



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 1, 1986

1986





**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 1

1986



Verlag Adolf Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Johann Diethart, Bernhard Palme, Brigitte Rom, Hans Tacuber

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgesendet werden. Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden besprochen.

Auslieferung:

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490 und P. Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 1986 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien. Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien. Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Anton E. Raubitschek (Stanford), Tyche zum Geleit.	1
Hermann Harrauer, † KAKH TYXH. Ein ἀποτρόπαιον	3
* * *	
Guido Bastianini (Milano), La corrente del Nilo (P. Lond. 934, III p. XLVII)	5
Reinhold Bichler (Innsbruck), Die Hellenisten im 9. Kapitel der Apostelgeschichte. Eine Studie zur antiken Begriffsgeschichte	12
Edmund F. Bloedow (Ottawa), Schliemann on his Accusers	30
Michel Christol (Paris) et Thomas Drew-Bear (Lyon), Documents latins de Phrygie (Tafel 1—12)	41
Johannes Diethart (Wien), Drei Listen aus byzantinischer Zeit auf Papyrus (Tafel 13)	88
Marie Drew-Bear (Lyon), Sur deux documents d'Hermoupolis	91
Thomas Drew-Bear (Lyon) et Michel Christol (Paris), Documents latins de Phrygie (Tafel 1—12)	41
Jean Gascoü (Paris), Comptabilités fiscales hermopolites du début du 7 ^e siècle (Tafel 14—25)	97
Herbert Graßl (Klagenfurt), Behinderte in der Antike. Bemerkungen zur sozialen Stellung und Integration	118
Bernhard Hebert (Graz), Attische Gelehrsamkeit in einem alexandrinischen Papyrus? Bemerkungen und Vorschläge zu den Künstlerkanones der <i>Laterculi Alexandrini</i>	127
Herbert Hunger (Wien), Die Bauinschrift am Aquädukt von Elaiussa-Sebaste. Eine Rekapitulation (Tafel 26).	132
Erich Kettenhofen (Trier), Zur Siegestitulatur Kaiser Aurelians.	138
Wilhelm Kierdorf (Bochum), Apotheose und postumer Triumph Trajans (Tafel 26)	147
Wolfgang Luppe (Halle/Saale), Poseidons Geliebte. Philodem, Περὶ εὐσεβείας P. Herc. 1602 VI	157
Rosario Pintaudi (Firenze/Messina) e J. David Thomas (Durham), Una lettera al banchiere Agapetos (Tafel 27, 28).	162
Anton E. Raubitschek (Stanford), Aristoteles über den Ostrakismos	169
Georgina Robinson (London), ΘΜΓ and ΚΜΓ for ΧΜΓ	175
Pieter J. Sijpesteijn (Amsterdam), Six Papyri from the Michigan Collection	178
Pieter J. Sijpesteijn (Amsterdam) und Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam), Bittschrift an einen <i>praepositus pagi</i> (?) (Tafel 29)	189
W. F. G. J. Stoetzer (Leiden) und Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam), Zwei Steuerquittungen aus London und Wien (Tafel 30)	195
Karl Strobel (Augsburg), Der Aufstand des L. Antonius Saturninus und der sogenannte zweite Chattenkrieg Domitians	203
Hans Taeuber (Wien), Ehreninschrift aus Megalopolis für Aristopamon, Sohn des Lydiadas (Tafel 31)	221

J. David Thomas (Durham) e Rosario Pintaudi (Firenze/Messina), Una lettera al banchiere Agapetos (Tafel 27, 28)	162
Emmanuel Voutiras (Thessaloniki), Bemerkungen zu zwei makedonischen Freilassungsurkunden (Tafel 32)	227
Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam) und Pieter J. Sijpesteijn (Amsterdam), Bittschrift an einen <i>praepositus pagi</i> (?) (Tafel 29)	189
Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam) und W. F. G. J. Stoetzer (Leiden), Zwei Steuerquittungen aus London und Wien (Tafel 30)	195

* * *

Literaturberichte und Buchbesprechung	
Peter Siewert, Peloponnesiaka	235
Ekkehard Weber: A. Demand, M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, <i>Les inscriptions latines de Belgique (ILB)</i> , Brüssel 1985	238
Indices: Johannes Diethart	240

Tafeln 1—32

EDMUND F. BLOEDOW

Schliemann on his Accusers

Before what has been called 'the vendetta against Schliemann'¹ assumes epidemic proportions², it may be appropriate to view within a wider context the most important area in which Schliemann has been accused of falsifying the evidence³.

While the instances involving his personal life may be of only indirect significance, in that they may carry implications for aspects of Schliemann's professional activity, the controversy surrounding 'Priam's Treasure' is of direct archaeological relevance. With this the debate over Schliemann has also acquired a new focus.

Traill acknowledges that what is termed 'Priam's Treasure' was indeed an 'important discovery', but in view of the 'many discrepancies' in Schliemann's various accounts, one cannot have any confidence in the results. Of these discrepancies, he has identified and discussed briefly at least 'five of the most noteworthy'. They are: the rôle of Sophia Schliemann, the location of the find-spot, the gold sauceboat, the jewellery, and the date of the discovery.

A brief analysis of these different aspects indicates that there does appear to be serious conflict in Schliemann's relevant accounts. On the basis of this, Traill finds it possible to reach the confident conclusion that 'we have no grounds, other than Schliemann's dubious testimony, for believing that all these pieces were found in one place at the same time. The treasure is of unparalleled magnitude for a single find from a West Anatolian site at this time. Its very bulk invites suspicion'. This permits Traill to ask: 'Did he excavate them himself ... or did he buy them from dealers in Athens, or Constantinople or from local villagers?'⁴ After introducing this latter, rather insidious, idea⁵, Traill, for whatever reasons, quickly appears to back off, replacing it with a distinct modification. He suggests that the Treasure was cumulative, and therefore, 'if, as now

¹ Cf. Machteld J. Mellink, *AJA* 86 (1982) 561.

² See, for instance, W. M. Calder III, *Schliemann on Schliemann: A Study in the Use of Sources*, GRBS 13 (1972) 335—353; D. A. Traill, *Schliemann's Mendacity: Fire and Fever in California*, *CJ* 74 (1979) 348—355; W. M. Calder III, *Wilamowitz on Schliemann*, *Philologus* 124 (1980) 146—151; D. A. Traill, *Schliemann's American Citizenship and Divorce*, *CJ* 77 (1982) 136—142; idem, *Schliemann's 'Discovery' of 'Priam's Treasure'*, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 181—186; idem, *Schliemann's Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure'*, *JHS* 104 (1984) 96—115; idem, *Schliemann in the Troad in 1868*, *Boreas* 7 (1984) 295—316; idem, *Schliemann's 'Dream of Troy': The Making of a Legend*, *CJ* 81 (1985) 13—24; cf. also G. Korres, *Επιγραφαὶ ἐξ Ἀττικῆς εἰς κατοχὴν Ἑρρίκου Σλήμαν*, *Athena* 75 (1974—75) 54—67.

³ D. A. Traill, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 181—186, cf. idem, *JHS* 104 (1984) 96—115. The latter is essentially a repetition (and, in places, an amplification) of the former. In his 1984 study, however, Traill, although acknowledging that Schliemann's excavations at Troy and elsewhere were of 'great importance', actually ascribes this importance to the fact that he was, by any reckoning, 'extraordinarily lucky' (a point made long ago by Wilamowitz). But a further thrust of the study is the attempt to demonstrate that, in addition to *Fortuna's* smile upon him, Schliemann in fact 'manufactured' a lot of further luck, and in so doing, 'seriously misrepresented the truth' when producing his 'archaeological reports'.

⁴ D. A. Traill, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 185.

⁵ For which, incidentally, he later never offers a shred of evidence.

seems likely, “Priam’s Treasure” must be a composite, we have no reliable evidence for the exact provenience of *any* of the pieces⁶. Accordingly, ‘For all we know the granulated earrings may have come from Troy III, IV or V levels’. As an important result, ‘It follows that no piece of “Priam’s Treasure” can be used for the purpose of dating the end of Troy II⁷, and indeed ‘all items in the Treasure ... are worthless for chronological purposes’⁸.

Traill also accepts the contemporary judgements of Wilamowitz, who ‘despised’ Schliemann, of Curtius, who declared him to be a ‘bungler and swindler’, and of de Gobineau, who accused him of being a ‘brazen charlatan’, a ‘liar’, and ‘capable of every falsification’, and today that of Calder, who considers Schliemann to have been a ‘pathological liar’⁹

This is clearly a serious conclusion, especially since it involves what has hitherto been considered to be important archaeological evidence. Is it, however, in fact as ‘well-founded’ as Traill would have us believe?

The response to Traill’s assault was immediate and, in large measure, effective¹⁰. One of the difficulties in responding to Traill’s thesis, however, lies in the very ambiguity which he creates. Thus, for instance, he maintains that ‘The discrepancies in findspot, discovery date, the jewellery, and the gold sauceboat suggest that Schliemann’s various accounts of his discovery of “Priam’s Treasure” ... are sheer fiction’¹¹. If, therefore, everything that Schliemann wrote about Treasure A is total fabrication, as such an allegation seems unequivocally to imply, Schliemann, presumably, *could not have found anything* on ‘31 May’, 1873. He simply invented it, namely to account for the items which he had been saving up for a long time. Consequently, Traill can conclude that ‘we do not know where, when or how Schliemann acquired the Collection of artifacts which he called “Priam’s Treasure”’.¹² It follows that he did not find them, any of them, on ‘31 May’¹³. But even if we must acknowledge total ignorance about ‘when, where or how’, still

⁶ D. A. Traill, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 185 (my emphasis).

⁷ *Loc. cit.*, cf. *idem*, *JHS* 104 (1984) 111.

⁸ *Idem*, *JHS* 104 (1984) 114–115.

⁹ D. A. Traill, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 186. Just how much weight such contemporary opinion should carry, may be seen from additional ‘evidence’ adduced by Calder. Upon informing Dorothea Freifrau Hiller von Gaertringen, née von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, that he regarded Schliemann to be a ‘pathological liar’, she declared: “My father would have agreed with you in a moment”. Moreover, ‘Schwester Hildegard von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff recalls that her father “thought nothing of Schliemann and very little of Dörpfeld”’ (W. M. Calder III, *GRBS* 13 [1972] 347 n. 41). If one were to take this to its logical conclusion, Wilamowitz would presumably also have thought ‘very little’ of Blegen, since the latter, in the final publication of the results of the Cincinnati Expedition of 1932–1938, has nothing but praise throughout for Dörpfeld’s incisive observations and conclusions on matters pertaining to stratigraphy and architecture. (On Dörpfeld, cf. also W. Schindler, “Heinrich Schliemann. Leben und Werk im Spiegel der neueren biographischen Forschung”, *Philologus* 120 [1976] 286–287). Did Wilamowitz perhaps also have a dim view of Rudolf Virchow? Calder also cites the following view expressed by Wilamowitz at the age of 24, but which he claims Wilamowitz retained throughout his life: “The Treasure is historically worthless, because it cannot be identified with any Greeks or Asiatics whom we know, but belongs to an era which *must continue to lie outside our knowledge*. From the standpoint of the history of art, the Treasure is totally worthless, as the vessels are bereft of any decoration and consist of the crudest shapes, so that it is worth only so many pounds’ weight in gold” (W. M. Calder III, *Philologus* 124 [1980] 150) (my emphasis). This must rank as one of the classical un-archaeological statements of all time.

¹⁰ Cf. the important discussions by D. F. Easton, ‘Priam’s Treasure’, *AS* 34 (1984) 149–169, and *idem*, *Schliemann’s mendacity — a false trail*, *Antiquity* 58 [1984] 197–204.

¹¹ D. A. Traill, *JHS* 104 (1984) 110, cf. *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 184.

¹² *Loc. cit.*

¹³ Many of Traill’s statements throughout the discussion bear out this impression. Cf., for instance (to take but one

Trail does seem to know something about the 'how', because he thinks that Schliemann had been saving up 'his best finds' over a long period of time.

There is, however, a much more important ambiguity which emerges from Trail's discussion. The claim that everything that Schliemann wrote about Treasure A was complete invention, and that, accordingly, nothing should have, indeed could have, been found on a specific date, is followed *immediately* by the statement that 'Yannakis' version of the discovery of *the treasure* is probably as close as we are likely to get to the truth ... Yannakis' description suggests that *the treasure* was found in a tomb just outside the city wall, which is very much what we would have expected for a find of *this kind* ...¹⁴ From this, four important conclusions follow. 1) A specific treasure *was* found. 2) It was found in a specific place (just outside the wall). 3) Its discovery was witnessed by an independent observer (Yannakis). 4) It was discovered at a specific time ('31 May', 1873)¹⁵. Thus the reader is asked to believe that there was no treasure found (the accounts are 'sheer fiction'), but at the same time asked to believe that a specific treasure was found¹⁶.

Just what, however, follows from the above? Once one accepts that a specific Treasure was found, and found in a specific place, on a specific date, and concedes that 'most, and probably all, of the pieces of "Priam's Treasure" were in fact found in Early Bronze Age Troy'¹⁷, one is bound to concede also that *all* the items *could* have been found in the same place at the same time (whatever the problems in Schliemann's account). This is all the more compelling in light of the concession that the Treasure is 'of this kind' — which, presumably, means of the type described by Schliemann, namely the very Treasure which he claimed to have discovered. In light of the above one is also bound to concede that all the items could have been found in the same place and at the same time, if one does not demonstrate which items were *not* found on '31 May', 1873.

One has clearly, then, to distinguish between two distinctly different, indeed mutually exclusive, propositions in Trail's theory: on the one hand, that Schliemann's accounts are a complete invention, and that, accordingly, he did not find any treasure on the day on which he claimed to have done so, but, rather, that it was cumulative, pieced together over a long period of time; on the other hand, there was a specific Treasure found, and found in a specific place, at a specific time, and that the items in this Treasure are all of essentially the same date, and accord with Schliemann's description and claim, being, as they are, 'of this kind'. If one accepts the latter, with the strong implication that *all* the items in the Treasure could have been, indeed (on the basis

example): 'Schliemann had several motives for putting aside his most valuable in order to announce one large discovery at the end' (JHS 104 [1984] 112).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 110—111 (my emphasis).

¹⁵ For the time, see *ibid.*, 106—107.

¹⁶ If Schliemann's accounts produce the impression in the reader of finding himself in 'a quagmire of inconsistencies' (*ibid.*, 108), in reading Traill's thesis the reader may be excused if he gains the impression of finding himself in a quagmire of ambiguity. One way to rescue both these notions might be to argue that Schliemann kept saving up his most valuable finds, that on '31 May' he found a small Treasure, but of no significance, and then to this small, insignificant Treasure he added everything that he had been accumulating over a long period of time, in order to make a dramatic announcement of a large discovery. But this is not what Traill says. Nor can such a combination be extrapolated from his statements — not even on the most generous interpretation. Nor indeed would the circumstances permit it (as we have already seen above). Most important of all, the only way in which this can be established is by Traill being compelled to believe the very accounts which he damns as being 'sheer fiction'. That requires a great act of faith. For why believe anything Schliemann said, if everything he wrote was 'sheer fiction'. Or is one to rely exclusively on Fraser's Magazine?

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 111.

of the concessions which are made) most probably were, found in the same place, at the same time, there should not be any need to refute the former, since it obviously could not at the same time be true.

None the less, since Traill devotes so much attention to Schliemann's accounts, the result is that the reader is in fact left with the strong impression that it is the first proposition that is true — that the accounts are so contradictory that they simply cannot be believed, and that therefore the only viable alternative is that the items in Treasure A are the result of a cumulative process, the object of a deliberate policy by Schliemann, conceived at a very early date.

It is this aspect of Traill's thesis in particular which Easton has addressed¹⁸. Easton has admirably demonstrated that there are no reasonable grounds for concluding that Schliemann's accounts were fabricated in connection with any of the essential points. On the contrary, with a sympathetic approach, and when a number of minor discrepancies are pared away, Schliemann's overall account is self-consistent and makes eminently good sense.

In this respect, I would add only one further element to Easton's arguments which also weighs against a cumulative thesis. The natural sense of Traill's language is indisputably that the cumulative process involved a long time. Thus we are told that 'It seems much more likely that Schliemann pieced the treasure together over a period of months or even years'¹⁹. As a matter of fact, the emphasis must fall on 'years', because elsewhere Traill maintains that 'it seems likely that *from the earliest days of the excavations* Schliemann put aside his most valuable finds with the intention of announcing one large discovery at the end'²⁰. Accordingly, Schliemann must have conceived the scheme of concealing his best finds from *the very outset* of his excavations. But how can one obtain a long time? The only way this would have been possible is if Schliemann had *purchased* the items — as Traill initially suggested. But, as we saw above, he immediately disregards this notion. At first sight, on the other hand, it would also appear to be possible that Schliemann did save the items up during his excavations, for, as already noted, Traill specifically suggests that Schliemann was putting aside his most valuable finds 'from the earliest days of the excavations'²¹. The term, 'from the earliest days of the excavations' should, presumably, take us back at least to 1870. This, however, seems most improbable. For in his Diary for 1872 Schliemann records the discovery of at least three Treasures²², all of which contained items that, when compared with the contents of Treasure A, could readily be construed as appropriate to qualify among 'his most valuable finds'²³. The implication is that, if he had found any such Treasures before 1872, he would have recorded these also in his Diary. Conversely, if he had been concealing 'his most valuable finds' already in 1870-1871, should we not expect him to have continued to do so also in 1872 and 1873²⁴ — if Traill's alleged policy is to make any sense? In

¹⁸ D. F. Easton, AS 34 (1984) 149—169.

¹⁹ Antiquity 57 (1983) 185; cf. 'over several months or perhaps years' (JHS 104 [1984] 111).

²⁰ JHS 104 (1984) 112 (my emphasis).

²¹ Antiquity 57 (1983) 185, cf. JHS 104 (1984) 112.

²² Treasure N, found in the spring; Treasure P, found on 31 July; and Treasure R, found on 2 August (cf. D. F. Easton, Antiquity 58 [1984] 200—202).

²³ Cf. A. Götze, *Die Kleingeräte aus Metall, Stein, Knochen, Thon und ähnlichen Stoffen*, in W. Dörpfeld, *Troja und Ilion I*, Athens 1902, 341—342. (Götze attributes Treasure P to Troy VI [Götze, 341], but Easton has shown that it should in fact be regarded as belonging to the Early Bronze Age [Antiquity 58 (1984) 202], confirming Schmidt's acceptance of it [H. Schmidt, *Heinrich Schliemanns Trojanische Altertümer*, Berlin 1902, 246] [hereafter cited as SS].) Cf. H. Schliemann, *Troy and its Remains*, London 1874, 164; 209—210 (hereafter cited as TR), and SS, 246—247.

²⁴ Schliemann also reports several Treasures found in 1873, prior to the discovery of Treasure A. Thus: Treasure C,

other words, there are solid grounds for believing that the reason why Schliemann does not mention the discovery of any Treasures in 1870 and 1871 is, not because he was concealing 'his most valuable finds', but because he did not find anything appropriate. Since Traill does not demonstrate that Treasures N, P and R, and Treasures B, C and S were not found, namely, that in these instances Schliemann's accounts were fabricated, and since there is no reason to think that he found any relevant items prior to 1872, there just does not seem to be any way whereby we can obtain *a long time*.

As Easton proceeds in his refutation of Traill's theory, he gradually moves into the sphere of Traill's second proposition. This is not surprising. Nor is it surprising that here there should emerge essential agreement on a number of points between Easton and Traill. Thus Easton agrees that there was a specific Treasure, found in a specific place (and where that place was), and on a specific date²⁵. Since Traill's two propositions are mutually exclusive, and since Easton sets out to refute the first of these, the essential agreement between him and Traill automatically represents his endorsement of Traill's second proposition — which, of course, moves in the direction of a vindication of Schliemann.

This agreement is not, however, without difficulty, at least not on one point — for it extends to the question of dating the contents of Treasure A broadly to the EBA. The ultimate point of Traill's thesis, whichever proposition one were to adopt, is that in the last instance the Treasure is 'worthless for chronological purposes'. This to him seems possible even when one concludes that 'most, and probably all, of the pieces of "Priam's Treasure" were in fact found in Early Bronze Age Troy'. Easton is in essential agreement with this dating²⁶. Consequently, despite Easton's apparently effective refutation of Traill's first proposition, his own conclusions in respect of the dating of the contents do not establish any chronological validity for the Treasure. Furthermore, is it, despite Easton's arguments, perhaps possible to maintain that human ingenuity could still have been capable of putting together such a Treasure from the allegedly available material? Could one not indeed argue that the items may derive from anywhere in the Levels of Troy II-V, the very framework within which Götze discusses the material, and indeed as is maintained by Traill, and with which Easton is in basic agreement?

Further help in answering both these questions (whether the Treasure was pieced together from material covering such a time-span and also whether, accordingly, it has any chronological significance) comes from a different quarter, namely by viewing the problem within a wider context. The point is that a precise allocation of the Treasure does in fact seem possible, thanks to the results of the Cincinnati Expedition. Although no 'Treasures' were found, and, comparatively speaking, only a relatively small number of items of gold and silver were discovered during the Cincinnati excavations throughout all phases, the circumstances in Troy II stand out conspicuously by themselves (cf. Fig. 1). If the American excavators were meticulous and if their findings are in any way representative for the site and if Schliemann discovered the contents of

found in the spring (cf. Götze, 322, and H. Schliemann, *Ilios. The City and Country of the Trojans*, New York 1881, 485—488) (hereafter cited as *Ilios*); Treasure S found at the end of March (cf. Götze, 342, and *Ilios*, 473 Nos. 795—798, 513 Nos. 979—980; *TR*, 267—268); and Treasure B, found only a few days before Treasure A (cf. Götze, 331, *Ilios*, 455, and D. F. Easton, *AS* 34 [1984] 162—163, 167; cf. also *SS*, 237).

²⁵ There is some disagreement over the exact date of discovery, but this turns out to be insignificant (cf. below).

²⁶ For Easton's view on this aspect, cf. *AS* 34 (1984) 147—149, and below.

Treasure A (as well as those of Treasures B-S)²⁷ at Troy itself, the only feasible place where they would seem to fit is in Troy II.²⁸

Phase	Gold	Silver	Copper Bronze	Lead	Totals
VIIb 2	0	0	4	0	4
VIIb 1	1	0	1	0	2
VIIa	0	0	5	2	7
VI	2	0	39	3	44
V	0	0	6	1+	7+
IV	0	0	11	0	11
III	0	0	33	0	33
II	1481	3	38	4	1526
I	0	0	16+	2+	18+

Fig. 1. Distribution of metal objects found at Troy during the Cincinnati Expedition. (After *Troy I*) (+ indicates additional pieces not numbered in the inventory.)

Nor is that all. The principal conclusion reached by Traill is, as we have already seen, that 'no piece from "Priam's Treasure" can be used for the purpose of dating the end of Troy II', and that 'all the items in the Treasure are worthless for chronological purposes'²⁹. Here too, however, the results of the Cincinnati Expedition shed light. The circumstances *within Troy II itself* are illuminating, for the 1471 gold beads, for instance, were found in *IIg* (cf. Fig. 2).

Metal	Phase							Totals
	IIa	IIb	IIc	IId	IIe	IIf	IIg	
Gold	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	9
Gold, Beads	0	0	0	0	0	1	1471	1472
Silver	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Copper	1	0	3	7	0	9	18	38
Lead	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4

Fig. 2. Distribution of metal objects within Troy II according to the results of the Cincinnati Expedition. (After *Troy I*).

²⁷ Since Traill omits any reference to additional Treasures, it may be pertinent to point out here that 'Priam's Treasure', although it represents the largest, is by no means the only Treasure found by Schliemann (as already indicated above). Götze, for instance, who surveys the entire material, in fact isolates and discusses a total of seventeen (Götze, 325—365, cf. SS, 225—247 [published very shortly after Götze's study], and H. Schliemann, *Troja. Results of the Latest Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Homer's Troy*, London 1884, 5, cf. 303). Götze designates the Treasures as A—S, in which 'Priam's Treasure' constitutes Treasure A. Most of these were of course found after 1873, and so do not bear directly on Traill's hypothesis, but they are most important, because *all* of them appear to come from the same stratigraphical context (cf. immediately below).

²⁸ This would appear to be in agreement with a statement by Schliemann himself: 'But a still more weighty proof that all the treasures belong, not to the third, but to the second, the burnt city, is found in the condition of the more than 10.000 objects of which they are composed, for every one of them, even to the smallest gold drop, bears the most evident marks of the fearful incandescence to which it has been exposed' (*Troja*, 58). So much for the contention that 'the granulated earrings may have come from Troy III, IV or V levels'!

²⁹ D. A. Traill, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 185, cf. *idem*, *JHS* 104 (1984) 114—115.

As the excavators comment, 'The number of items found in each stratum is seen to correspond in direct proportion to the thickness of the layer and to the amount of pottery recovered from it. The presence of so much gold among the ruins of Phase IIg is significant, and it permits us to assign most of Schliemann's treasures and accompanying pottery to the final phase of Troy II'³⁰. Let us hear no more about a cumulative Treasure! Furthermore, there is every reason to believe that, not only Treasure A, but indeed all the other Treasures as well derive from the same stratigraphical context — Troy IIg.

Having established that 'Priam's Treasure' almost certainly belongs in Troy IIg, is it possible to answer more satisfactorily the questions about the date and the find-spot of the discovery?³¹ These questions are clearly of lesser importance within the context of the principal thrust of Traill's hypothesis, but since here too Schliemann has been accused of fraud, it is appropriate to examine the problems — that is, over and above the observations already made by Easton.

The first of these actually constitutes one of the most contentious issues. While Meyer argued for a date of 7 June³², Easton thought that he could prove convincingly that it was 27 May³³. Traill, however, raised objections to Easton's thesis, and thought that he could demonstrate equally convincingly that the date was 31 May³⁴. This date, however, cannot be reconciled with 7 June, but for this Traill found an easy solution: he simply declared it to be another outright invention by Schliemann. Easton would not hear of this, although he could not entirely refute Traill's counter-attack, and so oscillated between 27 May and 31 May, leaning, if anything, towards the latter³⁵. I do not confess to be able to resolve the problem, but I should like to draw attention to an additional piece of evidence which neither Traill nor Easton appear to have considered. In a letter written by Schliemann from Athens on 26 July, 1873, to C. T. Newton in London³⁶, he states the following: 'The details of my doings and the results will be known to you by an article which I sent in *June* to the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*³⁷ and which will have been reproduced by the *Athenaeum*³⁸. But *after* having forwarded that article Divine Providence has repaid me with boundless liberality for all my sufferings and gigantic expense in that pestilential desert, for close to the Skaean gate ... I struck ... on the treasure of Priam ...'³⁹ Perhaps the question is not as simple as either Traill or Easton seem to think, and perhaps Meyer was after all not so wide of the mark. At all events, Traill's claim that Schliemann fabricated the date of 7

³⁰ Cf. C. W. Blegen, J. L. Caskey, Marion Rawson and J. Sperling, *Troy. General Introduction. The First and Second Settlements*, Vol. I, Princeton, N. J., 1950, 213, cf. 351, 359, 367, 371. 376. Cf.: 'It was almost certainly in this layer [Troy IIg] that he [Schliemann] found the great "treasure" and most of his other smaller "treasures" of gold objects' (ibid., 207). If this conclusion is accepted, it is no longer necessary to concur with Easton's cautious deduction that 'the Treasure was stratified amongst the deposits of Troy II, or possibly of Troy III' (AS 34 [1984] 146), or that it possibly belongs even in Troy IV (ibid., 148).

³¹ The only other relevant question raised by Traill concerns the rôle of Sophia. As Easton has correctly observed, however, despite the fact that Traill has convincingly demonstrated that this was invented by Schliemann, 'it does not discredit the discovery itself' (D. F. Easton, AS 34 [1984] 144).

³² E. Meyer, *Briefwechsel I*, 342 n. 335, cf. idem, *Heinrich Schliemann: Kaufmann und Forscher*, Göttingen 1969, 273.

³³ D. F. Easton, *Schliemann's Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure': Two Enigmas*, *Antiquity* 55 (1981) 179—181.

³⁴ D. A. Traill, *JHS* 104 (1984) 106—107.

³⁵ D. F. Easton, AS 34 (1984) 144.

³⁶ Newton was an official excavator for the British Museum, who considerably augmented its holdings.

³⁷ This is not the same instalment which was published in the *AAZ* on 5 August, 1873, the latter allegedly being an early draft of Traill's Document D, published in *Trojanische Alterthümer*.

³⁸ Traill, incidentally, notes that Schliemann never used the Julian calendar when writing to Europeans.

³⁹ E. Meyer, *Briefwechsel I*, 235 (my emphasis).

June is at most a very minor point, and otherwise something which cannot be proved. Furthermore, the evidence which he failed to cite weakens his claim even further.

As for the second, Traill makes much of the discrepancies which he purports to find in connection with the find-spot of the Treasure⁴⁰. As he points out, Documents A and B⁴¹ locate the find-spot 'in one of the rooms of the House of Priam', built alongside the fortification wall (and presumably inside it). Three Plans, however⁴², locate it *near* the fortification wall, but *outside* it. Document C, which, Traill takes to represent an 'intermediate stage', locates it 'in a narrow room of the Royal Palace', *near* the fortification wall (p.2), but later this changes to '*on* the city wall' (pp.13-14). Document D locates it 'right next to Priam's House', but at the same time also 'squarely on the wall'⁴³. From the above, Traill is able to attribute further deliberate fabrication to Schliemann.

Easton has responded to Traill's hypothesis, and his objections are important, but not decisive. There seems little doubt that the references to the Treasure having been found in a room of 'Priam's Palace' are, for whatever reasons, incorrect, and may immediately be eliminated⁴⁴. The issue then becomes whether the Treasure was found *near* or *on* the fortification wall. Whereas three Plans and one Document (C) all locate it near the wall, 'most later accounts place the discovery "on" the wall'⁴⁵. Easton resolves the textual discrepancy by maintaining that, because Schliemann states elsewhere in Document C that the Treasure was found *on* the wall, 'we must assume that Schliemann was here using the terms more or less synonymously'⁴⁶. This, however, actually confuses the issue. The point is that the term 'near the wall' (it appears only in Document C) is used in conjunction with the statement that the Treasure was found in one of the rooms of 'Priam's Palace'. Consequently, 'near' can logically mean only *inside* the fortification wall. The Plans to which Easton refers all locate it *outside* the wall. It is accordingly impossible that Schliemann was using the terms 'near' and 'on' synonymously. As a result, when the contention that the Treasure was found in a room of the Palace is given up, so must the idea of 'near' the wall, at least as used textually by Schliemann.

Nor does Easton's explanation resolve the discrepancy between the Plans and the various textual references. In an attempt to solve this problem, he takes the statement in Document C (following Traill) to mean 'on the outer circuit wall'⁴⁷. For this he finds support in 'Yannakis's testimony'⁴⁸. If Easton can, however, find good grounds for calling into question Yannakis' testimony in connection with the contents of the Treasure⁴⁹, is there any reason to regard it as

⁴⁰ D. A. Traill, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 182, cf. *idem*, *JHS* 104 (1984) 103—105.

⁴¹ On the identification of the four Documents which constitute Traill's evidence, cf. *JHS* 104 (1984) 97. For a fair assessment of these Documents, see D. F. Easton, *AS* 34 (1984) 143.

⁴² *Atlas Trojanischer Alterthümer*, 214, 216, 215 = *TR*, Plan I (at end of volume), Plan III (p. 306), and Plan IV (p. 347).

⁴³ *Trojanische Alterthümer*, 289: 'auf diese Mauer' (the statements are not necessarily incompatible). Cf. *Ilios*, Plan I.

⁴⁴ Traill's explanation (*JHS* 104 [1984] 103—105) may or may not be correct. At all events, as Easton explains, given the nature of the Documents, the discrepancy is plausible enough, and does not require one to attribute any sinister motive to Schliemann here.

⁴⁵ D. F. Easton, *AS* 34 (1984) 145.

⁴⁶ *Loc. cit.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 146, cf. Traill, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 182.

⁴⁸ *AS* 34 (1984) 146. Traill too had used this as his chief confirmatory evidence.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 145.

more reliable in connection with the location of the find-spot?⁵⁰ Furthermore, although Easton claims to be able to ‘pinpoint’ the find-spot, the indication on his plan leaves the matter somewhat ambiguous⁵¹. More important, however, his location of the find-spot ‘on the outer edge of the circuit wall’ does nothing to reconcile the discrepancy which still exists between the information on the three Plans and the statements in the ‘later’ accounts — unless one is to assume that whenever Schliemann wrote ‘on’ he meant ‘near’. But this, as we have seen, is impossible⁵².

Since neither Traill nor Easton refer to all instances of ‘on the wall’, it may be useful to note these here. In a letter by Schliemann to Friedrich Schlie (Curator of the Museum in Schwerin), written from Athens and dated 19 July, 1873, he states that he found the Treasure ‘auf der Göttermauer’ (= the fortification wall)⁵³. In another letter, written to C. T. Newton, also from Athens, and dated 26 July, 1873, he states that ‘... very close to the Palace of Priamos, I struck *on* the great circuite wall ... on the treasure of Priamos’⁵⁴.

Thus in four instances Schliemann states that he found the Treasure *on* the wall, to which we may add one Plan⁵⁵. Against these, we have three Plans which appear to locate it outside the wall, *but contiguous with it*⁵⁶. Here we seem to have a clear discrepancy. Is it, however, possible to interpret the three Plans as suggesting that the find-spot was in fact *on* the wall? By the very nature of the Plans this cannot, it seems to me, be ruled out, at least that the Treasure was *partly* on the wall. This would be all the more plausible if Easton is correct in suggesting that Schliemann himself may not have been entirely certain where the outer edge of the wall began. It would also be plausible if the place was entered immediately on a rough Plan and later transferred to the three Plans in question — probably made soon thereafter⁵⁷.

If this appears to be ‘stretching’ the evidence somewhat, there is an additional piece of evidence, or at least a further consideration, that may shed more light on the problem. I refer to observations made by Dörpfeld. Since these appear to have been entirely ignored in the debate hitherto, they may be cited *in extenso*:

‘The great Treasure does not belong in Level III, as Schliemann believed, but in Level II, and was most probably *enclosed within* the fortification wall made of mud brick⁵⁸. What Schliemann earlier maintained to have been the find-spot, this he himself later retracted (cf. *Troja*, 1882, 64). That the Treasure was walled in, can be deduced from the circumstances governing the discovery, as reported in *Trojanische Alterthümer* (189), and as Schliemann also explained to me on numerous occasions. The many objects of gold, silver and copper were

⁵⁰ This would not be surprising in view of the complicated circumstances of the immediate context as described by Easton, that is, if ‘we must in any case remember that it was only on the floor of the trench that the top of the wall and its sloping outer face was visible. Schliemann may himself have been uncertain where the wall’s outer edge began’ (AS 34 [1984] 145).

⁵¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 147, Fig. 2.

⁵² By following Traill in locating the find-spot, Easton involves himself in a whole series of additional problems (see below).

⁵³ E. Meyer, *Briefwechsel I*, 234.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 235 (Schliemann’s emphasis).

⁵⁵ Plan I in *Ilios*.

⁵⁶ The term ‘near the wall’ has to be eliminated, as we have already seen.

⁵⁷ One would not expect a keen observer like Schliemann to be incapable of remembering whether a find-spot of such importance was on the outside of a wall or on it. If, on the other hand, there had been some uncertainty about the nature of the location at the time of discovery, this becomes a distinct possibility.

⁵⁸ ‘in der aus Luftziegeln bestehenden Burgmauer *vermauert*’ (my emphasis).

found in a rectangular heap on top of the circuit stone wall and within a layer of ash and calcined débris 1—2 m thick. Since later excavations made it possible to establish that this red ash, to which Schliemann refers so often, derived from a burnt wall that had been made of mud brick and wood, and had been built on a stone substructure and still survives in some places, it can be concluded as certain that at the spot where the Treasure was found the super-structure of the wall was also still preserved at the time and that the great Treasure had been walled up inside it. In this mud-brick wall, which was several metres thick, it would have been easy to form hollow spaces which, when walled up, would make an excellent place to store treasures⁵⁹.

This seems to be an entirely viable explanation, and coming from Dörpfeld, who not only was later present on the site but also discussed the matter repeatedly with Schliemann, it ought to carry considerable weight. This explanation could at the same time also render unnecessary the suspicion raised by the circumstance that the Treasure was ‘of unparalleled magnitude for a single find from a West Anatolian site at this time’⁶⁰.

On balance, I would say that the evidence points towards the conclusion that the Treasure was found *on* the wall. It must, however, be admitted that absolute certainty cannot at this stage (if ever) be achieved, since the three earlier Plans do insert an element of ambiguity. At most, Schliemann can be accused of producing a degree of confusion, namely because of some of his earlier statements, but here too we can rule out any intent of deliberate fraud. Rather, it seems to me that much more weight should be given to the combination of his later accounts and Dörpfeld’s observations, which were based on repeated discussions with Schliemann. The results are intelligible and wholly consistent⁶¹.

Moreover, Dörpfeld’s explanation actually solves a whole series of problems. It, for instance, renders unnecessary the suggestion that the Treasure must have constituted a ‘cist-grave’⁶². Here too, if Yannakis’ testimony can be called into question in connection with the contents of the Treasure, it can, presumably, also be questioned in respect of whether ‘it was contained in a little place built round with stones, and having flat stones to cover it.’⁶³ Schliemann described the context as follows: ‘On top of this copper article lay a stratum of red and calcined ruins, from 1¹/₂ to 1³/₄ metres thick, as hard as stone’⁶⁴. Presumably, Yannakis could easily, two years later, have remembered the context as consisting of, or including, stones. Dörpfeld’s observations also have a

⁵⁹ W. Dörpfeld, *Troja und Ilion* I, Athens 1902, 8. Cf. Schliemann’s own statement to this effect (*Troja*, 57—58). Meyer provides the additional information that Dörpfeld was able to show him the exact spot still in 1933: ‘sie wurde dem Herausgeber als der Wirklichkeit entsprechend im Frühjahr 1933 an Ort und Stelle von W. Dörpfeld, nach früheren Gesprächen mit Schliemann, bestätigt’ (*Briefwechsel* I, 343 n. 324).

⁶⁰ D. A. Traill, *Antiquity* 57 (1983) 185.

⁶¹ The very fact of the ‘confusion’ would, incidentally, if anything, also argue against a cumulative Treasure. If one wanted to fabricate a major Treasure, the exact find-spot would be a crucial element. Ambiguity would simply play into the hands of keen-eyed ‘fraud-hunters’. The accounts themselves have a genuine ring about them, although these accounts, especially the earliest ones, are far from perfect. If what they contain is supposed to constitute deliberate falsification, this would have required a great deal more leisure to achieve than Schliemann had at his disposal at the time. And in any event, a pioneering archaeologist is presumably permitted, on the basis of later reflection and consultation with colleagues, to correct earlier impressions, just as Dörpfeld pointed out was the case.

⁶² D. F. Easton, *AS* 34 (1984) 147.

⁶³ W. Borlase, *A Visit to Dr. Schliemann’s Troy*, *Fraser’s Magazine* 17, 1878, 236.

⁶⁴ The German text reads: ‘eine 1¹/₂ bis 1³/₄ Meter dicke steinfeste Schicht von rother Asche und calcinierten Trümmern’ (*TR*, 323, cf. *Trojanische Alterthümer*, 289).

direct bearing on the suggestion, first made by, it seems, Döhl, that the Treasure may constitute evidence for a 'Trojan cemetery of the Early Bronze Age'⁶⁵. But above all, Dörpfeld's observations make it unnecessary to conclude that the Treasure 'must have been dug down into the ruins of Troy II (or III) or conceivably as late as Troy IV'⁶⁶. On the contrary, his observations too provide good grounds for concluding that the Treasure is contemporary with Troy IIg.

Conclusion

By viewing the problem of 'Priam's Treasure' (Treasure A) within a wider context, it is possible to go further than hitherto. By combining the fruits of the Cincinnati excavations and Dörpfeld's observations with the results of Easton's study, one can reject Traill's hypothesis with even greater confidence. But even more important, by viewing the question within such a context, one can with equal confidence assert that, so far as the historical information to be extracted from 'Priam's Treasure' is concerned, Schliemann can be considered as exonerated from in any way seriously falsifying the evidence. Consequently, far from being 'worthless for chronological purposes', Treasure A can be regarded as unquestionably having important chronological validity⁶⁷.

Thus it emerges that, if one views a given subject within narrow enough a perspective, virtually anything can be 'proved'. Of course there are numerous problems associated with Schliemann and the various accounts which he gave of himself and his activities, but one is inclined to agree with the view that the current vendetta against him 'threatens to obscure his archaeological contributions'⁶⁸, a point which is all the more important since the debate has meanwhile begun to focus on his archaeological activity rather than on his personal life. What is needed, therefore, is a balanced critical approach also in this sphere such as is represented in the biographical realm by Schindler's study⁶⁹.

If the above discussion proves anything, it demonstrates the crucial importance of adhering to the fundamental principle of always considering the wider context. This of course ought to be self-evident. Consequently, and in view also of ever mounting publishing costs, one must query the motives behind the attempt to fabricate problems where they do not in fact appear to exist, while all the time ignoring some of the most basic sources bearing on the question.

Department of Classical Studies
University of Ottawa
30 Stewart
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5
Canada

Edmund F. Bloedow

⁶⁵ D. F. Easton, *AS* 34 (1984) 148—149.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 147—148.

⁶⁷ In a thoughtful study, Maxwell-Hyslop and Hood have, on the basis of stylistic relations with the East and chronological interconnections with the eastern Mediterranean and the Aegean, shown that Treasure A fits excellently into Troy II (Rachel Maxwell-Hyslop and M. S. F. Hood, *Dating Troy II*, Papers delivered at the London Institute of Classical Studies Mycenaean Seminar, 17 January 1979 [cf. *BICS* 26 [1979] 125—129]). (I am grateful to Professor Hood for making available to me a copy of the full text of this study.)

⁶⁸ Machteld J. Mellink, *AJA* 86 (1982) 561.

⁶⁹ W. Schindler, *Philologus* 120 (1976) 271—289. Cf. also, for isolated points, K. Zimmermann, *Heinrich Schliemann — ein Leben zwischen Traum und Wirklichkeit*, *Klio* 64 (1982) 513—531.