



Schliemann of Troy: Treasure and Deceit

Review Author[s]:
David Turner

The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 116 (1996), 235-237.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4269%281996%29116%3C235%3ASOTTAD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-U>

The Journal of Hellenic Studies is currently published by The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/hellenic.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

welfare of the household). That a phylactery was found in a burial therefore does not imply any intended use in the underworld. It is not even certain that the well-known gold tablet (27) from a Roman grave, with its late mangling of 'Orphic' verses, was not worn in the deceased's lifetime simply as an amulet.

Of 28 I myself, at *AJA* 89 (1985) 162-67, gave a tracing and a text, from autopsy:

Αἰώνεργετα κύριε
Σάραπι, δὸς νείκην
κατὰ τῶν ὑπογεγραμ-
[μένων.....]

'Creator of eternity, Lord Sarapis, give victory over the underinscribed ...'. The hand is firm and confident, the letters regularly spaced. J. Gw. Griffiths, *ibid.*, 167 f., pointed out that the first word, hitherto unattested in Greek, is in fact a translation of an Egyptian term. On the tablet, there is a vertical crease about four letters away from the left-hand edge; it has produced a diamond-shaped wrinkle between κατὰ and τῶν in line 3. K., evidently relying on a photograph, draws and interprets the wrinkle as a deliberate mark and prints κατὰ ὀ(νομάτων). We may pass over the fact that the abbreviation in the one instance that K. cites, *Suppl. Mag.* II 94 ii 24, is not ο but ὀ, but is it likely that such a good scribe would have misunderstood any such abbreviation in his model and then tucked it up under the arm of another letter? K. in his commentary prints 'Αἰώνεργετα (?)' and suggests Αἰὼν <εὐ>εργετα, nowhere mentioning Griffiths' Egyptian antecedent of the new epithet.

36 opens, according to K., ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ μέγας ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ καθήμενος, / τὸ μολὸν κύτος ὅλου / τοῦ κόσμου, 'I am the Great One who sits in heaven <upon> the moving vault of the whole cosmos'. There is no '<upon>' in the Greek, and μολὸν can hardly mean 'moving' here. It is better to assume a scribal corruption from a model that had τὸ μόνον κύρος 'the sole governing force'. What follows is almost surely corrupt: σάον ὄνομα Μιαρσαυ, 'the sure name (is) Miarsau' in K.'s translation. Farther down, K. translates καὶ εἰ τίς με ἀδικήσι ἐπέκινᾳ ἀπόστρεψον as 'and if anyone shall injure me henceforth, turn (him) away'. Better: 'and turn away whoever shall injure me on the other side'—i.e. turn away supernatural visitors. The next phrase shifts to mischief at the hands of humans: μήτε με φάρμακον ἀδικήσι. (Reference to Griffiths, *CPh* 48 [1953] 145-54, could have eliminated most of the six-page excursus on the expression 'King of Kings'.)

Of 40, which begins with an invocation of Aphrodite's name, K.'s text and translation of lines 7-12 run ποιήσεται ἐπίχαρην (for -ρην), εὐοδῖαν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κὲ γυνεξί, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς ὃν θέλει αὐτῇ 'make favour, success with all men and women, but particularly with him whom (she) herself wishes'. The word ἐπίχαρις, which K. assumes to be a noun, is an adjective. M. Siebourg, *BonnJbb* 103 (1898) 134, whose text K. does not quote, recognized that we have here the proper name Euodia; otherwise there is nothing for αὐτῇ to refer to. Better (in normalised spelling): either ποιήσατε ἐπίχαριν Εὐοδῖαν 'make E. pleasing'; cf. *Cyran.* 87.59 Kaim. ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐπίχαριν τὸν φορ-οῦντα.

We can expect at least one more volume, K. tells us,

and eventually a general introduction to the subject. I hope that he and his editors will read and take to heart that severe review of Robert's. If they do, the whole, I am confident, will be a solid monument that will long outlast any of the ἀγωνίσματα ἐς τὸ παραχρήμα ἀκούειν of writers on ancient magic who have not touched and felt such texts as these.

DAVID R. JORDAN

Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens
American School of Classical Studies at Athens

TRAILL (D.) **Schliemann of Troy: treasure and deceit.**
London: John Murray, 1995. Pp. xiv + 365 + ill.

David Traill's detailed account of Heinrich Schliemann's archaeological career is at last with us. T. has published the most painstaking research into the life of the 'Father of Mycenaean archaeology' since Ernst Meyer's monumental *Heinrich Schliemann: Kaufman und Forscher*, published in 1969. Precisely because of this, his book—for the present reviewer at least—is in some respects a disturbing example of biographical methodology. In the name of 'truth' (13) and a compilation of moral precepts that would make even St Paul blush with envy, Heinrich Schliemann is given the proverbial 'works' by a scholar who still has not sufficiently defined what it is he wants to tell us, as opposed to prove. Is this a biography or a show trial?

Perhaps the book's title says it all. This tome is a *summa* of what T. calls the 'new, sceptical view of Schliemann' (10) that saw its first dramatic epiphany on 6 January, 1972, in William Calder III's (in)famous lecture at Mecklenburg where Schliemann was likened to a psychopath. The new book, and the 'school', appears to be mostly concerned with investigating the inconsistencies between Schliemann's autobiography, letters and texts on the one hand, and the 'truth' on the other. These having been established to the satisfaction of the author, certain episodes in Schliemann's archaeological career are scrutinised; it would seem that this is the book's main purpose. Priam's Treasure, the treasure from the Mycenae shaft graves, and other finds: where, when and how were they found? Are some pieces nineteenth-century fakes? For 'With an individual like Schliemann, we need always to be on our guard' (7). It is insinuatingly stated that 'as recently as the early 1980s, archaeologists maintained that Schliemann's archaeological work remained uncontaminated by this kind of behaviour [bribing and fraud]' (6). But then T. on the next page states: '... there is no doubt that for the most part Schliemann's archaeological reports are reliable. Later archaeologists have shown that the picture of sites presented by Schliemann's excavations is accurate' (7).

I leave it to the archaeologists to review his assessment of the Troy and Mycenae treasures. It should be noted, however, that T.'s well-known allegations that items in the Athens Archaeological Museum from the Mycenae excavations, including the famous death mask 'of Agamemnon', are nineteenth century fakes is presented as if it were a view held by many scholars (3: 'It has long been suggested ...') rather than his own cher-

ished theory. Not a single reference, incidentally, is made—even in the bibliography!—to the important works by Edmund F. Bloedow on this and related subjects (chiefly ‘Schliemann at Mycenae’, *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* XXXIII n.s. 8 (1989) 147-65, written in collaboration with S. Noyes-Roberts and D. Smulders, where T.’s Mycenae theories are roundly refuted.)

Here, I want to discuss T.’s biographical methodology as concerns the first four chapters of the book (childhood up to 1868), a period which I and my colleague Dr Mark Lehrer have been working on for some years for a book on Schliemann’s ‘conversion’ to archaeology.

No biographer would deny Schliemann’s penchant to inflate his self-image. T. himself actually admits this (4) but on the same page he states that ‘Scholars have not been immune to the spell [of Schliemann’s autobiography] ... It is scarcely surprising if many should find the recent revelations unwelcome.’ (4). He continues: ‘Clearly, if we want to penetrate the cocoon of myth woven by Schliemann and his biographers we need to adopt a more critical attitude to Schliemann’s statements about himself than has hitherto been customary.’ (4). This, of course, ignores the manner in which human autobiography develops over time. T. confines himself to comparing and scrutinising letters, diaries, and published documents in a magnificent example of detective work, but very little else.

The book’s air of objectivity and scholarly aloofness masks the fact that much of what T. has to say reflects his own at times eccentric opinions. And when the myriad occurrences of words such as ‘probably’, ‘perhaps’, ‘undoubtedly’ and ‘unquestionably’ are taken into account, cracks appear in his conclusions. Innuendo is used with such dexterity that it seduces the unsuspecting reader (including many reviewers of this book, who seem to have taken its findings at face value). For instance, see T.’s extraordinary effort to explain S.’s academic interests prior to 1868 (31). (Please note the present reviewer’s italics).

On 14 February [1866] he wrote to her [his first Russian wife, Katerina]: ‘Every evening I go to the theatres or to scholarly lectures ... and I could tell you stories for ten years without wearing you out’. There is a touch of pathos in this letter or rather *what seems to lie behind it*. He is *clearly* doing the best to make himself and his mode of life in Paris sound appealing. *Given* that his cultural activities were designed to meet with Katerina’s approval, it *seems likely* that his *sudden* interest in cultural self-improvement in 1856 was *also* intended to please her. *If so, then* the crucial conversion from merchant to archaeologist ... between 1856 and 1870 *may* have found its *original* impetus in the impossible task of pleasing a woman who despised him. *It is* in this tragic irony, not in the trumpery of the ‘childhood dream’, that the real romance of Schliemann’s life resides.

‘A masterpiece’! A = B, so therefore C must lead to D, and E is thus an emphatic ‘It is ...’ This is sloppy historical methodology. T. has the advantage of knowing his extensive material, but he gives the impression of cutting

and pasting it to suit his various arguments. Only when one actually sits with Schliemann’s letters and diaries does it become clear that T.’s image of his subject’s life is not always as clear as he would have us think.

One of the book’s leitmotifs is that Schliemann’s childhood ‘dream of Troy’ is a hoax. Nowhere does Schliemann give any indication, prior to 1868, that he *specifically* wanted to excavate Troy. This is, as far as we know, true. But then T. also attempts to diminish Schliemann’s interest in Greece and things Greek prior to 1868, the year of his first visit to the Troad. Schliemann is said to have learnt Greek simply to do transactions with Greek businessmen in Russia (25), and was an autodidact just to impress his first wife (*supra*). On 26, we read that for Schliemann Greece was just another ‘warm spot ... The mood [of the letters] in fact has much in common with that of today’s northern European flipping through a travel brochure towards the end of another dreary winter ...’

There are, in fact, quite a number of letters and drafts in Schliemann’s language exercise book—many in Greek—dating to between 1856 and 1868 that indicate that Greece and things Greek, ancient and modern (as opposed to a *specific* intention to excavate Troy), were not simply a whim in Schliemann’s pre-1868 career. Why has T. not addressed these letters, some of which were used by Emil Ludwig, and will be reused—along with unpublished material—by Lehrer and myself in our forthcoming book? Why has so much material been suppressed or overlooked by one of the only persons on the planet who *must have read it*? On 27, for example, T. quotes a passage in Schliemann’s language exercise book from July 1856: ‘I think Greece will be of great interest to me and I will stay there ... and then see the Pyramids ...’ etc. T. comments: ‘Here again there is no indication that a visit to Greece might be the fulfilment of a childhood dream, no sign of a specific interest in Homeric sites or even in archaeology, and no mention at all of Troy’. Fair enough. But why has T. failed to mention the unpublished passage (translated here from the Greek, courtesy of the Gennadeion) in the same book where Schliemann states:

I yearn to travel and visit Greece. Until now, I never enjoyed or was satisfied with my travels, always being caught up in business matters ... Now I can travel for other purposes involved with my beloved sciences, and in particular with philology ... I plan to go to Greece and Egypt with Homer and Thucydides in hand, and visit Ithaca, the Peloponnese, the plain of Troy, the Skamander where Achilles fought ... and the other worthy ruins of antiquity—of which there are now only paltry remains. (Draft, from before 9.1.1858, of a letter dispatched on that date to Carl Adress. This section does not appear in full in the final letter.)

Is this just more mendacity and day-dreaming? Of course, it would be naïve to indulge in using quotes such as these as any form of ‘evidence’ (e.g. of a wish to excavate Troy). But that is not the point. They exist, and the biographer has to look into the context in which they exist; how they could come to be stated in the first place. The very few of these texts that have been used

by T. are fobbed off in footnotes, where he does not mention having seen the originals, but only cites secondary sources: e.g. ch. 2, n. 11, 13, 44, 48, 63-65 etc. Ironically, this methodology is precisely that that T. accuses Ernst Meyer of having used, in favour of the latter's hero (9)!

An analysis of the intricate manner in which T. fashions his prose and selects his facts to back up his thesis would take up a volume. I feel obliged to state that his methodology is in itself as worthy of suspicion as any mask from Mycenae or trinket from Troy. For instance, in 1866 Schliemann wrote to his uncle and cousin that he intended to visit Troy after visiting the Black Sea. T. then states darkly: 'In the end he did not go so far south' (30). Why does he not also state that Schliemann writes in his 1866 diary (Gennadeion, A10, p. 46, September 5) that he had not been given a passport due to problems with St Petersburg, and this hindered his plans? Tricks like this abound.

Perhaps in the final analysis we cannot confine ourselves to facts and dates and letters and diaries. T.'s book suffers from a fundamental inability to grasp the importance of the human experience, to understand that meaning is far more important than the register of mundane tabulated facts. When Schliemann uncovered Priam's Treasure, and claimed that his wife was next to him at the time, the most important fact for the biographer is that Schliemann *wanted* her there at the time, at a crucial point in his life. So what if she were not really there? Pedantic footnotes of this nature make interesting reading buried at the back of a book but the real purpose of biography is to delve into the meaning of a person's life with tools of research that can help us rise above the empirical record of events.

Much of the fictional in Schliemann's life is probably the most important *fact* of his life. The dream of Troy may not exactly have happened as Schliemann said it did. But the dream is eminently capable of serving as a way into the mind of a complex human being with exceptional gifts of insight, whose life was expressed in a web of simile that at times merged into metaphor, to become *reality*.

But T. retorts in the finest empirical tradition, 'Fiction should be treated as fiction. Why then do biographers of Schliemann present his childhood conversation with his father as biographical fact?' (6). T. has not even paused to reconsider his method. The supreme goals of truth and (oddly enough) impartiality are paramount for him. But what is truth? And who is going to play God in defining it especially when it comes to biography? The rather Victorian set of values used to shore up T.'s arguments has nothing to do with what modern biographical research is all about. Why, when it comes to biography, should we treat the character of a 'fictitious' book differently from a 'real' historical figure? These are, I feel, fundamental questions that we should all be thinking about.

DAVID TURNER

British School at Athens

SCHREINER (P.) *Byzanz*. Rev. ed. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1994. Pp. xvi + 260. DM 38.

In common with all good things Byzantine, Schreiner's *Byzanz* comes in three parts: a basic chronological exposition of the Byzantine experience; a discussion of basic problems and directions in research in the field, and an extensive bibliography of primary and secondary sources.

The stated purpose of the series is to provide a helpmeet for historians, whether teachers or students, working in adjacent periods or territories, who require some guidance through unknown territory. Furthermore, the authors of individual volumes have been encouraged to present their material so that it may be used with profit by the non-specialist (v).

Given this aim, S.'s *Byzanz* is a remarkable achievement. In two hundred and sixty pages, he provides a chronological survey of ninety-eight pages; a survey of the major questions and problems of research in seventy-five pages; six pages of bibliography of primary sources; forty pages of bibliography of the secondary literature; one page of commonly encountered journal abbreviations; two pages of ruler lists; eight pages of simplified dynastic family trees; five pages of basic chronology; two maps; an index of places and objects; and finally an index of authors. In this structured fashion (aided by marginal keywords for each paragraph), S.'s *Byzanz* does indeed provide a clear guide to the world of Byzantium, but I was struck by the lack of illustrations in a work that discusses material evidence.

In the first edition (1985) introduction, reprinted here, S. describes his main goal as giving factual information about the Byzantine state in all its manifestations (xiii). After marking the boundaries, Schreiner gives a political history in twenty-five pages. Economic and social history is covered by coinage and its debasement; taxation; the relationship of persons to the land and between the powerful (*dynatoi*) and those tied to the land (*paroikoi*); the institutions of *charistike* and *pronoia*; and then matters of urban development, including social mobility, *demes*, guilds, the *eparch*, trade and price controls. Relief comes in the form of ten pages on government (46-56) and eleven on constitutional history (56-67). A section on the Church and Monasticism (68-81) follows, before attention turns to cultural and spiritual life (82-98). Language (82) is immediately followed by literature (83-91) which leads into education, its content, format, availability and the relationship between monasticism and learning (*Bildung*). Art history (94-97) and music (97-98) are then dealt with.

Treating problems and research, S. stresses the interdisciplinary nature of Byzantine Studies, uniting history, philology and literature, art history and archaeology. The section '*Forschungsgeschichte*' (99-104) is to my mind the reason that native English speakers should turn to this book. This five page section provides a summary of the historiography of Byzantine Studies. From Wolf, through the works of DuCange, Mabillon and de Montfaucon to Jean Bolland and the *Acta Sanctorum*, the survey moves on to cover the nineteenth century and then a nation by nation roster in the twentieth century. S. gives a useful history of the development of the subject and a thumbnail sketch of who does what where.