1

On the beginnings of field archaeology (or "spade research") - the first regular excavations at Hisarlik: 1871-1873

† Manfred Korfmann

"Homer, Troy, Schliemann"- for more than one hundred years these words have been united in the public consciousness. The subject has been taken up again and again. Schliemann is regarded as an epitome of the archaeologist, his life's work standing as a monument within the history of scholarship.

Schliemann himself did much to encourage this continued public interest by producing nearly 300 publications, large and small, including books and articles for specialist journals and newspapers. The bibliography of publications concerning Schliemann himself, as well as his work, in particular the archaeological excavations of Troy and Mycenae, cannot be ignored. A summary of "Schliemannia" compiled by the Athenian pre-historian and Schliemann researcher George Korres (1974) lists over 2000 publications - and the number increases every year.

In this, the centennial year of Schliemann's death, we turn with particular intensity toward the famous excavator of Troy. Recent research has focused on questions about his personality and, above all, his character. The negative personal aspects detailed in these discussions have given rise to general doubts about Schliemann's scientific honesty. Against this background, which we will not go into in further detail here, it is both justified and necessary to allow Schliemann himself another chance to speak, lest these contradictory personal judgements cause the concrete archaeological results of his excavations to disappear from view.

Schliemann's first book on the Trojan excavations, published in German in 1874 and in English in 1875 as *Troy and its Remains*, provides a useful point of reference. It reports on the first three years of excavation at Hisarlik (1871-1873), a place called Ilion or Troy in antiquity, as it would be again from the time of the Schliemann excavations. At the end of these first three years, the excavator wanted to halt the excavations "forever". For Schliemann, it "was not conceivable that scholarship could achieve anything more through further excavations". Soon afterwards, however, he saw things differently. He pressed ahead with excavations at Tiryns and Mycenae, resuming work at Hisarlik in autumn 1878.

The direct value of Schliemann's first book on the Trojan excavations lies in its facilitation of an understanding of Schliemann as he was at the beginning of his scholarly activities, when he was not yet influenced or supported by personalities from the established circle of antiquarian scholars. In particular, these would later include the anthropologist and pathologist Rudolf Virchow (from 1879 onward), or Emil Burnouf, the former director of the French Archaeological School in Athens (from 1879 onward) and the architect and archaeologist Wilhelm Dörpfeld (from 1882 onward). How often in later years would the negative aspects of the work at Troy be put down to Schliemann, with the positive aspects credited to the collaboration of others!

Troy and its Remains is an authentic, original document. The text is divided into 23 periodic reports, called "essays" by Schliemann. They consist of one-or-two-week, occasionally chronological progress reports, similar to those that Schliemann sent off regularly to the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung* during the Trojan excavations. The text is doubtlessly based on Schliemann's daily-kept diary and excavation notebooks, which are today stored in the Gennadius Library in Athens. Naturally, what we have here is a worked-over version deliberately placed at the disposal of a critical public.

The reader of Schliemann's first book must understand that the text retains much of its diary character and that he will be led astray. For example, during the first two years of excavation Schliemann held the assumption that the lowermost "settlement" was Homer's Troy. By the third year, the "second settlement" is Homer's Troy, as it is in the broad introduc-

tion written at the end of 1873 summarizing the results of three years of excavation. A similar interpretation made in light of additional findings from later excavations was published by Dörpfeld in 1902 as *Troy and Ilion: Results of Excavations of the Prehistoric and Historic Levels of Ilion, 1870-1894*.

The efforts of the first excavation cycle were crowned by the discovery of "Priam's Treasure" in 1873. Schliemann believed he had achieved the goal of his work and therefore intended to close the Trojan excavations for good and present the results as quickly as possible. This haste is noticeable throughout the text in the many discrepancies and contradictions of ideas and conclusions; however, this style serves to underline the naturalness of the presentation. This lack of basic revision and editing is also apparent in the introduction.

The speed with which the results were prepared for publication can also be seen in the accompanying volume of illustrations, the *Atlas trojanischer Alterthümer*. A user of the original German edition of the *Atlas* is confronted with photographs of varying quality, badly cropped and carelessly mounted. There is no planned or aesthetic arrangement. In addition, the textual references to *Atlas* illustrations could be much more exact, and where the references are precise, they occasionally turn out to be incorrect.

The majority of the original *Atlas* illustrations were reproduced as what Schliemann called "photographic drawings". These are drawings that have been documented photographically and reproduced as prints. As a result, every *Atlas* volume counts as a curiosity. The Athenian photographer Panagos Zaphyropoulos took not only the majority of the photos, but also made the over 100,000 prints. From these, 25,000 were rejected by Schliemann due to poor quality, which, considering the pervading circumstances, was surely an exceptional proportion. Nevertheless, the quality of the remaining photographs can only be described as very poor. It was an altogether laborious and unsatisfactory attempt with a relatively new medium. A new edition of these photographs was out of the question. The original photographic plates were not preserved and the prints in the few folios still extant in libraries became increasingly yellowed with the years.

The lesson drawn from this experience was so vivid that the finds and results from the Trojan excavations would never again be published as photographs during Schliemann's lifetime; they would henceforth always appear as engravings. These engravings, however, were frequently based on photographs, as Schliemann continued to document his excavations photographically.

Only one year after the publication of the original German *Atlas*, engravings were used to illustrate the English language edition, a change that was visually attractive. However, the scholarly worth of the original *Atlas* remains, based to a large extent upon the 19 photographs of "Priam's Treasure", the contents of which were lost during the final weeks of World War II.

It is sometimes claimed that Schliemann did not in fact find the treasure *in toto* at Troy, but instead enlarged a smaller group of finds with purchased pieces. It is therefore of particular interest that these objects were photographed in a partially uncleaned or unrestored state. How much more could be speculated concerning "falsification" were it not for an early publication with photographs such as these? In any case, there was not much time for falsification. Schliemann's prophecy that this treasure would "remain the subject of ongoing research for hundreds of years" has, without a doubt, proved true for the first century.

Schliemann's excavations at Hisarlik as a form of *Iliad*-reception

Heinrich Schliemann's excavations at Troy are only one part of the long and varied history of how the *Iliad* was received by its audience. This epic written in the eighth century BC has left its mark upon the spirit of the Western world like no other work. Archaeologists have ascertained that the theme of the battle for Troy inspired works of art a generation after Homer, after which time it was indeed on everybody's lips. The influence of the *Iliad* has not diminished to the present day.

In antiquity as well as today, the stories connected with the Trojan War inspired not only those learned in Greek. The theme was also employed toward artistic and even political ends. Rome professed its Trojan origins from the 5th century BC. In building up their dynastic ideology, Julius Caesar and the Julio-Claudian dynasty traced themselves back to Aenaes and his son, Iulus, himself named after the legendary founder of Troy. Notably, Troy had a second name: Ilios. Many holders of political

power made reference to the battle between the European Greeks and Asiatic Trojans, including Xerxes before the conquest of Greece, Alexander the Great before the campaign in southwest Asia, the knights of the fourth crusade before and after the capture of Constantinople and the Sultan Mehmet Fatih after the conquest of the same city by the Ottomans. Hundreds of the Franks, the kings of France, the dukes of Burgundy and many other ruling houses derived themselves genealogically from the Trojans (Chandler 1802; Rose 1997).

On the whole, the spiritual and ideological examination of the events around Troy produced a unified cultural basis for education and training in Europe. Powerful European cultural roots can be found in this Anatolian city on the borders of two continents and seas. In a time marked by efforts toward European economic and political unity, we should also be aware of such spiritual and intellectual foundations.

As an end result, the reception of the *Iliad* introduced two further "battles for Troy", both of which are still going on today:

1. Was Troy a "poetic fantasy", a legendary, yet wholly imaginary city?

2. If not, where was Troy?

The *Iliad* was pure poetic invention to most ancient philologists of the 19th and early 20th centuries. There were times when scholars even doubted the existence of Homer as a person. Antiquity, however, had no doubts. One knew where Troy was located. Ilion coins were minted at Hisarlik. The distances between the city and neighbouring locations are noted on the Peutinger map of Roman roads (a.k.a. *Tabula Peutingeriana*). Nevertheless, from the late 18th century until the time of Schliemann's excavations, the majority of those scholars who believed that the *Iliad* had a historical basis located the site of Troy not at Hisarlik, but at the ruins lying on the slopes over Pinarbaşi, some 10 km to the southwest.

The equation of Troy with Hisarlik can be described as the most important result of Schliemann's work, as it often is. However, the facts of the case do not present themselves so simply. Schliemann did not "discover" Troy, although he did attempt to resolve nearly 100 years of academic discussion with the help of a new method: excavation. Even here he was not the first. The Austrian Consul Johann Georg von Hahn excavated at Balli Dag in 1864, and in 1865, five years before Schliemann's first test trench, the British citizen Frank Calvert had already begun excavating at Hisarlik (Hahn 1865; Easton 1991; Allen 1999).

Calvert was a local resident of the Dardanelles who had amassed a fortune as a large landowner, merchant and British, as well as American, Consul. He was also a scholar interested in antiquities, which he publicized and exhibited internationally. For all the tenacity that one grants Schliemann, it should be emphasized that it was Frank Calvert who smoothed the way for him into the Trojan countryside and who drew his attention particularly to Hisarlik.

As was normal for the times, one went through the area in the 18th and 19th centuries with the *Iliad* in hand, as did Schliemann when he came here for the first time in 1868. Homer does not describe the Trojan topography in exact terms, but in a nevertheless satisfactory manner. He or his informants must have viewed the Scamander Plain with alertness. However, a present day comprehensible Homeric description of the landscape is still no proof that the Trojan War took place here some 550 years earlier, although post-Schliemann archaeology can show that Homer or his late 8th century BC contemporaries could have had the powerful walls of second millennium BC Troy (Troy VI and VII) before their eyes. Perhaps the last of these remains were still occupied.

Admittedly, one can occasionally detect a critical approach in Schliemann's reports opposite a literal trust in Homer; indeed, whenever the excavation finds do not manifestly agree with the evidence from the *Iliad*.

The majority of what was found by the German excavations of Heinrich Schliemann (1871-73; 1878-79; 1882; 1890) and Wilhelm Dörpfeld (1893-94) came from an appreciably earlier, nameless period. The same goes for the later American excavations directed by Carl Blegen (1932-38). The results were of high scholarly interest, but far removed from Homer and the supposed events of the *Iliad*, which most scholars date to the beginning of the 13th century BC. The "treasures" of Troy II and the archaeological level of Troy II are, as we know today contrary to Schliemann's opinion, some 1000 years older than the presumed "Epoch of Priam". The contemporary critics of Schliemann's interpretations were completely justified in this respect, but at the time Schliemann was concerned with archaeological-methodological arguments.

The general state of "Archaeology" up to Schliemann's time and the significance of the site of Hisarlik for prehistoric archaeology during the 19th century

Schliemann showed himself to be open to new points of view from the very beginning of the Trojan excavations. He corrected himself, sought the collaboration of others - including those from neighbouring disciplines - and absolutely invited discussion with his immediate, frequent publications. In this respect, he was, without a doubt, a scientist.

However, the publication year of the "treasures" (1874), was not yet ripe for any serious, informed discussion about the results of his first series of excavations. Schliemann himself would have to provide the basic material for archaeological-scholarly debate with his later excavations at Mycenae.

Shortly after Schliemann's death, the Trojan excavations of 1893 and 1894 under the direction of Wilhelm Dörpfeld uncovered the massive fortification walls of Troy VI along the southern and eastern edges of the citadel hill. As can be read and seen in Schliemann's first book, he himself had already seen at least one of the large structures belonging to this level on the south side of his great trench in 1873. These remains of Troy VI could only first be dated with the help of the findings from Mycenae, principally the typical vase forms and painted ceramic wares that occur at both sites.

Although Near Eastern and classical archaeology are bound up with Troy in other senses, in particular prehistoric archaeology, the so-called "spade research", began with this site. Hisarlik, with its many construction phases lying atop one another, was the first place where an excavator could recognize a chronological sequence of archaeological levels, realize the value of the "stratigraphic method" and at the same time report all this to the general public. There is no doubt that the credit for this is due to Heinrich Schliemann.

One can see his progression toward these realizations in his reports on the first three years' work. Schliemann noted that finds considered rather unprepossessing at the time had value as *Leittypen*. As he said, these were more important to him than the treasures. Already during the first year of excavation, Schliemann wrote (1875, 80):

> My expectations are extremely modest; I have no hope of finding plastic works of art. The single object of my excavations from the beginning was only to find Troy, whose site has been discussed by a hundred scholars in a hundred books, but which as yet no one has ever sought to bring to light by excavations. If I should not succeed in this, still I shall be perfectly contented, if by my labours I succeed only in penetrating to the deepest darkness of pre-historic times, and enriching archaeology by the discovery of a few interesting features from the most ancient history of the great Hellenic race. The discovery of the stone period, instead of discouraging me, has therefore only made me more desirous to penetrate to the place which occupied by the first people that came here, and I still intend to reach it even if I should have to dig another 50 feet further down.

His acknowledgement of the value of ceramic sherds and other small finds, understood in reference to their stratigraphic context, was the starting point for the construction of a relative chronology for the site itself and, over and beyond this, for the cultures of southeast Europe and Greece as well.

The excavations ran up against a great deal of criticism for which Schliemann himself was partly responsible. Among the academics, the critics came mainly from classical philology and ancient history, but also from classical archaeology. The antiquarian scholars of the time had almost nothing to do with excavations and their results. Most 18th and 19th century scholars considered this method beneath their dignity. The study of cultural antiquity, characterized for over 100 years by art historical analysis of only the more outstanding finds, would through Schliemann's work push ahead toward something entirely new. It should be particularly emphasized that, in contrast to classical archaeology, prehistoric archaeology did not exist as a discipline at any universities when the Trojan excavations began. If Schliemann is to be called an autodidact in the field of archaeology, as he commonly is, this can only be said from the point of view of art historical archaeology. There were as yet no trained excavators for the non-classical periods of human history; no scientists who treated all finds equally and with regard to their contextual associations in the ground. The systematic, documented excavation was not yet understood.

Schliemann had proved himself academically, at least as well as many others, with his 1869 dissertation

from the University of Rostock. The support of the Trojan excavations from 1879 onwards by one of the most distinguished personages of German science, the respected anthropologist and later prehistoric archaeologist, Rudolf Virchow, was certainly of great significance. It is frequently overlooked that Virchow was not only a medical doctor, but also a pathologist and politician. With regard to prehistoric archaeology Virchow could also be described as an autodidact. Interestingly enough, no one dares to put this forward. In contrast, he is honoured as the "old master of prehistoric research".

When Schliemann began his first regular excavations on Hisarlik in 1871, Alfred Götze, the first professional pre-historian in Germany, was only six years old. "Spade research" would be recognized as a useful method for the historical sciences thanks to Schliemann's excavations, in particular those at Troy and Mycenae. This knowledge was extended not only to archaeologists, but also to their financial backers. Thus the Greek and German Royal families took an active interest in Schliemann's excavations, as did, to no lesser degree, the British Prime Minister William Gladstone. The other "archaeologists" profited from this as well. Without Schliemann they would certainly not occupy their present high rank among the human sciences and, in particular, would not enjoy their present high status in the public consciousness.

Although Schliemann's excavations can be considered a form of *Iliad*-reaction, his results led to prehistoric archaeologists almost always perceiving the significance of the site as something separate from the *Iliad*. The key function of the site of Troy was recognized and appreciated. In the professional archaeological world it is not so much the "treasures" or the *Iliad* problems but rather the other "small finds" that made Troy the most-cited archaeological site in the world.

The most interesting phenomena at the site are the more than 40 construction phases from nine major levels with a height of more than 16 meters, lying atop one another, always in the same order like a historical layer cake. This alone clearly shows that the site was important for over 3.000 years, as does the fact that it was always fortified. The stratified cultural sequence made it possible to separate early and late finds and contexts, as well as to distinguish exports and imports in all directions, allowing the distribution of culture-specific articles to be dated relatively as well as absolutely. It is as a potential mediator of cultural influences stemming from Asia Minor, Syria-Palestine, Egypt, Crete and Mycenae that Troy is most interesting.

The construction method employed at Hisarlik explains why the levels lie over each other in such a way that a settlement mound was formed. The building material played the critical role. The house walls were built of sun-dried mud bricks atop stone foundations. This method is common in regions with warm climates, particularly if wood is not available as a building material. What makes Troy exceptional is the existence of mud architecture in a climatic border region where the technique is not normally practiced. As with all simply-constructed houses, a new building is required after one or two generations of use. In contrast to stone, half-timbered or log houses, the building material from a mud house is not normally re-used. It is simplest to level the old building and erect a new one atop the debris of the earlier building phase. A stratified settlement mound is the end result and, for the archaeologist, a very welcome one.

A chronological system can be worked out when the depths of the finds and their stratigraphic associations are recorded. Schliemann truly made the most of this opportunity. He expressly stressed: "Up to now no one has yet found such an accumulation of ruins anywhere in the world". His recording of the artefacts and their contexts becomes increasingly consistent as time went by. Stratigraphic excavation techniques were developed in principle and as a result a historical cultural sequence was found immediately before the gates of Europe.

The site was continually inhabited due to its economically favourable geographic location, but the fact that it was always defended by powerful walls shows that it was also continually endangered. These processes began in the third millennium BC during the Early Bronze Age, as the Hisarlik treasures verify, and continued for over a millennia, as the constant renewal of the fortification system clearly attests.

The wealth of the settlements can be traced to extreme local conditions: the strong winds and storms that opposed sea travellers through the Dardanelles. A strong north-easterly wind blows against ships sailing in this region during the summer, the season when one normally went to sea. Schliemann himself mentioned these winds, the so-called "Etesians" as being very disturbing to his work. Homer attaches

the epithet "windy" to the city of Ilios several times in his epics. The technology necessary to sail against the wind was only first developed during the Roman period. Before that, ships would be forced to wait in a bay outside the entrance to the Dardanelles until the wind changed. This could take weeks or even months. In addition to the winds, a powerful current reaching speeds of up to seven kilometres per hour ran from the straits into the Aegean.

These two navigation factors, together with the favourable geographical location, placed the inhabitants of Hisarlik in a particularly powerful position. They could levy a toll in almost any amount upon the ships forced to wait. This surely annoyed many, and there was probably a certain degree of strife around the site. The continually renewed defensive walls speak for themselves. We do not know, and probably will never learn, if the *Iliad* summarizes many wars from a nebulous past or reports on one very specific one. It is however certain that there were many wars at Hisarlik/Troy/Ilios during the 14th and 13th centuries BC.

From this we can, with simple arguments, answer the question of whether or not there is a real historical basis to the *Iliad*. It depends upon only what one means by "historical". In this region of the world men and cultures were constantly in conflict with each other. It was worth suffering, either as defenders or attackers, in order to enjoy the benefits of a site so well situated in regard to transport and trade - be it at the beginning of Troy I in the third millennium BC, or at the end of Troy VI in the 13th century BC. Of course, this goes as well for the time of Homer in the late 8th and early 7th centuries BC, when the Greek world was colonizing not only the Mediterranean coast, but the Black Sea as well. The strategic importance of the Dardanelle Straits was well known during Homer's time. Soon after, the Greek city-states would battle for supremacy in the Dardanelles.

The first cuts of the spade at Troy and the resulting discoveries occurred during a period of German national pride following the victory over France. This would make demands on the internationally-minded Schliemann. At the start of the Troy excavations, this German, Russian and American citizen lived in Paris and Athens. He received the excavation license through the agency of the American ambassador in Constantinople. Schliemann was moved only with difficulty to give over the finds from Troy, which were being exhibited in London, as "a gift to the German people". A German nationalist tone is foreign to Schliemann.

In view of this personal background, Schliemann's numerous references in his first book to swastikas and other "Aryan symbols" among the finds from Troy should not be interpreted otherwise than in the way they were meant. Schliemann noticed that these "symbols" occurred with particular frequency in the deepest levels at Troy. He believed they were proof of the presence of Indo-European Greeks, potential participants in the Trojan War - at the time the "first settlement" was Schliemann's sought after Troy of Homer.

This early equation of material culture with ethnicity is likewise methodologically interesting and well worth emphasizing. The "foreign people" who had left their traces two meters beneath the mound surface in the form of a completely new ceramic type, the "knobbed ware", is a further example of such an interpretation. Schliemann's attempt at a culture-historical interpretation of the archaeological legacy was extraordinarily stimulating for prehistoric archaeology. This approach would later be applied in other regions by his friend and co-worker Rudolf Virchow.

The archaeology of the time, for those who would reproach it, was not capable of achieving very much. We cannot today understand why Schliemann placed such immense importance upon "carousels" and "volcanos" when the objects in question were merely simple clay spindle whorls employed by many cultures to spin wool. For Schliemann, these pieces were "sacrificial" finds on account of their richly incised decoration and symbols. Doubts about his own interpretation came to him again and again, particularly as the "colossal amounts" of such finds surprised him. In thinking over this problem, he comes at one point very close to the solution. Here, as well as on many other points, one encounters the scholar who sought "the truth".

The frequently occurring representations of a human face or pair of eyes on vases and marble "idols" were for Schliemann the faces of "owls", which he associated with the symbolic animal of the goddess Pallas Athena, who was worshipped in Troy. He was manifestly not intimidated by the frequently noted depictions of female sexual characteristics; he was clearly not biased in this regard.

At the time, Schliemann believed in the accuracy

of Homer's Iliad "like the Gospels". While he did not really believe the epic to be an explicit, exact history of the events of the 13th century BC, it was nevertheless the accepted basis for the reconstruction of his excavated world. He freely corrected his views now and again, to the effect that Homer was not a historian and that one should make allowances for poetic exaggeration; one could nonetheless experience the satisfaction of knowing that there really was a Troy, however more modest its dimensions.

This "naive belief" was often derided, in particular by German ancient philologists. Bearing in mind their own similarly trusting belief in the "Holy Scriptures" at this time, the double standard revealed by their attitude toward Homer is rather surprising. The various Old Testament authors wrote during the first half of the first millennium BC about events, landscapes, peoples, cities and personages which (should) have occurred and existed between several hundred and in part over a thousand years earlier. Methodologically speaking, Homer should have been allowed the same knowledge of the past that was granted to the authors of the Old Testament. Despite their belief in the veracity of the Bible, most of Schliemann's critics saw no relationship worth discussing between Homer and the writers of the Old Testament - it was remarkably, or rather typically, not a topic for research or discussion for those studying the ancient world during the second half of the 19th century. In school lessons and religious services the Bible stories were presented as historical fact - despite the work of David Friedrich Strauss, who had already in 1835/36 explained the Gospels as myth-building.

The 19th century was also the age when museums in European capital cities were assembling vast archaeological and ethnographic collections. The more "valuable" and "first class" the object - and here one thought mainly of sculptures or "treasures" - the more welcome they were in these collections. These artefacts, whether precious or not, needed organizing. In most cases the pieces were appreciated simply as "pieces"; not as evidence of prehistoric events whose interpretation could be sought in connection with their context.

Schliemann was the first who did not set the making of spectacular finds as the primary goal of his excavations, seeking instead to answer culture-historical questions. Despite his occasionally long-winded interpretations, the revolutionary path he trod can be measured by an example of the hitherto best archaeological research of the time.

The spectacular uncovering of the pole dwelling settlements on the Swiss Lakes began methodically in the winter of 1853/4 under the direction of Ferdinand Keller. The beginnings of prehistoric archaeology are also associated with this date. These investigations were carried out from a purely antiquarian point of view of material culture. Culture-historical interpretations, though possible, were not attempted until eleven years later with the work of the young English reform politician and amateur prehistorian John Lubbock (1834-1913), the later Lord Avebury, only six years before the start of regular excavations at Troy (Lubbock 1865).

The excavators had at any rate noted the absence of metal, the existence of a village society, traces of cultivated plants and domesticated animals as well as many polished stone tools, in particular axes and typically retouched points, ceramic vessels, textiles, etc. The conclusions, however, were lacking. It is a measure of the times that the Late Stone Age, i.e., Neolithic, period discovered at the sites was not described in culture-historical terms as a period of an entirely new way of living defined by sedentarism and agriculture, but instead characterised by "polished stones". With his daring interpretations of events, as opposed to simple description of finds, Schliemann must have seemed an extreme outsider in such a scientific world, whereby he also fascinated many.

On Schliemann's observations and work methods

As already mentioned, we have the original Schliemann before us only in his first Troy-publication. An archaeologist familiar with the problems of Troy can go through this book meticulously in his own time. Regarding the illustrations, he or she will need to have the original *Atlas* at hand only for special questions.

The excavation at the time had no absolute altitude levels; every measurement was taken from the mound surface, which was relatively level. In view of this regularity, the archaeologist can still extract a great deal of information from the Schliemann reports. Amazingly, such investigations are only now being carried out, especially by Donald Easton. As a result, a great deal can still be learned about Troy, its

finds and contexts.

Schliemann is often reproached because he destroyed the critical levels in the course of his search for Troy of the 13th century BC. Schliemann was himself visited by doubts in this matter. We know today that he could not have come across the aforementioned period inside the mound. A cross-section of the mound shows this clearly.

While digging during the first and second years in the north slope area, Schliemann assumed that the levels in question lay all the way down on the rock surface: after present-day terminology, Troy I levels. Without paying any attention to, or even recording, the numerous architectural contexts lying above, he went quickly deeper. During the third year of excavation, he took the two to three meter thick burnt layer marking the catastrophic end of the "second settlement" as evidence of the Trojan War, for which additional proof was provided by the presumably accurate Homeric descriptions of the "Great Tower", the "Skaian Gate", the "House of Priam" and "Priam's Treasure". He found further support for his theories from the multiple finds of "Homeric Goblets" (the so-called Depas Amphikypellon). Following present-day assignment, all these would belong to Troy II and Troy III.

Schliemann over-hastily permitted the contexts of Troy IX, VII, V, IV and III to be cleared away. Nevertheless, his documentation of the find levels of various objects and observations of the major level divisions are astoundingly precise and consistent. Schliemann had noticed that wherever he dug, the level sequence with characteristic finds was repeated. He had already recognized the essential features of the settlement sequence during the first three years of excavation.

Our graphical comparison of Schliemann's stratigraphic sequence with one constructed on the basis of knowledge gained from 13 additional excavation campaigns shows how far in principle Schliemann had already come.

As can be read in his *Trojanische Alterthümer*, Schliemann had even recognized the significance of the "knobbed ware", to which I have just referred in a different context. If he had divided the "numerous catastrophe levels" of his "fourth settlement" into two, the archaeological sequence of Troy with the associated typical finds would have already been known at the beginning of 1874. Admittedly, Troy VI and VII levels would be missing - this despite the fact that remains from these periods turn up here and there in the *Atlas* illustrations and plate descriptions in the form of a particular ceramic type of lusturous, dark grey clay found at a depth of 15 meters beneath the mound surface, which Schliemann considered evidence of a "higher civilization". The deep find context could only be understood later, after the sequence of the demolition levels on the northern slope of the mound became known. With an angled wall to the southeast of the "Great Canal", a "Bastion" that "does not seem to be older than the time of Lysimachos", Schliemann had uncovered the eastern foundations of Troy VI palace, known later following Dörpfeld's excavations as House VI M. Schliemann had without a doubt recognized the exceptional quality of this "beautiful and venerable" building.

We can follow the advances of the first three years of excavation over the course of weeks and years. Of particular interest are the efforts of the second and third excavation years.

Schliemann the excavator had no patience. Sundays and Greek holidays annoyed him. So as to lose no time, he would then hire short-term Turkish workers. He employed more than a hundred, up to 150, as many as possible. He demanded extreme "superhuman" effort from his workers and everyone in his company. Each of his workers could shift four cubic meters of earth in a thirteen hour working day. With his goal to dig ever deeper constantly in view, Schliemann carelessly ignored all risks. Falling stones broke free from the up to 16 meters high trench walls. Men were, as was to be expected, buried by avalanches of earth. Schliemann does not come across sympathetically with his capitalist methods when, for example, he is pleased that he can lengthen the working day from twelve to thirteen hours for the same wages.

During the first three years of excavation Schliemann had no more than a handful of colleagues at his side. The collaboration of his second wife, a Greek, would be glorified by others in later descriptions. The archaeologist reading this book will notice that her active collaboration is wishful thinking.

An excavation worker at Hisarlik today can move approximately 0.5 meters of earth within an eight-hour working day. Today's archaeologist is allocated five workers at the most. The archaeologists achieve a great deal as well during a twelve-hour working day. Now, as then, Schliemann's words still apply: "With

all the hardships and suffering at the excavation one has, among other advantages, never any time to be bored". Nevertheless one is glad for the Sundays and holidays!

In full awareness of all the difficulties involved in an excavation, modern archaeologists are always amazed at how much Schliemann was able to observe, measure and publish under those conditions. The speed with which he published his results should arouse more respect than criticism. If we are now accustomed to waiting decades for the publication of results from comparable excavations, it is only fair that we should view the content and manner of Schliemann's reports according to a different standard. The editing and textual errors frequently held against him are as easy to distort as they are to single out, like his over-interpretations. Only those who rely exclusively on the written word will conduct a character study based on such points!

Despite all of his biases and over-estimation of his own abilities, Schliemann the scholar shows that he seeks "the truth" and is capable of learning. He was great enough to admit his mistakes - and this characterizes him until the end of his life. This led him to the painful realization that he had fundamentally erred in his assignation of the "burnt city" to the "second settlement" (Troy II). The principle seriousness of the goals of his work is unmistakable.

He was not a "gold seeker", as he is described in a well-known book title, but during his lifetime he always remained a "treasure hunter" (Ludwig 1931). To this topic I will refer again later. He concentrated, in accordance with his times, on antiquarian objects. As he wrote: "Science should in no case miss out on anything from my discoveries; an object that could be of interest to the scholarly world should be photographed or drawn by a skilled draughtsman and then published in conjunction with his work, along with the exact depths at which I discovered these objects". He knew as yet too little to do very much with the contexts of finds and with architecture. He developed the "deep sounding" technique, which is today common with settlement mound excavations, however methodologically different the aims. Despite his intelligence and erudition he sought advice and secondary knowledge everywhere. It is not surprising that his quest for knowledge involved the diverse fields of the humanities, but it is worth emphasizing that Schliemann also drew the natural sciences into his excavations from the very beginning. Thus the proportional composition of the metal finds was investigated, as was the clay quality and paint colours of the ceramic sherds. In addition to chemistry, human and veterinary medicine were also involved in the Trojan excavations from the start so that the human and animal bones could be correctly analysed. Schliemann even made an early attempt at "statistics" in treating the weight of the finds as a significant interpretation factor. He saw to it that the vases were professionally reconstructed, if models of their original form existed, and regretted their destruction, in so far as it could be traced to the speed and size of his excavations - for which he took full responsibility. His rethinking of his own interpretations along with massive self-criticism of his own excavation techniques are noticeable on several occasions. As he writes near the end of his third excavation campaign:

> "As a result of my earlier erroneous idea that Troy could only be sought on or immediately above the original surface, a large part of the city was unfortunately destroyed by me in 1871 and 1872, at which time I demolished all the house walls present in the higher levels".

He refers again several times to the massiveness of the levels and the chronological implications of such an accumulation.

Schliemann included the surrounding countryside in his investigations, both before and during the Trojan excavations, carrying out archaeological surveys of the area, admittedly with the *Iliad* in hand. He first investigated the Pinarbaşi question and soon afterwards the "heroic tombs" - the large tumuli found throughout the area. These provided the start for wide-ranging archaeological surveys of the Trojan countryside. This tradition was continued by Schliemann himself and then by Virchow, and then later by Blegen, Koşay, Duyuran, Cook, Akarca and others. In recent years archaeology has recognized the importance of investigating the land surrounding an excavation site, particularly in regard to the ways a settlement and its surrounding natural environment influence each other.

Schliemann's strength and enthusiasm, as well as his character, demanded sacrifices, or at the very least tolerance, from many of the men in his company. Among these were his "dear friend" Frank Calvert, with whom he arrogantly and provocatively quarrelled during the third year of excavation. With hair-

splitting, unconvincing arguments, Schliemann refused to admit that his excavations were actually a continuation of Calvert's excavations. The tensions between the two developed and became public because Schliemann did not reasonably compensate Calvert where an important find was concerned. Schliemann carried out his excavations on the western half of the mound, which was Turkish government property, as well as on the eastern half, which was privately owned by Calvert and the site of his own excavations there in 1865. Calvert had agreed to allow Schliemann to dig on his property and they had together arranged a system for the division of the finds and/or fair compensation payments. The Athena Temple stood on Calvert's land and it was in this area that Schliemann found the well-known Helios metope: "one of the most sublime masterpieces to come to us from the high point of Greek art". The marble block was taken out of the country and ended up, via Schliemann's Athens residence, in the Pergamon Museum in Berlin. Schliemann did not recognize his injustice to Calvert, let alone to the country of Turkey. He believed himself to be entirely in the right. Astonishingly, he managed to affect a reconciliation with Calvert. We can recognize similar behaviour a year later with "Priam's treasure". Here particularly spectacular finds were involved, to which the Turkish government had claim to at least half. The resulting lengthy legal battle with the Ottoman state came to a similarly harmonious conclusion when, after the levelling of a high fine in April 1875, Schliemann came up with a means of compensation generous for the times, so that apparently nothing stood in the way of further excavation permits for the years 1878, 1879, 1882 and 1890. We know today that Schliemann did not feel himself obliged to behave in so accommodating a manner.

It cannot be denied that the description of Schliemann as a "treasure hunter" is justified. His otherwise characteristic ability to learn manifestly broke down in 1890 when he once again came across a "treasure" in the Troy II level. Included among these finds, known later as "treasure L", were four richly decorated battle axes; three probably of nephrite and one of lapis lazuli. The archaeological value of these pieces was far greater than that of their metal prototypes, which were presumably made of gold. Several rock crystal pommels, various pieces of gold, silver and carnelian jewellery, and even an iron object, particularly rare and valuable for this period, were found in the same find context.

Schliemann recognized the importance of the "treasure" and realized the consequences of withholding knowledge of the find from the Turkish authorities, as we can gather from a letter he wrote to Virchow on July 15, 1890 while still at Troy. It must be kept completely secret, "even my wife hears nothing". As he wrote quite openly to various German correspondents, talking about his treasure with an unpleasant, gushing enthusiasm, he knew that he would never again be able to work at Troy if anything was learned about his actions in Turkey.

There is certainly nothing to be read in his 1890 excavation report to suggest the importance of the finds. He describes the iron object as indicating that iron was known in the second city. Four large stone axes were found with it along with "various other small objects ... which ... will be described later in the main publication". The objects were taken out of the country and ended up in the Berlin collection as part of Schliemann's estate following his death.

Having smuggled the Helios metope (1872), "Priam's treasure" (1873) and many other treasures out of the country during the 1870s, Schliemann had still not achieved the necessary detachment from the finds during his later excavation work at Troy. He was without a doubt a scientist, but at the same time was and remained a "treasure hunter" - or would lapse back into this role. We should remember in this context that the treasures taken "because of the greed of the Turks" were not in any way "saved". Indeed, if Schliemann had not taken the treasures out of the country they would still be in the Istanbul museum today; they certainly can't be found any more in Berlin!

The director of the Imperial Archaeological Museum in Constantinople at the time was Osman Handy Bey, a man highly respected not only in professional circles. In March 1890, Schliemann had deliberately invited Osman Handy to the Second Hisarlik conference in Troy with the intention that this distinguished man could testify to the entire professional and non-professional archaeological world as to the authenticity of the work of Schliemann and Dörpfeld.

The Turkish authorities had greatly supported the Trojan excavations during this period, despite unfortunate past experiences. Thus, in his own main publications, Dörpfeld explicitly thanks Osman Handy

and his representative Dr. Halil Edhem for their "benevolent support and in particular for the commendable way in which they have looked after the preservation of the ruins at Troy and continue to look after them today".

In this spirit of friendly cooperation, Osman Handy went so far as to allow Schliemann to export all the sherds and stone objects, not insisting upon the usual division of finds. As his "export" of Treasure L clearly shows, Schliemann did not repay his generosity. He deceived both the Turkish authorities and Osman Handy personally. To describe his actions in any other way would be false.

Such examples easily demonstrate Schliemann's determination and monomania, although he was no "treasure hunter" seeking personal financial gain. In contrast, he carried out the immensely expensive Trojan excavations from start to finish at his own expense. It is well known that he always intended to give his collection away as a gift - not to sell it. To insinuate that he sought to profit from dealing in antiquities would be false.

Schliemann's work altered the appearance of the Hisarlik mound more than all the other excavations put together. Competent, well-informed examination of his work, carried out with the necessary local knowledge, has until now only occurred on a limited scale. These examinations began early, as we can read in the first excavation reports, but there has been a pause since then that is difficult to understand. The scholarly Calvert, who also argued using Homer, but from his own excavation experience at Hanay Tepe, concluded in a newspaper article (25 January 1873) that the "second settlement" excavated by Schliemann could not be the Troy of the Trojan War as it was likely to be more than 1000 years older. The "fourth settlement" could also not be Homer's Troy. At the end of his life, Schliemann had yet to accept that Calvert was right.

Calvert had also correctly interpreted the "Great Tower" upon which Schliemann had based so much of his interpretation, along with the famous stone ramp (the "Skaian Gate") and "Priam's treasure". The "tower" was in fact a multi-faced, sharply angled stretch of the Troy II fortification walls.

Schliemann's excavation results have still not been reconciled with those of the later Dörpfeld excavations in the best possible way. It can be maintained that, in view of more recent excavations, Schliemann's archaeological publications have for the most part remained unanalysed. The same could be said for the results of the American excavations led by Carl Blegen. An example might make this clearer.

As we know from the first Trojan excavation reports, Schliemann's earliest excavations exposed skeletons and associated materials. Similar contexts were discovered during Schliemann's later excavations and by Blegen as well. Remarkably, these excavators neither concluded nor emphasized in any way that at least some of the almost twenty "treasures" found at Troy could have been grave goods. An earlier cemetery at Troy would fall freely within the time corresponding to an interruption of settlement in the mound area (Troy II or III). As we have already mentioned, there is a great deal to be worked on for the benefit of archaeology in Schliemann's publications, as unbelievable as this may sound today. It is all too easily said that the results of his successors provide us with all the necessary information.

Schliemann's work and achievements had an immensely powerful effect upon the intellectual life of the time. Nevertheless, to judge Heinrich Schliemann from our present-day point of view is not easy. So much is certain: he was not a "model" professional excavator, although his name is almost a synonym for archaeology among the general public. The view that archaeologists really search for "treasure", a view deeply rooted in the public consciousness, can be traced back to Schliemann's strong fixation with his "treasures". This completely false assessment of modern excavation goals is a handicap that occasionally becomes a burden. Even Wilhelm Dörpfeld sought to distance himself from it.

If one denies Schliemann many things, he is entitled to at least one: his work had a lasting impact on scholarship and is still provocative in many ways. Some of those who basked in recognition during his lifetime did not produce such a legacy. His work with its methodological approach should be highly regarded as one of the important starting points for "spade research". The achievements continue to have an effect today in all fields of archaeology and, of course, at Troy itself as well. More than 200,000 people a year visit Troy because of what Schliemann and Dörpfeld uncovered there. It was even Schliemann's expressed request that as much as possible should be left in place at Troy so that the visitor "can be convinced of the accuracy of all these statements which

might otherwise sound fantastic".

Dörpfeld would later compare Schliemann's discovery of a prehistoric/archaeological new land with Columbus' discovery of America. Both wanted to open up a specific new horizon, but both ended up finding something entirely different. Even if Schliemann erred in his identification of the "second settlement", which is likely, many scholars today would still subscribe to what he wrote on November 18, 1871: "If there ever was a Troy, and my belief in this is firm, it can only have been here on the site of Ilium" (Schliemann 1875, 85).

The question as to "if" is still as ever worthy of discussion, even after the later discovery of the very impressive building levels of the 13th and 12th centuries BC (Troy VI and Troy VII).

REFERENCES

Allen, S.H., 1999. *Finding the Walls of Troy; Frank Calvert and Heinrich Schliemann at Hisarlik*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Boedeker, D. (ed.), 1997. *The World of Troy: Homer, Schliemann, and the Treasures of Priam. Proceedings from a Seminar sponsored by the Society for the Preservation of the Greek Heritage*, Washington: Society for the Preservation of the Greek Heritage

Calvert, F., 1873. 'Excavations in the Troad' (Dardanelles, 25 January 1873), *The Levant Herald* (daily edition, Tuesday, 4 February): 90d-e, 91a.

Chandler, R., 1802. *The History of Ilium or Troy: including the Adjacent Country, and the Opposite Coast of the Chersonesus of Thrace*, London: Nichols and son.

Dörpfeld, W., 1902. *Troja und Ilion: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in den vorhistorischen und historischen Schichten von Ilion* 1870-1894, Athen: Beck & Barth.

Easton, D.F., 1991. 'Troy before Schliemann', *Studia Troica* 1: 111-29.

Hahn, J. G. von, 1865. *Die Ausgrabungen auf der homerischen Pergamos: in zwei Sendschreiben an Georg Finlay*, Leipzig: W. Engelmann.

Korfmann, M. (Hrsg.), 1990. *Heinrich Schliemann, Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Troja in den Jahren* 1871-1873, München und Zürich: Artemis.

Korres, G., 1974. *Βιβλιογραφία Ερρίκου Σλήμαν*, Athen.

Lubbock, J., 1865. *Pre-historic Times, as Illustrated by Ancient Remains and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages*, London: Wiliams and Norgate.

Ludwig, E., 1931. *Schliemann of Troy, the Story of a Gold-seeker; with an Introduction by Sir Arthur Evans* (translated from the German by D.F. Tait), London: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Rose, C.B., 1997. 'Troy and the historical imagination', in Boedeker (ed.): 98-109.

Schliemann, H., 1869. *Ithaque, le Péloponnèse, Troie, recherches archéologiques*, Paris: C. Reinwald.

Schliemann, H., 1874a. *Trojanische Alterthümer. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Troja*, Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.

Schliemann, H., 1874b. *Atlas trojanischer Alterthümer. Photographische Abbildungen zu dem Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Troja*, Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.

Schliemann, H., 1875. *Troy and its Remains; a Narrative of Researches and Discoveries made on the Site of Ilium, and in the Trojan Plain* (translated by Miss L.D. Schnitz), London: J. Murray.

Schliemann, H., 1891. *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Troja im Jahre 1890. Mit einem Vorwort von Sophie Schliemann und Beiträgen von Dr. Wilhelm Dörpfeld*, Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.