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I The Discovery of Troy

Schliemann and the Ottomans in the 1870s

In May 1873, Heinrich Schliemann discovered a large, spectacular cache of gold and silver jewellery, bronze bowls and cups, copper axes and other valuables at Hisarlık, a mound on the Asian shore of the Dardanelles in the Ottoman Empire. Schliemann announced that he had found the remains of Homeric Troy and called the precious finds Priam’s Treasure (Fig. 8). Schliemann’s report of the discovery of Priam’s Treasure published in the Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg) on 5 August 1873, was hailed around the world and impressed scholars and the general public alike. The Homeric world had become tangible for an enthralled audience. Schliemann’s discoveries triggered new interest in Homer and made him world-famous as the excavator of Troy.²

Schliemann smuggled many of the artefacts he found out of the Ottoman Empire. The illegal export of Priam’s Treasure caused a scandal.³ Sources show that many in the Empire were appalled by the loss of these Trojan remains and the effect on Ottoman attitudes towards Classical heritage was profound. As Lowenthal observes, heritage is most valued when it is perceived to be at risk: ‘threats of loss spur owners to stewardship.’⁴

The Question of ‘ubi Troia fuit’⁵

For centuries, European countries identified with Troy and traced their foundation to the heroes of Troy, providing them with an honourable and glorious ancestry.⁶ Sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror (1432-1481) also identified with the Trojans and adopted the same European tradition, tracing the origins of the Turks to the Homeric heroes (Fig. 9).⁷ However, the actual
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setting of Homer’s *Iliad* remained uncertain and had long been a subject of discussion and speculation. Was Troy just a legend or was Homer’s *Iliad* based on fact? And if it really had existed, where was it located? Was Troy under a Greek and Roman city at the mound of Hisarlık, like most Ancient writers, including Herodotus and Xenophon, believed? Or was Troy situated somewhere between the Scamander and the Thymbrios, as claimed by local expert Demetrius of Scepsis (around 180 BC) and later repeated by Roman geographer Strabo (63 BC–AD 19)? Or was Troy in Alexandria Troas and Sigeum, both situated on the west coast of the Troad, as many scholars thought in the seventeenth and eighteenth century?

Gripped by the landscape of the Troad, the Dardanelles attracted Western scholars and travellers. In the seventeenth century, the first scholarly attempts were made to find the location of the events of the *Iliad*. In the early seventeenth century, the English traveller George Sandys identified the rivers Scamander and Simois. Erudite English traveller Robert Wood pioneered the topographical research of the Trojan question when he visited the Troad in 1742 and 1750. In his *Essay on the Original Genius of Homer* published in 1769, Wood described possible changes in the topography over the centuries and laid the foundation for future research. Wood’s work suggested that it might be possible to determine the location of Troy and the historicity of the Trojan War by field research, and prepared the way for the modern topographical research of the Trojan question.

The Nineteenth Century
Uncertainty continued to surround the location of Homeric Troy into the nineteenth century, a period characterized by neo-humanism and an increasing national focus in the humanities. In many European countries, Classical Greece provided a reference for the new sense of national identity. As Europe appropriated the classics, appreciation of Homer and the identification with his heroes increased. Homer became a key element in the educational syllabus in Europe, which emphasized the study of Greek scholars and literature. Homeric heroes and heroines such as Hector, Achilles, Priam, Helen, Paris, Agamemnon and Odysseus offered a rich potential for identification, which made the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* perfect
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8 For the various hypotheses concerning the site of Homeric Troy, see: Stoneman, _Land of Lost Gods_, 265–269; Allen, _Finding the Walls of Troy_, 40–48; Cook, _The Troad_; and Lascarides, _The Search for Troy_.
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reading material in the classrooms of Europe’s imperial powers and its newly founded nation-states in the nineteenth century.

Homer’s impact on nineteenth-century educated Europeans was considerable. For prominent liberals, such as William Gladstone, Homer provided compelling moral lessons and offered a ‘full study of life in every one of its departments.’

Meanwhile, developments in archaeology and increasing implementation of innovative archaeological and geological methods in the nineteenth century made the issue of the topography of the plain of Troy even more fascinating. The desire to confirm the historical reality of the Trojan War and to prove the existence of Homer’s locations and heroes preoccupied many minds.

By the second half of the nineteenth century, two principal sites had been associated with Homeric Troy: Pınarbaşı-Ballı Dağ and Hisarlık. Although a substantial group of scholars remained sceptical regarding the existence of the site, the majority of European intellectuals and travellers were convinced that the Homeric legends were indeed historical and believed that the first of these sites was the correct location. It was Jean-Baptiste Lechevalier (1752-1836), employed by the French ambassador to the Sublime Port from 1784 to 1792 Marie Gabriel Florent Auguste (Comte) de Choiseul-Gouffier (1752-1817), who proposed Ballı Dağ near the village of Pınarbaşı as the site of Homeric Troy in 1785. Lechevalier identified the warm and cold springs at the top of the Pınarbaşı Çay as those described by Homer: these springs were the evidence for his hypothesis. In 1864, the Austrian consul on Syros, Johannes Georg von Hahn, excavated the site.

A few scholars supported the identification of the hill near the town of Çanak, known to the Ottoman Turks as Hisarlık (Place of Fortresses), as Troy. Engineer Franz Kauffer, also employed by Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier in 1787, was the first to map Hisarlık. At the turn of the century, traveller and antiquary Edward Daniel Clarke identified Hisarlık with the Greco-Roman city of Ilium Novum, Roman New Ilium, but did not make any connection with Troy. It was Scottish journalist Charles Maclaren who identified the mound of Hisarlık as Homeric Troy in 1822. This met with little enthusiasm since Strabo had written that Homeric Troy and Ilium Novum were at two different locations. Finally, convinced that Hisarlık was the place to find Homeric Troy, Frank Calvert (1828-1908), an archaeologist who...

10 Quoted in Den Boer, ‘Homer in Modern Europe,’ in European Review, 181.
11 Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 50.
12 Jähne, ‘Heinrich Schliemann,’ 330; Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 57.
lived at the Dardanelles and who was a local authority on Trojan topography, carried out exploratory excavations at the mound, part of which his family actually owned, between 1863 and 1865.¹³

Frank Calvert was a member of a leading English expatriate family in the Dardanelles, which had acquired property in the region. Various Calverts served as consul in several countries during the nineteenth century, including Britain and the United States, the eastern Mediterranean and particularly the Dardanelles. Passionate about Homer and living in the setting of the *Iliad*, Frank Calvert soon developed a keen interest and a profound expertise on the topography of the Troad, which European visitors frequently made use of. Calvert excavated several sites, such as Hanay Tepe, Ophryneion, Colonae and Pınarbaşı. During his investigations, he combined Ancient sources with modern scholarly methods and observations, along with his local knowledge. Indeed, Calvert was a pioneer of archaeological research in the Troad.

In 1863, Calvert abandoned the theory that Pınarbaşı was the site of Troy and decided to dig trenches on the eastern side of the hill of Hisarlık. This presumably convinced him that he had actually found the site of Troy. Yet, initially, Calvert made no important claims and his views were barely recognized. Moreover, he lacked the financial resources to excavate the complete mound of Hisarlık and his appeals to institutions such as the British Museum in 1863 to fund his excavations fell on deaf ears.¹⁴

This was the state of affairs in August 1868, when Schliemann first visited the Troad. Having made a fortune in business, the German Heinrich Schliemann aspired to the status of intellectual and scholar which archaeological research might provide. Settling the question of ‘ubi Troia fuit’ was the perfect opportunity to achieve such fame.¹⁵

2  Heinrich Schliemann in the Troad

Johann Ludwig Heinrich Julius Schliemann was born in 1822, in Neubukow in the grand duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (Fig. 10). According to his own account, Schliemann’s fascination with Homer and Greece began in early

14  Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 56; Allen, *Finding the Walls of Troy*, 63, 72–85, 103, 105, 120; See also a recent biography of Frank Calvert: Robinson, *Schliemann’s Silent Partner*.
childhood and his life’s ambition had always been to one day to excavate Troy. At the age of fourteen, he began a five-year apprenticeship at a grocer shop. From there he launched a successful career in commerce. Until his late forties, he devoted his life to trade, making the money he needed to be able to realize his dream. Later, he studied archaeology in Paris. Using the *Iliad* as a travel guide, he examined the topography of the Troad and started excavations at Hisarlık. Finally, he discovered the legendary city of Troy.16

However, as his biographer David A. Traill argues, Schliemann’s ‘various accounts of his life diverge on a number of details, making it impossible to state the facts with certainty. More important perhaps than the details themselves is the clear evidence these discrepancies present of a cavalier attitude towards the truth.’ Traill shows that misinformation about Schliemann has gained widespread acceptance and this may be traced to Schliemann’s own accounts.17 Much of what we know about Schliemann is based on his diaries, his many letters and autobiographical forewords to his archaeological publications. Schliemann’s life story and his archaeological achievements were full of contradictions and subject to debate during his lifetime, and they still are.18

What we know for certain is that Schliemann did indeed make a fortune in business, before retiring and taking up travel. Between 1864 and 1866, Schliemann visited Tunis, Egypt, Italy, India, Indonesia, China, Japan, America, Cuba and Mexico. Having seen the world, he settled down to study in Paris, focusing on Greek philosophy and literature, Egyptian philology and archaeology. He also attended meetings of scholarly societies and travelled to Italy and Greece. Learning from watching professional archaeologists at work, he carried out his own experimental excavations in Greece. After a stay in Athens, he set sail to Istanbul and from there to the Dardanelles to explore the landscape and potential locations.19

Soon after his arrival in the Dardanelles in August 1868, Schliemann began examining the plain of the Troad and carried out excavations at Ballı Dağ-Pınarbaşı. He concluded that this site was not significant enough to be Homeric Troy.20 While there, Schliemann met Frank Calvert. He saw

---

17 Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 19, 2.
19 Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, see in particular Chapter 3.
Calvert’s excavations at Hisarlık and viewed his collection of precious antiquities.

This encounter, in which Calvert shared the results of his research at Hisarlık and his opinion that Homeric Troy was underneath Novum Ilium, is thought to have been crucial in prompting Schliemann to start excavating the hill at Hisarlık.21 For his part, Calvert greeted the wealthy tycoon’s zeal with enthusiasm and saw it as a chance to settle the Homeric question.22

By December 1868, Schliemann had ‘quite decided to dig away the whole of the artificial mount of Hissarlik’23 and had secured Calvert’s ‘hearty cooperation.’ Indeed, Calvert supplied the necessary information about the topography of Hisarlık and offered extensive practical advice for the planned excavation. Moreover, Calvert implied that Schliemann had his consent to examine his part of the hill. As for the rest of the mound, the north-western half, he promised that he would use his ‘influence with the other proprietor to allow the excavation.’ Indeed he wrote to Schliemann that he had ‘no reason to expect any serious difficulty in persuading him [the Turkish landowner].’24

Schliemann asked Calvert, as an influential resident of the Dardanelles, to arrange a permit for him to excavate at Hisarlık.25 However, Calvert’s attempts were not successful. In fact, obtaining permission to excavate in this crucial, centuries-old Ottoman province turned out to be rather more complex.26

The Troad: An Ottoman Realm

Ottoman dominion in this region dated back to 1350s. With the capture of Gallipoli on the European side, the Ottoman Turks gained control of the entire Dardanelles strait, the start of the Turkish presence in Europe.27 Gallipoli emerged as the main Ottoman naval base in the 1390s and became especially significant in the reign of Mehmed II the Conqueror, who founded a town here (Kal’e-i Sultaniye) and built strong bastions for the defence of
the Dardanelles and recently conquered Constantinople around 1460.28 It was in the Dardanelles that celebrated Ottoman cartographer Piri Reis created his first world map in 1513, worked out his two versions of Kitab-ı Bahriye (Book of navigation) in 1521 and 1526, and created a second world map in 1528-1529.29 Gallipoli retained its importance as a naval base until the construction of the Galata maritime arsenal in Istanbul in the first half of the sixteenth century.30

In the second half of the seventeenth century the region caught the interest of Hatice Turhan Sultan, mother of the young Ottoman Sultan Mehmed IV. This powerful Valide Sultan (queen mother) had the fortifications on both shores of the Dardanelles renovated and modernized. For an advanced defence of the strait she ordered the construction of two new fortresses at the entrance to the strait, Seddülbahir and Kumkale, between 1658 and 1660.31

In 1680, the provincial capital of the Dardanelles,32 Kale-i Sultaniye (in popular speech Çanak Kalesi – Clay Castle), had a population of around 3,000 mainly Turks and Jews.33 The town flourished in the eighteenth century and in the early nineteenth century most European countries had representatives there, as well as Iran and the United States.

Vessels passing through the strait were obliged to stop at Kale-i Sultaniye to present their papers and pay taxes. As a result, the local population enjoyed frequent contact with people from across the world. With its close links to the Western world, the town became a major commercial centre and a key market for local produce. Greek, Armenian and Jewish residents of this multiethnic Ottoman town ran small businesses tanning leather, and making rope, soap and jam. Most of the Ottoman Turks were armourers and shipbuilders.34 While the inhabitants of the town could

28 Babinger, ‘Kale-i Sultaniye.’
29 Soylu, Piri Reis Haritası’nın Şifresi, 14.
30 Bostan ‘Ottoman Maritime Arsenals.’
31 Babinger, ‘Kale-i Sultaniye’; for research on the architectural patronage of Hatice Turhan Sultan and the two fortresses for the defence of the Dardanelles, see: Thys-Şenocak, Ottoman Women Builders.
32 Known to the Ottoman Turks as Cezair-i Bahri Sefid (the archipelago) until 1876, and later Biga province.
33 Babinger, ‘Kale-i Sultaniye.’
34 According to the Ottoman General Census of 1881/1882-1883, the population for Kale-i Sultaniye consisted of 4093 Muslim females and 4225 males, 2532 Greek females and 2407 males, 432 Armenian females and 532 males, 766 Jewish females and 729 males, 19 Protestant females and 27 males, 125 foreign females and 167 males: see Karpat, Ottoman Population; Karpat, ‘Ottoman Population Records’; Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 266.
speak Turkish, they lived in separate quarters and often spoke their own languages.\(^{35}\)

According to Babinger, writing in 1890 in *Brill's First Encyclopaedia of Islam*, the bastions on both the European and the Asian side were renovated again in 1887 and the town had a population of 11,000, with eleven large and several smaller mosques and four churches.\(^{36}\)

By the nineteenth century, Ottoman Turks ruled over the mythical landscape of the Troad and lived in the presumed setting of the *Iliad*. The Dardanelles, moreover, was a strongly fortified region and a crucial gateway to Istanbul. Obtaining permission to excavate here would not be easy and, indeed, the Ottomans kept Schliemann waiting a long time. But this did not stop him.

3  **Schliemann’s Confrontation with Ottoman Authorities**

From 9 to 19 April 1870, Schliemann conducted excavations on the northwestern corner of the hill without a permit and without approval from the two Turkish landowners. He explained this by saying: ‘Knowing in advance that the two Turkish owners would refuse to give me permission I did not ask them.’\(^{37}\)

Although Calvert had already authorized him to dig on his part of the mound of Hisarlık, Schliemann wished to excavate the entire hill. He therefore proposed to buy the field outright, since possessing the property would release him from having to yield any potential finds to the landowners.\(^{38}\) In a series of letters, Schliemann asked Calvert to buy the land from the Turkish owners for him as soon as possible and as cheaply as possible.\(^{39}\) However, the two owners ‘refused to sell the field at any price’ and as Schliemann explains in *Troy and Its Remains* (1875), he was unable to continue his excavations in April 1870 ‘because the proprietors of the field […] who had their sheepfolds on the site, would only grant me permission to dig further on condition that I would at once pay them 12,000 piasters for damages, and in addition they wished to bind me, after the conclusion of my excavations, to put the field in order again.’ These demands were a major inconvenience for Schliemann.\(^{40}\)

---

36 Babinger, ‘Kale-i Sultaniye.’
38 Allen, *Finding the Walls of Troy*, 128.
Schliemann’s unauthorized excavations caused irritation among the Ottoman authorities. According to Calvert’s letter to Schliemann on 20 July 1870, there was ‘not much chance’ of obtaining a permit since the government was ‘very much opposed’ to it. Schliemann had apparently boasted of his ‘arbitrary proceedings and having acted without authorization’ and according to Calvert they ‘must suffer the consequences and get the firman when the government are in better humour.’ Schliemann expressed regret for his harsh words to the minister of public instruction Safvet Pasha, on 31 August 1870.

Schliemann faced formidable obstacles attempting to obtain a permit to excavate. He commented around this time that the sultan would no longer give permission for excavations, since ‘the Turkish government are collecting Ancient artefacts for their recently established museum in Istanbul.’

By the time Schliemann conducted his exploratory excavations at Hisarlık in 1870, Ottoman interest in antiquities was increasing and official involvement in archaeology was expanding significantly. In the nineteenth century, the Tanzimat reforms of 1839-1876, the Ottoman Enlightenment, had created a new intellectual group mainly of civil servants with a keen interest in European culture and literature and a special regard for Greco-Roman artefacts.

Meanwhile, these same bureaucrats faced nascent nationalist movements in many parts of the Empire which were attempting with the support of various Great Powers to secede and threatened enormous territorial losses.

The Eastern Question
In the course of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire’s weakness and the potential consequences of this developed into a major issue on the international political agenda. European views on the subject were ambivalent. As historian Donald Quataert explains, ‘through their wars and
support of the separatist goals of rebellious Ottoman subjects, European states abetted the very process of fragmentation that they feared and were seeking to avoid.\textsuperscript{48}

The significant role of international politics in the revolts against Ottoman rule became apparent during the Greek War of Independence (1821-1830). Europe’s admiration for Classical Greek culture instilled sympathy for the Greek rebels. This European sentiment in favour of the Greeks also related to a long anti-Turkish tradition and the expansion of Western European Great Powers at the start of the age of modern imperialism in Europe.\textsuperscript{49}

Support for the Greek rebellion reached a climax with the intervention of a combined British, French and Russian fleet at the Battle of Navarino in 1827. In the Treaty of London of 1830, the signatories acknowledged the sovereignty of Greece. This set a precedent for other Christian peoples in the Empire and encouraged European sympathy for new anti-Ottoman uprisings.\textsuperscript{50}

**Tanzimat**

To deal with the complexities of an ‘increasingly unwieldy state with outdated systems of governance,’\textsuperscript{51} the Ottomans began to modernize the Empire. The main goal of those who supported these changes was to create a modern, centralized, unitary and constitutional state, as well as to dominate domestic rivals. The centralization of the state during the Tanzimat period created new relations between the state and its subjects and created a powerful bureaucracy.

Western administrative and technological skills were essential to achieve this. Knowledge about the West and European languages became increasingly important. Members of the bureaucracy attended European schools to learn Western languages and technical skills, and passed this knowledge on to the next generation of Ottoman students. These prominent bureaucrats were eager to create a new Ottoman identity with a modern or Western image and lifestyle.\textsuperscript{52}

Ottoman officials were also aware of the need for international support to defend the Empire’s interests and that they could not rely on military means alone. Defence became dependent on diplomacy. It was not the military

\textsuperscript{48} Quataert, \textit{The Ottoman Empire}, 56.

\textsuperscript{49} For a recent study on the history of anti-Turkish sentiments in Europe, see: Jezernik, \textit{Imagining ‘the Turk’}.

\textsuperscript{50} Hanioğlu, \textit{A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire}, 67-70.

\textsuperscript{51} Shaw, \textit{Possessors and Possessed}, introduction.

\textsuperscript{52} Quataert, \textit{The Ottoman Empire}, 62-64; Zürcher, \textit{Turkey}, 56-58, 66.
but rather the civil ruling elite, especially the French-speaking diplomats, who became influential. As diplomatic influence became increasingly important, a provincial administration was created and expanded, making civil officials the leading elite of the nineteenth century.

Three diplomats and successive grand viziers symbolized this era of civil-bureaucratic hegemony and shaped the Tanzimat period: Mustafa Reşid Pasha (1800-1858), Keçecizade Fuad Pasha (1815-1869), and Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha (1815-1871). These grand viziers were decisive in elaborating the reforms of the Tanzimat. This reform was no longer driven by the will of the sultan, but by bureaucrats who wrote decrees for the sultan to sign.53

These changes resulted in various new institutions emerging during the Tanzimat period, such as ministries of trade and commerce, health, education and public works, as well as a museum.

The Imperial Museum

Since 1723, Hagia Irene, a former Eastern Orthodox church located in the outer courtyard of Topkapı Palace, had served as a depot for the sultan's collection of military equipment and as a place to store valuables. Yet a formal collection of antique objects was only started around 1846. Known initially as the Depository of Antiquities, in 1869 it was renamed the Imperial Museum (Müze-i Hümayun).

The order with which the Imperial Museum was founded in 1869 reveals the Empire's displeasure at European acquisitions of antiquities from Ottoman soil: ‘the museums of Europe are decorated with rare artefacts taken from here.’54

As the new museum took shape and disapproval of the export of artefacts grew, efforts to collect antiquities increased. Directives from the minister of public instruction Mehmed Esad Safvet Pasha (1814-1883), a prominent scholar and politician of the late Tanzimat period (Fig. 11), illustrate the formal attempts to promote the acquisition of Ancient objects. In 1869 and 1870, Safvet Pasha instructed governors of various provinces to collect antiquities and to send these to the museum in Istanbul. This decree received particular acclaim: the imperial collection expanded with artefacts sent from several provinces, including Salonica, Crete and Aydın. The Ottoman newspaper Terakki covered these shipments, reflecting growing public interest.

53 Findley, The Turks in World History, 158-163.
54 Kocabaş, ‘Müzeçilik haraketi ve ilk müze okulunun açılışı,’ 75; see also: Shaw, Possessors and Possessed, 86.
interest in these efforts to collect antiquities. In 1871, the museum published its first catalogue.\(^{55}\)

In 1867, Sultan Abdülaziz (1830-1876) was the first Ottoman monarch to pay an official visit to Europe. While in Vienna, he viewed the splendid collection of antiquities at Abras Gallery. Sultan Abdülaziz was himself fond of literature, music and painting and it was under his rule that politicians and members of the elite promoted the appreciation of fine art and antiquities and the foundation of the Imperial Museum.\(^{56}\)

### Securing the Possible Setting of the *Iliad*

This was the climate in which Heinrich Schliemann conducted his experimental excavations at Hisarlık, a time when the Muslim cultural elite of the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire had started to appreciate its Classical heritage. As we have seen, Schliemann’s efforts to buy the field at Hisarlık were not successful and his requests to obtain permission to conduct excavations at Hisarlık were equally unproductive. At this point Schliemann reports that it was the director of the Imperial Museum, French scholar Anton Philip Dethier (1803-1881), and Safvet Pasha who were obstructing him: ‘For reasons only known to them and in spite of all their previous foul dealing they want me now to take out a firman in a regular way, which will require at least two months.’\(^{57}\)

In a remarkable development, while Schliemann was trying to obtain an official permit, the Ottoman government acquired the land from the two Turkish owners on behalf of the Imperial Museum. Schliemann suggests that he played a decisive role in this transaction and that it was he who prompted Safvet Pasha to compel the proprietors to sell their land to the government.\(^{58}\) However, it seems far more likely that the government organized the purchase in order to establish control over Schliemann’s excavations. In reality, Schliemann was enraged at the Ottoman transaction, and told Safvet Pasha that he would not excavate ‘without the security of owning the land.’\(^{59}\)

Schliemann’s letter to Calvert illustrates the point: ‘but the field must be my property and as long as this is not the case I will never think of commencing the excavations for if I dig on government ground I would be

---

57 Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 86.
exposed to everlasting vexations and trouble. In his letter to the American ambassador Wayne MacVeagh on 12 March 1871, he states ‘Joyfully will I give him [Safvet Pasha] any amount of previous metals I may discover and even twice the amount I may discover but never my life would I think of putting the spade to the ground as long as he retains the ownership of the field, which he purchased merely to wrong me and which he afterwards, on my representations, abandoned to me in the presence of several witnesses.’ In fact Safvet Pasha had mentioned to Wayne MacVeagh that he could not let Schliemann ‘have the land.’

The official correspondence concerning Schliemann’s request for permission to excavate at Hisarlık clearly shows this. In a letter to Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha on 19 June 1871, Safvet Pasha states that when preliminary investigation revealed that Schliemann had attempted to buy the land at Hisarlık, the governor of the Dardanelles was instructed to buy the field for the Imperial Museum (Fig. 11).

So the Ottoman government discovered the trial excavations at Hisarlık and acquired the land. The Ottomans were determined that Schliemann should not own the possible setting of the Iliad.

In his introduction to Troy and Its Remains, published in 1875, Schliemann states that Safvet Pasha ‘knew nothing about Troy or Homer’ when they met in December 1870. In addition he reports: ‘I explained the matter to him briefly, and said that I hoped to find there antiquities of immense value to science. He, however, thought that I should find a great deal of gold, and therefore wished me to give him all the details I could, and then requested me to call again in eight days. When I returned to him, I heard to my horror that he had already compelled the two proprietors to sell him the field for 600 francs, and that I might make excavations there if I wished, but that everything I found must be given up to him. I told him in the plainest language what I thought of his odious and contemptible conduct, and declared that I would have nothing more to do with him, and that I should make no excavations.

On 29 June 1876, however, Schliemann expressed regret for his hostile remarks and begged a ‘thousand pardons.’ Whether he made his apology to obtain a new permit to excavate at Hisarlık or not, he declares in this
letter printed in *The Times*, ‘I regret it all the more as His Excellency Safvet Pasha has from the beginning till the end been the benefactor of my Trojan discoveries.’

**Schliemann’s Ottoman Counterparts**

The Ottoman representatives with whom Schliemann dealt were well aware of the importance of the archaeological quest to find Homeric Troy.

Safvet Pasha was a key Tanzimat reformer with a respectable administrative career, serving as foreign minister six times. His speech on 20 February 1870 at the opening of the Darülfünun-u Osmani (Ottoman House of Multiple Sciences), recently reorganized to serve modern science and technology, clearly shows him to be an enlightened politician. Safvet Pasha hoped that the ‘support, respect and protection of people of science received during the first two hundred years of Ottoman history would continue another two hundred years’ and stated that if good relations had been established with Europe’s civilized nations and if Ottoman progress had paralleled the speed of progress of these nations, the situation in the Empire would have been quite different. Indeed, he identified the main cause of this Ottoman failure as ‘the disconnection of the Empire with the civilized nations.’ He explained that ‘sciences based on intellect improve by interaction of ideas and through debate between scientists. This is how the civilized nations of Europe reached their state of progress.’ Safvet Pasha argued that the Empire should become a truly civilized European nation and this would only be possible by taking reform ‘seriously and sincerely’ and by a ‘total’ adoption of European civilization, as he explained further in a personal letter in 1879. Only in this way, he believed, would the Empire be able to combat European interference and superiority; otherwise it risked losing its honour, rights and even its independence.

Safvet Pasha, who won his spurs in the salons of the leading Beşiktaş Science Society (Beşiktaş Cemiyet-i İlimiyesi) in the first half of the nineteenth century, was a major supporter of reform of the educational system.

---

65 Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 142-144.
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67 Berkes, *Türkiye’de Çağdaşlaşma*, 209-211.
in the late Empire and founder of the lycée at Galatasaray in 1868, modelled after the French Lycée school. Galatasaray Lycée provided a modern Western secondary school curriculum. The students were instructed in French and various other Western and Eastern languages.\(^69\) It seems unlikely that this leading partisan of the Tanzimat, proficient in French and with a keen appreciation of European culture, was unaware of Homer or the Trojan legends.

This is equally true of Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha: ‘the last great reforming statesman of the Tanzimat’ (Fig. 12).\(^70\) He started his career at the Empire’s Translation Office and built a respectable career serving as a diplomat in Vienna and London (1841-1844) and as foreign minister and grand vizier from 1857 until his death in 1871. It is hardly surprising that this fervent supporter of the Tanzimat reforms, a scholar and linguist with a noted career and knowledge of Europe, called Troy ‘the celebrated city of Troy from Ancient times’ and emphasized that the discovery of objects during the excavations would be of value to science. He also attached great importance to the preservation and public display of Troy’s city walls, should they be discovered.\(^71\)

**Permission to Excavate for Troy**

The American citizen Heinrich Schliemann presented a written application to this humble servant’s ministry, in which he expresses his wish and requests permission to carry out excavations at his own expense in an open field in the district named Hisarlık, a territory located in the surroundings of Kal’e-i Sultanıye, where in his opinion the fortress of the famous dominion called Troy is situated. Mr Brown [the American ambassador] expressed and confirmed that the status of the aforementioned person is recognized by the embassy. The aforementioned person’s permit will be on condition that the excavations are at his own expense, and, if Ancient artefacts surface during the excavations, half will be taken on behalf of the Imperial Museum and half will be left for him. If the city walls are discovered, their preservation as a whole and their public display are required.

Minister of public instruction Safvet Pasha to Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha: IBA: I.HR. 250/14863 (1): 01 Ra 1288 (20 June 1871), translated from Ottoman Turkish

\(^{69}\) For a history of Galatasaray Lycée, see: Sungu, ‘Galatasaray Lisesi’nin Kuruluşu’; and Engin, 1868’den 1923’e Mekteb-i Sultanı.

\(^{70}\) Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, 109.

\(^{71}\) IBA: I.HR. 250/14863 (1) and (2): 01, 10, 11 Ra 1288 (20, 29, 30 June 1871).
Submitting and presenting the memorandum from the Ministry of Instruction, about providing permission to Heinrich Schliemann, a citizen of the American government, to carry out excavations in the empty field in the district named Hisarlık, a territory located in the surroundings of Kal’e-i Sultaniye. The aforementioned person is of the opinion that the fortress of the most eminent city of Troy from Ancient times is situated in this field. With regard to the position of the aforementioned city in the written Ancient histories, if as he expects a number of artefacts may be discovered, these will be of value to scholarship (Fig. 13).

Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha to Sultan Abdülaziz: IBA: I.HR. 250/14863 (2): 10 and 11 Ra 1288 (29 and 30 June 1871), translated from Ottoman Turkish

It was through the mediation of John P. Brown, diplomatic agent for the United States in Istanbul, that Schliemann received permission to realize his dream of uncovering Homeric Troy. As the imperial decree of 30 June 1871 states – part of the Ottoman text is translated and quoted above – Schliemann would pay for his own excavations, including the costs of an Ottoman overseer. Furthermore, the decree ordained an equitable division of any antiquities discovered, half for the Imperial Museum and half for Schliemann. Finally, it included an arrangement for the preservation and public display of the city walls. This last clause worried Schliemann since he intended to demolish the many walls not belonging to the heroic age and this might cause new difficulties.

Despite his permit, when Schliemann arrived at the Dardanelles on 27 September he encountered new problems with Ottoman officials. This time the local governor, Ahmed Pasha, refused permission to dig since the official permit did not indicate the excavation area accurately enough. The governor wanted more detailed instructions from the grand vizier. Diplomatic support and a change of ministry eventually enabled Schliemann to start his first season of excavations on 11 October 1871. The campaign continued until 24 November 1871. The second full season ran from 1 April to 14 August 1872 and his final season covered the period between 2 February and 14 June 1873.

On 31 May 1873 Schliemann found a treasure of gold and silver cups and vases and a spectacular collection of gold jewellery: an ornate headband, numerous rings, bracelets, earrings and diadems. Schliemann smuggled the
treasure out of the Empire. He called the ensemble of precious jewellery ‘Helen’s Jewels’ and had his wife Sophia photographed wearing them. The treasure included a gold cup with two handles: Schliemann saw a striking resemblance between this cup and the *depas amphikypellon* mentioned in the *Iliad*. He claimed this was proof that he had discovered the remains of Homeric Troy. The finds soon became known as ‘Priam’s Treasure.’

4 Ottomans Claiming Trojan Artefacts

By smuggling Priam’s Treasure out of the country Schliemann broke the agreement with the Ottoman authorities. He justified the illegal removal of the objects by saying that the Ottoman government had already broken the written contract (the permit of 1871) by issuing an additional decree in 1872, which had prohibited Schliemann from exporting any of his share of the Ancient objects. That decree – which expressed the Ottoman desire to stop the export of all antiquities found on their soil – had annoyed Schliemann considerably.

The Ottoman government held an internal inquiry into the smuggling of the treasure to discover how the ‘robbery’ had taken place, in particular ‘by whom, from which quay, with whose vessel, how often and on which date.’

75 For an overview of the excavations and finds of Schliemann during his excavations between 1871 and 1873, see: Easton, *Schliemann’s Excavations at Troy*. See also: Van Wijngaarden, ‘Heinrich Schliemann.’

76 Priam’s Treasure has been subject to debate since its discovery. The date of the discovery, the way it was taken out of the Empire, the context of the finds and the content of the treasure are disputed. For a recent treatise on the discovery and the smuggling of the treasure, including Ottoman sources: Aslan and Sönmez, ‘The Discovery and Smuggling of Priam’s Treasure’; Uslu, ‘Schliemann and the Ottoman Turks’; Uslu, ‘Ottoman Appreciation of Trojan Heritage.’


78 IBA: MF.MKT.17/188: 11/S/1291 (30/03/1874).
Inquiries into Schliemann’s operations, his helpers and his accomplices led to a purge of local administrators who were found to have been negligent and careless in the face of these illegal transactions. Meanwhile, Schliemann had become extremely unpopular with the Ottoman authorities: he was branded a liar and a thief (Fig. 14).79

The Ottoman government was in no mood to let this pass. They claimed a share of Priam’s Treasure and began legal proceedings to acquire it. The correspondence of the Ministry of Public Instruction addressed to the Bab-ı Ali, the Ottoman Sublime Porte, highlights the main goal of the lawsuit. Since Schliemann was unwilling to hand over the Ottoman share of the artefacts in Athens and the objects had been put up for sale, the director of the Imperial Museum was sent to Athens to institute legal action. In fact, the Ottomans were correct in assuming that Schliemann intended to sell his Trojan artefacts. Schliemann did try to sell the complete Trojan collection, including Priam’s Treasure, to both the British Museum and the Louvre in September and October 1873, respectively.

The Ottoman Empire and Schliemann met in court in Athens in April 1874, where the Trojan collection was ordered to be impounded. However, Schliemann had transferred the objects to a secret location and they could not be found.80 The Ottoman government, furious at this development and concerned about ‘a possible sale of the entire collection or in parts, by Schliemann,’ decided to publish a protest letter in prominent newspapers and periodicals in the Empire, as well as in Vienna, Berlin, Paris and London (Fig. 15).81 This course of action in the form of a published protest, in French, against a donation or sale of the Trojan treasuries, reflects the determination of the Ottoman government to retrieve the Trojan artefacts (Fig. 16).82

Conflict is common to heritage; ‘claims of ownership, uniqueness, and priority engender strife over every facet of collective legacies.’83 The Ottomans took Schliemann’s illegal actions as an affront: they had been robbed by an untrustworthy person.84 Schliemann, on the other hand, believed that if the antiquities had gone to the Imperial Museum ‘they would be forever lost to scholarship’ and considered the Ottoman government ignorant.85 To understand his position we have to take the Western bias against the Turks

79 IBA: MF.MKT.18/147: 09/C/1291 (24/07/1874); MF.MKT.18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).
80 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 124, 130.
81 First part of dossier; IBA: MF.MKT. 18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).
82 Second part of dossier (dated 06/06/1874); IBA: MF.MKT. 18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).
83 Lowenthal, Possessed by the Past, 234-236.
84 IBA: MF.MKT. 18/147: 09/C/1291 (24/07/1874); MF.MKT. 18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).
85 Schliemann, Troy and Its Remains, 52-55.
into account. Schliemann received significant diplomatic support when he abandoned his agreement with the Ottoman authorities. The point is illustrated by a letter written to Schliemann on 16 September 1873 by George Henry Boker (1823-1890), US minister in Istanbul between 1871-1875:

It would be worse than throwing away articles which you have discovered to permit any part of them to go into the absurd collection of rubbish which the Turks call their “Museum.” [...] Of course, if you once get your treasures to America, they will be safe from Turkish pursuit. [...] You must understand that all which I have written above is unofficial and personal. If I wrote you as minister of the US, I should be obliged to use very different language, and to advise you to conform yourself to Turkish law [e]tc. But in my sympathy with you as a man of science, I cannot be guilty of the hypocrisy of giving you such advice, knowing that it would be better for the world of letters that you should re-bury the objects than to turn them over to the Turks.86

The possibility that ‘the Turks’ might themselves be interested in Classical civilization clearly had not occurred to him. As John Pemble states in his The Mediterranean Passion: Victorians and Edwardians in the South, the West ‘judged and denigrated the Turks from a vantage point of political and moral superiority.’87 As the famous nineteenth-century Egyptologist Sir John Gardner Wilkinson once asserted, the Turks were considered uncivilized: ‘they are the only instance of a nation that has reached the zenith of its power and fallen again, without ever having become civilized.’88

Battling prejudice, the Ottomans duelled over the Trojan treasures for a year. Schliemann described the legal conflict as ‘a most bloody battle.’89 Finally, the Ottomans were forced to settle for financial compensation of 50,000 francs from Schliemann, which was used to fund the construction of a new building for the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul.90 In the midst of a financial crisis, the Ministry of Public Instruction’s letters to the grand vizier in 1875 show that the reason why the government gave up the ‘lengthy and futile legal struggle’ was the considerable expense involved.91

86 Letter from Boker to Schliemann, 28 June 1873, quoted in Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 167-169, 164.
87 Pemble, The Mediterranean Passion, 228; Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 168.
88 Wilkinson, Dalmatia and Montenegro, 85-86; Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 168.
90 Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi, 299.
91 IBA: MF.MKT. 26/153-26/S/1292 (03/04/1875).
The Empire's Financial and Political Problems
As historian Carter Vaughn Findley concludes, the Achilles’ heel of the Tanzimat was money. The downward spiral of the Ottoman economy began with the failure of an attempt to centralize revenue collection and disbursement, just as free-trade treaties were being signed with the major European countries.92

The economic expansion of the principal European states and the free-trade treaties drew the Ottoman economy with growing momentum into the capitalist system. This led to an expansion of Ottoman foreign trade. Nonetheless, as a leading expert on Turkish history, Erik Jan Zürcher, indicates, a key aspect of trade during the period of the Tanzimat was the large Ottoman trade deficit. The reforming governments faced considerable financial problems. After the Crimean War (1853-1856), European economic involvement in the Empire concentrated on loans to the Ottoman government. To meet the excessive cost of the Crimean War, the Empire started borrowing on European markets. These loans, as Zürcher points out, ‘soon became a millstone around the treasury’s neck,’ since the Empire had to pay back double the amount it actually received, plus interest. The repayment of these loans became a major problem, ‘debt servicing took up one-third of treasury income by 1870 and this percentage was rising fast.’ Moreover, new loans were largely spent on interest and paying off earlier loans. During the critical economic crisis in the 1870s, the Ottomans became painfully aware of the Empire’s economic weakness and its dependence on European loans.

In this period the Ottoman government also faced serious political problems. Increased pressure of taxation, due to the economic crisis of 1873-1878, culminated in revolts against the Empire in the Balkan provinces. The Ottoman suppression of these revolts, known as the Bulgarian Massacres, raised anti-Ottoman sentiment in Europe. The discussions about the Eastern Question led to the Andrassy Note of 30 December 1875, proposing extensive reforms in Bosnia-Herzegovina under foreign supervision. In February 1876, the Empire consented.93 However, this turned out to be only the beginning of a political crisis that resulted in the Treaty of Berlin in 1878.

It was in this climate of political and financial chaos that the Empire gave up its Trojan claims and settled for an agreement. As Kamil Su implies in his work on the history of Ottoman museums, the Empire seemed about

92 Findley, The Turks in World History, 162.
93 Zürcher, Turkey, 63-66, 71-74.
to fall and so avoided any action that might antagonize foreign states.94 Nevertheless, using the financial compensation to fund the construction of a new building for the Archaeological Museum demonstrates the continuing interest in creating an institution in which to preserve and present antiquities found on Ottoman soil.

**Ottoman Antiquities Legislation**

Schliemann’s request for a permit, his excavations at Hisarlık and the illegal transfer of Priam’s Treasure occurred at a time when the Ottoman opposition to illegal and indeed legal export of antiquities was growing. On 29 January 1869, the grand vizierate ordered the Ministry of Public Instruction to prepare detailed legislation for the examination and authorization of excavation permits.95 Safvet Pasha informed British ambassador Sir Henry George Elliot ‘that by a recently promulgated law, the excavation for export of antiquities is for the future prohibited throughout Turkish dominions.’96 The first antiquities law (published on 13 February 1869) banned the export of all antiquities except coins.97 As historian Edhem Eldem notes, this marks the start of a modern approach to the organization of Ancient objects and archaeological sites in the Empire.98

By 1874, a second law was published to protect antiquities from European ‘pilfering’: ‘for some time inside the [Empire] people from various countries have been collecting attractive and rare artefacts the protection of which needs to be kept in mind.’99 Schliemann’s illegal export of his Trojan discoveries in 1873 was the latest and most prominent of these acquisitions. The High Council of Education, worried about the continuing foreign acquisition of antiquities, pointed at Schliemann’s illegal transport of the Trojan treasures: ‘it has already been proved that Schliemann sent all the valuable and precious objects found at Hisarlık, by means of which it is possible to establish and set up several museums, to foreign nations without giving the Empire its share. [...] [A]ll attempts and the lawsuit to acquire

---

94 Su, Osman Hamdi Bey’e kadar Türk Müzesi, 27; See also Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi, 245.
95 Su, Osman Hamdi Bey’e Kadar Türk Müzesi, 37, 45; Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi, 243.
96 Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 118, 310.
97 For further details of the regulation of 13/02/1869, see: Çal, ‘Osmanlı Devleti’nde Asar-ı Atika Nizamnameleri.’ The law is dated March 1869 in Aristarchi Bey, Législation ottomane, 161; Young, Corps de droit Ottoman, 388; Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 310.
98 Eldem, ‘From Blissful Indifference to Anguished Concern,’ 281-283.
99 Rehnuma quotes the writ of the grand vizier to the Sultan (arz tezkeresi) for the new law, from Topkapı Palace Archives (Maruzat Arşivi), in Shaw, Possessors and Possessed, 89.
the mentioned share have been futile and the claim of the state is lost.’ This kind of robbery, in which objects were often ‘dismantled and removed violently,’ had to be avoided.100 The law was passed in the year in which the Ottoman government and Schliemann met in court.

In the end, the Antiquities Law of 1874 could not prevent the ongoing export of artefacts to Europe and America. It contained too many loopholes and was too easily circumvented. In 1884, the law was revised and again in 1906 under the auspices of Osman Hamdi Bey, an Ottoman painter and architect and director of the Imperial Museum from 1881 to 1910.

5 Troy: A Protected Zone

With Priam’s Treasure gone, the Ottoman government declared the site of Troy a protected area and banned all future excavations. When the Ottoman army began constructing military buildings at the hill of Dardanos in 1874, they soon received a warning from the Ministry of Public Instruction: the army should stay away from Troy. Furthermore, the order stated that if any antique objects were found during construction at Dardanos, the ministry should be notified and an official would be sent to investigate. To protect the area, the government instructed the local authorities to keep a careful watch for any secret or public excavations.101 When the British antiquary William C. Borlase (1849-1899) went to the Troad to view Schliemann’s discoveries in 1875, he was not allowed to visit the site without an ‘escort.’102

As to Heinrich Schliemann, he was now persona non grata. Frederick Calvert, Frank Calvert’s elder brother, urged Schliemann to avoid returning to the Empire ‘until the matter will have been arranged or forgotten.’103 The US minister in Istanbul, George Henry Boker, from whom the Ottoman authorities had demanded an explanation regarding Schliemann’s actions,104 also advised Schliemann not ‘to return to Turkey until the whole affair has blown over.’105 Pointing to the Ottoman anger at the loss of Priam’s Treasure,

100 Su, Osman Hamdi Bey’e Kadar Türk Müzesi, 52-55.
101 IBA: MF.MKT. 18/94: 19/R/1874 (05/06/1874); IBA: MF.MKT. 18/147: 09/C/1291 (24/07/1874).
102 Borlase, ‘A Visit to Dr. Schliemann’s Troy,’ 229; Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 327.
103 Letter from Frederick Calvert to Schliemann, 23 July 1873, quoted in Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 169.
104 Letter from Schliemann to Boker, 16 September 1873, quoted in Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 175.
he reported that many felt that he ‘should be brought here in chains for punishment.’

Indeed, the Ottoman High Council of Education had decided that ‘from now on there is no need and no possibility for Schliemann to do excavations and research’ on Ottoman territory. He was ‘only allowed to obtain pictures of future findings at the Imperial Museum.’ All that was left for Schliemann was to publish.

The remaining Trojan artefacts were added to the collection of the Imperial Museum. Official plans were made for continuing excavations at Hisarlık in 1875, now on behalf of the Imperial Museum. However, these excavations by the Turks did not take place. That same year – with drought and famine in Anatolia leading to widespread misery and agitation and making the collection of taxes impossible – the Empire was forced to declare bankruptcy following a major financial collapse. Moreover, the Balkan Crisis of 1875-1876 required the government’s full attention. Troy was no longer a priority, although this did not prevent the authorities from sending officials there in 1876 to ensure that nothing illegal was going on and to buy antiquities from the local consul, presumably Calvert.

An Inoperable Permit

Having smuggled finds out of the country and having clashed publicly with the Ottoman government, there seemed little chance of Schliemann obtaining permission to resume excavating at Hisarlık. As Schliemann wrote in 1874, when the legal conflict was about to break: ‘There can be no question at present of a continuation of the excavations.’

However, he was determined to return to the Troad. As early as 29 June 1873, Schliemann asked Boker to help him make an arrangement with the Porte. He suggested that he excavate at Troy for another three months at his own expense for the exclusive benefit of the Ottoman government, ‘but that on the other hand no claim can be made on me by the Porte for the antiquities I hitherto found.’ He hoped that this would enable him to keep Priam’s Treasure. Schliemann explained that he had made ‘such liberal

106 Letter from Boker to Schliemann, 8 November 1873, quoted in Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 176.
107 IBA: MF.MKT.18/147: 09/Ca/1291 (24/07/1874); MF.MKT.18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).
108 IBA: MF.MKT.18/147: 09/C/1291 (24/07/1874).
proposals’ because of his ‘ardent wish to continue all my life the excavations on Turkish territory.’ He needed Boker to help him ‘to make friends again with the Turks.’ Meanwhile, he rejected the Imperial Museum’s request for some of the owl-faced vessels that he had found.

Following the legal settlement reached in Athens, Schliemann tried to obtain the support of the British government for a new application to excavate at Troy for the British Museum. However, this was not forthcoming. He even asked Gladstone to apply personally for a permit, but this request was also rejected.

Schliemann’s wish to resume excavations was fuelled by a controversy surrounding his claim to have found Homeric Troy. His Trojan antiquities were disputed and opinions differed as to their date and significance. Scholars such as François Lenormant (1837-1883), Charles Thomas Newton (1816-1894) and Frank Calvert believed that the artefacts did not belong to Homeric Troy, but rather to a period between 2000 and 1900 BC. Schliemann had a thousand-year gap to explain. He also had to explain major differences between his finds and those from Homeric sites in Greece. He needed to resume his work at Troy in order to shed light on these matters, and most of all to prove he was right to locate Homeric Troy at Hisarlık.

Schliemann reopened negotiations with Turkish officials in early 1876. In a letter to Queen Sophie of the Netherlands in 2 March 1876, he explains that he had been at Istanbul for two months ‘for the purpose of getting a new firman, but encountered the very greatest difficulties.’ Schliemann called on foreign ambassadors at Istanbul to put pressure on the Ottomans to grant him permission to excavate. As he later explained, he would never have been able to overcome the difficulties ‘had it not been for the universal interest’ his ‘discovery of Troy excited and for the great enthusiasm the foreign ambassadors in Constantinople feel for Homer and his Ilium.’ The ambassadors ‘joyfully seconded’ his efforts and ‘by their conjoint pressure on the Turkish government’ he had ‘at last received the firm promise to get a new firman.

To obtain permission to resume excavations Schliemann needed to mend fences with Safvet Pasha. The Ottoman minister was reluctant to

113 Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 178.
115 Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 171-175.
grant Schliemann’s request and declined to cooperate with him in any way. Besides the negative experience of his previous archaeological activities, Safvet Pasha was also ‘much irritated’ with the bad press Schliemann had given him in the preface of his recently published *Troy and Its Remains* (1875). Schliemann had described him as ignorant and only interested in gold.117

Perhaps this is why Schliemann excavated at Cyzicus, a Greco-Roman site in the province of Balıkesir, north-west Turkey, in April 1876. Schliemann stated that he had dug there as a favour to Rafet Bey, Safvet Pasha’s son.118

Although his permit was authorized on 24 February 1876, Schliemann did not receive the firman until 5 May, after ‘superhuman efforts’ and not before he had ‘suffered in Constantinople during the 4 months.’ As he wrote to Gladstone on 8 May 1876: ‘I have been for four months at Constantinople to get a new firman for Troy and I have had to battle with almost insurmountable difficulties. Two months it has cost me to persuade Safvet Pasha, the minister of public instruction, to send to the Sublime Porte the project of a new convention with me for Hissarlik. [...] At last he sent the project of our convention to the Sublime Porte, but it was rejected by the Council of State.’ Following this, Schliemann changed tack and focused on getting the foreign minister, Reşid Pasha, to persuade the grand vizier to reject the Council of State’s decision and order Safvet Paşa to grant the firman. Given his role in international affairs, Reşid Pasha would clearly be more sensitive to pressure from foreign diplomats in Istanbul than Safvet Pasha.119

Wiser from bitter experience, the Ottomans distrusted the prospect of foreign archaeologists excavating in their country. They were profoundly uneasy about Schliemann in particular. As a result, the new permit was far more detailed and complex than the first.

**The Permit of 1876**

---

118 *Traill, Schliemann of Troy*, 141.
The state has the right to suspend Schliemann’s activities and to cancel his authorization in the event of any inconvenience or legal issues, for example, if the aforementioned person [Schliemann] contravenes the law or this regulation during the period of excavation. [...] And if the state so requires, it has the right to excavate and examine the site itself or to order others to carry out excavations. [...] Monsignor Schliemann has no right to oppose this procedure. He is not authorized to take legal action if he suffers a loss or for any comparable claim or for any other reason. [...] An official appointed by the state will inspect the storehouse sheltering Ancient artefacts. [...] Discovered artefacts will be placed in the storehouse for protection after having been registered and correctly named in the inventory books by both parties and after having been signed by both parties. [...] Any movable objects found which are designated as divisible, will be apportioned by an administrator appointed separately by [the Ministry of] Public Instruction each month. [...] In the event of a conflict or dispute between the Empire and the aforementioned person, the courts of the Empire will decide on the matter.

Part of the permit of 1878. IBA: MF,MKT. 34/30: 28/M/1293 (24/02/1876), translated from Ottoman Turkish

The permit, part of which is quoted above, paid special attention to stone structures such as temples and other buildings. Schliemann was not allowed to claim any part of these since they ‘already belonged to the state.’ Any stone structures discovered during the excavations would clearly not be included in the division. Schliemann was forbidden to ‘touch any aspect or part of it’ and would ‘receive no part of these.’ The permit insisted that these ‘will be left in their original form.’ While the Ottomans clearly feared that Ancient structures might be taken out of the country, the clause also reveals a determination to possess and protect this heritage.

As to movable objects, ‘since the aforementioned place [Hisarlık] is property of the Empire’ the permit required that two-thirds of the artefacts be rendered to the state, leaving a third for Schliemann. While the first permit of 1871 stipulated an equal division of any discovered antiquities, this time the Ottomans were more insistent. The state had the right to claim any artefacts they considered necessary for the Imperial Museum: ‘these objects must be transported to Der Saadet [Istanbul] every six months.’ Evidently, the Ottomans did not intend to be passive in the selection of artefacts and claimed priority.

The safety of the artefacts was a major point. Schliemann was required to build a storehouse to protect the Ancient artefacts. This would be inspected by an official appointed by the state. The permit required that any artefacts
found be registered, and listed and signed for by Schliemann and the Ottoman authorities in inventory books before being placed in the storehouse for protection. Besides emphasizing the safety of the antiquities, the firman also stressed the need to control Schliemann’s activities. An inspector appointed separately by the Ministry of Public Instruction each month would determine which objects were divisible. Presumably the Ottoman authorities could not trust an overseer who received a salary from Schliemann and wished to ensure a proper division and to leave nothing to chance.

Under the Antiquities Law of 1874, the permit remained valid for two years: Article 11 stated that a new authorization would then be required and it would not be possible to continue the excavation without this. Moreover, after two years, Schliemann would have to leave the built structures, in particular the city walls. In addition, the firman forbade Schliemann ‘to claim the buildings constructed by him or the ground on which the buildings were constructed.’

Furthermore, the permit specifically stipulated the right of the state to suspend Schliemann’s activities and to withdraw its authorization in the event of any inconvenience or any legal issues, if Schliemann broke the law or any regulations while excavating. To emphasize the authority of the Ottoman state, the permit stated its right to excavate and to inspect the site independently or to order others to carry out excavations.

Schliemann had no right to oppose any such measures and had no legal recourse to demand compensation for losses or any other claims or indeed for any reason whatsoever. Following their humiliation in court in Athens, the Ottomans were determined to safeguard their position and stipulated that in the event of a conflict or dispute between the Empire and Schliemann, the matter would be decided by the courts in the Empire.

While Schliemann was permitted to map the excavation site at Hisarlık, he was not allowed to cross the borders on the map. The permit was ‘only valid for the territories pointed out on the map.’ If he wished to excavate in uncharted areas he would have to file a new request.

The permit stated that Schliemann would be accompanied by at least 20 persons with a salary of 100 liras during the excavations. Arrangements and payments would be Schliemann’s responsibility. The state had ‘no responsibilities in this matter.’ However, a supplementary resolution to the permit issued by the Ministry of Public Instruction on 22 June 1876, stated that the Ottoman overseer of the excavations would keep a ‘constant’ eye on Schliemann’s employees.120

120 IBA: MF.MKT. 38/61 (1): 30/Ca/1293 (23/06/1876).
Clash with the Local Authorities

Kadri Bey, restoration director and member of the staff of the Archaeological Museum and the Ministry of Public Instruction, was initially appointed to oversee Schliemann’s activities. However, the Ministry of Public Instruction reported that Kadri Bey’s busy workload prevented him from visiting the Dardanelles. In the absence of an official overseer, Schliemann was assigned to Ibrahim Pasha, governor of the Dardanelles. In the event, Schliemann met with strong opposition from Ibrahim Pasha. He was not impressed by Schliemann or his permit.

When Schliemann arrived in the Dardanelles in early May 1876, Ibrahim Pasha ignored the permit, explaining that he had received no orders regarding the matter from the grand vizier. The Ministry of Public Instruction had communicated Schliemann’s permission to carry out excavations at Hisarlık to the province of Cezair-i Bahr-i Sefid on the 4 May. Yet this notification was rather general and stated that no overseer had so far been appointed.

On 10 May 1876, a second message was sent to the province. This time it was more detailed and the local authorities were instructed to ensure that the stipulations of the permit were strictly observed.

Despite the government notice to the province announcing Schliemann’s permit, Ibrahim Pasha continued to prevent Schliemann entering the site and stopped him building barracks and huts at Hisarlık. Moreover, he appointed an overseer named Izzet Efendi, who turned out to be even more uncooperative. Izzet Efendi was ordered to ensure Schliemann’s ‘strict compliance with the stipulations of the permit.’ According to the resolution of the Ministry of Public Instruction of 22 June 1876, Izzet Efendi had ‘the qualities’ and was ‘also according to the local authorities capable of performing this job.’

Besides inspecting the excavations, Izzet Efendi was instructed to keep the key of the antiquities storehouse in his possession. Furthermore, he was expected to examine Schliemann’s employees and if he suspected anything untoward, he was authorized to dismiss workers. A particularly unwelcome figure was Nicolaos Zaphyros Giannakes, who had served Schliemann in his first campaign of excavations and had played a significant role in the

121 IBA: MF.MKT. 36/137: 29/R/1293 (24/05/1876); IBA: MF.MKT. 38/61-1: 30/Ca/1293 (23/06/1876).
123 IBA: MF.MKT. 36/23: 10/R/1293 (04/05/1876)
124 IBA: MF.MKT. 36/42: 16/R/1293 (10/05/1876).
125 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 142.
smuggling of Priam’s Treasure. Because of ‘his former misdeeds,’ Nicolaos was ‘regarded as suspicious by the state.’ He was required to leave.\textsuperscript{126} Izzet Efendi forbade Schliemann to make drawings of the objects he discovered and even ordered Schliemann ‘to dismiss his own faithful servants and inspectors.’ He insisted on selecting workers for Schliemann and also demanded that they be Turkish.

Schliemann wrote that Ibrahim Pasha had appointed Izzet Efendi simply to spite him. Izzet Efendi’s sole aim was to throw ‘obstacles’ in his way and to ‘vex’ him. Although Schliemann paid Izzet Efendi’s salary, this did not incline him to make things any easier for Schliemann. Izzet Efendi took his job seriously and made Schliemann’s venture a misery.\textsuperscript{127}

By 29 June 1876, probably hoping to please Safvet Pasha and to reach a more flexible arrangement, Schliemann apologized for his previous hostile remarks, describing Safvet Paşa as the benefactor of his Trojan discoveries in a letter to \textit{The Times}.\textsuperscript{128}

Even so, the local authorities in the Troad were of little help to Schliemann. On the contrary, they opposed and obstructed him. In the end, they made the venture completely impracticable. Schliemann wrote that he ‘had encountered insurmountable obstacles with Ibrahim Pasha, current governor of the Dardanelles.’ He suspected that Ibrahim Pasha felt frustrated that he had received a permit from the government which prevented the governor from admitting others who wanted to visit the site of Troy. ‘Since these fermans no longer apply when the excavations resume, he impedes progress by imposing highly effective obstacles. For two months I fought against him in vain, and came here yesterday firmly resolved not to return to Troy before he has been replaced.’\textsuperscript{129} Exasperated by Ibrahim Pasha’s opposition, Schliemann left the Dardanelles early in July 1876 where he had been for two months without having carried out any excavation at all.

Schliemann held Ibrahim Pasha in low esteem and he hoped and expected that he would soon be replaced, since ‘in Constantinople he is considered a

\textsuperscript{126} IBA: MF.MKT. 38/61 (i): 30/Ca/1293 (23/06/1876).
\textsuperscript{127} Meyer, \textit{Heinrich Schliemann. Briefwechsel II}, (18), 47, 30 June 1876.
\textsuperscript{128} Traill, \textit{Schliemann of Troy}, 142-144.
tremendous nonentity.' He felt that Ibrahim Pasha's position as governor was a mere 'farce.' Yet Ibrahim Pasha's tenure was clearly not an issue in Istanbul. After returning to Athens, Schliemann was strongly advised by Safvet Pasha to get on good terms with Ibrahim Pasha. And so Schliemann left for the Dardanelles 'in great haste.' Once there, however, Schliemann explains that he found 'Ibrahim Pasha enervated and determined to crush the project however he could. He was beside himself, and humiliated me in every possible way, treating me like a dog in the presence of the governors.'

Nevertheless, Schliemann persisted. He appealed to Gladstone to put pressure on the Ottomans. In a letter dated 28 December 1876, Schliemann expresses his gratitude for Gladstone's 'powerful recommendation to Sir Henry Elliot, which has had the desired effect, the grand vizier having given to the governor general at the Dardanelles the strictest orders, not only not to throw obstacles into my way, but to render me every assistance and to give me every possible facility.' Even so, by the end of 1876, Schliemann decided that the region had become too unsafe to carry out excavations at the Troad.

Schliemann's permit of 1876 had proven ineffective. However hard he tried and despite his extensive lobbying, he could not resolve his problem with the Ottoman-Turkish authorities and so was unable to resume his excavations at Hisarlık in 1876. Moreover, insecurity in the region and mounting unrest in the Ottoman capital between May (the deposition of Sultan Abdülaziz) and August 1876 (the succession of Sultan Abdülhamid II) took its toll.

While the Ottomans kept their eye on Troy, Schliemann focused on other promising sites, such as Mycenae. Meanwhile, telegrams from the Ministry of Public Instruction to the province of Cezair-i Bahr-i Sefid on 29 September 1876 and 18 November 1876 reflect the Ottoman preoccupation with Troy: the ministry wanted information about possible archaeological activities at Hisarlık, since 'there is a rumour that Schliemann has started excavations.' If this is correct, since when and is there an official overseer present? Although Schliemann was focussing on Mycenae and

133 See Hanioğlu, A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire, 109-124.
134 IBA: MF. MKT. 45/24: 01/Za/1293 (18/11/1876); IBA: MF. MKT. 43/81: 10/N/1293 (29/09/1876).
his extensive archaeological activities there, the authorities were obviously aware of Schliemann’s continuing interest in Troy.

During the Russo-Turkish War (April 1877–March 1878) the Ottomans continued to monitor Troy. Even as the Russians approached the gates of Istanbul, the Ministry of Public Instruction still found time to inform Dardanelles province on 7 February 1878 that Schliemann had not received a new permit to excavate at Hisarlık and was planning to use the permit issued in 1876. Since Schliemann was preparing a visit to the Troad to view the site and assess the extent to which the war was affecting the region, the telegram also contained a request to the authorities to inform the ministry about conditions in the area.135

The authorities had seen almost immediately that Schliemann’s permit had expired and had determined that the Dardanelles was not a safe area.136

6 Excavating in the Shadow of War

The late 1870s were a traumatic time for the Ottomans in many ways. After the financial crisis and provincial rebellions in the Balkans, on 24 April 1877 Russia declared war on the Empire. The Russo-Turkish War was a disaster. On 3 March 1878, the Ottomans signed a peace treaty at San Stefano (now Yeşilköy), only a few kilometres from Istanbul, already invaded by the Russians at the end of the war. This resulted in the creation of a large autonomous Bulgarian state under Russian protection, after nearly five centuries of Ottoman rule (1396-1878). The treaty recognized territorial gains and independence for Montenegro and Serbia. Romania, too, became independent and Russia annexed the Asian provinces of Kars, Ardahan, Batum and Doğubeyazit.

However, Austria-Hungary, Britain and Germany feared Russian domination of the Balkans and Asia Minor. This shared anxiety and the desire to prevent the destabilization of the European balance of power following a potential collapse of the Ottoman Empire led the Great Powers to convene a summit in Berlin. The Congress of Berlin (13 June–13 July 1878) was one of the last major conferences to settle a serious international problem in the period before the First World War.

135 IBA: MF.MKT. 57/149: 04/S/1295 (07/02/1878).
In essence, the resulting Treaty of Berlin of 1878 was a revision of the Treaty of San Stefano. The principalities of Romania, Serbia and Montenegro remained independent, but Serbia and Montenegro had to be content with reduced territorial gains. Bulgaria remained autonomous and also gained less territory than recognized at San Stefano. Russia’s Anatolian acquisitions were virtually unaffected. Another result of the treaty was Austria-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and British control over Cyprus, although these regions officially remained part of the Ottoman territory.\(^{137}\)

Although the treaty attempted to resolve the Eastern Question and to prevent the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, which it was generally agreed would precipitate a major European conflict, the Berlin Congress ended up repeating the mistakes of the past: the creation of autonomous regions. The Empire suddenly held far less territory in Europe, while the European powers were now far more influential, effectively intervening and parcelling out Ottoman possessions.\(^{138}\)

Meanwhile, a couple of weeks after the Berlin Congress, Schliemann relaunched negotiations in Istanbul for an extension of his permit. This time the British ambassador to Istanbul, Sir Austen Layard (1817-1894) supported him.\(^{139}\) Indeed, the Ottoman government was unable to resist diplomatic pressure and as Schliemann explains, he obtained the firman in the summer of 1878 ‘by the good offices of my honoured friend Sir A.H. Layard.’\(^{140}\)

The new permit was an extension of the earlier two-year permit. So Schliemann was still not allowed to claim any structures such as temples and buildings. These had to be left in place and in their original state. As to the movable objects, he had to hand over two-thirds of his finds to the Imperial Museum in Istanbul. Moreover, any artefacts found would be registered in inventory books and shelved in a special storehouse, the keys to which were kept by the Ottoman overseer. In addition, Schliemann was responsible for all the expenses of the excavation.\(^{141}\)

---
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Excavations in 1878
Schliemann’s new excavation started on 30 September 1878 and continued until 26 November 1878. ¹⁴² His overseer was Kadri Bey, the Ministry of Public Instruction official. ¹⁴³ He was appointed to control Schliemann’s activities and to maintain ‘the perfect protection of any artefacts found.’ The province was instructed to support the representative in ‘a correct way and to give him the necessary assistance.’¹⁴⁴ The first mention of Kadri Bey in connection with the archaeological activities at Hisarlık dates from 7 October 1878. It is a report on the excavation progress. According to this account Schliemann did provide Kadri Bey with the key of the storehouse, but was too busy to sign the inventory books. Since the permit required that the artefacts be registered and both parties sign, Kadri Bey wondered how he should manage this problem.

The Ministry of Public Instruction answered clearly: according to Article 29 of the Antiquities Law all artefacts should be registered, with the signatures of both parties, the excavation date and a description of the items in two inventory books. No exception to this rule was possible. The ministry ordered Schliemann to assign someone else to sign the inventory books on his behalf, to be approved by the American consulate and the local authorities. Furthermore, the directive ordered Kadri Bey to change the lock of the storehouse and ensure that there were only two keys: one of these had to be kept by Kadri Bey, the other was for Schliemann or his authorized representative.¹⁴⁵

The Ottoman authorities watched Schliemann’s activities closely. The minister of public instruction in 1878 was a prominent statesman and a leading figure in the nineteenth-century Turkish-Ottoman Enlightenment, Mehmet Tahir Münif Pasha (1828-1910).¹⁴⁶ Münif Pasha did not hesitate to reply sharply to Schliemann’s requests when necessary: ‘Your rebukes are without foundation and contemptible.’¹⁴⁷ His letters to Schliemann reveal him to have been a capable administrator who could politely yet resolutely

¹⁴² Schliemann, Ilios, 50-51.
¹⁴³ While no biographical information is available regarding Kadri Bey, in Peter Ackroyd’s adventurous novel The Fall of Troy, Kadri Bey is the model for the energetic site manager.
¹⁴⁷ ‘Vos reproches sont sans fondement et indignes,’ Letter from Münif Pasha to Schliemann, 17 November 1878, Schliemann Archive, Gennadius Library, American School of Classical Studies, Athens (B 78/620).
respond to Schliemann’s requests to bend the rules or allow him to expand the excavation site. When Schliemann asked not to have to register all the artefacts found, for instance, Münif Pasha politely refused: ‘As to your proposal to dispense with compiling and signing registers of excavated antiquities, I regret that I am unable to authorize this, since the law is dictated by a higher authority.’ He subsequently advised that in this respect Schliemann could appoint a formal representative, in joint agreement with the local authorities in the Dardanelles and the American embassy, who could sign the registers instead of him.148

Besides Schliemann, his overseer Kadri Bey also came under strict supervision. If Kadri Bey neglected to provide the government with information about progress in Troy, he would receive a serious reprimand within weeks. The correspondence of the Ministry of Public Instruction of 31 October 1878 demonstrates a keen concern that the terms of the permit be maintained and scrupulous attention paid to the preservation of Trojan artefacts. Kadri Bey was called to account whenever his attention lapsed. His superiors responded fiercely after they had ‘received nothing else than just one piece of a writ’ ever since he had left for Hisarlık. Moreover, the ministry immediately insisted on a detailed report of ‘the undertaken activities, the amount of the discovered antique artefacts and their conditions, whether they are under lock or not.’

The government clearly wished to have a meticulous inventory of the Trojan antiquities. The same directive instructs Kadri Bey to stipulate the different strata in which the artefacts had been found in the inventory books, and the authorities also felt it ‘necessary to mark the objects with the same number with chalk or paint.’149

Schliemann had apparently communicated to the director of the Imperial Museum that the division of the artefacts would be scheduled for the beginning of December 1878. This was another reason for the authorities to reprimand Kadri Bey on his delayed report and to alert him to his duties, in particular the inspection, keeping an inventory and the protection of the Trojan antiquities. The ministry ordered Kadri Bey to assess which of the antiquities should be included in the division, since the permit stated that not all discoveries could be divided. This was obviously true for structures

148 ‘Quant à votre proposition de vous dispenser de dresser et de signer les registres de antiquités mises au jour, je regrette de ne pouvoir vous satisfaire, les prescriptions de la Loi étant formulées la dessus.’ Letter from Münif Pasha to Schliemann, 21 October 1878, Schliemann Archive, Gennadius Library, American School of Classical Studies, Athens (B 78/574).
149 IBA: MF.MKT. 58/59: 04/Za/1295 (30/10/1878).
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such as temples; Schliemann had no right to claim these. Kadri Bey was once again reminded of his duties and of his responsibility to inspect and to report the finds.150

A telegram to Kadri Bey on 31 October states that ‘you are ordered to report the nature of your services, how many artefacts have been found, and what happened to them.’ When the authorities in Istanbul learned that Kadri Bey had taken his cousin to the Troad to assist him during the excavations, they warned him that this had not been well received. This particular cousin had acquired a bad reputation when he had worked at the Imperial Museum.151 Kadri Bey was ordered to avoid this kind of complication. The warning demonstrates that the authorities were extremely cautious and suspicious and clearly concerned that a person with a shady reputation was present at the site.152

In addition to this official distrust, public opinion of Schliemann was equally critical. He appeared in Ottoman cartoons as a greedy opportunist (Fig. 17).153 His request for a new permit was debated in the Ottoman press. On 6 August 1878, Tercüman-ı Şark newspaper stated: ‘Hopefully this time Baron Schliemann will not smuggle the antique objects to Athens, so that our museum can also take advantage of it.’154

Schliemann’s finds at Hisarlık in 1878 included four valuable items: golden earrings, bracelets, pins and many small beads, often identical to earlier discoveries. Most of the season’s finds were made in the last two weeks of excavation; three of the four treasures were found on 11 November. A collection of seashells at prehistoric occupation levels was another substantial discovery.155

The division of the artefacts found in 1878 did not go smoothly. In fact Schliemann once again clashed with the Ottoman authorities. The government demanded that the division take place at Istanbul under supervision of an official other than Kadri Bey. However, Schliemann insisted that Kadri Bey represent the government during the division, since he considered him ‘civilized’ and ‘reasonable.’ Schliemann also insisted that Hisarlık was the

150 IBA: MF.MKT. 58/59.
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153 Hayal, 31 Ağustos 1290 (12 September 1874).
154 Tercüman-ı Şark, 111, 19/S/1878 (06/08/1878), quoted in Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi, 299.
appropriate place to divide the artefacts. In the end, Schliemann got his way. The Ottomans yielded to pressure from British ambassador Sir Austen Layard and the division took place at Hisarlık.\textsuperscript{156} As to the supervision, the Ottomans remained insistent. Although Kadri Bey continued to supervise the division, he was only allowed to carry out his work in strict cooperation with Dardanelles province.

In response to Kadri Bey’s report informing the authorities that Schliemann was about to complete the excavation season of 1878, the ministry sent a telegram on 9 November 1878, ordering Kadri Bey to supervise the division, but only in the presence of two officials appointed by the province.\textsuperscript{157} Meanwhile the province was ordered to oversee the division.\textsuperscript{158} Evidently, the idea of letting the division take place under the auspices of Kadri Bey – whose salary was paid by Schliemann – did not sit well with the authorities. They clearly had their doubts about his loyalty.

The telegram of 9 November also gave Kadri Bey guidelines for the division of the Trojan artefacts. He was to make a list of the artefacts with a description of the ‘type and shape of all objects,’ specifying those intended for Schliemann. The list was to be made out in triplicate and signed and sealed by Kadri Bey, the two officials as well as by Schliemann. These lists would be confirmed by the local authorities. Kadri Bey then had to send one copy of the list with the Ottoman share of the Trojan artefacts to Istanbul.

As to Schliemann’s share of the Trojan finds, the artefacts would be forwarded to the customs house at Kal’a-i Sultaniye together with a copy of the list. The directive stipulated that Schliemann’s share could only ‘pass the customs after regular customs handling.’ Moreover, Kadri Bey was instructed ‘to write to all persons it may concern to be watchful that nothing else passes the customs than the objects declared on the list.’\textsuperscript{159}

Finally, the directive discussed finds made after the lists were completed: ‘it is not permitted to exclude these objects, whatever they are, from the division.’\textsuperscript{160} The ministry sent an additional warning to the customs house of Kal’a-i Sultaniye to keep a sharp eye on the objects that Schliemann wished to pass through the customs, urging them to check the objects against the lists and ‘in the case of export of any object that is not on the list, the customs officers who allowed this would bear the responsibility.’

\textsuperscript{156} Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 185; on Sir Austen Layard in the Ottoman Empire, see: Kurat, Henry Layard’ın İstanbul Elçiliği.
\textsuperscript{157} IBA: MF.MKT.: 58/63: 13/Za/1295 (08/11/1878).
\textsuperscript{159} IBA: MF.MKT.: 58/73: 20/Za/1295 (15/11/1878).
\textsuperscript{160} IBA: MF.MKT.: 58/63: 13/Za/1295 (08/11/1878).
Furthermore, the customs house was ordered to pay equal attention to the objects sent to Istanbul.\textsuperscript{161}

Finally, in late November 1878 the Imperial Museum received its share of the finds. Twelve boxes filled with Trojan artefacts arrived safely in Istanbul and were added to the museum collection.\textsuperscript{162} This collection already included the remaining Trojan artefacts from Schliemann’s first excavation season and gold items discovered and stolen by Schliemann’s workmen, some of which were confiscated by the Ottoman police in 1873.\textsuperscript{163}

Schliemann had been collecting potsherds ever since the excavations in Mycenae in 1876. In order to include Trojan pottery in his collection, Schliemann asked Münif Pasha for some fragments of Trojan pottery soon after the official division. However, Münif Pasha refused to give Schliemann the pottery, which was already included in the Imperial Museum’s collection. He handled Schliemann’s request with care and diplomacy. Despite the museum’s close ties with the Ministry of Public Instruction, he maintained a certain distance and replied: ‘As to your proposal that you be given the Trojan pottery fragments, [...] since these objects belong to the Museum and are not at my disposal, I regret that I can not give them to you.’\textsuperscript{164}

Excavations in 1879

Schliemann planned to resume his excavations on 1 March 1879.\textsuperscript{165} To enhance his credibility, Schliemann invited well-known scholars to participate in the excavations at Hisarlık. He had become increasingly accepted by the intellectual world as his scholarly status rose. In September 1877, Rudolf Virchow (1821-1902), a pathologist from the University of Berlin and founder of the German Society of Anthropology, Ethnography and Prehistory, had enabled Schliemann to become an honorary member of that society. This gave Schliemann admission to the German intellectual world. Virchow, who had long been a close friend, would join the excavations in 1879.

Schliemann needed intellectual backing to secure his status in the world of scientific archaeology. Involving scholars of international standing might
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\textsuperscript{164} ‘Quant à votre proposition de vous céder les fragments de la poterie troyenne [...], ne pouvant disposer des objets appartenant au Musée, je regrette de ne pouvoir vous les accorder.’ Letter from Münif Pasha to Schliemann, 21 January 1879 (B 79/52).
\textsuperscript{165} Herrmann and Maab, \textit{Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow}, (4), 85-87.
certainly help.\textsuperscript{166} He offered them a good salary, travelling expenses, food and lodging.\textsuperscript{167} For his excavation in the spring of 1879, Schliemann was joined by experts such as Virchow and Émile-Louis Burnouf (1821-1907), the latter a leading nineteenth-century Orientalist. Burnouf researched the arrangement of the excavated dwellings and prepared maps and plans of the site. He also worked on his astronomical and geodetic studies. Virchow studied the geology of the Troad, ‘particularly the development of the Trojan plain, the river courses, springs, people, animals and plants.’ In addition, Virchow also worked as a medical doctor and treated local inhabitants of the Troad.\textsuperscript{168} Schliemann had also invited Assyriologists François Lenormant (1837-1883) and Archibald Henry Sayce (1846-1933) to join him at Hisarlık although they did not accept his invitation.\textsuperscript{169}

Kadri Bey continued to supervise Schliemann’s archaeological activities at Hisarlık. The Ministry of Public Instruction informed the local authorities of the Dardanelles of Schliemann’s imminent arrival on 25 February 1879, and asked the province to assist and support Kadri Bey with his work on location.\textsuperscript{170}

In April 1879, Schliemann applied to excavate tombs in the vicinity of Hisarlık, outside the assigned space. Despite pressure from diplomats urged on by Schliemann,\textsuperscript{171} Münif Pasha took a firm stand and maintained that the terms of the Antiquities Law would be maintained. Since the tombs were situated on private land, Schliemann had to obtain permission from the owners. Münif Pasha strove to proceed correctly in this matter and refused resolutely to bend the law.\textsuperscript{172}

As Schliemann explained to Gladstone, while his 1879 excavations ‘produced less gold-jewels (I found only two treasures),’ they resulted in ‘discoveries of the greatest possible importance.’ And he emphasized the role played by his experts: ‘[discoveries] which I could not have made without the assistance of the famous professor Rudolf Virchow of Berlin and Émile
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Burnouf of Paris." As with his findings of 1878, Schliemann attributed the treasures of 1879 to the Homeric stratum (Troy II). Schliemann believed that he had confirmed the identification of Priam’s Troy with the second stratum.

Indeed, this stratum was the main focus of the 1879 excavations; Schliemann uncovered a significant section, including a major part of the fortification wall. By the end of this season, Schliemann believed his mission was accomplished and that he would ‘stop forever excavating Troy.’

On 21 May 1879, the Ottoman authorities ordered the supervisor to send the artefacts that had been found to Istanbul. The museum was particularly interested in the ‘precious pottery’ from Hisarlık. Schliemann, however, wanted to include the Trojan pottery fragments in his collection and asked Layard’s support. He was convinced that if the potsherds went to the Archaeological Museum, they would be ‘forever lost to science.’ Schliemann still portrayed the Archaeological Museum in a negative light. As he explained to Layard, ‘The Turkish Museum is anything but public and [...] the Trojan jewels are of no value to science as long as they remain in the hands of the Turks.’

The Ottomans, again, yielded to the pressure of the British ambassador and the ministry decided that the pottery remains would be left at the site. The millstones were also left there. If Schliemann was interested in these, he could include them in his collection.

**New Excavations for Troy in Store**

Although Schliemann felt that his work at Hisarlık was complete, new doubts arose. Virchow began to express doubts regarding the accepted theories about the Troad’s geological formation. His conclusions contradicted Schliemann’s view, noting that ‘this plain is an old fiord, which has been filled by river-deposit.’ In his opinion, a branch of the sea had covered the plain in prehistoric times. Schliemann began considering a new excavation.

---
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At the same time Calvert was digging at Hanay Tepe, a mound a few miles south of Hisarlık. Schliemann funded the excavations, in exchange for half of the finds. No gold objects were found, or any artefacts of artistic value, just a number of skeletons. Schliemann planned to ship his share to the Berlin Museum and persuaded Calvert to do the same. Schliemann had already decided to donate his entire Trojan collection to Germany.\footnote{Traill, \textit{Schliemann of Troy}, 192; Herrmann and Maab, \textit{Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow}, 156-159.}

On 17 July 1879, the Ministry of Public Instruction ordered the customs house at the Dardanelles to clear the eight boxes filled with artefacts that Schliemann was ‘intending to send to the German museum.’\footnote{IBA: IMF.MKT. 69/116: 27/B/1296 (17/07/1879).}

However, the shipment to Berlin proved complex. Presumably prompted by his fear of having to share the discoveries with the Ottomans, Schliemann interrupted Calvert’s careful packing of the skulls and ordered them to be shipped immediately in July 1879. However, a conflict between Schliemann and the German consul prevented the shipment from taking place until the autumn. As a result, some skulls were broken.\footnote{Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 202, 341. Calvert’s share of the Hanay Tepe artefacts was shipped to Germany late in 1879.\footnote{Traill, \textit{Schliemann of Troy}, 337.}

Meanwhile, Calvert continued excavating at Hanay Tepe, still sponsored by Schliemann. Despite a warning from the governor, who had ‘new orders from Cple [Istanbul] to stop the work at Hanai Tepe,’ Calvert continued his excavations until mid-March 1880.\footnote{Letter from Calvert to Virchow, 15 January 1880, partially quoted in Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 195; Traill, \textit{Schliemann of Troy}, 199.}

Schliemann, on the other hand, spent his time working on a new book, \textit{Ilios}, published on 10 November 1880 in German, British and American editions. After the publication, Schliemann became increasingly doubtful concerning the size of the settlement that he connected with Homer’s Troy. So Schliemann and Calvert planned an extensive archaeological survey at various sites in the Troad area. Calvert would carry out the excavations, funded by Schliemann. These excavations had to be clandestine, since Schliemann’s permit had expired. As Calvert explained to Schliemann on 10 November 1880,

\begin{quote}
... pioneer work should be undertaken now with not more than six men in the necropolis of Ancient towns – this I can do without attracting attention – this method will save you much time – by the results the most likely localities can be selected as no share will be given to the govt., I
\end{quote}
propose the proceeds should be shared by us equally. I give my time and
knowledge, you the funds.\footnote{Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 207-209; Letter from Frank Calvert to Schliemann, 10 November 1880, quoted in Allen, 208.}

Obtaining a permit for such a large-scale survey was no easy matter. All
the landowners had to be contacted and persuaded to make arrangements
with the archaeologists.\footnote{Schliemann wrote to Calvert that he would have to make arrangements with all the
landowners on 9 December 1879: quoted in Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 345.} In fact the Ottoman authorities had already
been alerted to Schliemann’s extended excavations in February 1879: on
18 February 1879, the Ministry of Public Instruction ordered the province to
inquire into Schliemann’s activities. The ministry wished to know whether
the excavated lands were the property of the state or private estates. The
ministry also wondered, ‘if these lands are possessed by private persons,
do the landowners agree to the excavations, and are there any objections
against performing excavations.’\footnote{IBA: MF.MKT. 60/8: 25/S/1296 (18/02/1879).}

Nevertheless, Schliemann and Calvert’s clandestine campaign continued
until the spring of 1882. On the Ottoman side, however, no documentation
has been identified showing any knowledge of these illegal archaeological
activities. Meanwhile, Schliemann, now an honorary citizen of Berlin,\footnote{Schliemann received his honorary citizenship on 7 July 1881.} was
determined to get a firman that would give him the right to explore
the Troad plain. This time he relied on German diplomatic support. He
appealed to the German chancellor, Prince Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898),
to support him in obtaining a liberal permit that would allow him ‘to make,
simultaneously with the exploration of Troy, excavations on any other site in
the Troad’ he might desire. Bismarck’s intervention had the desired effect:
in October 1881 he received a new firman to excavate at Hisarlık, and on
the site of the lower town of Ilium. Within a couple of months, Bismarck
had ‘obtained’ the liberal firman. He was now allowed to explore the Troad,
but on condition that excavations were carried out at one site at one given
time and were made in the presence of a Turkish overseer.\footnote{Schliemann, \textit{Troja}, 5.}

Yet the conditions would turn out to be more strained than expected.
It soon became clear that the Turks were less than enthusiastic about this
extensive foreign venture on their soil, especially since it concerned the
Troad.
Figure 8  Priam’s Treasure

Source: Kelder, Uslu and Şerifoğlu, Troy: City, Homer and Turkey

Figure 9  Michael Kritovoulos, History of Mehmed the Conqueror

Source: Topkapı Palace Museum, G.1.3

Michael Kritovoulos (c. 1410–c. 1470) dedicated his History of Mehmed the Conqueror to the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II. It describes the rise of the Ottoman Empire between 1465 and 1467 and includes a report on Mehmed II’s visit to Troy in 1462.
On 20 June 1871 Safvet Pasha, minister of public instruction, wrote to Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha concerning Schliemann’s request to excavate at Hisarlık. Safvet Pasha emphasizes the importance of the discovery of Troy’s walls, but was also wary of Schliemann. Before the official permit is granted, Safvet Pasha purchases the site on behalf of the Imperial Museum.
Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha (1815-1871), Ottoman linguist, diplomat and leading politician of the Tanzimat period, was one of Schliemann’s Ottoman counterparts. Here representing the Ottoman government at the Conference of Paris in 1856 which brought the Crimean War to an end.

Letter from Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha to the palace secretary of Sultan Abdülaziz (1830-1876) about Schliemann’s request to excavate at Hisarlık. In this letter the grand vizier emphasizes the significance of the quest for Troy. He envisages major advantages to scholarship and the understanding of human development from the excavations and the possible discovery of city walls and artefacts. He then lays down conditions for the excavation, which are ratified by the palace secretary through royal decree (below left).
The Prime Ministry launched inquiries into Schliemann’s operations in the Troad and the smuggling of Priam’s Treasure. This report by the Ottoman official Izzeddin Efendi of 24 July 1874 provides detailed information about the smuggling of the objects from Troy. Schliemann worked strategically and efficiently. According to Izzeddin Efendi, Schliemann put the gold jewellery in a box and the small pieces in his own and his family’s pockets and smuggled the objects to Athens in alliance with the Greek shipper Andrea. The report highlights Schliemann’s Ottoman helpers and henchmen, among them Ottoman custom officers who allowed Schliemann to pass without searching or inspecting him.

Source: Ottoman Archives division of the Prime Minister’s Office at Istanbul (IBA): MF.MKT.18/147: 09/C/1291 (24/07/1874)
Photo: Günay Uslu, 2012
According to the minister of public instruction, in a letter to the grand vizier, Schliemann was unreliable and had serious plans to sell the artefacts to others. Moreover, the American Embassy was unwilling to put pressure on Schliemann to cooperate with the Ottoman government. The minister emphasizes the need to publicize Schliemann’s illegal activities by alerting the international press.

Draft of the Ottoman letter of protest against a donation or sale of the Trojan treasuries by Schliemann, written on 6 June 1874.
Figure 17  Cartoon published in the satirical magazine Hayal, 12 September 1874

Photo: Günay Uslu, 2012

Cartoon published in the satirical magazine Hayal, 12 September 1874 (31 Ağustos 1290). Mrs Schliemann: ‘You promised these to the Ottomans, and these to the Greeks. Now you tell me that you’re promising these to the American ambassador. What will remain for us?’ Schliemann: ‘Everything!’
Figures 18 and 19  Employees of the Imperial Museum in front of the Alexander Sarcophagus and the museum entrance in the late nineteenth century

Source: Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi