

## Schliemann at Troy

Edmund Bloedow

In a series of studies David Traill has sought to demonstrate that Schliemann was guilty of serious and deliberate misrepresentation, lying and fraud. This applies not only to what he wrote about his private life but also to what he published on his activities in the field of archaeology.<sup>1</sup> The rigorous scrutiny of what Schliemann committed to writing is by no means unwelcome, as one of the cardinal features of Western culture has been a strong emphasis on truthfulness and integrity. So strong is this that when we discover falsehood and deception in an individual's conduct in one area, we tend to question whether such an individual can be trusted in anything. This is understandable enough, but it can lead to an oversimplified assessment. This is true not least in the case of Schliemann.

So far as Troy is concerned, Traill has claimed that Schliemann "seriously misrepresented the truth" when producing his "archaeological reports", and in particular that this was deceitful and fraudulent - i.e., it was deliberate misrepresentation on Schliemann's part. What has entered the literature as "Priam's Treasure" (Treasure A), illustrates the point for Traill in a most convincing way. Indeed, "the discrepancies in find spot, discovery date, the jewellery, and the gold sauceboat suggest that Schliemann's various accounts of his discovery of 'Priam's Treasure' ... are sheer fiction, with the later accounts more elaborate and colourful than the first".<sup>2</sup> Traill's ultimate object, it seems, was the attempt to demonstrate that this Treasure was of no historical significance - which follows from the claim that "we do not know where, when or how Schliemann acquired the Collection of artifacts he called 'Priam's Treasure'".<sup>3</sup> And if this is true, presumably one cannot, unless there is reliable

independent testimony, rely on anything Schliemann said about anything he claimed to have found. This includes in particular also the actual stratigraphical contexts - i.e., where Schliemann claims to have found things.

More recently, Traill has taken issue with my conclusions on the subject.<sup>4</sup> In doing so, he once more seeks to cast Schliemann as wholly unreliable. The basis for any objective discussion of the problems associated with Treasure A has to be a correct understanding of the sources involved. We are indebted to Easton for a thoughtful evaluation of these.<sup>5</sup> For Traill, however, the touchstone for his thesis is Schliemann's claim that Sophia was present at the time of the discovery of the Treasure. Traill once more makes much of the evidence that she was not, and with this lays the groundwork for rejecting what Schliemann says about the Treasure. Easton has, however, protested that, even if Schliemann may have fabricated Sophia's presence at the time of the discovery, this "does not discredit the discovery itself".<sup>6</sup> Traill, however, although now accepting the force of this argument, nonetheless still attempts to use "Sophia" to justify his rejection of Schliemann's report of the discovery published in *Trojanische Alterthümer* (his version D) as a reliable account of the Treasure: "...the whole framework of version D is false insofar as it casts Sophia in a leading, indeed, as Schliemann says, indispensable role".<sup>7</sup> Thus Traill seeks to imply that the remainder of the contents of this report are no more reliable, and so feels justified in rejecting Schliemann's claim there to have found the Treasure on the wall. But if Easton's point is valid, that "Sophia" does not discredit the discovery of the Treasure, by the same logic one may argue that "Sophia" does not prove that Schliemann's

1. Traill 1979, 348-355; Traill 1982, 136-142; Traill 1983, 181-186; Traill 1984a, 96-115; Traill 1984b, 295-316; Traill 1986a.

2. Traill 1984a, 110; cf. Traill 1983, 184.

3. Traill 1983, 185; Traill 1984a, 114-115.

4. Traill 1988, 235-239.

5. Easton 1984a, 141-143.

6. *Ibid.*, 144.

7. Traill 1988, 236; cf.: "The report is clearly fraudulent in that Schliemann claims that he was assisted by his wife, Sophia..." (*ibid.*, 235).

statements in this report about the Treasure are false. Consequently, it does not follow “that the veracity of Yannakis [on the location of the find-spot] is confirmed by his insistence that Sophia was in Athens”.<sup>8</sup> This is simply a lapse in logic.

Nonetheless, Traill once more seeks to lay great importance on the testimony of Yannakis - both in respect of Sophia and the location of the find-spot. But he glosses over some difficulties too readily. I do not wish to imply here that Yannakis’ testimony should not necessarily be taken seriously. Nonetheless, there are three points which should be remembered. 1) We do not possess Yannakis’ own statements on the matter, but only Borlase’s report of them.<sup>9</sup> 2) It is a report of what Yannakis recalled *two years after the event*.<sup>10</sup> We all also know something about the difficulties of remembering details of events which occurred two years earlier. Nor do we have a transcript of the exchange between Yannakis and Borlase, much less a preservation of the possibly important vocal nuances, etc. 3) Borlase did not report Yannakis’ report until almost three years later. We have therefore to consider the possibility that Borlase was reporting on what he remembered Yannakis to have said almost three years earlier, about what Yannakis tried to remember he had witnessed two years earlier. While Yannakis may well have had no difficulty in remembering whether Sophia was present or not, he may have had more difficulty in remembering details about the actual discovery. According to Borlase, Yannakis “remembered that there was a large quantity of bronze articles, but his memory was hazy as to the rest of the treasure”.<sup>11</sup> On the basis of this aspect of Borlase’s report Traill goes on to conclude that Schliemann did not find any of the other pieces of the Treasure (the gold and the silver objects) at that particular time in that particular place.<sup>12</sup> And this, then, forms the foundation for Traill’s oft-repeated hypothesis, that at least the gold and most of the sil-

ver pieces in the Treasure were a “composite” affair, comprised of items which Schliemann had accumulated by having put aside his most valuable finds “from the earliest days of the excavations”.<sup>13</sup>

It scarcely needs to be pointed out that Yannakis’ reported hazy recollection of the remainder of the Treasure does not necessarily require the conclusion that the remainder of the Treasure was non-existent. On the contrary, the opposite is implied. From the character of Borlase’s report one gains the impression that this is precisely a point on which he would have pressed Yannakis. If the remainder of the Treasure had been non-existent, we should expect Yannakis to have denied it as emphatically as he denied Schliemann’s claim that Sophia had been present.

Apart from the above, there is the real possibility that Yannakis was not even present during the discovery. Easton, for instance, whom Traill acknowledges to know “far more about Trojan archaeology”, than he does himself, expressed the view that this too “is very doubtful”.<sup>14</sup>

What emerges from the above is that Yannakis’ testimony, if it is not to be rejected altogether, is not as “gilt-edge” as Traill would have readers believe. Consequently, Yannakis’ reported recollection that the find-spot was “a little place built round with stones, and having flat stones to cover it”,<sup>15</sup> may not necessarily represent the facts. It *may* be correct, but it is no more than that.

Before proceeding further, it is relevant to draw attention here to a dilemma in which Traill finds himself, but which he never resolves. He construes Schliemann as a completely unreliable source, thanks to his lying, deliberate misrepresentation of the truth and outright fraud. At the same time, however, he appears to have no alternative to using Schliemann as a fundamental source for drawing major conclusions. How it is possible to paint an individual as “despicable”, as a “botcher and swindler”, and as a “shameless

8. *Loc. cit.*

9. In other words, we do not have Yannakis’ witness, but only a report of it. This may appear to be quibbling, but we all know something about the possible difficulties involved when a second party reports what another party reports to have witnessed. Traill seems to imply that Borlase’s integrity is based on the circumstance that he was “an English antiquarian of some distinction” (Traill 1983, 183).

10. Traill glosses over this factor too.

11. Borlase 1878, 236.

12. As he puts it, rhetorically: “It is hard to understand how

he [Yannakis] could have forgotten such striking pieces as the gold bottle and the sauceboat” (Traill 1983, 184-185). Cf. “... the treasure ... contained no gold pieces” (AJA 1982, 288). Easton has meanwhile pointed out that Yannakis may well have had good reason for a hazy recollection of the treasure, as he could otherwise be suspected of being an accomplice in its removal from Turkey and shipment to Greece (Easton 1994, 230). See also Bloedow 1999, 55-57.

13. Traill 1983, 185, cf. *idem* 1984a, 112.

14. Easton 1984a, 167, cf. *idem* 1984b, 200.

15. Not Yannakis’ words, but Borlase’s report of them.

charlatan”, a “liar” and “capable of every kind of falsehood”,<sup>16</sup> and designate the writings of such an individual as “sheer fiction”, but then turn around and use them as an important source defies simple logic. The only objective reaction to such a source would require one to throw it out altogether. That is what is in fact usually done. One instance will illustrate the point. For many decades the ancient historian Ephorus (mostly preserved in Diodorus) was treated with something approximating disdain as a source because of the numerous discrepancies and errors which had been identified in his accounts. More recently, however, there has been a change of view, based on a restudy of many details.<sup>17</sup> But according to Traill, “In the case of an individual as unscrupulous as Schliemann, we have no choice, it seems to me, but to regard all inconsistencies with the utmost scepticism...”<sup>18</sup> This, however, is simply an attempt to have it both ways. If Schliemann is really as bad as Traill makes him out to be, it is not merely where we find inconsistencies that we should call in the utmost scepticism. Rather, there is no reason why we should believe anything he says. Simply because such an individual says the same thing in two (or more) places, is no proof that such an individual is telling the truth there.<sup>19</sup> Despite Traill’s apparent *volte face*, he seems at the same time to have recognised the broader dimension, for in his 1986 study he argues that “we must regard his statements with utmost scepticism”.<sup>20</sup> In other words, there is no longer any mention of “inconsistencies”.

For Traill, since Schliemann fabricated at least the gold and most of the silver items in the Treasure, he also fabricated the find-spot. For him the two are inextricably linked. If, however, Schliemann did find the bronze items of the Treasure on 31 May,<sup>21</sup> but fabricated the remainder of the items, why would he want to fabricate the find-spot? More specifically,

what would he gain from re-locating the Treasure to *on the wall*? According to Traill, Schliemann deliberately fabricated his accounts at this point. Since he was therefore consciously fabricating the account of the Treasure, while knowing that he had been saving up numerous items from previous excavations, his locating of the find-spot could only have been motivated by the wish to make it appear more plausible. Would placing the find-spot of the Treasure on the wall achieve this, compared with locating it in a grave?<sup>22</sup> One cannot see any advantage at all. On the contrary, the very opposite is more likely. If Schliemann were fabricating the contents of the Treasure and the date of its discovery, the least likely place to locate a fabricated find-spot, with a view to making it appear more plausible, would be *on a wall*, a point which Traill himself acknowledges. It would appear much more plausible to locate it in a grave.

For Traill’s hypothesis, the problem is compounded by the account which Schliemann gives in his *Diary*.<sup>23</sup> His entry in the *Diary* at this point is of particular importance, because it seems that, in the course of writing it,<sup>24</sup> Schliemann may have changed his mind about the find-spot. For near the beginning of the account Schliemann states that the Treasure was found “in one of the rooms of the house of Priam”. If Schliemann were fabricating a find-spot for a fabricated Treasure, a room in “Priam’s Palace” might be suitable enough. A little further on in the same text, however, he states that the Treasure was found *on the wall* - and sticks to this location from then on. But this makes no sense at all within the framework of Traill’s hypothesis, since the Treasure would not gain anything in plausibility from such a location. Traill maintains that locating the find-spot “outside but adjacent to the city wall ... makes much better archaeological sense than Schliemann’s version in *TR*”.<sup>25</sup> In other words, Traill agrees that *on the wall* does not make

16. Traill accepts with approbation these judgements by contemporaries of Schliemann (cf. Traill 1983, 186). On the value of their judgements, cf. Döhl 1981, 16-75, who could outmatch Schliemann. Having been better educated than he, their conduct was even more reprehensible.

17. As a particular, and not unimportant, case in point, one may allude to the famous naval battle of Cyzicus between Athens and Sparta in 410 BC (cf. Bloedow 1992, esp. n. 36).

18. Traill 1988, 286.

19. In response to Easton’s studies, Traill appears to have modified his initial position rather dramatically (cf. Traill 1986a, 91-92, cf. 98). This, however, also seems to be a case

of attempting to have it both ways.

20. *Ibid.*, 93.

21. Which, on Yannakis’ testimony, Traill seems to be prepared to accept.

22. As Traill would also like to conclude on Yannakis’ testimony.

23. This is found on pp. 271-290 of his *Diary* of 1873. For another draft of this version, cf. Meyer 1953, 231-233.

24. Possibly in the space of 10 days (25 June and 5 July 1873), if Traill is correct (Traill 1988, 235).

25. Traill 1988, 236; cf. Traill 1984a, 110: “Yannakis’ account makes much more sense than Schliemann’s”.

archaeological sense, and in fact says so.<sup>26</sup> But, in that case, one has to explain why Schliemann would want to re-locate it there. If one were fabricating a find-spot, is one likely to choose a place that does not make any archaeological sense? Was Schliemann that stupid?

Is it possible to find another explanation for the change of find-spot in Schliemann's *Diary* and his sticking with this location thereafter? If Easton is correct in suggesting that Schliemann himself may not at the time of the excavation have been entirely certain about conditions in the bottom of the Trench,<sup>27</sup> one could visualise Schliemann, while writing the entry in his *Diary*, working from rough notes and a rough sketch on which the spot had been entered, or, even more plausibly, from memory, attempting to determine more precisely the exact location. The three plans on which the find-spot is indicated near the wall<sup>28</sup> could also reflect transmission from an early sketch made at the time of the excavation, or from memory. It should also be noted that in the same volume in which these plans are published, Schliemann has a plan on which the find-spot is located on the wall, and confirms this in the text.<sup>29</sup> If Schliemann were fabricating the find-spot, he is scarcely likely to have exposed himself by such anomalies in the same volume. If, on the other hand, he were not fabricating the find-spot, one could see these as "honest mistakes", made in the midst of haste in excavating and publishing. That this is within the realm of the possible is indicated by the fact that he says that the room in which he found the Treasure "abutted on to this [circuit] wall", *alias*, "In excavating this wall further and directly by the side of the palace of King Priam I came upon a large copper article...".<sup>30</sup> The proximity of the building to the wall as perceived at the time

could account for the difficulties. This is also essentially the way in which Easton has seen the problem.<sup>31</sup>

At all events, if Schliemann were fabricating the Treasure, and also the find-spot in order to make the Treasure appear convincing, we need an explanation why he relocated the Treasure to *on the wall* - the least convincing place to put it. Traill has not offered any explanation. Until he does, his hypothesis lacks conviction.

Nor is it unimportant to note the number of times that Schliemann subsequently refers to the Treasure having been found on the wall, and the consistency with which he does so. In addition to his *Diary*, written between 25 June and 5 July, there are four instances.<sup>32</sup> Traill has dismissed my appeal to the letters to Schliemann and Newton as of no consequence, since they were written after Schliemann had completed his report for Brockhaus in which he registers his change of the find-spot.<sup>33</sup> According to Traill, Schliemann simply keeps repeating what he had said there. The point, however, is that they underline the consistency which Schliemann maintained on this point. In fact, the letter to Newton warrants particular attention because in it Schliemann actually emphasises the word "on" by rendering it in italics. This suggests two things: 1) that the point was of particular importance to him; and, 2) that he must have consciously been preoccupied with the problem. The change in the text of the *Diary*, as noted above, could also be seen as reflecting this process. Between 25 June and 5 July Schliemann reached a firm conclusion about the exact find-spot, and by 26 July he was in a position to emphasise this. Thereafter, he refers to it as a resolved question. The location of the find-spot indicated as elsewhere on three plans in *Troy and its Remains*

26. "The notion of a treasure chest abandoned on the city wall was always at best highly implausible" (Traill 1984a, 110-111).

27. "We must in any case remember that it was only in the floor of the trench that the top of the wall and of its sloping outer face was visible. Schliemann may himself have been uncertain where the wall's outer edge began" (Easton 1984a, 145).

28. These are found in *Trojanischer Alterthümer*, 214, 216 and 215, and in Schliemann 1875, plan I (at the end of the volume), plan III, p. 306 and plan IV, p. 347. It should be noted that on these, the find-spot is located on, not the inside, but the outside of the wall.

29. Schliemann 1875, plan XIII, cf. 321 and 323.

30. Schliemann's report for Brockhaus as published in Traill

1984a, 97, cf. Schliemann 1875, 323.

31. "On this point we can, at most, accuse Schliemann of vagueness or of succumbing to the temptation to 'correct' his memory away from the site" (Easton 1984a, [104] 145). See now also Bloedow 1999, 49-51.

32. Schliemann 1875, 321, cf. 323; Schliemann 1881, 453, cf. Δ on plan I; Schliemann's letter to Friedrich Schlie (Curator of the Museum in Schwerin), written from Athens and dated 19 July, 1873; "auf der Göttermauer" ["on the Divine Wall"], and his letter to C.T. Newton, also from Athens and dated 26 July, 1873: "very close to the Palace of Priamos, I struck on the great circuit wall ... on the treasure of Priamos" (cf. Meyer 1953, 234 and 235).

33. Traill 1988, 235.



derives from early sketches made at the time of excavation, since Schliemann is not very likely to have consciously included two types of contradictory plans in the same volume. More weight should in fact be given to what the combination of text and one plan reveal, than to three plans by themselves, not least because of the emphasis placed on “on” in the letter to Newton and the subsequent consistency in texts and plans. Consequently, the letters to Schliemann and Newton, far from being irrelevant, provide important additional information. This, it seems to me, offers a better solution to the problem - especially in view of the absence of any convincing reason for fabricating a find-spot *on the wall*.

The above reconstruction receives further plausibility from Schliemann’s account of Treasure J (his tenth treasure), discovered in 1879: “Another treasure was found by me, in the presence of M. Burnouf and Professor Virchow, at a depth of 33 ft. below the surface (in the place marked v to the north of the place marked  $\Delta$  on Plan I, of Troy), *on the slope of the great wall*, close to the house of the ancient town-chief or king, and *close to the spot where the large Treasure was found in 1873*”.<sup>34</sup> If Schliemann is here telling the truth about Treasure J, which I see no reason to question, would he, after invoking the testimony of Burnouf and Virchow, have linked the find-spot of this treasure so directly with the find-spot of Treasure A, if he had fabricated the latter - of which he would at the time still have been only too well aware?

If, therefore, Schliemann did not fabricate the Treasure, and if he did find it, on the wall (not a very likely place at first sight), but in the form later explained by Dörpfeld, this would make logical sense. But Traill also objects to Dörpfeld’s explanation. He does not, however, appear to have any counter-arguments to offer, but simply dismisses it with a rhetorical flourish - namely, by referring to “Dörpfeld’s romantic theory”.<sup>35</sup> Let it be said that we need a little more than this to discredit Dörpfeld’s explanation, which was made in consultation with Schliemann and after examination of the place with him. Moreover, Dörpfeld’s work at Troy and his publication of it are

not characterised by romanticism.

I am not sure that at this stage we can resolve definitively the question of where the Treasure was actually found. On balance, however, and without beginning with the presupposition that the Treasure was “composite”, it seems to me that the evidence allows us to regard the find-spot as being on the wall to have more to recommend it. And until Traill offers a convincing explanation for Schliemann having fabricated such a find-spot, one need not take his hypothesis too seriously.

No less significant in attempting to resolve the most important question in this controversy - whether Treasure A is of any historical significance - are the data deriving from the Cincinnati excavations, which I also reviewed in my study. This evidence too Traill discounts, chiefly on the basis of the following statement by Blegen: “In many works treating of Trojan chronology, moreover, there has been a tendency, understandable enough in view of Schliemann’s and Dörpfeld’s publications, to ascribe to Troy II most of the finer objects which Schmidt in the catalogue assigns only generally to settlements II to V. The danger of such an ascription has been demonstrated by our excavations which have shown clearly that Troy III, IV, and V were rather more than ‘miserable villages’ - indeed, each was a substantial establishment in its own right”.<sup>36</sup> To this Traill comments that “the attribution of just one of the larger of these treasures to Troy III would give that level more gold than Blegen found in IIg”.<sup>37</sup> Indeed it might! But on what grounds could one make such an attribution? For Traill, there is no difficulty. Blegen knew nothing about Schliemann’s reprehensible conduct, and so Traill speculates on what Blegen might do, did he but know: “Given Blegen’s strictures against the tendency to ascribe all the Early Bronze Age finds to Troy II rather than to Troy III, IV or V, it seems reasonable to suppose that in light of the new evidence he would have no objection to the view that ‘Priam’s Treasure’ either properly belongs to Troy III or IV or is a composite of smaller finds from several of the Early Bronze Age levels at Troy”.<sup>38</sup> It is of course difficult to predict what Blegen would do. Should he have “no

34. Schliemann 1881, 502 (my emphasis). For additional treasures found on a wall (“on a house wall”, *alias*, “on a fallen house wall”), also “in the presence of MM. Burnouf and Virchow”, cf. *ibid.*, 328, 499, 794.

35. *Ibid.*, 237.

36. Blegen *et al.* 1950, 208-209.

37. Traill 1988, 238.

38. *Loc. cit.*

objection”, we would have to accuse him of bad archaeology<sup>39</sup> - for two reasons. In the first place, there is no specific evidence that Treasure A belongs in Troy III or IV. This is pure speculation. Secondly, there is no evidence that it is “a composite of smaller finds from several of the Early Bronze Age levels at Troy”. This too is pure speculation.<sup>40</sup>

We should be clear about the evidence which we possess. Blegen *did* find gold and silver in Troy II (most of it in IIg). Traill cannot deny this evidence. His approach is therefore to attempt to play down its significance: “Seen in this light the Troy IIg gold finds are much less impressive - five very small separate finds, a necklace, and a single cache of jewellery”.<sup>41</sup> But 1484 pieces of gold and silver for Troy II (1478 for IIg) are at least 1484/1478 pieces<sup>42</sup> - over against the fact that Blegen did not find a single piece in Troy III or IV or V. As a further argument, Traill claims that the figures “did not convince Easton, who knows far more about Trojan archaeology than either Bloedow or myself, that ‘Priam’s Treasure’ must belong to Troy II”.<sup>43</sup> Since Easton never so much as refers to this specific Cincinnati evidence in this context, there is no indication that he (like Traill) ever even considered it. Now that this evidence has been brought into the debate, Traill clearly appears to be irritated by it. To reject the evidence which we do possess and attempt to substitute speculation for it, is surely perverse (or at least unscholarly and grasping at straws). Not only did Blegen find a significant amount of gold and silver in Troy II (and actually ascribed Treasure A to Troy IIg),<sup>44</sup> but Schliemann was at the time also digging in Troy II. If anything therefore appears to be reasonable, it is that Treasure A belongs in Troy II, with the good possibility of even narrowing it down to IIg. Unless one is to suggest that, could we bring

Blegen back and confront him with “the new evidence”, he would be prepared to take the gold and silver items which he found in (allegedly) good stratigraphic contexts and re-attribute them to Troy III or IV.

What emerges from the above discussion is that the problem at issue derives from a number of discrepancies in Schliemann’s various accounts,<sup>45</sup> some of which are more important, others less significant. Such a circumstance, however, is not unique. Moreover, it prevails down to our own day. The following example illustrates the point. In one context it is speculated that “from the earliest days of the excavations Schliemann put aside his most valuable finds with the intention of announcing one large discovery at the end”.<sup>46</sup> Or: Treasure A “appears to be a composite of numerous small finds made over the 3 years of excavation (1871-1873)”.<sup>47</sup> Elsewhere, however, we are told that the Treasure was “probably a composite assembled by Schliemann from several tomb finds over the preceding months of excavations”.<sup>48</sup> Elsewhere it is suggested that “there is good evidence for believing that the treasure was found in a tomb outside the city wall...”.<sup>49</sup> Still elsewhere it is stated: “While I still believe that ‘Priam’s Treasure’ is most probably a composite of a number of finds from a variety of Early Bronze Age levels at Troy”.<sup>50</sup> In one place it is suggested that the Treasure was “possibly augmented by purchases”,<sup>51</sup> whereas elsewhere it is stated that “the compatibility of all the finds in Priam’s Treasure with Early Bronze Age Troy appears to rule out the possibility that some of the pieces were purchased”.<sup>52</sup>

Here, then, we have, in a fairly simple context, a series of discrepancies, which are never resolved. Readers coming upon this 100 years hence might well wonder about the motivation which lies behind them.

39. That Blegen could sometimes do less than good archaeology, is illustrated by his treatment of Troy VIIa (cf. Bloedow 1988, 23-37).

40. Which Traill does not tire repeating, but to date has not provided a shred of specific evidence that this is so.

41. Traill 1988, 238.

42. Or, even if one reduces them to “five small separate finds”, they are still five finds.

43. Traill 1988, 237.

44. Blegen *et al.* 1950, 213, 351, 359, 367, 371, and 376. Cf.: “It was almost certainly in this layer [Troy IIg] that he [Schliemann] found the great ‘treasure’ and most of his other smaller ‘treasures’ of gold objects” (*ibid.*, 207).

45. Construed as “a quagmire of inconsistencies” (Traill 1983, 183).

46. *Ibid.*, 185. Accordingly, Schliemann concocted this scheme already before his excavations began, or, at any rate, upon the first discovery of any gold and silver objects.

47. *AJA* 1982, 288.

48. Traill 1986b, 51.

49. *AJA* 1982, 288.

50. Traill 1988, 237 n. 16 (my emphasis). Cf.: “a composite of smaller finds from several of the Early Bronze Age levels at Troy” (*ibid.*, 238). If it were the result of an accumulation from several levels, presumably it could not have come from a single tomb.

51. *AJA* 1982, 288, cf. “... did he buy them from dealers in Athens or Constantinople or from local villagers?” (Traill 1983, 185; Traill 1984a, 111).

52. Traill 1988.

Easton has demonstrated for us how, in a much more complex context, discrepancies also occurred, and has shown how Schliemann could even “invent” a treasure, but that this was almost certainly the result of “innocent misunderstanding combined with wisdom after the event”.<sup>53</sup> And in this very context he makes the cogent observation that, “if this is how Schliemann works when he invents a treasure of six or more objects and a skeleton, then it is truly remarkable that of an invented treasure of over four thousand objects *not a single one* should appear earlier in the notebooks”.<sup>54</sup>

Despite the fact that Traill still persists in adhering to his thesis, we may have gained a little ground in the debate over Treasure A. As pointed out at the beginning of this discussion, Traill’s original objective was to demonstrate that the Treasure “should be regarded as a composite find”. From this he extrapolated that “it follows inevitably that all items in the treasure are therefore worthless for chronological (and of course also for historical) purposes”.<sup>55</sup> Now, however, it seems that, while still maintaining that the Treasure is a composite affair,<sup>56</sup> he is prepared (after bringing Blegen on board) to see it as possibly belonging in Troy III or IV.<sup>57</sup> If that is so, it should presumably be of some chronological and historical worth.

Can we, however, narrow the date even further? Traill has strongly objected to my arguments for dating the Treasure in Troy IIg, preferring to follow Easton’s suggestion that it could belong in Troy III or IV, as this, in his view, opens the door for his composite case. He maintains, therefore, that “Easton is in effect

proposing an ingenious solution to an immensely complex problem that has long plagued Anatolian scholars: the date of the end of Troy II”.<sup>58</sup> Easton, it seems to me, was not particularly concerned with dating the end of Troy II when he proposed that Treasure A could have been located in a Troy III or IV context, but be that as it may. More important, is the case for his proposal. In fact, it appears to be bound up very much with Traill’s own conclusions. Traill, relying primarily on Plates 214 and 215 of the *Atlas* accompanying *Trojanische Alterthümer*, located the find-spot outside the citadel wall,<sup>59</sup> and accepted Yannakis’ testimony that it was a grave. Easton was inclined to follow Traill on this point, and from this extrapolated that “it must have been dug down into the ruins of Troy II (or III) at a date probably in Troy III or conceivably as late as Troy IV”.<sup>60</sup> All this, however, appears to hinge on “if we accept that the Treasure was found in a cist-grave on or outside the Troy II citadel walls”,<sup>61</sup> which is based on “Yannakis’s evidence”, “that it was contained in a little place built round with stones, and having flat stones to cover it” – which “may well suggest a cist – grave”.<sup>62</sup> Later, however, as we have already seen, Easton questions Yannakis’ testimony, in fact he doubts whether he was even present at the time of discovery of the Treasure. Indeed, he goes so far as to maintain that “No reliance should be placed on Yannakis’ statement. Borlase was clearly taken in by a boastful foreman who, naturally, claimed to have been present at the great discovery but on further questioning proved to be ignorant of what had been found”.<sup>63</sup>

53. Easton 1984b, 200-201.

54. *Ibid.*, 201 (author’s emphasis). And for correspondence between Schliemann’s accounts and those of Dörpfeld and Blegen, cf. *ibid.*, 199. As noted above (n. 19), Traill has responded to Easton’s studies (Traill 1986a, 91-98). His new arguments, however, are based on evidence which here too (to use Easton’s words) is “exclusively textual”. Although not entirely irrelevant, it too does not take us beyond the realm of the hypothetical.

55. Traill 1984a, 114-115.

56. This despite the excellent case, which Easton has made for its integrity (Easton 1984a, 141-169, especially 161-165 and 167; Easton 1984b, 197-204).

57. Traill 1988, 237-238.

58. *Ibid.*, 237.

59. Traill 1983, 182; Traill 1984a, 103-105. He would also like to rely on the early statement in the *Diary* (C) (p. 300), but this should not be possible, since in that text Schliemann says, as we saw earlier, that there it was “in one of the

rooms of Priam’s house” (i.e., inside the citadel wall).

60. Easton 1984a, 147-148.

61. *Ibid.*, 147.

62. Borlase 1878, 236.

63. Easton 1984a, 167; Easton 1984b, 200. cf.: “Indeed, there must be a real question whether Yannakis can have been telling the truth in claiming to have been present at the time of the discovery. We should consider the possibility that he arrived late on the scene, in time only to see the removal of the last few bronzes, or that Schliemann later pointed out the findspot to him and that he lied to Borlase about the extent of his own involvement. In any case, Yannakis’ evidence on this point is shown to be of very doubtful value” (Traill 1984a, 164). Traill, meanwhile, has attempted to rescue Yannakis, by arguing that the reason why he did not remember the two silver pieces is that “tarnished silver... looks much the same as bronze” (Traill 1986a, 92). This point, however, hinges on Traill’s view that these two pieces were the only non- Bronze items in

To sum up, in view of 1) uncertainties over Yannakis' testimony, 2) the emphatic and consistent statements by Schliemann placing the find-spot on the wall,<sup>64</sup> 3) the fact that this place does not make any archaeological sense within the context of a fabricated find-spot, 4) the fact that Traill does not offer any explanation of such action by Schliemann (inventing a find-spot precisely there), 5) that, by contrast, Dörpfeld's explanation does make sense, 6) that Schliemann's evidence is compatible with the well-stratified Cincinnati evidence, 7) that Traill does not sub-

mit any independent evidence confirming a "composite" thesis, 8) whereas Treasure B may even have been an additional part of Treasure A<sup>65</sup> - all these one may view as combining to uphold both the authenticity and the integrity of Treasure A, namely, as Schliemann's reports allege. Troy IIg, therefore, seems to be an entirely acceptable context for the Treasure. That being so, Treasure A continues to be of no mean significance chronologically and therefore also for the historical reconstruction of this cultural phase at this important site.

---

Treasure A. Since this is a hypothesis for which Traill does not bring any direct evidence, it cannot qualify as a compelling argument. Traill also cites Schliemann's letter to Newton, in which Schliemann is thought to "imply" that Yannakis "struck the treasure" (*loc. cit.*). Since Schliemann elsewhere, however, denies that Yannakis was present, it is difficult to see how Traill, given the picture which he paints of Schliemann's overall unreliability, can be so

certain here. But this is not the only instance in which Traill, when confronted with a discrepancy in Schliemann, opts for the version which confirms his own presuppositions. Cf. above n. 12.

64. That is to say, once he had clarified in his own mind the exact location.

65. Easton 1984b, 202.

## REFERENCES

- Blegen, C.W., Caskey, J.L., Rawson, M. and Sperling, J., 1950. *Troy. General Introduction. The First and Second Settlements*, vol. I, Princeton.
- Bloedow, E.F., 1988. 'The Trojan War and Late Helladic III C', *PZ* 63: 23-37.
- Bloedow, E.F., 1992. 'Alcibiades: "Brilliant" or "Intelligent"?'', *Historia* 41.2: 139-157.
- Bloedow, E.F., 1999. "'Priam's Treasure" Revisited: Old Theories and New Evidence', *Acta Praeistorica et Archaeologica* 31: 48-75.
- Borlase, W., 1878. 'A visit to Dr Schliemann's Troy', *Fraser's Magazine* 17 (February): 236ff.
- Döhl, H., 1981. *Heinrich Schliemann: Mythos und Ärgernis*, München: Bucher.
- Easton, D.F., 1984a. 'Priam's Treasure', *AnatSt* 34: 141-143.
- Easton, D.F., 1984b. 'Schliemann's mendacity - a false trail', *Antiquity* 58: 197-204.
- Easton, D.F., 1994. 'Priam's Gold: The Full Story', *AnatSt* 44: 221-243.
- Meyer, E., 1953. *Heinrich Schliemann. Briefwechsel I*, Berlin: Mann.
- Schliemann, H., 1874. *Trojanische Alterthümer. 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., 1881. *Ilios: the City and Country of the Trojans. The Results of the Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Troy and throughout the Troad in the Years 1871, 72, 73, 78, 79. Including an Autobiography of the Author*, New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Traill, D.A., 1979. 'Schliemann's mendacity: Fire and fever in California', *CJ* 74: 348-355.
- Traill, D.A., 1982a. 'Schliemann's American citizenship and divorce', *CJ* 77: 136-142.
- Traill, D.A., 1983. 'Schliemann's "discovery" of "Priam's Treasure"', *Antiquity* 57:181-186.
- Traill, D.A., 1984a. 'Schliemann's discovery of "Priam's Treasure"', *JHS* 104: 96-115.
- Traill, D.A., 1984b. 'Schliemann in the Troad in 1868', *Boreas* 7: 295-316.
- Traill, D.A., 1986a. 'Schliemann's mendacity: A question of methodology', *AnatSt* 36: 91-98.
- Traill, D.A., 1986b. 'Schliemann's acquisition of the Helios Metope and his psychopathic tendencies', in W.M. Calder III and D.A. Traill (eds.), *Myth, Scandal, and History. The Heinrich Schliemann Controversy and a First Edition of the Mycenaean Diary* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press): 48-80.
- Traill, D.A., 1988. 'Bloedow on Schliemann's accusers', *Tyche* 3: 235-239.