Figures of modernity: Heinrich Schliemann, Kate Field and a Smithsonian Collection
Georgia Flouda

This paper tells the extraordinary story of the ‘Schliemann collection’, an unpublished collection of 177 artefacts excavated in Troy in the nineteenth century and bequeathed in 1893 to the Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of Natural History, in Washington, DC. Specifically, it explores through archival research the role of Heinrich Schliemann, the entrepreneur and archaeologist, and how his approach to archaeology encapsulated universal aspects of Western modernity, including the connection with capital and maintaining a high public profile. The renowned American journalist Kate Field is another key figure, as she lobbied for Schliemann and publicized his archaeological activity in England and the United States. This coincided with Schliemann’s wish to be appointed as a US Consul to Greece; in return, he planned to donate the entire Trojan Collection to the Smithsonian Institution. Although this did not come to pass during his lifetime, Sophia Schliemann selected 177 Trojan artefacts for donation to the Smithsonian after Schliemann’s death. The gift made the archaeology of the distant Troas — at that point a part of the Ottoman Empire — a subject of public interest for the Americans. The paper concludes with reflections on the mobility of the Trojan artefacts after their excavation, and on the layers of meanings with which the Smithsonian’s ‘Schliemann Collection’ was ultimately imbued.

The ‘Schliemann collection’
Traditionally, the beginnings of archaeology have been regarded as interwoven with imperialism, colonialism and capitalism, three social phenomena that even today provide the discipline with theoretical and methodological paradigms. Archaeological explorations were first initiated by enterprising traders, travellers, antiquarians and scholars from various
professional societies, or colonial missions funded by great museums. The second half of the nineteenth century also saw the foundation of numerous museums in many colonies. Heinrich Schliemann (1822–1890), a nineteenth-century autodidact patron of archaeology and a pioneer, stands out as a controversial and exceptional figure. While he had roots in an imperialist Eurocentric context, he represents a departure from the antiquarian of his era, who was driven mostly by connoisseurship and a quest for ancient artefacts suitable for a ‘Cabinet of Curiosities’. Although his excavation techniques were often far from successful, Schliemann deserves credit for developing the concept of stratigraphy as a means of reconstructing successions of deposition and establishing relative chronologies. This fact made him popular not only in the eyes of pioneer British archaeologists, such as Arthur Evans, but also Sigmund Freud, who saw in excavation a metaphor for his psychoanalytic method of exploring the unconscious. Moreover, due to his independence from the traditional authority structures of academic discourse, Schliemann was able to champion methodological concepts, such as drawing and photography of the finds, the use of painted pottery specimens as diagnostic tools for dating archaeological levels and interdisciplinary collaboration focused on scientific analyses. Despite the controversial assessments of his personality that have provoked much discussion, he is rightly considered one of the founding fathers of archaeology as a ‘self-conscious scientific discipline’ during the second half of the nineteenth century, and the archaeologist who initiated the field of Aegean prehistory.

This paper draws inspiration from Kathy Gere’s recent characterization of Schliemann as a ‘prophet of modernism’, and explores how facets of Schliemann’s archaeological conduct encapsulated specific universal aspects of the nineteenth-century ‘global transformation’, usually termed Western modernity, such as the connection with capital and the promotion of a public persona. The last quarter of the nineteenth century, during which Schliemann’s intense activity as an archaeologist unfolded, was also marked by the genesis of ‘the modern Museum idea’ through a union of private benefaction and public reform. Consequently, this paper takes as a case study an unpublished collection of 177
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artefacts, bequeathed to the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of Natural History in Washington, DC, as the ‘Schliemann collection’ (accession number 27023),¹⁴ and seeks to set the story in historiographic context.

The relevant objects originate from the excavations that Schliemann conducted at Hisarlık (or Hissarlık), the ancient site of Troy, and are no longer on display. Employed in the recent past as exhibits of a significant World Heritage site, these objects have an intriguing ‘biography’ as itinerant objects that transcended ethnic boundaries. Specifically, they have travelled from the grounds of Troy, which at the time of their discovery was part of the late Ottoman Empire, to the private home of Schliemann in Greece and, ultimately, to Washington, DC. In the following, I shall reconstruct through archival testimonies the ‘itineraries’ these artefacts followed as a result of their excavator’s agency.¹⁵ The ‘birth’ and the ‘after-life’ of the ‘Schliemann collection’ will emerge from the discussion on the background of their donation through the influence of the US journalist Kate Field (Fig. 1),

¹⁴ See online database: http://collections.si.edu/search/results.htm?q=schliemann%2C+heinrich
¹⁵ On the concept of ‘itineraries’ of objects, see Hahn & Weiss 2013.
who promoted Schliemann’s publicity through reports she published in the press.\(^{16}\) In this framework, I shall also discuss how related aspects of Schliemann’s actions and priorities fit within intellectual dimensions of modernity, such as individual self-consciousness, ideologies of progress and a rational cultural spirit.\(^{17}\) Extending the analysis from the emerging historiographic points, the paper concludes with reflections on the mobility of the Trojan artefacts after their excavation, and on the layers of meanings with which the Smithsonian’s ‘Schliemann collection’ was ultimately imbued.

**The USA connection and Schliemann’s American citizenship**

Originally a German native and citizen, Heinrich Schliemann took up Russian citizenship in 1848 at St Petersburg, where he was based as a successful entrepreneur,\(^{18}\) i.e. before he married his first wife, Jekaterina Petrowna Lyshina (1826–1896) in 1852.\(^{19}\) Nevertheless, his restless spirit led him to one of his most legendary journeys, his first trip to America in 1850–1851. This experience is memorialized by his American travel journal,\(^{20}\) an intimate and detailed account of how he made his second fortune within a period of fourteen months thanks to his participation in the Californian gold rush.\(^{21}\) Although in his mythologizing autobiography, Schliemann states that he travelled to the USA, to Sacramento, due to the death of his brother, Ludwig, from typhoid,\(^{22}\) the opening lines of the journal underline two central aspects of his personality: his intellectual curiosity and his love for travel, which made him a cosmopolitan citizen of the world: “The irresistible desire to travel and to see the world prompted me to leave St Petersburg again on the 10 December 1850 (sic)”.\(^{23}\)

Moreover, his bourgeois self-consciousness is vividly demonstrated as he probably introduced himself to the White House as a wealthy businessman from St Petersburg.\(^{24}\) By May 1851, he had started a thriving banking business in San Francisco,\(^{25}\) acting as an agent for cash transactions between the Rothschild ownership and other business.\(^{26}\) In order to advertise his services in the newspaper *Sacramento Union* on 27 September he used the Americanized version of his name, ‘Henry’. One year later, on 7 April 1852, he sold his bank and travelled first to Europe and, finally, to St Petersburg.
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Long after his established entrepreneurial ventures in America, Schliemann stated in his autobiography (1881) that he had become an American citizen in 1850 during his stay in California. He most probably aimed to promote his image in the US due to aspirations he developed at this late stage in his life, as will be discussed below. However, this statement proves inaccurate according to the official documents, which are held along with the thousands of letters and papers written by Schliemann at the Gennadius Library-Schliemann Archive in Athens. Although the process started with an application in 1851, for unknown reasons Schliemann only attained his citizenship in 1869, as confirmed through three documents of the Superior Court of the City of New York. More importantly, American citizenship enabled Schliemann to file his petition for divorce from his Russian wife, and to follow a new path in life by marrying the Greek Sophia Engastromenos (1852–1932), as well as to embark on his plans for archaeological explorations in the Troas.

An avid excavator-collector is born (1870)

When Schliemann started his excavations in 1870, prehistoric archaeology was still in its infancy, and was not yet institutionalized in the universities. Although Frank Calvert, an American Consul, preceded Schliemann in conducting systematic excavations in the area of the mound at Hisarlık Tepe (in the 1850s), Schliemann was the one who actually initiated the exploration of mythical sites on both sides of the Aegean. Moreover, through his excavation campaigns Schliemann established the relevance of the Homeric Iliad and of classical Greek tradition, an important constituent of the humanistic education to the cultural heritage of the West. It was precisely his free spirit, driven by the lack of tutored education, which allowed him to view the Homeric poems and the Greek myths not as sagas but as literal histories and, as such, to search for their material remains in an empirical way that was suited to the rational cultural spirit of the era. Influenced by the current scientific empiricism, he explored aspects of everyday life and elements of progress through the archaeological record by introducing the methodological value of studying the small finds of clay, metal and bone as well as plant residues.

Although Schliemann still adhered to the values of antiquarianism dictating the creation of archaeological collections, he did not follow the prevailing custom of providing funds for the purchase of antiquities from art dealers. The circumstances in which he started his first excavations at Hisarlık, 9–19 April 1870, without an excavation permit, are well known. As the ground was on a Turkish private estate, he was forced to stop excavating
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until he was granted an official excavation permit through a decree (‘firman’) of the Ottoman empire, through the mediation of John P. Brown, diplomatic agent of the United States in Istanbul.\(^{35}\) The decree entitled him to keep half of his excavation finds and to give the other half to the Imperial Museum in Istanbul.\(^{36}\) Despite this agreement, in 1873 he managed to smuggle what he called ‘Priam’s Treasure’ out of Hisarlık and to hide it in Athens.\(^{37}\) Contrary to what has been suggested, he did not intend to sell the collection.\(^{38}\) This is revealed by the fact that he initially communicated his intention to ultimately bequeath it to the Greek State, along with the material from the excavations he intended to pursue at Mycenae and Olympia, provided that his application for an excavation permit be approved.\(^{39}\) In 1874, after the rejection of this plan, which ran contrary to the Greek Archaeological Law, the Ottoman government started legal action against Schliemann in Athens, but finally agreed to receive financial compensation of 50,000 francs from him.\(^{40}\)

Schliemann’s letter to S.E. Safvet Pacha, the Ottoman Minister of Public Instruction, in which he asks for a firman in order to continue his excavations at Hisarlık (in French, dated ‘Constantinople 6 Janvier (?) 1876’), reveals the pride he took in his self-financed project. Moreover, the unpublished draft (in Greek) of this application for an excavation permit\(^{41}\) sheds some light on his belief in the future legacy of the excavations at Hisarlık. In this application, Schliemann also insists on his right to obtain the ancient objects that were not kept by the Istanbul Museum. He starts by saying that Safvet Pacha and Djebdit Pacha (Minister of Public Education) had assigned Isset Efendi as his overseer. He then forcibly defends his right to continue his excavations immediately: “…to have the right to draw (the finds) as well as the undoubted and perpetual right to choose both his own workmen and foremen, and to receive the objects, which will be ‘rejected’ as useless by the Imperial Museum, (translation by the author).

At the end of his letter he threatens that he will stop his excavations forever if Isset Efendi continues to cause difficulties for him, he will stop his excavations forever, in which case nobody will ever continue the work. He also gives his personal view on his explorations, which by modern standards indirectly demonstrates the commodification of the antiquities,\(^{42}\)
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as he assigns value to them in terms of the cost invested in their excavation: “…and then not a single remarkable person and not even a government will be found in order to continue these ‘gigantic’ excavations, which demand the expenditure of 22 pounds a day (translation by the author”.

Schliemann’s Smithsonian plans and the Smithsonian Institution
Schliemann’s intention to donate the Trojan collection to the ‘United States National Museum at the Smithsonian Institution’ in Washington, DC, can be traced back to 1878, as argued by Arndt (1981), through archival sources held at the Boston Public Library and the National Archives and Records Administration (N.A.R.A.). It is noteworthy that at this point archaeology was still developing as a discipline in the United States, despite its public appeal in American modernist circles. Whereas scholars of west-European nations had by then taken the lead in organizing postcolonial archaeological expeditions throughout the Mediterranean, the Archaeological Institute of America had just been founded in May 1879. At about the same time, the first efforts were taken to establish an American presence in classical archaeology. At this formative stage, the Smithsonian Institution possibly provided an attractive challenge in Schliemann’s eyes, because it was just being established as a museum and educational institution, which was meant to promote the aims of Enlightenment. Nonetheless, one cannot dismiss the possibility that Schliemann’s motivations for the donation to an American museum were also connected with his social image. German scholars had adopted a very critical stance to his work after the 1874 publication of his book Troy and Its Remains. As a result, Schliemann was often widely ridiculed in the newspapers, even with cartoons.

Although many influential or prominent personalities, such as Arthur Evans, sought to make his acquaintance, and he, also, cultivated contact with European royalty through correspondence and occasional gifts, it is worth exploring how a particular social network provided ground for Schliemann’s intentions with respect to the Smithsonian Institution. Mary Katherine Keemle or ‘Kate’ Field (1838–1896), one of the first American celebrity journalists, who featured prominently in the late nineteenth-century intellectual and social life in the USA and also in Europe, was instrumental in this respect. The publication of Field’s correspondence by Moss (ed, 1996) offers significant glimpses into her influence in literary circles in Florence and European society in general, as well as her connections with prominent personalities such as Anthony Graham Bell, Sir William Gladstone and the British novelists Charles Dickens and Anthony Trollope. Schliemann’s acquaintance and correspondence with her was initiated on 28 March 1877, during his visit to London, where
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Field was living at the time and working as a freelance-journalist reporting for American newspapers. The reception of Schliemann’s excavations in England was enthusiastic, largely due to Gladstone’s mediation. In introducing Schliemann’s lecture to the Society of Antiquaries on 24 June 1875,49 Gladstone had publicly stated that ‘a real objective Troy is thus, for the first time presented to our view’.50 In March 1877, when Schliemann and Sophia were pronounced as honorary members of the same Society in the presence of Gladstone,51 Field developed a strong interest in Schliemann. Thus, in a letter to him (Figs. 2a-b), addressed to Charing Cross Hotel/London, Field declares in a confident tone her strong interest in interviewing the excavator. She writes that she was informed by their mutual friend, Luigi Palma di Cesnola (1832–1904), the first Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (1879–1904):

(…that you are not averse to discussing the subject of your excavations with members of the American Press. As a representative of the New York Herald I should be glad to have you call upon me with a view to publicizing whatever might be of interest to the public in the conversation that would ensue. I am a busy person but can devote Saturday morning to you if you can spare the time for such a purpose.)

Her letter to L.P. Cesnola is also included in the Schliemann Family Papers, at the Gennadius Library.53 Field’s connection with Schliemann continued through letters and meetings (Gennadius Archive/Box 73, nos 299, 323; Box 74, nos 450, 473; Box 73, no. 444), and Schliemann’s visit to her house on 4 May 1877 (Box 74, No 553).

Finally, her article was published in the New York Tribune on 8 September 1877 (announced by her to Schliemann in a letter, cf. Box 74, no 857). This article must have generated more interest on Troy in American circles, which culminated in a series of lectures, both private and public, in Washington, DC, such as the one announced in October 1877 on the Supplement of the Young Men’s Christian Association Weekly Bulletin and archived by Schliemann himself:

(… Chauncey Hickox, ESQ., will lecture on ‘Ancient Troy’. Many have heard Mr. Hickox’s private lectures on Troy, ‘once fabled’, but now known to history through the discoveries of Schliemann; and we may expect in this public lecture one of intense interest, bringing U.S. into vivid association with the races of the past (see Gennadius Archive/Box 75, no 930a–d).
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Figs. 2a-b. Letter from Kate Field to Heinrich Schliemann (28 March 1877). © Heinrich Schliemann Papers, Gennadius Library/American School of Classical Studies at Athens, no. B_073_F3_237a-B_073_F3_237b.
Contact with Kate Field was maintained after ‘Priam’s Treasure’ was exhibited at Burlington House in December 1877 and in 1878. Correspondence between Field and Schliemann included subjects such as a lecture she gave in early December 1877, a meeting for a dinner, and Schliemann’s contribution to the Shakespeare memorial to which her efforts were directed at the time (March 1878). Nevertheless, the turning point was the year 1878, when Schliemann aspired to benefit from his American citizenship and to be appointed as the US delegate to the Ethnographic section in the Universal Exhibition in Paris, which Field was promoting, or as a US consul to Greece in return for his intended donation to the Smithsonian Institution. This is suggested by his letter to Field dated 28 March 1878, in which he declares:

I am very ambitious to be nominated by the American government as delegate at the Ethnographic section in the Universal Exhibition in Paris… Or could you perhaps manage to get me nominated US consul for Athens or the Piraeus? I mean of course as unpaid consul. I merely aspire to the dignity of an employ by the US government, and would of course amply reward the Smithsonian Hall in Washington by gifts of antiquities for the honor the govt. might bestow upon me by their nomination.

I would like to suggest that Schliemann’s wish to promote his presence in the Greek capital, where he had permanently settled in 1871, with a diplomatic office was mostly due to consular privileges and immunities which would indirectly facilitate his excavations at the Troas and in Greece. He probably conceived his plan to donate his Trojan Collection to the Smithsonian following the news about the foundation of a National Museum at the Smithsonian Institution, which was authorized by Congress in the framework of the American Centennial. Dr George Brown Goode (1850–1896), a historian of science and an intellectual of evolutionism responsible for collecting objects of Natural History, started organizing the display in the new National Museum building (now known as the Arts and Industries Building). His project was meant to mark a departure from the historicist outlook that traditionally underlined the Smithsonian Institution’s principles for exhibiting artefacts.
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Field reacted positively to Schliemann’s aspirations through a swift reply (dated 2 April 1878). Acknowledging gratitude for his ‘generous contribution’ to the Shakespeare memorial, she informed him that she would inquire about his candidacy for the Athens Consulship. Regarding her lobbying efforts, she also adds:

The bearer of this letter is Mr Edward King correspondent of the Boston Journal whom you met with me at the South Kensington Museum. He says he thinks he knows the very man from whom the Ethnographic appointment can be obtained in Paris. Mr King will communicate with you, and should he fail in his efforts (which is not likely), he will let me know.

Her next letter to Schliemann, on 25 April 1878, (Figs. 3a–b) suggests her efforts to exert her influence on his consular appointment. Subsequently, Schliemann informs her on 30 June 1878 that according to US sources the American government was eager to restore the office of a Consul General in Athens, and asks for her instructions: ‘In case I have to write to anybody in the US on the subject please give me all the details of what I have to write and to whom’. On 28 January 1879, Field informs Schliemann that she was also using her connections with the American press in order to publicize his candidacy for a consulship: ‘Gen. Noyes has sent my letter about Consulate to Washington. The New York Herald promises to advocate your appointment.’ It has been supported that Schliemann’s initially unfavourable attitude towards Germany was reversed by early September 1879 through the influence of his new collaborator, the German anthropologist Rudolf Virchow, to the extent that Schliemann finally decided to bequeath his entire collection of antiquities to the German Nation. However, the last letters of Schliemann’s correspondence to Field suggest that he made this decision after his plan for a US consulate turned out unsuccessful. An excerpt from a letter from Field (Figs. 4a–b), dated 27 June 1879, reveals that despite her lobbying endeavours it seemed impossible to bypass official US politics, so that Schliemann would be appointed as consul.
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Figs. 3a–b. Letter from Kate Field to Heinrich Schliemann (25 April 1878). Photo: ©Heinrich Schliemann Papers, Gennadius Library/American School of Classical Studies at Athens, no. B_076_F4_256a-B_076_F4_256b.
Figs. 4a-b. Letter from Kate Field to Heinrich Schliemann (27 June 1879). Photo: ©Heinrich Schliemann Papers, Gennadius Library/American School of Classical Studies at Athens, no. B_080_F1_447a-B_080_F1_447b.
Now with regard to the Consulate, I've written to Washington and many journals have printed paragraphs to the effect that it would be a capital idea to make you consul at Athens; but Gen. (Robert Sanderson) McCormick whom you saw in Persia writes that so long as Gen. Read wants to remain at Athens nobody else has a chance. My advice is for you to watch Gen. Read closely and the moments you find that he has taken leave of Greece, to put your claim.

The correspondence between Schliemann and Field seems to have been interrupted after that point. Only speculations can be made as to why the Federal government did not proclaim Schliemann a US consul. Academic scepticism with regard to him was essentially overcome by then through the involvement of Rudolf Virchow and the architect Wilhelm Dörpfeld (1853–1940) in the last seasons of the Trojan excavations. Naturally, the US government’s intention may have been to ensure political neutrality, so that they would not appear to be promoting Schliemann’s expedition to the Troas. In any case, the formal excuse was that a former US Minister to Greece (General Read) had personal interests in the Athens consulship. Schliemann’s connection to Kate Field was so close that he accordingly notified her of his decision to donate the Trojan collection to Germany on 15 January 1881. He also personally took care of the collection’s shipment from the South Kensington Museum in London, where they had been exhibited from 1877 until 1880, to the Kunsgewerbemuseum at Berlin. Both Heinrich and Sophia worked on the installation of the exhibits in the summer of 1881, and the exhibition opened on 7 February 1882. The donation was received enthusiastically, Schliemann was granted honorary citizenship of Berlin and the German newspapers did not stop reporting on the Trojan Collection before the end of the year.

In America the publicity relating to Schliemann’s archaeological activities was maintained from 1880 until his death in 1890, as reports appeared regularly in various newspapers in the state of California. Excerpts such as the following from an article published in the 17 March 1884 issue of the newspaper Daily Alta California most certainly contributed to cultivating his upper-class magnate profile in the USA by stating that: ‘Dr. Henry Schliemann, the discoverer and explorer of the ruins of Troy, lives in a splendid marble palace at Athens’.

However, the donation to Berlin eventually gave rise to cynical remarks, as revealed by a few lines in the Daily Alta California from 2 December 1887:
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Dr. Schliemann’s will leaves his archaeological museum to Berlin (sic). Schliemann used to buy gold dust in Sacramento, and got his start in life in this state. He might have sent some of his articles of ‘virtue and bigotry’ to our university.\footnote{Arentzen 2014, 71.}

Two unpublished documents held at the National Archive of Monuments in Athens referring to material imported to Greece from Troy in 1879 and in 1885 form our unique source as to what constituted Schliemann’s collection in Athens after the transfer of ‘Priam’s Treasure’ to London (1877) and the donation of the antiquities to Berlin (1881). The document that dates from June 1879\footnote{National Archive of Monuments at Athens, Box 523 folder 457/18, document no. 4178/2280 of 5-6-1879.} also confirms that the Greek General Ephor of Antiquities P. Eustratiadis had opened and inspected 70 boxes at Piraeus.

The 1885 report submitted by Panagis Kavvadias, the Greek General Ephor of Antiquities, also offers valuable insights into Schliemann’s practice of expatriating archaeological finds. Kavvadias specifically states that he opened and inspected at the Customs House in Piraeus 25 boxes of Trojan antiquities; these were imported by Schliemann from Constantinople through the German Ambassador von Radowitz.\footnote{National Archive of Monuments at Athens, Box 523 folder 487/1, document no. 3508/4778 of 24-10-1885.} According to a report by Schliemann himself, submitted to the Greek Ministry of Education,\footnote{National Archive of Monuments at Athens, document no. 14437/19-10-1885.} the importation took place in accordance with the Greek Archaeological Law. In his report, Schliemann declares that he had managed to buy from the Istanbul Imperial Museum his share of the 1878, 1879 and 1882 excavation campaigns, and adds a rough list. He also states his wish to donate a few boxes to the Copenhagen museum and some boxes of sherds from the Tumuli of the Troas to the ‘Berlin Schliemann Museum’.\footnote{’Αγαθή τύχη ωνησάμην από του εν Κωνσταντινουπόλει αυτοκρατορικού Τουρκικού Μουσείου όσας τρωικάς αρχαιότητας αυτό ειλήχει εν έτει αωοη΄, αωοθ and αωπβ΄ τα υπʹ εμού εν Τροία ανακαλυφθέντα προς εμέ μεριζόμενο. Ωστε τω επιόντι Σαββάτω ο της Γερμανίας πρεσβευτής φον Ράδοβιτς στέλλει εμοί δεκα του σημερινού αυτοκινήτου.}

On 16 January 1889 Schliemann’s official will was submitted to the National Bank of Greece through the US Consul Mollitt, who subsequently certified it in a document issued on 26 January 1889.\footnote{Korres 1974.} The will was also certified by the bank through an unpublished formal document held at the National Archive of Monuments at Athens.\footnote{National Archive of Monuments at Athens, Box 523, protocol no. 140/1889.}

The following excerpt from Schliemann’s handwritten ‘Testament-Entwurf’ (1889) mentions the Trojan antiquities without any reference to specimens destined for the Smithsonian Institution, suggesting that Schliemann did not intend to donate anything to the latter when he wrote his will:

\footnote{National Archive of Monuments at Athens, Box 523 folder 487/1, document no. 3508/4778 of 24-10-1885.}
I give, as their portion of the inheritance, to my children Andromache (born in May 1871) and Agamemnon (born in March 1878) all the remaining part of my moveable and immovable property which would be found after my death, excepting forever, my house Iliou Melathron and the peristyle belonging to it, in University Street, Athens; because this house with the house-site belonging to it, I have given with the furniture of every sort and with the library and my antiquities (the Trojan antiquities, being, however, excepted) to my present wife Sophia Schliemann, born Engastromenos and which is to be found in the envelope of the will… I definitively give to the Schliemann collection in the building of the new Ethnological Museum in Berlin the entire collection of the Trojan Antiquities, of which those made of bronze are to be found in two of the cupboards in my office, and all the rest in the four halls or rooms on the ground floor of my house in Athens. In due time I obtained from the Greek Ministry the permission for exporting again my Trojan collection. The original of this permission was deposited in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Berlin and copy thereof is to be found in the iron cupboard in my office.

Despite this will, after Schliemann’s death 177 archaeological objects from Troy were bequeathed to the Smithsonian Institution in 1893 by his widow. These include a broad range of artefacts, including clay vessels, clay loom weights and spindle whorls, stone objects (such as tools and a mould, weights and idols), bone utensils, and various bronze artefacts. A cast of a Trojan marble relief excavated in 1873 was also presented to the Smithsonian Institution and deposited in the Corcoran Art Gallery in Washington, DC. I would like to suggest that the donation to the Smithsonian Institution can be attributed to Sophia Schliemann’s wish to keep alive her husband’s legacy as an American citizen and archaeologist in the capital of the United States and, also, to the intervention of Truxtun Beale, a US diplomat. The latter had served as ‘envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary’ to Greece in 1892 and 1893. Beale came from the wealthy Californian family that owned Decatur House, located in Lafayette Square across from the White House. According to an account published in the American press, Sophia Schliemann had initially negotiated the donation with A. Louden Snowden, the previous American minister

85 Harney 1978, 4.
86 See Wright 2015, ‘Appendix 3. List of Articles deposited by the Smithsonian Institution and to the Corcoran Art-Gallery, Washington’.
87 At the same time he served as Minister Resident/Consul General of Yugoslavia and Romania, see https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/people/beale-truxtun
88 Letter of Truxtun Beale to John W. Foster, Secretary of the State – Washington DC (SMNH archive). At the time of the donation to the Smithsonian, Harilaos Trikoupis served as the Greek Prime Minister (1833–1896).
to the court of the King of the Hellenes and a native of Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{90} In the end, she was persuaded by Truxtun Beale to donate the archaeological objects to the National Museum (now Museum of Natural History) at the Smithsonian Institution.\textsuperscript{91} This was by no means exceptional, as in 1892 she had also bequeathed a similar collection to the National Archaeological Museum at Athens,\textsuperscript{92} which was officially founded with a royal decree in 1893 in order to protect the cultural identity of the Greek State.\textsuperscript{93}

The Heinrich Schliemann Collection of the National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 32 specimens of which are exhibited today, is a small but representative collection of antiquities, consisting of clay vases, stone idols and gold jewels, as well as stone, bone and bronze tools from Troy. Korres (1977, 145) has suggested that clay vessels and other objects dating to the Troy II stratigraphic horizon were specifically donated both to the National Museum at Athens and to the Smithsonian Institution. This paper proposes that the Smithsonian Collection, which forms a heterogeneous assemblage of objects, in fact provides an overview of the most important stratigraphic horizons comprising Troy II to Troy V, which date from the Early Bronze Age II to the Middle Bronze Age. So, the characteristic clay two-handled cup with a tall cylindrical body, conventionally called ‘depas amphikypellon’, is represented by three examples in the collection.\textsuperscript{94} The ‘depas’ is commonly encountered during the so-called Anatolian Trade Network Period, which covers the later part of the Early Bronze Age II and the Early Bronze Age III (later Troy III contexts and onwards) in the Aegean and western Anatolian littoral, and is characterized by the intensified cultural interactions between these regions.\textsuperscript{95} Many other vessels, such as a rim handled tankard,\textsuperscript{96} a flask-shaped spouted jug\textsuperscript{97} and a ‘face pot’\textsuperscript{98} can be dated through close comparanda to the Early Bronze Age III. Examples of stone idols of the ‘Troy type’\textsuperscript{99} and of the ‘owl-faced type’\textsuperscript{100} from the collection are also diagnostic components of the EB III contexts in the coastal western Anatolia.

\textsuperscript{90} See How Washington got them. A Diplomatic Incident Concerning the Trojan Relics. The source of the newspaper article could not be procured. A copy of the article accompanies the NMNH Registrar’s accession file for the Schliemann Collection and was kindly given to the author by the curator, Dr. James Krakker, whose help is hereby acknowledged.

\textsuperscript{91} Beale 1954, 122.


\textsuperscript{93} Mavromichali 2014, 102–103.

\textsuperscript{94} See e.g. Şahoğlu & Sotirakopoulou (eds) 2011, 271 no. 132.

\textsuperscript{95} Şahoğlu 2004, figs. 6a, 12; 2005, 348 fig. 4; also, Şahoğlu 2011, 140.

\textsuperscript{96} It belongs to the type F IVb of two-handled tankards, see Podzuweit 1979, 158, pl. 7. According to Şahoğlu (2011, 139), ‘shoulder handled, rim handled and neck handled tankards all begin to appear contemporaneously and continue to be in use until the middle of the Early Bronze Age III’.

\textsuperscript{97} See e.g. Şahoğlu & Sotirakopoulou (eds) 2011, 350 no. 493.

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid. 278 no. 150 (from Troy) respectively.

\textsuperscript{99} Ibid. 341 no. 452, 342 no. 458, 352 no. 502.

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid. 2011, 334 nos. 387–389, 341 no. 455.
From the fact that Schliemann and his collaborators, W. Dörpfeld, R. Virchow and A. Brückner, started excavating Troy VI in the period from 1 March to 31 July 1890,\footnote{Saherwala 1985, 23. On Virchow’s visit to Troy in 1890, see Goebel & Giannopoulou (eds) 2010, 157 fig. 12.} we can infer that the objects sent to the Smithsonian Institution may also have included finds from Schliemann’s final excavation campaign. Dörpfeld himself conducted his first campaign of Troy excavations with his collaborators Brückner, Weigel and Wilberg from 1 May to 11 July 1893, and he published his report in Troja 1893,\footnote{Dörpfeld 1894, 3.} i.e. after the objects destined for the Smithsonian Collection left Greece. On the other hand, some objects of the Smithsonian collection closely reproduce a small collection of artefacts donated by Schliemann to the University of Oxford in the early 1880s,\footnote{Galanakis 2013, 64 fig. 114.} which were later transferred to the Ashmolean Museum.\footnote{In 1883, Schliemann also donated a bronze Troy II axehead to the Pitt Rivers Museum at Oxford, most probably when he received an honorary degree and an honorary fellowship from the Queen’s College, see Galanakis & Hicks 2013, 319.} This suggests the possibility that Schliemann himself had selected most of the artefacts that were later sent to the Smithsonian Institution so that they represented the progress reached by the successive settlements built at Troy. In the same way, he had presented selected assemblages of his Trojan finds to many European sovereigns, including the Queen of the Netherlands, as well as to numerous museums, such as Museo Pigorini at Rome, the Museo Civico at Bologna, and the National Museum of Denmark in Copenhagen, to name just a few.\footnote{Korres 1990, 41.} His practice of donating antiquities even extended to the ones he had acquired in the art market, such as in the case of eighteen ancient objects from Orchomenos and other sites, which he had presented to King Oscar II of Sweden and Norway.\footnote{See Seeberg 2017; these ancient objects were finally donated by the king in 1887 to the then Ethnographical Museum at Oslo (now The Museum of Cultural History, University of Oslo).}

Before their dispatch to America, the Smithsonian artefacts were catalogued by Frank Bigelow Tarbell of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.\footnote{Originally an Annual Director of the American School (1888), Tarbell became the chief executive (Secretary) of the school in 1892, but in 1893 resigned to accept a professorship in the University of Chicago (Capps 1920–1921, 9).} After an inspection by the General Ephor of Antiquities and Ephor of the Greek National Museum, Valerios Stais, they were boxed and shipped to the United States Dispatch Agent at London, B.F. Stevens.\footnote{Korres 1977, 69; also ‘Heinrich and Sofia Schliemann. The Northeastern Aegean Culture’, http://www.namuseum.gr/object-month/2010/mar/mar10-donor-en.html} On 22 March 1893, Truxtun Beale addressed a letter to John W. Foster, Secretary of State in Washington, DC, announcing the shipment of the Trojan antiquities and asking that a thank-you letter be sent to Sophia Schliemann by Dr George Brown Goode, the Director of the National Museum from 1887 to 1896.\footnote{Letter of Truxtun Beale to John W. Foster, Secretary of State- Washington, DC (SMNH archive). At the time of the donation to the Smithsonian Harilaos Trikoupis served as the Greek Prime Minister (1833–1896).} The antiquities were
accordingly received for the museum by Samuel P. Langley (1834–1906), third Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution (1887–1906). A newsletter article publicizing the donation was entitled *For the National Museum. Trojan Relics from the Mines of the Ancient City.* Thus, the legacy of Schliemann’s name was preserved, and Agamemnon, the son of Sophia and Heinrich Schliemann, was later sent to Washington, DC, as a diplomat representing Greece.\textsuperscript{111}

**Concluding thoughts**

From an anthropological perspective, the mobility of things is a phenomenon that has occurred since the beginning of time. However, in the era of rational state building, the forced ‘itineraries’ of antiquities due to archaeological expeditions also acquired new meaning and gave rise to political agendas, as suggested by the seemingly insufficient Ottoman legal framework for protecting the cultural heritage\textsuperscript{112} and the Ottoman Empire’s belated attempt to prohibit the export of antiquities since 1869.\textsuperscript{113} Above all, the primary sources from the Gennadius Library at Athens and other evidence presented here adds to our understanding of the way antiquities could be moved beyond ethnic boundaries and become instruments in a transactional approach to archaeology by archaeologist-collectors like Heinrich and Sophia Schliemann, lobbyists like Kate Field and diplomats like Truxtun Beale, in order to achieve personal advancement or to further political interests through forging diplomatic relations.

Furthermore, the ‘biography’ of the Smithsonian archaeological collection from Troy is undoubtedly intertwined with the materialistic concerns of Western modernity, as it was primarily affected by Schliemann’s progressive spirit. Milestones that helped Schliemann build his individual self-consciousness and his transnational experience were mapped out in the paper, such as his travels to America, his capitalist exploits there and most of all the granting of American citizenship to him. These key points increased his intellectual curiosity and his international outlook to the point that he later became the first entrepreneur to self-finance his large-scale excavations, his own research goals and negotiate the donation of his finds. Moreover, his effort to manipulate his public image in the United States was naturally embedded in the new social circumstances of the industrialized late nineteenth century, which favoured the rise of the potential for individual self-realization, social movement and historical progress. Duesterberg (2015, 277–282) has also analysed how he managed to create for himself in Britain an image of fortune and happiness attained through hard work that accorded well with the core values of Victorian society.

On the other hand, the mobility of the Trojan artefacts does not contradict the historical conditions of their era, as ‘itinerant’ museums were very common in the nineteenth

---
\textsuperscript{110} The source of the newspaper article could not be procured. A copy of the article accompanies the NMNH Registrar’s accession file for the Schliemann Collection and was kindly given to the author by Dr. James Krakker.
\textsuperscript{111} Bobou-Protopapa 2004, 68.
\textsuperscript{112} See also Uslu 2009.
\textsuperscript{113} Eldem 2011.
century before the museum as an institution was identified with a permanent structure. As shown by Podgorny (2013), travelling displays had acquired significance because of the potential they offered for educating the general public and mostly because ‘they blurred the boundaries between science, commerce, and entertainment’.

The items making up the Trojan collection had evidently become a subject of public interest for the educated American elite even before their arrival to the US capital, mainly through Schliemann’s publications and the press releases on his excavations and lectures. The further publicity they had received through Kate Field’s articles in the *New York Tribune* and the *New York Herald* had also stirred up the traditional nineteenth-century American enthusiasm for the classical past. In any case, Field’s influence was arguably considered by Schliemann as instrumental for achieving status through public office, namely that of the Consul representing his country of citizenship (USA) in his adopted country, Greece. I would like to suggest that Schliemann was not only self-conscious in terms of his legacy, which he sought to proclaim, but also conceived and anticipated the future epistemological value of his finds for the Western world. For scholars of the era and for the readers of the newspaper article ‘From the National Museum’ (Anonymous, 1893), which announced the dispatch of the Trojan Collection to Washington, DC, ethics and the history of morals provided the intellectual framework for exploring the social dimensions of past cultures.

In this regard, Schliemann’s excavations marked a significant ideological breakthrough. Asia, which until then was examined through the veil of ‘Orientalist discourse’, could now in effect be connected with the Homeric heroes and their ethos. Still, it is a matter of speculation whether he had fully imagined the political value with which his excavation and its finds were to be invested a century after his archaeological explorations for the purpose of unfolding national agendas. This value may be deduced from the narratives underlying the organization of relevant Trojan exhibits mounted by Turkey in the twentieth- and twenty-first centuries.

The acceptance of Sophia Schliemann’s donation served the prevalent vision behind the inception of the Smithsonian, namely the ‘increase and diffusion of knowledge’, as it enriched the encyclopaedic collection of the Smithsonian National Museum. Admittedly, the Smithsonian artefacts have played a minimal role so far in the historiography of Troy and the interpretation of the excavations at Hisarlık. Nevertheless, after the objects were installed for the first time in the Hall of Old World Archaeology (‘Western Civilization Hall’) in 1978, they rendered the archaeology of the distant Troas publicly accessible in the New World. In this way, they finally acquired some form of agency of their own, fulfilling an

---

115 Duesterberg 2015, 281.
117 Compare the case discussed by Chippindale 1989, 27.
118 Said 1978.
119 Kotsonas 2015, 238–240.
121 Harney 1978, 4.
aspiration of their visionary excavator. It can be argued that the Trojan exhibits themselves were transformed into political movers, as they symbolized Schliemann’s self-projected identity as a German-American. This identity was strategically exploited by the American academic community in order to provide the foundations for their active involvement in the exploration of Aegean prehistory in the twentieth century. The excavations undertaken by Carl W. Blegen (1887–1971), a professor at the University of Cincinatti, from 1932 to 1938, the collaboration of American scholars from the same university with the University of Tübingen for the Troy Excavation Project (1988–2012) and the recommencement of excavations at Troy by the University of Cincinatti122 demonstrate the enduring academic legacy and allure of the archaeology of Troy.
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