V Homer and Troy during the Final Years of the Empire

Government efforts to protect antiquities increased rapidly in the years after the revised antiquities code came into effect in 1884, forbidding archaeologists to take original Ancient objects out of the Empire. The Antiquities Law was made even stricter in 1907. Not only had it become difficult to obtain permission to excavate on Ottoman soil, visits to archaeological sites were also restricted; foreigners needed formal permission from the Foreign Ministry to visit historic sites and monuments.

1 Controlling Heritage and the Development of the Ottoman Museum

Authorities were on the alert for illicit excavations, yet guarding the Empire’s Ancient sites was not easy. Foreign archaeologists were constantly trying to avoid the regulations in every possible way. Besides excavating without a permit, illegal removal of Ancient objects and attempting to arrange secret deals with senior officials and to purchase land near Ancient sites in order to excavate secretly all added to the pressing problems plaguing the Ottoman Empire at the turn of the century.

Efforts to end these activities were made in various official communications, warnings, investigations, orders and decrees. Local bureaucrats, education commissioners, high school principals and teachers received requests from their superiors to watch out for illegal activities and to inform the government. This is what happened when illegal excavations were spotted at Troy in 1886. According to a report filed on 28 October 1886, a group of Germans who had hoped to excavate and research at Troy without first obtaining permission were barred from the area.

Reports of illegal excavations frequently resulted in Imperial Museum staff being sent to investigate and confiscate artefacts. These objects were

---

1 The new Antiquities Law was to a large extent adopted from the Greek law of 1834. See Meyer, Heinrich Schliemann. Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Humann, 7 February 1890 (326), 348-350; Humann to Schliemann, 9 February 1890 (327), 350-352. See Chapter 2 above.
2 Çelik, ‘Defining Empire’s Patrimony,’ in Scramble for the Past, 460.
3 IBA: DH.MKT. 1415/45, 01/S/1304 (28/10/1886).
sent to the museum in Istanbul. Artefacts coincidentally found by locals also went to the museum. The government encouraged local people to protect sites and Ancient objects. Inhabitants of the Empire were enticed by monetary rewards to hand in finds to the government.\textsuperscript{4}

Yet illegal excavations by Ottoman subjects were a recurrent problem. In March 1887, Ottoman authorities discovered illegal excavations by a group of locals at the mound of Çobantepe – or the tomb of Paris – near Pınarbaşı on the Ballı Dağ at the Troad. This tumulus had not yet been excavated. The finds were impressive, including a golden diadem, three thin golden fillets with decoration, fine strips of gold and fragments of a bronze mirror case and bronze bowls. The authorities secured the treasure immediately and included the finds in the Imperial Museum’s Troy collection.\textsuperscript{5}

Meanwhile the museum was becoming increasingly congested. The collection expanded even further following Ottoman excavations at places such as Sidon. Impressive Ancient objects, such as the stunning sarcophagus of Alexander the Great (fourth century BC) and the sarcophagus of the Mourning Women (fourth century BC), came to the museum in 1887. In fact, the latter – in the form of an Ionic temple with female figures standing between the columns – was recognized as a paragon of Hellenic culture and became the model for the new museum building, completed in 1891.\textsuperscript{6}

The neoclassical style of the new museum building matched the tradition of European museums (Fig. 35). The style was chosen to express the function of the Imperial Museum, which had become an institution representing modern Ottoman cultural identity linked to Western civilization. The Ottomans had discovered the Hellenistic sarcophagi within the territories of the Empire, they brought them to the capital of the Empire and now they used them as a model for the Imperial Museum: so ‘a form thought of as Western was shown to be local.’

Moreover, the Imperial Museum was devoted to archaeology and emphasized the concept of territory. The organization and presentation were based on archaeological sites, rather than the historical or art-historical narrative typical of Western museums.\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{4} Çelik, ‘Defining Empire’s Patrimony,’ in Scramble for the Past, 462.
\textsuperscript{5} Calvert, [Report]; Calvert, ‘On the Tumulus of Choban Tepe in the Troad’; Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 218.
\textsuperscript{6} Hamdy Bey and Reinach, Une Nécropole Royale à Sidon; See historian Edhem Eldem’s comments on the publication, part of research material for an exhibition by Lebanese filmmaker, photographer and curator Akram Zaatari, in the SALT Beyoğlu gallery in Istanbul in 2015: Eldem, ‘The Royal Necropolis of Sidon.’
\textsuperscript{7} Shaw, ‘From Mausoleum to Museum.’
Meanwhile, the finds at Ballı Dağ had rekindled Schliemann's interest in Troy. He came back to the region on 24 April 1887. Far from receiving a festive welcome, his visit was definitely not appreciated: local authorities gave him a hard time.⁸ They insisted on seeing a formal permit, which he did not have, and refused to allow him to visit the site in light of his previous illegal activities. Ottoman officers watched the scholars accompanying Schliemann closely and obstructed their movement, causing great annoyance. In the end, Schliemann and his companions had to leave the region without even seeing the site at Hisarlık.⁹

In addition to triggering Schliemann's interest in Troy, the new finds also encouraged scholars and archaeologists who preferred Ballı Dağ as the site of Homeric Troy. Schliemann, who believed he had delivered sufficient proof that he had uncovered ‘Ilios of the Homeric Poems’ during his excavations of 1882,¹⁰ found his claim to have discovered Troy was once again a point of discussion.

2 Schliemann's Reputation under Fire

Schliemann's foremost opponent was Ernst Bötticher, a retired army captain and member of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte. He had been attacking Schliemann's interpretation of the site since 1883. Bötticher claimed that Schliemann's Homeric Troy – second stratum (Troy II) – was not a city at all, but a huge necropolis. The ashes, cinerary urns and half-burnt bones at Hisarlık mound were proof. Bötticher accused Schliemann and his associates Dörpfeld and Virchow of deliberately fostering an illusion by misrepresenting the site at Hisarlık.

His two books and numerous articles, reviews, pamphlets and letters published in various papers and journals made life difficult for Schliemann for years.¹¹ Bötticher's article in the Gesellschaft's Correspondenzblatt in July 1889, in which he presented more arguments for his burnt necropolis theory, left Schliemann in a state of shock. His associate Virchow's circle
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⁸ IBA: HR.SYS. 16/50, 07/§/1304 (01/05/1887); Herrmann and Maaß, Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow, 467.
⁹ Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 218-220; Ottoman correspondence regarding Schliemann's visit at the Troad on 24 April 1887 is also discussed in Aslan, Sönmez and Körpe, ‘Heinrich Schliemanns Ausgrabungen’; See in particular DH. MKT. 1417/90, 11/§/1304 (05/05/1887) and the memoirs of Carl Schuchhardt, Aus Leben und Arbeit, 143.
¹¹ Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 218-221.
dominated the Gesellschaft, so the inclusion of an article by Bötticher was an unexpected confrontation. Expressing his bitter disappointment about the matter, Schliemann wrote to Virchow:

I saw that Mr Ranke has placed the columns of his distinguished journal at the disposal of Captain Boetticher. Mr Ranke could not have insulted you more outrageously, knowing full well that you have worked with me at the site, that you have often lectured about this and have published serious articles. [...] You know that Boetticher has called you and the renowned expert on Ancient architecture Dr Dörpfeld, who spent five months working with me at Troy in 1882, forgers and deceivers. Have you fallen in with Mr Ranke? How could anyone with a rational mind accept such utter nonsense? Where was the city of the living when Hissarlik was a necropolis?12

Various learned societies were interested in Bötticher’s publications and his theories gained increasing scholarly acceptance. Familiar with this academic threat, Schliemann exclaimed in 1886 ‘and most annoyingly, he gathers many proselytes.’13 He was right, Bötticher’s ideas received a serious intellectual following, including the prominent archaeologist Salomon Reinach (1858-1932) of the Institut de France, who was close to the Ottoman government; Reinach had been charged by Osman Hamdi Bey to classify and catalogue the Imperial Museum collection.

In a paper delivered at the Tenth Congrès International d’Anthropologie et d’Archéologie Préhistoriques in Paris in August 1889, Reinach offered a synopsis of one of Bötticher’s recent critical articles. Schliemann realized that the credibility of his interpretation of the site at Hisarlik was losing ground and he faced serious rivals. He considered Reinach one of them: ‘But I have an enemy here [at the Paris conference]; namely Salomon Reinach, director

---

of the museum at Saint-Germain en Laye, who again defended a polemic by Captain D.E. Boetticher attacking Virchow, Dörpfeld and myself.\textsuperscript{14}

These continuing attacks by Bötticher, who had never seen Troy, left Schliemann desperate. Wilhelm Dörpfeld, an authority on Ancient architecture, was also furious that Bötticher had called his plan ‘Phantasiegebilde’ and that he had accused Dörpfeld and Schliemann of inventing buildings, temples and walls and ‘turning the tiny chambers of the ovens into massive halls!’\textsuperscript{15}

The damage to Schliemann’s reputation and that of his associates was considerable and their integrity was under attack. Schliemann’s efforts to silence Bötticher were ineffective. Dörpfeld and Virchow tried to force him to withdraw his accusations, but their attempts failed as well. Although Schliemann believed he had finished with excavating Troy forever after his efforts in 1882,\textsuperscript{16} he felt obliged to go back to Troy to silence his opponents and to answer his critics.\textsuperscript{17} In a letter to the German ambassador, Joseph Maria von Radowitz (1839-1912), about the situation, he wrote: ‘There is no other way of defeating this incorrigible slanderer than to resume our excavation at Hisarlik as soon as possible and once we are established there to summon Bötticher to work there alongside us.’\textsuperscript{18}

Determined to prove Bötticher’s accusations wrong and his theories baseless, Schliemann made preparations for a final Trojan campaign in 1889/1890, including two conferences attended by prominent scholars and of course Bötticher.

3 The Final Encounter of Schliemann and the Ottomans in Troy

By September 1889, Schliemann had sent a request to Osman Hamdi Bey asking to resume excavations at Troy. Both Osman Hamdi Bey and Schliemann


\textsuperscript{15} ‘aus den kleinen Kammern des Verbrennungsofens grosse Säle hergestellt haben!’ Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion, 14–16.


\textsuperscript{17} ‘Die Unmöglichkeit einsehend diesen furchtbaren Schmähscbriever auf andere Weise los zu werden sind wir entschlossen die Ausgrabungen in Hisarlik schleunigstmöglich fortzusetzen, und, nachdem wir dort eingerichtet sind, Bötticher aufzufordern unser Mitarbeiter zu werden.’ Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 233–235, 279–282; Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 220.

were at that time in Paris. Osman Hamdi Bey demanded a plan of the site that Schliemann proposed to explore and pressed Schliemann to respect the Ottoman antiquities code of 1884. Schliemann promised ‘to submit to the new regulation, whereby the explorer has no right to any of his finds.’

Giving up his finds to the Ottomans would be unprecedented for Schliemann, since all his previous archaeological enterprises had involved illegal shipments of items from the Empire. But soon the truth came out and his real plans were revealed: he had no intention of leaving the archaeological finds with the Ottomans; he meant to take the finds with him. Above all he was tremendously ambitious and strategic, and used diplomatic channels more effectively than anyone.

In a letter to Herbert von Bismarck (1849-1904), son of the German chancellor, Schliemann asked for help in obtaining permission to excavate and assured him that Berlin would be the beneficiary of everything he found. Meanwhile, he also wrote to German ambassador Radowitz, asking for support in obtaining a permit and maintaining that Osman Hamdi Bey had already promised him the sale of his finds to the museum in Berlin. No evidence of any reference to this sale has been found so far. Possibly his assurance that the director of the Ottoman Imperial Museum had promised to sell the objects may have been part of his strategy to gain diplomatic support for a permit as soon as possible.

His correspondence in February 1890 with Carl Humann (1839-1896), excavator of Pergamon and director of the Royal Museums in Berlin, suggests that Schliemann's statements about obtaining all his Trojan finds may have been little more than a strategic argument. Schliemann asked Humann to assist him in getting half the finds from the Ottomans. Yet Humann, while appreciating his 'youthful fire,' felt obliged to point out that the situation had changed in the Empire and it was not so easy to obtain antiquities: ‘But I must add water to your wine. You know that the Turkish Antiquities Law, which is copied from the Greek, declares all antiques that are found to be state property and forbids their export.’ Humann notes that exceptions were always possible. Although in principle only copies of artefacts were allowed to leave the country, with the support of Osman Hamdi Bey an exception might be made. Schliemann’s communication with Osman Hamdi on

19 Quoted in Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 281.
20 Letter from Schliemann to H. von Bismarck, 11 October 1889, Schliemann, Briefe, 293.
22 ‘Ich aber bin leider gezwungen, Wasser in ihren Wein zu gieben. Sie kennen das türkische [sic] Antiken-Gesetz, das auf dem Griechischen abgeklangscht, jede Antike, auch die künftig
13 September 1889, however, shows no sign of support. On the contrary, Schliemann even distanced himself from the finds.\(^{23}\)

Schliemann received his firman in late October and started excavating at the site in early November 1889. Osman Hamdi Bey sent Galib Efendi to observe for the Imperial Museum. As Osman Hamdi Bey pointed out, Galib Efendi was an excellent draughtsman who could assist Schliemann during the excavations.\(^{24}\) The museum representative was responsible for protecting the finds, since only he was allowed to have the key of the store in which objects were kept. Eventually, another museum employee, Halil Bey, was appointed to represent the Ottoman authorities at Hisarlık and to keep the key.\(^{25}\)

Schliemann’s main purpose was to determine the nature of the ruins of what he believed to be Homer’s Troy once and for all, namely the second stratum. To back up his position, Schliemann requested academies in Germany, Austria and France to send delegates: independent scholars. Schliemann’s first conference at Hisarlık in December 1889 was attended by George Niemann (1841-1912), a prominent architect and professor at the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts; cartographer Major Bernhard Steffen (1844-1891), who had produced maps of Mycenae, came from the Academy of Berlin; Halil Bey; Frank Calvert; Dörpfeld; and, last but not least, Captain Bötticher himself. No French delegate was present. Although Schliemann had hoped to attract Reinach,\(^{26}\) the latter was unable to come. The French Academy chose another specialist, but he could not make it to the conference in December.\(^{27}\)

At the conference Schliemann tried to prove to Bötticher that all the data ‘conformed with the truth,’ stating ‘that all the ruins of buildings, gates, towers, and walls described in my book are accurately depicted in the plans and nothing in them has been falsified.’\(^{28}\) Major Steffen and George Niemann signed the conference protocol in Schliemann’s defence. This was

\(^{23}\) Letter from Schliemann to Osman Hamdi Bey, 13 September 1889 (BBB 41/387), quoted in Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 281.

\(^{24}\) Osman Hamdi Bey to Schliemann, 13 November 1889, B 41/545.


a declaration confirming that the remains in the second stratum were of a town with a temple and halls. Yet this did not confirm Schliemann’s claim that Hisarlık was Homeric Troy. Nor did it give dates for the stratum. In the end – with great effort – Bötticher was persuaded. He acknowledged the protocol and retracted his accusations, but he did not sign. He also refused to make a public apology and left Hisarlık on 6 December.

Schliemann discovered two Greek inscriptions during that excavation. On 31 October, while digging under Schliemann’s direction, Frank Calvert discovered a fourth-century necropolis at Hisarlık. However, since permission to excavate Ancient cemeteries in the Troad was difficult to obtain, this was kept a well-guarded secret.

Despite retracting his accusations at Hisarlık, once Bötticher left the site he resumed his criticisms of Schliemann. He resurrected his burnt necropolis theory and gained increasing scholarly acceptance, whereupon Schliemann resolved to host a second, larger international conference. He lost no time in inviting scholars and made preparations to resume excavations, which he launched on 1 March 1890. Gradually, scholars arrived at the site. The participants of the second Hisarlık conference between March 23 and April 7 included Osman Hamdi Bey, director of the Ottoman Imperial Museum; his brother, colleague and future successor, Halil Edhem Bey (1861-1938); Carl Humann; Friedrich von Duhn (1851-1930), professor of Classical Archaeology from Heidelberg; Charles Waldstein (1856-1927), director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens; Wilhelm Grempler (1826-1907) from Breslau, a member of the German Society for Anthropology, Ethnography and Prehistory; and the French Near Eastern Archaeology specialist Charles L.H. Babin (1860-1932) and his wife. Frank Calvert, Virchow and Dörpfeld were also present (Fig. 36).
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Osman Hamdi’s presence is striking. After twenty years of insolence towards the Ottomans, was Schliemann finally about to show respect for Ottoman involvement in Classical archaeology? Did he believe that it was appropriate for a prominent Ottoman figure to attend the conference and take part in interpreting the archaeology of Troy? Osman Hamdi Bey’s invitation should be seen in perspective, since Schliemann’s letter to Humann on 20 August 1890 shows that Schliemann invited him merely on Humann’s advice since Osman Hamdi’s attendance at the conference was needed to foster goodwill. At any rate, it is obvious that Schliemann was now forced to take the Ottomans seriously and to involve them in his archaeological activities. The Ottomans accepted the invitation and sent their most senior archaeologist to Troy.

After discussing the excavation results and Schliemann’s interpretations, the conference participants signed the protocol on 30 March. This rejected Bötticher’s theories and declared that Schliemann and Dörpfeld’s plans were correct and that no sign of burnt corpses had been found at the site. This was a relief for Schliemann; yet Bötticher – not invited this time – continued to attack Schliemann. Reinach was not convinced either.

Schliemann’s Achilles’ heel in his struggle with Bötticher was his failure to find a prehistoric cemetery at Hisarlık. His excavations starting in March concentrated on the search for a cemetery and on exposing all of the house walls of Troy II. Moreover, he wanted to identify the fortification walls of each settlement. To achieve these objects, he decided to excavate outside the centre of Hisarlık. But, instead of finding buildings of the second stratum outside the walls, Schliemann and Dörpfeld discovered impressive buildings and Mycenaean pottery in the sixth stratum (Troy VI). These significant discoveries played havoc with the stratigraphy of Hisarlık: if the sixth stratum was contemporary with Mycenae, the second city had to be dated much earlier. In fact, already in 1873, Frank Calvert had pointed out that the second stratum could not be later than 2000 BC. Calvert’s view was vindicated.

The Mycenaean pottery of the sixth settlement undermined Schliemann’s identification of the second stratum as Homeric Troy. As Carl Schuchhardt,

36 The protocol text was published in Schuchhardt, *Schliemann’s Excavations*, 325–326.
who was writing a book on Schliemann’s excavations and who had visited the site, pointed out,

I witnessed only the beginning of work on the sixth city, but it was already apparent that its impressive stone buildings contained good Mycenaean pottery. Since this sixth stratum was contemporary with Mycenae, Dörpfeld regarded it as the Troy destroyed by Agamemnon. Schliemann was annoyed. He did not want to abandon the ‘Palace of Priam’ and the ‘Treasure of Helen’ from the second city and looked with displeasure at each stirrup jar that emerged from the earth.40

Given Schliemann’s particular interest in potsherds,41 Osman Hamdi and Halil Edhem Bey probably allowed him to take the potsherds found at the site.42 As he wrote to Humann, ‘It was a great idea to invite Hamdy to the congress, and to be friendly and generous to the Mancar [supervisor]. So for example Hamdy told the Mancar to allow me to take everything I had found, saying that the museum did not need these things. With regard to the broken pottery and stone items the Mancar carried out his task honestly.’43 Schliemann’s words suggest that Osman Hamdi Bey and the overseer were willing to hand over artefacts to him. Yet the text of another letter from Schliemann concerning the discovery of a council chamber, which he identified as an odeon or a small theatre, shows a totally different Ottoman attitude. In this letter to Virchow on 30 May, Schliemann states that he found ‘a beautifully preserved odeon with marble heads of Caligula, Claudius I, and the younger Faustina, all well-preserved and skilfully worked, as well as a marvellously sculpted lion. I will have to give the lion and the Claudius to the Turkish Museum, although the Turkish overseer has been ill in the Dardanelles for a long time now. The two others, however, I hope to rescue for science and for the benefit of the fatherland, but no word about this must get out; otherwise Hamdy will learn of it right away and not only cancel our firman at once but hang a suit on us too.’44 Apparently, Osman Hamdi Bey was not as obliging as Schliemann had made him appear in his previous letter to Humann.

41 Bloedow, ‘Schliemann’s Attitude to Pottery.’
42 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 288.
44 Herrmann und Maab, Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow, 545-546; See also his letter to Bismarck on 22 July 1890, Meyer, Heinrich Schliemann. Briefwechsel II, (347), 371-374.
Schliemann’s communication with Alexander Conze (1831-1914), now secretary of the German Archaeological Institute, on 9 December 1890 is also revealing on this point. Telling him about his secret discovery of a treasure, which he considered more valuable than his finds at Mycenae, he noted that he had secured the treasure from ‘Türkei’ and asked Conze ‘do not reveal the secret to anyone.’ Otherwise, ‘it will be impossible to obtain a Firman.’ To Humann, moreover, he expressed his worry about the possibility that Osman Hamdi Bey might think he had secretly discovered valuable finds. In which case, ‘he will not want to renew my Firman.’

Schliemann had promised to obey the Ottoman antiquities code. According to his permit he was bound by the requirements of the Antiquities Law. As he stated to Frank Calvert on 6 March 1890, he was allowed to excavate wherever he pleased ‘in a circuit of two days journey in diameter. But, alas, as to the antiquities to be discovered I have to submit to the new règlements.’ Nonetheless, he did smuggle important finds to Athens. His principal strategy was to reward workmen who brought objects directly to him. This tactic worked well. To get a reward, the workmen bypassed the Ottoman overseer and handed their finds to Schliemann directly, who smuggled them illegally to Athens with the help of Agis de Caravel, consul in

45 In his diary on 8 July Schliemann notes that his workman Demos discovered a major treasure: four axes of nephrite, four sceptre knobs of crystal, 50 pieces of crystal in the shape of large semi-circles and two round plaques of crystal, one iron sceptre knob, a large number of small gold objects, two clumps of bronze fragments with small gold trinkets. His biographer Traill is sceptical of the treasure. He maintains that it is quite remarkable that Schliemann, once again, found an important treasure close to the end of the season. He notes that Schliemann is inconsistent about the circumstances in which the treasure was found: Schliemann ignores Demos in his later reports and sometimes claims the presence of Dörpfeld, whereas Dörpfeld says nothing of the sort. Although Schliemann suggested that the treasure, known to scholars as Treasure L, was found at Troy II, the characteristics of the objects correspond more closely with Troy VI or VII: see Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 290-292; The objects are catalogued for the Schliemann collection in Schmidt, Heinrich Schliemann’s Sammlung trojanischer Altertümer, and Götze, ‘Die Kleingeräte aus Metall.’ See also Easton, ‘Schliemann’s Mendacity,’ and Schliemann’s letters to Schöne, 9 October 1890, (356), 382-384, to Alexander Conze, 9 December 1890, (363), 388-391 and to Gustave von Göbler (1938-1902), the German minister of culture, on 13 September 1890 (353), 379-382, all in Meyer, Heinrich Schliemann. Briefwechsel II.


49 Nationale Zeitung, 30 January 1891.
the Dardanelles for Spain and Italy. In Greece, his brother-in-law Alexandros Castromenos collected the objects.\textsuperscript{50}

Using this method, Schliemann managed to smuggle the most beautiful and significant artefacts to Athens while the excavation continued from March to the end of July, among these were Treasure L.\textsuperscript{51} Apart from the treasure, he illegally removed a decorated silver vase, 17 cm in height and nine marble chests, including the marble heads and the lion he had found in the odeon. Although Schliemann was considering handing over the head of Claudius I and the lion to the Ottomans, he found a way to avoid this too.\textsuperscript{52} This is remarkable, since the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul knew about that discovery. In fact, in a telegram to Istanbul on 8 June, the overseer Galib Bey reported the discovery of ‘an odeon and two marble statues.’\textsuperscript{53} As Schliemann had noted in his letter to Virchow on 30 May,\textsuperscript{54} perhaps Galib Bey’s illness offered an opportunity to ship the chests.

Illegally exporting artefacts was nothing new for Schliemann. His previous shipments show clearly that he always managed to find a way to circumvent laws and supervisors and to find collaborators to organize illicit shipments. Moreover, he always treated his collaborators with great respect and made a serious effort to reward them for their help: helping Schliemann was profitable. This time he also commended A. de Caravel in letters to various prominent figures, calling him the saviour of Trojan antiquities, and even tried to arrange a German medal for his services.\textsuperscript{55} The three heads are now in Berlin, but it is unclear what happened to the lion after it arrived in Athens.

The large amount of Mycenaean pottery which Schliemann discovered in the sixth stratum forced him, as Traill aptly points out, ‘to think the unthinkable,’ namely that it was not Troy II which was Homer’s Troy but

\textsuperscript{50} Trall, \textit{Schliemann of Troy}, 288.
\textsuperscript{51} See Schliemann’s outgoing letters: BBB 42/315, 42/352, 42/400 and 42/431, Schliemann Archive, Gennadius Library, American School of Classical Studies, Athens; see also Trall, \textit{Schliemann of Troy}, 288-192.
\textsuperscript{52} Treasure L, now thought to be in Moscow, and the heads in Berlin have been claimed by the Turkish government, since they were illegally removed from Turkish soil. Trall, \textit{Schliemann of Troy}, 289, 301.
\textsuperscript{53} IBA: Y.PRK.MF. 1/12, 20/L/1307 (08/06/1890).
\textsuperscript{54} Herrmann and Maab, \textit{Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow}, 545-546
in fact Troy VI. In his letter to King George of Greece on 27 July 1890, he actually hinted at this conclusion; however, he did not explicitly claim the discovery of the real Homeric Troy. The credit for finding the correct Homeric Troy went to Wilhelm Dörpfeld.

Schliemann concluded his excavation at the end of July, having resolved to resume work in March 1891, but poor health brought his plans to a halt. He died on Christmas Day 1890, before he had received his excavation permit and without finishing his life’s work.

4 Finding Troy Once More: Dörpfeld’s Excavations in 1893 and 1894

‘Rest in Peace. You have done enough,’ were Dörpfeld’s moving words at Schliemann’s funeral on 4 January 1891. Dörpfeld took over the task that Schliemann had left. He wanted to settle the issue of the new Mycenaean discoveries of the sixth stratum. He published these new discoveries in Troia und Ilion (1902), particularly the remains of two large buildings, and cautiously proposed that this stratum may have been Homer’s Troy. He explained that Troy VI contained the remains of two large buildings distinguished from the other buildings of the stratum by their dimensions, by the quality of their architecture and the strength of their walls. A plan of the layout of one of these buildings appears on page 59 of the report, revealing the form of a Greek temple or an old residential house, a Megaron.’ He continued,

Have we found one or two temples erected in prehistoric times after the destruction of Homeric Troy over the ruins of Troy II? Or were these two major buildings which we had found the inner structures of a larger castle whose surrounding wall had stood further out and was yet to be discovered? Perhaps the previously discovered wall, which was hitherto presumed to be Greek, was the outer wall of Troy VI, a Mycenaean layer? If so, Troy II must have been much older than the Trojan War and would have to cede the honour of being Homer’s Troy to Troy VI?

56 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 289, 288, 346.
57 On Wilhelm Dörpfeld, see: Goessler, Wilhelm Dörpfeld.
59 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 297.
60 ‘enthält an jener Stelle die Reste zweier grossen Gebäude, die sich durch ihre Abmessungen, durch die Güte ihrer Bauweise und durch die Stärke ihrer Mauern vor den Bauten aller anderen
Only further excavations would provide an answer to these questions. Ottoman authorities also attached special importance to a clarification of the Trojan issue and a settlement of the questions concerning the strata raised by Schliemann's final excavation. After discussing these matters at a meeting of the Education Committee and reviewing the advantages excavations might bring for the Imperial Museum, the Ministry of Public Instruction and the grand vizier decided to grant Dörpfeld permission to resume excavations at Hisarlık. The palace secretary approved Dörpfeld's request on 23 August 1892. The permit was valid for a year, on condition that Dörpfeld and his team adhered to the Ottoman Antiquities Law. Moreover, excavations were only allowed in prescribed areas, and the archaeologists had to stay away from fortifications and security zones. Sophia Schliemann funded the excavations, since she believed it was her duty to enable her husband's work to be finished.

Dörpfeld’s team included archaeologist A. Brückner, prehistorian R. Weigel and architect W. Wilberg. The discovery of the major fortification walls and strong constructions in the sixth stratum were a great relief. As Dörpfeld wrote, these discoveries substantiated the proof that Troy VI was Homer’s Troy. They also showed that Troy II was prehistoric. In fact, the stratigraphy of the site was the main focus of the researchers and the purpose of the excavations carried out by Dörpfeld and his assistants. In the end, Dörpfeld identified nine separate cities, situated on top of one another; the first five lower cities belonged to the prehistoric era, the sixth stratum was classified as the legendary Troy of the Mycenaean period and the three upper layers were identified as late Greek and Roman.

The impressive walls of Troy VI, which invited comparison with the famous walls of Troy described by Homer in the *Iliad*, were a major reason for Dörpfeld

---

62 A great deal of research has been done on the stratigraphy of Troy and the layers have been rearranged through time, but this is not the subject of this thesis. For an overview of the history of the archaeology of Troy and its stratigraphy, see: Korfmann, *Troia*, and the series *Studia Troica*. See also Kelder, Uslu, and Şerifoğlu, *Troy: City, Homer and Turkey*, in particular Chapter 2.
to propose this stratum for Homeric Troy. The possibility that Homer’s Troy was about to be positively identified enabled Dörpfeld to resume excavations the following year. The Ottomans decided to extend Dörpfeld’s permit for another year. Moreover Kaiser Wilhelm II supported Dörpfeld and funded the excavations of 1894, which started in spring and lasted until mid-July.

The excavation team consisted of scholars from various scientific fields, among them architect W. Wilberg, prehistorian A. Götze and archaeologists H. Winnefeld and H. Schmidt. Museum staffer Ahmed Bey joined the team as supervisor and representative of the Ottoman state. The excavations focused on the sixth stratum, looking for more evidence. Dörpfeld’s excitement regarding his discoveries is palpable in the excavation reports: ‘Given the stately ruins, especially the beautiful retaining walls and the mighty castle wall, there is no longer any doubt: these are the walls and towers of which Homer sang, this was the castle of Priam.’

Finally, Dörpfeld clarified the size of Troy VI and convinced many scholars. He became the archaeologist who had decided the question of Troy. Even Frank Calvert, who in an earlier period had dated Schliemann’s second stratum to between 2200 and 1800 BC, was convinced. He announced that Dörpfeld had proved the sixth city to be Homer’s Troy, and not the older, burnt second city.

This time the Ottoman authorities were dealing with an erudite partner with a serious reputation and scholarly experience. The Ottoman newspaper Servet-i Fünun emphasized Dörpfeld’s reputation as an academic and reported his discoveries and the nine different settlements he had identified. Dörpfeld acted in line with the regulations and handed in the finds he discovered at Troy. The most beautiful artefacts were included in the Troy collection of the Imperial Museum in Istanbul. Dörpfeld’s priorities were different. He was not looking for the kind of recognition Schliemann had sought. His interest was


64 Nevertheless, in the course of time the discussion over which city should be associated with Homer’s Troy would re-emerge. Dörpfeld’s successor, Carl Blegen, held that it was impossible for Troy VI to be Homer’s Troy, since an earthquake had destroyed that city. Troy VIIa, on the other hand, had been destroyed in a war. This led him to believe that Troy VIIa presented Homer’s Troy. The discussion regarding the identification of Homeric Troy with both layers VI and VIIa is still not over. Traces of fire in Troy VI are seen as possible evidence of war. On whether Homer’s *Iliad* has a basis in history, see: Latacz, *Troy and Homer*; Wood, *In Search of the Trojan War*; and Rigter and Van Wijngaarden, ‘Troy VI and VIIa in the Late Bronze Age,’ 32-35.


66 Servet-i Fünun, 25/Mart/1320, 26 (07/04/1904).
Overseeing Troy at the Turn of the Century

For all their positive experiences with Dörpfeld and his excavation team, the entrenched suspicion and caution of the Ottomans towards any activity at the Troad could not easily be assuaged. Dörpfeld’s plans to explore tumuli in the surroundings, for instance, were rejected by the authorities. Although Dörpfeld emphasized the importance of these surveys, the Ottomans could not be persuaded. They were suspicious. Ottoman documents demonstrate that visitors to the archaeological site of Troy were recorded. This was in line with the new regulations regarding foreigners, who needed formal permission to visit historic sites and monuments. Yet in addition to formal registration, it is remarkable that local officers were also instructed to observe ‘the attitude and actions’ of these visitors closely. It was not only difficult to get a permit to visit Troy at the turn of the century; once there, they were also closely watched.

In September 1894, for example, when the eminent British Admiral Edward Hobart Seymour (1840-1929) visited the site together with the British ambassador, local authorities were secretly instructed by telegram to follow their movements closely. Although this probably related to the visitor’s military position and the strategic importance of Troy and the Dardanelles, the Ottoman attitude was no different when Dörpfeld and various scholars visited the site in 1902, 1903 and 1906. In line with the regulations, permission to visit the site was granted by the Foreign Ministry, the grand vizier and the Sublime Porte respectively and finally confirmed by the sultan. Meanwhile the authorities of Biga province were ordered to keep a close but inconspicuous eye on Dörpfeld and his companions during their visit. Should they ‘detect any noticeable or suspicious act,’ this had to be reported by telegram ‘using a secret code.’

68 Dörpfeld, _Troja und Ilion_, 23.
69 He served as a Royal Navy officer in the Crimean War and became commander-in-chief of China Station in 1897.
70 IBA: Y.PRK-ASK 100/24:12/Ra/1312 (13/09/1894).
71 IBA: I.HR. 376/1319/Z-9: 21/Z/1319 (31/03/1902); DH.MKT. 702/57: 7/S/1321 (05/05/1903); I.HR. 383/1321/S-03: 1/S/1321 (29/04/1903), DH.MKT. 1074/21: 21/R/1324 (28/05/1906).
As we have seen, this was general practice. There is a long list of people, from artists to politicians and travellers of various nationalities, whose visits and activities in Troy were recorded and reported to different ministries and departments of the Ottoman state. Newspapers, too, paid attention to visitors of Troy, and informed Ottoman readers about their identities and nationalities.

However, despite efforts to regulate and inspect activities at Troy, the authorities were unable to control the archaeological activities in the region. Frank Calvert, who had lived in the area for decades, knew the Troad better than anyone. Although Ottoman authorities had granted no official permits to excavate in Troy after Dörpfeld's excavations, Calvert managed to continue digging clandestinely at rich, mostly unknown sites around the Troad, such as Hanay Tepe and Tavolia nearby Karanlık Limani. His private collection at Thymbra Farm, his family home, expanded tremendously around the turn of the century. Calvert kept his collection secret in order to avoid claims from the Imperial Museum. Witnesses reported that it was kept in a secret chamber which only he could enter, and it included numerous items from various historical periods. Thymbra Farm would serve as military quarters for the Ottomans during the Battle of Gallipoli in 1915-1916.

In 1900, Calvert donated nine acres of land at Hisarlık to the Imperial Museum. Clearly pleased by this gift, the Ottomans rewarded Calvert with the highest imperial honour. In 1905, he secretly sold part of his collection to Worcester Art Museum in Worcester, Massachusetts. Other artefacts were destroyed by the earthquake of 9 August 1912, but Frank Calvert had died in 1908 and did not witness that disaster.

Meanwhile, the Ottomans were working on the regional infrastructure in order to make travelling to Troy easier. In 1901 a pier was built in Karanlık Limani harbour ‘for the visitors of the ruins of Troy.’ Troy attracted Ottoman visitors such as İhtifalçı Mehmed Ziya (1866-1930), an expert on antiquities and a member of the Ottoman Committee for the Protection of Ancient Objects, who saw the historical sites at the Troad in 1909. His account of this visit reflects the vivid interest in the legendary stories of Troy and the Dardanelles, in mythology and Homer, but also in Herodotus and Strabo.

72 Here a selection: IBA: Y.PRK.ASK. 205/28:10/Ca/1321 (04/08/1903); DH.MKT. 763/25:20/Ca/1321 (14/08/1903); Y.PRK.DH. 12/55:20/Ca/1321 (14/08/1903); Y.PRK.ASK. 229/24:13/R/1323 (17/06/1905); DH.MKT. 1060/80:26/M/1324 (22/03/1906); DH.MKT. 1152/89:28/M/1325 (13/03/1907).
73 İkdam, 03 Kanun-i evvel 1313 (15/12/1897).
74 In the 1930s Frank Calvert’s family gave what remained of the Calvert Collection to Çanakkale Archaeological Museum. In Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 231-245.
75 IBA: DH.MKT. 2512/102:5/Ra/1319 (22/06/1901).
Homer and Troy within Ottoman Society in the Wake of the First World War

The neo-Hellenist movement, launched by leading intellectuals Yahya Kemal (1884-1958) and Yakub Kadri (1889-1974) in 1912, stimulated interest in Homer and Troy. The impressive Esâtîr-i Yunaniyan (Greek mythology) by Mehmed Tevfik Pasha (1855-1915), published in 1913, was a kind of manifesto of Ottoman neo-Hellenism. Homer received extensive treatment in this 762-page volume, a product of the zeitgeist of the progressive late Ottoman period (Fig. 38).77

Adherents of the neo-Hellenist movement published articles extolling Classical Antiquity in newspapers and magazines and regarded Classical culture as an example for Turkish literature and arts. Critics of these neo-Hellenist ideas raised objections during the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. A cartoon by Sedat Nuri showing Yahya Kemal (1884-1958) in Ancient costume appeared in Peyam-i Edebi, the literary supplement of the newspaper Peyam, on 26 January 1914. The sceptical text accompanying the cartoon derided Yakub Kadri as ‘a neo-Hellenist poet, his work is unpublished, just like Homer he declaims’ (Fig. 39).78

Reports published in Ottoman periodicals made visiting Troy fashionable. A detailed travel account appeared in Şehbal in 1913, with illustrations (Fig. 40). This delightful piece explains that the best way to reach the ruins of Troy was by ‘asking the drivers in Çanakkale to bring you to the place of Hisarlık. Upon leaving Çanakkale the coastal road will be followed. After one and a half hours, this road will take a curve to the left and go uphill. At that moment you will enter a quite beautiful pinewood. The panoramic view from the peak of the slope is very lovely. On one side the view of the city of Çanakkale and on the other side the panorama through the pine trees of the Dardanelles stretching like a blue ground, is astonishing. And one remembers all the civilizations that came here and have been destroyed.’79

Not only the route to the ruins of Troy was painted in glowing terms, the author also devoted attention to the Trojans and the Trojan War. According to the writer, Cemal, the famous Trojan War was a battle between Greek city-states led by Agamemnon and ‘the very important people who inhabited Troy, with other Asian people who were united to defend the country, led

77 Tevfik, Esâtîr-i Yunâniyan; and Ayvazoğlu, ‘Neo-Hellenism in Turkey.’
78 Nuri, [cartoon]. For the neo-Hellenist movement in the Ottoman Empire, see: Ayvazoğlu, Yahya Kemal; Karaosmanoğlu, Gençlik ve Edebiyat Hıtraları; Ayvazoğlu, ‘Neo-Hellenism in Turkey.’
79 Cemal, Şehbal, 3/68, 394, 1 Kanun-i sani 1328 (14/01/1913).
by the celebrated Hector.’ Again, the Asian origins of the Trojans were emphasized, which made Turkish identification with the Trojans easier.

After discussing the fall of Troy, the report highlights the development of the various settlements at the mound of Hisarlık and the discoveries made by the Ottoman army while digging trenches in preparation of the Ottoman-Italian War (1911-1912). The author noted that these discoveries showed Troy to have been much larger than the mound at Hisarlık. The piece then discusses Heinrich Schliemann’s excavations, ‘who took a lot of objects with him, among them fairly precious weapons and vases.’

It concludes with a striking characterization of Troy as ‘one of the historical treasures of our nation,’ which demonstrates not only the appropriation of the history of the Empire’s territories and its remains, but also the key position of Troy within Ottoman society in the wake of the First World War, a conflagration that brought an end to the Ottoman Empire.

Figure 35  Original drawing of the façade of the main building of the Imperial Museum

Source: Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi

80  The war between the Ottoman Empire and Italy is called the Tripolitanian War in Turkey and the Libyan War in Italy. It started in September 1911 and ended in October 1912. The Empire lost and Italy occupied the last Ottoman provinces in Africa; Tripolitana, Fezzan and Cyrenaica (together Libya). The Italians also captured the Dodecanese islands in the Aegean. The Ottoman-Italian War showed the Empire’s political and military weakness; even more, it encouraged the Balkan provinces to combine and remove the Ottomans from Europe. This led to the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. See: Zürcher, Turkey, 106-109.

81  Şehbal, i Kanun-i sani 1328 (14/01/1913).
Figure 36  Hisarlık Conference, 1890

Source: Collection of Museum für Ur- und Frühgeschichte, Berlin, in Allen, *Finding the Walls of Troy*

Standing from left: Virchow, Grempler, Halil Bey, Schliemann, Edith Calvert, Dörpfeld, Madame Babin, Babin, Duhn and Humann. Seated: Calvert, Osman Hamdi Bey and Waldstein

Figure 37  Thymbra Farm served as military quarters for the Ottomans during the Battle of Gallipoli in 1915/1916

Source: Collection Çanakkale Deniz Museum

Photo: Geert Snoeijer, 2012
Greek mythology is discussed extensively in this book. This 762-page volume reflects the zeitgeist of the progressive late Ottoman period in which Homer and Greek mythology gained an increasing place in the Ottoman-Turkish intellectual world.
Two leading intellectuals, Yahya Kemal and Yakub Kadri (1889-1974), launched the Turkish neo-Hellenist movement in 1912. Adherents published articles about Classical Antiquity in newspapers and magazines and extolling Classical culture as an example for Turkish literature and arts. Critics of neo-Hellenist ideas were spurred by the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. In this critical cartoon, Yakub Kadri is ‘a neo-Hellenist poet, his work is unpublished, just like Homer he declaims.’
This detailed, illustrated travel report appeared in Şehbal, a periodical, in 1913. The author, Cemal, described the Trojan War as a battle between Greek city-states led by Agamemnon, and ‘the very important people who inhabited Troy, with other Asian people who were united to defend the country, led by the celebrated Hector.’ This emphasis on the Asian origins of the Trojans encouraged Ottoman-Turkish identification with the Trojans.
Figure 41  Times War Atlas (1914)

Source: Bijzondere Collecties, University of Amsterdam