to Constantinople in 1784-1792, from where he was able to employ a wide group of scholars, painters and architects. Jean-Baptiste Lechevalier and Louis François Sebastien Fauvel were the most distinguished among them.

The most noteworthy scholars of this era were the British travellers William Gell, Edward Dodwell and William Leake. Despite their continuing dependence on the ancient texts for their interpretations, their work represented genuine developments. They visited, measured, drew and made plans of most of the Heroic monuments, such as the Treasury of Atreus and Minyas; with their numerous publications, they made these sites known to a wide audience.

c) The identification or discovery of new Heroic sites (including the question ubi Troia fuit?)

As a result of this interest, at the end of 1832 a dozen new Heroic sites were located (or thirty, if one includes the several mounds in the Troad thought to be tumuli of Heroic heroes) (see TABLE 4.3).

In 1780, Louis Fauvel, together with the architect Jacques Foucherot, located the remains of the 'Treasury of Minyas' on the basis of Pausanias's *Periegesis*. Meanwhile, Lechevalier was the first scholar who tried to give a satisfactory answer to the question *Ubi Troia fuit?* With Homer's poems and Strabo's *Geography* in hand, he explored the Troad three times between 1785 and 1787; he claimed that a hill named Balli Dag, near the village of Pinarbaşı, was Homer's Troy, while he identified other tumuli throughout the Troad as the burial places of Greek heroes, such as Aesyetes, Achilles and Patroclus. His theories launched a new 'Trojan war', involving many travellers and 'armchair' scholars. As a result, two hills emerged as contenders for the location of Troy: Balli Dag and Hisarlik.

Other travellers of the Grand Tour identified new sites and monuments, e.g. Gropius reported the Tholos tomb at Vaphio, while Gell, Dodwell and Leake with their meticulous research at Mycenae brought to light three previously undiscovered beehive-tombs (the Lion Tomb, the Kato and the Epano Phournos Tombs), as well a 'Mycenaean' bridge.

d) The desire for collecting and the first prehistoric excavations

During these decades, the creation of personal collections as an indication of prestige, the establishment of the first museums and a general high demand for antiquities led to an interest in every kind of ancient art, including 'ugly' primitive artefacts. Some travellers even conducted excavations in their effort to enrich their private collections, while local inhabitants started excavations for financial profit. Hence, in the 1780s Louis Fauvel conducted three 'prehistoric' excavations, while in 1802 Vlassopoulos excavated at the entrance of the Treasury of Atreus on behalf of Lord Elgin; later, in 1810, Veli Pasha excavated at Mycenae and revealed the remains of a Tholos tomb (known today as the Tomb of Clytemnestra), and in 1812 de Bosset uncovered a Mycenaean cemetery at Mazarakata on the island of Cefalonia. These excavations revealed new prehistoric sites, which were all re-excavated after Schliemann's astonishing discoveries at Mycenae in 1876.

e) The first descriptions of prehistoric finds

Due to this wide-ranging interest in ancient artefacts, several prehistoric objects started to appear in the late eighteenth – early nineteenth centuries. These were interpreted by means of antiquarian methods, i.e. the use of ancient texts, quite often in correlation with 'proto-evolutionary' principles, in which everything that looked 'simple' or 'rude' belonged to a primitive or early period. This practice, however, soon led to an 'antiquarian impasse': due to their reliance on documentary sources, scholars often failed to appreciate the real antiquity of these finds, e.g. Cycladic figurines were usually dated from the fifteenth to the eighth century BC, because they were thought to belong to the period of the 'foreign' or 'oriental colonies' (see TABLE 4.4).

III. From 1833 until 1865

The next phase from 1833 until 1865 is characterised by the recently established Greek state, which occupied the southern part of the Greek mainland and the Cyclades, while the rest of the Aegean area remained under Ottoman rule. This

new *status quo* had certain effects on the development of Aegean archaeology. In general, during this phase one can observe: 1) a stagnation in the region occupied by the new Greek State, 2) the start of excavations in the Troad, 3) a meticulous survey in Crete, 4) the first attempts to classify ancient Greek pottery, including prehistoric artefacts, and 5) the introduction of the cross-dating method.

During these early decades of an independent Greece, the interest in Heroic culture suddenly waned. Greeks instead focused on their classical past, wanting to make a direct link between the newly established Greek state and their classical heritage as a way to support their right of independence. Only a few scholars would now contribute to the rediscovery of the Heroic culture, such as Ludwig Ross, George Finlay, and Alexandros Ragavis, who, besides their classical investigations and research, visited Mycenae and Tiryns frequently, collected primitive artefacts, such as Cycladic figurines and Bronze Age seals, or even conducted excavations.

However, some significant progress occurred in places that were still within the Ottoman Empire: the Troad and Crete. The excavations of Frank Calvert and Georg von Hahn during the 1860s proved that the long celebrated hill Balli Dag could not be Homer's Troy, while Calvert's excavations at Hisarlik revealed important architectural foundations belonging to the ancient city of New Ilium, which were later seen by Schliemann. Concerning Crete, the British travellers Robert Pashley and Thomas Spratt made a thorough survey, and their books became the standard guides for the island in later years, inspiring the work of the first Cretan archaeologists.

Other scholars made some important contribution. For example, Burgon, Birch and de Witte classified ancient Greek pottery and suggested that pottery decorated with geometric designs should be dated to the Heroic times. Henri-Adrien de Longpérier also observed that some primitive vases that had been found on Thera and Melos were identical to those illustrated on the 'Keftiu fresco' from the Egyptian tomb of Rekhmara, a vizier of the pharaoh Thutmose III, and therefore the vases must date to the pharaoh's reign. In this way de Longpérier introduced the cross-dating method in Aegean archaeology, which was later used by Burnouf, Schliemann, Tsountas and, above all, Evans.

IV. From 1866 until 1875

In the next phase, from 1866 until 1875, one can see the beginning of what one may call 'modern' Aegean archaeology. During this decade new evolutionary theories that had previously appeared in the rest of Europe at last reached the Aegean (Chapter 6). The most important developments achieved in these years were 1) the introduction of new theories and methods of archaeology, 2) the prehistoric excavations at Therasia, Thera and Ialysos, 3) Newton's idea of a 'Graeco-Phoenician' period, and 4) the arrival of Heinrich Schliemann and his excavations at Hisarlik (1871-1873) and Mycenae (1874).

Albert Dumont and George Finlay should be credited for introducing and establishing in the Aegean region Thomsen's Three Ages (i.e., Stone, Bronze and Iron Age), Lubbock's divisions of a Palaeolithic and Neolithic period, and, in particular, the idea of 'Prehistory'. The term prehistoric, which was employed in the United Kingdom from the early 1850s, replaced the old-fashioned term Heroic, but at the same time it inherited the problems of the latter (i.e., when to date its endpoint). However, the introduction of evolutionary theories did not mean liberation from ancient testimony and the 'antiquarian impasse' of the previous years. On the contrary, most Aegean scholars started to combine ancient Greek and Roman tradition with evolutionary ideas and methods. François Lenormant, for example, employed Thomsen's Three Ages in addition to calendar dates provided from Thucydides to date finds from Therasia.

The prehistoric excavations at Therasia, Thera, and Ialysos on Rhodes also had a significant effect on the development of Aegean archaeology. The artefacts from these sites, the pottery in particular, were later used for typological comparisons with those found at Hisarlik and Mycenae. Also, Charles Newton's concept of a 'Graeco-Phoenician' was extensively used by Schliemann to date his Trojan and Mycenaean finds.

With their remarkable work, scholars from the Renaissance until the early 1870s paved the way for the pioneering Aegean archaeologists of the late nineteenth century. Thus, when Schliemann arrived in the Aegean in 1868, he visited exactly the

same sites as previous travellers, and from 1868 until his death in 1890, he excavated the renowned Heroic sites, which had been studied by Lechevalier, Gell, Leake, Calvert and others: 'the castle of Ulysses' on Ithaca (in 1868 and 1878), Balli Dag (in 1868), Hisarlik (in 1870s-1880s), Mycenae (in 1876), Tiryns (in 1876 and 1884-85) and the Treasury of Minyas (in 1880-81). He would have excavated also at Knossos, which he visited in May 1866 and March 1889, had he not been discouraged by the high demands of the Turkish proprietors (Meyer 1936, 255ff.).

Whilst literally following in the footsteps of previous travellers, Schliemann also used the same ancient texts and interpreted them in the same way as Gell and Leake did, using the work of previous scholars and their ideas. For example, in order to date his 'Mycenaean' finds, Schliemann employed an argument first promoted by Gell on the basis of Strabo: given that the city was destroyed and depopulated by the Argives before ca. 468 BC, the finds should be dated at least before the fifth century BC. Schliemann also used ideas and materials taken from other scholars, e.g. Hamilton and Squire's division of four styles of walls, Donaldson's restoration of the Treasury of Atreus, de Longpérier's cross dating, Newton's theory of a 'Graeco-Phoenician Age', etc. Last but not least, Schliemann's attitude to the teachings of the 'Göttingen School' is characteristic: the very fact that he believed he could excavate and find Homeric Troy, the Palace of Odysseus, and the tombs of Agamemnon and his companions shows that he adhered to the opinion of Müller and other German scholars who, unlike Grote, believed Greek myths and legends contained a kernel of historical truth.

After Schliemann's impressive finds at Mycenae in 1876, many archaeologists – mainly Greeks – were keen to continue the Heroic research of previous generations. Throughout the next thirty years, until the late 1890s, almost all sites that had been classified as Heroic (i.e. prehistoric) before 1875 were excavated (e.g. in the late 1870s Kalokairinos excavated at the Palace of Knossos and Kondakis at the 'Cyclopia': see TABLE 6.6). Among these Greek archaeologists the most eminent was unquestionably Christos Tsountas who, from 1886 until the early 1890s, excavated a large number of Mycenaean sites in the Peloponnese that were previously known, such as the Tholos tomb at Vaphio (first recorded in 1805), or the Beehive tombs at

Mycenae identified by Gell, Dodwell and Leake. In the late 1890s, he excavated in the Cyclades, including sites like Chalandriani on Syros, a well-known prehistoric site identified at the beginning of the nineteenth century, or at Messada, where Petros Kordias excavated in the 1820s.

Evans also adopted and even elaborated upon theories and interpretations that had taken shape in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to explain his archaeological finds. Karl Hoeck's book *Kreta* certainly had a significant impact on Evans's work. In his 1894 article 'Primitive pictographs and a prae-Phoenician script from Crete and the Peloponnese', Evans adopted Hoeck's concept of a Minoan Age and civilisation, as well as the terms 'Minoan' and 'pre-Minoan' (Karadimas and Momigliano 2004). Hoeck's other ideas too, such as the cultural primacy of Crete, the Minoan Thalassocracy, the conquest of the Greek mainland by Minos, the existence of a non-Greek race in Crete before the Dorian invasion (dated to 1040 BC by Hoeck), became crucial tenets in Evans's Minoan paradigm.

In the construction of his Minoan paradigm, Evans took advantage of many other theories as well. When he announced his tripartite chronological system of an Early, Middle and Late Minoan Age at the international congress in Athens in 1905, he claimed that the name Minos was in fact a title (Evans 1906, 4), an idea borrowed from previous scholars (cf. Chapter 2.1). The tripartite division that he proposed also contained the notions of growth, maturity, and decadence that were very common in nineteenth century scholarship. Evans also drew an explicit analogy between the Homeric or Heroic Priest-Kings and the creators of the Minoan civilisation. To achieve a portrait of a Priest-King, he combined several wall fragments, which during the excavation he initially attributed to different frescoes, and since then it has been known by the name 'the Priest King' (Evans 1900-01, 15-16). But even if we accept that the fresco was indeed like this and not the fruit of Evans's imagination, as some archaeologists continue to maintain (e.g. Shaw 2004), it is more important to understand why Evans chose such a name. It is because he was still working from an antiquarian perspective, largely influenced by the scholars' work presented in this dissertation.

To conclude, the period that preceded Schliemann's, Tsountas's, and Evans's work was not some kind of *tabula rasa*. Certainly their spectacular discoveries and seminal publications represent an important and undeniable watershed in the history of Aegean archaeology; nevertheless, the antiquarian research completed in the eighteenth/early-nineteenth centuries and presented in this dissertation was an indispensable precondition for the success of these 'fathers' of Aegean archaeology, in terms of a) periodisation, b) other theories (e.g. relevant to the ethnicity of pre-Doric people in the Aegean), and c) actual archaeological discoveries.

