

**THE “WRITING” OF CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY  
IN POST-WAR GREECE (1950 TO THE PRESENT);  
THE CASE OF MUSEUM EXHIBITIONS AND  
MUSEUM NARRATIVES**

Thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
at the University of Leicester

by

Maria Mouliou  
Department of Museum Studies  
University of Leicester

October 1997

# **VOLUME ONE**

**(TEXT)**



# **ABSTRACT**

## **The “writing” of Classical Archaeology in Post-war Greece (1950 to the present); The case of museum exhibitions and museum narratives**

Maria Mouliou, Department of Museum Studies, University of Leicester, UK

This study puts forward an argument for the importance of studying museum constructions of the past in relation to the intellectual histories of archaeological scholarship involved with the investigation of material culture of the past.

Informed by post-structuralist theories in the fields of archaeology and museology, this study essentially proposes to investigate why museum representations of the past come to look the way they do through a critical analysis of the discourse of archaeology, that is the disciplinary poetics and socio-politics of archaeology.

Furthermore, it argues that museum receptions of the Greek classical past and the discipline of classical archaeology, with its abundance of original material, its vast body of scholarly production let alone its key role in the genesis of European thought and archaeological discipline as such, provides a fertile ground for exploring the above supposition.

Thus, classical archaeological discourse and museum representations of the classical past in post-war (1950 to the present) Greece are examined in order to understand the architectonics of their interrelation in their various scholarly, socio-historical, political, ideological and economic dimensions.

Essentially, it is sought to unmask how the long standing intellectual tradition of classical archaeology and its operation within a certain historical, cultural and political context informed or even governed museum constructions of the Greek classical past and their varied receptions from audiences in Greece and beyond, both in the past and in the present.

Thirty four case-studies are selected and provide ample material to proceed beyond the strictly empirical analysis and experience into further philosophical reflection and theorising. National, Site, Regional, Private and University Museums together with temporary and travelling exhibitions are thoroughly examined to demonstrate how master narratives of classical archaeological discourse have been for so long endorsed and perpetuated by the Greek Museum discourse.

The examination of the case studies is most revealing and empowering for making some general observations regarding the poetics and politics of scholarly traditions and the manner in which these traditions lead to specific cultural appropriations and constructions of the past in museum displays.

Finally, this study also shows how such a theoretically and historically informed approach to museum constructions of the past, Greek classical and other, can potentially bring new impetus to archaeological exhibitions, their themes and forms of expression.

*To my parents, my husband, and my daughter*

# Table of Contents

## VOLUME ONE

Table of Contents.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	v
List of Plates .....	viii
List of Figures.....	xxv
List of Abbreviations .....	xxix
CHAPTER 1.....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Introduction to the study .....	1
Studying archaeology and museums as discourses. Theoretical orientations.....	7
Studying Greek exhibitions of classical archaeology: Methodological tools.....	14
Outline of the study.....	19
CHAPTER 2.....	22
CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY OF GREECE; SOME INSIGHTS INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DISCIPLINE .....	22
Introduction.....	23
Defining the object domain of the discipline .....	28
The birth of a tradition; Classical archaeology in its formative years.....	31
Classical archaeology and empiricism; Systematic research and scientific methodology .....	35
Classical archaeology and art history.....	44
Classical archaeology and classics.....	46
Classical archaeology and ancient history.....	48
The Greek archaeologists and Hellenism. Classical archaeology of the homeland.....	50
From induction to deduction: the age of substantive research.....	65
Conclusion .....	69
CHAPTER 3.....	71
ANCIENT GREECE AND ITS MATERIAL CULTURE; SOME INSIGHTS INTO THE CULTURAL POLITICS OF A VENERATED HERITAGE .....	71
Introduction.....	72
The hegemony of the foreign countries over Greece (1830-1922); The legacy of the Classical Greek past and the emergence of Hellenism. ....	76
The ideological power of classical antiquities, the formation of the modern Greek state and national consciousness (1830-1922) .....	77
The Interwar (1922-1949) and Post-war periods (1950s-1980s). ....	81
Hellenism and the classical tradition in the late twentieth century: Changing attitudes and future perspectives .....	84
CHAPTER 4.....	88
STUDYING THE DISCOURSE OF GREEK ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUMS AND EXHIBITIONS; A MODEL OF ANALYSIS.....	88
Introduction.....	89



Towards the study of the Greek museum discourse; three key sources..... 90
 Towards the study of the Greek museum discourse; a model of analysis..... 92
 MUSEUM & EXHIBITION HISTORY ..... 93
 MUSEUM MATERIAL..... 93
 EXHIBITION MATERIAL..... 95
 MUSEUM & EXHIBITION ENVIRONMENT..... 112
 MUSEUM & EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE ..... 112
 Conclusion ..... 113
 CHAPTER 5..... 114
 NATIONAL AND SUPRA-NATIONAL “SHRINES” OF GREEK (CLASSICAL) ART; THE NATIONAL AND THE ACROPOLIS MUSEUMS IN ATHENS. .... 114
 Introduction..... 115
 The National Archaeological Museum and the Acropolis Museum in the pre-war period (late nineteenth-century to 1940). .... 119
 MUSEUM HISTORY AND MATERIAL..... 119
 EXHIBITION MATERIAL..... 122
 MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE..... 122
 The National Archaeological Museum and the Acropolis Museum in the post-war period (1948 to today)..... 123
 MUSEUM HISTORY AND MATERIAL..... 123
 EXHIBITION MATERIAL..... 128
 MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE..... 134
 A ‘Museum for the Future of the Acropolis’ ..... 140
 Conclusion ..... 143
 CHAPTER 6..... 144
 CLASSICAL SITES OF HELLENISM AS SACRED LANDSCAPES AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL HETEROTOPIAS; CONCEPTUAL VALUES, MUSEOLOGICAL MESSAGES ON SITE AND IN THE MUSEUM..... 144
 Introduction..... 145
 Inter-state (Pan-Hellenic) sanctuaries of Ancient Greece; The National Museums of the past - Ancient Olympia, Delphi, Nemea: sites and museums..... 146
 MUSEUM HISTORIES..... 146
 MUSEUM MATERIALS ..... 151
 EXHIBITION MATERIALS ..... 153
 MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE..... 158
 ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’ ..... 163
 Civic centres, the hearts of ancient cities - The Ancient Athenian Agora: site and museum..... 165
 MUSEUM HISTORY ..... 165
 MUSEUM MATERIAL..... 168
 EXHIBITION MATERIAL..... 170
 MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE..... 173
 ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’ ..... 175
 Ancient Cemeteries and the Greek discourse of death - Kerameikos: Site and museum..... 176
 MUSEUM HISTORY AND MATERIAL..... 176
 EXHIBITION MATERIAL..... 178
 MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE..... 179
 ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’ ..... 180
 Conclusions..... 183
 CHAPTER 7..... 187
 THE PRODUCTION OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY ON THE PERIPHERY OF THE HELLENIC HEARTLAND. REGIONAL MUSEUMS..... 187
 Introduction..... 187
 Macedonia and the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki..... 191
 MUSEUM HISTORY AND MATERIAL..... 191



EXHIBITION MATERIAL.....	193
MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE.....	196
Epirus and Aegean Thrace - The Archaeological Museums of Ioannina and Komotini .....	203
MUSEUM HISTORIES.....	203
MUSEUM MATERIALS.....	207
EXHIBITION MATERIALS.....	208
MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE.....	210
Thessaly and the Archaeological Museum of Volos .....	213
MUSEUM HISTORY, MATERIAL AND ENVIRONMENT .....	213
EXHIBITION MATERIAL.....	214
MUSEUM SIGNIFICANCE .....	218
The Eastern Aegean and the Archaeological Museums of Samos and Lemnos. ....	219
MUSEUM HISTORIES AND MATERIALS .....	219
EXHIBITION MATERIALS.....	223
MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE.....	229
Conclusions and ‘alternative readings’ .....	233
CHAPTER 8.....	236
GREEK PRIVATE COLLECTING OF ANTIQUITIES AND THE MUSEUM; TWO COLLECTORS, TWO MUSEUMS AND THEIR TALES.....	236
Introduction.....	236
The Canellopoulos and Goulandris Museums; Studying private collecting of antiquities in a Greek context. ....	238
COLLECTORS’ HISTORIES .....	239
MUSEUM HISTORIES.....	244
MUSEUM MATERIALS AND ENVIRONMENT .....	246
EXHIBITION MATERIALS.....	247
MUSEUM SIGNIFICANCE AND ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’ .....	250
Conclusions.....	252
CHAPTER 9.....	253
SHAPING ARCHAEOLOGISTS; THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY MUSEUMS OF ARCHAEOLOGY .....	253
Introduction.....	253
Greek (classical) archaeology in the Greek University .....	254
Greek University Museums of Archaeology - The examples of Thessaloniki and Athens.....	256
MUSEUM HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT .....	256
MUSEUM AND EXHIBITION MATERIALS .....	258
MUSEUM SIGNIFICANCE .....	259
‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’ .....	260
Conclusion .....	263
CHAPTER 10.....	264
ON GREEK TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS OF CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AND THEIR POETICS; ALTERNATIVE ROUTES INTO THE RE-PRESENTATION OF THE ANCIENT GREEK PAST.....	264
Introduction.....	264
The early period (1970s -early 1980s) .....	266
EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT .....	266
EXHIBITION MATERIALS AND ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’ .....	269
EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE .....	272
1985, a creative and fruitful year .....	272
EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT .....	272
EXHIBITION MATERIALS AND ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’ .....	274
EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE .....	276
The later period (1986 to today) .....	276
EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT .....	276

EXHIBITION MATERIALS AND ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’ .....	279
EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE .....	286
Conclusions.....	286
CHAPTER 11.....	288
TREASURES, HEROES, MIRACLES: THE POETICS AND POLITICS OF TRAVELLING EXHIBITIONS OF GREEK CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY ABROAD.....	288
Introduction.....	290
The period of pioneer exhibitions and the early controversy (1979-1982) .....	292
EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT .....	292
EXHIBITION MATERIALS.....	296
EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE .....	301
The expansive period (1982-to today) .....	302
EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT .....	302
EXHIBITION MATERIALS.....	308
EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE .....	311
Conclusions.....	314
CHAPTER 12.....	318
ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOURSES AND MUSEUM CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE PAST; AN OVERVIEW. ....	318
Looking back at the aims of this study. ....	318
Looking forward - the road ahead. ....	322
‘RE-FIGURING THE PAST’ .....	322
‘SHOWING THE INVISIBLE / SPEAKING THE UNSPOKEN’ .....	323
‘EXHIBITING DISCIPLINARY DISCOURSES / EXHIBITING THE MUSEUM’ .....	324
NOTES .....	326
APPENDIX ONE .....	365
APPENDIX TWO .....	369
APPENDIX THREE.....	372
APPENDIX FOUR.....	375
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	378

## VOLUME TWO

Table of Contents.....	i
List of Plates .....	v
List of Figures.....	xxv
PLATES.....	1
FIGURES.....	179



# Acknowledgements

Looking back at all those years of my doctoral research, I feel content for many reasons.

First of all, as all PhD students are when arriving at this most awaited moment of submission of their study, I am relieved that my research is now completed and that I can finally enjoy my leisure time without constantly thinking of my work. Secondly, I am really pleased to have come to Leicester for my post-graduate studies and have met people who enriched and changed my life intellectually, culturally and emotionally, indeed in so many ways.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Susan Pearce, who opened new horizons for me and showed me the way towards a more exciting and mindful investigation of the museum world. Furthermore, I thank her for useful discussions, guidance, support and encouragement throughout the years of my research in Leicester.

The A.S.Onassis Public Benefit Foundation and the Humanities Board of the British Academy provided research grants for the period 1993-1996. Without the help of these two bodies, to which I am very grateful, none of the present work could have been carried out.

Additionally, my most sincere thanks go to a great number of individuals and organisations that helped me greatly in compiling the bibliography I needed and in accessing important archival material, both documentary and photographic, which was necessary for the examination of my case-studies.

Great thanks are especially due to Professor Ian Morris (University of Stanford, USA) for sending me an advanced draft of his paper 'Archaeologies of Greece' at a very early stage of my research (in Morris, I., ed., 1994: *Classical Greece: Ancient histories and modern archaeologies*, New Directions in Archaeology, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.). This text proved to be most useful at the beginning of my research work. Professor A.Snodgrass (University of Cambridge, UK), Dr. J.Bintliff (University of Durham, UK), Dr.N.Merriman (Museum of London), Dr. N.Kourou and Dr. A. Lemos (University of Athens, Greece) also offered kindly their time, at the beginning of my study, to discuss ideas and ways to go ahead and to put those ideas into actual production.

For provision of source material and for useful conversations, I thank: Dr.Y.Tzedakis, Mrs S. Boutopoulou, Mrs. D.Tsolaki (Hellenic Ministry of Culture); Mrs T.Hatzinikolaou, Dr.N.Zias, Mr.G.Liondos (Hellenic National Committee, ICOM); Dr.I.Trianti (A' EPCA); Mrs M.Theochari, Mrs. O.Karagiorga-Stathakopoulou (C' EPCA); Mrs G.Hatzi (Z' EPCA), Mrs.D.Skorda (I' EPCA); Mrs. E.Sapounaki-Sakellaraki (IA' EPCA); Mrs. P.Karatzeni (IB'

EPCA); Mrs. Z.Malakasioti (IC' EPCA); Mrs D.Ignatiadou, Mrs. E.Trakosopoulou (IST' EPCA); Mrs. M.Akamati (IZ' EPCA); Mrs. K.Xanthopoulou, Dr.D.Triantafyllos (IΘ' EPCA); Mrs. A.Archontidou-Argyri (K' EPCA); Mrs.V.Giannouli (KA' EPCA); Mrs.E.Morati (National Archaeological Museum); Mrs.Synodinou (Benaki Museum); Dr.V.Petrakos, Dr.G.Dontas (Archaeological Society at Athens); Prof.St.Miller (Director of the Nemea excavations); Dr.T.Stefanidou-Tiveriou (University of Thessaloniki, Greece); Dr.E.Serbeti (University of Athens, Greece); Mrs.M.Brouskari; Dr. N.Yalouris; Prof. D.Pandermalis; Dr.K.Lapatin; Dr.I.Lemos (Goulandris Museum); Dr.R.Anderson, Mrs Jan Jordan (American School of Classical Studies at Athens); Dr.K.Gex, Dr.A.Vlachopoulos (Suisse Archaeological School at Athens); the Director of the Photographic Archive of the Ecole Française d' Athènes; Mrs.N.Lazaridou (Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut-Athen); Dr.A.Pasquier, Mrs.Ch.Huré (Museum of Louvre, Dept. of Greek, Roman and Etruscan Antiquities); Mrs.Louise Chu (The Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco, USA); Mrs. Ann Robertson (National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, USA); Mr.Robert Edwards, Dr.Colin Hope (Museum of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia); Mr.Rob Joyner (Australian Museum, Sydney); Mr.Sergio Salvi (Centro Mostre di Firenze, Italy); Mrs Cristina Morigi Govi (Museo Civico da Bologna, Italy); Dr.Geneviève Sennequier (Musée des Antiquités, Rouen, France); Dr.Louise Maquire (National Museums of Scotland); Mr.Benoît Quessy (Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal); Mrs.L.Savvidi and her team (Archives of the newspaper *To Vima*); Mr.I.Staveris (Archives of the newspaper *I Aygi*).

During the interesting, albeit difficult years of my research, I was fortunate to have generous and most needed support and encouragement from good friends and a wonderful family.

Alexandra Bounia, Özlem Görey, Kostas Daramaras, Paul Martin, Pedro Lorente, Pedro Casaleiro, Alex and Valeria Peixoto and Heide Classen were the friends of all these memorable Leicester years. Alexandra and Paul should also be singled out, not only for their friendship which I will always cherish, but also for their interest in my work and their useful commentaries on earlier or advanced drafts of my study. Furthermore, Paul together with my friend Philippa Currie carried out remarkably the difficult task of proof-reading my written English.

Last, but my no means least, comes my family to which I owe everything. My husband Diogo Thomaz has brought a lot of love and happiness into my life. With his constant encouragement and belief in my work, not to mention his almost unlimited patience, has been the ideal companion through my research years. Besides his moral support, he also helped me greatly in overcoming technical difficulties on computing and information technology matters.



My dearest daughter, Maria Cristina, came to my life four years ago to offer me all the pleasures, and of course responsibilities, of motherhood. Her smile and her tenderness helped me immensely in some anxious and stressful moments.

My parents and my sister have been at my side all the time, showing their love and care. They also struggled heroically with occasional blue moods and idiosyncrasies of mine.

Athens, October 1997

# List of Plates

- Plate 1** Some illustrations that accompany newspaper articles on the subject of archaeology and heritage management. These specific illustrations are often not simple visual additions to a written text but perform a summarising function, usually with a caustic or humorist outlook, as in the issue of illicit traffic of antiquities and museum thefts, the financial support of EU for Greek archaeology and the appearance of managers in cultural matters [Source: *To Vima*, 1/7/90:B14; 11/10/92:B1; 8/7/90:B14; 8/4/90:59].
- Plate 2** John Davidson Beazley (1885-1970) [Source: *To Vima*, 13/5/70:4].
- Plate 3** Konstantinos Romaïos (1874-1966) [Source: *AE* 1987:153]
- Plate 4** Christos Karouzos (1900-1967) [Source: Karouzos 1981]
- Plate 5** Ioannis Miliadis (1895-1975) supervising the unearthing of a statue of Athena (Museum of Acropolis, No.140) after the end of World War II [Source: Petrakos 1994:102].
- Plate 6** Manolis Andronikos (1919-1992) [Source *To Vima*, 28/3/93:B4/30]
- Plate 7** The Internet page of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture wherein the Parthenon is presented as the prime symbol of Hellenic Culture. Most of the other representations (e.g. the Poseidon from Artemision, the Boy from Marathon, the 'Kritian Boy', Hermes of Praxiteles, busts of Perikles and Alexander the Great, an Attic red-figured vase, etc.) are also dated to the Classical Period, the 'golden age' of Hellenic culture' [Source: <http://www.culture.gr>]
- Plate 8** Greek classical antiquity as represented by Hitler's Third Reich and Ioannis Metaxas' 'Third Hellenic Civilisation' dogma [Source: *To Vima*, 23/9/84:20; 3/8/86:22].
- Plate 9** Installation view exhibition 'Art/artifact', staged in 1988 in the Centre for African Art in New York. Presentation of African sculptures in the style of an art museum. Each piece is isolated to be contemplated as a work of art [Source: Vogel 1991:202, fig.12-8].
- Plate 10** Installation view of the exhibition 'Art/artifact', staged in 1988 in the Centre for African Art in New York. Diorama in the style of a natural-history museum [Source: Vogel 1991:200, fig.12-6].
- Plate 11** Installation view of the exhibition 'Art/artifact', staged in 1988 in the Centre for African Art in New York. Recreation of the Hampton Institute curiosity room [Source: Vogel 1991:199, fig.12-4].
- Plate 12** Installation view of the exhibition 'The ?Exhibition?' or 'The Curator's Egg', staged in the Ashmolean Museum in 1991-2 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 13** Installation view of the exhibition 'The ?Exhibition?' or 'The Curator's Egg', staged in the Ashmolean Museum in 1991-2 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 14** Installation view of the exhibition 'The ?Exhibition?' or 'The Curator's Egg', staged in the Ashmolean Museum in 1991-2 [Photo by the author].



- Plate 15** The National Archaeological Museum in Athens [Photo by the author].
- Plate 16** The Acropolis Museum soon after its erection in 1874 [Courtesy of the DAI, No. Akrop. 55]
- Plate 17** The Acropolis of Athens today [Photo by the author]
- Plate 18** The Parthenon at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century [Source: an old postcard].
- Plate 19** Replicas of the Parthenon as tourist souvenirs at the Monastiraki market [Photo by the author].
- Plate 20** Representations of the Parthenon and of ancient vases in tourist souvenirs [Photo by the author].
- Plate 21** With the outbreak of World War II, all the Greek museum collections, including those of the National Archaeological Museum, were scattered and hidden away in various places for safety [Source: Petrakos 1994:89]
- Plate 22** Empty gallery in the National Archaeological Museum in 1941, after the removal and burial of the collections [Source: Petrakos 1994:88].
- Plate 23** National Archaeological Museum: view of the Vase Room, datable to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century [Source: an old postcard].
- Plate 24** National Archaeological Museum: view of the Room of Funerary Reliefs, datable before 1906 [Source: Kokkou 1977:fig.97].
- Plate 25** National Archaeological Museum in 1949: antiquities await their turn to be re-mounted and exhibited [Source: Vanderpool 1949:197].
- Plate 26** National Archaeological Museum in 1949: view of one of the workrooms used for the cleaning, repair and restoration of statues [Source: Vanderpool 1949:198].
- Plate 27** National Archaeological Museum in 1948-1949: view of the first post-war temporary re-display in the room that contained monuments of the eighth to sixth centuries BC. The general rule in that re-display was that the larger sculptures were placed on low stone bases, the smaller sculptures and larger terracottas were on high stands veneered with light wood, whereas small terracottas and bronzes were exhibited in cases around the rooms. The intention was to avoid crowding and segregation of sculpture and vases as much as to minimise the use of glass cases [Source: Weinberg 1948:148].
- Plate 28** National Archaeological Museum in 1948-1949: view of the first post-war temporary re-display in the room that contained monuments of the seventh to sixth centuries BC. Special care was taken for the enhancement of the aesthetic appeal of the displays. The walls were in light pastels, free of any decorative elements, and screens were erected behind many of the sculptures so that one concentrates on looking straight at the sculpture instead of glancing about here and there [Source: Weinberg 1948:149].
- Plate 29** National Archaeological Museum in 1948-1949: view of the first post-war temporary re-display in the room that contained monuments of the fifth century BC. The arrangement of the objects has been deliberately asymmetrical, in order to exalt the individual posture and outlines of every sculpture in the eyes of the beholder. Thus, the exhibition stayed again aloof from the pre-war rule that dictated the placing of statues against the walls, in linear and symmetrical order [Source: Vanderpool 1949:196].

- Plate 30** National Archaeological Museum: view of the so-called Altar Gallery (Rooms 34-35), with grave and votive sculptures of various periods and regions, that connect the old museum with the new upper floor wings [Photo by the author].
- Plate 31** National Archaeological Museum: Archaic Sculpture (Room 8) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 32** National Archaeological Museum: Archaic Sculpture (Room 13) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 33** National Archaeological Museum: Classical Sculpture (Room 15) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 34** National Archaeological Museum: Classical Funerary Reliefs (Room 16) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 35** National Archaeological Museum: Classical Funerary Reliefs (Room 18) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 36** National Archaeological Museum: Funerary Reliefs of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC (Room 28) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 37** National Archaeological Museum: Classical and Hellenistic statues and reliefs (Room 21) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 38** National Archaeological Museum: Classical sculpture. Parts of the sculptural decoration of Asklepios' sanctuary at Epidavros (Room 22). It is one of the most recent re-displays of the museum [Photo by the author].
- Plate 39** National Archaeological Museum: Bronze Collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 40** National Archaeological Museum: Bronze Collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 41** National Archaeological Museum: Bronze Collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 42** National Archaeological Museum: Bronze Collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 43** National Archaeological Museum: Vase Gallery (Room 49), the Geometric collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 44** National Archaeological Museum: Panel texts (datable to the 1960s) in the Vase Galleries [Photo by the author].
- Plate 45** National Archaeological Museum: Panel texts (datable to the 1960s) in the Vase Galleries [Photo by the author].
- Plate 46** National Archaeological Museum: Vase Gallery and the collection of objects from Heraion of Argos (Room 52) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 47** National Archaeological Museum: Vase Gallery (Rooms 52-53) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 48** National Archaeological Museum: Vase Gallery (Room 54), Attic black- and red-figure style, 6<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> c.BC [Photo by the author].
- Plate 49** National Archaeological Museum: Vase Gallery (Room 55), Attic white-ground lekythoi and red-figure style, 5<sup>th</sup> c.BC [Photo by the author].
- Plate 50** National Archaeological Museum: Vase Gallery (Room 55), Attic white-ground lekythoi [Photo by the author].
- Plate 51** ground lekythoi and red-figure style, 5<sup>th</sup> c.BC [Photo by the author].
- Plate 52** National Archaeological Museum: Vase Gallery (Room 56), containing vases of the 4<sup>th</sup> c.BC [Photo by the author].



- Plate 53** Acropolis Museum: British soldiers inside the museum during the Greek Civil war (1944-1949) [Source: the newspaper *Eleutherotypia*, 10/10/94:22].
- Plate 54** Acropolis Museum: view of the Sculpture Galleries today. The exhibition remains unchanged since its post-war re-display carried out in the 1950s. Then the display author sought to show the sculpture as sculpture without neglecting the chronological connections and sequence. The azure blue of the walls was meant to create the impression of out-of-doors.[Photo by the author].
- Plate 55** Acropolis Museum: view of the Sculpture Galleries today. Most of the pedestals are inconspicuous poros limestone and coloured screens are widely used for the display of free-standing sculpture [Photo by the author].
- Plate 56** Acropolis Museum: view of the Sculpture Galleries today. The intense striking colours of the old museum walls and of the pre-war exhibition have been abolished and their place has been taken by delicate hues, not distracting to the eye. Colours such as the light green or pale violet were tied on the colours of the sculpture itself [Photo by the author].
- Plate 57** Acropolis Museum: view of the Room of Archaic Korae [Photo by the author].
- Plate 58** Acropolis Museum: view of the Room of Archaic Korae [Photo by the author].
- Plate 59** Acropolis Museum [Photo by the author].
- Plate 60** Acropolis Museum: view of the Room with the restored Gigantomachia pediment of the Old Temple of Athena [Photo by the author].
- Plate 61** Acropolis Museum: view of the room containing sculpture from the west pediment of the Parthenon [Photo by the author].
- Plate 62** Acropolis Museum: view of the room containing sculpture from the east pediment of the Parthenon [Photo by the author].
- Plate 63** Acropolis Museum: view of the room containing sculpture from the Parthenon frieze [Photo by the author].
- Plate 64** Acropolis Museum: the Caryatids Room [Photo by the author].
- Plate 65** Pikionis' landscaping of the Acropolis site. Pikionis created a new paved access road, a system of pedestrian walkways leading to the entrance of the Acropolis - which according to some looked more like a work of art by Klee or Modrian than simple walkways [Source: Oikonomaki-Brunner 1991:83]
- Plate 66** Pikionis' landscaping work in Acropolis aimed primarily at safeguarding and enhancing the readability of the ancient topography, especially at preserving the 'sacred' features of the Attic mythical landscape and additionally at opening up the Acropolis antiquities to the pedestrian in both physical and spiritual sense [Source: Oikonomaki-Brunner 1991:79].
- Plate 67** Flier presenting some of the educational programmes of the A Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, conducted in the site of the Acropolis and in the Centre for the Acropolis Studies [Photo by the author].
- Plate 68** Plaster model of the New Museum of Acropolis as proposed by the winners of the architectural competition, the Italian architects Manfredi Nicoletti and Lucio Passarelli [Source: *Acropolis*:36].
- Plate 69** The Old Museum of Ancient Olympia [Courtesy of the DAI, No. Ol.142].
- Plate 70** The New Museum of Ancient Olympia in the present [Photo by the author].



- Plate 71** View of the village Kastri, which has been situated on the ancient site of Delphi since the Middle Ages, before the beginning of the French excavations in 1892 [Source: Amandry 1992:119, fig.58].
- Plate 72** The Museum of Delphi in the present [Photo by the author].
- Plate 73** The Museum of Ancient Nemea in the present [Photo by the author].
- Plate 74** Plans for the future extension of the Museum of Delphi (designed by the Greek architect Alexandros Tompazis) [Source: Picard & Pentazos 1992:289, fig.180].
- Plate 75** The Old Museum of Ancient Olympia: view of the gallery dedicated to the sculptures from the Temple of Zeus and the statue of Nike by Paionios [Courtesy of the DAI, No. Hege 531].
- Plate 76** The New Museum of Ancient Olympia: view of the central hall dedicated to the sculptures from the Temple of Zeus [Photo by the author].
- Plate 77** The New Museum of Ancient Olympia: view of the central hall dedicated to the sculptures from the Temple of Zeus [Photo by the author].
- Plate 78** The New Museum of Ancient Olympia: view of the Gallery II that contains objects of the Geometric and Early Archaic periods, such as bronzes, terracottas, orientalising bronze plaques, griffins, armour and weapons displayed in type groups and morphological order, shields and corselets on the wall, cases of greaves, lances, and helmets below [Photo by the author].
- Plate 79** The New Museum of Ancient Olympia: view of Gallery III, with late Archaic bronze and clay statuettes, tripods, marble and poros sculptures (most of them from the pediments of Treasuries) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 80** The New Museum of Ancient Olympia: view of Room IX, with Roman sculpture [Photo by the author].
- Plate 81** The New Museum of Ancient Olympia: view of Room VII wherein the famous Hermes of Praxiteles is displayed [Photo by the author].
- Plate 82** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery I [Photo by the author].
- Plate 83** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery III with sculpture (e.g. frieze and parts of the pediment) from the Treasure of Siphnians. The sculptural groups from the Treasuries, like the one of Siphnians, are displayed individually on pedestals in the post-war exhibition. The rationale behind this display fashion is to enhance the observation of the structural pieces at a level the visitors can clearly see. The drawback of this approach is that it distorts the integrity, the real dimensions of the monuments and disforms the real perspective of the reliefs as those were meant to be viewed from a lower level and from afar [Photo by the author].
- Plate 84** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery III with sculpture (e.g. frieze and parts of the pediment) from the Treasure of Siphnians [Photo by the author].
- Plate 85** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery III with Archaic sculpture (e.g. Sphinx of the Naxians, Caryatid, etc.) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 86** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery IV with the statues of Cleovis and Viton [Photo by the author].
- Plate 87** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery X [Photo by the author].

- Plate 88** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery V with chryselephantine objects and the silver bull from a sacred dump near the Stoa of the Athenians [Photo by the author].
- Plate 89** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery XII with the Bronze Charioteer and other bronze remaining fragments from the same group [Photo by the author].
- Plate 90** Museum of Delphi: view of Gallery XI with the Acanthus Column with the three dancing girls, the Daochos' Monument and the Philosopher's Statue [Courtesy of the EFA, No.45892].
- Plate 91** Museum of Delphi: view of the first display of sculpture from the Treasure of Siphnians, datable around 1905. The most characteristic feature of that first exhibition was the spectacular effort to accommodate sculptural groups of huge dimensions, albeit repaired and heavily reconstructed with the liberal use of plaster. The plaster reproduction of the entire facade of the Treasury of the Siphnians was perhaps the most characteristic example [Courtesy of the EFA, No.2273].
- Plate 92** Museum of Delphi: view of the Bronze Charioteer and of other bronze remaining fragments from the same group as displayed at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century [Courtesy of the EFA No.2228].
- Plate 93** Museum of Ancient Nemea: the dedicatory plaque of Rudolph A. Peterson, donor of the museum [Photo by the author].
- Plate 94** Museum of Ancient Nemea: view of the display wherein a map of eastern Mediterranean, entitled *The Ancient Greek world, Visitors to Nemea*, shows the various places in the Greek world which provided ancient visitors to Nemea as we know from ancient literary sources and numismatic evidence [Photo by the author].
- Plate 95** Museum of Ancient Nemea: view of the gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 96** Museum of Ancient Nemea: view of the site from the gallery. Three large picture windows overlook the site and allow the visitor a direct visual contact with the temple and the rest of the archaeological zone [Photo by the author].
- Plate 97** Museum of Ancient Nemea: a reconstructed model of the Sanctuary of Zeus as it would have appeared early in the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BC (scale 1:200) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 98** Museum of Ancient Nemea. authentic and secondary (e.g. photographic and textual) material from the galleries [Photo by the author].
- Plate 99** Museum of Ancient Nemea: a display on the athletic aspects of Nemea including authentic athletic equipment and gear together with colour representations of the various athletic events and aerial photos of the stadium [Photo by the author].
- Plate 100** Ancient Athenian Agora [Photo by the author].
- Plate 101** Ancient Athenian Agora and the Stoa of Attalos before reconstruction [Courtesy of the ASCS, Agora excavations, No.LVI-49].
- Plate 102** Ancient Athenian Agora and the Stoa of Attalos during reconstruction [Courtesy of the ASCS, Agora excavations, No.LXXIV-3].
- Plate 103** Ancient Athenian Agora and the Stoa of Attalos after reconstruction [Courtesy of the ASCS, Agora excavations, No.81-266].



- Plate 104** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: ground floor colonnade where there are statues, other pieces of sculpture and inscriptions [Photo by the author].
- Plate 105** The Stoa of Attalos as a museum: view of the ground floor colonnade [Photo by the author].
- Plate 106** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: view of the memorial room displaying three bronze plaques on the back wall commemorating the excavation of the Agora, the rebuilding of the Stoa of Attalos and the landscaping of the area [Courtesy of the ASCS, Agora excavations, No.83-144].
- Plate 107** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: dedicatory bronze plaque from the memorial room [Courtesy of the ASCS, Agora excavations, No.81-483].
- Plate 108** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: view of the room containing a collection of ancient wine amphoras [Photo by the author].
- Plate 109** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: view of the main gallery as conceived by the display authors [Courtesy of the ASCS, Agora excavations, No. 80-65].
- Plate 110** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: view of the main gallery. In the exhibition areas, there has been care for the provision of informative secondary material (e.g. interesting labels, some texts, topographic plans and maps, models, drawings of objects, of cross-sections from excavated graves, wells, etc.) whose quantity is surprising if one considers that the exhibition has been put together in the 1950s and since then has remained generally unaltered [Photo by the author].
- Plate 111** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: view of the main gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 112** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: display of objects from the public life of ancient Athenians [Courtesy of the ASCS, Agora excavations, No.82-314].
- Plate 113** The Stoa of Attalos as museum: display of ostraka used in the process of ostracism [Courtesy of the ASCS, Agora excavations, No.81-418].
- Plate 114** The Ancient cemetery of Kerameikos [Photo by the author].
- Plate 115** The Ancient cemetery of Kerameikos [Photo by the author].
- Plate 116** The Museum of Kerameikos soon after its erection in 1936 [Courtesy of the DAI, No. Ker 4350].
- Plate 117** The Museum of Kerameikos as it is today [Photo by the author].
- Plate 118** The Museum of Kerameikos: view of its first display before World War II [Courtesy of the DAI, No. Ker 3502].
- Plate 119** The Museum of Kerameikos: view of Gallery I, which contains Funerary stelaerecovered from the Themistoclean Wall and other funerary sculpture such as sphinxes, acroteria of Funerary stelae, bases, etc. [Courtesy of the DAI, No. Ker 4349a].
- Plate 120** The Museum of Kerameikos: view of Gallery II, which contains a very significant collection of Sub-Mycenaean, Protogeometric, Geometric and Protoattic vases [Photo by the author].
- Plate 121** The Museum of Kerameikos: view of Gallery III, which contains grave groups of the Archaic and Classical period [Photo by the author].
- Plate 122** Classical antiquities as tourist commodities; Tourist shops selling Greek art souvenirs in Monastiraki and Plaka districts of Athens [Photo by the author].



- Plate 123** Classical antiquities as tourist commodities; Tourist shops selling Greek art souvenirs in Monastiraki and Plaka districts of Athens [Photo by the author].
- Plate 124** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki [Source: Fessa-Emmanouil 1987:116].
- Plate 125** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: display of a reconstructed Macedonian tomb [Photo by the author].
- Plate 126** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the Gallery of Roman Sculpture [Photo by the author].
- Plate 127** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the Sindos Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 128** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the Sindos Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 129** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the Sindos Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 130** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the ‘Thessaloniki from the Prehistoric Period to Christianity’ Gallery [Courtesy of the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki].
- Plate 131** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the Vergina and Derveni Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 132** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the Vergina and Derveni Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 133** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the Vergina and Derveni Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 134** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of the Vergina and Derveni Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 135** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: view of a temporary display in 1992, which is now dismantled [Photo by the author].
- Plate 136** National Tourist Board of Greece: advertisement of 1994 for Macedonia [Source: National Tourist Board of Greece].
- Plate 137** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina [Photo by the author].
- Plate 138** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina. The lighting system of the galleries by means of atrium glass panes or skylights with aluminium louvres, the exterior walls made of local prime materials (brick or exposed stone), and the incorporation of the building within the form of the natural environment added to its particular architectural personality [Photo by the author].
- Plate 139** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina: view of the Prehistoric displays [Photo by the author].
- Plate 140** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina: view of the displays from the cemeteries of Vitsa and the Nekyomanteion of Ephyra [Photo by the author].
- Plate 141** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina: view of Gallery B where there are examples of ancient Greek and Roman marble sculpture [Photo by the author].
- Plate 142** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina: view of Gallery D with recent finds from the excavations of the local Ephorate in the cemeteries of the region [Photo by the author].

- Plate 143** Archaeological Museum of Komotini [Photo by the author].
- Plate 144** Archaeological Museum of Komotini: archaeological map of Thrace [Photo by the author].
- Plate 145** Archaeological Museum of Komotini: view of the Sculpture Room [Photo by the author].
- Plate 146** Archaeological Museum of Komotini: view of the galleries [Photo by the author].
- Plate 147** Archaeological Museum of Komotini: view of the galleries [Photo by the author].
- Plate 148** Archaeological Museum of Komotini: view of the gallery that was prepared in 1992 presenting the new excavations and finds of various Thracian sites, on the occasion of an International Congress on Ancient Thrace and Greek civilisation [Photo by the author].
- Plate 149** A mosque in Komotini [Photo by the author].
- Plate 150** Archaeological Museum of Volos [Source: TAP Museum leaflet].
- Plate 151** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of the display of the painted funerary stelae from the cemetery of ancient Demetrias, as prepared by D.Theocharis in 1961 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 152** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of a gallery that was re-displayed in 1961 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 153** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of the Neolithic Gallery which was re-displayed by G.Hourmouziadis in 1975 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 154** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of the Neolithic Gallery. One of the principal innovations of this re-display was the abolition of the glass showcases. The glass cases have been replaced by niches, shelves and tables on drystone walls [Photo by the author].
- Plate 155** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of the Neolithic Gallery. The displays are lying or hung exactly as they would have been in a Neolithic house. Colours, materials and the formation of space all had as a starting point the knowledge of Neolithic culture. The colours were based on the ochre [Photo by the author].
- Plate 156** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of the Neolithic Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 157** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of the Neolithic Gallery. Display units were generated simply by using raw materials such as stone, clay, wood and reed. The soil and the stone, (used in different structures), were brought from the surroundings of Neolithic settlements themselves [Photo by the author].
- Plate 158** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of Gallery Six with grave groups and grave goods from the Mycenaean to the Hellenistic Period (2nd millennium-3rd century BC) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 159** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of Gallery Six with grave groups and grave goods from the Mycenaean to the Hellenistic Period (2nd millennium-3rd century BC) [Photo by the author].



- Plate 160** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of Gallery Six with grave groups and grave goods from the Mycenaean to the Hellenistic Period (2nd millennium-3rd century BC) [Photo by the author].
- Plate 161** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of Gallery One with temporary displays [Photo by the author].
- Plate 162** Archaeological Museum of Volos: view of Gallery One with temporary displays [Photo by the author].
- Plate 163** Archaeological Museum of Samos: the old building is at the right side of the picture and the new one at the left side. Between the two buildings, there is a small square [Photo by the author].
- Plate 164** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos [Photo by the author].
- Plate 165** Archaeological Museum of Samos: the new building with the sculpture galleries [Courtesy of the DAI, No. 87/668].
- Plate 166** Archaeological Museum of Samos: the new building with the sculpture galleries [Photo by the author].
- Plate 167** Archaeological Museum of Samos: the famous gigantic Kouros of Samos in the new museum building [Courtesy of the DAI, No.87/669].
- Plate 168** Archaeological Museum of Samos: the old building and view of a recently re-displayed gallery which contains various objects from the Heraion of [Samos Courtesy of the DAI, No.87/674].
- Plate 169** Archaeological Museum of Samos: the old building and another view of the same gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 170** Archaeological Museum of Samos: the old building and view of a recently re-displayed gallery which contains bronze objects from the Heraion of Samos. The themes here are: Griffin Protomes, Hammered Griffin- Protomes, Cast Griffin-Protomes, Samian Bronze Statuettes, Personal ornaments, Phrygian Bronze Objects, Bronze Objects from Egypt, Bronze Objects from the Ancient Near East, Bronze Objects from Cyprus, Bronze workshops, Bronze vessels and Geometric Bronzes[Courtesy of the DAI, No.87/673].
- Plate 171** Archaeological Museum of Samos: the old building and view of the unique collection of wooden objects [Photo by the author].
- Plate 172** Archaeological Museum of Samos: view of another gallery in the upper floor of the old building [Photo by the author].
- Plate 173** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos: view of the ground floor with displays of funerary monuments, inscriptions, decrees and sculptures from the later historic periods [Photo by the author].
- Plate 174** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos: view of the displays of the Prehistoric site of Poliochni [Photo by the author].
- Plate 175** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos: view of galleries of the upper floor with displays of the ancient sanctuaries of the island [Photo by the author].
- Plate 176** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos: view of galleries of the upper floor with displays of the ancient sanctuaries of the island [Photo by the author].
- Plate 177** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos: display of terracotta Sirens figurines, dated to the 7<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> c. BC and found in the sanctuary of the Great Goddess at Hephaistia (Lemnos) [Photo by the author].



- Plate 178** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos: view of galleries of the upper floor with displays of the ancient sanctuary of Hephaistia [Photo by the author].
- Plate 179** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos: view of gallery that contains Bronze and Gold objects [Photo by the author].
- Plate 180** National Tourist Board of Greece: advertisement of 1988 for Greece [Source: National Tourist Board of Greece].
- Plate 181** Paulos Canellopoulos, the collector [Source: *To Vima*, 16/6/72].
- Plate 182** Paulos Canellopoulos, the collector [Source: *To Vima*, 7/3/66].
- Plate 183** Paulos Canellopoulos Museum, view of the interior [Photo by the author].
- Plate 184** Paulos Canellopoulos Museum, view of a gallery in the second upper storey of the building, which contains geometric, archaic, classical, Hellenistic and roman antiquities of various types and workshops [Photo by the author].
- Plate 185** Paulos Canellopoulos Museum, view of a gallery in the second upper storey of the building, which contains geometric, archaic, classical, Hellenistic and roman antiquities of various types and workshops [Photo by the author].
- Plate 186** Paulos Canellopoulos Museum, view of a gallery in the second upper storey of the building, which contains geometric, archaic, classical, Hellenistic and roman antiquities of various types and workshops [Photo by the author].
- Plate 187** Paulos Canellopoulos Museum, view of a gallery in the second upper storey of the building, which contains geometric, archaic, classical, Hellenistic and roman antiquities of various types and workshops [Photo by the author].
- Plate 188** Nicholas P. Goulandris [Source: Marangou 1991:6]
- Plate 189** Nicholas P. Goulandris; his bust displayed at the entrance of the Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Classical Greek Art [Photo by the author].
- Plate 190** Dolly Goulandris [Source: Marangou 1991:21]
- Plate 191** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: view of the Cycladic Gallery [Photo by the author].
- Plate 192** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: view of the Gallery containing the Goulandris classical collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 193** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: view of the Gallery containing the Goulandris classical collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 194** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: view of the Gallery containing the Goulandris classical collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 195** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: view of the Gallery containing the Goulandris classical collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 196** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: view of the Gallery containing the N.Politis' classical collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 197** Paulos Canellopoulos Museum [Photo by the author].
- Plate 198** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: view of the collection of posters that have been produced in the course of the tour of the Goulandris' collection to a number of foreign countries, before the establishment of the museum in Athens [Source by the author].
- Plate 199** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art [Photo by the author].

- Plate 200** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: the Stathatos Building which serves as an extension to the main museum building [Photo by the author].
- Plate 201** Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art: view of the entrance hall and of the museum shop [Photo by the author].
- Plate 202** Archaeological Museum of the University of Thessaloniki [Photo by the author].
- Plate 203** Archaeological Museum of the University of Thessaloniki [Photo by the author].
- Plate 204** Archaeological Museum of the University of Thessaloniki [Photo by the author].
- Plate 205** Archaeological Museum of the University of Thessaloniki [Photo by the author].
- Plate 206** Archaeological Museum of the University of Thessaloniki [Photo by the author].
- Plate 207** Archaeological Museum of the University of Athens: view of the plaster cast collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 208** Archaeological Museum of the University of Athens: view of the plaster cast collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 209** Archaeological Museum of the University of Athens: view of the plaster cast collection [Photo by the author].
- Plate 210** Archaeological Museum of the University of Athens: view of a didactic display explaining the pointing technique which is one of the main methods of reproducing copies and plaster casts [Photo by the author].
- Plate 211** Archaeological Museum of the University of Athens: view of the exhibition on ceramic groups [Photo by the author].
- Plate 212** Temporary exhibition 'Child in Antiquity', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1978-1979 [Courtesy of the NAM, No.unknown].
- Plate 213** Temporary exhibition 'Child in Antiquity', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1978-1979 [Courtesy of the NAM, No.unknown].
- Plate 214** Temporary exhibition 'Child in Antiquity', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1978-1979 [Courtesy of the NAM, No.unknown].
- Plate 215** Temporary exhibition 'Child in Antiquity', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1978-1979 [Courtesy of the NAM, No.unknown].
- Plate 216** Temporary exhibition 'Child in Antiquity', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1978-1979 [Courtesy of the NAM, No.unknown].
- Plate 217** Temporary exhibition 'Child in Antiquity', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1978-1979 [Courtesy of the NAM, No.unknown].
- Plate 218** Temporary exhibition 'The Ancient Greek Musical Instruments', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1979 [Courtesy of the NAM, No.unknown].
- Plate 219** Temporary exhibition 'The Ancient Greek Musical Instruments', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1979 [Courtesy of the NAM, No.unknown].



- Plate 220** Temporary exhibition 'Treasures of Ancient Macedonia', Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, 1979: exhibition leaflet [Photo by the author].
- Plate 221** Temporary exhibition 'Treasures of Ancient Macedonia', Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, 1979: at this exhibition, the intention was to create the impression of an underground chamber tomb or an enclosed reliquary containing the Macedonian ancestral heritage which would evoke deeper emotional responses and aesthetic admiration regarding the beauty, variety and functionality of the displays. To achieve this effect, there was extensive use of wooden screens and false ceilings painted with natural earth colours and heightened by artificial but unobtrusive lighting [Source: Rhomiopoulou 1978b:193, Fig.4].
- Plate 222** Temporary exhibition 'Treasures of Ancient Macedonia', Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, 1979 [Source: Rhomiopoulou 1978b:189, Fig.3].
- Plate 223** Temporary exhibition 'Democracy and Classical Culture', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1985 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 224** Temporary exhibition 'Democracy and Classical Culture', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1985 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 225** Temporary exhibition 'Democracy and Classical Culture', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1985 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 226** Temporary exhibition 'Democracy and Classical Culture', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1985 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 227** Temporary exhibition 'Democracy and Classical Culture', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1985 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 228** Temporary exhibition 'Democracy and Classical Culture', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1985 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 229** Temporary exhibition 'Democracy and Classical Culture', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1985 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 230** Temporary exhibition 'Democracy and Classical Culture', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1985 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 231** Exhibition Centre in Piraeus [Courtesy of the Benaki Museum, No. unknown].
- Plate 232** Temporary exhibition 'Greece and the Sea', Exhibition Centre in Piraeus, 1985 [Courtesy of the Benaki Museum, No.unknown].
- Plate 233** Temporary exhibition 'Greece and the Sea', Exhibition Centre in Piraeus, 1985 [Courtesy of the Benaki Museum, No.unknown].
- Plate 234** Temporary exhibition 'The Mind and the Body. Athletic Contest in Ancient Greece', National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1990 [Courtesy of the Hellenic National Committee of ICOM, No.unknown].

- Plate 235** Temporary exhibition ‘The Mind and the Body. Athletic Contest in Ancient Greece’, National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1990 [Courtesy of the Hellenic National Committee of ICOM, No.unknown].
- Plate 236** Temporary exhibition ‘The Mind and the Body. Athletic Contest in Ancient Greece’, National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1990 [Courtesy of the Hellenic National Committee of ICOM, No.unknown].
- Plate 237** Temporary exhibition ‘The Mind and the Body. Athletic Contest in Ancient Greece’, National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1990 [Courtesy of the Hellenic National Committee of ICOM, No.unknown].
- Plate 238** Temporary exhibition, ‘Delphi. In the Sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research’, Benaki Museum, 1992 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 239** Temporary exhibition, ‘Delphi. In the Sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research’, Benaki Museum, 1992 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 240** Temporary exhibition, ‘Delphi. In the Sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research’, Benaki Museum, 1992 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 241** Temporary exhibition, ‘Delphi. In the Sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research’, Benaki Museum, 1992: plaster model of the site of Delphi [Photo by the author].
- Plate 242** Temporary exhibition, ‘Delphi. In the Sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research’, Benaki Museum, 1992: an audio-visual apparatus, a kind of interactive multi-media game, that aimed to recreate for the visitor the experience of seeking and receiving an oracle by the renowned Pythia of Delphi [Photo by the author].
- Plate 243** Temporary exhibition, ‘Eleutherna’, Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, 1994 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 244** Temporary exhibition, ‘Eleutherna’, Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, 1994: a plaster model of the site [Photo by the author].
- Plate 245** Temporary exhibition, ‘Eleutherna’, Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, 1994: newspaper clips referring to the excavations and finds of Eleutherna [Photo by the author].
- Plate 246** Temporary exhibition, ‘Eleutherna’, Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, 1994 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 247** Temporary exhibition, ‘Eleutherna’, Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, 1994 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 248** Temporary exhibition ‘From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece’, National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1995 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 249** Temporary exhibition ‘From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece’, National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1995 [Photo by the author].
- Plate 250** Temporary exhibition ‘From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece’, National Archaeological Museum at Athens, 1995 [Photo by the author].



- Plate 251** Poster produced by the Panhellenic Cultural Movement in 1978, as part of a generalised campaign against the exportation of Greek antiquities abroad for the purposes of temporary exhibitions in foreign museums. The text reads as follows: 'No to the up-rooting; Yes to the abolishment of Law 654. We must not let the masterpieces of our art being exported outside Greece' [Source: *To Vima*, 3/12/78].
- Plate 252** Cartoons commenting on the exportation of Greek antiquities abroad for the purposes of temporary exhibitions, and the determination of the then right wing government (in 1978-1979) to loan antiquities to foreign museums despite the intellectuals' and Greek people's reactions [Source: *Oionoskopou* 1988:50-51].
- Plate 253** Museum of Louvre, Paris [Photo by the author].
- Plate 254** Travelling exhibition 'Mer Égée Grèce des Iles', Museum of Louvre, 1979: exhibition catalogue [Photo by the author].
- Plate 255** Travelling exhibition 'Mer Égée Grèce des Iles', Museum of Louvre, 1979: Greek and French flags outside the museum [Courtesy of the Museum of Louvre, Dept. of Greek, Roman and Etruscan Antiquities, No.unknown].
- Plate 256** Travelling exhibition 'Mer Égée Grèce des Iles', Museum of Louvre, 1979: the President of the Hellenic Republic at the opening of the exhibition [Courtesy of the Museum of Louvre, Dept. of Greek, Roman and Etruscan Antiquities, No.unknown].
- Plate 257** Travelling exhibition 'Mer Égée Grèce des Iles', Museum of Louvre, 1979: the French and Greek Presidents of the two Republics at the opening of the exhibition [Courtesy of the Museum of Louvre, Dept. of Greek, Roman and Etruscan Antiquities, No.unknown].
- Plate 258** Travelling exhibition 'The Search for Alexander', USA, 1980-1983: exhibition catalogue [Photo by the author].
- Plate 259** Travelling exhibition 'From Myth to Logos. The Human Figure in Early Greek Art', Palazzo Strozzi at Florence, 1986: exhibition catalogue [Photo by the author].
- Plate 260** Travelling exhibition 'Greece and the Sea', Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam, 1987: [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 261** Travelling exhibition 'Greece and the Sea', Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam, 1987: [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 262** Travelling exhibition 'Greece and the Sea', Nieuwe Kerk in Amsterdam, 1987: [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 263** Grand Palais, Paris [Photo by the author].
- Plate 264** Travelling exhibition 'Eros Grec; Amour des Dieux et des Hommes', Galleries Nationales du Grand Palais, 1989-1990 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 265** Travelling exhibition 'Eros Grec; Amour des Dieux et des Hommes', Galleries Nationales du Grand Palais, 1989-1990 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 266** Travelling exhibition 'Eros Grec; Amour des Dieux et des Hommes', Galleries Nationales du Grand Palais, 1989-1990 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 267** Travelling exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Museum of Victoria, Melbourne 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the Museum of Victoria, No.unknown].



- Plate 268** Travelling exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Museum of Victoria, Melbourne 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the Museum of Victoria, No.unknown].
- Plate 269** Travelling exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Museum of Victoria, Melbourne 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the Museum of Victoria, No.unknown].
- Plate 270** Travelling exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Museum of Victoria, Melbourne 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the Museum of Victoria, No.unknown].
- Plate 271** Promotional slogans for the exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Australia 1988-1989 [Source: Australian newspapers dated at the time of the exhibition].
- Plate 272** Promotional leaflet for the exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Australian Museum, Sydney, 1989 [Source: Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki].
- Plate 273** Promotional leaflet for the exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Queensland Museum, Brisbane, 1989 [Source: Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki].
- Plate 274** Advertisement for the exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Australia 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the Museum of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia].
- Plate 275** Travelling exhibition 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand', Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal, 1993 [Courtesy of the Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal].
- Plate 276** Travelling exhibition 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand', Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal, 1993 [Courtesy of the Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal].
- Plate 277** Travelling exhibition 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand', Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal, 1993 [Courtesy of the Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal].
- Plate 278** Travelling exhibition 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand', Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal, 1993 [Courtesy of the Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal].
- Plate 279** Travelling exhibition 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand', Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal, 1993 [Courtesy of the Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal].
- Plate 280** Travelling exhibition 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand', Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal, 1993 [Courtesy of the Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal].
- Plate 281** Travelling exhibition 'The Human Figure in Early Greek Art', USA, 1988-1989: exhibition catalogue [Photo by the author].
- Plate 282** Travelling exhibition 'The Human Figure in Early Greek Art', Los Angeles County Museum of Art, USA, 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 283** Travelling exhibition 'The Human Figure in Early Greek Art', Los Angeles County Museum of Art, USA, 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 284** Travelling exhibition 'The Human Figure in Early Greek Art', Los Angeles County Museum of Art, USA, 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].

- Plate 285** Travelling exhibition 'The Human Figure in Early Greek Art', Los Angeles County Museum of Art, USA, 1988-1989 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 286** Travelling exhibition 'The Human Figure in Early Greek Art', The Art Institute of Chicago, USA, 1989 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 287** Travelling exhibition 'The Human Figure in Early Greek Art', The Art Institute of Chicago, USA, 1989 [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 288** Travelling exhibition 'The Greek Miracle. Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy. The Fifth-Century BC', Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA, 1993 [Source: de Montebello 1994:82].
- Plate 289** Travelling exhibition 'The Greek Miracle. Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy. The Fifth-Century BC', National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, 1992-1993 and Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA, 1993: exhibition leaflet [Photo by the author].
- Plate 290** Travelling exhibition 'The Greek Miracle. Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy. The Fifth-Century BC', National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, 1992-1993 and Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA, 1993: the Greek Prime-Minister at the opening of the exhibition [Courtesy of the HMC, No.unknown].
- Plate 291** Temporary exhibition 'The Birth of Democracy', National Museums of Scotland, Edinburgh, 1994 [Photo by the author].



# List of Figures

- Figure 1** Map of Greece [Source: PCL Map Collection, in [http://www.lib.utexas.edu/Libs/PCL/Map\\_collection/Europe/Greece](http://www.lib.utexas.edu/Libs/PCL/Map_collection/Europe/Greece)].
- Figure 2** Model for object study by Susan Pearce [Source: Pearce 1992:App.1.6].
- Figure 3** Information structure of the artefact by Peter van Mensch [Source: van Mensch 1990:147, fig.2].
- Figure 4** The Discourse of the Museum, a model of analysis.
- Figure 5** Semiotic analysis of exhibition by Susan Pearce [Source: Pearce 1992:142, fig.6.9].
- Figure 6** Temporary exhibition ‘The ?Exhibition?’ or ‘The Curator’s Egg’, staged in the Ashmolean Museum in 1991-2 [Source: the exhibition leaflet].
- Figure 7** National Archaeological Museum at Athens: museum plan after its completion in 1889 [Source: Kokkou 1977:245, fig.95].
- Figure 8** National Archaeological Museum at Athens: museum plan after its extension of 1903-1906 [Source: Kokkou 1977:253, fig.99].
- Figure 9** National Archaeological Museum at Athens: museum plan in 1995 [Source: museum leaflet by TAP 1995].
- Figure 10** The Acropolis Museum: museum plan after 1888 [Source: Kokkou 1977:149, fig.81].
- Figure 11** The Acropolis Museum: museum plan in 1991 [Source: Papathanassopoulos, G 1991:67].
- Figure 12** Sanctuary of Zeus at Olympia: plan of the site [Source: Morgan 1990:fig.4].
- Figure 13** Museum of Ancient Olympia: museum plan in 1991 [Source: Yalouri & Yalouris 1991:32].
- Figure 14** Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi: plan of the site [Source: EFA 1991:3].
- Figure 15** Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi: plan of the site [Source: Morgan 1990:fig.19].
- Figure 16** Museum of Delphi: museum plan in 1903 [Courtesy of the I’ EPCA].
- Figure 17** Museum of Delphi: museum plan in 1950-1958, of the temporary exhibition which followed the plan of the interrupted by the World War II exhibition of 1936-1940 [Courtesy of the I’ EPCA].
- Figure 18** Museum of Delphi: museum plan in the 1960s-1980s [Source: Petsas 1983:20].
- Figure 19** Museum of Delphi: museum plan in 1991 [Source EFA 1991:4].
- Figure 20** Sanctuary of Zeus at Nemea: plan of the site [Source: Miller 1990a:34, fig.10].

- Figure 21** Museum of Nemea. plan of the public areas and displays of the museum [Source: Miller 1990a:19, fig.4].
- Figure 22** The Ancient Athenian Agora and its environs in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c.AD: plan of the site [Source: ASCS 1990:30, fig.8].
- Figure 23** The Ancient Athenian Agora in the 2<sup>nd</sup> c.AD, at the period of its fullest development and the time of the traveller Pausanias [Source: ASCS 1990:29, fig.7].
- Figure 24** The Stoa of Attalos as museum of the Athenian Agora: museum plan [Source: ASCS 1990:192, fig.130].
- Figure 25** Proposed plan (No.1) by an unknown architect for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947-1949. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 26** Proposed plan (No.1) by an unknown architect for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947-1949. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 27** Proposed plan (No.2) by the architects William T. Aldrich and W.Stuart Thompson, for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947-1949. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 28** Proposed plan (No.2) by the architects William T. Aldrich and W.Stuart Thompson, for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947-1949. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 29** Proposed plan (No.3) by the architects W.Stuart Thompson and Phelps Barnum, for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 30** Proposed plan (No.4) by the architect Piet de Yong, for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947-1949. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 31** Proposed plan (No.4) by the architect Piet de Yong, for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947-1949. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 32** Proposed plan (No.4) by the architect Piet de Yong, for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947-1949. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 33** Proposed plan (No.4) by the architect Piet de Yong, for a purpose built museum of the Athenian Agora, datable to 1947-1949. It has never been realised [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 34** Ancient Athenian Agora: plan for the landscaping of the site, by R.E.Griswold in 1958 [Courtesy of the ASCS: Agora excavations].
- Figure 35** Ancient cemetery of Kerameikos: plan of the site [Source: Knigge 1990:fig.165].
- Figure 36** Museum of Kerameikos: museum plan [Courtesy of the C' EPCA].



- Figure 37** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: museum plan [Source: Doumanis 1984:116].
- Figure 38** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: plan of Gallery Eight (Sindos Gallery) [Courtesy of the IST' EPCA].
- Figure 39** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: plan of Gallery Four ('Thessaloniki from the Prehistoric Period to Christianity' Gallery) [Courtesy of the IST' EPCA].
- Figure 40** Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki: plan of Gallery Nine (Vergina & Derveni Gallery) [Courtesy of the IST' EPCA].
- Figure 41** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina: axonometric drawing [Source: *ArchThem* 1967].
- Figure 42** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina: sections [Source: Doumanis 1984:167].
- Figure 43** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina: museum plan [Source: Doumanis 1984:120].
- Figure 44** Archaeological Museum of Ioannina: museum plan [Source: Vokotopoulou 1973: fig.1].
- Figure 45** Archaeological Museum of Komotini: axonometric drawing [Source: *ArchThem* 1972].
- Figure 46** Archaeological Museum of Komotini: sections and museum plan [Source: *ArchThem* 1972:153-154].
- Figure 47** Archaeological Museum of Komotini: museum plan [Source: Pentazos 1977:73].
- Figure 48** Archaeological Museum of Volos: museum plan [Source: museum leaflet TAP 1987].
- Figure 49** Archaeological Museum of Lemnos: museum plan [Source: *XX Ephorate* 1993].
- Figure 50** Axes of masterpiece : artefact and authentic : spurious which structure notions of value, by Susan Pearce [Source: Pearce 1995:288, fig.16.4].
- Figure 51** Axes of material valuation for the Canellopoulos collection of antiquities, after Pearce 1995: fig.16.4.
- Figure 52** Axes of material valuation for the Goulandris collection of antiquities, after Pearce 1995: fig.16.4.
- Figure 53** Notions of distinction and difference plotted against the axes of space and time, to create sense of Us and Other, by Susan Pearce [Source: Pearce 1995:313, fig.18.1].
- Figure 54** Notions of distinction and difference plotted against the axes of space and time, to create sense of Us and Other, for the Canellopoulos collection of antiquities, after Pearce 1995:fig.18.1.
- Figure 55** Notions of distinction and difference plotted against the axes of space and time, to create sense of Us and Other, for the Goulandris collection of antiquities, after Pearce 1995:fig.18.1.

- Figure 56** Temporary exhibition 'Treasures of Ancient Macedonia', Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, 1979: exhibition plan [Source: Rhomiopoulou 1978c].
- Figure 57** Temporary exhibition, 'Eleutherna', Goulandris Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, 1994: exhibition plan [Source: exhibition leaflet].
- Figure 58** Travelling exhibition 'Mer Égée Grèce des Iles', Museum of Louvre, 1979: exhibition plan [Courtesy of the Museum of Louvre, Dept. of Greek, Roman and Etruscan Antiquities].
- Figure 59** Travelling exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Australian Museum, Sydney, 1989: exhibition plan [Courtesy of the Australian Museum, Sydney].
- Figure 60** Travelling exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia', Australian Museum, Sydney, 1989: map to show the location of the exhibition in the museum [Courtesy of the Australian Museum, Sydney].
- Figure 61** Travelling exhibition 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand', Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal, 1993: exhibition plan [Courtesy of the Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal].
- Figure 62** Travelling exhibition 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand', Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal, 1993: exhibition plan [Courtesy of the Palais de la Civilisation, Montréal].
- Figure 63** Travelling exhibition 'The Greek Miracle. Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy. The Fifth-Century BC', National Gallery of Art, Washington DC, 1992-1993 and Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA, 1993: advertisement [Source: *To Vima*, 15/11/92].

# List of Abbreviations

<b>AAA</b>	<i>Archaiologika Analekta ex Athinon</i> [Athens Archaeological Annals]
<b>ABV</b>	<i>Attic Black-Figure Vase Painters</i>
<b>Acropolis</b>	Greek Ministry of Culture (Directorate of Museum Studies) (1991): <i>The New Acropolis Museum, International Architectural Competition</i> , (Exhibition Catalogue), Ministry of Culture.
<b>ADelt</b>	<i>Archaiologikon Deltion</i>
<b>AE</b>	<i>Archaiologike Ephemeris</i> [Archaeological Gazette]
<b>AH</b>	<i>Art History</i>
<b>AJA</b>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<b>Ancient Macedonia</b>	Greek Ministry of Culture, ICOM-National Hellenic Committee, International Cultural Corporation of Australia (1988): <i>Ancient Macedonia, An Exhibition Catalogue</i> .
<b>ARC</b>	<i>Archaeological Review from Cambridge</i>
<b>ArchThem</b>	<i>Architektonika Themata</i>
<b>ARV</b>	<i>Attic Red-Figure Vase Painters</i>
<b>ASCS</b>	American School of Classical Studies at Athens
<b>ASEN</b>	Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism
<b>Athens</b>	Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Direction of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (1987): <i>Athens in Prehistory and Antiquity. Exhibition on Architecture and City Planning, 15<sup>th</sup> century BC-6<sup>th</sup> century AD</i> ,. Exhibition Catalogue, Stoa of Attalos, Athens.
<b>BSA</b>	<i>British School at Athens. Annual</i>
<b>CAS</b>	Centre for Acropolis Studies
<b>CCAM</b>	Committee for the Conservation of the Acropolis Monuments
<b>DAI</b>	Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut - Athen
<b>Democracy</b>	Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Direction of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (1985): <i>Democracy and Classical Culture</i> . Exhibition Catalogue, Athens.
<b>EFA</b>	École Française d'Athènes
<b>EPCA</b>	Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities
<b>Eros</b>	Ministère de la Culture de Grèce, Direction des Antiquités, Ministère de la Culture, de la Communication, des Grands Travaux et du Bicentenaire, Réunion des Musées Nationaux (1989-1990): <i>Eros Grec, Amour des Dieux et des Hommes</i> , Catalogue de l'exposition .



<b><i>Greece and the Sea 1</i></b>	Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Benaki Museum (1985): <i>Greece and the Sea. A short guide</i> , Piraeus.
<b><i>Greece and the Sea 2</i></b>	Greek Ministry of Culture, Benaki Museum, National Foundation de Nieuwe Kerk in honor of Amsterdam (1987): <i>Greece and the Sea</i> , Exhibition catalogue .
<b><i>HMC</i></b>	Hellenic Ministry of Culture
<b><i>ICOM</i></b>	International Council of Museums
<b><i>IJCP</i></b>	<i>International Journal of Cultural Property</i>
<b><i>IJCT</i></b>	<i>International Journal of Classical Tradition</i>
<b><i>IJMMC</i></b>	<i>International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship</i>
<b><i>JAR</i></b>	<i>Journal of Archaeological Research</i>
<b><i>JEA</i></b>	<i>Journal of European Archaeology</i>
<b><i>JFA</i></b>	<i>Journal of Field Archaeology</i>
<b><i>JHC</i></b>	<i>Journal of the History of Collections</i>
<b><i>JHS</i></b>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<b><i>JMGS</i></b>	<i>Journal of Modern Greek Studies</i>
<b><i>Medea-Sappho 1</i></b>	Greek Ministry of Culture / ICOM-National Hellenic Committee (1995): <i>From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece</i> , Exhibition Leaflet, Athens.
<b><i>Medea Sappho 2</i></b>	Greek Ministry of Culture / ICOM-National Hellenic Committee (1995): <i>Apo ti Mideia sti Sapfo. Anupotaktes gynaiques stin archaia Ellada</i> [From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece], Exhibition Catalogue, Athens.
<b><i>Mer Égée</i></b>	Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Éditions de la Réunions des Musées Nationaux (1979): <i>Mer Égée, Grèce des îles</i> , Catalogue de l'exposition, Paris.
<b><i>MI</i></b>	<i>Museum International</i>
<b><i>Mind and Body 1</i></b>	Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. National Gallery and Alexander Soutzos Museum (1989): <i>Mind and Body. The Revival of the Olympic Idea 19th-20th Century</i> , Athens.
<b><i>Mind and Body 2</i></b>	Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Zappeion Megaron (1989): <i>The Mind and the Body. Athletics and Motion in Contemporary Greek Art</i> , Athens.
<b><i>MJ</i></b>	<i>Museums Journal</i>
<b><i>MMC</i></b>	<i>Museum Management and Curatorship</i>
<b><i>MR</i></b>	<i>Museological Review</i>
<b><i>Myth/Logos</i></b>	Greek Ministry of Culture. Exhibition Centre of Florence (1986): <i>From Myth to Logos; The human figure in Greek art (8th-6th cent.BC)</i> , Exhibition catalogue, Greek Ministry of Culture .
<b><i>NAM</i></b>	National Archaeological Museum at Athens
<b><i>NAR</i></b>	<i>Norwegian Archaeological Review</i>



<b>NE</b>	<i>Nea Estia</i>
<b>Proceedings</b>	<i>Proceedings of the First Congress of the Association of Greek Archaeologists</i> (1984), 30/3-3/4/67, Athens.
<b>RA</b>	<i>Révue Archéologique</i>
<b>Sindos</b>	Greek Ministry of Culture, TAP (1985): <i>Sindos, Exhibition Catalogue</i> .
<b>TAP</b>	Tameion Archaialogikon Poron [Archaeological Receipts Fund]
<b>ThChT</b>	<i>Themata Chorou kai Technon</i> [Design+Art in Greece]
<b>Thessalonike</b>	Greek Ministry of Culture, TAP (1986): <i>Thessalonike from the Prehistoric Period to Christianity, Exhibition Catalogue</i> .
<b>TLS</b>	<i>Times Literary Supplement</i>
<b>Treasures</b>	Greek Ministry of Culture and Science General Direction of Antiquities and Restoration (1978): <i>Treasures of Ancient Macedonia, Exhibition Catalogue</i> , TAP, Athens.
<b>Troia</b>	Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Direction of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (1985): <i>Troy, Heinrich Schliemann's excavations and finds</i> ,. Exhibition Catalogue, Athens.
<b>XX Ephorate</b>	XX' Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities & Italian School of Archaeology in Athens, (1993): <i>Lemnos Archaeological Museum</i> , Ministry of Culture, XXth Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities and the Italian School of Archaeology in Athens.

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Introduction to the study**

In a series of writings produced during the 1980s, Georges Hourmouziadis, a distinguished Greek academic, professional archaeologist and museum author, expounded his theories regarding the historical, social, ideological and epistemological role of the archaeological museum in modern Greek society (see Hourmouziadis 1976; 1980; 1984; 1985; 1987). Primarily, his views, surprisingly post-modern in their general bearings and explicitly Marxist in their specifics, were that the functioning of the museum was a cultural process embedded in a given social context. As such it was directly related to a number of interrelated parameters and social, economic and ideological considerations (Hourmouziadis 1980; 1984; 1987). Similarly, the archaeological interpretation and preparation of an archaeological display were processes, culturally specific and thus ideologically subjective and selective. They reflected, alongside the original ideology that the archaeological objects embodied, the aesthetic predisposition of a particular author and of the social structures that s/he represented (1980:39-42). The museum nonetheless carried all along the obligation to encourage and promote a collective, sharing relationship and active partnership with its audiences; otherwise it ran the risk of becoming an institution socially remote and culturally impotent. Similarly, the museum bears the responsibility of establishing an equal and democratic distribution of the cultural product, be it educational or aesthetic, among its public and so cater for the different cultural needs of its audiences.



Within this frame of reasoning, Hourmouziadis tried to analyse the post-war museum reality in Greece and produce some preliminary points and general directions. Thereby, he argued upon the existence and indeed the breadth of a kind of museological problem in Greece. For him, this predicament resulted in the ‘distancing’ of the museum institutions from their public and effectively led to a disruption of their communication structures and mechanisms (see Walsh 1992:26-27, who examines distancing as a fundamental experience of modernity with distinct implications in the institutionalisation of many of the services that modern societies rely upon; see also the definition of expert systems as museums for instance, as ‘disembedding mechanisms’ in Giddens 1990:28).

Hourmouziadis used the ideological placing of Greek museum practices within a certain historical, epistemological and social environment as a springboard for the understanding of museum processes and their cultural overtones. In his pursuit, he proposed as a possible reason for the Greek museum ‘maladies’ the fact that:

(...) In Greece, no specific museological theory has been so far put forward. The views regarding the organisation and operation of a museum arise from a subordinate ideological and aesthetic positioning in conjunction with current idealistic and historiographic theories (...) In Greece, we are not in a position to locate museum exhibitions that have been theoretically out-dated, for these (i.e. museum exhibitions) have never been grounded on a formulated theory. Almost in their totality, the Greek museums nourish time and again the same aesthetic conception and the same historiographic theory; therein the phenomenon of the aesthetic relation is autonomous, revealing and pre-existent whereas history approaches the man [human] as an abstract entity outside predetermined social relations (Hourmouziadis 1984:16) [the original in Greek].

Alongside his declaration upon a presumed theoretical void in the archaeological and museum world of his country, he formulated a gamut of other relevant insights. These considered the ideological, hegemonic, ‘hoarding-up treasures’ perceptions of the Greek museum. In his view, these perceptions encouraged and sustained certain empirical, particularistic and formalistic exhibition norms and manners. Of course, this is not a uniquely Greek phenomenon. Many of those who work in museums in the UK, for instance, have rejected theory in favour of empiricism which posits itself as obvious and natural whereas theory is seen as unnecessary or even distorting (see Macdonald & Fyfe 1996; Macdonald 1996; Porter 1994; 1996). Nonetheless, such outmoded



perceptions most often prevail and eventually generate traditional displays whose self-existent merit as rare and spectacular ancient objects supports a plea for shallow aestheticism and museological and historical eclecticism. Hourmouziadis further suggested that Greek archaeological writing and museum exhibiting steadfastly reinforced the dominant tenet and maxim of ‘ancestor-worship’, national consciousness and national continuity within a general climate of national ‘intolerance’, class divisions and inequalities. His observations led him to the eventual conclusion that the Greek archaeological museum has been turned into a sanctified temple-like institution (*Naός*), clearly a place of religious mysticism and hierarchical discipline that has been, not-surprisingly, fairly unpopular among a non-specialist public.

Hourmouziadis particularly stressed that this situation, although realised by the archaeology and museum practitioners in Greece (see for instance Proceedings 1984; Pallas 1987; TAP 1987; Tsaravopoulos 1983; 1985), has not been officially and scientifically located and thus theoretically described and defined. Instead, the efforts to define the contours of this particular museological problem had focused on an array of relevant, yet essentially secondary issues such as the architectural style of the museum building, the storage systems or security measures, the conservation of the collections or the preparation of various educational activities. For Hourmouziadis, as for many museum theorists (see Macdonald & Fyfe 1996; Macdonald 1996; Pearce 1990b; 1992:11; Sherman & Rogoff 1994a; 1994b; Vergo 1989; also Bal 1996), the whole matter should be approached as a problem of theory and indeed of gnoseology (theory of knowledge) rather than merely as a dispute over empiricist everyday practice, museum designs and administrative bureaucracy (1984:16). For: ‘any museum or exhibition is, in effect, a statement of position. It is a theory: a suggested way of seeing the world (...) For this reason, museums and exhibitions, like social and cultural theorising, deserve careful and critical scrutiny’ (Macdonald 1996:14).

From the perspective of the Greek public and its perception of matters of archaeology, museums and heritage, there have been similarly various signs attesting to this ‘distancing’ that Hourmouziadis reported, between actors and systems of cultural production (i.e. archaeologists, museums, etc.) and consumers of cultural production (i.e. heritage and museum visitors or non-visitors), but no comprehensive body of related data. Foregrounding the absence of a systematic, or indeed even preliminary,



nation-wide survey in the country accounting for public use of and attitudes to the Greek past(s) and its material culture (see Bourdieu & Darbel 1991 for France; Merriman 1991 for UK), the mass media and most notably the Greek national Press prove to be valuable sources of information. For instance, a comprehensive and exhaustive survey of the distribution of all the archaeological articles in two national quality newspapers, *To Vima (The Tribune)* and *I Aygi (The Dawn)*, for the period 1950 to 1994, conducted by the author for the purposes of a separate study which had been going on in parallel with the present one, has revealed a number of illuminating reports concerning the status, value and use of heritage and museums in modern Greek society. Notwithstanding the fact that the reportage of the mass media cannot really represent cultural consumers, that is the non-specialist public, they can nevertheless be taken as formulators of a particular archaeological agenda and as power resources with potential to influence and control public opinion (Budd & Ruben 1979; Silverstone 1988). It can also be assumed that by looking at the archaeological production of the print media in Greece, an indirect but closer contact with voluntary museum visitors and people sensitive about their past and cultural heritage can be obtained. In this context, the author has come across numerous writings, which, apart from focusing on matters of protection of cultural patrimony by the state, have also shown a considerable and constantly increasing attention to museums and their service to the public, both Greek and international [Plate 1]. They have made a strong case for an extensive reorganisation of museums to be implemented through increases in state funding and rate of museum distributions around the country. Furthermore, they have argued for a general reformation in matters of curatorship, security, display policies, marketing and management, and, just as importantly, public accessibility, both physical and intellectual.

Headlines such as ‘The slow reorganisation of museums hampers tourist development’ (1954)<sup>1</sup>, ‘An archaeological country without museums’ (1957)<sup>2</sup>, ‘The Museums must become living organisms’ (1962)<sup>3</sup>, ‘Ancient monuments and education’ (1964)<sup>4</sup>, ‘Campaign for a better organisation of our museums’ (1975)<sup>5</sup>, ‘Museums for all the people’ (1977)<sup>6</sup>, ‘The archaeological education in Greece is underdeveloped’ (1980)<sup>7</sup>, ‘Our museums are for ... the Museum. They don’t inform or approach the public’ (1982)<sup>8</sup>, ‘The Museum and the School’ (1982)<sup>9</sup>, ‘The National Archaeological Museum, the cracked window of the Hellenic culture’ (1984)<sup>10</sup>, ‘The heart of the museums

malfunctions' (1984)<sup>11</sup>, 'The Museum is not a mausoleum...Greece is full of ancient monuments but the Greeks do not know them' (1986)<sup>12</sup>, 'The lonely statues. The Greeks treat museums snobbishly, even now that there is no admission fee' (1989)<sup>13</sup>, 'The managers of culture' (1990)<sup>14</sup>, 'Labyrinths and clues. The Greek museums and how they are exhibited' (1991)<sup>15</sup>, 'Let's revive the museums' (1992)<sup>16</sup>, 'Museum policy in Greece. Familiar evils' (1993)<sup>17</sup>, have frequently turned the spotlight on various issues concerning the museum culture in the country in post-war years.

Thus, taking the preceding writing and observations, produced by Hourmouziadis and the national Press, as points of departure, this research project endeavours to fill a gap in Greek museum literature by approaching and understanding Greek museums from a largely theoretical perspective. This research aims to address a profound and comprehensive inquiry into the conceptual and socio-historical origins of the post-war museological reality in Greece. It basically sets out to critically explore the cultural history and nature of archaeological exhibitions, and more specifically museum representations of the classical past in Greece from 1949 onwards. The intention is to give insights into the process of production through which Greek museums construct, order, represent and interpret the classical past. In short, the prime aim is to shed some light onto why exhibitions of classical archaeology in Greece have come to look the way they do. Thus, in aiming to unmask the poetics and politics of museum representations of the classical past, that is 'structures, rituals and procedures by which the relations between objects, bodies of knowledge and processes of ideological persuasion are enacted' (Sherman & Rogoff 1994b:ix), this research project essentially aims to unmask the discourse of the Greek museum and classical archaeological exhibitions as an 'utterance within that discourse' (Bal 1996:214). However, as museum theorists argue, the museum discourse has itself taken part in and been informed by the elaboration of other critical discourses such as those of cultural value, epistemic structures and modes of representation (Sherman & Rogoff 1994b:x). Therefore, this research will also expand to look at the Greek museum discourse in terms of its connections to other significant discourses such as that of classical archaeology and its scholarly tradition.

Before turning to define the meaning of discourse in the context of the present study and the approach believed to be appropriate for its analysis, it is first essential to clarify the



reasons for choosing to concentrate on the study of museum presentations of classical archaeology that have been produced during the post-war period.

An array of different but interconnected factors have suggested this specific concentration. In terms of thematic scope, some of the reasons were the sheer abundance and diversity of classical antiquities up and down the country and in Greek museums, the long standing tradition of classical scholarship in Greece and abroad, the poetics and politics of classical tradition, the transcendent values of the Greek classical past and their instrumental role in the making of Greek national and European identities and ideologies. Manifestly, classical archaeology, as Michael Shanks recently concluded: ‘provides so many materials for contemporary heritage interests: European heritage, Greek heritage, world heritage, indeed the heritage of archaeology, given the role of classical antiquities in the history of the discipline. Here is a major field which needs to be addressed and a stand taken’ (Shanks 1996:181; see also Cartledge 1986:1011; Dyson 1981:242).

In terms of chronological span, that is the post-war period, the choice has been directed from the aspiration to go beyond the boundaries of a study that would concentrate on the antiquarian and historical background of classical archaeology and museum culture in Greece. Besides, this period has been sufficiently covered by the pioneering book *The care of antiquities in Greece and the first museums*, by A.Kokkou (1977, in Greek) and more recently by a comprehensive and painstakingly detailed doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Leicester in 1993 under the title *Archaeological museums in Greece (1829-1909). The display of archaeology* (Gazi 1993; see also Gazi 1994). Thus right from the outset of the present research project, the intention was to look at the more recent past and the current present which also tend to be of great relevance for the future of archaeological and museum production in the country. It is important to note here that with the outbreak of the Second World War in 1940, all museum exhibitions in Greece had been dismantled and the antiquities had been buried in the ground for safety reasons (Petrakos 1994:81-102). However, by ‘destroying’ the work that past generations of Greek archaeologists had previously created, Greek archaeologists in the post-war era were faced with a challenge to produce altogether new museum displays and embark on fresh museum development and re-organisation in the country which can now be studied almost as one unit, both in material and conceptual terms.

## Studying archaeology and museums as discourses. Theoretical orientations.

This is how Michael Shanks and Ian Hodder define the workings of discourse (Shanks & Hodder 1995:24; also Shanks 1996:103-104; for a general introduction into the Theories of Discourse, see MacDonnell 1986):

*Discourse* is a key concept in directing attention not so much to the content, but to the way something is written or told, and the social and historical conditions surrounding writing and telling. Discourse can be treated as heterogeneous networkings, technologies of cultural production (of a particular kind) which enable and are the conditions within which statements may be made, texts constituted, interpretations made, knowledges developed, even people constituted as subjectivities. Discourse may consist of people, buildings, institutions, rules, values, desires, concepts, machines and instruments. These are arranged according to systems and criteria of inclusion and exclusion, whereby some people are admitted, others excluded, some statements qualified as legitimate candidates for assessment, others judged as not worthy of comment (...). Discourses include media of dissemination and involve forms of rhetoric. Archives are built up providing reference and precedents. Metanarratives, grand systems of narrative, theory or orientation, often approaching myth, lie in the background and provide general orientation, framework and legitimation.

Foregrounding this broad definition of discourse and sociology of knowledge, a critical analysis of classical archaeological and museum discourse in Greece will be deployed by drawing from a couple of theoretical approaches and philosophical stances: one calls on a combination of the so-called internalist/externalist approaches concerning the study of archaeological historiography; the other consists of a body of post-structuralist theories originally developed in the field of literary criticism but increasingly influential and ground breaking within other spheres such as those of art history, philosophy, history, social and political theory, geography, anthropology, archaeology and now museums.



- **Studying archaeological historiography from an internalist/externalist perspective.**

Bruce Trigger, a leading scholar in the study and writing of archaeological historiography, distinguishes two main approaches in the process of historical explanation and interpretation (Trigger 1985; 1989a; 1994; see also Christenson 1989a). One is the positivist approach which presents successive periods of archaeology as a logical and inevitable development. In essence, this internalist approach concentrates on delineating the changing understanding of a particular problem within archaeology or through theoretical developments in other fields, such as ecology, system analysis and art history (Trigger 1994:118). Advocates of this position have largely been the positivist and processual archaeologists who adhered to the view that the development of archaeology has been primarily shaped by the scientific analysis of a growing body of archaeological data (i.e. Willey & Sabloff 1974; Binford 1983). Counterpart to the former disposition is the intellectual/contextual approach which considers all the social, economic, political or other factors that infringe on archaeology from the outside. Fundamentally, this externalist approach focuses on the relationship between archaeological understanding and the socio-cultural context in which archaeology is practised (Trigger 1994:118). Advocates of this proposition have been mostly post-processualist archaeologists who generally gave greater emphasis to matters of self-reflection, subjectivity and relativity in archaeology and in this context argued that social, political and cultural differences could influence not only the questions archaeologists ask but also the answers they were prepared to accept as credible (Trigger 1985:230; 1994:116).

Despite those differences that compelled historians to believe that only one of these approaches could be applied at one time, a current view, also upheld by Trigger himself and one to be fully endorsed by the author in the present study, suggests that these approaches are interconnected rather than antipathetic and that a comprehensive and spherical examination requires both (Trigger 1985:233; 1994:118).

- **Studying archaeological and museum discourses from a post-structuralist perspective.**

What has just been discussed in relation to the internalist and externalist approaches takes us a step further to the consideration of some broader theoretical ideas.

The broad approach and theoretical underpinning of this study has been formulated mostly on the basis of post-structuralism much of which has been advocated by Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault (Olsen 1990; Tilley 1990b). During the last decade, post-structuralist theories, originally restricted to the domain of philosophy and literary theory and criticism, have exercised increasingly enlightening and forceful influences on other areas concerned with the interpretation of cultural production such as those of archaeology and museum theory (Hodder 1986; Shanks & Tilley 1987; 1989a; 1989b; 1992; Shanks & Hodder 1995; Tilley 1990b). They proposed new thinking and opened new exciting avenues for theoretical problematisations and practical considerations. They did so by focusing attention on a number of themes of pivotal interest and meaning such as the reading, interpretation and writing of material culture, the process of writing and also the process of presenting archaeology, the realisation of archaeology as a textual discourse and as a rhetoric, the process of transforming the past in the present, the intrinsic socio-political character of archaeology, the subjectivity and plurality of archaeologies and histories, of interpretations, and many more (Olsen 1990; Owoc 1989; Shanks & Hodder 1995; Shanks & Tilley 1987; 1992; Sinclair 1989; Tilley 1990b; 1991; Thomas 1990; Ulin 1994).

Notwithstanding the fact that this idealist conception arguing that ‘no historical problem should be studied without studying (...) the history of historical thought about it’ was a philosophical approach already expressed and advocated by R.G.Collingwood, philosopher and archaeologist, in 1939, post-structuralist reasoning has dynamically restored and revived it in contemporary archaeological thinking (see Dunnell 1984:490; Olsen 1990:180-181; Trigger 1989a:1-2; cf. Collingwood 1939).

In essence, what post-structuralist theories suggest, when applied to the field of archaeology is that material culture must be seen and treated as analogous to text. It is conceived by the use of words, that is of language, which means that it must be read as text. This inescapable and transformative act of textualisation, with all its facets as



analysis, description, observation, classification, etc., has a central position in the practice of archaeology. It creates a kind of meta-language which has ancient objects and the past as its language. To write material culture is to produce material culture or else to create a simulacrum of it in the present. In effect, to study the study of the past, that is of archaeology itself, is to formulate a kind of meta-archaeological text, or else to unfold an archaeology for and of archaeology (Olsen 1990; Tilley 1990b; see also Hinsley 1989; Shanks & Tilley 1987; 1992).

Thus, post-structuralist work provides great lessons as it urges archaeologists to adopt a critical and ethical stance on the interpretation, writing and presentation of the past in the present and in this respect recognise that the written past does not really exist as a 'real reality' which is identical with the past but rather as a 'representative reality' which is re-constructed by the workings of the archaeological discourse. As the past is re-constructed within and from the interpretative practice of archaeology, archaeology itself can be demystified, deconstructed and questioned regarding the roles assigned to and performed by its various component parts, that is, its 'people, buildings, institutions, rules, values, desires, concepts, machines and instruments', rhetoric devices, media of dissemination, narratives, chronicles and story-lines, and grand systems also known as meta-narratives<sup>18</sup> (see Shanks & Hodder 1995; White 1978; 1987).

All the above direct us to reflect upon the ideological function of archaeology as a written discourse. For, as archaeologists who develop and endorse many of these concepts and operate within post-processualist or as recently re-named interpretive archaeologies would have it: 'The act of writing always presupposes a politics of the present, and such writing is a form of power' that is never innocent or neutral but rather authoritative, historically and culturally situated and time-bound (Tilley 1991:185-194; see also Shanks & Tilley 1992; Tilley 1990b; for interpretative archaeologies see Shanks & Hodder 1995).

Writing and textual production, with their rules, codes and rhetoric strategies, assign the object a preconceived significance and thereby charge it with a specific and so unidimensional interpretation. However, material objects and the past are polysemous and their meanings are similarly plural and open to a variety of readings. In this frame

of mind, it means that the reader is radically incorporated into the production of meaning and this is another important contribution made by this approach.

Processual archaeologists, however, are fairly sceptical and at times openly polemical regarding the implications this textualisation of material culture entails for the discipline of archaeology and the dichotomies positivism:relativism, objective:subjective, singular:plural past denote for the production of archaeological knowledge. Whereas they may agree with the post-structuralist and interpretative position regarding the socially and historically constituted nature of archaeological theory and practice, they nonetheless perceive pluralism as a threat to any authoritative, scientific, disciplined and realist research and interpretation of the past, or indeed this very credibility of archaeology as a science. They denounce post-processualist work on the grounds that it lacks any coherent concept of the practice of archaeological research as a systematic discipline and that it misses out the importance of facts and data (Renfrew 1989:64-36). They hold that any claims for the plurality, openness and polyvalence of material objects and their meanings create an idealist 'past-as-wished-for' and impose an extreme and ideologically dangerous relativism which can then be taken as a licit tool for the production of racist, fascist, sexist or other reactionary readings (Renfrew 1989:36; also Bintliff 1993; Trigger 1989b; 1994).

To these charges, interpretative archaeologies counter-argue that relativism and multivocality, with their preference for non-authorial readings, do not mean that all readings are equally valid, legitimised and approved. Archaeologists surely withhold an ability and right to judge and openly argue against certain readings which can be rejected as less plausible than others. The essence of interpretative approach rests on its empowering ability to transform the reader from a passive recipient of determined and 'closed' texts and narratives to an active creator of meanings, engaged in a productive, creative and critical dialogue with the workings of a written text. For, in reality, the relative and subjective nature of writing and reading and the self-reflexive position taken towards them do not discredit the very existence and value of objectivity, as some may condemn. Rather, by promoting and creating the conditions for critical analysis and dialogues to take place: 'the subjective [becomes] the form of the objective. Objectivity and subjectivity do not stand opposed. They both form part of each other' (Tilley 1990b:332).



Archaeology has several means and media to present the past and disseminate and communicate its interpretative work to wider audiences, such as the excavated archaeological sites, the museums, the mass media, the published media, education, etc. However, as Shanks & Tilley argued in their seminal book *Re-constructing Archaeology* (originally published in 1987): 'the museum is probably the main institutional connection between archaeology as a profession and discipline, and wider society' (1992:68).

The archaeological museum, as a medium of the archaeological discourse, carries along, reproduces and employs many of archaeology's materials and working methods as described above (i.e. techniques, styles, narratives, classifications, values, people, writers and readers, buildings, institutions, collections etc.) (Shanks & Hodder 1995:25-28). The archaeological museum is truly and intimately connected with archaeology's discursive nature, its institutional practice, poetics and politics. In a sense and within the context of the post-structuralist and interpretative archaeologies thinking exposed before, it can then be argued that the museum is itself a discourse, textual, expressive, transformative and historically situated and defined (Bal 1996). It also engages in a process of 'writing' that is performed by display authors; it also constructs texts which metaphorically refer to permanent or temporary public exhibitions and displays; subsequently, these 'texts' are also meant to be 'read' by an audience, the museum visitors and critics (Carman 1995a; Ferguson 1996; Pearce 1992; Sherman & Rogoff 1994b). Finally, a natural but also essential consequence of this confining nature of museum as a discourse is the need primarily to engage in its self-critical analysis; after realising the history, materials, workings and interpretations of the museum and its exhibitions, may subsequently come the need to depart from singular and fixed narrative displays so deeply embedded in traditional museum practice, towards more experimental and reflexive 'writings' that welcome and generate multivocal responses and alternative 'readings' that also bring important cultural debates into the museum. Such 'writings' can potentially reveal the links between the past and the present and thus in a way expressively expose the process of interpretation in the museum and the creation of meaning.

This concern with a historically and discursive understanding of the museum, of its rhetorics and regimes of public display is reflected in much of the recent museological

literature (Alpers 1991; Buckley 1996; Cameron 1995; Carman 1996b; Duclos 1994; Duncan 1991; 1995; Duncan & Wallach 1980; Elsner 1996; Greenberg & Ferguson & Nairne 1996; Hooper-Greenhill 1992; 1995; Karp & Lavine 1991; Karp & Kreamer & Lavine 1992; Kavanagh 1991; 1996a; Lowenthal 1985; Lumley 1988; Macdonald & Fyfe 1996; Macdonald 1996; Owen 1996; Pearce 1989; 1990a; 1992; 1994a; 1994b; Sherman & Rogoff 1994a; 1994b; Taborsky 1990; Ucko 1996; van Mensch 1986; 1989; 1990; Vergo 1989; Walsh 1992; Weil 1995:3-17).

It is also increasingly mirrored and meditated practically through the development of new museum communication models as well as innovative, creative and experimental museum exhibitions (Beard & Henderson 1994; Belcher 1992; Chaudron 1995; Cotton & Wood 1996; Danish National Museum 1993; Falk & Dierking 1992; 1995; Hooper-Greenhill 1991; Humbert 1995; Karp & Wilson 1996; Laberge 1995; Mayer 1994; 1995; Rosenberg & Thomson & Seipel 1995; Schärer 1994; 1996; Stone 1994; Stone & Molyneaux 1994; Vogel 1991; Wall & Tousignant 1995; Ziegler & Pantazzi & Humbert 1995).

In brief, much of current museum theory and practice places the onus on the Museum to approach it: 'as a process as well as a structure, as a creative agency as well as a contested terrain' (Macdonald 1996:5; cf. Lavine & Karp 1991:1). It aims to explore the museum not only as a treasurer-container of material culture, but equally significantly, as a transformer of material culture and of its various 'languages' as well as a creator of meanings and of certain 'meta-languages'. Contemporary 'meta-museum' thinking then poses questions about the poetics and the historically and culturally specific politics of the museum and its public displays. It examines the museum's position on concepts and practices of cultural appropriation of knowledge and power, authorship and interpretation, selection and thus inclusion or exclusion, identity and difference (i.e. ethnic, national, local, regional, gender, social, etc.), ownership and readership, multivocality, subjectivity and/or objectivity, relativity and self-reflectiveness.

Current museum theory and practice is about investigating the public presentation of archaeology from an array of perspectives, both of theoretical scope and empirical-practical bearing. It is about understanding and encouraging the importance of getting the museum visitor, the 'reader', actively involved in the process of interpretation and



creation of meaning in the museum. This is not a sheer claim for more education and learning in the museum; rather it is an aspiration for better and more democratic learning and ‘intrinsically motivated’ and ‘mindful’ experiences in the museum that results from the possibilities given to the museum ‘reader(s)’ to ‘draw novel distinctions, examine information from new perspectives, and be sensitive to context’ (Langer 1993:44; Csikszentmihalyi & Hermanson 1995; Falk & Dierking 1995).

Taking on board all this truly inspiring, exciting and ground-breaking production in the fields of theory of archaeology and museum studies, this study sets out to explore the presentation(s) of the Greek classical past within the Greek museum discourse. In response to the findings, this research project concurrently ventures to propose some alternative ‘ways of seeing’ (Berger 1972) and interpreting the material culture of the Greek classical past informed by new research advanced in the museum, archaeological and cultural worlds. The prime aim and aspiration of the author, who must not only be regarded as a museum critic but equally as part of the broader community of museum visitor-‘readers’, is to try to accomplish both research purposes in a challenging and ‘mindful’ manner.

## **Studying Greek exhibitions of classical archaeology: Methodological tools.**

In Greece [Figure 1] during the post-war period and after the final delineation of the geographical and political territories that was completed in 1948, the creation of new museums proceeded at an expeditious pace up and down the country. The numbers are indicative of the museum prosperity the Greek state and its citizens enjoyed during this century. In 1900, there were fifteen (15) archaeological museums of all types (i.e. national, site, regional, etc.) and twenty eight (28) archaeological collections nationwide; eighty years later the former were multiplied by six and the latter by four, raising the overall numbers to ninety one (91) museums and one hundred and twelve (112) collections (see Kokkinis 1979; Pantos 1985:180; Zapheirpoulou 1987). A more recent list compiled by the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and the Department of Prehistoric and

Classical Antiquities (1996) has accounted for a total of ninety five (95) museums, twenty six (26) archaeological collections and one hundred and sixteen (116) fenced archaeological sites [Appendices 1-2]. In addition, since 1977 a respectable number of temporary and travelling exhibitions have been organised by the Greek Ministry of Culture and hosted in museums within Greece and abroad [Appendices 3-4].

The mere size of this continually expanding corpus of Greek archaeological museums and temporary exhibitions presents a problem of control and mastery over a very large body of material [Appendices 1, 3, 4]. Distinctly, this seems to also be a recurring issue in the practice of classical archaeology, that is the idea that in archaeology mastery of a body of material is all that is required (Morris 1994b). For Michael Shanks, it is also: ‘an interest in the control afforded by information which is intimately related to Modernist projects of surveillance and institutional control and summarised in the panoptic gaze’ so characteristic of traditional, empirical archaeological or indeed museum work (Shanks 1996:97).

Given that the prime objective of the present research was not to construct a detailed and complete narrative history of Greek archaeological museums after the war but rather to ‘de-construct’ their discourse and understand them through the academic and socio-historical processes in which they participate, it was agreed that a selection of a number of case-studies was necessary and would not be reproved as an un-scholarly practice of inexcusable arbitrariness. Rather, it was understood that this selection would provide the necessary means to approach and examine the main research inquiries in a systematic yet also critical and meaningful manner, allowing concentration on specific but undoubtedly representative examples of modern Greek archaeological and museological practice.

But which museums and exhibitions were to be included or excluded from this survey on the writing of classical archaeology in the Greek museum discourse? How could it be ensured that the quality of the research and the value of its results would not be seriously compromised by the inevitable, albeit subjective process of data selection? After careful thought, a list of some thirty four museums and exhibitions was compiled. From those, half represent permanent exhibitions in Greece, whereas the remaining half refer to temporary and travelling displays at home and abroad. The criteria for the



selection of these specific case-studies were geographical, chronological, typological and conceptual.

First, there has been a determined effort to provide a balanced representation of museums from all around the country, that is when talking about permanent exhibitions, and from all around the world, when applied to travelling exhibitions presented in hosted institutions abroad. If certain regions of Greece are excluded from this representation, such as the case of the western islands of the Ionian Sea, the Dodecanese and Crete, this is due either to the absence of interesting museological examples in these particular areas, with potential to provide further insight into the discussion or to the fact that the great bulk of their collections fall beyond the chronological and disciplinary boundaries of classical archaeology that the subject matter of this study (i.e. the Cretan Minoan material culture) deals with.

In addition, the intention was to review displays, both older and more recent, that represented the entire period from the 1950s to the present day in order to shed some light onto the 'changing cultures of viewing' (Goldhill and Osborne 1994b:10) and representing the classical past to wider audiences within this extended period of time. The objective was also to draw paradigms from a broad gamut of archaeological museum institutions, which would include national, site, regional, private and university museums, not forgetting the distinct category of temporary and travelling museum displays. This classification would eventually inform and direct the critical analysis of Greek archaeological museums and through them the study of classical archaeological writing by relating it to a host of relevant and interconnecting concepts, narratives, meta-narratives and practices such as those of: Hellenism, Classicism, art and reason, taste and aesthetics, nationhood, national, regional and European identities, cultural appropriation and cultural politics of the classical past in the present, material valuation, state and private collecting and archaeological learning intended for both specialist and non-specialist audiences.

To conduct the critical and interdisciplinary analysis of this body of material, it was necessary to design a coherent and comprehensive working model and apply it to the totality of the case-studies. This model would gradually proceed from a discussion on the formal appearance and content of the exhibitions to a consideration of their deeper meanings and significance. At the same time, it would have to reflect on the theoretical

dispositions, that is internalist/externalist and post-structuralist, as described above and thereafter endorsed. As it will be shown below (Chapter Four), the model adopted and adjusted for the present study examines both museums and exhibitions as artefacts and by extension as texts [Figure 4]. It follows a step-by-step footing of thoughts and data gathering. It starts by looking at the history and functions of a museum and exhibition. It then goes on to analyse their material properties which can infer anything from the museum's architectural form and institutional classification to the exhibition's description, organisation and philosophy. The next level of inquiry is to locate a specific case-study within a certain environment that is determined by its spatial setting and temporal context, both used in their literal and metaphorical sense alike. Finally, the model suggests the assessment of any case-study according to its scientific esteem, social contribution and its historical or political *raison-d'être*. In the light of these findings, the model also allows and encourages the proposition of other 'ways of seeing' that can potentially lead to complementary or altogether different alternative 'readings'.

Naturally, such a kind of externalist and intellectual analysis as the one proposed in the present study requires 'more data and contextualisation' and hence according to some scholars: 'is more difficult to handle in a convincing [meaning objective] manner than is the internal one' (Trigger 1994:121). To ease this 'predicament' arising from the adoption of externalist and post-structuralist ways of thinking for the purposes of the study, data was drawn from a broad canvas of archaeological, museological and other interdisciplinary sources.

For an understanding and outline of classical archaeological discipline, from an internalist and externalist perspective, research has been mostly confined to published sources which had been fairly rich and enlightening. Special effort was given to the study of all existing archaeological and of a fair amount of interdisciplinary material and to the accounting of more than one view on any particular subject in order to avoid any predetermined biases and secure the soundness of this general and introductory history on the poetics and politics of classical archaeology in Greece and abroad.

For the analysis of the case studies, the first source was the physical evidence of the museums and exhibitions themselves: the buildings and their architectural scripts, the public display areas, the collections, the supportive exhibition soft and hard-ware, in essence everything that constitutes the material core of museums and their exhibitions.



An information-collecting survey for each of the seventeen permanent exhibitions began by personal site visits and meticulous photographic recording that provided a direct encounter with the collections and their modes of display. For older exhibitions that were no more on public view or indeed for the great bulk of temporary and travelling exhibitions, this first-hand experience has not been possible. However, this physical barrier has been overcome by the search, and in most cases successful discovery, of relevant photographic documents in various institutions such as the German Archaeological Institute in Athens, the French Archaeological School in Athens, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, the Suisse Archaeological School, the National Archaeological Museum, the Benaki Museum, the Hellenic Ministry of Culture (Department of Antiquities), the Hellenic National Committee of ICOM, the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, the Museum of Louvre and other museum or cultural organisations in Australia and Canada. In addition, a number of related photographic and illustrative material has been reproduced from printed sources (i.e. periodicals, books, newspapers).

The second source of this research has been published accounts and histories of the museums and displays under study that appeared in guide books, museum and exhibition catalogues, museum brochures, professional academic and popular journals or newspapers. This information was supplemented by archival materials in the form of preliminary museum and exhibition plans relating to specific projects, working notes, press releases and numbers of visitors when these existed and were made available. In addition, interviews and correspondence with staff from Greek museums and Ephorates as well as leading members of foreign archaeological teams operating in Greece were conducted for the great majority of the case-studies in order to understand their views regarding the specific displays and their vision for the museum.

Finally, newspaper material, Greek and foreign alike but mostly from the newspapers *To Vima* and *I Aygi* proved to be an invaluable source of information for two main reasons: firstly, they supplemented empirical data, at times missing from any other type of original or published sources; secondly, they provided an indirect link with the general public and potential museum audiences, that was otherwise totally absent due to the lack of detailed visitor, sociological or cultural studies examining the size and structure of Greek museum audiences. In this sense, newspaper articles have shed light on the ways

Greek public opinion and public ‘ways of seeing’ archaeology, heritage and museums’ issues have been since 1949 through types of mass media other than that of the museum. Foregrounding this useful contribution offered by journalistic writing, each of the following chapters will thus open with ‘public readings’, that is relevant and short, or at times longer, passages which are retrieved from the newspapers *To Vima* and *I Aygi*, and translated from the Greek by the author.

## **Outline of the study.**

Chapter Two intends to discuss the development and nature of classical archaeological writing from a diachronic, international and cross-disciplinary perspective. In essence, it sets out to investigate the classical archaeological discourse from an internalist standpoint by shedding light on the theoretical underpinnings of the discipline and its ‘changing cultures of viewing’, as these have been delineated by certain influential archaeological personalities in Greece and abroad.

Chapter Three moves on to examine, from an externalist perspective, a number of distinct ideological complexes and grand narratives that are deeply entrenched in the workings of classical archaeology, such as those of Hellenism, Classicism, Western Humanism and Greek nationhood. What this chapter anticipates is to briefly review the cultural politics of the classical past and its legacy in Greece and the West in a time period spanning from the Greek War of Independence (1821) and the emergence of the modern Greek nation-state (1830) down to the present (1990s). In so doing, the driving forces that enabled and sustained dominant ideologies and archaeological philosophies during this long period, either emanating from abroad or from within the Greek state’s geographical and cultural boundaries will be examined.

Chapter Four presents and discusses in detail the formulation and the specific properties of the theoretical model [Figure 4] that will be subsequently employed in the entirety of the case-studies in order to direct and foster their analysis in a critical, comprehensive and coherent manner. In the context of this presentation, contemporary museum theory will be briefly summarised as a way to explain the specific workings of the model and to orientate the reader with a plethora of museological concepts, meanings and practices



that are to be of relevance and significance for the following discussion of the Greek displays of classical archaeology and the Greek museum discourse.

Chapters Five to Eleven deal with the crux of the matter, that is the writing on classical archaeology in Greek museums and displays. The material is divided typologically and conceptually and is analysed accordingly.

Chapter Five approaches the Acropolis Museum and the National Archaeological Museum in Athens as national and supra-national ‘shrines’ of Greek (classical) art. Both museums, with their long histories and their roles in specific historical contexts, provide fertile ground for producing a survey of the development of museum theory and practice in modern Greece and offer truly unique opportunities for reflecting on the ideological and symbolic values of Greek national museums. Furthermore, with regard to the Acropolis classical site and museum, numerous opportunities are given for discussing nineteenth and twentieth century ethics of managing, conserving and restoring ancient monuments as well as the relation of a classical landscape with modern society and its integration within a modern cityscape.

Chapter Six explores five classical sites of Hellenism and their museum representations of Greek classical antiquity. This section, essentially, plunges into the conceptual issues the presentation of ancient sites involves and in effect discusses ancient monuments as embodiments of a host of conceptual values, that are aesthetic, symbolic, scientific and/or economic.

Chapter Seven analyses six regional museums and through them studies the ways history and archaeology is produced on the periphery of the Hellenic heartland. The intention is not only to look at specific museum collections and their history, but also at their contribution to a set of scientific, symbolic, cultural and economic values that affect the relation of regional communities and contemporary Greek society with the archaeological resources of their collective past.

Chapter Eight deals with two cases of private collecting of antiquities and museum-making in Greece. In this sense, it aims to address a number of issues such as the process of collecting, the process of transition from collection to museum and of museum exhibiting, collecting ethics as well as the character and content of Ancient Greek Art collecting. Moreover, it attempts to reflect on how we can construct

alternative modes of presenting private collections of ancient Greek Art in the Museum by concentrating on the moral, intellectual and social attitudes that empowered them with or deprived them of monetary, collective, symbolic and/or epistemological value.

Chapter Nine reviews two university archaeological museums and through them intends to reflect on the nature, prospects and perspectives of university archaeological education in Greece. As these museums accommodate two of the only three cast collections currently existing in Greece, it takes the opportunity to consider the changing definitions of Classical scholarship and Classical art, through the parochial history of casts and their changing values through the times.

Chapters Ten and Eleven are about short-life displays. In the former, there will be attempts to sketch the general tendencies of classical archaeological scholarship in Greece within the span of the last two decades, as these have been administered through the choice of themes, the range of philosophies and museological strategies employed in the setting up of temporary displays. In the latter, attention will be concentrated on the exploration of the poetics and politics of travelling exhibitions of classical archaeology. Their history, their archaeological orderings and chosen narratives as well as their museological and museographical physiognomy and its development in the course of time will be discussed. An attempt will be made to cast some light onto a host of complex and diverse issues, such as the formation of a certain national Greek identity for international consumption abroad, the use of archaeology and museum exhibiting by national governmental cultural and foreign affairs policies, the ethical issues entangled around the preservation, protection and exportation of national heritage and many more.

The final chapter of the study is naturally reserved for concluding remarks regarding the past and current writing of classical archaeology in the context of the Greek museum. It is also about the meanings of the findings and their implications for future theoretical and practical developments in the archaeological and museological worlds of Greece and beyond.



# CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY OF GREECE; SOME INSIGHTS INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A DISCIPLINE

But archaeology has changed. It is no longer an empirical and isolated research aiming at the discovery of ancient art. It is a discipline-handmaid to history, as epigraphic and numismatic studies similarly are. It tries to recreate a period, a culture and a way of life within a real frame.

Older generations of researchers were used to immediately uncovering the wanted object: a temple, a statue or an inscription. They would then unearth and bring it into light in a triumphant manner. But in the course of this research, they also mixed up everything in front of them. Nowadays, archaeologists operate in a distinctively different way. They do not move anything, before it has been recorded and studied (...) The methods of archaeology have altered. But the spirit remains largely the same. A mere glance at the map of the currently conducted excavations persuades even the non-believer that the flame that burned in Schliemann's and Evans' souls has never dimmed.

Anonymous, in *To Vima* 29/3/53:4.

Archaeological research cannot possibly expect a revival solely or principally through the discovery of new material (...) Every discipline and science is in need of renewing its methods of research in order to conquer new areas of knowledge; otherwise, it remains stagnant, exhausts its strength and finally declines (...)

M.Andronikos, in *To Vima* 16/10/83:4.

The persistent inspiration for many archaeologists to discover impressive palaces and the frequent omission, intentional or unintentional, of the economic and social conditions under which

specific civilisations have come to the fore emanates from a problematic situation, for they deny the science of archaeology the dialectic method (...) A dialectic archaeology will be able, not only to acquire validity and scientific objectivity but also, to explain the perceptions and views held by people not involved in archaeology in various periods. For we all know that until recently the increasing supply of consumer goods and the desire for their attain rendered most people either indifferent to archaeology and its subject matter or at best -and also at worst- only interested, within a mixture of popular beliefs and legends, in lost treasures and remains of the past that have a mere aesthetic and artistic value (...) Important archaeological finds, the relative raising of the cultural level and the spread of the masses helped the transition of people into the phase of commercial cognisance of cultural heritage (...).

K.Chrysafis in *I Aygi*, 6/9/87:24.

If our country [Greece] has been always charged with a moral obligation to develop classical studies, today this duty and necessity is becoming even more pressing. If we are to take pride in our title and rights as heirs of a valuable ancient heritage with a superfluous self-complacency, we also ought to accept the obligations this bequest entails. We have encroached enough upon the ancients and our ancient marbles for other and not always valid and worthy reasons. It is time to get serious and take the torch from the runner [i.e. the foreign scholars] who seem to be ready to hand it over [meaning they are not interested in the field of classical studies anymore].

One would assume that the first need for the undertaking of such a task would be increased economic resources. This view may be correct. However, more than the lack of adequate economic resources, I believe we lack proper organisation, systematic and methodical work and serious and effective efforts for the generation of substantial contributions.

M.Andronikos, in *To Vima* 24/9/89:58.

## Introduction

Classical archaeology is the oldest of the archaeological sub-fields with an established and 'mature' scholarly tradition of more than two hundred years. However, as Stephen Dyson observed in the late 1980s 'classical archaeologists have been rather inactive in examining the ideological as well as the theoretical basis of their discipline but have subconsciously accepted the major elements of the late 19th-century founding ideology of their profession while dropping some of its most imaginative components and not



replacing them with any new paradigms drawn from the social and intellectual experience of the last 75 years' (1989a:129).

Much of the writing in relation to the history of the discipline has been either traditional and inward looking chronicles on the development of specific studies within classical archaeology such as those on Greek painted pottery and classical sculpture (see Cook 1972; von Bothmer 1987; also Ridgway 1986; 1994), or as Dyson put it again: 'downright hagiographical' narratives on the lives of distinguished classical scholars of the discipline (Dyson 1989a:129; see Kurtz 1985 on J.D.Beazley; also Edlund et al 1981; Bonfante 1981). In this category, we can also include broader surveys in the form of biographical encyclopaedias of classical scholarship such as those written by Pfeiffer (1976), Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1982) and more recently by Briggs & Calder III (1990). The latter is, however, worth particular mention, for it has, unlike previous biographical histories of classical scholarship, concentrated on the modern period of the discipline up to the present. It advocates that to write the history of a discipline one ought to go beyond the collection of biographical details and explore the interplay between its practitioners and the values of their time. Thus, the successive generations of scholars and their changing receptions of, and reactions to, the heritage of Greece and Rome can be remembered (Calder III 1990:xiv-xviii).

There have also been other interesting essays and books reporting specifically on the American history of classical studies but these certainly can not picture the whole discipline (Dyson 1989a; 1989b; Lord 1947; Meritt 1984).

Since the early 1980s and alongside mainstream production of writing on classical sites and their material culture, a number of groundbreaking essays have been produced by distinguished and influential archaeologists working in the wider field of classical archaeology of Greece and Rome (see Beard 1986; Cartledge 1986; Culham and Edmunds 1989; Dyson 1981; 1989a, 1989b; 1993; McNally 1985; Renfrew 1980; Snodgrass 1985a; Snodgrass & Chippindale 1988; Wiseman 1983, etc.). These essays, now benchmark readings for those interested in the poetics of classical scholarship, briefly describe the 'Great Tradition' of classical archaeology and make pleas for the presence of a 'Great Divide' between classical and prehistoric archaeological theory and practice. In essence they addressed a wish to bridge existing theoretical and methodological divides and suggested ways for closer and integrated approaches

between the two disciplines. In so doing, they also introduced self-reflection within classical archaeology and envisioned a new theoretical framework for the understanding of the present research prospects and future perspectives of the discipline, a 'kind of manifesto for a new Classical archaeology' (Snodgrass & Chippindale 1988:725).

Since the 1980s, the social, cultural and intellectual context for the study of Classical material culture has been undergoing profound change, which will be addressed in some detail below. With regard to the writing of classical archaeology's history, this profound change culminated in 1994 and 1996, a period during which this research project was well under way, with the publication of two books; the first was an edited volume of essays on *Classical Greece: ancient histories and modern archaeologies* edited by Ian Morris and the second was the *Classical Archaeology of Greece: Experiences of the discipline* written by Michael Shanks, one of the founding personalities of post-processual and interpretive archaeologies. Both place Classical archaeology firmly in a historical and theoretical framework.

The first volume opens with a long and wide-ranging introductory essay on the intellectual history of classical archaeology written by the editor (Morris 1994b). Therein, Morris adopts an externalist and socio-historical method of historical explanation which provides a fascinating and valuable new account of the history of Classical archaeology (cf. Morris, S. 1995). Among other issues, he concentrates on questions related to the way classical archaeology, its practitioners and the tradition of Hellenism operate in contemporary western society and on how information and interpretations about the Greek classical past serve to reinforce contemporary social structures and power relationships. Morris, thus, sets out to explore a body of powerful meta-narratives, long-lived within the tradition of classical scholarship, and to demonstrate their role in constructing and sustaining the discourse of classical archaeology as a whole.

Shanks' book is: 'intended as an introduction for the future, providing a set of tools and observations for others to make something of the [classical] discipline for themselves' (Shanks 1996:6). Writing from a post-modern perspective, Shanks sets forth promisingly to fill the hitherto existing gap of a full-length classical archaeological historiography and provide a rudimentary: 'guide to the discipline and its objects' (Shanks 1996:1). A plethora of important issues are addressed in this potentially



‘classic’, and so far unique, book on classical archaeology (cf. Whitley 1996:712). It includes topics such as art histories of classical archaeology, typologies and classifications, judgement of styles, connoisseurship, classical collecting and taste, the writings and methodologies of classical archaeology and the historical and conceptual conditions of their production. Similarly to Morris, Shanks puts great emphasis on unravelling the meta-narratives and ideologies of classical archaeology, both in the past and in the present. Within this framework, he moreover intends to assess the current position of the classical past in modern western society and reassure non-believers about the pertinent role of classical archaeology in the future in matters of archaeological theory and practice, heritage management, construction of identities and historical knowledge.

Research such as the above, together with other recent work reflecting on the traditions of classical scholarship, its ‘changing cultures’ of viewing art and its interdisciplinary methodologies of exploring the classical past, vividly demonstrates the point that today is a period of change for the classical archaeology of Greece towards theoretical invigoration, constructive self-reflection and critical retrospectives (see also Beard & Henderson 1995; Davis 1994; Dyson 1995; Goldhill & Osborne 1994b; Kardulias 1994b; 1994d; Schnapp 1993; Shanks 1997; Small 1995b; Sparkes 1996; Spencer 1995). Stephen Dyson pointed out in a recent essay on the writing and textualisation of historical archaeology that: ‘the field of classical archaeology is almost devoid of good recent autobiographical and memoir literature which might aid in the understanding of the scholarly thinking of major field workers’ (1995:37, n.29). However right his observations may be, the foundation stones for this sort of self-reflection seem fortunately to have been laid already (cf. Shanks 1992).

This shifting stance towards the discourse of Greek classical archaeology and its history has not been equally represented in Greek archaeological literature, but recent writings suggest that similar developments, albeit on a lesser scale and in a different, that is less philosophical and theoretical orientation, may be under way.

Much of the relevant research in this area has been produced by Vasileios Petrakos who since the late 1980s has held the post of Secretary General of the Archaeological Society of Athens. Petrakos has compiled a thorough narrative history of the Archaeological Society of Athens (1987a; 1987b), an analytical description of the

Greek archaeological legislation (1982; see also Doris 1985), and more recently an archaeological biography of Christos Karouzos, a distinguished Greek classical archaeologist of the 20th century, which can also be taken as a general account of the history and micropolitics of Greek Archaeological Service (Petrakos 1995a; see also 1995b; 1995c; 1995d; see also Pantos 1993). The realities and perspectives, the micropolitics, bureaucracy and practice of Greek archaeology has also been focused on in a critical and poignant book by A.Zois (1990; see also Kardulias 1994c; Konstantinopoulos 1989a; 1989b), whereas discussion of the theoretical dispositions and orientations of Greek archaeology was introduced by K.Kotsakis in 1991, following theoretical developments within western archaeology. If matters of theory and construction of knowledge have been difficult areas to reflect on, the socio-politics of the Greek past have also been a traditionally complex and intricate field of inquiry for Greek archaeologists. Nowadays, however, the relative paucity of relevant literature is slowly, but significantly, being replaced by a number of interesting publications in which the great majority bring attention to the use of the classical past and archaeology in the construction of nation-building and dominant national and international ideologies (Andreadis 1989; Chrysos 1996a; 1996b; Hamilakis & Yalouri 1996; Kakridis 1996; Kalpaxis 1990; 1993; 1996 Karakasidou 1994; Kotsakis 1991; Skopetea 1984; Politis 1993; also Gehrke 1996; Funke 1996; for more see Chapter Three).

With all these contributions, some of them truly insightful, to build on, this chapter will attempt to discuss the development and nature of classical archaeological writing in a diachronic and trans-national perspective, by shedding light on the theoretical underpinnings of the discipline and its 'changing cultures of viewing' (Goldhill & Osborne 1994b:10), mostly as they have been advocated by certain influential archaeological personalities. With regard to this significant role of biography in writing the history of archaeology, some scholars (Christenson 1989b:167; Collingwood 1946; Preziosi 1989:156-158) appear somewhat sceptical as to the adequacy or indeed validity of this genealogical/biographical approach that considers 'who thought what and when'. Others take a much more positive view towards the legitimacy of biography in explaining archaeology's past and disapprove of any dismissal of biography as irrelevant to intellectual history as a simple denial of facts (Calder III 1990:xvii; Givens 1992). One way or another: 'the rhetorical battles between formalism and



contextualism, between social history and connoisseurship, between modernist and poststructuralist semiologies, owe their marching orders as much to the agonistic fragmentation naturalised by modern disciplinary knowledge as to substantive theoretical differences. As we have seen, the art historian is as much an artefact of the discipline as are its ostensible objects of study' (Preziosi 1989:157-8).

In this section of the study the intention is not to present a very detailed, encyclopaedic history of classical scholarship by listing in full all the remarkable personalities that catered for the classical archaeology of Greece and their biographies. Such an attempt would be a task for an entire book rather than an essay. Essentially, what follows is a very general outline of the poetics of classical archaeology explored through the contributions and values of specific foreign and Greek archaeologists. In the next chapter, this search for classical archaeology's past, present and future will be pursued further by means of an externalist approach of inquiry which aims in the main to review the cultural politics and meta-narratives of the classical past and archaeology, as developed since the War of Independence (1821) and the emergence of the modern Greek nation-state (1830). In other words, the focus will be on the historical conditions and the ways in which classical archaeology became socially engaged within the Greek homelands and the West.

Both essays will hopefully provide enough information and intellectual guidance for the understanding and further exploration of the classical archaeological discourse as formed and sustained in Greek archaeological museums after the Second World War. Also they will provoke reflexive thinking regarding the place of classical archaeology in the late 20th century and its future role within science, the humanities and society as a whole.

## **Defining the object domain of the discipline<sup>1</sup>**

The Oxford Classical Dictionary defines the aims, methodologies and subject matters of the discipline as follows (Hammond & Scullard 1970:95-96):

'Classical Archaeology is the study of the ancient Greek and Roman world from sources other than transmitted texts; its primary concern is with material remains and tangible objects'

and further

‘the traditional role of classical archaeology is the presentation and study of the different classes of artistic products, and its principal fields have consequently been the fine arts and architecture’.

With regard to the chronological limits of classical archaeology, the Oxford Classical Dictionary expands them substantially:

‘its upper one is not tied to the arrival of Greek-speaking and Italic peoples in the Mediterranean lands; in fact the prehistoric as far back as the Neolithic commonly falls within the sphere of the classical archaeologist's activity. The lower limit is the breakdown of the pagan civilisation of antiquity’.

Brilliant proposed, a similar but more general definition of the discipline's aims and objectives (1973:xviii):

‘Classical archaeology must be understood as that aspect of historical study concerned with the reconstruction of the civilisations of Greece and Rome by means of the discovery, classification and interpretation of its material remains’

whereas Snodgrass and Chippindale (1988:725) gave a less conventional account on the nature and thematic spectrum of Classical Archaeology:

‘Classical Archaeology is about a world where acquisition by conquest, rapine and other kinds of constraint was more prestigious than purchase, and where possession, ostentation, largesse and sheer hoarding counted for more than profit’.

The present research focuses solely on paradigms and cases of the Ancient Greek Civilisation from the Greek ‘Dark Age’ down to the end of the Hellenistic Period. The following periods will be comprised in the scope of this work: Greek ‘Dark Age’ (c.1200-900 and 900-720 BC, or less conventionally termed ‘Proto-geometric’ and ‘Geometric’), Archaic (720-480 BC), Classical (480-323 BC) and Hellenistic (323-31 BC). Both the historical-chronological sense of the term ‘classical’ as well as the qualitative and stylistic ones will be profiled in this work. However, references to earlier or later periods other than those defined above will be occasionally made when is deemed appropriate or necessary.

‘Classical’ is a highly conventional term which is merely used to facilitate the chronological definition and limits of our subject matter (Pollitt 1972:2). But classics also involves complicated matters of judgement and taste. Still today, the adjectives



‘classical’ and ‘classic’ are used to determine value, changing measures of value, approval and admiration (Beard & Henderson 1995:82-83). In the minds of most classical archaeologists there might still be the vividly traditional view that by studying the classical culture they come closer to a society that represents one of the highest points in human achievement. In this respect and ‘in a variety of ways both positive and negative, this sense of being special has shaped the development of classical archaeology during the last 100 years’ (Dyson 1989a:131).

So, it becomes clear that many more conceptual meanings and dimensions rest behind the term ‘classical’, other than the strictly thematic, chronological and methodological. That is the ideological vigour and cultural hegemony of the classical material and of classical archaeology that studies it. Classical archaeology and more generally classics, as Beard & Henderson rightly put it (1995:6):

‘is a subject that exists in that gap between us and the world of the Greeks and Romans. The questions raised by Classics are the questions raised by our distance from “their” world, and at the same time by our closeness to it, and by its familiarity to us. In our museums, in our literature, languages, culture and ways of thinking. The aim of Classics is not only to *discover* or *uncover* the ancient world. Its aim is also to define and debate *our* relationship to that world (...) If classics exists in the “gap” between our world and the ancient world, then *Classics* is defined by *our* experience, interests and debates as well as by *theirs*’ [emphasis in the original].

Classical archaeology is a discipline that matters politically, emotively, culturally as well as academically (Cartledge 1986:1011). The present face of the discipline owes many of its properties to the previous periods of its gradual formation. The discipline emerged with an aura and mystique, primarily as the aesthetic study of works of art, retaining even today its Victorian respectability (Dyson 1981:242). For many people, mostly in countries with a strong classical tradition and education, classical archaeology sometimes represents what the word archaeology actually means and stands for. So, it is now time to begin an investigation of the tradition that shaped Classical Archaeology and constructed its discourse.

## **The birth of a tradition; Classical archaeology in its formative years.**

Greek Classical archaeology has originated from a belief in the importance of a certain cultural tradition (McNally 1985:6) and coincided with the birth of the doctrine of 'art for art's sake' (Snodgrass 1987:173) when this appeared in the German Romantics of the late eighteenth century.

The formative years of classical archaeology also coincided with the 'old order' of history (study of political, military, constitutional episodes) that showed little or no interest in issues to do with agriculture, animal husbandry, demography, slavery, gender relations, etc.

The founding father of the discipline 'the man who invented ancient Greece as an object of idolisation' (Jenkyns 1991:87), was *Johann Joachim Winckelmann* (1717-1768) (Borbein 1986; Howard 1990:162-174; Metzler 1983; Morris 1994b:16-18; Pfeiffer 1976:167-172; Potts 1982; 1994; Shanks 1996:56-59; Snodgrass 1987:2; Tanner 1996).

Winckelmann established such a close relationship between the fields of art history and classical archaeology that it seemed until recently that the two disciplines were the same thing. The immense impact of his work derived from the fact that he laid the foundation stone of modern empirical archaeology at a time when archaeology was developing under the umbrella of classical philology. His dedication to classification and attribution by correlating surviving works of art with ancient texts and inscriptions determined the studies of classical archaeology for generations. Winckelmann, by studying Greek statuary through Roman copies which consisted at that time of the main body of the great Italian, French and British collections, gave back to art works their own value and their right to be studied as artefacts and not as mere illustrations of the classical authors.

In his *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (1764), he provided the first periodisation of Greek and Roman sculptural styles by formulating a classification of Greek Art based upon the notion of style (Etienne 1992:61; Trigger 1989a:38; Jenkins 1992:22; Stewart 1990:29): the Antique or Archaic Style ('straight and hard'), the Sublime or 'Grand, Elevated' Style of Pheidias ('grand and square'), the Beautiful Style of



Praxiteles ('beautiful and flowing') and the Decadent (imitative) Style of the Romans. The characteristics of Greek Art were 'a noble simplicity and a calm grandeur'. Undoubtedly, his work shaped the future development of classical studies which until recently have continued to be based on the dual investigation of written documents and Art History.

Winckelmann was more interested in the mechanics of beauty. According to his philosophical notion and aesthetic theory, the examination of the individual parts of an art work could reveal and value the whole. It was a particularistic and descriptive line which gained a lot of ground and considerably influenced the future approaches in the interpretation and appreciation of Greek sculpture. For him, only the art of the Greeks in its best period could show an approximation to ideal beauty that represented the overall aim of art. Gombrich (1977:319) notes in his approach that: '[by] looking at Greek art through eyes surfeited with Baroque exuberance and rococo frivolity, he exalted it as both simple and noble, the expression of untroubled innocence and moral restraint'. His insistence on the supremacy of Greek Art over the Roman proved to be the more lasting element of his ideology.

However, all the above explain Winckelmann's tremendous impact only on an internalist level. From an externalist angle, Winckelmann's popularity can be best seen in the wider framework of German elite culture and the role of German Protestantism. More specifically, it has been argued that the immensely influential character of his work has arisen from the fact that his stylistic categorisations have been products of the German cultural resistance to France which had then proclaimed itself as the 'new Rome' of the time (Morris 1994b:16). Thus, the German appeal to Greece could also be seen as a counterbalance to the French use of Rome. Winckelmann has been a key figure in the rise of 'Romanticism', the 'counter-Enlightenment' and the ideological foundations of classical archaeology which Morris calls Hellenism (1994b:11). He worked and developed his theory of art in a period signalled, according to Foucault, by a shift from classical to a modern episteme which found its ideals in the simplicity and hardness of Greek civilisation (Morris 1994b:17). Indeed, for many theorists of classical archaeology, Winckelmann in essence articulated a metanarrative, that of the superiority and splendour of Hellenism and classical art, that came to dominate the study of and attitudes towards the Classical Past (Morris 1994b; Shanks 1996:58).

The German idealisation of Greece gradually gathered momentum through the new discipline of *Alterumswissenschaft*, developed by the Prussian education minister and advocate of Hellenism, Alexander von Humboldt. According to this ideology, history aimed at identifying the *Zeitgeist* (the spirit of the age) which belonged to each Volk. Specifically, the Greeks were viewed as a race beyond comparison and historical criticism (Morris 1994b:18-19). Yet, around the beginning of the twentieth century, in Germany, *Alterumswissenschaft* faced a declining prestige along with its sister discipline of classics, whereas its influence arose substantially in the rest of the world. National schools of thought, despite their many differences, were framed in terms of *Alterumswissenschaft*. German education and scholarship were idealised and those who sought professional and serious education opened universities based on the German model. On the purely political level, classical education was associated with conservatism while from the social perspective the learning of Greek was aimed at the social elite.

Hence, one of the fundamentals of the eighteenth century was that:

‘individuals achieve dignity through reason; that great individuals determine the course of history by both exemplifying and developing the values of their societies: that there is a hierarchy of human achievement based on dignity, rationality and leadership: and that the highest achievements sprang from the Greeks and were transmitted through the renaissance to the modern Western world’ (McNally 1985:2).

As such, the imitation of the ancients was considered as the only means people had in order to become great. The study of antiquities was invigorated by three things: the discovery of Greece, the Romantic Movement and the development of Natural History (Daniel 1975:20).

The great age of collectors had begun in the eighteenth century but took off in the early years of the nineteenth century and largely shaped the public and scholarly appreciation of Greek art. These early collectors brought back from their Grand Tours to the alluring classical lands of Italy and later of Greece, antiquities for their closets and cabinets of curiosities - the forerunners of many European archaeological museums (see Jenkins & Sloan 1996; Wilton & Bignamini 1996). Although sculpture collecting was more popular, the proprietor of a fine sculpture gallery rarely restricted his collecting activities to marbles alone. Vases, gems, bronzes, terracottas and coins have all featured



to a greater or lesser extent in a well stocked classical cabinet (Jenkins 1988:452; Sparkes 1996:45-62). That was undoubtedly a golden era of antiquarianism and imperial collecting. It was an era of quest and possessive greed for the desired Classical object and of race and trans-national antagonism for the formation of grand national collections of classical antiquities in the western world's great capitals.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the art of the Greeks was thought to be exemplary, and it was in relation to this art that most judgements were made. The self-appointed tasks of the nineteenth century scholars were to record, describe, identify, catalogue and publish the ancient monuments. The production of *compendia* (Brilliant 1973:xv) had created a bibliographical corpus of ancient art, yet usually far removed from the objects themselves and the circumstances of their creation and thus meaning.

Also in the nineteenth century, German archaeology, an undeniable intellectual formulator in the shaping of the discipline, has been highly idealistic in offering a close tie-in between art history, aesthetics and philosophy (Whitley 1987:9). For many German thinkers, the retrieval of the past had to possess a moral dimension. In contrast, the British approach to Greece and its Classical heritage was in temper more empirical and less idealistic (Jenkyns 1991:88).

The central ideas of the period as regards the classical past's material culture come from philosophers and art historians. Hegel, following Winckelmann's views and objective idealism, for instance conceived a civilisation as a continuous process whose course could be mapped by the passage of a transient spirit from one nation to the other. In Hegelian historicism the central notion is artistic or aesthetic evolution or development. Also fundamental to his philosophical system is the concept of the absolute mind (*Spirit*) of which religion, philosophy and art are the three manifestations. He was the first to relate artistic development to an aesthetic and philosophical system. According to Stewart (1990:29):

‘he saw classical sculpture as the peak of a development towards a congruence of self-aware Spirit and eloquently ideal form’.

## Classical archaeology and empiricism; Systematic research and scientific methodology

In archaeology, the application of the typological method constitutes the most important theoretical development of the second half of the nineteenth century and thereafter. Bianchi-Bandinelli asserts that: 'if the nineteenth-century has to be considered in the history of the ancient world as the century of systematic research, of the ordering of the archives of the past, what took place in the first half of the twentieth century was the start of an increased awareness and examination of the problems they posed, a constant effort to grasp the object of art in its intrinsic value' (quoted in Etienne 1992:117).

Darwin's evolutionary theory and inductive methodology (*Origin of the Species* 1859) with its objective and scientific fundamentals, together with the widespread adoption of the Three Age System influenced the theoretical predilections of classical archaeologists. Their orientation involved the search for origins which translated into archaeological language, meant a search for the evolution of style. Classical archaeologists, thus, abandoned general interpretations in order to concentrate more on the facts. A general eagerness for new data and finds which, when put in order, contrasted or related to each other, and which could potentially provide some meaningful answers, was predominant, along with a gathering momentum for exact scholarship. Testing theories upon local workshops, their provenance and chronology along with the first attempts for the classification of the pottery were the general postures of the century.

These objectives were enhanced with the expansion of systematic and scientific excavations which added a lot of understanding and knowledge in the world of Greek art. In 1828, the necropolis of Vulci was found and by the end of 1829 over 3000 painted vases, of original Greek art, had been unearthed. From 1870 onwards, a new archaeological method was developed in classical excavations which became the standard for all subsequent excavational technique (Daniel 1975:164). Systematic excavations were organised, primarily with the aim of discovering the location of all the elements of the urban sites and sanctuaries known from ancient literature. This development was largely due to the Austrian and German excavators in the Aegean,



especially Alexander Conze with his expedition in Samothrace (1873), Ernst Curtius in Olympia (1875-81) and Doerpfeld who became the moving spirit in the new methods of preservation and excavation. By the end of the century, archaic art was becoming better known through the excavations at Delphi, Aegina and the Acropolis at Athens. Yet, the discovery of archaic art as a pure expression of the early Greek spirit was reserved for later, in the beginning of twentieth century (Lullies & Hirmer 1957:13). Finally, the great discoveries of Schliemann and his successors in the last thirty years of the nineteenth century had brought to light the Mycenaean Civilisation. Schliemann acted as a catalyst in the conventional wisdom of German idealism by ignoring the norms of *Alterumswissenschaft* and showing the great potentials of archaeology in Greece (Morris 1994b:25). In more or less the same period, Sir Arthur Evans discovered the Minoan Civilisation while digging the site of Knossos in Crete.

From the mid-nineteenth century onward, the specialised study of style prevailed, mainly as regards the study of Greek vases, encouraged and supported by excavations in the Greek lands. The positivist philosophy of August Comte was then stroking intellectual Europe. French philosophical positivism, which wished to restrict all scholarly endeavour and research of the positive, the given, the actual declared all metaphysical questions to be theoretically impossible and therefore useless. The catchwords of the time were systematic classification according to shape, chronology and workshop, objectivity and scientific approach (Hoffmann 1979:63).

*Adolf Furtwängler* has to be particularly mentioned here for his pioneering contribution in the studies of painted pottery. His catalogue of the vases in Berlin (1885) is a landmark study wherein he compiles his texts not with the old fashioned narrative writing but with the 'scientific' classification of vases according to date, fabric and shape and the Morellian lines of description, to which we shall return (Morris 1994b:28; see also Cook 1972:323; Furtwängler 1990:84-92). With Furtwängler and his pottery studies, later to culminate in the monumental work *Griechische Vasenmalerei* that carried on until 1932, commenced a long period of classical scholarship during which: 'the analytical text was identified with the scientific text (...) whereas academic creativity was defined as the list' (Shanks 1996:96).

Around the same time in the 1890s, the critical historian of art *Alois Riegl* (1858-1905) from the Vienna School together with *Heinrich Wölfflin*, advocated the autonomous

character of artistic development as a sequence of forms governed by an internal logic. In his first book, the *Stilfragen* (1893), Riegl showed that questions on artistic evolution could and should be discussed in a purely 'objective' manner without introducing subjective concepts of progress and decline (Gombrich 1977:15; Podro 1982). For him, the art historians' task was to explain and not to judge. Forms of art and nature shared the same evolutionary vitality and dynamism (Whitley 1987:12; Shanks 1996:29). Artistic shifts were driven from alternations in the artistic will (*Kunstwollen*) and not from the high or low (*Koennen*) qualities of art, as it was hitherto believed (Karouzos 1981:90). Essentially, Riegl: 'examined and eliminated the idea of decadence previously associated with such non-naturalistic styles as late Roman and early Christian art. He also stressed the importance of the so-called minor arts for the process of stylistic evolution and the social context of art.' (Richter Sherman 1981:29).

Along very similar lines, Heinrich Wölfflin (1864-1945) pointed out, with his *Principles of Art History* (*Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* 1915), that aesthetic values change. He understood the nature of the work of art or style in terms of formal principles (Malina & Vasicek 1990:87; McNally 1985:4; Whitley 1987:15; Richter Sherman 1981:28-29). This critical art historical approach influenced classical archaeology and brought the study of Ancient Greek and Roman Art some steps forward by exposing and rejecting Winckelmann's traditional judgement of style and his biased art classification system. Wölfflin encouraged historians and classical archaeologists to relate works to the values of the cultures that produced them rather than to universal or contemporary standards. In these terms, each artistic period could be understood and explained in its own right, a theory that further promoted the studies of stylistic change and the logic of these changes. It became common to analyse the forms, comparing the objects of the same epoch or different periods and trying to contrast the abstract principles they embodied; in so doing, the fundamentals of the represented periods were pointed out and explained. This was: 'a history of art without names' and in isolation from social context (Beardsley 1966:365). It nonetheless hoped to be 'a rational account of the intrinsic properties of a work and its style, and one which was universal hence scientific' (Shanks 1996:29).



Concurrently, German art historians have seen works of art as the physical manifestation, the embodiment of ideas held by the artists themselves and in effect they commenced the search for *Meisterforschung* as a prime goal of scholarly connoisseurship (Ridgway 1994; Stewart 1990:30; Whitley 1987:10; 1991:14). The study of sculpture, as a branch of classical archaeology, continued to be almost monopolised by the tradition of German idealism. Until well into the twentieth century, it was difficult for most people to see Greek sculpture in terms other than that of Germanic sentimentality (Bittel 1990; Osborne 1968:4). The link between the production of forms and images and a society was of little or no interest.

Adolf Furtwängler, along with his prominent work on Greek pottery, produced his most masterful and influential work on ancient Greek sculpture in his *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik* (1893). The main thrust of this work was that the original sculptures from Greece were works of the second or even lower rank. He asserted, on the other hand, that the Roman copies had preserved that pick from the masterpieces of the classical epoch which pleased ancient taste and connoisseurship in the times of highest culture. It was, then, the pick of the best and the most famous that antiquity possessed. It was among these pieces that classical archaeologists should look for the masterpieces mentioned by the authors, for the statues that made epochs or initiated movements (Furtwängler 1964:viii). In addition to this idea, his assumption was that attributions could be given not only to the authority of the ancient sources but also on purely formal and iconographic grounds. Furtwängler created a strong tradition that was followed by later generations of scholars, such as the German Ernst Buschor, the French Charles Picard and the German-American Gisela Richter and Margarete Bieber. These scholars developed and expanded his methods of analysis in order to reveal the variety and directions of Greek sculpture and the personal styles of its makers, implementing the results of the scientifically based archaeological excavations. However, to use the words of Andrew Stewart: 'the continuing spell of Furtwängler's achievement, and of the great sculptors themselves, has ensured that much of the bibliography of Greek sculpture still addresses [up to the present], in one way or another, these basic concerns, often to the detriment of other lines of inquiry' (1990:30).

*Ernst Buschor* (1876-1962) left a memorable legacy at the University of Munich where he taught and directed the work of nearly two generations of German and foreign classicists (Benson 1980; Homann-Wedeking 1966:221-224; Raubitschek 1963:421). His influence, particularly on Greek archaeologists, has been profound, as we shall discuss shortly. His writings were characterised by their particular poetic style and by their lack of attention to factual and bibliographical detail, some particularities that also went on in the work of his disciples. Buschor's contributions were the result of an intimate and prolonged association with original monuments. In this vein, he created a school of thought which placed exclusive emphasis on originals and chose not to get involved with speculations studying literary sources or Roman copies. As Raubitschek put it (1963:421): 'having seen Greek art in its true light, [Buschor] refused to speculate about shadows and reflections which for all their distorted details had lost what mattered to [him] most: beauty (κάλλος)'. His most challenging and idiosyncratic achievement was his devotion to the concrete and abstract aspects of the ancient works. For him, the historical importance and the relevance of ancient works to the modern beholder were implied in both those aspects that remained in a dialectical tension one with the other (Schindler 1990:14-15). This theoretical stance led him to interpretations, often cyclical or even mystical in tone, that required the task of making the cultural legacy of antiquity relevant (ibid.15; also Stewart 1990:31).

*Gisela Marie Augusta Richter* (1882-1972), a distinguished scholar and museum archaeologist from a wealthy family with a deep humanistic education, offered rich archaeological work in the Morellian and Furtwänglerian tradition (see Edlund et al 1981:275-300). Her influence particularly from Morelli's work is clearly stated in some of her writing: 'I later found this method the best possible one also in evaluating Greek and pseudo-Greek Sculpture....' and further '[Morelli's method] has become the basis of connoisseurship not only in Renaissance paintings, but in all art, including Greek vase-painting' (quoted from Edlund et al 1981:279, n.17,18). So, her early desire and commitment to defining the essence of Greek style and the conflicting strains evident in its chronological development dominated her subsequent thinking and writing on the stylistic analysis of different media. One can distinguish from the bulk of her work, three very influential published studies, fundamental contributions to the understanding of archaic art (*Kouroi, Archaic Greek Youths* 1942, *Korai, Archaic Greek Maidens*



1968, *Archaic Gravestones of Attica* 1961) wherein she sought to trace the evolution and chronology of the Kouros and standing Kore type as well as of the Attic Gravestones of the Archaic Period respectively. Some of her writing is illustrative of her methodological systems:

‘In the kouroi the chronological sequence is indicated by the gradual progression in the knowledge of anatomy, from the superficial observations during the 7th-century BC to the detailed understanding of the structure of the human body attained during the 5th-century’

and further:

‘The detailed analysis of the consecutive development of anatomical knowledge along naturalistic lines, not only in general structure but in the rendering of each and every part has been of use both in dating the Kouroi themselves and for the chronology of related works’ (Richter 1970:ix).

In these short reflections on methodology, her biographers added that (Edlund et al 1981:292): ‘Each [of her] books is a catalogue in which the pieces are described individually and then placed in their respective stylistic and chronological framework. She based her relative and absolute chronology on the theory of a gradual development from a stylised and conventional rendering of the human body to a more naturalistic one. Her approach has been criticised by some as too formalist, and also for not allowing for regional variations in style; but who else has contributed such a vast number of research tools so continually used by both scholar and layman alike?’

*Margarete Bieber* (1879-1978), another distinguished female scholar that studied history of ancient art in Bonn, added her personal brush strokes in the general delineation of classical sculptural studies (Bonfante 1981:240-274). Starting her career in Germany but moving in the 1930s to the USA to escape from the Nazis, she thus contributed to the influx of German art-historical scholarship in American archaeology and classical studies. Bieber developed an interdisciplinary approach which opened her work to scholarly criticism. Practical and positivistic in her general approach, she offered an early and pioneering exploration of Roman copies (see *Ancient Copies: Contributions to the History of Greek and Roman Art*, 1977) in viewing them as Roman art and not as mere reflections of the superior and ‘sublime’ Greek art (Bonfante 1981:256).

Generally speaking, German idealism and the quest for *Meisterforschung* and *Meisterwerke* have been two of the main internal, yet also compelling factors that shaped the poetics of classical archaeology on the basis of scholarly traditionalism, connoisseurship and judgements of value. She divorced classical works of art: 'from the social and religious purposes for which they were originally made and stripped them of the extra-artistic values which they once have carried' (Osborne 1968:185).

Turning now from sculptural to pottery studies, the most influential figure in this area of research has been the Englishman *John Davidson Beazley* (1885-1970) [Plate 2] who worked ceaselessly for over sixty years and determined the field and the lines of its research inquiries which was continued by others (Andronikos 1970; Ashmole 1972; Beard 1986; 1991; Boardman 1985; Cook 1972; Hoffmann 1979; Kurtz 1985; 1989; Levi 1986; Robertson 1971; 1985; 1991; Shanks 1996:30-41; Sparkes 1996; Vickers 1987:100; Vickers & Gill 1994; von Bothmer 1985; 1990; Whitley 1997). Beazley was familiar with Giovanni Morelli's system according to which the identity of Italian painters could be established through the study of a number of insights, especially those constantly recurring details such as the ears, eyes and hands which composed the artist's unconscious formula-implied signature.

Morelli himself had expressed openly his position on this classification system: 'My adversaries are pleased to call me someone who has no understanding of the spiritual content of a work of art, and who therefore gives particular importance to external details such as the form of the hands, the ear, and even, *horribile dictu*, to such rude things as fingernails' (Morelli 1897:4).

In this same direction, Beazley sought<sup>2</sup> to provide a Renaissance model for the history of Athenian Vase Painting. By analysing the rendering of detail, especially anatomically, the way of outlining an eyelid, earlobe, fingernails or the repeating patterns on the drapery of the figures, Beazley did not aim to interpret the whole work as a cultural or personal expression. Rather his life project was: 'to classify by the hands of painters the hitherto indeterminate mass of Greek painted pottery' (Elsner 1990:950) and so set up the architectonics for the establishment of a relative date-chronology in ancient Greek pottery and by extension classical archaeology. The revolutionary importance of Beazley's work rests on the fact, as some have observed, that he, by distinguishing the development of Attic vase-painting in terms of individual



masters, has saved classical pottery from a schematic structure like the one of Minoan and Helladic Pottery (Morris 1994b; Robertson 1985:19). Beazley developed an elaborate system on the basis of which he drew distinctions between a painter and a vase in manner, and between 'manner' and the following workshop, school, circle, group, influence, kinship and so on (Vickers 1985:127; see Robertson 1983:xi-xvii). His technique was applied to thousands of vases, some fifteen hundred by the year 1942, and resulted in the identification of some eight hundred individual craftsmen (masters and pupils, colleagues and rivals). His most prominent publications have been the *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters* (ARV first published in 1942), *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters* (ABV published in 1956) and *Paralipomena* (1971), the three are also referred to as 'the Bible'.

According to some studies, classical art historians' acceptance of Beazley's Morellising was no doubt derived in part from their post-Freudian world-view, whereby every small detail of the individual's character could be placed under scrutiny in order to define the whole personality (Beard 1986). In this respect, this late nineteenth-century 'epistemological model' stood on the assumption that 'tiny details provide the key to a deeper reality, inaccessible by other methods. These details may be symptoms for Freud, or clues for Holmes, or features of paintings for Morelli and Beazley (Ginzburg 1983:87).

Beazley also mirrored Russel's 'logical atomism' which insisted that only individual and observable sense data are relevant and worth recording (Hoffmann 1979:65), a practice more in favour of the descriptive objectives of the discipline rather than the interpretative ones. Beazley's connoisseurship has been undoubtedly of the highest quality and converted what had been the subject of antiquarian interest into high status art history (Sparkes 1996:91-2). Thus, it has not been surprising that he attracted and inspired many warm advocates, including Sir John Boardman, until recently Lincoln Professor at Oxford being the most influential of them, who has continued and impressively extended his work up to the present (Boardman 1974; 1975; 1989; Carpenter 1989; Cook 1972:327; Kurtz 1975; Kurtz & Beazley 1983; von Bothmer 1985).

However, in recent years, Beazley's highly sophisticated and particularistic art-historical approach and his indisputable qualities as a connoisseur have come to divide

academic research on the field of pottery studies and have given rise to a series of questions and debates. These reflected on important issues such as the validity and credibility of the Beazleyite approach and tradition. Objections have also gathered pace with regard to the position or 'tyranny' of the attribution process, that Beazley himself developed in a masterly manner, over other, more socio-historical, anthropological, economic and contextual, lines of inquiry that could divert attention from other important matters of function, meaning, interpretation and imagery.

Recent truly insightful and inspired research touched upon the association of attribution studies and material valuation of ancient vases as high art with the creation of an archaeological and historical fallacy regarding the real functions and values of ceramic artefacts and the artistic status of their creators in antiquity. More precisely, Michael Vickers and David Gill argued that since the eighteenth century classical archaeologists, of course including Beazley and his ground-breaking work in the twentieth century, have overvalued Greek painted pottery out of a mixture of complexity in the art market and naive positivism (Gill & Vickers 1989; Vickers 1985; 1987; Vickers & Gill 1994). For them, painted vases, generally seen and appreciated as high art, were in reality imitations and copies of metal vessels that, although today notoriously less represented in the archaeological record, were in the ancient world the truly precious symbols of status and expressions of art. This position, today generally accepted and endorsed by the progressive practitioners of classical archaeology, has also made a case for the affiliation of the Beazleyite explanatory systems and ideals with the nineteenth-century Arts and Crafts Movement and doctrines. The latter advocating that: 'fine ceramics could only come from the labours of independent artists using new technical knowledge with the pure objective of making beautiful things' (Hoffmann 1979:66; see also Morris 1994b:37; Vickers 1985:122-124; Vickers 1992:353) gave ground to Beazley's ambitious, albeit largely utopian, vision in finding or rather inventing 'real men with real lives', personalities and artistic individualities based on an array of stylistic details and clues (Elsner 1990:950). Many scholars working at present in the field of ceramic studies see a link between this ceramocentric Beazleyite scholarship and tradition and the creation and rise of a symbolic and monetary commodification of ancient pottery. They also question and make judgements on how this exaltation of ancient Greek figured vases as a valuable collectable relates to the workings and mechanisms of the



international art market and by extension the clandestine removal of pots from their contexts of origin in order to meet the former's increasing demands (Beard 1986; Elsner 1990; Gill & Vickers 1989; Hoffmann 1979; Shanks 1996:34-36, 64; Sparkes 1996; Tanner 1994; Vickers 1985; Vickers & Gill 1994; Whitley 1992-3:7). To use Hoffmann's words: 'the influence of Beazley on the market in classical antiquities during his lifetime was profound, on a market which it must be stressed, was responsible in the decades following World War II for a mass exodus of Greek Vases from their lands of origin quite comparable to that of the days of Lucien Bonaparte' (Hoffmann 1979:66).

So, largely, much of what concerns Beazley's methodology and contribution to the field involves a sort of 'politics of connoisseurship' (Elsner 1990:952), intended and promoted by Beazley either consciously or unconsciously (Beard 1986; Vickers & Gill 1994:154). The Beazleyite promotion of the study of ancient ceramic art expressed either as an antidote (also advocated by the Arts and Crafts Movement) to the corruption of materialism and industrial society (Morris 1994b:37) or as 'an imperial method in an imperialist time that stamped the aura of genius on the greatest masterpieces of the great national collections' (Elsner 1990:952), or lastly as a means to provide 'that most saleable of commodities -artists' names' has certainly left a legacy that proved to be one of the most contentious and controversial, yet also intellectually most interesting for classical archaeology and the study of its discourse.

All these achievements and conceptual approaches in the field of classical art history denote that, for more than two hundred years, the artefacts of ancient Greece (especially pottery, statuary and architecture) have been worshipped as models of excellence. As Snodgrass & Chippindale recently put it: 'our choosing to venerate the classical as classical says something about ourselves but not of itself about classical society' (1988:724).

## **Classical archaeology and art history**

So far, what has been revealed is that classical archaeology or the studies of classical art had shared many features with the discipline of art history, in terms of discipline,

aims and methods. Clearly, founders of art historical enterprise such as Morelli, Riegl and Wofflin exercised significant influence upon classical Art historical studies.

This close allegiance to art history is reflected in the object-oriented approach so consistently adopted by the classical archaeological discipline. The roots that both specialties had followed in pursuit of the required scientificity and professionalism have been similar, mainly as regards their endorsement of traditional sign theories as connoisseurship and iconology. Therefore, the rationale and underlying methodologies of art history are of great interest and importance in order to assess the archaeology of classical archaeology.

The scientific establishment of art history has been devoted to the comparison and analysis of works of art and their creators' biographies, to the estimation of their relative worth, aiming further, but not always achieving it with success, at the understanding of their evidential value with respect to the history and progressive evolution of man (Preziosi 1992:365). The meaning of an item, according to art historical reasoning, is a function of its place, its ranking in the system which assesses first the aesthetic qualities and further the moral values of an artwork. Its emblem has been the act of collecting, peering at groups and systematically displaying a universal history of art. Art historical practice has been in main focused on the restoration of the circumstances that conditioned the production of an artwork. In this respect, the principal question to be answered was what was the *evidential status* of an object -apart from its mere aesthetic status (Preziosi 1992:374). According to Donald Preziosi (1992:375), the theory that underpinned art history as an academic discipline was that the object was a medium, 'a vehicle by means of which the intentions, values, attitudes, messages, emotions, or agendas of the maker are conveyed to beholders or observers'. Further, 'a correlative supposition is that synchronic or diachronic changes in form will signal changes in what the form conveys to its observers...An artistic practice or tradition are assumed to be an index of variations in an evolving system of thought, belief or political or social attitudes'. That type of approach presupposed the gathering of large amounts of data that would allow comparative 'anamorphic' archival treatment, or else what Preziosi termed 'the panoptic gaze' of disciplinary knowledge after Bentham's Panopticon (see Preziosi 1989:31-6, 54-79).



However, in this treatment, the bulk of the mundane artefacts and features have often been ignored despite the wealth of data they contained. Today, classical archaeologists can say much about the chronology of fine wares or civic and monumental architecture, for instance, but poignantly little about ordinary artefacts or domestic forms (Kardulias 1994d:43).

Over the last decade there has been an animated discussion upon a presumed crisis in/of art history (see *Art Journal* 1982; cf: Preziosi 1989). For Preziosi, the crisis that occurs goes deeper than being a mere disagreement on behalf of its practitioners about modes of study. It regards the essential identity, goals and purposes of the discipline (1989:18).

New directions such as theories of visual semiotics and signification considerations that infringed on other disciplines laid also in flux the theoretical establishment of art history despite its strong connection with powerful institutions such as the auction houses and the world of the commodity marketplace (see Preziosi 1989:8; see also Bal & Bryson 1991). As will be seen below, recent analogous discussions reveal that similar theoretical and ideological uneasiness impinges in the field of classical archaeology.

## **Classical archaeology and classics**

The general term Classics stands as a conventional shorthand for the studies of the Greco-Roman world (Finley 1986:105). Its thematic spectrum encompasses all aspects of the life of the Greeks and Romans, material and symbolic. It is often identified more narrowly as philology which stands for the study of linguistics, epigraphy, papyrology, etc.

It was around the 1870s, when Classics secured the required social prestige for a gradual and prosperous development as an independent discipline. In the USA, for instance, classical values fitted well with the puritan ethic so strongly imposed on the capitalist and industrial society of the time (Halporn 1989:309). Again, it was the German model that prevailed which exemplified by Wilamowitz's dictum, viewed classical studies as an expression of the *Altertumswissenschaft*, or else as purely historical in matter and perspectives. Classical archaeology's rightful purposes and

scientific methods thus found a route to realisation by being considered a sub-discipline of classics. Later generations of archaeologists applauded and reinforced this intrinsic relation that was pursued successfully as one of the main visions of the field (Morris 1994b:9).

Classical archaeology is distinctively a text-aided discipline with many successes as a result of this. Classical archaeology and its subject matter are about the material culture of a historical period with rich literary sources. Thus, it seemed originally much more sound to relate classical archaeologists with classicists rather than other world archaeologists (see the university traditions in Britain, USA, Greece, etc.).

Reliance on classical authors was so pervasive that ancient texts defined the problems and standards of proof. Classical archaeology relied considerably on ancient texts and translated their biases into field work agendas (Kardulias 1994d:42). For instance, the role of Pausanias' *Description of Greece* written in the second century AD, and its authority in shaping classical archaeology's research purposes in Greece stands as a good example of this interrelation. Yet, Pausanias' *Periegesis*, as extensive and detailed as it might have been and as occasionally accurate in providing topographic 'maps' to classical sites, has been nonetheless biased as regards the monuments chosen to be presented and relished. Pausanias gave contextualizing stories which plunged his readers into a subjectively narrated past. By concentrating particularly on sanctuaries and by focusing on the community *par excellence* (Arafat 1992:388; Elsner 1992; 1994; Swain 1996:330-356), Pausanias tacitly excluded simple day-to-day life from his narrative. Pausanias's *Periegesis* exercised a momentous influence upon the excavating options of the late nineteenth century, with the inauguration of grand research projects primarily in sanctuaries and later urban centres (Delphi, Olympia, Acropolis, Delos, Athenian Agora).

This interaction had its trade-off as it generated the general tendency to perceive the classical archaeologist's material culture studies as mere illustrations of the world already known from written sources. Hence, classicists have been slow to absorb the new developments in archaeology and literature and have gone on assuming that their fields aim at a historical rather than also a theoretical understanding of the past (Edmunds 1989:xix).



Since the late 1960s, there has been some observation of a declining prestige of the discipline and a divide between the Old and New Humanities which became even more prominent in the 1990s (Connor 1989:29). Some interpreted this crisis as a need for theoretical orientation and a challenge to the old order of *Altertumswissenschaft*. For instance, the Swiss classical philologist Manfred Furhmann suggested that classics should get integrated into a broader literary discipline, taking the character of a new science of text interpretation and hermeneutics<sup>3</sup> (Halporn 1989:311; Connor 1989:31). The great majority of those who debated the crisis perceived it as a social and political phenomenon that is part of a general shift from modernism to post-modernism (Tanner 1994; Morris 1994b; for the crisis in classics in USA see Bernal 1989; Galinsky 1993:154-170; Halporn 1989; Peradotto 1989; Richlin 1989). What is most important from the above is that the declining prestige of classics inevitably alters the context in which classical art historians work.

## **Classical archaeology and ancient history**

Similarly to Classics, ancient history performs an active interaction with the field of classical archaeology. Classical archaeology with its ability to acquire vast amounts of new data, through excavation practices and the assistance of written records, has been in the unique and favoured position to expand our knowledge on the classical world.

Yet, much of the written record is quantitatively biased towards certain places at certain times (e.g. classical Athens). Many excavators of classical sites, in the past, or even today, present their results essentially in the form of a traditional historical narrative.

With regard to this practice, Clarke stated (1968:12) that:

‘the danger of historical narrative as a vehicle for archaeological results is that it pleases by virtue of its smooth coverage and apparent finality, whilst the data on which it is based are never comprehensive, never capable of supporting but one interpretation and rest upon complex probabilities. Archaeological data are not historical data and consequently archaeology is not history’.

Anthony Snodgrass also spoke (1983; 1985b:38) about the ‘positivist fallacy’ of classical archaeology, as a subject dominated for some time past by various kinds of

positivism. The fallacy consists in making archaeological prominence and historical importance into almost interchangeable terms: in equating what is observable with what is significant.

As a result, scholars other than classical archaeologists often believe that history in the narrow sense is often history in the general sense as if the only obtainable past is contained within documents. Such paradoxical conclusions are very much criticised (Arnold 1986:35) by both archaeologists and historians who most of the time find it pointless to catalogue the many important contributions archaeology has made to our knowledge of ancient history (Finley 1986:95).

The above reports do not hint at any desire to widen the gap between history and archaeology. On the contrary, as the former discipline faces new challenges and poses new kinds of questions (see Figueira 1989), a vivid interaction, the breaking-down of barriers (Snodgrass 1991:62; Morris 1994b:15) is ached for by both parties, despite the difference of their employed methodologies (Small 1995b).

For classical archaeology, there are two major alternative methodologies for the interpretation of the past:

a) methods which present a certain culture as history, in an attempt to describe and understand its material remains and; b) systems which display a culture as process, thereby trying to explain and predict by making 'law-like' assumptions which can be tested, accepted or rejected.

Between these two options, it was certainly the former one that dominated the field of classical archaeology by separating ideas and aesthetics and giving different status to their economic and social context. This intellectual choice has established a certain tradition which is today viewed sceptically by many of those operating mainly in the field of anthropology but also through classical archaeology itself.



## The Greek archaeologists and Hellenism. Classical archaeology of the homeland.

‘Η Ελληνική αρχαιολογία, Κύριοι, δεν είναι επάγγελμα, αλλά ιερά αποστολή’ (Oikonomos 1936, quoted in Petrakos 1987a:168).

[Greek archaeology, Gentlemen, is not a profession; it is a sacred mission!]

‘Η αρχαιολογία είναι η κατ’ εξοχήν ελληνική και εθνική επιστήμη’ (Petrakos 1982:104).

[Archaeology is a Greek and national science *par excellence*]

In Greece, classical archaeology has largely evolved and matured within this sort of ideological apparatus. The immense national and political significance of classical archaeological remains in the Greek lands, both as material culture and as meaning generating, ever after reinforced the primacy of the national dimension of the archaeological science in the Greek homeland. Originally, the western appropriation and monopoly of the ancient Greek heritage, made the use of ancient Greece by modern Greeks problematic, which in turn made the practice of archaeology by the Greeks a complex matter (Morris 1994b:11). Many Greek intellectuals conformed to a western Hellenist reading of antiquity, which gave Greece a special place in Europe (Kotsakis 1991). Further, the notion and definition of an unbroken continuity with the classical and Byzantine past have been taxonomic devices for ascertaining the extent of Hellenism and outlining a present that was also a past. The connotations of a continuous and unified past were turned against the prevailing tendency in European historical circles to view the Greek past as a series of separate and discontinuous worlds (Augustinos 1989:18). They eventually formulated the essence of modern Greek nationalism, which was embedded in romantic ideology, and defined the grounds upon which the archaeognostic disciplines developed in Greece at the turn of the nineteenth to the twentieth century. Thus, the narrative of lineage, or else of historical continuity has been a significant theoretical and ideological tool. On the lines of this ideological discourse, Greek archaeologists have, ever since the establishment of the new Greek State in 1831, been called on to serve their country and to practice archaeology as a literally patriotic duty. This whole approach hindered Greek archaeology from any kind

of innovative theorising resulting in intellectual stagnation and conservatism (see Kalpaxis 1993).

Greek archaeology has been deeply inspired by and has adhered to the German art historical tradition. In the 'heroic' period of Greek classical archaeology (1830 to mid-twentieth-century) the deep knowledge of the ancient Greek world (ελληνομάθεια), the cordial interaction with the classical philology and other archaeognostic disciplines and the deep personal devotion to their scientific and national duty ran high among Greek archaeologists and their classical peers (Editorial *Horoc* 1984:9-14). During the inter-war period, the tendency was to approach classical archaeology largely as history of ancient art whereas in the post-war period, Greek archaeology has been mainly field and lab-oriented, and therefore more 'scientific', drawing its technical progress from several means provided by the hard sciences. Becoming neo-positivistic in spirit, the new Greek archaeology has been more sceptical about the absolute primacy and accuracy of the literary sources and has used excavation results and data as its main factual evidence. In effect, it deviated partly from its favourable root through archaeognosia and philology but always recognised its literary assets and significance (ibid 9-14).

Greek archaeologists have always been attentive with matters of archaeological textualisation. However, this interest did not relate to any post-modern development on literary and reception theories, as discussed in Chapter One; rather it concentrated on the use of a proper language (either kathareuoussa or dimotiki) in the archaeological text which would ideally produce versed writings with a 'severe beauty', both in terms of scientific accuracy and lingual form (Petrakos 1982:104-106). In this respect, for many archaeologists, poor linguistic expression was equal to deficient archaeological knowledge (Petrakos 1982:106). From an ideological standpoint, the choice between kathareuoussa or dimotiki, or the preferred position regarding the complex 'language question' and its fashioning channels in twentieth century Greek academia and society generally, often revealed the political predilections of the respective authors (further discussed in Chapter Three) (Hertzfeld 1987:49-56; Lowenthal 1988; Frangoudaki 1992, etc.).

Much has also been said<sup>4</sup>, about the organisational structure, the administrative bureaucratic machinery, the micropolitics and somewhat incurable maladies -i.e. the



shortage of adequate personnel, the huge and often exhausting pressure of excavation and curation work, the relatively low scale of conducted systematic research, study and publication of archaeological data, the generally a-theoretical stance taken by Greek archaeologists towards archaeological work, the lack of an efficient legislative framework for the protection of cultural patrimony, etc.- of archaeology in Greece, as performed mainly by the State Archaeological Service, the Archaeological Society, the Central Archaeological Council and the four University archaeology departments (Kalpaxis 1993; Kardulias 1994c; Konstantinopoulos 1989a; 1989b; Kotsakis 1993; Lambrinoudakis 1993; Pantos 1993; Petrakos 1982; 1987a; 1987b; 1995a; 1995b; 1995c; 1995d; Zois 1990). However, we shall not go into any specific details here.

In what follows, some of the most influential Greek archaeological personalities will be reviewed. Their ideology and personal archaeological identity catered to the formation and perpetuation of a certain classical archaeological philosophy in Greece. The list follows a chronological order and does not intend, by any means, to be exhaustive.

*Kyriakos Pittakis* (1798-1863) served the Greek Archaeological Service in the period 1833-1863. He was the most heroic personality in Greek archaeology during the first half of the nineteenth-century (Petrakos 1982:98-101; Petrakos 1987b:248-253). Despite the fact that he lacked adequate classicist education and archaeological knowledge, he cared enormously for the preservation of the antiquities and dedicated himself to this task. He carried with him the ideological agenda that shaped the Hellenic Romantic Enlightenment.

*Stephanos Ath.Koumanoudis* (1818-1899) had a wide classical education in Germany (under F.Thiersch and Boeckh), in France and Italy (Petrakos 1987b:264-276) and a very active archaeological life. He was a warm advocate and idealist of the Enlightenment and revival of the classical past and Hellenism through European neo-classicism.

Karouzos wrote once of Koumanoudis (quote in Petrakos 1982:105, n.92 in 1946):

‘The heroic period of classical archaeology owes a great deal to Stephanos Koumanoudis (...) In Koumanoudis’ texts, we can see the

heritage of natural nobility and the cult of the sublime which both have characterised Winckelmann's era (...) In his youth, Koumanoudis has translated Winckelmann. What is most remarkable is that the classicist spirit of his descriptions has never caused problems of accuracy. In fact, accuracy is what we often look for, but in vain, in contemporary inventories (of artefacts) which are sober in their "objectivity", arrogant and yet not always conscientious' [the original in French].

*Panagiotis Kavvadias* (1850-1928) studied archaeology in Munich under Henrich Brunn. After, as the fifth General Secretary of the Archaeological Society, he was extraordinarily dynamic but also very ambitious and authoritative. He introduced a new mode of archaeological practice which was rather closer to a more technocratic spirit. Greek archaeology owes to Kavvadias the first systematic organisation of the Archaeological Service, the first display of the National Archaeological Museum and of the Museum of Acropolis, the increase in the number of the excavations conducted by the Archaeological Society, the care for Byzantine monuments and the erection of new museums (Petrakos 1987a; 1987b:282-4). Yet, it seems that this new technocratic orientation proved to be both a boon and a bane for the archaeological development in Greece, for it prevailed on one of the main archaeological institutions of the country to work independently from the spheres of political power and control.

On a personal and political level, Kavvadias was a very conservative personality, closely related to the Greek royal family. His conservative positioning on the language question marked the ideological profile of the Archaeological Society (Petrakos 1987a:146) which has languished ever since from conservative linguistic predilections, deliberate isolation from the cultural trends and needs of Greek society and the inability to catch up with the current socially relevant archaeological studies<sup>5</sup>.

*Christos Tsountas* (1857-1934) studied archaeology in Athens and Germany with Kirchhoff and Brunn. First as ephor in the Greek Archaeological Service for the period 1883-1904 and then as professor of archaeology at the Universities of Athens and Thessaloniki. He was the founder of Greek Prehistoric archaeology (Petrakos 1987b:284-287; Karouzos 1937 in *Mentor* 1989:15-18). His contribution to the field of classical archaeology has oscillated between two courses of action. Firstly, for him, as



for other prehistoric archaeologists of his time, to bring the Greeks into prehistory was not a question of diffusion or migration (central concerns in European prehistoric archaeology) but rather a matter of showing once again the ethnic or cultural continuity of a charismatic culture (Kotsakis 1991:70). In this matter, Morris argues that some of the strongest challenges to Hellenist archaeology have seeped into discussion through initial applications in the Bronze Age (Morris 1994b:15). According to this rationale, Tsountas claimed that Schliemann's discoveries showed that the Hellenic spirit has not been restricted to the 5th to 4th centuries BC, but could appear in many times and in many forms (Morris 1994b:34; Bernal 1987:368).

Similarly, Kotsakis pointed out that Tsountas had discussed the close relationship between the Neolithic 'megaron' and the Classical Doric temple, by following the prominent ideology of ethnic continuity with the Greek classical past not only forwards but also backwards. This ethnocentric ideological construct had serious consequences for the development of Greek archaeology. Being a solid paradigm for research, it legitimised the absence of any theoretical discussion (Kotsakis 1991:68). Yet today, despite the fact that we cannot speak of the introduction of theoretical paradigms in Greek prehistoric archaeology until after the Second World War, Greek prehistoric archaeology in Greece is nevertheless rapidly diverging from an accord with the unchanging concepts and practices of classical archaeology.

Tsountas' second, more explicit contribution to classical archaeology has been the writing of the first Greek handbook on the *History of Ancient Greek Art* in 1928. The merit that his peers prescribed to Tsountas' handbook was so high that no other similar undertaking was attempted or managed to outweigh it until the beginning of the 1990s in Greece. Christos Karouzos (see below) reviewed his *History of Ancient Greek Art* (see in Tsountas 1981:5-8) and remarked that:

'his narrative is a perfect balance of the lessons that come from the monuments, of the information derived from the ancient literary sources and of the critiques or feelings of a modern lively person. And it is -no less importantly- a real *narrative*: history is not devoid, even in the most systematic parts, of the original character of the narrative which is a natural characteristic' [the original in Greek and the emphasis in the original].

On the political level, Tsountas was liberal and a supporter of the Venizelos ideologies (see Chapter Three). He was also a warm advocate of *dimotiki*, although he wrote widely in a moderate *katharevousa*.

*Konstantinos Romaïos* (1874-1966) [Plate 3] studied archaeology in Athens and Germany (with Furtwängler, Kalkmann and Loeschcke). First as ephor and General Inspector of Antiquities in the Greek Archaeological service (1908-1928) and after as professor of archaeology at the University of Thessaloniki (1928-1940) he was the teacher of many Greek archaeologists. His interest was centred around the study of ancient Greek religion and art specifically as realised in architectural monuments and sculpture. As a traditionalist, he considered the study of ancient art as the main aim of archaeology (see Karouzos 1966; Andronikos 1966; 1967; Petrakos 1987a:153). He dedicated part of his writing to folklore studies that distinguished him as a populariser of archaeological knowledge. Initiated by his intimate love for Greece and everything Greek, he grew up within the ideological framework of the diachronic continuity of Greek culture. Thus, his work, both archaeological and folk, sought to trace the similarities between the recent and previous periods of Greek culture. He was also a supporter of *dimotiki* and of a general and holistic education that would encompass both archaeognostic and exact sciences. In one of his essays in his book *Mikra Meletimata* [Small Studies], he exposed his views about university teaching and his ideal methodology towards the understanding of ancient art (Romaïos 1947 in Romaïos 1955:208-209):

‘Standing in front of a statue, we are looking for the core idea and aim of the artist, the central and united movement that spread and organised all the individual parts and reached without any intermission even the smallest detail. We achieve this way of understanding by knowing that the statue or the relief was not a depiction of the external world but rather a representation of the esoteric spiritual reality; and [we] also [accomplish this] by trying to identify this reality with a universal and thus spiritual and moral reality’ [the original in Greek].

Within the same frame, he believed in the power of the art historian’s instinct and internal aesthetics that could help him to obtain a closer approach to an object of art and its creator.



In another essay on the relation between science and art, he again stressed the importance of a profitable combination between rationalism and scientific knowledge as well as intuition and internal aesthetics (Romaïos 1946 in Romaïos 1955:214-215):

‘With the intuition (as it is expressed by Bergson) we always face every object, human being, animal, tree or group of peers as an entirety. We don’t stop only in the facts, but we pursue internally and penetratingly; we join everything in a unified picture and thus they obtain a special importance’ [the original in Greek].

In this way, he was a pioneer of a kind of reflexive archaeology.

‘The history of ancient art as one of the many disciplines Archaeology comprises, is not realised with the direct and exclusive intervention of aesthetic superiority. First, there is the need for ample and varied knowledge on religious, social, historical, chronological and bibliographical aspects... All this knowledge is a tool for the understanding of the entirety’ [the original in Greek].

Finally, reviewing a book on Greek Folklore Studies, he had the opportunity to express his opinion on historic materialism, its qualities and drawbacks. He recognised that historic materialism, despite its inadequacy to explain change, nonetheless contributed substantially to historical discipline by pointing out the importance of the economic factor in the process of historical explanation and understanding of the social and cultural values of any society (see 1950 in Romaïos 1955:224-225).

*Christos Karouzos* (1900-1967) [Plate 4] studied archaeology and philology at the University of Athens near Christos Tsountas and then at the Universities of Munich and Berlin under Ernst Buschor’s and Pinder’s supervision. He served the Greek Archaeological Service for the period 1919-1964 and largely affected its cultural orientations through his innovative work at the National Archaeological Museum of Athens which he directed from 1942 to 1964. Essentially, for many of his peers, the fortune and future of the National Archaeological Museum has been equated with Karouzos’ influential personality (for Karouzos’ work see Despinis 1987; Devambez 1969; Dontas 1987; Hatzidakis 1987; Kalogeropoulou 1987a; Marangou 1987; Moebius 1968; Petrakos 1995a; Schefold 1969).

He was probably the first Greek archaeologist that decided to keep out of excavation activities and study the Greek antiquities, museum collections and art from an art-

historical, theoretical and philosophical perspective. He chose as his main subject of research Greek sculpture from the archaic period down to the Roman era. Thus, with a deep knowledge on the history of Western Art, he developed and lavishly published his theories on the interpretation of ancient Greek art, drawing mainly from Riegl, Wolfflin and Pinder (see Karouzos 1981). He had also read and frequently cited Bergson, Breysig, Lamprecht, Schneider, Kuhn, Deonna, Marx and Engels. From Buschor, he learned to view the ancient art as a mirror of the ancient Greek culture and spiritual life and he sought to explain in several of his writings what the art and its accompanying phenomena meant for the ancient Greeks (Kunze 1981).

He was an upholder of dialectical materialism. He overtly believed in the anamorphic power of ancient art. According to Despinis (1987), his methodological tool for the understanding of ancient sculpture was the analysis of the form, although Karouzos was aware of the possible pitfalls and drawbacks this approach could entail. He applied it in order to explain and conceive the sequence and function of certain sculptural pieces within the entire context of the ancient world and managed to avoid generalisations, axiomatic phrasing or simplifications. Thus, his interest was not merely in the external form of the artefacts and monuments. He was forever expanding his thought. Karouzos had both the knowledge and the sensitivity to embark on theoretical reflections about ancient monuments. With the combination of all these qualities that synthetically shaped his scientific personality, his studies on particular subjects such as the *contraposto* of the early classical statues proved to be quite valuable.

What was notable with Karouzos was that he combined the practical analysis of the researcher archaeologist and the philosophical quests of the theorist of art. He divided this practical analysis in four stages: I: the monument, II: the artist, III: the artistic period, IV: the spirit or ideology. According to Kunze, Karouzos' scientific achievements were mainly the multifarious explanation and morphological-historical interpretation of the works of art.

Through his writings, Karouzos suggested that there was an *a priori* 'subjectivity' of the interpreter of the ancient or any art and that the real value of the Greek art was to engage its viewers either specialists or lay to a kind of personal interpretation and meditation :



‘The cultural phenomena suffer from an essential distortion as they are translated by means of oration which is a fairly different expressive tool [from the vision and hand of the artist who created a particular piece of art] (...) We have to exert a special effort in order to avoid a further distortion [of the cultural phenomena] and remain close to the particular occurrences of art’ (Karouzos 1981:9) [the original in Greek].

and

‘The art that the ancient Greeks created and bequeathed to us speaks directly to everyone (as long as he did not lose his instinctive ability to feel) without setting any presuppositions. Of course, it reveals many more secrets and intensified pleasures to those who try with love, that means with time and effort, to understand its real meaning’ (Karouzos 1981:35-36) [the original in Greek].

In his seminal essay *‘The cultural reformation in the studies of the ancient art’* (see Karouzos 1981:78-103) Karouzos surveyed the changing attitudes and philosophies in the interpretation of the ancient art within the space of almost one century. Firstly, he noticed that in the nineteenth-century, the historians of art endeavoured to identify *‘promptly and by any means* the artistic works of the famous ancient artists that the literary sources recognise[d] unanimously as masterpieces’ (Karouzos 1981:80). So, their methodology was dictated by philology and the survival of ancient texts, resulting in the occasionally mistaken identification of ancient statues as Roman copies of originally classical art works. In the most recent studies undertaken at the beginning of the century, there has been a shift of interest and methodology wherein the literary sources assisted only as secondary pieces of information whereas the monuments themselves and the comparison between groups of monuments revealed all the necessary evidence for their chronological placement and their interpretation. Additionally, he made the point that the recent research placed its main interest in original sculptural creations and not in reproductions and copies even if the latter ones have been more glamorous and yet still scientifically important. Furthermore, he remarked that the previous historians of art have not made the distinction between the stylistic and formal elements of an art work from its iconographical aspects. This inadequacy was due to the fact that the previous trend focused only on the visual details of the form but neglected the true essence of art. Rarely did it make a synthetic analysis going from the individual pieces to a whole and to the functional qualities within this

cultural whole. For him, the recent research development of his generation managed to improve the analytical description by looking for the details and by understanding their coherence and their function within the whole, believing that in this way it better approaches the essence of the work (Karouzos 1981:83). To quote him in full:

‘It goes without saying that -whether for an individual piece or for a whole group- the deduction of the analysis, when it conveys the meaning of the totality and of the parts, when in other words it leads to the real understanding of the cohesion and its sub-elements and becomes a useful tool for a general application, it cannot avoid the inclusion of a smaller or larger amount of abstraction from the particular and individual. [It cannot avoid] a theoretical generalisation and incorporation which in succession must be tested occasionally by means of the particular and possibly corrected. But the positivism of the last century was originally resistant to any type of theorisation that was not empirical and factual’ (Karouzos 1981:84) [the original in Greek].

He acknowledged that the approaches of the last century were also strictly critical and aesthetic giving special credit to classical artworks while underestimating or condemning archaic and Hellenistic artefacts (that was Winckelmann’s tradition). The modern research in contrast ‘did not allow him to value the various *periods of art* by taking as a mere and single criterion the art’. For him: ‘all the eras have the same value’ and in effect art historians should write art history not by judging the artistic qualities or deficiencies of certain eras but by looking at the particularities of every period, ‘what each period wants and what it has to say’ (Karouzos 1981:85). Here one can clearly trace Riegl’s and Wolfflin’s theories and tenets which fostered a better chronological determination and the interrelation of iconography with the formal identity of the art work both as form and colour, as surface and space. These are important points of departure especially when they apply to museum displays.

Karouzos, as the dynamic director of the National Archaeological Museum, has essentially shaped its post-war image and identity. Further below, when the case-study of the respective museum is presented, we shall have the chance to look more thoroughly at Karouzos’ museum theories (Chapter Five). Here what he thought a Museum of (Ancient) Art was about is quoted, as this text reveals clearly his whole position on the theorisation of Art:

‘I accept, as other [art-historians] did before, that a Museum of the History of Art has as its *main* objective not to serve the History *tout*



*court* but the History of Art. All the monuments of art are also historical monuments sometimes explicitly and always implicitly, and can assist, without any doubt, the illustration of history. But human history, either in its general aspects or in its particular moments, has demands that cannot at all compromise or be reconciled with the demands of the history of art; however, if we try to reconcile them, we will produce something outrageous, arbitrary and unpleasant for both history and art... A well organised Museum of Art History acts as an illustration of a handbook of Art History, -and can also act as an illustration of a handbook of history only by coincidence...[Therefore], the Museum is obliged to praise in every way and to reveal the artistic nature and value of the works of art' (Karouzos 1981:137-138) [the original in Greek].

Karouzos also remained renowned in the intellectual circles of post-war Greece for his general ethos as a scholar (Petrakos 1995a). Liberal with leftist orientations in his political ideology, he was a warm advocate of the modern Greek language (*dimotiki*) at a time when certain choices were more than mere dispositions on linguistic forms (Kakridis 1987; Andronikos 1987). In this, he had paid special attention to the proper usage of language writing with an accurate, mature and often poetic style.

*Ioannis Miliadis* (1895-1975) [Plate 5] served in the Archaeological service in the period 1919-1961. He has been distinguished mainly in the post-war archaeological milieu as the aesthete who re-organised the Museum of Acropolis. His approach to the study of ancient art could be characterised as deeply romantic. For him (see Miliadis not dated:1):

‘[Ancient places] are sealed with the stamp of History and of Art; the charm of an ancient ruin faced against the blue sky speaks to us less about change and decay and more about the resistant qualities of the ideas that gave it life, and the everlastingness of the beauty’ [the original in Greek].

On the political level, he was liberal and was considered by some to be an advocate of communism. In the language debate, he deeply supported the demoticism whereas he also demonstrated a particular interest in the social role and popularisation of archaeology. Two of his articles ‘*The archaeologist; how he is considered and how he is*’ and ‘*The people and the antiquities*’ could possibly reveal some more information about his archaeological personality and ideology:

‘A European had once said that archaeology in Greece feels at home. It is true that our lives are very much linked with the antiquities in this sacred country which is strewn with miracles. It is one of the general characteristics of our country’s physiognomy. It is one of our greatest prides and most genuine distinctions. It is our wealth, which along with this land, we shall bequeath to our offspring’ (1939 reprinted in 1989:12) [the original in Greek].

Clearly influenced by Riegl and Wolfflin and his co-patriot Karouzos, he believed that the positivistic nature of archaeology proved that every historical period has one value and also that:

‘excavation is the probing of the synthetic work created by the archaeologist’s hypothesis... Archaeology has something pragmatic by looking always for the factual and tangible evidence which will ratify the theory’ (1939:14) [the original in Greek].

*Semni Papaspyridi Karouzou* was the first woman ever employed in the Greek Archaeological Service (1921-1964). Coming from an upper-middle class family, she studied archaeology at Athens University near Tsountas (for her life see Karouzou 1984a). Her archaeological personality has been very much influenced by John Beazley and Ernst Buschor. She was a warm advocate of original Greek art, regardless of the historical period (archaic, classical or Hellenistic). In contrast, she often expressed her dislike for Roman copies (see Karouzou 1983:65):

‘Copies of classical sculptural creations, those which have not been created in the Roman period, are displayed (in the Musei Vaticani) in a linear way against walls or inside niches or alternatively in the middle of the gallery. Naturally, that they don’t offer the real human warmth or the religious ambience that is usually transmitted through the displays of the Greek archaeological museums’ [the original in Greek].

or elsewhere (Karouzou 1983:13):

‘the Roman copies of Greek works [have] the frigidity of the classicist imitation, the abolition of the physical hypostasis of the statue and the obvious plotting of Roman bad taste’ [the original in Greek].

Apart from her prolific published work, she was distinguished together with her husband Christos Karouzos for the post-war re-display of the National Archaeological Museum in Athens. As a museum archaeologist, she often expressed her philosophical predilections on the display of archaeology, either through museum catalogues of the National Archaeological Museum or through her written accounts on her visits to



Italian archaeological museums. For instance, she remarked on the way sculpture should be displayed in a museum (Karouzou 1983:17-18):

‘Apart from the surrounded space and the other exhibits in close proximity, there is another important factor that determines the display of sculptural pieces in a museum; this is the artist’s will. [In other words we should pay attention to] the posture that the sculptor gave to the statue in order to develop it in a uniform way to the viewer, to the angle at which this could be best presented without losing the outlines of the work. ...The right way to display a statue is to place it parallel with the background of the gallery’ [the original in Greek].

and elsewhere (Karouzou 1983:177):

‘[A good museum display] is one that lacks predisposition, of submission to a predetermined form before an understanding of the material and a study of its needs is achieved. It has an understanding of the different spirit of every era, and on an arrangement wherein the displays stand in line or the unique pieces [stand] on a scenographical isolation. In other words, [a good museum display must be devoid] of all the weaknesses that characterise some of the modern museums and galleries’ [the original in Greek].

In this general perspective, her ideal museum visit stands as an initiation (see Karouzou 1983:178):

‘It needs time, comfort and devotion; it also needs thorough knowledge’.

*Nikolaos Kontoleon* (1910-1975) studied philology and archaeology in Athens and Germany, specifically in Munich and Koln with A.Rumpf and E.Buschor. Originally he worked for the Greek Archaeological Service (1933-1956) and then as an influential professor of archaeology at the University of Athens. His written work is mainly archaeognostic and interpretative focusing on domains such as epigraphy, classics, religion, architecture, topography, sculpture and ceramics. From the bulk of his written work, his article *Excavations - Archaeology and Ancient Art* (1973) is notable, for it reveals the author’s ideology on essential issues of archaeological theory and practice. The core of his ideology was that archaeology should be more related to the history of ancient art rather than to the excavations and to the studies of the entire archaeological material culture. He argued that an archaeologist could be perfectly successful without even being an excavator:

‘The archaeology exists as a science only from the moment that the object of art appears in front of the archaeologist’s eyes who will understand it by interpreting its form (...) Classical philology, archaeology as well as history of art have as a common aim the interpretation of the form by means of which the object of art comes into existence’ (Kontoleon 1984:19-20) [the original in Greek].

and further

‘Archaeology is a science and not just a mere technique. It is an archaeology of the art investigating the expression of the “poetic” (with the sense of “making”) skills of the man in antiquity’ [the original in Greek].

*Georgios Bakalakis* (1908-?) studied archaeology at the University of Athens and then in Vienna, Munich and John Hopkins University in USA. He worked mainly in Northern Greece. For the period 1945-1971 he was a Professor at the University of Thessaloniki (see Bakalakis 1990). He, as most of his peers, has been a historian of ancient art with a deep archaeognostic knowledge in his object domain.

*Manolis Andronikos* (1919-1992) [Plate 6] studied in Thessaloniki under K.Romaïos and in Oxford under J.D.Beazley; thus, his archaeological and scientific personalities have been largely shaped by these two influential teachers. He was to be celebrated as the active and world famous excavator of the Royal Macedonian Tombs in Vergina which he discovered in 1977 (see Chapter Seven). With his remarkable findings, he brought Macedonian archaeology into the centre of national and international interest; subsequently, with the great popularity that circumvented both himself personally and his object domain, he contributed remarkably to a modern shift of the Greek public’s perception of archaeology and its techniques. In a more general perspective, the historical import of his discoveries gathered larger momentum in the 1980s, as they envisaged a strong tight and unabashed interaction with domestic and international politics (Karakasidou 1994). His excavations were believed to have given ample evidence that confirmed strong ethnic and cultural ties between the ancient Macedonians and the other Greek city-states. They generated a renewed archaeological enthusiasm as well as moral and financial support on behalf of Greek politicians (starting in 1976 with the then Prime Minister Konstantinos Karamanlis). They also



provided the theme and the material for numerous temporary loan exhibitions organised by the Greek government which were then hosted at museums abroad.

In this respect, the portentous importance of Andronikos' findings both in terms of scientific and historical significance and in terms of their political connotations, elevated him to high esteem. Eugene Borza wrote for Andronikos:

‘Through his excavations, his prompt and lavish publications translated into several languages, his dynamism as a lecturer, and his enormous skill and energy in diplomacy and publicity, he almost single-handedly removed Macedonia from the near-obscurity of a frontier culture and made it a central issue in the archaeology of the ancient Balkans’ (Borza 1992:758).

After his death in 1992, he was mourned as a national hero of archaeology and honoured with many national and international awards among which was the Grand Phoenix Cross, the highest civilian award of the Greek nation. One obituary described him as the ‘national archaeologist’ of Greece, and praised the historic and national significance of his Vergina findings (Trikoukis 1992). As A.Karakasidou put it: ‘despite his fears, and without his immediate consent, Andronikos and his work came to the service of Greek national ideology and its political struggles. His funeral itself provided a ritual forum through which his discoveries could be ceremonially elevated to the status of a near national canon by those who indulge in the ideological appropriation of historical knowledge’ (1994:42).

Beyond the political dimensions of his work, Andronikos was an influential and exciting archaeology teacher belonging to the last generation of Greek humanists. He was also a great philologist with deep knowledge of all the aspects of the classical written world, as well as an historian of modern art and philosophy. His doctoral thesis *Plato and the Art* (1952) investigated complex theoretical matters of ancient and modern aesthetics looking mainly at the relation between Platonic ideas of beauty and plastic arts (see Tiverios 1993). For him:

‘The classical world and specially the ancient Greek world, stands in front of each individual and each era as a very lively problem. For its solution, one must start from the investigation of his own problems struggling to understand them and to provide an answer that our life demands so pressingly. The classical world remains still and unchanged for the researchers. The researchers are those that move and alter their positions towards the ancient world...’ (Andronikos 1952, 1986:17) [the original in Greek].

Thus, he essentially based his analysis on the understanding of changing attitudes towards the past and its artistic expressions, an approach that somewhat echoes current views on the interpretation of the past.

*Stephanos N. Koumanoudis* (1930-1987) studied philology and archaeology in Athens and Paris (Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes and College de France). He participated in the re-display of the Museum of Acropolis. He was an important epigraphist and theorist of archaeology with a deep knowledge of the ancient Greek world. He preferred to work on issues of archaeological interpretation and reconstruction of the ancient world rather than on trivial analytical, empirical and mechanical deconstruction of the archaeological data (Koumanoudis 1984). His conceptual principle can be summarised in the following:

‘the researcher of the historical sciences commands only one part of his science; he commands only the observation but not the experiment which gives the opportunity to test what the researcher set as a rational hypothesis. Thus, in the historical sciences what is right is the real and not the rational, just like the real is not always rational’ (Mathaiou 1987:11) [the original in Greek].

Although for some a controversial personality, he contributed considerably to the intellectual development of Greek archaeology.

## **From induction to deduction: the age of substantive research<sup>6</sup>**

So far, we have discussed how classical archaeology has developed, since its birth and until well into the middle of the twentieth century, as the history of the arts of the ancient Greek world with special emphasis on the studies of pottery, sculpture, architecture and inscriptions. It has also been shown how this traditional art-historical approach, with its concentration on elite goods, aesthetics, judgement of styles and taste, generated a: ‘gap in the understanding of the circumstances under which the majority of classical people lived and the social processes to which they were subject’ (Kardulias 1994d:39-40). It is absolutely true that this sort of scholarship has assembled a large body of factual data and has compiled it in textual products of distinctive and standardised form, such as artefact-centred monographs, catalogues, attribution lists,



excavation reports, compendia, etc. It is also equally true that classical art history, as a stance, has imposed a significant drawback in the development of a social archaeology and generalised knowledge of the classical world. Indeed, in traditional classical archaeology, as Arafat most ingeniously put it 'there is a tendency to forget that we are studying the works of men, not typological ciphers and that cross-cultural stylistic influences occurred by means of actual people, rather than walking cultures (...) Clients and artists moved around the Mediterranean, not disembodied stylistic influences' (Arafat 1990:n.18).

In the 1960s, however, with the coming of Binford's anthropological theories (1962; 1983), Anglo-American archaeology moved from the age of induction, still generally exercised by classical art historians, to a new era of deduction wherein new epistemological problems were to be raised. Supporters of the 'New Archaeology', drawing their theoretical paradigms from the natural and social sciences, have sought to discover universal laws and provide explanations in terms of social practices, social changes and processes of cultural evolution (Shanks 1996:129). These theoretical developments have radically altered the way archaeology, mainly the prehistoric, was practised and provided a distinctive interdisciplinary framework within which future archaeological research was to be performed.

As revolutionary as it might have been for prehistoric archaeology, the 'New Archaeology' with its four step methodology based on 'theory-experiment-verification-model building', had hardly any impact on the 'Great Tradition' of classical archaeology (Renfrew 1980). 'Classical archaeology has kept its borders patrolled', for it 'was a subject tarnished beyond recovery by the candle smoke of the salon, steeped in cultural conditioning, caned with accretions of untestable value judgement replacing the true patina of an agreed methodology', as Geertz and Snodgrass noted ten years ago (Geertz 1985:623; Snodgrass 1986a:193). Classical archaeologists have been reluctant to taste the 'Nouvelle Cuisine' offered by New Archaeology which seemed to them: 'seductive in appearance but nutritionally unsatisfying' (Boardman 1985:52-3; see also Boardman 1973; 1988; Courbin 1982). New Archaeologists, for their part, have been equally, albeit regretfully, apprehensive about venturing into a specialist and traditionalist domain, such as that of classical archaeology, whereby a vast body of pre-existing knowledge had to be assimilated and re-read. Thus, intellectual walls were



raised that fostered, what Renfrew termed, the 'Great Divide' between new archaeological deduction and classical archaeological induction (Renfrew 1980). Gradually, however, things started to change with a considerable broadening of outlook, both in terms of perception and methodology.

In the field of pottery studies, French classical archaeologists, drawing from anthropology, literary reception theories, semiotics and structuralism, made a detour from the Beazleyite norms and methodological standards and proceeded with new and insightful ways of looking at Greek vases, deciphering Greek imagery and interpreting Greek society as a whole (Bérard et al 1989; Vernant 1980; 1983; 1989; Gnoli & Vernant 1982; also Hoffman 1977; 1988; 1994; Lissarrague 1990; Beard 1991; Sourvinou-Inwood 1991; Osborne 1994a). Their indisputable contribution to classical studies and understanding of the ancient world rests on their vision to: 'make sense of ancient *mentalités*, delving beneath the surface into basic dispositions towards self and other, society and history' (Shanks 1996:4). The intellectual vigour of their approach, as Michael Shanks recently pointed out, comes from their employed method that did not: 'attempt to ascribe a single meaning to any one design'. Instead, as Shanks continues, '[French archaeologists and their followers] bring together in their interpretations all sorts of imagery and evidence about ancient thought and society to attempt to reconstruct the way the ancient Greeks looked at the world, how they conceived relationships between people and gods, humanity and the natural world, men and women, for example, to understand the underlying structures of meaning which lie behind the images and artefacts remaining of the ancient world' (Shanks 1996:19).

If the 'Paris School' with its anthropological and structuralist treatment of ancient material has been fairly influential and warmly received among continental classical archaeologists, in Britain, Anthony Snodgrass, with his today three decade-long research, could be viewed by many of his peers as the head of a group of scholars who managed to produce pioneering work by blending remarkably traditional classical approaches and strengths with innovative ideas drawn from social and economic ancient history (see Morris 1994b:39-40; Shanks 1996:132-135). Snodgrass, a 'giant intellect [with] a Winckelmann-like'<sup>7</sup> (Morris 1994b:39) or 'maverick'<sup>8</sup> (Shanks 1996:95) role in post-war Greek archaeology, gradually developed an alternative programme of social and Processual archaeology that influenced and informed the latest generations of



classical archaeologists engaged in the study of ancient material from the Iron Age down to the Roman period. The new classical archaeology of Snodgrass was aimed at a historical exploration and understanding of ancient Greek societies and archaeological materials in terms of descriptive and systemic models of social change. It prompted others to do so by overcoming disciplinary divisions and drawing eclectically on historical and literary archaeological sources; it thus made use of social and anthropological theory in social narratives of Dark Age and archaic Greece. One of the greatest merits of his work rests on the fact that he extended the traditional rigour of classical archaeology to all objects and concentrated not only on artefactual groups but also on contexts of deposition such as burials, houses and votives (Snodgrass 1964; 1971; 1977; 1986b; 1987; 1991).

Such explorations of classical material culture informed by an anthropological and historical and so largely social perspective have been the thresholds for a fascinating new and promising exposure of classical archaeologists to a whole range of alternative theoretical directions and methodological techniques, that the field witnesses nowadays. The intellectual landscape of classical archaeology, as is being presently developed and repositioned, encompasses studies which can range from social and contextual<sup>7</sup>, structuralist<sup>8</sup>, post-structuralist<sup>9</sup>, style and viewer-centred art histories<sup>10</sup>, hard-processual<sup>11</sup> or quantitative processual<sup>12</sup>, post-processual/interpretive<sup>13</sup>, to *Annaliste*<sup>14</sup>, core-periphery<sup>15</sup> and regional<sup>16</sup>.

As their names range so similarly do their subject matters, methodologies and interpretations. They can concentrate on the individual artefact or expand on the total material assemblage through the use of statistics; they can look at objects, both of 'high' and 'low' culture, and/or at literary texts. They can combine demographic, historical, ecological, economic, topographic studies with insights from sociology, psychology, cultural anthropology or philosophy. They can continue investigating urban centres but also significantly expand in rural settlements and landscapes through systematic surface survey. They can unravel the place of material culture in systems of exploitative power relations or through fundamental units of mythological thought, or through forms of analysis which integrate material culture with larger social structures and with the intentions and perceptions of individual actors. They can be interested in

Early Greek societies, classical, Hellenistic or later Roman ones, although some imbalance still exists (e.g. Hellenistic and Roman periods are less explored by social archaeologists than the Iron and Archaic Ages).

To analyse and critically judge the potential achievements and/or drawbacks of each one of all these different approaches in detail, in the present chapter, would be a very heavy task, almost impossible to undertake in a satisfactory and full manner even in the space of a book entirely dedicated to this matter, let alone in the space of an introductory essay as Chapter Two is meant to be.

What can, however, be pointed out is that the new directions in classical archaeology, despite all their conceptual or methodological differences, share a clear concern and interest in refiguring the past, by which is meant the repeopling of the past by ‘making the ancient Greeks themselves rather than the archaeological residues they left behind them the main subject of analysis’ (Morris 1994b:46). They also prompt and stress the need for a good deal of problematisation and introspection regarding the writing and academic practices of classical archaeology, essentially the understanding of the discourse of the discipline as a whole.

## Conclusion

In the preceding pages, an attempt has been made to provide an introductory outline of classical archaeology and its change as a discipline over time. It was shown how a single and two-centuries long Great Tradition of intellectual research, with a massive literature and large community of scholars, has shaped most of what classical archaeology is today and is still believed, by certain quarters, to stand for (i.e. Boardmann 1985; 1988).

It was further shown how the ground has shifted in recent years and how the ‘classical’ intellectual landscape of the discipline is changing. This process is still very much in progress, encompassing not one but many archaeologies of Greece with a plurality of agendas, theoretical positions and interpretations. For, as historians of classical archaeology writing from a Foucaultian perspective, assert and further uphold, today we cannot assume that there is, or indeed should be, a single manifesto and rhetoric for the ways classical archaeology must work (Morris 1994b; 1994c; Shanks 1996; Snodgrass



1987:xiv). Instead, as Morris suggests: 'there [must be] a recognition that in a changed world no amount of continuing success in pursuing research aims defined by nineteenth-century ideologies can give deep meaning or wide relevance to the archaeology of Greece. Any refiguring of the intellectual landscape of archaeology involves us in asking unsettling questions about what, and whom, the subject is for; and perhaps in accepting, and trying to make the best of, a plurality of answers' (Morris 1994c:4; for the same views see also Shanks 1996).

Such questioning, however, suggests or rather postulates an examination of the history of classical archaeology, and indeed of any discipline, in a historical and diachronic perspective. By looking at the cultural politics and other issues that may have been entrenched in classical archaeology, from its origins throughout its development, such as matters of cultural appropriation, fostering of identities, or/and ownership of the past, a more profound understanding of the discipline, its institutions, people and practices will be arrived at. It will also elucidate the current relevance and value as well as potential future roles ascribed to classical archaeology within world archaeology, other sister academic disciplines and society, more specifically, modern Greek and the West as a whole.

It is time, then, to move on and briefly look at the cultural politics of a venerated heritage, that of the Greek classical past. Essentially, an attempt will be made to shed some light on the perceptions and varied receptions of ancient Greece and its material culture as these have been fashioned within the historical and cultural context of the western world -and within it of modern Greece- from the nineteenth-century to the present.

# ANCIENT GREECE AND ITS MATERIAL CULTURE; SOME INSIGHTS INTO THE CULTURAL POLITICS OF A VENERATED HERITAGE

In Greece, antiquity has been the great era of the country's history; toilesomely and belatedly did its colossal weight allow creations of other historical eras to be equally recognised (...) The maturity that a nation needs to gaze rightly at its history and accordingly understand its various monuments is (usually) achieved slowly and arduously.

Kontis, I., in *To Vima* 7/7/64:3.

Hellenism, as an ethnological entity, with consciousness of common origin and with common language, religion, manners, customs and traditions, has existed since the appearance of the first Hellenic races (...) The Neo-Hellenic nation speaks the language of its remote ancestors (...) and is aware of its Hellenic descent which has been reinforced through education. In manners and customs, traditions, songs and art we trace the origins of the Hellenic nation (...) The ancient Greek civilisation has incarnated the *ideas and glory of Hellenism* and transformed them into a living historical entity; it ensures the *continuity of Hellenism*, irrespective of the amount of pure Greek blood running into the Greek peoples veins (...) Hellenism survived, thanks to the immense moral strength and radiance of its *ancestral heritage*, to loom up, with its own virtues, in the avenues of free nations.

A.Papandreou, in *I Aygi* 25/5/75:8 [emphasis added]

Archaeological finds and old buildings are not just material remains of the past that attract exclusively the interest of archaeologists, of



architects and of other specialists and researchers. Archaeological finds (i.e. statues, reliefs, coins, inscriptions, and other artefacts) of any period are not merely evaluated for their material value, but for their evidential value (...) as records of the historic life and culture of the Greek people. Thus, all these old artefacts and the ancient literary sources, beyond their scientific, educational, aesthetic or other values, are primarily *national monuments*. Being national monuments, they attract the interest of every Greek and especially of those people who endeavour to become pioneer members of our society; for the national monuments are indeed *sources of popular self-knowledge and causes of national self-fulfilment*.

Anonymous, in *I Aygi* 1/9/78:4 [emphasis added]

If the study of history is a necessity and weapon in our own lives, archaeological research is the most essential and inexhaustible source of historical records.

M.Andronikos, in *To Vima* 13/11/80:1.

(In the nineteenth century...) the need for historical knowledge as an essential framework for the shaping of *national self-definition* has not been a unique characteristic of Greek society. Although this need has been more determinant in our country than in other older societies, it nonetheless reflected some more general demands of the Romantic era (...) Principle demand was the formation of the ideology of modern Hellenism in an organic and emotionally operational bond so that the necessary intellectual base for the *politics of national unity*, followed by the Greek state both in domestic and foreign affairs, could be created (...) The demand for the fostering of national consciousness... imposed unity as the prime subject-matter of historiographic grounding: unity in space, unity in time, unity in national ideology.

Kitromilides, P., in *To Vima* 27/10/91:38 [emphasis added]

## Introduction

The relationship between Greek archaeology and museum practice must be understood within the Greek socio-political milieu and the present Western world-system. One may begin by considering the complexity and diversity of that relationship. Greece [Figure 1] is a small country, founded on a consciousness of its history. It was one of the first states of the Mediterranean region to experience a direct connection between archaeological discoveries and national feelings. The special place that history has been accorded has influenced the purpose and the manner of Greek archaeology and of Greek

archaeological exhibitions. Greek archaeology [Plate 7] has been called into the service of the state for the glorification of the past and has taken on a distinctly patriotic content with nationalistic dimensions.

Although Greek archaeology has certain particularities, it must not be seen as a unique and isolated phenomenon (see for instance all the recent articles and collective volumes discussing regional traditions of archaeological research and nationalism in depth: Atkinson, Banks & O'Sullivan 1996; Díaz-Andreu & Champion 1996; Kohl & Fawcett 1995a, etc.). For example, with the turn of the eighteenth century, but more particularly during the nineteenth century, a general feeling prevailed among European countries - Great Britain, France, the German states, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden and Denmark - which motivated them to 'draw a picture of their infancy in glittering colours' (Thorpe 1851:1-2, quoted in Silberman 1989:1). Similar examples are provided by Mediterranean countries, where the conflicting boundaries sustain the status of the past as a battlefield. Beyond the local idiosyncrasies, dispositions and historical events that define the nature of each country's archaeological research, there is a mainstream model that helps to locate archaeologies, categorically, in a global context. In this model, the nature of archaeological research is shaped, largely, by the roles that particular nation states play economically, politically and culturally, as interdependent parts of the modern world system.

Archaeology indeed operates within a socio-political context. This is not a recent development or disclosure. Although it might not be the case that archaeology, after its scientific innocence, only lost its political purity as late as in the 1980s (Kristiansen 1993:3), it was certainly then that a new, more unabashed interaction with domestic and international politics was envisaged. It was also around that period that 'the politics of archaeological claims to both objectivity and subjectivity became more central to understanding the formation of the discipline' (Rowlands 1994:130).

Archaeology finds itself embroiled with politics in many different historical circumstances, ideological configurations and cultural phenomena, two of which are nationalism and the construction of national identities<sup>1</sup>.

The early association of archaeology with nationalism in the late eighteenth century gathered momentum in the nineteenth century, at a time when nationalism itself became



one of the most powerful of political forces. The spread of nationalism in the nineteenth century and the growth of archaeology in the Mediterranean littoral have a significant correlation. Both arose in the aftermath of the Ottoman empire's collapse into colonies and nation-states (MacConnell 1989). In the Mediterranean region today, archaeology has been 'transformed into a peaceful, if subtle, instrument of national policy' (Silberman 1990:99).

Nationalism has been defined by Anthony Smith (1991:73; 1995b; see also Gellner 1983:125) in these terms:

'an ideological movement for attaining and maintaining autonomy, unity, and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential "nation"'.

In discussing nationalism's interrelation with the concept of national identity, Smith (1991:vii) makes the point that

'we cannot begin to understand the power and appeal of nationalism as a political force without grounding our analysis in a wider perspective whose focus is national identity treated as a collective cultural phenomenon'.

Fundamental features of national identity are the acknowledgement of a historic homeland, the choice of common myths and historical memories and symbols, a common mass public culture, common legal rights and duties for all members and a common economy with territorial mobility for members (Smith 1991:8-15; Gellner 1983:125).

Some of these features will be of importance in understanding the interactions between archaeology, the construction of national identities and nationalism, viewed through the specific case of the modern Greeks and the sense of their cultural affinity with ancient Greece and its classical heritage.

MacConnell (1989:112; see also Trigger 1984; Kohl & Fawcett 1995b; Rowlands 1994; Silberman 1995; Trigger 1995) in discussing the relation between archaeology and nationalism, comes to the conclusion that the interaction that happens between the two fields does not directly address any of the questions posed by the archaeological research, nor does it fully examine the concept of nationalism as a social phenomenon. Nevertheless the study of this interaction encourages archaeologists to reflect on the

direct relevance of their research to contemporary affairs, to understand the history of their discipline and also to consider its future.

In the same frame of mind, Trigger, in his influential paper '*Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist*' (1984:368-369) states that archaeology does not function independently of the societies in which it is practised. Although archaeologists should not renounce the search for objectivity, it is rather unlikely that a value-free archaeology in the way positivists and empiricists scientists endeavoured to establish objective knowledge may emerge in the future. Taking into consideration the potential weaknesses of archaeology, as a 'dispassionate' and apolitical science, one must make a start to override the consequent ideological limitations. This pursuit should avoid seeing socio-political influences in archaeological presentations merely as sources of error which can be corrected, or as distortions which can be neutralised or eliminated. Instead, these should be seen as constitutive of archaeological ideologies and practices (Tilley 1989:107; Wylie 1989:93).

Therefore, in the course of this chapter and following ones (mainly Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eleven), the analysis of the interactions between cultural politics and archaeology, will not aim to be fully explanatory of the objectives and methodologies of Greek archaeology. Furthermore, it will not offer an alternative, value-free archaeological discourse. In fact, it will aim to stress the power of archaeological symbolism, particularly as these are implicitly or explicitly exposed and disseminated to wider audiences in the course of museum exhibitions.

A brief historical outline follows which describes the directions taken by Greek archaeology, political ideology and the legacy of the classical past since the war of Independence (1821-1830) and the subsequent emergence of the modern Greek nation state (1830). This historical review will examine the driving forces -either emanating from abroad or arising within the state's own geographical and cultural boundaries- that sustained the dominant ideology and archaeological philosophies during this entire period. It will also provide an intellectual grounding to pursue a more general aim in the present study, that is the treatment of archaeological activity specifically as this appears in museum exhibitions as itself a historical phenomenon.



## **The hegemony of the foreign countries over Greece (1830-1922); The legacy of the Classical Greek past and the emergence of Hellenism.**

In the late eighteenth century, a transfer of interest from Rome to Greece ensued when the values, ideas, and institutions inherited from the Roman and Christian past began to be undermined (Turner 1981:2; Harth 1994). The search for new cultural roots was nurtured by the need to enunciate the political, social and intellectual experience that Europeans confronted in the wake of Enlightenment and the democratic revolutions in America and France (Baeumer 1986). These revolutions were ideologically grounded on the heritage of ancient Greek democracy, particularly that of Athens. Following on from the decades of industrial and demographic change at the end of the eighteenth century, Europe had to face a new kind of political confrontation between the social classes for the exercise of political authority and power (Bowen 1989:161).

This shift from the classical to the modern 'episteme', -according to Foucault's (1970; 1972) divisional periods of intellectual transformation-, involved an assortment of new beliefs about Europeanness which Ian Morris (1994b:11) calls Hellenism. Hellenism idealised ancient Greece as the birthplace of the European spirit and of Western civilisation. It portrayed Greece as an imaginative landscape for the discovery of new artistic and ethical values. This proved to be a powerful ideology which sought, as its ultimate objective, the legitimisation of Eurocentric beliefs. It operated as an intellectual communion amongst the 'civilised'. Knowledge of the classical world, acquired through a classical education, provided much of the intellectual confidence of the ruling political classes throughout Europe at this time (Turner 1981:5; see also Chrysos 1996a). In a way, as D.Harth recently suggested (1994:89):

'the construction of antiquity as a cognitive image with aesthetic features could be considered as a response to the question if the antagonistic structure of modern life could be overcome by a utopian idea restricted however to a relativistic, i.e. national concept of classical studies'.

In a similar frame of thought, Ian Morris (1994b:11) proposes that:

'Hellenists created a continentalist rather than a nationalist view of the past, and did it by glorifying Greece and insisting on its unique, or even superhuman, qualities'.

Thus, those who wrote about Greece, and the political leaders who espoused ideas, approached their subject with a steady certitude that what they said about Greece would have an impact on contemporary political, religious, and moral discourse<sup>2</sup>. Exercising a kind of cultural imperialism, they imposed, on the past and present, their own account of what constitutes Greek culture. In so doing, they amplified even more the ideological dilemma concerning Greek national consciousness and identity which has preoccupied modern Greece almost to the present day.

### **The ideological power of classical antiquities, the formation of the modern Greek state and national consciousness (1830-1922)**

Classical antiquity and its ideals, when transferred to modern Greece, played a predominant role in the country's social and educational life, both before and, particularly after liberation. Classical archaeological monuments became the emblems of the new state and administrative measures for state patronage were officially introduced. Tsoukalas' (1981:42-3) definition of tradition succinctly describes the ideological disposition of the newly born Greek state, of its intelligentsia and of their intellectual and moral engagement in the construction of the Greek national consciousness:

‘In order to justify its future, the state has to construct its past, to build up its political and symbolic autonomy and to substantiate its exclusive identity. The new state society can be recognised in its own right only through the constant building of its complete national identity and tradition as exclusive and definite ideologies. The state has to form its tradition, to standardise it, to make it a central symbol and to historicise it. But this procedure has as a result the fraudulence of its tradition’[the original in Greek].

The dependence of the Greeks on their classical heritage was far more complex than the relationship other Western states had established with the classical past [Plate 7]. For the Greeks, appropriation of the classical past had a dual point of departure, eventually delineating two distinct types of idiom and two realities, external and internal (Holden 1972; Herzfeld 1982:ix).



Externally, as heirs and general guardians of the classical past, Greece and its people had a special role of great honour and responsibility among the European nations. Thus the new state received the required 'historical passport' (Spiridon Zambelios 1852 quoted in Beaton 1988:103) for its political and cultural integration within the 'Western world'. This occurred at a time when the West was participating in the Greeks' heritage to an extent unparalleled in the case of Ireland, Iceland, Israel or any other modern state (Lowenthal 1988). For Greece, this was a means of entry to Europe as the cultural and political equal of other nation states. As Lowenthal (1988:733) puts it:

'the awe in which the Western world has held the classical tradition has shaped and reshaped Greek apprehension of their own past...The West sold the Greeks a romanticised version of their classical identity that had immediate practical benefits. But it was a version with which at the start most Greeks were unfamiliar'.

Internally, the creation of the Greek nation's sense of identity was an act of self-portraiture which would incorporate miscellaneous elements of Greek heritage, including language, literature, religion, folklore, Byzantine and Christian traditions as well as oriental influences. All of these elements accumulated to foster a single national and cultural identity which would represent the whole *ethnos* as a self-defining entity (Svoronos 1992:23; also Svoronos 1985). Much of the history of Greece has been written in terms of the *ethnos* and much of Greek politics has occurred within the notion of *ethnos*. Although frequently invoked, it was generally a problematic concept (Just 1989:71), as it was constructed around the complex issue of the Hellenic thesis versus its counter argument, the Romeic proposition (ancient versus modern Greeks or Hellenism versus neo-Hellenism). In a way, the common people who constituted the Greek *ethnos* were called to renounce the parts of their cultural self which although familiar to them were considered as 'barbarous' and 'oriental' by the Westerners (see Herzfeld 1982; Kitromilides 1985a; Leigh Fermor 1966; Leontis 1990; Petropoulos 1978; Puchner 1996; Shanks 1996:82; Skiotis 1978; Tsoukalas 1994).

Another facet of this same tension originated in the attempt to purify the Greek people from the barbarous and oriental elements which burst into its culture. This was the famous 'Language Question' (Hertzfeld 1987:49-56; Lowenthal 1988; Frangoudaki 1992). The 'Language Question' and its fashioning channels are products of the same discourse to which belongs the material culture of the classical past. That is:

‘Reference to this prestige in almost every positive mention of modern Greece, function in fact as a pejorative euphemism through the implied contrast between the glorious past and the insignificant present’ (Frangoudaki 1992:376).

So the general tendency was to disseminate and reshape the Greek heritage in accordance with the European philhellenes’ classical ideals. This inclination was also epitomised in the efforts of the wealthy Greek Diaspora to educate the Greeks and remove the patina of four hundred years of Ottoman rule so that Greece’s true metal would shine again (Just 1989:84).

Greek identity and heritage, like any national mythology, were built upon a series of motifs or elements that Smith (1986) calls ‘myths’. The essence of prevailing Greek ideology before, during and soon after the War of Independence was epitomised by the ideological myths of liberation, re-birth, ancestry and the Golden Age [Plate 7] (Smith 1986:192). The cult of the Golden Age was elevated to the highest levels of official ideology, partly because of its historicity, which Smith considers to be secondary, but mainly because of its ability to evoke a lost splendour and virtue and to act as a model for national self-renewal (Smith 1986:200). The heritage of the past appealed in equal measure to the liberal as well as to the conservative intelligentsia, and to the insurgent Greek communities who still lived outside the boundaries of the Greek state.

Moreover, questions with historical, cultural and philosophical dimensions such as ‘what is Greece’ and ‘what is it to be Greek’ (Papacosma 1983:41; Vryonis 1978), ‘what constitutes Greekness or Hellenicity’ (Pollis 1992:179; Diamantouros 1983; Tsaousis 1983a; 1983b) have influenced politics, surely not only in the past, and divided Greeks seeking answers to them. Besides, such dilemmas emanated from the fact that the new Greek state was geographically far too limited to comprise all the realms of Greek culture and all the Greeks who lived beyond its borders. These dilemmas can be understood within the historical boundaries of the long-standing struggle for the survival of Hellenism, an encounter which only ceased at the beginning of the twentieth century. They can also be associated with the study of the concept of ‘territory’ and its negotiation, which have been especially compelling and relevant to modern Greek history, politics and culture (Leontis 1990; 1991). Essentially:

‘a cornerstone of nationality, together with a people and its history, territory has been perceived as a precondition for the birth and



development of Greek civilisation. Hence the tracing of national territory on an imaginary map of the Hellenic world became a central project and point of contention in Greek politics and culture' (Leontis 1990:37).

This is indeed an important and valid argument which can be traced and asserted in many older and more modern debates and negotiations of Greek political and cultural ideology. Throughout the following analysis of Greek museums and exhibitions, it will come again many times to the fore when discussing the cultural politics of Hellenism and its lands, be they classical, Macedonian, Aegean, Thracian, etc. (Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eleven).

The Great Idea (*Megali Idea*), based on the doctrine that classical and Byzantine Greece formed the twin roots of Greek heritage (Tatsios 1984; cf: Skopetea 1984; Toynbee 1981), had its heyday towards the end of the century. The aspiration of all Greeks was 'the grandiose vision of restoring the Byzantine empire, through the incorporation within the bounds of a single state of all the areas of compact Greek settlement in the Near East, with Constantinople as the capital' (Clogg 1993:60).

The definition of an unbroken continuity with the classical and Byzantine past was a taxonomic device for asserting the extent of Hellenism and outlining a present that was also a past. The connotations of a continuous and unified past were turned against the prevailing tendency in European historical circles to view the Greek past as a series of separate and discontinuous worlds (Augustinos 1989:18). They eventually formulated the essence of modern Greek nationalism, embedded in romantic ideology, and defined the grounds upon which the archaeognostic disciplines developed in Greece for a substantial part of the early twentieth century.

Archaeological activities in post-liberation times were augmented substantially within a certain framework determined by the archaeological legislation that had been introduced as early as 1834, but even more importantly by the domestic and international socio-political and economic predicament of that time. In providing scientifically validated evidence relating to issues such as the definition of the Greek race and the Byzantine restoration (i.e. the question of which lands were associated with Greek history), archaeology, from its earliest development, was indentured as an instrument of the state. In like manner, a prime example of the dynamic relationship that was then unfolding between ideology, society and the state was the progress of

historical studies in Greece. The seminal historiographic production of Konstantine Paparrigopoulos' *History of the Greek Nation* weathered as 'an intellectual achievement of great magnitude where scholarship served to aid the bonding process of nationhood by the assertion of continuity and distinctiveness' (Augustinos 1989:19). Greek historians of that first generation, as their fellow scholars in other sister disciplines, were part of a fledgling state that had to contend with economic disruption, social dislocation and political disunity. 'In defence of this fragile edifice (they) turned to the symbols and ideology of nationalism' (Augustinos 1989:18; see also Kitroeff 1990).

Likewise, the study of Greek Folklore right from its birth, organised around the discourse of historic continuity and survivalism of certain cultural phenomena and grounded on a 'patriotic and archaeological' model (Orlandos 1969:6; Puchner 1996), acquired political significance in fashioning an acceptable image of the nation abroad.

### **The Interwar (1922-1949) and Post-war periods (1950s-1980s).**

When the ideological underpinning of the 'Great Idea' could no longer be sustained, the focus of study turned inward to explore the nation's historical experience more fully. A critical ethnocentric nationalism developed which would prevail in the ideological dictates of Ioannis Metaxas' dictatorship in 1936, and later on, in the Colonels' regime of April 21<sup>st</sup>, 1967 (Augustinos 1989:21).

The new parameter defining state ideology was the shifting of emphasis from the *ethnos* to the people and from irredentist ideals to aspirations for national economic development (Xydis 1969:244). In addition, the formation of the League of Nations encouraged the revival of humanist ideas of liberal and international nationalism. Thus, after 1923, cultural identity was losing ground to political identity.

Ioannis Metaxas' regime of the 4th of August 1936 tried to imitate Hitler's Third Reich ideological exemplars, by abusing in every sense the Hellenic past and its exquisite artistic output and elaborating the notion of the 'Third Hellenic Civilisation' [Plate 8] (Clogg 1993:118-119). The first was that of ancient Greece, particularly that of Sparta, second that of the medieval Byzantium and the third was an amalgam of the essentially contradictory values of his regime. Archaeology was again exposed to the ideological



pressures of repressive regimes (cf.: Díaz-Andreu 1993). Classical Greek antiquity has been interpreted, used or often misused in various ways since the Renaissance. In the case of the totalitarian regimes of the 1930s-40s, the selective adoration of the classical past and of its material culture impersonated the clash with everything that seemed modern and innovative. The employment of classical ideals in Nazi Germany, however deprived of every humanistic reference, was an aftermath of the German idealism of the 19th century. The Classical archetypes were used to overthrow human subjectivity and diversity by introducing a pseudo-ethology towards uniformity, usually signified through pieces of classical sculpture and architecture which embodied certain timeless values (Mosse 1985:171; cf.: Constantine 1984:114; Ioannides 1988).

With the end of the Second World War and the Greek Civil War (1945-1949), the new foreign relations of Greece and her new long-term dependency were made explicit, firstly with an open British intervention during the Civil War and, secondly, with the initiation of the Truman Doctrine in 1947 which allowed the continuous involvement of the USA in the political, economic and administrative life of Greece (Alexander 1982; Fatouros 1981:239).

During the Cold War, Greece once more became a focus for international rivalry. This differed markedly from previous competitions, being now a rivalry between two social regimes. This was an essential point of departure for an understanding of the directions Greek archaeology has taken ever since -whether practised by foreigners or by Greek researchers- and also for an understanding of Greek museum development and exhibitions after the wars (both World and Civil).

The result of the Civil War, which ended with the defeat of the Communists, was crucial in preserving Hellenist archaeology<sup>3</sup>. Hellenism, the Greek Classical past and its material culture, all continued to be worshipped as near metaphysical entities (Svoronos 1992:136). Indeed, this gradually led to the neutralisation of the theory of classical archaeology and to the total isolation of the discipline from wider intellectual changes (Morris 1994b:12).

Within this particular environment and its sub-systems, Hellenist archaeology developed its post-war and, particularly, its post-dictatorial (i.e. post-1974) apparatus. The management of a rich and multifarious heritage faced new challenges.

The development of post-war Greek society has been determined by several factors that collectively portray the country's internal and international character (Kourvetaris & Dobratz 1987; see also Triandafyllidou 1997). These factors, such as the decline of the Soviet regime and ideology, the emergence of a Turkish and more recent Slavic threat. The position of the USA in the Graeco-Turkish dispute, the challenge of European integration, and a general recession with trade deficits and high defence expenditure have all contributed to the content and design of museum exhibitions which are discussed in Chapters Five to Eleven.

In the late twentieth century, the value of archaeology has been accepted by virtually all Greeks (Silberman 1989:8). It is acknowledged that archaeology promotes national unity and proclaims cultural uniqueness. Antiquities, mainly classical, symbolise both the ideals of conservative politicians and the more patriotic and anti-imperialist ideas of the Socialists. Silberman (1989:10) expresses this in painterly terms:

‘in our times, the picture of [the past's] infancy in glittering colours is determined by the archaeologists who decide which colours each nation's poets, prophets and politicians should use’.

The preservation of the past serves political ends, expressed in nationalism, and economic aims, achieved through tourism. It has also been observed that a new type of nationalist fundamentalism emerged in Greece which was not based on irredentist objectives, being defensive, regressive and inward-looking (Tsoukalas 1981:331). In the same way that similar phenomena have emerged in countries like Israel (Shay 1989:769), archaeology furnishes Greeks with a concrete link to the past and to their land. Combining these factors, it can be argued that the allocation of funds to archaeological research by the modern Greek state has been allied to the conviction that archaeology plays an important role in the formation of national identity and serves the purposes of the nation state.



## Hellenism and the classical tradition in the late twentieth century: Changing attitudes and future perspectives

So far it has been briefly discussed how the 'classical' has been a central discourse and dominant myth in Western and, within this, Greek history. It was also roughed out how the classical discourse has been shaped and appropriated by Western society to produce a host of central and long-standing meta-narratives as those of Western and Greek Hellenism, Europeanness, Western civilisation and excellence. The centrality of Classics and classical archaeology to the study of classical tradition, of classical material culture and in effect to all forms of our cultural politics ascribed an aura of superiority and uniqueness to these disciplines.

The Post-modern Age came to question, however, the special qualities and privileged position of the classical discourse in western education and culture and put it under scrutiny and often open criticism.

The publication of the first two volumes of Martin Bernal's book *Black Athena: The Afro-Asiatic Roots of Classical Civilisation*, in 1987 and 1991, stands out as a cause célèbre of this new state of affairs. These books have ignited a storm of controversy<sup>4</sup> with their central thesis that: 'classics has incorporated social and cultural patterns in society as a whole and has reflected them back, to provide powerful support for the notion of Europe possessing a categorical superiority over all other continents, which in turn justified imperialism or neo-classicism as missions civilisatrices' (Bernal 1994:119; also Bernal 1986; 1987; 1988; 1991). Bernal identifies two rival models of Greek prehistory. The one is the 'Ancient Model' according to which Greek culture has arisen as a result of colonisation around 1500 BC, by Egyptians and Phoenicians who civilised the native inhabitants of Hellas. Bernal claims that this view was held by most Greeks in the classical and Hellenistic eras. Its counter-model is the so-called 'Aryan' Model which, invented in the early nineteenth century and adopted by European and Western classicists, saw the Greeks as Indo-Europeans invaders from the north and thus Ancient Greece as 'European, the Ancient Hellas, the pure Aryan Ursprung of modern Europe' (Hall 1996:333). In many ways, Bernal and his supporters thus suggest that classicists have been sort of 'propagandists from the White European Ministry of Classical Culture' (Lefkowitz 1996:5). He condemns the 'Aryan Model' as Eurocentric

and holds it responsible for the denial of the Afro-Asiatic and Semitic roots of Greek culture and for the rise of racism and anti-Semitism in the modern Western world, in the nineteenth-and twentieth-centuries. Bernal, by means of his own 'Revised Ancient Model' urges a return to the original view that supports the Afro-Asiatic origins of classical civilisation and so establishes an Afrocentric view of ancient history and in extent of western culture.

Classical scholarship, however, has not denied that there is plain and undeniable evidence of Egyptian influence on certain aspects of Greek culture. Furthermore, it has highlighted the role of other Mediterranean civilisations on Greek culture. Modern scholars, due to the lack of sufficient evidence from the remote past, hold many conflicting ideas about the true origins of Greek and thus western civilisation.

Bernal, a non-classicist himself, has found many adherents, supporters of multiculturalism and Afrocentric ideas. Equally, he has found many opponents who accused him and his work of amateurism, naiveté, overstatements, serious historiographical flaws and errors, lack of scholarly methodology and disciplinary rigour, not to mention political prejudices and hidden agendas in his own interpretation of ancient records and appreciation of the relation between cultural politics and classical scholarship (see Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a wherein lay further authors and arguments). Bernal, instead of offering a new multicentric model and interpretation of ancient history, did no more than reject the old-fashioned Eurocentric stance in order to replace it with an equally biased Afrocentric and Levantine position.

Although Bernal, to his discredit, failed to relate objectively archaeological sources to their political and social context, he has undoubtedly managed to open the discipline of classics to a period of self-criticism which, in many aspects, has reshaped research and the teaching of classics, mainly in the United States. His writings challenged scholars and academia to reflect upon their role as reproducers of cultural and political ideologies. He showed, as many scholars similarly practised in recent years, how the present influences the study of the past and how different perspectives related to differences in race, class, gender can be incorporated into the understanding and teaching of classical antiquity. In a way, Bernal, either intentionally or not:

'has done for classicists, ancient historians and classical archaeologists what they have done less well recently themselves: he has made their



fields and them important, relevant, even critical to a national, some would even say global debate about who we are and what we should tell our children about the past we have claimed. The role of *Black Athena* in that debate will be to remind future generations that all historiography, if not history, is contemporary' (MacLean Rogers 1996:443).

To a great extent, the questioning of the origins of Greek civilisation itself says something about the dissolution of an hegemonic Western identity (Friedman 1992:840). In this line of thinking, Ian Morris, writing in the aftermath of *Black Athena's* first publication, identifies a crisis in classical archaeology which is challenged as old-fashioned and unfit to cope with today's social and intellectual debates. Morris interprets this crisis and the rejection of the meta-narrative of Hellenism not just as a struggle between theoretical and traditional positions, but as a by-product of a more general epistemic change and transition from the Modern to the post-modern era, as these have been defined by Michel Foucault (see Morris 1994b; also Shanks 1996:108-111). Modernism formulated and sustained the discourse of classical tradition and Hellenism. Post-Modernism, with its broader questioning of traditions, certainties and flaccid complacency of past times, has challenged the supremacy of the "West" and thus also lessens Hellenism's and classical archaeology's social and intellectual relevance.

What then can be the future of classical tradition and classical scholarship?

Will classical tradition be waned and marginalised as an out-moded carrier of past ideologies and negativisms (i.e. ethnocentrism, imperialism, elitism) said to be entrenched in its centuries-old history?

Post-war and contemporary scholarship has also strongly emphasised the "otherness" of the Greeks. Classicists such as Jane Harrison, E.R.Dodds, Moses Finley, J.P.Vernant and others have used anthropological methods to study ancient Greek slavery, homosexuality, primitiveness, impurity and irrationality to create a picture of Greek religion and society which was the antithesis of humanistic idealisation and thus a remote intellectual landscape to our own western society (see Kennedy 1994:14; Shanks 1996:85; Taplin 1989:25-27).

Some scholars urge the refiguring of classical scholarship which will help to approach ancient Greece in a more realistic, less idealistic and more reflective manner (Morris

1994a; 1994b). Others hold that the waning of the classical tradition will not result from scholarly and public discovery of the 'otherness' of the Greeks, but rather from lack of knowledge of them on the part of wider society and from the competition of other discourses for public attention (Kennedy 1994:15). A somewhat pessimistic view is that classicists will turn into some kind of cultural conservationists, seeking to preserve Homer, the Greeks and the Romans as a living heritage for the enjoyment and health of the future, in the same way that environmentalists seek to preserve the natural heritage of the planet for the mental and physical health of those to come (ibid:15-16). A more optimistic standpoint is that Ancient Greece, classics and classical archaeology have still a great deal to offer to contemporary intellectual debates, by examining for instance how ancient writers confronted the diverse cultural traditions of their world and debated the multi-culturalism of their own societies (Beard & Henderson 1995:28-29). Likewise, classical archaeology and tradition are believed to hold great potential for studying contemporary heritage interests from many different angles (Shanks 1996:181-182).

Adhering to the promising latter views, this study sets out to do nothing less than examine how a theoretically and historically informed approach to museum constructions of the Greek past can enhance public understanding and future social relevance of the classical material culture and its venerated heritage.

It is now time to see how a comprehensive working model based on a step-by-step gathering of thought and data can channel coherent thinking towards an effective realisation of this present study's prime goal.



# STUDYING THE DISCOURSE OF GREEK ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUMS AND EXHIBITIONS; A MODEL OF ANALYSIS

Museums are no longer considered cemeteries of valuable objects or places for the presentation of unconnected and lonely products of human activity. Museums are places wherein objects, tools and forms co-function and co-exist organically within the landscape, social conjunction of circumstances and political structures that gave them birth and rendered them indispensable (...) A modern Museum is a theatre and an imitation of past life (...) The presence of human life is implicit, however, and becomes perceptible through the museum objects (...) The Museum as a theatre and the visitors, specially children, as actors, essentially perform an act of mimicry that excites the senses and the imagination. This is indeed an educational experience of unique significance.

K.Georgousopoulos, in *To Vima* 10/8/82, 1, 5.

The Museum is the show-case of a country (...) The Museum offers a new temporal dimension to our lives (...) It requires from us contact and participation.

A. & N.Goulandris, in *To Vima* 17/5/92, 38.

The prime duty of a museum is to collect and protect all the components of cultural tradition; in parallel, it is to study, classify, interpret, disseminate and scientifically distribute and present the collections to the society. The latter duty, namely the educational, is the most weighty of all. For the museum, by nature, is an institution that acquires the status of a school (...) The museum is a deeply democratic organisation that can overcome ageing and death thanks to its ongoing stages of revival. The Museum must and can change with the passage of time and generations (...) Regarding Greek museums, the competent Greek authorities and administration count on the fact

that museums can attract their visitors' interest merely through their magnificent collections. As the prevailing view is that Greek museums do not have any particular needs, the museums of the country continue to under-function.

A.Delivorrias, in *To Vima* 17/5/92, 38.

## Introduction

A prime aim of this study, as already outlined in Chapter One, is to examine and understand the poetics and politics of museum representations of the classical past in Greek museums for the period 1950 to today. In essence, this study sets out to achieve this goal by shedding light on the process of production through which Greek museums and museum exhibitions, permanent, temporary and travelling alike, construct, order, interpret and represent the classical past. Further, it is the writer's intention to explore how we can make museums and exhibitions of classical archaeology more interesting for wider audiences by finding new ways of approaching the collections and of rendering Ancient Greece once again socially relevant in the late twentieth century.

The investigation that follows intends to be thorough, touching upon an array of both theoretical and practical matters of museum writing and exhibiting of the Greek classical past. Therefore, it is necessary to define and coherently apply a good and structured, let alone flexible, model which will potentially reveal the manifold aspects (museological, archaeological, social, historical, political) of this study's case-studies.

In recent years, a number of theoretical models (Panofsky 1939; Fleming's in 1974 see Schlereth 1982; Elliot et al 1985; Prown 1982; Pearce 1986c; Batchelor 1986) for artefact study have been developed in order to provide a systematic methodology of object analysis. They have generally followed a kind of step-by-step examination which has led to the creation of various structures within which the known facts about the objects and their intrinsic values have been grouped.

In this section of the study, the intention is not to present the whole body of the developed models, or to display and analyse their similarities and differences (see Beraha 1988; Pearce 1992). The purpose of this chapter is firstly, to present the sources, the object analysis models which will be used for the purposes of this study, either in



their original structure or in largely modified forms; secondly, to describe the analysis model of the current study and its properties; and thirdly to speak about some basic concepts of contemporary museum theory as a way to explain the specific workings of the model and to orientate the reader through a plethora of museological meanings and practices that are to be of relevance to the following discussion of the discourse of Greek archaeological museums and exhibitions.

### **Towards the study of the Greek museum discourse; three key sources**

Three theorists of material culture and museums have provided significant inspiration for the purposes of this study: firstly, Susan Pearce with her model for object study [Figure 2] (Pearce 1986c; 1992; Beraha 1988; Gazi 1993); secondly, Peter van Mensch with his study of the museological object and its structure [Figure 3] (van Mensch 1989; 1990); thirdly, T.Schlereth with his own proposition for the Historical Museum Exhibit Review (Schlereth 1989:233-237).

Susan Pearce, starting from a discipline background in archaeology and anthropology, developed her model in 1986 based on a step-by-step, linear footing of thoughts and data gathering which can potentially be applied across the whole range of material culture (Pearce 1986c;1992; Beraha 1988:17-18). The basic core of this arrangement is the attribution of four main characteristics to the object: a *material body*, a *history*, a place in the *environment* and a cultural *significance*. Furthermore, the first attribute is subdivided into smaller units which act as ‘aide-mémoires’ (Pearce 1992:265) for a detailed gathering of data for the object under inquiry. These subdivisions are the object’s construction, its design and its provenance as parts of its external reality. When it comes to the object’s history, Pearce addresses inquiries about the object’s use and function. The chronological dating of the artefact can also be attempted. The object’s environment-context is divided into micro and macro and to its location regarding its relation to the landscape and to patterning; in other words it involves all its spatial relationships. So far, all these enquiries substantially help the analyst to collect as much information as s/he can get about the object’s material life. The last category, the significance, provides the theoretical framework within which the object’s analysis is

made, by using one or a combination of more than one known philosophical systems (i.e.: functionalism, structuralism, etc.). What comes at the end, as a sum of our understanding of the object's characteristics, is its interpretation and its value in the social organisation through time. It is of course straightforward that the significance, being the last property of the object, is of a highly subjective nature for it potentially provides a wide range of different meanings for the same object.

Peter van Mensch concentrates on museum fundamentals and explores, as Pearce did previously, the possibilities of analysing the museological objects (or *musealia*) as information carriers and establishing a workable model by structuring the data into certain levels. There are four levels of data (van Mensch 1990:146): 1) the *structural properties* which indicate the physical characteristics of the object; 2) the *functional properties* which refer to the usage of the artefact; 3) the *context* (physical and conceptual) which surrounds the object; and finally 4) the *significance*, meaning and value of the artefact.

Moreover, according to van Mensch, the artefact has a biography with three distinguished stages: 1) the *conceptual stage* which implies the idea of the maker, the potential object; 2) the *factual stage* which refers to the realised object as this appears just after its completion; 3) finally the *actual stage* is the accumulation of information from all the previous levels. In addition, we have the *structural identity* (form and appearance) and *functional identity* (function) which are both expressions of the conceptual identity and appear within the factual stage of an object's life [Figure 3]. Much of van Mensch's theories had been developed on the basis of a similar approach to the object as data bearer formulated by Maroevic (1983; 1995). Maroevic was the one who divided the life of artefacts into three levels: artefact as a document, artefact as message, and artefact as information (impact and meaning of the message).

Alternatively, Schlereth (1989:233-237) suggests his students should consider a historical museum exhibition a scholarly organisation of historical evidence, and therefore a type of historical publication that could fulfil an array of objectives. These objectives are usually: stimulation of historical interest, promotion of historical thought and of the notions of historical development and continuity, and finally incorporation of the subject matter into a historical context larger than the specific topic of the exhibition itself (Schlereth 1989:233). Along the lines of this approach, students and



generally all authors of exhibition reviews must remember that their critiques should follow the principles of a book review. Here are some of his useful guidelines (Schlereth 1989:233):

‘[the reviewer must] say what the exhibit is about, in general; explain its relationship to other exhibits on the subject; judge its worth, according to the quality of the artefacts, the manner in which the artefacts are interpreted, and the way in which the artefacts are displayed. The reviewer should also say what the exhibit was planned to do, whether it accomplishes what it had been planned to accomplish, and, if not, why it falls short of its aim’.

Additionally, Schlereth proposes certain review questions which are grouped into eight general categories:

1) *purpose* of the exhibition; 2) *organisation* of the displays (e.g. arrangement of the exhibition space); 3) *method* followed by the curator-historian for the presentation of the exhibition’s topic (or else the philosophy of the exhibition); 4) *pedagogy* of the exhibition in relation to its audience; 5) *scholarship* or else the exhibition’s historical accuracy and its contribution to the research knowledge; 6) *fabrication* or differently the construction process and design techniques of the exhibition as well as its hard and software devices; 7) the *institution* and its scientific status and esteem among other fellow institutions; 8) and finally the *summary* or conclusions upon the effectiveness of the exhibition’s communication methodology. At the end, some suggestions might be offered for the improvement of the exhibition.

## **Towards the study of the Greek museum discourse; a model of analysis**

Deetz defines material culture as ‘that sector of our physical environment that we modify through culturally determined behaviour (Deetz 1977:24-5). In this sense, material culture is not only the tangible, movable artefacts but something much broader. Within this mindset and drawing on the principles of the abovementioned three models of analysis, the present study regards both museums (as institutions and concrete edifices) and exhibitions (as media of communication) as artefacts with their own material, history, environment and significance [Figure 4].

Let us explore the structure and characteristics of each individual property separately.

#### MUSEUM & EXHIBITION HISTORY

Every museum and/or exhibition has *history*, in a way their own ‘archaeology’, that is being chronicled from the day of their establishment up to our own era. Throughout their life, they set certain aims and perform particular functions<sup>1</sup> which either continue unchanging for a long time or alter according to new needs.

They have been many interesting studies regarding the history of museums<sup>2</sup> that have endeavoured to establish greater knowledge of the operational mechanisms and characteristic elements that define the modern museum as a cultural institution and indeed as an ‘Ideological State Apparatus’<sup>3</sup> (See Meltzer 1981:115; cf: Althusser 1971) that stands alongside other state ideological institutions such as schools and information networks. Museums are restless institutions with variable and discontinuous identities, targets, functions and subject positions (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:21; 191). The realities of museums have altered many times according to shifting historical moments, geographical spaces, socio-political and economic conditions and other agents that surrounded them.

Further, the writing of museum histories can be done in a traditional way which concentrates on encyclopaedic accounts, chronological descriptions and tangible data regarding the development of museums (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:18-22; cf: Foucault 1977:153). It might also be performed in an ‘effective’ manner which adopts more synthesising and interdisciplinary methodologies that ask the ‘when’, ‘hows’, ‘whys’ and ‘in which way’ changes and progress had emerged (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:9-12). For the purposes of the present study, both these modes of analysis will be espoused and pursued.

#### MUSEUM MATERIAL

Additionally, every museum and/or exhibition is a human construction made of concrete materials. In this sense, they are human creations that carry particular *material*



properties. In the case of a museum, these properties can emanate: firstly from its classification within one of the museum institutional types, according to the nature of its collections (e.g. Archaeological, Art, Ethnographic, Historical, Natural History Museums etc.) and range of tasks (e.g. National<sup>3</sup>, Regional<sup>4</sup>, Site<sup>5</sup>, Private<sup>6</sup>, University<sup>7</sup> Museums, etc.); secondly, from the museum's architectural form and its positioning in the evolution of museum architectural style.

Specifically, with regard to the analysis of a museum as an architectural script, one can address plentiful inquiries about the impressions, the senses, the messages and values that are respectively conveyed, affected and transmitted through a museum building.

Indeed, there is today a considerable amount of published literature<sup>8</sup> which concentrates on the artistic, stylistic and ideological agendas that the Museum embodies and on the messages, rituals<sup>9</sup> and 'obsessions of the sacred' (Deloche 1989:31-69) that are realised through museum architecture.

For instance, Duncan and Wallach, who first introduced the term 'doing code' as a special feature contained in a museum building, explore a type of museum which they call 'universal survey museums'. They suggest that museums are examples of modern ceremonial monuments which reaffirm the power and social authority of the ruling classes through their physical prominence and programmed experience (Duncan & Wallach 1980). For them as for many museum theorists, the museum, with its external facade and interior spaces altogether, is a mirror of the dominant state ideology and authority, whereas the triumphal architecture and display of universal survey museums like the Museum of Louvre, the Metropolitan Museum of New York, etc. is a testimonial rhetoric of western civilisation, and even western imperialism. And as western culture has been traditionally associated with the Classical miracle and ideal, subsequently the museums which act as repositories and transmitters of this high classical tradition for contemporary society transform the visitor into an ideal citizen and 'heir at an ideal, civilised past' (Duncan & Wallach 1980:451). Special architectural elements such as the monumental staircases and long linear galleries turn out to be metaphors of a museum ritual which subsequently offers to museum goers spiritual enlightenment and universal values.

Naturally, architectural norms and shapes evolve, affecting also the museum typology. Ample possibilities appear for the shifting of stylistic standards towards the shaping of new forms and deconstruction of others. The 'palaces of rooms', that is the universal museums, may be replaced or may co-exist with museums-'anti-palaces' of the twentieth-century that tend to desanctify art by means of their vast, open, unarticulated and fragmented spaces (Searing 1986:21; Davis 1990:42). Museum antistyles of the late twentieth-century accentuate as emphatically as their universal museum predecessors the double coded use of museum as a museum-of artefacts and as an artefact itself<sup>10</sup>.

Informed by such theories on the power of museum architectural scripts and their embedded ideological messages, the following analysis of the Greek museum discourse of the post-war period will not omit exploration of the nature and codes of Greek museum architecture, whether this is represented and communicated through old non-purpose built edifices<sup>11</sup>, neo-classical<sup>12</sup>, neo-vernacular<sup>13</sup> or modern museum buildings<sup>14</sup>.

#### EXHIBITION MATERIAL

In the case of museum exhibitions, the material properties are similarly widely ranged and involve:

- 1) the physical description of the components of the exhibition, that is the a) collections, b) the secondary materials (i.e. images, writings and sound recordings, labels and panel texts<sup>15</sup>, catalogues, leaflets), c) the display hardware (i.e. showcases, the technical agents such as light, colour, environmental key-tools) etc.
- a) Museum objects and collections traditionally play a key-role in the structuring of any exhibition. Do, however, display authors and museum media offer enough intellectual stimuli to museum visitors to reflect on the lives of these artefacts and collections and on the roles, values and meanings these objects are ascribed with in various and different contexts?

Were we to explore this point a bit further and with specific regard to archaeological objects and collections, we could recognise that objects can move within three main contexts: firstly, the '*systemic context*' of an archaeological artefact which



corresponds to the object's first life and original place in an ongoing society (Schiffer 1972, 1987:3; Carman 1990:196). Martin Schärer, a museum theorist, names this same first context of objects' lives '*wirkliche Realität*', that is *true reality* (Schärer 1994:217).

Then, comes the object's life as refuse within a certain '*archaeological context*'. Once the object is discovered, it again becomes part of a modern ongoing society, that is of a kind of '*systemic context No.2*' - which is equivalent to the discovery, archaeological study, museum display etc. On entering this new context, the objects acquire value, which can be economic (object as treasure, as art), aesthetic (object as art), historical (object as history data carrier), to mention just a few of them. None of these present values represent the value of the object held in its past social context. They rather represent 'tournament[s] of value[s]' (Appadurai 1986:21), for 'the link with that past value has been shattered by a period of invisibility during which the object lay in the ground' (Carman 1990:205).

More specifically, the assignment of certain values to the museum objects and furthermore to the selection of certain objects that fulfil the ideological predilections of exhibition authors determines both content and form of display (Gathercole 1983:41).

Yet, the combination of 'historical sedimentation', or 'acte de separation' as Davallon calls it (1986b:244-245) and forms of 'musealization' leads to highly compressed information and to a formation of a museum world full of invisible objects (van Mensch 1986:39). It also results in the decontextualisation of the object from its immediate environment and to its positioning in the exhibition's artificial context and pseudo-reality, also referred to as '*erdachte Realität*', that is *imaginary reality* (Schärer 1994:217). Thereby, the museumified object does not perform its original function but signifies what this function could be.

At the end comes the *personal context* or *personal reality* of the object whereby objects again acquire new and multiple dimensions. That is because the personal context of a museum object or collection is conditioned by the individual museum viewer's response, both sensual and intellectual, and her own way of understanding the object's meaning(s) and function(s).

All the previous intellectual propositions can be subtly summed up by means of a diagram. Pearce (1990b:149; 1992:141-143) [Figure 5] provides a semiotic analysis of the relationship between ancient material culture, museum collections, and exhibitions. Drawing on Saussure's semiotic thinking, she projects the relationships and interactions that occur between the following counterparts, structured under the semiotic principles of *langue* and *parole* and their continuous and sequential intershifts: the surviving material of the past, the society which created it, the archaeological material, the current archaeological theories and practice, the museum archives, the contemporary archaeological theories. These all together result in the creation of one particular exhibition, the final, but yet one of many, *parole* of the whole interaction.

- b) Secondary exhibition materials and display hardware are also crucial elements in the course of an exhibition process and therefore must not be seen as mere aesthetic and technical devices. Indeed, recent scholarly research into the forms and roles of museum texts calls for a reassertion of the label's status as an object of display in its own right (Coxall 1990; 1991; 1995; also Beard & Henderson 1994). Museum texts consist of words which carry inherent meanings that have the potential to construct or deconstruct a certain museum rhetoric and a certain museum experience. Different styles of labels are related to different styles of display 'with different kinds of values, different kinds of understanding, different kinds of appropriation of the past' (Beard & Henderson 1994:28). The inherent power of museum texts as semantic tools in any exhibition is most vividly summarised in the following two phrases that have been themselves used as 'museum artefacts' in the challenging and exciting post-modernist exhibition 'The Curator's Egg', held some years ago in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford (December 1991-May 1992) (see Beard & Henderson 1994:28):

'If Museums are about giving information, the labels do most of the work'.

'If Museums are about keeping mysterious secrets, the labels do most of the work'.

- c) Likewise, showcases as part of the display hardware are exhibition utensils used by display authors in order to signify the differences that exist between the outside world and the exhibition world (Davallon 1986b:246). They function as coded



elements of an exhibition and as a materialisation of the bonds between the exposed objects. They indicate how the author put the objects together, how s/he hierarchised, ordered, chose, categorised them. They indicate in reality how the viewer should interpret the whole exhibition. Showcases are said to represent empty time, time as a container filled with the content of archaeology. The cases are the content-less temporal form in which objects are brought to exist (Shanks & Tilley 1992:70).

2) the philosophical description of the exhibition that looks at the aims and target audiences of an exhibition [purpose]; the display strategies, styles, techniques, circulation patterns and space morphology of an exhibition [organisation] and finally the range of theoretical stances and philosophies adopted by display authors in the course of an exhibition [philosophy]. All these attributes, in total, construct specific 'ways of seeing' material culture and 'writing' of archaeology in the museum, which in the case of the current study is the material culture of the Greek classical past and the writing of classical archaeology.

Let us look in some detail at the range of choices that exist both regarding the exhibition organisation and exhibition philosophy.

### Organisation-strategy

Hall (1987:25-27) distinguishes two main types of exhibitions according to the choice of strategy: taxonomic and thematic exhibitions.

The *taxonomic*, typological or else generic-objective type of strategy (the last term proposed by Maranda 1991:69) is a derivative of a classification system, and displays the material based on instrumental rationality and arrangement of exhibits into corresponding groups and chronological sequential patterns. Usually they are linear and object-oriented and accent determinism and progression (Dean 1994:4-5). The visitors walk through history. The objects stand isolated, segregated from their social contexts but they fit in a rigid linear structure. The objects are objective and unambiguous. They are viewed as chronological objects and specimens, as objects of academic study. This

type of exhibition assumes an informed visitor. Its didactic dimension is minimal. It is a solution associated with the intensive development of sciences, wherein there has been a quest for 'neutralism' to aesthetics (Swiecinski 1977:56). Shanks and Tilley, based on the exhibitions' illusory objectivity, name them objective and find that their 'descriptive archaeological narrative is implied but almost totally absent' (Shanks and Tilley 1992:69).

The *thematic* exhibitions, as an inverse treatment of the museum material, tell a story and are textbook like, with a fluid style. They are in other words concept-oriented, placing emphasis on good educational design. They are what Shanks and Tilley call narrative displays (1992:69).

Another type of museum presentation is what is called a *situational* display (Shanks & Tilley 1992:77). It projects and facilitates the communicative-value of the objects. The artefacts are brought together in spatial and temporal associations which will supposedly enable the visitor to decode a meaning through experience of context. They are docu-drama like and function as time-machines taking the visitor to past periods and times.

The representative example of this type of exhibition is the period room and period settings. The period room reconstructs an original room in its totality and initial ambience; in contrast, the period setting is based only on the assets provided by the authentic architectural and decorative features and combines artefacts to express an idea. Additionally, historic villages and historic houses stand between naturally accumulated artefact sets and artificially accumulated sets.

### Organisation-style

First, there is the *aesthetic* style (Belcher 1991:59-60; Burcaw 1979; Hall 1987:29; Maranda 1991:69; Shanks and Tilley 1992:71-3) that represents either exhibitions which focus primarily on the aesthetic qualities and 'cult values' of their displays or exhibitions highly aesthetised per se. While the latter is not a very usual case in archaeological exhibitions as the positivist attitude towards a dry, pure presentation of the past is well spread into the scientific circles, the former springs as a common



approach to archaeological objects of beauty. Thus, in order to achieve the maximum appreciation initiated by objects of art and the creation of a general aesthetic ambience, there must be a minimum of 'visual interference'.

The *evocative* style (Belcher 1991:60-62) is a call to romanticism. It is theatrical, based on experience design. Here, 'feeling', emotion, affection plays a primary role in understanding. There is a basic and vital union between mind and body, intuition and reason. Pearce (1990b:154-155) says of the emotive type that it is grounded in the conviction that: 'an experience of the ancient, the exotic and the beautiful is good because it enables us to share in the common scope of human experience, to live more interestingly and to accept more easily the essential precariousness of life'. It is usually applied to situational displays.

Specifically, as concerns archaeological exhibitions, the conscious engagement of emotional involvement with the displays is occasionally denied by display authors as 'distasteful' (Meredith 1990:210-211).

When the intention is to create displays that aim to impart knowledge rather than mere visual excitement to the viewer, then we talk about *didactic* or else educational exhibitions (Hall 1987:28-9; Pearce 1990b:154-155). Exhibits are chosen to illustrate the written text and are therefore immediately forced into a supporting role. For Roger Miles (1988) all exhibitions are educational as they try to tell visitors things that they are unlikely to have known before. For Pearce (1990b:153-154), didactic exhibitions are: 'grounded in the belief that knowledge is morally good, partly in an absolute sense and partly because it helps to develop socially responsible citizens who identify constructively with their community and its traditions'.

### Organisation-technique

There are *interactive* displays (Hall 1987:27-8; Belcher 1991:65) which demand a minimal or extensive degree of physical and intellectual involvement on the part of the visitor, for the material and message to be appropriated.

*Active* displays are those which are simply changing constantly while *responsive* are those which automatically respond to the arrival of the visitor (Velarde 1986:396; Belcher 1991:65). Moreover, Miles (1988), based on the number of physical states an exhibit can take, distinguishes between *static* and *dynamic* exhibitions. The former is predetermined and unchanged whereas the latter is open-ended and involves the visitor in some type of dialogue.

### Organisation-space morphology

Studies at the Royal Ontario Museum in Canada have proposed that the floor plan of an exhibit has a crucial influence upon how much of it most people will see (Royal Ontario Museum 1976:107-13).

Peponis and Hesdin (1982) worked on the same idea, seeking to elucidate the relationship between spaces in an exhibition gallery. Their resulting work generated three relational properties (Pearce 1990b:149-150; 1992:137, 139). The first concerns the relative separation of spaces and is recognised as depth of an exhibition. Depth is the number of spaces that need to be crossed to move from one point to another. In this sense, there might be deep or shallow exhibitions.

The second property is about the 'ring' factor of a gallery. It concerns the provision of alternative ways of going from one space to another, that is the number of rings defined in the plan.

The final attribute is called entropy. It has largely to do with the ease with which the visitor understands and uses the structural pattern of the gallery. The more entropic, the simpler and the less structured the gallery is. What is most important with all these properties, is that they imply certain social connotations regarding the way exhibit writers and readers feel when walking around the galleries. For instance, Pearce (1990b:150; 1992:139) makes the point that exhibitions with strong axial structures, shallow depth and low ring factor present knowledge as if it were the map of a well-known terrain.



Finally, Lehmbruck (1974; see also Belcher 1991:112-113) evolved an alternative typology of circulation patterns which identifies five basic types: arterial, comb, chain, star and block which may be used individually or in combinations to cover most situations.

### Philosophy-Art history

In Chapter Two, there was the chance to discuss to some degree the relation between the institutionalisation of art history and the professionalizing of archaeology, mainly of classical archaeology in the nineteenth century.

The scientific establishment of art history has been devoted to the comparison and analysis of works of art and their creators' biographies, to the estimation of their relative worth and aiming further at the understanding of their evidential value with respect to the history and progressive evolution of man (Preziosi 1992:365). The meaning of an item, according to art historical reasoning, is a function of its place, its ranking in the system which assesses first the aesthetic qualities and further the moral values of an artwork. Its emblem has been the act of collecting, peering at groups and systematically displaying a universal history of art. According to Donald Preziosi, the theory that underpinned art history as an academic discipline was that the object was a medium, 'a vehicle by means of which the intentions, values, attitudes, messages, emotions, or agendas of the maker are conveyed to beholders or observers'. Furthermore, 'changes in an artistic practice or tradition are assumed to be an index of variations in an evolving system of thought, belief or political or social attitudes' (Preziosi 1992:375).

One can note easily a direct correlation between the practices and principles of art history and those of the traditional museum. Preziosi (1992:379) again provides a very sound and meticulous account of the analogue between museological space and art historical apparatus which is worth quoting at length:

'What is guaranteed above all [in a museological tableau] is the spirit of artisanry and of human creativity as such, the existence of such a phenomenon as art (...). In spatially formatting examples of characteristic forms of expression of an artist, movement, nation, or

period, the visitor or user of the museum is afforded the opportunity to *see* for himself the evidence of what is quintessentially and properly human in all its variety. The absences of the past are peopled with palpably material relics, synecdochal reminders that the present is the product of a certain historical evolution of values, tastes, and manners -or a certain moral sensibility- summarised by and inscribed in museological space’.

Museum displays often follow the more formalistic arguments of art history by dividing the objects into separate spaces, according to time periods, styles, schools of art, or morphological and iconographic patterns.

What is the overall impression conveyed to the viewers of an exhibition set with art historical principles is that museum collections function as exemplary moments of an ideal historical period which is itself largely unified and homogeneous. Yet, above all, the viewer is most firmly led to regard the museological object as object of contemplation which communicates ‘the ritual values of the cult of *Homo Artifex*’ (Shanks and Tilley 1992:77).

These types of exhibitions have a long tradition world-wide and are usually familiar to our tastes and senses (Pearce 1992:203). In this respect, they attract large audiences.

### Philosophy-Historical Narrative

The presentation of the past as a historical narrative stands as one of the most common ways of explaining man's history. The objects are - at least for the more distant past - the only real and tangible evidence of societies' existence. Thereby, they are viewed as social products and used as mere illustrations to support a story nicely arranged in chronological order. Archaeological artefacts are presented in terms of classic written historiography and served as the ‘glossy’ outcome of the societies' cultural unfolding. (Pearce 1992:206). As Michael Shanks asserts in his recent important book *Classical Archaeology of Greece: Experience of a discipline* (1996:116-117):

‘Although eschewed in many of the textual formats of Classical archaeology, versions of historical narrative remain for many the ultimate aim of archaeological work -combining the particulars of the



archaeological past into meaningful wholes with features such as events and plot (...) Narrative is a basic human means of making sense of the world, and narratives form a basic component of self-identity (...) Narrative forms accordingly feature prominently in nationalist and heritage appropriations of the archaeological past'.

### Philosophy-Functionalism

Functionalism views objects as artefacts whose meaning is valued in terms of their function. Objects are mainly regarded as the outcome of applied technology to raw material (Pearce 1992:23-30; Pearce 1986a:79-82; Hodder 1986:19-34; 1988). Hence, this perspective demotes their significance to a purely materialistic level. This way of thinking proves to be unable to cope with the fact of social change. Employed mainly by anthropologists who had given absolute primacy to agriculture and economy, it presents societies in a synchronic moment, a 'frozen now', without past and future.

Around the 1960's, the Systems Theory Analysis emerged as a fundamental approach engaged to supersede limitations of this kind (Clarke 1968). According to this neo-functional view, expressed in the language of Systems Theory, societies incorporate a self-regulating mechanism which helps them to reach a level of absolute stability (called homeostasis) (Pearce 1992:159) which does not threaten the survival of the system. Societies are composed of several sub-systems equal to each other and organised in an inter-reacting network. When a factor of imbalance appears within one of the sub-systems, a sequence of development and change is expected as a result of their intimate inter-reactions.

One could argue (Pearce 1992:157) that adopting the same form of analysis for every community, is like defining a series of society types by one of which all actual societies have belonged. Each society has a typical cluster of patterns linked with themes of economy, production, culture, technology and ideology. Simultaneously, limitations are created by the amount of 'determinism in which societies take inevitable form and work out predetermined destinies' (Pearce 1992:158).

Nonetheless, when enough data is available, Systems Theory can prove to be considerably useful by describing the articulation of a particular society. Also, it

involves an emphasis on complex causality when all the patterns operate simultaneously and no single factor is totally responsible for the changes in the structure of a society.

As Shanks and Tilley stated (1987:34), functionalist reasoning necessitated a consideration of sub-system interaction within a cultural whole, rather than permitting concentration on any single cultural phenomenon, such as subsistence or ceramic design characterising mainly traditional styles of archaeological research and explanation. Objects do not operate as mere illustrations of a storyline. It gives them a certain degree of significance but only as an equal component of the system theory, and usually as evidence of social development and technological change.

However, it seems that artefacts are still treated as passive recipients rather than active ingredients of a certain society; it is a weakness which has not been overridden even by the more elaborate and sophisticated neo-functionalism. The individual's active involvement in the process of social change is also diminished. Each individual stands, however, as an independent social unit and must be regarded as such by any theoretical model which seeks to be more competent and objective.

Consequently, this drawback of functionalism is followed by its inability to explain social changes (the hows and whys) even if system theory analysis had considerably managed to predict these shifts. In these studies, it is the social relations of production which either dominate or form a two-way relationship with the forces of production. Ideology, in particular, plays a secondary role. There is no consideration about the meaning of the objects as ideas (Hodder 1986:62). A simple relationship between environment and social strategies is taken for granted while emphasis is placed on demonstrating how the artefacts are made in terms of their raw material and technology. It is an approach which 'lies at the heart of the great majority of exhibitions mounted in the human history field' (Pearce 1992:147).

It bears weaknesses which characterise the whole functionalist thinking. These are:

1) the inability to explain change and 2) the downgrading of the individual's role in the formation of the society.

Broadly, functionalism or environmental concepts stand at the root of many archaeological exhibitions. It is worth noting that functionalist structures are incorporated into archaeological displays, unconsciously, even when curators argue



against the implementation of theoretical stances in the preparation of permanent exhibitions.

Despite its several drawbacks concerning both interpretation and presentation of archaeological collections, functionalism is very popular among curators, for it provides factual evidence and an empirical view which correspond to the archaeologists' scepticism as regards the speculative character of intellectual realms and past people's ideas. Exhibitions of this kind are relatively uncontroversial and are believed with good reason.

There has been a pressing need to go beyond the functional boundaries of an artefact in order to reveal its basic underlying structure. As Tilley (1991:188) puts it specifically for the discipline of archaeology:

'If archaeology is anything, it is the study of material culture as a manifestation of structured symbolic practices, meaningfully constituted and situated in relation to the social. Such an analysis is difficult, but it does at least have the merit of trying to capture the sheer complexity of what we are trying to understand'.

### Philosophy-Structuralism

The inadequacy of functionalism to impart this sort of thinking can be surpassed by generating a deeper meaning for material culture products, by providing them with a content of ideas as signs and symbols.

Based on the comprehensive work of the linguists (see Hawkes 1977; Hodder 1986:35-56; Pearce 1986b; 1987a; 1987b; 1992:166-191; Tilley 1990a; 1990b; 1991,; etc.) and their pioneer studies in semiotics, the analysis of material culture artefacts as signs and symbols depends upon the belief that all human beings across time and space are similar to each other. They organise themselves into societies grounded on the same fundamental mechanisms (Pearce 1991-2:31). These communication systems can incorporate kinship arrangements, ritual beliefs, social patterns, basic age and gender divisions.

Levi-Strauss (1972) suggested that all social activities could be organised into opposed sets drawing from all the message of the systems that characterise a society in a certain period of its existence. These opposed sets take the form of basic binary pairs.

Objects are a fundamental element in this process, because their social life enables them to play a crucial part in the creation of tangible social structures (Pearce 1992:176). The assumption that material culture, everyday life or more complex objects are somehow meaningfully constituted in relation to a set of symbolic schemes of beliefs and ideas, has influenced the archaeological work and research to a considerable degree. Obviously, structuralist analysis (like the functionalist one) cannot begin to be developed without one having as much information on the social content of the society under enquiry, as is possible.

Clearly, as a theoretical edifice, structuralism has taken material culture studies many steps forward, as it views artefacts not as results of social acting but as essential factors predetermining the 'becoming' of a certain society.

However, it shares with functionalism the inability, firstly, to cope with change since it treats societies as fixed synchronic units in a more or less ahistoric time, and secondly fails to give to the individual value as an active ingredient of social development.

For the former argument, one can reply that the fundamental structures of a society, in the form of basic binary pairs, do not change. Such structures are: good:bad :: warm:cold :: day:night :: white:black :: old:young :: life:death, etc.

On the other hand, the very subjective nature of structuralism lays it open for criticism from many archaeologists and museum curators. They prefer to hold with more empirical interpretative methods, using tangible ideas (such as 'objects as functions') rather than making speculations about past people's ideas and minds. Structuralism, offering an inter-disciplinary mode of interpretation and a means of demonstrating that material culture and museum collections are central to our understanding of social operations (Pearce 1987a:5), steps forward and provides more interesting organisational forms.

Structuralist ideas are not often chosen consciously by the curators as the underlying theoretical rationale of their exhibitions, although the structuralist plot presents many similarities with the general form of many exhibitions.



## Philosophy-Literary Reception Theories

Iser (1974), drawing on the literary work of the Tavistock School, created a reception theory in relation to literary texts. According to this outlook, the meaning of the text derives from the text itself and equally from its interaction with its readers (see Pearce 1992:217-220). This type of creative interplay occurs also between objects and their viewers. This creative process of 'reading' an object's meaning is called by Iser *Konkretisation*, or else 'realization'. In this respect, the possibilities for dynamic interpretations and reinterpretations of an object by the same or different viewers are abundant. As Pearce observes (1992:219), 'the viewing process is selective, and the potential object is richer than any of its realisations (...) The resulting interpretation arises not from the objects as such; it arises from the meeting between the objects and the mind of the viewer. The interpretation, therefore, is not the true meaning of the object, it is an individual's construction of its meaning'.

In relation to what has just been said, we can make two further points. First, the museum experience as such offers by its very nature a dialectical structure of viewing. Additionally, reflections of this receptionist approach can be observed in recent studies on Ancient Greek iconography, at least as a starting point to pursue further arguments. For instance, the Paris School of Greek Pottery Studies (Bérard et 1989), Mary Beard (1991:12-35) and Robin Osborne (1985) try to understand, read and explain scenes of ancient Greek vases. In their quest, they make parallels and bring examples from our own not so remote world and everyday life. They present and interpret with more than one ways modern advertisements from magazines, or pictures from modern rural Greece. They ask us to 'look at the pictures' (Osborne 1985:61) and use our imagery. They both raise the point that 'reading images' must not be taken for granted, because images do not speak for themselves. Each reading may decode one or many meanings, for 'the interpretations of images change in different contexts, with different viewers and according to our different expectations' (Beard 1991:13).

These reception theories are indeed stepping-stones that enable museum theorists to continue discussing museum and exhibition communication theories in greater depths, moving towards the unravelling of the mechanisms that structure and shape the discourse of the museum itself.

### Philosophy- Unravelling the discourse of the museum

Lavine & Karp start their seminal edited volume *Exhibiting Cultures* with the following declaration (1991:1):

‘Every museum exhibition, whatever its overt subject, inevitably draws on the cultural assumptions and resources of the people who make it. Decisions are made to emphasise one element and to downplay others, to assert some truths and to ignore others. The assumptions underpinning these decisions vary accordingly to culture and over time, place and type of museum or exhibit (...) The very nature of exhibiting makes it a contested terrain’.

The question of ideology and hidden agendas in museum exhibitions is very much related to the appointment of certain values (objects as relics, treasures, historical narrative or re-constructions of the past, see Pearce 1992:197-209) to the objects. Never do museum objects remain neutral without a symbolic content, despite the fact that the official intention, most of the time, is to project a supposed neutral profile. They do make moral and also quite often political statements. Their aptness to be transformed into metaphors, meaning-carriers and vehicles for ideas, render them prone to ideological and political appropriations.

To use Ames’ words (1992:23)

‘[The museum] place[s] history, nature and traditional societies under glass, in artificially constructed dioramas and tableaux, thus sanitising, insulating, plasticizing, and preserving them as attractions and simple lesson aids; by virtue of [its] location, [it is] implicitly compared with and subordinated to contemporary established values and definitions of social reality. When we ‘museumify’ other cultures and our own past, we exercise a conceptual control over them’.



Hence, the museum is a socio-cultural phenomenon, anything but morally neutral, which sustains a certain ideology and, most commonly the dominant one. It constructs values and puts forward intended and unintended messages.

Meltzer (1981:116) makes the statement that ideology appears in the museum sets through two avenues. On the one hand, there can be a conscious effort to promulgate the ideological message; on the other hand, it may be that certain elements or structures are simply a reflection of ideological systems, of a certain ontology. Meltzer also uses the terms vulgar ideology and non-vulgar ideology. One could probably associate the former with the effort to pass an ideological message and selective remembering whereas the latter with the reflection of an ideological ontology.

Recent developments in museological thinking encourage the employment of vulgar ideology in museum exhibitions and the introduction of political content into displays, but with a new dimension and objective. To put it more clearly, the public is now shown how knowledge may be constructed and owned and how the past may be used, appropriated or even misrepresented for present purposes. Exhibitions may also emphasise authorship and changing perceptions of the artefactual past, and also stimulate the museum goer to think about the meaning of the objects.

The 'museum effect', as Svetlana Alpers (1991:26-27) calls the tendency to isolate something from its world, to offer it up for attentive looking and thus to transform it into art or ideology, is also put on display. Recently, there have been a number of exhibitions that exposed the ways museums interpret and appropriate material culture, as well as the ways museums are 'equally places of exclusions and confinements' (Crimp 1987:62).

These innovative and somewhat experimental examples of museum exhibiting were intended to 'present multiple perspectives or admit the highly contingent nature of the interpretations offered' (Lavine & Karp 1991:7). Therefore, they did not attempt to 'teach connoisseurship' (Vogel 1991:193) but rather to 'allow the public to know that the museum is not a broad frame through which the art and culture of the world can be inspected, but a tightly focused lens that shows the visitor a particular point of view' (ibid.200).

For instance, the exhibition 'Art/artifact' [Plates 9-11], staged in 1988 in the Centre for African Art in New York, was an exhibition about perception and the museum experience, focusing on the ways Westerners have classified and exhibited African objects over the past century (Vogel 1991). The exhibition showed how we, as Westerners, view African objects arguing that much of our vision of Africa and African art has been conditioned by the dominant Western culture. The exhibition approached the question of perception through individual objects and installation styles.

Similarly, the temporary exhibition '700 Years of Food', displayed in the Alimentarium Food Museum, in Vevey of Switzerland, in 1991-2, simultaneously incorporated several different museological modes and thus attempted a discussion of form, i.e. the historical exhibition as such and with it the medium of the museum (Schärer 1994; 1996). In other words, it stood as a presentation of the ways and means available to display authors for telling a particular story in the museum, which in this case was the diachronic history of food in Switzerland from the late Middle Ages to today. Various means of visual representation were put to the test, each of which assigned a different role to the object. The seven proposed scenarios sequentially exposed the museum as store-house, as dream-world, as history book, as theatre, as school, as forum for discussion, as narrative.

The exhibition 'The ?Exhibition?' or 'The Curator's Egg' [Plates 12-14; Figure 6], in the Ashmolean Museum in 1991-2 aimed to be reflexive and to explore 'from the inside' the museum-discourses of appropriation, specifically as regards the museum presentation of the Greeks and Romans (Beard & Henderson 1994). The range of discursive options in this specific case have been between science, appreciation, (art) history, classification, iconography, taste, museology and wonder. It tried to turn authority over to the visitor and became an exploration within the museum's own culture and language, an exploration of the values, the claims to value, the legitimisation of value, that the museum supports.

The exhibition 'Museum Europa', staged in the Danish National Museum in 1993, was similarly an examination of the museum's way of looking at things (Danish National Museum 1993). In many ways, the exhibition proposed to investigate the discourse of the museum in its historical development from the Renaissance to our time and in parallel to remind us that 'every exhibition threatens to reduce the things to illustrative



material for a certain idea (...) However, besides being lots of other things, the museum is a stage for the objects' splendour - *theatrum gloriae rei*' (Danish National Museum 1993:8).

#### MUSEUM & EXHIBITION ENVIRONMENT

Museums and exhibitions do not operate in a vacuum but rather are socially and historically located, that is, bound up with broader social and cultural reactions. They belong within a certain *environment*, which is determined by both their spatial and temporal contexts.

The spatial context can be defined literally by the museum's and exhibition's physical and geographical location within a continent, country, city, archaeological site etc. as well as metaphorically within a particular cultural and ideological terrain (i.e. monocultural or multicultural societies, the West, the Third-World, etc.).

The *temporal* environment defines the era within which the museum or exhibition has been created or performed.

#### MUSEUM & EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE

Finally, museums and exhibitions have varied degrees of *significance*, conditioned by the sum of the following agents: a) the museum's contribution and impetus within a certain scientific milieu; b) its social image and ideological profile as 'a site of a symbolic transaction between the visitor and the state' (Duncan & Wallach 1980:457); and c) its interrelation with certain historical and political events which either resulted in its creation or affected implicitly or explicitly its being.

All these properties that have been described above, namely history, material, environment and significance, summed up and assessed together will eventually direct the author of the present study to some general conclusions and further to some alternative 'readings' and interpretations as to how the same material could be presented differently in the museum. Exhibitions are open to never-ending interpretations, as 'the visitor's utopic world may not be in conformation with the

display author's original text, but rather be the result of the encounter that occurs between the visitor and the moulded space' (Davallon 1986b:256).

Indeed, every visitor may approach and interpret museum messages and exhibition meanings differently. This is a line of argument which will be pursued in the forthcoming analysis of the museum constructions of the classical past in post-war Greece, through specific alternative propositions.

## Conclusion

Bal concludes in her essay on the 'Discourse of the Museum' (1996:215):

'It is obvious that the "order of things" in a museum matters (...) Understanding this method -the discursive system that underlies apparently incidental acts -seems a real contribution from humanists to a museology that wishes to deserve its title of honour: "new"'.  
'

To sum up, then, with the step-by-step gathering of data, which was described in some detail in the present chapter, it is essentially endeavoured to view this 'order of things' that new museology aims to study, that is museums and museum constructions of the past, as 'the intricate amalgam of historical structures and narratives, practices and strategies of display, and the concerns and imperatives of various governing ideologies' (Sherman & Rogoff 1994b:ix).

Based on the structure of this model for museum and exhibition analysis and on the multitude of innovative and ground breaking 'new museology' theories, in the following chapters we shall turn to a body of case-studies in order to explore the nature of their museological stagecraft and their regimes of display. In essence, what will be sought in these chapters is the deciphering of the Greek museum and exhibitions discourse in its own right but also in terms of its connections to other significant discourses such as that of classical tradition and archaeology.



# NATIONAL AND SUPRA-NATIONAL “SHRINES” OF GREEK (CLASSICAL) ART; THE NATIONAL AND THE ACROPOLIS MUSEUMS IN ATHENS.

The re-opening of the National Archaeological Museum is a cultural event of global significance. Undoubtedly our National Museum is the most important museum of its kind world-wide. It is also one of the most significant cultural institutions of the world. (...) We welcome the opening of the Museum as an auspicious turning point for the revival of the cultural values in our land.

M.Kalligas, in *To Vima* 15/1/1948, p.2.

With hard work and care from people that whose aim in life is to save our cultural heritage in its entire splendour for the forthcoming generations, our National Museum gradually becomes a priceless jewel for Greece.

E.Nika, in *I Aygi*, 18/4/1959, p.3.

This Museum should not change. It is a museum-monument of classical museological philosophy, a museum that is Pan-Hellenic and irreplaceable. (...) The National Archaeological Museum is some sort of sacred cow; it is considered to be one of the greatest museums of the world, and the tourist guide-books in each one of their latest editions write: “The organisation of the exhibition is exemplary”. This is the pre-ordained opinion.

P.Katimetzi, in *I Aygi*, 7/2/1982, p.5.

The future for the Acropolis Museum consists of a plan for the re-organisation of one “Main Museum”, wherein the best pieces of the

collection will be put back on display (...). An innovative element, however, will be introduced by the current director of the museum. If this new methodology - namely the juxtaposition of statues with architectural patterns of their historical era as a background- succeeds, it will then be a milestone work in our museological history.

Ch.Lambrakis, in *To Vima*, 9/8/1953, p.3.

For a treasure of such priceless value as the monuments of Acropolis, we carry a responsibility to show a boldness of spirit when it comes to the costs of a worthy new, bigger and better museum that will be in a position to offer to the displays the place they really deserve.

M.Mercouri, in *To Vima* 12/6/1988, p.42.

The monuments of Acropolis are the visual symbols of Hellenism. These differentiate us from other people. [Thus] the exhibits to be housed in the [New] Acropolis Museum are part of this existing national identity; they are not artefacts to be stored up or objects of any grand museological trend.

A.D.Photiades, in *To Vima* 12/6/1988, p.43.

## Introduction

In a recent issue of the *Museums Journal* reflecting on the nature and roles of the National Museums in Great Britain and beyond, we read that: 'although the term "national museum" is widely used around the world, there is nothing resembling an agreed definition for it' (Boylan 1995:24).

Whether there is a deficiency of widely accepted resolutions as to what constitutes a national museum or not, it has been customary, at least in recent publications, to approach the subject by relating national museums to discussions of the nature of the nations, the nation-states and their annals of birth, unity and historical continuity. The ideological, political and symbolic dimensions of national museums and national collections have been chronicled in parallel in relation to the definition of the 'self' and the creation of national identity and tradition (see Kaplan 1994; also Azoulay 1994; Bohrer 1994; Hoffmann 1994; Horne 1984; Karp & Lavine 1991; Karp & Kreamer & Lavine 1992; Wallis 1994, etc.)<sup>1</sup>.

With regard to Greece, the Acropolis Museum and the National Archaeological [Plates 15-16] in Athens are two excellent examples for reflecting on the ideological and



political role of national museums. Both institutions were the first Greek museums to be erected after the formation of the independent Greek State in 1830. They both stood out as two of the largest and most important museums of ancient Greek art in a national and supra-national level. After the end of the Second World War and the ruthless Civil War (1945-9), they were also the first to be re-organised and re-opened in times when the Greek nation-state itself was slowly embarking on its post-war economic, social and cultural reconstruction.

Hence, the National Archaeological Museum with 'its collections representing almost every region of Greece from the islands to Macedonia and Thrace and its galleries defining and verifying every moment of Greek history'<sup>2</sup>, then came to signify the cultural revival of the entire nation and thus to justify its designated title as the national archaeological museum of Greece *par excellence*.

The Acropolis monuments [Plate 17] and particularly the Parthenon have been strongly associated with Greek consciousness of national identity and cultural heritage, ever since the Greek War of Independence. The Acropolis and the Parthenon acquired the power of a symbol, that is the emblem of the revived Greek nation [Plates 7, 18]. They were sanctified and became, to quote a few eulogies, 'the symbolic navel of the nation (...) following a course parallel to that of the destiny of Greece'<sup>3</sup>; 'a landmark with symbolic connotations of eternal Hellenic greatness and creativity, (...) a national *shrine* and a focal point of Hellenism'<sup>4</sup>; 'a supreme monument of eternal glory'<sup>5</sup>; 'a cultural ideal'<sup>6</sup>; 'an icon'<sup>7</sup>; 'an absolute canon'<sup>8</sup>; a 'monument of all monuments'<sup>9</sup> and 'a symbol of pure classicism'<sup>10</sup>. In this sense, both the Acropolis building complex as an out-door museum and the site museum itself occupy a privileged position in modern Greek national ideology and 'have time and time again been given the attribute of a banner'<sup>11</sup> [Plates 19-20].

The Acropolis of Athens, however, has not been only thought of as a national heritage. It has also been immortalised as the most holy place of western civilisation, indeed as the place of origin and collective memory of Western world. Thus, it has been appropriated by the West for its own uses: namely the collection of cultural artefacts with the Parthenon Marbles as one of the best-known examples, the provision of an aesthetic education, the expansion of historical knowledge and the enhancement of

national prestige<sup>12</sup>. To use the post-war reformer of the Acropolis Museum Y.Miliadis' words (not dated):

‘[Thanks to the Classical Pericleian Miracle] the Acropolis was brought from time into eternity and was given its universality forever. No other work of man has been so national in its roots, and so international in its fruit. None was more the product of its own age, and none has meant so much to all future ages. Nothing is less a relic of the past, and more perennially present’ [the original in Greek].

Given the way in which the sanctity of the Parthenon has been projected on a global scale, we can easily understand why the Acropolis and its museum -both the present and the future one which for the time being exists only on paper- transcend the national ideological frontier and acquire a universal and supra-national cultural scope<sup>13</sup>, as no other Greek museum has ever done before.

Thus, the long histories and the roles of both museums in specific historical contexts offer truly unique opportunities to discuss the ideological and symbolic values of the Greek national museums. Naturally though, our attempt to trace these values and the historical contexts from which they emerged cannot make claim to scholarly completeness, for the topic is so vast that it warrants a separate doctoral thesis in its own right. In addition, the symbolic impetus of these two case-studies is far from being the only notable or indeed exciting aspect of their history. As unfolds below, with the outbreak of the Second World War, the Greek Archaeological Service was placed in the unfortunate situation of having to dismantle all the archaeological exhibitions in museums around the country and bury the antiquities back in the ground, hideouts, safe-deposits and caves, in order to secure their safety and survival during wartime operations (Petrakos 1994:81-102). However, by ‘destroying’ the work that past generations of Greek archaeologists had created, archaeologists in Greece were faced with a true challenge to produce new museum displays and embark on an altogether fresh museum development and re-organisation in the country after the war. For example, the National Archaeological Museum, through its permanent post-war re-display, became a prototype that fashioned a certain exhibition style and philosophy and exemplified the ‘classical museological perception’ in Greece during this era<sup>14</sup>.



Thus, the life-histories of the National and the Acropolis Museums, richly documented, provide fertile ground for producing a survey of the development of museum theory and practice in modern Greece.

Furthermore, the Acropolis, the classical site of Hellenism *par excellence*, as a case-study opens up numerous possibilities for discussing nineteenth and twentieth century ethics of managing, conserving and restoring ancient monuments. Finally, and again with regard to the Acropolis site and museum, other important issues are involved, such as the relation of a classical landscape to modern society and its integration into a modern cityscape. These last two lines of inquiry, although at first seemingly inconsistent with the main task of this chapter, have nevertheless immense potential to shed further light on the ideological, archaeological and museological status and profiles of both the National and the Acropolis Museum.

In order to produce a consistent and comprehensive synopsis of our two case-studies, we had to deal with an enormous volume of widely varying material which diffused outward in a number of directions. The analysis will follow the theoretical guidelines of the model presented in Chapter Four and will be deployed in three chronological axis. The first looks back to the past history of the museums from the time of their establishment to the outbreak of the Second World War. This section will be kept as short as possible<sup>15</sup>. The second chronological axis is about the present state of affairs and covers the entire period from the end of the Second World War to today. The fact that both museums' exhibitions have remained largely unchanged since the completion of their post-war re-arrangement in the 1960s, frozen in time, provides a unique opportunity to study the post-war museological reality of Greece as one unit, both in material and conceptual terms. The last chronological axis is about the future of the National Archaeological and the Acropolis Museum. In this section, discussion will concentrate on the debate about the New Acropolis Museum, the 'Museum for the Future of Acropolis', whose history has been no less turbulent than the history of its predecessor. In addition, some general anticipatory remarks will be made regarding the potential of the (New) Acropolis and the National Archaeological Museum for contribution to new museum practices currently emerging in Greece.

## **The National Archaeological Museum and the Acropolis Museum in the pre-war period (late nineteenth-century to 1940).**

### **MUSEUM HISTORY AND MATERIAL**

The most remarkable issue to be raised right from the outset regarding the history of the National Archaeological Museum [Plate 15] is the almost half a century long controversy over its architectural design, the site of its erection and its actual construction, which offered museum historians a unique opportunity to study nineteenth century museological issues in regard to Greece in some substantial detail (see Kokkou 1977; Gazi 1993).

The founding of the National Museum coincided with the legal establishment of the Greek state in 1834. The first archaeological law of 1834, article 1, made provisions for the foundation of a 'Central Public Museum for Antiquity' to be located in Athens which by then was the proclaimed capital of modern Greece. For the realisation of this cultural and national endeavour, a succession of architectural competitions<sup>16</sup> was declared for the design of the building. In 1866 the official ground-breaking ceremony was held, and the museum foundations were led in accord to Ludwig Lange's plans. It was only much later in 1889 that the neo-classical Museum building was brought to completion under the supervision of the German architect Ernst Ziller [Figure 7].

Ziller introduced many changes to Lange's original plans and left his own architectural imprint on the building which stands out today as a typical example of museum architecture from the late nineteenth century.

The transfer of the antiquities to the museum began in 1874, whereas the organisation of the collections became more systematic in 1885 and intensified from 1889 onwards. At around the same time, the aims of the museum were officially set down by means of a royal decree which declared that:

'The National Archaeological Museum is dedicated to furthering the study and teaching of the science of archaeology, to promulgating archaeological knowledge and to developing a love of great art'<sup>17</sup>.



The collections were to comprise unique works of art from Greek antiquity. The objects would be scientifically classified within the collections and presented in a number of galleries that would compose a panorama of the long evolution of ancient Greek art from the prehistoric period to Late Roman Antiquity<sup>18</sup>.

In the years to come, significant new finds from various excavations around the country came to the museum. The lack of adequate space for the display of the collections, which was to be an enduring and significant problem for most of the Greek archaeological museums in the succeeding periods and mostly after the Second World War, gradually led to a number of extensions that gave the building its present form and architectural plan<sup>19</sup> [Figures 8-9].

With the outbreak of war, all the museum collections were scattered and hidden away in various places for safety [Plates 21-22], whereas the whole museum building, along with its brand-new wings, was occupied by numerous organisations and services to be used for a variety of purposes. The building, deprived of its original purpose as a *shrine* of high art, suffered substantial structural damage whose costly repair would be the first concern in the technical and scientific museum staff's long re-organisational agenda after the liberation and the years to come<sup>20</sup>.

Turning now to the establishment and history of the Acropolis Museum [Plate 16], this must be studied in relation to the philosophical and practical choices that prevailed in the Western world and Greece during the nineteenth and early twentieth century regarding the modern function and role of the Acropolis complex as well as the style and extent of its preservation, restoration, excavation, public presentation and management. For, in essence, the function and status of this museum building has been defined time and again with regard to the veneration of the Acropolis site as a national and universal sanctified symbol of classical aesthetics, conceptual values and political ideals<sup>21</sup>.

In 1833, when the Acropolis passed into the hands of the newly-founded Greek state, the monument entered a new phase in its history, as a sacred archaeological precinct and a museum piece of unique value. In 1834, Leo von Klenze determined precisely what the policy of intervention on the Acropolis was to be. That policy was clearly influenced

by Winckelmann's (18th century) and Ruskin's (19th century) work on art criticism and their choice of the Classical Period as the era that represented the 'best', the most perfect in the history of art. Under these influences, Klenze's ideas lasted throughout the nineteenth century and provided the clearing of the Rock of 'all ruinous and ugly buildings of the barbaric ages' - namely the medieval and later buildings that covered it - restoration works to the benefit of the classical remains, excavations and construction of a museum<sup>22</sup>. Klenze's proposals, which are clearly characterised by a spirit of radical purism, were endorsed by the Greek Archaeological Service and Archaeological Society and have prevailed ever since in regard to this site. The conservation of post-classical remains or the erection of modern buildings on the Acropolis were systematically ruled out in the following years and down to the present. With this frame of philosophical principles in mind, archaeologists worked in the name of scholarship to strip the entire Acropolis and expose it to the rock. In the course of a century of restoration by successive generations from 1834 to 1933, much of the later history of the Acropolis was lost. And so 'everything has been sacrificed to the age of Pheidias' and Greek and foreign beholders of the Acropolis came to experience it 'in a timewarp, as if the *disiecta membra* of the Periclean age have been magically transported to the 20th century' (McNeal 1991:50). Today, we are 'the inheritors of a neo-classical idealised icon; we cannot go back in history, except to the Classical age and except through the eyes [of the generations of Acropolis restorers]. Moreover, we have become used to their view of the past, which is now our symbol' (Murray 1994:212-213).

The erection of the small and inconspicuous museum on the east-south corner of the Rock, completed in 1874, has been the only exception to the general canon of purism and the sole authorised defilement on the classical perfection of the site. The establishment of the museum in this 'relatively non-visible low area' (Dontas 1979:18) can be seen as an attempt to reconcile two conflicting needs: to offer a repository for the finds that were collected haphazardly or excavated on the Rock, and also to do so without disturbing the aesthetic integrity of the ancient monuments (Philippidis 1994:302-305). Before long, space in the new museum was too limited for the wealth of material [Figure 10], especially after the extensive excavations of P.Kavvadias and G.Kawerau between 1885 and 1890 which unveiled exceptional finds, amongst them the archaic korai which stand out as the most well-known<sup>23</sup>. With the exception of the



inscriptions, coins, bronzes and vases, which were then housed in the National Archaeological Museum -and continue to do so up to the present-, the museum contained all the portable objects discovered on the Acropolis plateau since 1834.

#### EXHIBITION MATERIAL

Both exhibitions were arranged according to the standard organisation principle and philosophy of the time<sup>24</sup>. This dictated the arrangement of the displays in chronological order with each room representing a period of ancient Greek art. With the progress of archaeology as a discipline, the collections were also divided into broad categories and material of construction (i.e. sculpture, bronzes, vases, etc.) according to typology [Plates 23-24]. Furthermore, the general aesthetic principles that developed and prevailed in most great European museums, meaning the arrangement of the artworks in linear and symmetrical ways juxtaposed according to size and placed mostly against the walls, was indeed the pattern to be followed in the specific case-studies.

Some early post-war sources, however, expressed dissatisfaction with the overall aesthetic result that this kind of nineteenth century museum exhibiting attained<sup>25</sup>.

#### MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

Right from the outset, the entire physiognomy and significance of the National Museum have been intimately related to the history of the Greek State after the War of Independence and the formation of a national identity rooted in the ancient classical past. Also they have been closely linked with national inspirations for cultural revival, diachronic continuity, direct kinship with the past, exemplified in the material evidence of the past and thus in the genesis of the first systematic archaeological collections in the country. Then and ever since, the value of the National Archaeological and the Acropolis Museum alike has also been conditioned by the nature of their collections which in their entirety were unearthed from ancient temples and cemeteries of the Hellenic lands, and thus 'were brimful of sacredness (...) disclosing a spirit of creativity and spiritual breadth' (Karouzou 1982:5).

In addition, the function and significance of the Acropolis museum has been in keeping with the interventions on the Acropolis and the overriding scholarship against its profanation; they have been conditioned by the ways the doctrine of pure classicism has affected and impaired the ideological approach of historical continuity which gradually gathered momentum from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. This doctrine, however, impeded the meaningful understanding of the history of the Acropolis by the general public. In the early 1880s, a relevant commentary in the newspaper *Ora* vividly illustrates this point:

‘Yet how many of the eight hundred thousand Greeks resident around the Acropolis have ever visited, as they ought, this sanctuary of art, and how many of them, having visited it have understood the relics of human genius located therein and have been inspired by them?... Even now, we are not inspired by the life-giving spirit of Greek antiquity and Greek art, and seek teachings about the beautiful not in the ancient sources of which we are the possessors and guardians, [...] but in the research, and even the misunderstandings of others’<sup>26</sup>.

Hence, the connection of the museum with the official and popular ideologies of the time regarding the supremacy of the splendid classical past and the creative incorporation of these classical architectural beacons into the continuous flow of life around them is a matter of interest here. For, in some way or another, it is the direct ancestor of a recent (since the 1970s) controversy over the current restoration of the Parthenon, the creation of the New Acropolis Museum and its specific spatial and conceptual relation with the Sacred Rock. These are matters touched on below.

## **The National Archaeological Museum and the Acropolis Museum in the post-war period (1948 to today).**

### **MUSEUM HISTORY AND MATERIAL**

‘Noon at the [National] archaeological museum. They now unearth - some crates, some bare to the flesh in the earth - the statues. In one of the big old galleries, familiar from our student years, with the dull façade that somehow resembled the dreary public library, the workmen



excavate with shovels and pickaxes. If you didn't look at the roof, the floor, the windows and the walls with inscriptions in gold, this could be any excavation. Statues, still sunken in the earth, appeared naked from the waist up, planted in random...It was a chorus of the resurrected, a second coming of bodies that gave you a crazy joy' (Seferis 1986:38-39).

This is how the poet expresses his thoughts about his personal encounter with the very early post-war efforts of the archaeologists to embark on their long and difficult duty of reconstructing the National Archaeological Museum. This is also how he himself, along with other Greek intellectuals, translated the resurrection of the National Museum as an allegory for efforts to devise a forced national union of people and territory in a time when a terrible civil war was still going on in the country (Leontis 1991:3).

In their post-war re-organisation and re-display, both the National Archaeological and the Acropolis Museum benefited immensely from the charismatic personalities of the archaeologists that were in charge of their administration.

In the National Museum, Christos Karouzos, acting director for the period 1942-1964, and his wife Semni Papaspyridi-Karouzou, Keeper of the Vase Galleries for the period 1932-1964, worked painstakingly, with determination, 'integrity, passion and virtue'<sup>27</sup> and against many odds<sup>28</sup>, of a practical and ideological nature, to create an exemplary museum dedicated to the veneration of high Ancient Greek Art (Kunze 1968 in Karouzos 1981:xix).

The old building and the second floor of the new wing were seriously damaged during the war and needed immediate repair. The restoration and the new arrangement was supervised by P. Karantinos (architect of many museum buildings in the post-war era) and was funded by the Economic Co-operation Administration (Marshall Plan). Due to the amount of alternations and repairs introduced in the structure of the building and the heavy load of conservation work on thousands of objects from the museum collections [Plates 25-26], the Karouzos' foresaw at the time that many years would be needed before being able to complete with patience and care aesthetically pleasing and scientifically accurate exhibitions that would 'last for many generations to come' (Karouzou 1956:849). So, in order to cater for the nation's and mostly younger generations' need for cultural revival, they decided to prepare some temporary exhibitions on the main floor of the new wing which had escaped fairly unscathed. As

for the permanent displays, their plan was to prepare them simultaneously in stages, on the second floor of the new wing and in the old building.

On January 14th, 1948, a new exhibit of Greek art of the Geometric and Archaic periods (c.900-500 BC) was opened in three rooms of the new wing (ground floor), with a general atmosphere of enthusiasm and euphoria<sup>29</sup> [Plates 27-29]. By 1956, fourteen galleries were ready, and of those, twelve were opened to the public. Eight of them were of a temporary nature whereas the other four, located on the second floor, shaped the first post-war permanent Pottery Galleries of the museum. By 1966, the permanent re-display of the sculptural collections had taken full shape within twenty six galleries of the old building, and the temporary exhibitions were dismantled [Plates 30-52]. Karouzos, who despite his retirement in 1964 was actively continuing his work in the museum, died on April 4, 1967 and thus left the redisplay of the remaining collections uncompleted (i.e. votive reliefs, Classical and Hellenistic bronzes, golden objects and terracotta figurines). Nonetheless, his legacy has lived on into the present, either through his personal imprint in the galleries that have remained unchanged ever since or through the work of his successors who have drawn inspiration from his living spirit or who have simply reproduced his originally successful but gradually outmoded aesthetic and philosophical rationale.

The re-organisation of the Acropolis Museum began about eight to ten years after the end of the war, and was largely the outcome of one person's, Yannis Miliadis, personal vision, wisdom, aesthetic sensitivity and expertise (as director of the Museum for the period 1942-1964) [Plates 5, 53]. According to the view expressed in the Press of those days: 'this Museum [was] a work of love. Miliadis loved the Museum passionately and this enthusiasm gave him the strength to create a new and wonderful Museum of Acropolis'<sup>30</sup>.

In 1952, remodelling of the Acropolis Museum was in progress<sup>31</sup>. All the alterations, again supervised by P.Karantinos, resulted in an entirely new museum plan, which was approximately 1200 square meters (Brouskari 1974:15; Kokkou 1977:200; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:314). In 1954, the first state funding was authorised (app. 50,000 drachmas) in order to proceed to the second phase of the museum's reformation,



that was the preparation of a new display<sup>32</sup>. This was undertaken in three stages which started in 1954 and ended in 1964<sup>33</sup> [Plates 54-64; Figure 11].

Parallel and contemporary with the early post-war history of the Acropolis Museum has been the project of landscaping the surroundings of the Sacred Rock and the Philopappos Hill. In the 1950s, at a time of rapidly growing tourism, Dimitrios Pikionis, the Hellenic architect *par excellence* was commissioned to execute the project [Plates 65-66]. This project, completed in 1958, aimed to offer the visitor on a classical pilgrimage an aesthetic adventure and to create an approach which would be evocative of historic memories. Despite initially generating some controversy, Pikionis offered an intellectual approach to the monuments which has been subsequently appropriated by the Athenians and has been celebrated as the milestone creation of post-war Greek architecture (Oikonomaki-Brunner 1991; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:323-355; cf: Kotionis 1994:13-15; *To Vima* 31/8/56, p.3; 31/3/1985, p.19; 24/1/88, p.51). As regards the specifics of the architectural language introduced and its symbolic connotations, these are issues which are looked at below when discussing the overall significance of the post-war reformation of the museum and the Acropolis plateau.

Since the 1960's, the history of the museum has been directly determined by the problems that the entire site of the Acropolis had been facing. These can be outlined as:

- a) problems stemming from the elevation of the site as the Mecca of classical cultural tourism<sup>34</sup> ;
- b) the alarming diagnosis of the deteriorating state of the monuments, caused by an array of different reasons, according to a report drawn up by UNESCO scientists in 1969-1971;
- c) the formation of a special national task force, that is the interdisciplinary Committee for the Conservation of the Acropolis Monuments (CCAM) in 1975 in order to respond to the magnitude and urgency of the conservation problems;
- d) the implementation of extensive restoration in the four main buildings of the plateau [Plate 17] (Parthenon, Temple of Nike, Propylaia, Erechtheion) and the gradual replacement of existing sculptures still on the monuments with accurate copies;
- e) the positioning of the removed sculptures in special displays in the museum to ensure their protection from pollution;

- f) the proposal in the 1980s of an ambitious and inspired project which aimed to proceed beyond the absolutely necessary conservation of the Parthenon by reincorporating in the monument the fallen architectural elements which have been in the meantime collected, documented and identified with impressive scientific accuracy;
- g) the international debate regarding the philosophy and scale of this intervention to the Parthenon which has especially arisen during regular international congresses organised by CCAM (1976, 1978, 1983, 1989)<sup>35</sup>;
- h) the increasing public sensitivity over the future of the Acropolis that was reinforced by frequent coverage through the national Press<sup>36</sup> and the increasing interest of the state and experts in enhancing the didactic and social role of the monuments as objects of cultural significance to the wider masses.
- i) Finally, the Greek demand for the return<sup>37</sup> of the Parthenon Marbles to the country, launched officially in the 1980s by M.Mercouri, the then Minister of Culture, has brought the Acropolis and its museum once more to the forefront of discussion.

All the above situations resulted in a number of changes-landmarks in the history of this institution. The first dates were 1976 and 1979, when pedimental sculptures from the Parthenon and the Caryatids of Erechtheion respectively were dismantled and transferred to the museum wherein, since 1984, the public can see them placed in a special, environmentally controlled gallery, with the aim of safeguarding them from pollution<sup>38</sup>. In 1992-1993, the salvage work concerning the lowering and transportation of the existing stones of the Panathenaic Frieze to the museum began and was completed with the storing of the stones in Gallery VII, thus impelling the problem of space to a dramatic climax<sup>39</sup> (Korres 1994:129). Today a great deal of exhibits asphyxiate in the area. In conjunction with the building's limited dimensions, this gives rise to serious problems regarding the circulation of visitors in the museum and drawbacks in the quality of the exhibition.

A second development came on September 26th 1987, when the Acropolis Ephorate in collaboration with the CCAM inaugurated a new museum, the Centre for Acropolis Studies (CAS). Apart from acting as the administrative seat of the archaeological Ephorate, the Centre, thanks to a series of wide ranged educational activities, specially



conceived and implemented to provide better and more didactic management and interpretation of the Acropolis site<sup>40</sup>, established a public reputation, mostly amongst school children and their teachers, and a scientific value for the specialists [Plate 67] (Hatziaslani 1994; McNeal 1991:62; also *To Vima* 16/2/85, p.12).

The third milestone, and the most important of all regarding the future of the museum, was the state's decision to proceed with constructing a New Acropolis Museum. The quest for a new museum was to traverse many decades<sup>41</sup> (1976-1989-to today) and was to remind the turbulent history of the National Museum in the nineteenth century. In 1989, the first post-war international competition<sup>42</sup>, and the last so far for the museum of Acropolis, was announced by the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and held under the aegis of the International Union of Architects. In 1990, the competition ended with the awarding of the first prize to the Italian architects Manfredi Nicoletti and Lucio Passarelli [Plate 68]. However, in the aftermath of the competition, an unprecedented turmoil of reactions rendered the whole matter the most disputed architectural and museum event to take place in Greece in the past few years<sup>43</sup>. Today the first prize remains unbuilt and the future of the New Acropolis Museum looks no less doubtful and ambiguous than two decades ago. Nonetheless, the significance of the future museum in relation to the Acropolis Sacred Rock, the particularities of the specific competition, the reactions provoked as it unfolded and its enormous advance promotion provide unique ground for discussing in the third and last part of this analysis current views regarding the ideological values of the classical past and its archaeological presentation in the museum.

#### EXHIBITION MATERIAL

Today, the Prehistoric, Sculpture, Bronze, Pottery, Miniature Objects and Egyptian Collections of the National Archaeological Museum, which are amongst the richest in the world, occupy almost the entire space of the edifice available for exhibitions<sup>44</sup>. Some galleries are also reserved for the preparation of temporary exhibitions [Plates 30-52; Figure 9]

The great majority of the current exhibitions have remained unchanged since 1967, and so what we still see today in the Museum is largely the outcome of Karouzos' post-war redisplay. As mentioned earlier, the very first post-war re-display of the National Archaeological was a provisional exhibit to illustrate the main periods of ancient Greek art. It gradually took shape in the space of eight galleries<sup>45</sup> in the years between 1948 and 1954 [Plates 27-29]. According to the display authors, the intellectual preparation, the scientific knowledge and documentation as well as the aesthetic cultivation were the most important factors in the course of preparing a museum exhibition (Karouzou 1956:850). For them, the lack of adequate and appropriate gallery space in the aftermath of the war, the nature and chronology of the objects as well as the artistic quality and archaeological value of the material determined the three main principles followed for the arrangement of that provisional exhibit. These were:

- a) to select a limited number of objects from the vast collections of the museum,
- b) to exclusively display pieces of exceptional artistic quality and
- c) to display objects of different materials (i.e. marble and bronze sculpture, bronzes and vases) juxtaposed together in a didactic way. In essence, the intention was to put objects, that were chronologically contemporary and stylistically akin, both in close proximity to each other but also in some distance in order to preserve and raise their aesthetic individuality and the exhibition's variance and appeal. The idea was also to depart from the nineteenth century tiring and schematic conception of displaying separately the various types of art within their historical progression (Karouzos 1953 in Karouzos 1981:142-168; *ibid.* 850).

So the displays were arrayed as follows: in the vestibule, there were three representative examples from three different periods of ancient Greek sculpture, namely the Peplophoros (540-530 BC), the 'mourning Athena' (460-450 BC) and the 'Jockey of Artemision' (c.200 BC). In Gallery One, there was a selection of Geometric (c.1100 BC-700 BC) and Dedicatory Art (7th century BC)<sup>46</sup> [Plate 27], to be followed by famous archaic seated figures, kouroi, bronze objects and vases and unique examples of the Early Classical Age [Plate 28] in Galleries Two and Three<sup>47</sup>, and marbles and bronzes of the 'Severe Style' (fifth century BC) [Plate 29] in Gallery Four<sup>48</sup>. Finally, in the three remaining galleries, on display were marbles, bronzes, terracottas of the fourth century



BC, the bronze Youth of Antikythera, the bronze Youth of Marathon, the colossal statue of Themis from Ramnounta, and many more.

That provisional exhibit, regarded as a general rehearsal to the permanent displays by its authors, was highly praised at the time for its scientific methodology and accuracy, aesthetic simplicity and appeal. It is worth quoting these passages at length, for they reveal much of the museological and archaeological perceptions of that period:

‘That exhibit display[ed] the choicest treasures of these centuries with excellent taste’ (Weinberg 1948:148).

‘The carefully selective display in the temporary galleries now open, their excellent lighting, the clear and informative labels provided, and the attention given to all details of mounting and exhibition, provide a foretaste of what the museum can one day be, once the great undertaking of reconstruction is completed. If the work is continued as it has begun, the museum will rank, not only as one of the richest, but also as one of the most agreeable and comprehensible of the museums in Europe, and will give as much pleasure to the average visitor as it can to the specialised student’ (Vanderpool 1949:196).

‘It is a new manner, really magnificent (...) The museum staff, scientific and technical, managed to present a splendid synopsis of the ancient Greek artistic production in a didactic, [aesthetically] pleasing and convincing way. They brought [again] this [Greek] miracle to the public to delight the eyes and enlighten our mind. Their achievement must be acknowledged as a great artistic and national service’ (Papanoutsos in *To Vima* 7/9/50:1-2).

‘The new exhibits form an harmonic and beautiful ensemble which is at the same time scientifically correct. Until recently, museums were for the specialists and not for the art lovers and the non-specialist visitor. Now, [in the National Archaeological Museum], every gallery provides a lesson on the History of Art which is exceptionally impressive but also simple enough to be understood by everyone’ (Savvidi in *To Vima* 13/5/54:3)<sup>49</sup>.

‘That exhibition satisfie[d] both the modern needs and the needs of the artworks (...) In order to find the proper way of displaying Greek sculpture, we must ask how these statues were displayed in the great ancient sanctuaries of Delphoi, Olympia and Acropolis. What the visitor of an ancient sanctuary will notice even today is that there was neither axial arrangement, nor symmetrical placing, nor even perspective orientation. This lack of any axial perspective, however, happens only because there is a splendid self-sufficient plasticity within the Greek sculptures themselves. The Greek statue, only when isolated and removed from the walls, can unravel its internal plastic power and transmit it to the viewer. All this knowledge regarding the essence of the Greek sculpture was used constructively for the first

time in the National Archaeological Museum at Athens. In this exhibition, we notice that symmetry is avoided. Every statue stands free in the space and is visible from all around. The space does not lose its airing and light (...) The non-specialist visitor thus gains a lot by not letting himself being carried away by the linear series of a number of statues; instead, he gets the opportunity to view its work individually, to eye it on all sides, to question and understand its form (...) This way of exhibiting and viewing works of art is at one with the contemporary modes of human existence. So, instead of the old scrupulous tenor to exhibit everything in a museum, the direction of the National Museum preferred to present only the best in quality and state of preservation. So, it is like seeing many well-known artworks for the first time (...) With only very simple means, the exhibition authors managed to give back vivid life to the works of art. There is a balanced and well planned relation between the sculpture and the surrounding space so that the latter does not offend the plastic forms of the objects. The lucidity of the galleries comes as much as possible near to the one experienced in an open-air ancient sanctuary' (Langlotz in *To Vima* 21/2/54:3,6) [the original passages in Greek].

The permanent galleries opened in stages between 1954 and 1966<sup>50</sup>. Overall, the re-display was based on the same aesthetic principles of how to elevate each individual work of art to its best and how to make it speak either as an individual unit or as part of its historical [chronological] and stylistic group [Plates 30-52].

From an epistemological standpoint, the exhibition was grounded on the scientific maxim of ordering and dividing the objects 'as the material dictated' and as the 'scientific research, stylistic analysis and experienced eye' suggested into chronological periods, regions, styles and artistic personalities (Karouzou 1967:xviii-xix; 1984b:62-63; see also Petrakos 1995a:110). As Semni Karouzou eagerly upheld: 'if two works of art were attributed to the same sculptor or painter, it would be a mistake to present them separately. It would also be unforgivable to mingle together objects from different workshops, i.e. Attic, Islands, Boeotian, Thessalian, Peloponnesian. Such a fusion would confess a scientific backwardness and deficiency' (Karouzou 1956:850).

Further to this, and as both Christos and Semni repeatedly pointed out, the preparation of a successful museum display demanded some basic requisites from its author. These depended on:

- a) good knowledge of the material;



- b) effort to keep up to date with the current international research;
- c) thorough knowledge of the ancient history of art;
- d) ability to understand the *Zeitgeist* that is the spirit of every period and
- e) good knowledge of the History of European Art which would foster the display-author's scientific understanding and aesthetic sensibility (Karouzou 1967; 1984b:62-63).

Turning now to the Acropolis Museum and its post-war exhibition, its aesthetic and philosophical rationale, let alone its practical workout have been strikingly similar to the ones observed in the National Archaeological Museum during the same period [Plates 54-64].

Miliadis' re-display<sup>51</sup> was very much conditioned by his view of the museum as a stifling closed place, a sort of prison wherein sun-bathed pieces of art, living entities themselves, were obliged to live away from their natural environment, the sunlight, clear air and sky and were juxtaposed in an arbitrary and often unhappy match. Thus, he focused his work on finding ways to ease out this imprisonment by creating a warm and natural environment for the displays, essentially: 'as least museum-like as possible' (Miliadis 1964).

In general, both museums, and the National Archaeological most of all, have structured scientific exhibitions through the theoretical framework of the history and evolution of Art.

With regard to the presentation of sculpture, we can argue that the main thrust of the display was to show devotion both to the concrete and pragmatic as well as to the abstract and more spiritual aspects of the ancient works of art. This approach was in keeping with Karouzos' general theoretical predilections, very much shaped in the wake of Buschor (see Chapter Two) and thus with his philosophical position regarding the importance of making the cultural legacy of antiquity relevant to the process of interpreting ancient art. So, the context of the presentation was humanistic, pragmatic but also poetic and mystical with a certain loftiness and nobility of thought.

Overall, the value of the National Archaeological and Acropolis Museums re-displays of sculpture rested in the great appeal of its aesthetic purism during the early post-war period. In addition, the worth of the National Archaeological's re-display was assessed with respect to its theoretical vigour. Indeed throughout his professional life, Karouzos has been distinguished among Greek archaeologists, for he sought to depart from archaeological explorations, beyond the mainstream practice of dealing merely with raw material (i.e. excavations, catalogues, empirical descriptions). In essence he sought to produce archaeological texts and narratives based on what he called 'αρχικό νόημα', meaning a primary concept and fundamental argument (Petrakos 1995a).

However, Karouzos' theoretical framework has been both a boon and a bane in the process of rendering the exhibition readable to a wider public. For, it has not always been easy to communicate complex concepts based on the evolutionary form theory and on a relentless pursuit of such goals as the interpretation of historical, social or psychological factors (Benson 1980). The notable scarcity of interpretative material in the space of the sculpture galleries of the museum certainly has not helped to overcome such conceptual obstacles.

With regard to the presentation of pottery in the National Archaeological Museum [Plates 43-52], its theoretical structure was drawn up in the Beazleyite method of seeking the bearers of style and thus of looking at the vases as art objects (see Chapter Two). That approach was in keeping with the development of pottery studies during that period when the spell of Beazley's achievement and legacy had already been fully recognised and endorsed by classical archaeologists all around the world. As mentioned above, the pottery galleries of the museum were completed some time in the 1960s. Only much later in the 1980s was it realised that there were also other fields of study to turn the spotlight on, namely pot distribution, contexts of use, meaning, interpretation, ideology, social and historical contexts, image-making and iconography. However, today in the National Archaeological Museum and its Vase Galleries, there are no clues suggesting any attempt to reorder the vast assemblages of vases and bring them down: 'from lofty heights to the accoutrement of everyday life' (Shanks 1996:154-155).

Will the National Museum question the validity of its current theoretical approaches and realise the value of new theoretical interpretations of Greek art? This will surely be one of the many grand challenges to undertake in the near future.



## MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

In order to identify the ideological, museological and social contours of the National Archaeological and the Acropolis Museums in the span of the last fifty years or so, we must see them in their contexts, that is in the broader cultural framework, the mentality and inclinations of the individual-specialists, state machinery or general public that contributed actively or participated as recipients of their production and consumption.

At the dawn of post-war reformation, when the nation was still embroiled in a ruthless civil war, certain commentaries written at the time of the museums' re-opening suggested that both museums, and particularly the National Archaeological, might have operated as potent forces in forging national consciousness, national unity and 'cultural revival in the Greek land' (Kalligas in *To Vima* 15/1/48:2). With allusions to the civil war and its ideological repercussions for restoring Hellenism's historical monuments, some then attested that:

'the re-opening of the Museum acquire[d] a further significance, for it provide[d] the opportunity to weigh up [the symbolic representation of the classical and European] values, and to judge whether it was worth fighting for their survival or instead for their replacement by other values which represented, according to some views, a new state of affairs' (Kalligas in *To Vima* 15/1/48:2) [the original in Greek].

and:

'as that civil war was not a contest to seize and destroy a national past, but to control the interpretation of this past within Greece, [the resurrection of the National Museum -now under the control of ruling Greek authorities] became an allegory for efforts to devise a forced national union of people and territory' (Leontis 1991:3)<sup>52</sup> [the original in Greek].

In relation to matters of identity and definition of Greekness, both museums, with their distinguished collections, may have also been perceived as unique guides for mirroring the physiognomy of Greek art, its principles and ideals. For as Christos Karouzos pointed out in some of his most seminal essays (1981:10-11):

'we talk about the ancient Greek art because the scholars gather and understand the characteristics of Greekness from the examples of this ancient art; and these same intrinsic characteristics we have in mind

when talking about the Greekness of our contemporary art (...) [These are also the qualities] that a European sees and [automatically] feels much more familiar with and kindred to than when encountering the arts of other peoples [i.e. oriental arts]' [the original in Greek].

From a similar ideological perspective, we can approach the post-war landscaping and interpretation of the Acropolis historic site [Plates 65-66] which has been both an artistic undertaking and a 'point of self-redefinition of the modern Greeks' (Kotionis 1994:13-15). The most definitive features of the Acropolis landscaping, however, were:

- a) the use of archetypal Greek and Mediterranean architectural forms in the new buildings in order to relate them directly to the antiquities;
- b) the absence of any direct confrontation between new constructions and ancient monuments;
- c) the 'invisibility' of the intervention and
- d) the use of historical architectural quotations from various historical periods (i.e. marble elements taken from demolished neo-classical houses of Athens to be used for retaining walls, seats and pavements). This latter feature, favouring the formation of a diachronic and timeless landscape and hinting at the understanding of history as 'memory', has been closely related to Pikionis and other Greek intellectuals' philosophy regarding national identity and tradition at the time. Totally integrated with the historic space and appropriated by generations of Athenians in the following years, its value has recently attracted attention once more in the context of various ideological debates regarding the New Acropolis Museum and its integration within the modern cityscape (Oikonomaki-Brunner 1991:74-75).

Moving now beyond the ideological significance of the museums' re-opening and archaeological landscaping, the cultural and educational<sup>53</sup> impetus, mainly for the younger generations of children who had passed through the schools without having visited a museum during the World and Civil wars, was also emphasised in various sources of the time<sup>54</sup>:

'As the knowledge of [ancient] Greek language, that allowed a direct [mental] contact with the ancient texts, is not anymore as it was in the nineteenth-century the embellishment of the bourgeois, as the humanistic education is going through an unprecedented crisis, the



only remaining alternative is to provide the citizen with a fixed acceptance of the ancient world through images. The works of art must be presented with lucidity and vividness; the knowledge must be concealed behind the visual pleasure, for a new element has unexpectedly emerged, that is *vision*. In Greece, where neither impressive Galleries, nor old cities ornated with statues in their streets nor ash-coloured houses with a great history exist, the main source of national and aesthetic education is the archaeological museums.

Our National Archaeological Museum is something more: it is the most important School of Greek education for the entire world. And this is so, not only because of its vast collections of antiquities but mostly because of their value (...) Since 1948 when the first temporary galleries of the [National Archaeological] opened, thousands of visitors from all over the world have been coming to the Museum to be revitalised in the Greek miracle (...) Teachers from all around Greece brought their pupils to the perennial ancient Mother; artists, students, workers, clergymen, citizens from all the world come to get educated (...) In the Museum, the people learn that our ancient ancestors were not a legend but created a true and live grandeur that nurtured and continues to enlighten all the world' (Karouzou 1956:849-850) [the original in Greek].

Moreover, the new aesthetic appeal of the National Archaeological and the Acropolis Museums bestowed on these institutions the attribute of a museum archetype in the early post-war era. The post-war redisplay of the National Archaeological has been variously characterised as 'the priceless jewel of Greece'<sup>55</sup>, as the 'greatest archaeological undertaking of this era in Greece (...) an achievement that offered the ancient Greek art to the Greeks and the world as seen and interpreted by a great connoisseur of art'<sup>56</sup>. Similar remarks have been expressed about the Acropolis Museum, the 'brightest museum'<sup>57</sup> and its 'wonderful exhibition'<sup>58</sup> which became 'a milestone' of Greek museological history and philosophy<sup>59</sup>.

Since the early 1940s, Christos Karouzos and Yannis Miliadis, the celebrated directors of those institutions, have advocated their viewpoints regarding the need for reformation<sup>60</sup> of the Greek archaeological museums and have formulated an intellectual approach towards museum exhibiting, altogether different to the one existing before 1940. Therefore, some of their theories are worth quoting in some length here, for they propose a certain idea-exemplar that has been subsequently reproduced, intentionally or not, in many other archaeological exhibitions around the country.

Miliadis, a real humanist and classical aesthete with studies on the history of ancient and modern art in Germany, advocated that:

‘a modern museum is both a work of science and art (...) that should be appreciated from within [by means of its collections] and not from the outside specially when this museum is located on the Acropolis Sacred Rock’ (Miliadis 1957:19; see also Bouras 1989) [the original in Greek].

For him, the socialisation of antiquities to a non-specialist public was a matter of great importance as he urged that:

‘[Archaeologists] must find ways to render the antiquities and the key of their secret back to the people. For it would be totally incorrect to keep on assuming that the antiquities were merely made for the sake of the archaeologists [...] These sacred ruins are living relics of a civilisation which was closely connected with life; thus, they must be offered living values of beauty and art to the souls of all the courteous and sensitive people” (Miliadis 1939 in *Mentor* 1989:13) [the original in Greek].

In Karouzos’ important essay on ‘The educational role of museums’, originally addressed as an oral paper in 1954 and later published in 1972, we also read about the nature of a Museum of Ancient Art and its role in the artistic education of the people:

‘I accept as other [art-historians] did before that a Museum of the History of Art has as its *main* and special objective not to serve the History *tout court* but the History of Art. All the monuments of art are also historical monuments sometimes explicitly and always implicitly, and can assist without any doubt to the illustration of history. But human history, either in its general aspects or in its particular moments, has demands that cannot at all compromise or be reconciled with the demands of the history of art; if we, even so, try to reconcile them, we will produce something outrageous, arbitrary and unpleasant for both history and art. A well organised Museum of Art History acts as an illustration of a handbook of Art History, -and can also act as an illustration of a handbook of history only by coincidence.... [Therefore], the Museum is obliged to praise in every way and to reveal the artistic nature and value of the works of art’ (Karouzos 1981:137-138) [the original in Greek].

So, in this text, he sets out two basic preconditions: first that the Museum must concentrate exclusively on the presentation of a history of art and not generally on history; secondly that the Museum of Art carries the inherent obligation to elevate and enlighten the special artistic character of the ancient work. With regard to the educational role of the museum, he argues that:



the Museum of any type, either with an academic or artistic orientation or with both, must not only be a sort of specialised workshop for the experts but must become an important part of the people's spiritual and mental life (ibid. 137) [the original in Greek].

For him, however, the action of teaching in a museum lay less on the psychology of the recipient and much more on the instructor's solid and good grounding on his subject of study. He was an eager advocate of the view that a successful communication in the museum was conditioned by the interpreter's knowledge and not by his methodology or ability to transmit this knowledge efficiently to the museum audience. He based his opinion on the presupposition that as art *a priori* appealed to the sight and as knowledge of art did not simply mean the accumulation of information but mainly the cultivation of the visual sensibility, the instructor should, and ought to, be well educated and cultivated (ibid. 140).

In this proposition alongside his corresponding antipathy against various products of popularised archaeology and art<sup>61</sup>, we can detect, however, a certain elitism or purism and unfamiliarity with basic modern principles of museum communication.

To these purist positions about the supremacy of the antiquities' aesthetic and artistic values in conjunction with the generally purist and reserved Greek philosophy concerning the preservation and site management of the Acropolis that has been sustained throughout the post-war period (Bouras 1989; 1994a:328; Philippidis 1994:305-307), we can impute some of the later practical insufficiency of the National Archaeological and the Acropolis Museum to respond efficiently to new demands. These new demands have risen from the process of social evolution, the rising level of education, the general modernisation, the tourist development, the transformation of monuments from symbolic to social commodities and the general theoretical trends and methodological applications with regard to the management of monuments that gradually gathered pace and ripened to maturity in the country. In the light of these developments, the traditional functions of both museums and the very ideas which were originally responsible for their exhibitions later seemed certainly outmoded. To quote McNeal's (1991:62) brief but sound description about the current situation in the Acropolis Museum, equally relevant for the National Archaeological:

'relying on broken statuary and bits of pottery stacked in glass cases, and with virtually no interpretative material of any kind, the

[Acropolis] museum is only another example of the way in which Western European cultural norms of the 19th century were imposed on the Greeks and continue to guide their behaviour. Modelled on the Glyptothek in Munich (1816-1830), it is a kind of hybrid between a curiosity shop and a temple to the arts, an institution which serves the interests of archaeologists and art historians in the preservation of artefacts for research. What the general public carries away from a visit is anybody's guess. One gets the impression that to come and genuflect before this *shrine* to archaic and classical art is supposed to be the sole and satisfying object of the pilgrimage [emphasis added].

Certainly, since 1975 the interdisciplinary CCAM has contributed a great deal (and promises to continue to do so) to change this predicament and to increase the didactic character of the ruins through restoration work, scientific reports, exhibitions and educational programmes. Charalambos Bouras, the president of the committee holds that the ongoing restoration work, which has nevertheless been a bone of contention for its philosophy and methodology between the traditionalists and those favouring historical continuity, is on the verge of spanning the great divide between the specialist's appreciation and the general public classical humanist education (Bouras 1994b:101-103).

When it comes down to visitors' numbers, the popularity of the Acropolis site and of the National Archaeological Museum in the post-war period do not suggest any reasons for great anxiety<sup>62</sup>, with current average numbers running as high as twelve thousand visitors a day on the Acropolis in the busy months of the summer (Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:17). The proportion, however, of foreign visitors, who are one time visitors, to locals is a matter of concern. For instance, in 1965 only 7,000 of the 206,000 visitors to the Acropolis in a period of six months were Greek (3.4%). In August 1985, the proportion was 15,847 Greeks in a total of 307,129 (5.2%) whereas in July 1988, the ratio was even lower with only 1,986 locals in a total of 198,617 visitors<sup>63</sup> (1.0%). This fact, according to a recent explanation, 'may not necessarily be a proof of negligence by the locals, (...) that the pilgrimage is an essential obligation for those who come from afar but it might equally well not have the same value for the Athenians(...) That is the way things are: although the Athenians are too busy to find the time to visit the Acropolis, they are perfectly capable of expressing their concern about the fate of their great heritage, and of proposing solutions' (Philippidis 1994:296).



Despite the expected high attendance by foreign visitors, articles that appeared in the national press in the 1980s have provided some concern regarding the low attendance of the Greeks at the archaeological museums and sites of the country<sup>64</sup>. In essence, these texts concentrated on various issues such as lack of organisation, shortage of services for the public, poor management and marketing strategies, lack of personnel, lack of funding, the appearance and endurance of intellectual elitism, and mostly the need for new aesthetically attractive and intellectually stimulating exhibitions and archaeological interpretation in the museums. They, thereby, argued that both museums have gradually withered from 'museological cornerstones' and 'priceless jewels' to 'cracked window(s) of the Hellenic culture'<sup>65</sup>, let alone 'stifling'<sup>66</sup>, 'cold, inhospitable and out-fashioned (...) museum-monuments of classical museological philosophies'<sup>67</sup>.

### **A 'Museum for the Future of the Acropolis'**<sup>68</sup>

The twenty year long history of the New Acropolis Museum and particularly its course in the aftermath of the recent architectural competition suggest that this new project has been found at the centre of the most turbulent architectural and museum debate to take place in Greece in the past few years [Plate 68].

The museum and the discussion about it appeared to be extending into almost every area of everyday life, embracing topics as broad and divergent as stylistic architectural criticism, association of the Museum with the Sacred Rock of the Acropolis, juxtaposition of the building with the modern urban environment, ideal character and functions of the new museum, its museological and museographical profile as well as the symbolic presence of the Acropolis site and museum, as the icons of the classical tradition, in the Western civilisation in the modern age. Some of these issues have been in the forefront of the debate whereas others were left under-discussed.

The topographic location<sup>69</sup> of the new museum, preferably in close vicinity to the Sacred Rock, and the creation of a certain tension between the future museum and the site due to the decision to detach major architectural decorative elements from their natural setting and exhibit them independently were perceived by the majority of the

contestants as the major architectural problem to be solved (see Kalogeras & Papalexopoulos 1992; Kondaratos 1992). In the light of these ethical and ideological dilemmas, many have expressed concern as to how the objects would function when placed in a closed space and how the loss of a part of their ideological identity would be compensated by the nature of their surroundings. Since most of the people involved with the competition agreed that the objects in the collection of the museum constituted an inalienable part of the Acropolis monuments and contributed both to the overall architectural presence of the monument complex and to the focusing of the wider Attic landscape, a direct dialogue and visual connection between the space of the Acropolis seemed urgent (see Kalogeras 1991:26; Papoulias 1991:55; Spanomaris & Zachariadis 1992:100; Zevi 1991:26).

In the light of these complex matters, there has been no consensus as to which would be the ideal architectural language of the new museum. Would it be a museum-landmark for the architecture of our time (Candylis 1991:21) or rather a discreet, reserved, modest, non-narcissistic and traditional building that should not afflict a rival presence to the monumentality of the Acropolis, the classical architectural symbol *par excellence* (Antonakakis 1992:87-88; Tsiomis 1992:103-104)?

So, there is ground to suggest that the affair of the new museum has been played out in the manifestations of a dilemma between those supporting purist views regarding the scale of intervention in a classical archaeological site which for them represented the city's abaton (holy of the holies) and those supporting intervention and historical continuity achieved through enhancement of the building's relationship with the existing urban context (Simeoforidis 1991:26).

Another very important issue was the character and type of museum which the new Acropolis museum ought to be, and the meaning of the answers given to its museological and museographical existence (Kondaratos 1992; Korres 1992; *Tefchos* Editorial Board 1991). According to the last two directors of the Acropolis Museum (E. Touloupa and P.Kalligas), the new museum should fulfil the basic demands for preservation, display and research of the artistic and historical treasures of the site, but also act as a cultural and educational venue wherein the entire historical development of the Acropolis would be elucidated to visitors and scholars alike (Kalligas 1991:9; Touloupa 1991:25-26; cf: Haskaris 1991; McNeal 1991:62-63; Simeoforidis 1991:22).



The building programme, as outlined by the Competition Organiser, indeed seemed to redress the historical balance, previously absent in the exhibition philosophy of the existing Acropolis Museum. As it stands now, the exhibition policy provides for the display of all the material from the Prehistoric and Geometric collections to material related to the Ottoman period and to the recent history of the restoration work in the site, although the classical period and its material culture have again the lion's share in terms of space and architectural monumentality within the galleries (*Acropolis*:11-15).

Despite this positive gesture, the Ministry of Culture did not deem it significant, however, to specify a generally accepted museographical way of arranging exhibits. That omission, which was subsequently substantially criticised as being an inherent weakness of the organisation of the competition, provided ground for another debate which concentrated yet again on the primacy of aesthetic purism in the museographical approach, with many architects asserting the importance of creating simple and minimal exhibitions and of placing art pieces at the centre of attention within a neutral visual background field, both in terms of colour and form (Hollein 1991b:7-18; Korres 1992; Nikolakopoulos 1992:97-98).

To conclude, the debate for the New Acropolis Museum has been concocted within a very intricate system of architectural, topographical, museological, archaeological, historical and symbolic contexts, which have been roughly outlined above. The homogeneity of the museum's collections and its relationship with the Acropolis, both in terms of space and symbolic meaning, render it a unique cultural institution which can be given the attribute of a classical archaeological and museological monograph. Indeed, in a Greek architect's and member of the jury's words:

'The Acropolis Museum is not just another museum. It transcends the concept of museum policy and presentation. It is not only the Acropolis Museum but the Museum in the Acropolis, in the vicinity of the Acropolis. It is a part of the area, of the immediate and wider environment. The Acropolis Museum is a contradiction in terms in its very conception as a Museum. It is a material imbued with life. The Acropolis Museum is a proposition for life, an apotheosis and ritual, a humble offering and an ecstatic dialogue' (Fatouros 1991:23).

Therefore, the fact that it requires a different approach compared to any other archaeological museum and exhibition opens up room for speculation regarding the

breadth of this museum project's impact to the new contingencies regarding the future functions and museographical profiles of archaeological museums, currently emerging in Greece. Rather, we should see the Acropolis Museum example and its impetus getting a wider scope and touching upon topics such as the future nature of classical scholarship and the relevance of the Acropolis and of the Hellenic civilisation, that this national *shrine* of art represents, to the national and supra-national community at the turn of the century and beyond.

## Conclusion

Pulling the threads of the above analysis together, we can surely argue that the National Archaeological, the Acropolis Museums and their post-war re-displays are themselves now museum pieces in their own right. They are national *shrines* of Greek classical art, sanctified in time and space. Nonetheless, despite having been bestowed a great deal of merit for their contribution to the early post-war reformation of the archaeological museums in Greece, they are today in need of change. Still, their sanctification as national icons implies that they cannot easily be reduced to mere objects of profane research, be it of an archaeological or museological nature. Thus, in what spirit and to what extent this change will finally be expanded and performed, remains to be seen and for time to tell.



# CLASSICAL SITES OF HELLENISM AS SACRED LANDSCAPES AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL HETEROTOPIAS; CONCEPTUAL VALUES, MUSEOLOGICAL MESSAGES ON SITE AND IN THE MUSEUM

‘Historical knowledge is documented through ancient monuments, especially in the absence of written sources. Ancient monuments can replace ancient literary sources and/or supplement them by offering special vividness on anything that may be occasionally mentioned in ancient texts. Pieces of art, on the other hand, cultivate aesthetic experiences. Generally, monuments and pieces of art constitute the stem of cultural education. The management of monuments and heritage exacts specialised knowledge which fosters self-consciousness in a country and its people’

D.Pallas, in *I Aygi*, 14/2/82, 5.

‘Walking up-hill, after a visit to this serene topos, wherein under the shadows of tall pine trees ancient ruins rest in high density testifying to ancient glory and vigour, the visitor arrives at the museum. Entering the museum, his soul is filled with emotions (...) At the sight of fragmented ancient bodies, his eyes and mind are filled with the great ideal (...) How many more artistic achievements, historical memories, symbols of the Hellenic faith and Olympic ideal could he experience in this unique museum!’

M.Andronikos, in *To Vima*, 14/2/65, II/6.

‘The Museum [of Ancient Agora] is a monument in itself (...) In there, the visitor does not merely see pieces of art. The nature of the collections render this museum unique and its relation to the visitors is more direct and explicit than the ones observed in other archaeological museums. For side by side with the pieces of art, the

visitor can see artefacts of everyday life that bring the Ancient Athenians back to life, with their material needs, passions and feelings; all these certify to the visitor that what he experiences is not a fairy tale with immaterial heroes but a warm and emotional fragment of human life that is so similar to our very own'

M.Andronikos, in *To Vima*, 21/2/65, II/6.

This simple and carefully displayed museum [of Kerameikos] presents the circle of death that is the natural progression of life (...) There, excavation finds and burial goods narrate, in the best possible manner, social habits and the everyday life of our ancient ancestors (...) The material on display has been chosen in order to fulfil the didactic purpose of the museum, as well as to present characteristic samples of ancient burial customs and the evolution of ancient art'

M.Gerakis, in *To Vima* 27/9/80, 5.

## Introduction

The somewhat cumbersome language of this chapter's title is deliberate, for it denotes the diversity of elements and factors that entangle with issues of Site Interpretation and Management as well as with forms of museum presentation of archaeological sites. This matter has both empirical and practical as well as theoretical dimensions, and although the former ones (i.e. legislation<sup>1</sup>, techniques of site presentation, conservation, salvage and generally cultural resource management<sup>2</sup>) are of great merit and interest, the discussion that follows will focus primarily on theoretical and ideological points and queries.

This section of the study endeavours to explore the particularities of site museums<sup>3</sup> and archaeological sites as 'lieux-exposition' (Bourdin 1986:70), and to impart and examine their pretensions to publicly render intelligible a specific 'museological message' (Maroevic 1995:30). To this extent, we shall plunge into the conceptual issues that the presentation of ancient sites involves and in effect discuss ancient monuments as authentic and powerful national symbols of the past and as sacred landscapes of memory-building that can spur notions of respect, understanding and protection of the ancestral past and culture. We shall seek to contemplate ancient monuments and their site museums as political tools and talismans that recount tales of origin, lineage and historical continuity and promote patriotic and/or nationalistic aspirations. Furthermore, we shall study ancient monuments as tourist dreamlands and economic commodities of



the present. Lastly, we shall attempt to review alternative ways of looking at ancient sites and their museum interpretation by means of recent contextual and social archaeological studies that favour the study of the past as a process with meaningful connections to the present rather than as a simplistic and fixed narrative.

Of the thirty four site museums existing and operating currently in Greece<sup>4</sup>, we shall analyse only five of them. Although the number is far from exhaustive, it is nevertheless representative and covers various issues and possibilities either practical, ideological or scientific/archaeological. The case-studies will be grouped into three categories: a) site museums of major ancient sanctuaries (Museums of Ancient Olympia, Delphi and Nemea), b) site museums of ancient civic centres with both cult and other public character (Museum of Athenian Agora) and c) site museums of ancient cemeteries and necropolises (Museum of Kerameikos).

## **Inter-state (Pan-Hellenic) sanctuaries of Ancient Greece; The National Museums of the past - Ancient Olympia, Delphi, Nemea: sites and museums**

### **MUSEUM HISTORIES**

The famous precinct of Ancient Olympia<sup>5</sup>, with its sacred enclosure known as the Altis dedicated to Zeus, the Treasuries of several city-states arranged roughly in line on a terrace overlooking the Altis, and the many other public buildings related mainly to the Olympic Games, attracted the interest of local and foreign archaeologists and academics as well as government officials soon after the independence and formation of the new Greek state [Figure 12]. In 1875, a German expedition began excavating the site with the approval and support of Kaiser Wilhem I, after having signed a contract of very favourable terms with the Greek government. Ernst Curtius was in the scientific forefront and managed to achieve a synthesis of excavation and *Altertumswissenschaft* (Kalpaxis 1996:51-58; Morris 1994b:25). Their work, which provided the model for

other 'big-dig' expeditions in Greece, covers three periods: 1875-8, 1936-41, 1952 to today.

The original motives behind the German undertaking of the excavations, apart from the sheer desire for genuine scientific discoveries and promotion of historical knowledge, were also ideological and political. The prime mover was aesthetic and artistic, namely the expectation of finding statues of athletic victors made by renowned artists whose names were mentioned in ancient literature (Connor 1989:189). Additionally, the excavations in Olympia and the site itself delineated all the classicist romantic ideals that prevailed in the nineteenth-century, about spiritual and physical life, freedom, ancient religion, art, learning, morals, gymnastics, and Olympism. They allowed the excavators the appropriation of all these ideals of the past for themselves. They also expressed the German national pride and will for peace after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, and at the same time reflected some substantial degree of competition with France which had mounted a short-lived and unsuccessful campaign at Olympia in 1828. Martin Bernal finds further ideological overtones to the story of excavations and explains ancient Olympia as the classical site that would serve to exemplify the German Aryan Model, that preached about a categorical European superiority, and to develop and sustain the theory of the historical lineage of the Greeks with the Indo-Europeans (Bernal 1991:332-336, 442-443).

For the Greek Government that did not have the resources to undertake such a big task at that time, the benefits of having the Germans excavating Olympia were many and mainly national (i.e. promotion of the state's national matters abroad).

Within this historical framework, the Museum of Ancient Olympia, the first site museum to be built outside Athens, was inaugurated on 18/5/1887 and housed, for more than half a century, all the finds that were unearthed from the precinct (Gazi 1993:206-213; Kokkou 1977:305-306). Yet, in the mid-1950s, due to its inadequate space and its poor condition especially after the earthquake of 1954, the museum building proved to be inadequate to fulfil its purposes, and a new museum was needed. The erection of the new building was completed in 1975 and the museum was inaugurated in 1982 with a full redisplay of its treasures (see Yalouris 1973; Yalouri & Yalouris 1991; Kallegia 1993).



In a very similar manner, the ancient site of Delphi<sup>6</sup> represents an exceptional and tremendously interesting case for the archaeological chronicles of the country [Figures 14-15], as 'the most spectacularly beautiful ancient site in Greece and the one which, even to the uninitiated, most vividly evokes the Classical past'<sup>7</sup>. Additionally, its importance also rests on the fact that Delphi 'illustrates a fundamental theme in the relationships between the Greeks and the foreign schools' (Morris 1994b:33) and reinforces the tale of Western hegemony on the early phase of archaeology in Greece.

In Antiquity, Delphi, a site that was mentioned most frequently in the ancient literary sources together with Ancient Athens, symbolised the neutral centre of the world. The image of centrality was also reinforced by the omphalos, an egg-shaped stone which was supposed to mark the navel of the earth (Morgan 1990:224-225). Thanks to this symbolic allegory as well as its function as an oracle, the place acquired a high political, historical, social and spiritual prestige that extended far beyond the borders of the Greek world. The precinct and oracle of Apollo enjoyed its most prosperous and glorious period during the 6th-4th centuries BC. The famous and popular Pythian Games and the important association of the Amphictyonic League as a rudimentary United Nations, were some of the institutions closely related to the site and its functions (see Pentazos 1992a; Pentazou 1992; Skorda 1992). As at Olympia, the site contained a sacred enclosure with the Temenos of Apollo, other monumental dedicatory edifices of various city-states (the so-called Treasuries), and utilitarian architecture such as hippodrome, theatre, gymnasium and stadium.

'Walking among the ruins of the past splendour one recalls the great moments of the history of Greeks, their national exaltations and petty political competitions. The sanctuary is the true mirror of ancient Greek history since it has directly or indirectly participated in all the events of this glorious course' (Pentazou 1992:50). In the nineteenth-century<sup>8</sup>, after the formation of the new Greek state, the complexity and excellence of those past functions and values of the site excited the interest of experts and other officials nationally and internationally and fostered a long and intricate debate on the issue of archaeological pre-eminence over Delphi (see Amandry 1992; Dassios 1992; Picard 1992; Picard & Pentazos 1992; Pentazos 1992b).

The fact that an entire village (Kastri) [Plate 71] had been situated on the ancient site since the Middle Ages, entangled the whole matter even further, for it presupposed an extremely expensive and time consuming expropriation of the land before any excavations could possibly start<sup>9</sup>. The chronicle of the negotiations<sup>10</sup> over the scientific monopoly of the site, mainly between Greece and France but with Germany and USA also involved, provides a colourful illustration of the international and local conditions of archaeological work in Greece in those times and once more points out the prominent, decisive and perennial role of politics in archaeology and cultural management. This long debate, that involved many diplomatic manoeuvres, came to a close in 1891 when the Greek government agreed to award the excavation and scientific rights to the French Archaeological School. Thus, on 7/10/1892, the French commenced their scientifically and politically ambitious, albeit financially costly 'Great Excavation' under Th.Homolle's direction, whilst 'the Greek and French flags were streaming in the wind on the decauville dumpers carrying away the first debris of the excavations' (Amandry 1992:122).

Today, after a century of intensive excavations with magnificent and unique archaeological finds as well as careful scientific restorations (1938-1942) affording the sanctuary its present monumental appearance, there still remains considerable excavation and other scientific work to be carried out. For Olivier Picard, former director of the French Archaeological School in Athens, this major archaeological undertaking will come to an end not when the archaeological material becomes a scarcity, but rather when the interest in the classical *paideia* ceases to exist' (Picard 1992:40; emphasis in the original).

The site museum of Delphi was built in its main part by the Greek government in 1894. In 1901-1903, the museum re-opened with enlarged gallery space after an extension designed by A. Tournaire and sponsored by Andreas Syngros who had also benefited the Old Museum of Olympia (see above). During its inauguration, an atmosphere of patriotic effusion and euphoria prevailed, along with the presence of many officials and war fleets of both France and Greece situated in the nearby port of the village of Itea (Pentazos 1992c). In the years 1935-1940 and 1957-1960, two additional extensions gave the building its present form [Plate 72].



Nemea [Figure 20], as a sacred site-precinct, always held a prominent position in the mythology of Greece, especially in connection with Herakles and his first labour of slaying the Nemean lion. The Nemean Games<sup>11</sup> were celebrated biennially in rotation with the other three Pan Hellenic festivals (Olympic, Pythian and Isthmian), in the cypress grove surrounding a Temple dedicated to Zeus (dated at about 330BC). Like in Olympia and Delphi, there were periodic influxes of tens of thousands of visitors alternated with quiet times when only a very small permanent population of priests and caretakers remained in the ancient site of Nemea (Miller 1990b:1-2). Around the temple, which is one of the most important architectural monuments of the 4th century BC, there was an open sacred square at the southern side of which there have been found nine buildings, all originally constructed during the first half of the 5th-century BC. These *Oikoi* remind us of the Treasuries at Delphi and especially of those at Olympia, but they are on average four times larger than those buildings and no dedications survive in connection with them perhaps because the buildings were poorly preserved. So probably their functions were different<sup>12</sup> (Marchand 1990:118-120).

The site often fell into adversity due to regional struggles with the nearby city of Argos (see Miller 1984; 1990a). When Pausanias visited Nemea in the 2nd century AD, he saw and described an abandoned site where little or no activity was going on. Later in the 6th-century AD, Nemea, after a brief period of peace, was invaded and ruined by the Slavs. The picture given by visitors in the early 19th century was one of desolation. Yet, by the end of the 19th-century and the beginning of the 20th-century, a number of developments affected Nemea. Antiquarians and archaeologists arrived there to rediscover the important but ill-starred sanctuary. In 1884 and 1912, the French Archaeological School studied the Temple of Nemean Zeus. Thereafter, the site was partly excavated by the American School in 1924-27, and again in 1964. Large scale excavation commenced in 1974 and continues today under the auspices of the American School of Classical Studies, Prof. Stephen G. Miller's direction (University of Berkeley, California), and the Greek Archaeological Service's supervision.

The project has largely been funded (90%) by the gifts of American private citizens and foundations, who are 'curious about our *common heritage* and willing to support archaeological research in an effort to satisfy their curiosity' (Miller 1990c:194; emphasis added).

The site museum [Plate 73] is located between the east edge of the modern site of Archaia Nemea and the south edge of the ancient sanctuary. Works for its construction started in 1975 and finished nine years later with the formal dedication and presentation of the building to the Greek State on 28/5/84. Its erection and organisation as a site museum, which was made possible thanks to Mr. Rudolph A. Peterson's (ex-president of the Bank of America) generosity (Pachygianni-Kaloudi & S.G. Miller 1991) was conducted by the University of Berkeley, California as part of its commitment to the general research programme of the American School of Classical Studies.

According to the excavators and organisers of the exhibition, the museum's aim is to store the finds from the site of Ancient Nemea, study them, conserve them, and present them to the general public (Miller 1984). With its proximity to the ancient site, it intended to become an integral part of the archaeological zone in an attempt to bring the visitor closer to the architectural remains of the precinct and its material culture.

#### MUSEUM MATERIALS

The old museum at Olympia [Plate 69], designed by the Germans F. Adler and M. Dörpfeld and sponsored by the wealthy Greek Andreas Syngros, was built on a hill very close to the site. The building both in its external facade and its interior arrangement followed, in a more modest manner, the norms of the nineteenth-century neo-classical architectural maxims that prevailed in the so-called Sanctified Museum-Palaces. Like other peer institutions of the period, it aimed to create the appropriate setting for the highest enjoyment of original and monumental classical sculpture and for noble contemplation of classical ideals. Today, this building, that remains closed to the public, is a museum artefact itself.

The new museum building [Plate 70; Figure 13], albeit modern looking in its external facade and interior design and much less aesthetically thrilling in comparison to the old edifice, has a similar overall plan and layout. Thus, its main feature is a central spacious rectangular gallery dedicated to the sculptures from the Temple of Zeus, surrounded by linear long rooms on all four sides (see Yalouris 1973). Thanks to its larger spaces, the museum houses much larger collections of both monumental sculpture and minor arts



in bronze and clay, signifying a modern exemplar of the neighbouring ancient Treasuries. Thus, its “doing code” remains essentially unchanged, by stressing on the virtues of symmetry and harmony that, alongside the superb and monumental original classical displays, provide the necessary visual means for spiritual enlightenment and search of the Self.

In comparison, the museum building at Delphi did not conform with strict neo-classical principles in terms of design. Originally, it had two large pavilions on either end, bringing to mind the architectural script of small provincial French train stations of the time [Figure 16] (Gazi 1993:254-259; Pentazos 1992c). The old plan of the museum was generally symmetrical, with two large high-ceiling side rooms in both ends and a central linear section sub-divided by low walls into four small compartments. This original symmetrical arrangement gradually developed into a less homogeneous space layout [Figures 17-19]. On the whole, this museum building functions solely as a mere protective cell for unearthed original classical treasures without any elegance -but rather aesthetic violation for the surrounding monuments- or intended message in its architectural script. The plans for yet another extension of the building [Plate 74] (designed by the Greek architect Alexandros Tompazis, approved since 1986 and financed by the European Union), concentrate mainly on the creation of practical spaces for the better servicing of the visitors, but also on the transformation of the façade and its alignment with more discreet lines, congruous with the surrounding environment.

The architectural script of the Nemea museum [Plate 73], with its white coated external walls and tiled roof, is the simplest of all. Ingenuous in its conception, it follows the form of the local traditional houses from the modern village of Archaia Nemea. The museum has been built in a parallel orientation with the Temple of Zeus. Its most particular feature, in connection with its functionality and mission as a site museum, is the use of three large picture windows that overlook the site and allow the visitor direct visual contact with the temple and the rest of the archaeological zone. Specifically, the dimensions of the north window were purposefully planned so that in the case of an extensive anastylosis of the temple, the monument would be visible in its entirety through this frame-like window [Plates 96-97].

## EXHIBITION MATERIALS

The new museum of Olympia houses the numerous and valuable finds from the excavations at the Sacred Altis and the surrounding area, whereas it has approximately one fifth of the entire material on display<sup>13</sup>. Apart from the major sculptural pieces, a total of 1500 bronze and clay objects and 150 marble and poros sculptures have been displayed in the post-war exhibition. Thus, the exhibits include monumental sculpture (with a large number of Roman statues) and small artefacts (with a most complete collection of bronze votive offerings as well as some pottery), most of them transferred from the old museum in the early 1970s (see Yalouris 1973; Yalouri & Yalouris 1991:33). The eminent sculptures from the Temple of Zeus, the statue of Nike by the sculptor Paionios and the group of Hermes with baby Dionysos<sup>14</sup> have remained for longer in the old museum and have only latterly been put back on public view.

For the display authors, namely Mr. N.Yalouris and other archaeologists of the State Archaeological Service, the purpose of the exhibition was to reflect the long lasting glorious life of the most renowned Pan-Hellenic sanctuary and through it to outline the sensational history of ancient Greek art (Yalouri & Yalouris 1991:33).

The organisation of the exhibition follows the stereotyped way of arranging the material in chronological order and typological groups, thus wrongly assuming, an informed audience [Plates 75-81; Figure 13]. It is entirely object-oriented, exploiting the obvious aesthetic values of the displays which are left to speak for themselves without the interference of any possible concept-oriented devices.

Here, the main central gallery of the new museum (Gallery V in the plan) [Plates 76-77] is purposefully built to accommodate the pedimental sculptures<sup>15</sup>, the metopes and some fragments of the cornice from the Temple of Zeus. These were reinstated in their original position, especially after the post-war restoration<sup>16</sup> of the sculptural group and the addition of some hundred fragments that have been discovered in the store rooms of the museum and which have been identified and matched together.

The rest of the museum's collections are arranged in long linear galleries that run all around the main central hall<sup>17</sup>.



In the Museum of Delphi, the experiences we can have are fairly alike. The objects on display are of exquisite quality and in a good state of preservation. Those that should be briefly mentioned are the sculptural groups from the Treasury of Siphnians [Plates 83-84, 91], the two statues from Argos (Kleovis & Viton) [Plate 86], the chryselephantine objects [Plate 88], the silver bull, many bronze dedications, the Acanthus Column with the three dancing girls [Plate 90], the Daochos' Monument [Plate 90], the musical hymns to Apollo, the famous Bronze Charioteer [Plates 89, 92], the statue of Antinoos [Plate 82] and many others (see Fig).

The collections went through many phases of redisplay, which all conformed with object-oriented, taxonomic, rigidly linear and essentially aesthetic arrangements. In the first phase (1903-1936), the material was spatially organised according to provenance and chronology, by the French director of the excavations T.Homolle. Thus, each room was devoted either to a specific building in the sanctuary or to a group of monuments dating from the same period [Plates 91-92; Figure 16]. As for the end result, some believe that the fact that the museum contained almost exclusively sculpture gave the displays a very coherent look (Gazi 1993:258-259). Others assert that the numerous monumental (in height and scale of reconstruction) displays, set in very close proximity to each other leave the exhibition devoid of the necessary congruity (see Picard et al 1992:210). The most characteristic feature of that first exhibition was, apart from the lack of small displays (metal, ceramic, etc.), the spectacular effort to accommodate sculptural groups of huge dimensions, albeit repaired and heavily reconstructed with the liberal use of plaster. The plaster reproduction of the entire facade of the Treasury of the Siphnians was perhaps the most laudable of Homolle's achievements [Plate 91] (Themelis 1981:21).

In the following exhibition phase, this approach was disparaged as being scientifically incorrect and the reconstructions were dismantled. The Greek Archaeological Service decided, then, to enlarge the Museum and to bring its display up to date with the collaboration of Pierre de La Coste-Messelière, Christos Karouzos and Konstantinos Romaïos. With the extension of 1936-1940, a new gallery, named after Monsieur Pierre de La Coste-Messelière, was devoted to the Ionic archaic monuments<sup>18</sup>. With the outbreak of war the museum was evacuated and the exhibits were either concealed in caves and tombs or buried underground.

The first post-war redisplay (1950-1958) largely followed the unfinished arrangement of 1936-1940 [Figure 17]. The Ephor Ioanna Konstantinou, having support and advice from the archaeologists Ioannis Miliadis and Christos Karouzos, reassembled the collections in such a way in order to present them according to more strict and objective scientific principles that elevated more clearly the beauty of the objects. The layout followed more closely a chronological sequence leaving each gallery for the presentation of an individual monument or homogeneous groups of objects.

The succeeding phases of the exhibition [Figures 18-19] are not what we could call major redisplays but mostly amendments and additions<sup>19</sup> (ADelt 1983; Petsas 1983; Themelis 1981). Future plans of redisplay concentrate on yet another rearrangement of the Treasury of Siphnians by placing the frieze and the pediment on a pedestal that has the exact size of the original building. The pedestal, which will be supported by eight columns, will allow the free circulation of the visitors underneath. The same plan, if successful, will apply also to the metopes of the Treasury of Athenians.

The site museum of Nemea houses discoveries from the valley of Ancient Nemea as well as the valleys of Kleonai and Phlious. Although some of the artefacts on display are important for their art historical value (i.e. a bronze hydria of late 6th-century BC) and their architectural rarity (i.e. a stadium entrance tunnel), most of the exhibits are ordinary objects (i.e. coins, broken bits and pieces of pottery, architectural elements, small figurines) with authentic and sound evidential status which led the archaeologists to the assessment that this Pan Hellenic centre suffered a violent destruction late in the 5th century BC [Plates 94-99; Figure 21].

Along with the authentic artefacts, there is plenty of secondary material. The purpose of the exhibition is purely didactic and its target audience is a public that would not be merely interested in the spectacular object but in the social aspects of the Ancient Greek life and its relevance with the present. Therefore, only 5% of the excavated material is on display, for the aim of the exhibition is to enhance understanding and encourage further thinking.

The display in the entrance hall is situated on four three-sided islands that include engravings, drawings, photographs, texts and quotations. It intends to give some of the



views and comments of travellers to the site in chronological sequence since 1776. In short, it seeks to trace the development of the scholarly interest in Nemea and the Temple of Zeus, showing a tendency from the romantic to the scientific and calling forth ethical and practical issues of monument restoration<sup>20</sup> by focusing upon the three standing columns of the Temple of Zeus (Miller 1984).

The main exhibition aims to display our knowledge on the history and monuments of Nemea and the evidence for that knowledge which has been provided through the scientific means of excavation. Large windows overlooking the Sanctuary of Zeus<sup>21</sup> enable the visitor to relate various discoveries with corresponding sections of the Sanctuary and thus to gain a more complete picture of the workings of Nemea and the Nemean Games [Plates 96-97].

The overall organisation of the exhibition is dynamic and presents a linear view of the past by creating a sequential cause-effect relation that moves chronologically forward by fostering social change. The exhibition is concept-oriented and uses authentic artefacts as specimens, as hard and objective facts. The models, the reconstructions, the original quotations of early travellers but mostly the direct visual contact with the site add a further evocative dimension to the exhibition.

Andrew Stewart wrote rather lyrically when referring to the pedimental sculptures of Olympia that '[they are of those] certain monuments in the history of art to which all roads lead and from which all diverge again' (Stewart 1990:142).

The collections of the Olympia and Delphi museums stand as evidence of the glorious past of both sanctuaries and in extent as landmarks in the field of typological studies of classical archaeology. The framework, however, within which we study sites like Delphi and Olympia is more usually derived from historical sources than from the material record (Morgan 1990). Here, history is self-evidential and *a priori* incorporated within the objects. The museum presentation does not divert from traditional, neo-positivistic art historical approaches. The collections are aesthetically outstanding and self-contained, and therefore there was no need for further verbose didactic explanations. Besides, in a remarkably indirect way, the objects are enrolled to narrate intentions, values, attitudes, messages, emotions or agendas of the makers and societies that brought them into being and also to expose an evolving system of thought,

political or social attitudes. Their archaeological narrative is implied but not made explicit. What the exhibition effectively puts across is a celebration of the artistic/aesthetic value of original masterpieces of classical antiquity and a complete concealment of their role as symbolic, economic and historical agents both in the past and the present.

Ancient Olympia, Delphi and Nemea were three Pan-Hellenic precincts similar in their original function and role in antiquity. However, Nemea's life history was different in the present. The late post-war commencement of systematic excavations at Nemea -in contrast with Olympia and Delphi that have been excavated for over a century, the different scientific methodology, theoretical alignments of its excavators and their possible detachment from the traditionalism of Hellenism along with the ordinary, non-spectacular material record of the excavations have all resulted, as is quite clear, in a very different museum exhibition and interpretation. This exhibition assents to and demonstrates the traditional way archaeologists usually choose for the study of the classical lands, namely consultation of i) ancient literary sources, ii) early surveys of the site, iii) mythological tradition, iv) topography, v) systematic excavation, vi) accession of data, vii) their interpretation and story building. As an approach, it had a much greater impact on the field of classical archaeology in comparison to the four step deductive methodology of theory-experiment-verification-model building. On the other hand, the exhibition seems to be more positivistic and sceptical about the primacy and accuracy of the literary sources, and more emphatic about the objective value of the excavation data and results. Thus, the textbook-like design, which functions as a concise and popular version of a comprehensive archaeological report, serves to illustrate a certain historical narrative and supports the archaeological argument. Yet, the intention here is not to transform the human element (ancient and present) into a passive recipient of this particular narrative. In essence, the human presence in Ancient Nemea is made explicit through the right use of the archaeological material and the accentuation of its social and demographic significance (see for instance the displays of coins, athletic gear and industry with the ancient workmen's and sculptors' tools, etc.) [Plates 94, 98-99]. The human factor at the present time concerns both archaeologists and the general public. The archaeologists' presence is illustrated through excavation photographs and certain texts, mounted on the galleries, as: 'The man who descends the



well must be free of fear, especially claustrophobia. He works in dark and damp, frequently in running water.....'. The visitor and her role and status in the museum and exhibition are constructed through encouraging imperative forms of language (i.e. note, compare) and visual clues (photos, drawings, etc.) to rediscover the evidence, pull the threads together and build up the stolyline of the past and its social pertinence in the present.

However, by way of conclusion, it is useful to recall David Clarke and his concerns as regards the use of historical narrative as a vehicle for archaeological results (1968:12):

'the danger of historical narrative as a vehicle for archaeological results is that it pleases by virtue of its smooth coverage and apparent finality, whilst the data on which it is based are never comprehensive, never capable of supporting but one interpretation and rest upon complex probabilities. Archaeological data are not historical data and consequently archaeology is not history'.

#### MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

The sites of Ancient Olympia and Delphi, and by extension their museums with the exquisite collections of classical art, hold prominent positions in the traditional western discourse of Hellenism. Thus, their roles within different temporal contexts comply with the role that this discourse enacts during those periods and the various receptions of Hellenism through Western history. So, during the late nineteenth-century when both archaeological sites were rediscovered and their first museum presentations were born, nationalism, imperialism and industrialism had an important effect on Hellenism. The former two exploited the classical tradition in order to bring the general public into the experience of classical space and enhance the sense of national unity and superiority. The latter social and economic development had a slower but eventually potent counter-effect on Hellenism, for it moved education further away from its classical core towards technology (Kennedy 1994:13). In this respect, the archaeological sites of Hellenism gradually became part of a market system and faced the results of a rapid, albeit often corroding commodification. Today, in the late twentieth-century, there is an increasing tendency in contemporary scholarship to accentuate the 'otherness' and 'remoteness' of ancient Greeks rather than their powerful legacy on western culture

(Kennedy 1994:15). This ideological development in conjunction with a generally inadequate classical education and knowledge on the part of the public can potentially alter the conceptual values of those sites of Hellenism, and render their museological messages less accessible and intelligible to a general audience. If, as Kennedy suggests, the only remaining great appeal of the classical tradition is its aesthetic achievements in literature and the arts, then what would be the new -albeit ever old and traditional- role of site museums, such of those of Ancient Olympia and Delphi, other than mere state repositories of treasures?

Both Ancient Olympia and Delphi, by means of their material culture that came to light after long lasting excavations, remarkably enriched our knowledge about ancient Greece and assisted in the progress of classical archaeology. From the perspective of art, Olympia offers unique examples of the so-called 'severe' style with the sculptures from the pediments and metopes of the Temple of Zeus. Delphi provides the discipline with free-standing and architectural originals of the Archaic period that can only rank with those from the Museum of Acropolis (Kouroi and Korai) and Museum of Munich (Aegina Marbles from the Temple of Aphaia) respectively. The totality of the material evidence, and especially the number and range of votive offerings (terracotta and bronze figurines, bronze and iron tripods, jewellery dedications, etc.), provides all the requirements for a combined and desirable study by both archaeologists and historians that would enable them to abandon their concentration merely on works of art, military and political history respectively.

As Morgan suggested: 'dating and narrative history [could give] way to questions of process and change' (1990:24). In this respect, Delphi, for instance, forms a most important case study for establishing the relationship between sanctuary development and early state formation, by virtue of its intimate connection with some of the most powerful emergent states of the Greek mainland (Morgan 1990:106). It also provides, through the institution of divination with its significance, power and mechanisms, the opportunity to study the organisation of religious activity of all kinds in the Greek world which was intimately related to the particular socio-political ordering of the society in which it was practised (Morgan 1990:155). In parallel, and in connection with the institution of Panhellenic *agones*, it is socially meaningful to remember the close and symbolic relationship that occurred between athletics and warfare in ancient



Greece and thus to study the formation of a privileged locus for the complex interaction of the international aristocracy in the course of Pan Hellenic games (see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995a:236).

Beyond the sheer scientific significance of the sites, we have already examined some ideological and political overtones related to the early modern life-history of Olympia and Delphi. In the last hundred years, the site of Olympia, along with part of its material culture and some of the purest institutions that Hellenism represents, such as the ideal of Olympism, got directly involved with further political, ideological and economic tensions and ventures. This situation originally emerged in the late nineteenth-century (1896) with the revival, or rather appropriation of the ancient Olympic Games by Pierre de Coubertin, and its aftermath (Kidd 1984). The Modern Olympic Games, dressed up in the image and the symbols of antiquity, represented an idealised past and embodiment of excellence but mostly a commercialised capitalist present. Thus, it had considerable utility for the promotion of national prestige, civic pride, tourism, urban development and commercial growth (Gruneau 1984; see also Kidd 1984; Tomlinson 1984; Tomlinson & Whannel 1984; Triesman 1984). The postulate that no direct links were ever to be found between the ancient ideal of Olympism and its modern recast, gradually became an indisputable fact to be reaffirmed some years ago when instead of Athens it was Atlanta, the Coca-Cola<sup>22</sup> city, which won the vote of the Olympic International Committee to hold the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games. It was, then, evident that the sense of the past as an emotional construct did not harmonise with the cognitive and technocratic mementoes of the present capitalist spirit.

Moreover, in 1991, dispute<sup>23</sup> emerged in the country over ownership rights to the Olympic tradition as well as over related ancient material culture. That was due to the Greek Government's decision to offer one hundred and fifty nine original objects from the Museum of Olympia to Switzerland for the benefit of the Museum of Olympic Games in Lausanne, headquarters of the International Olympic Committee. Thus, the Museum of Olympia by means of its collections again became a vehicle for negotiations between state officials and international political agents. It also exemplified the strong ideological resistance on behalf of the discipline's practitioners and the national press against the western hegemony that had controlled the archaeological matters of the country so much in the past. Moreover, it raised a fresh

debate over issues of protection of cultural property and exportation of antiquities abroad.

Similarly, Delphi, by means of its monuments and museum collections, signified the peculiar nexus of relations between a small state and a great power at the end of nineteenth-century. In the economic level, the impact of tourism has been immense<sup>24</sup>. Delphi has been turned 'from a poor village under the Ottoman occupation (...) to a sort of Disneyland whose economy depends on the organisers of touristic enterprises' (Picard & Pentazos 1992:9).

Or to put it in the poet's words (Seferis 1981a; 1981b:145):

'Delphi has become a limitless hotel', as 'the temple becomes a *topos* of tourism, with organised guides showing the sights to the masses. Today the common faith is lost and the people who came each have their own different personal mythology. They read or listen to a guide and, based on this information, add up their own story'.

Nemea's relations to the discourse of Hellenism are however different. Nemea is situated in a fertile upland, well watered and peaceful valley in the eastern foothills of the Arcadian mountains. Both site and museum belong to an archaeologically very important and touristically popular county, since prominent prehistoric sites such as Mycenae and Tiryns are in relatively near proximity. Nemea's key spatial setting in relation to other major archaeological sites has, nonetheless, been both a boon and a bane, at least as regards cultural mass tourism and its drift towards other more fairy-like tourist dreamlands (i.e. Homer's Mycenae).

In relation to the specific spatial and temporal context of Hellenism, Nemea and its museum as *topoi* of the classical past, do not divert conceptually from other paradigms such as Olympia, Delphi or Athenian Agora. In reality, however, Nemea has been a less ambiguous and disputed site of Hellenism, due to its relatively recent systematic scientific rediscovery and its less spectacular, in terms of aesthetic value, archaeological database.

The significance of Nemea, of its excavations and by extent of its museum does not spring from the aesthetic and artistic value of its monuments and material remains. In



essence, it rests on the historical and social information we can potentially deduce from them and its theoretical exploration.

Stephen Miller wrote that: ‘the goal of the excavations is not only new insights into ancient architecture, sculpture, painting, numismatics, and the other physical remains of antiquity but also a better understanding of the ancient athletic festivals and the vicissitudes of the Pan Hellenic idea. [...What is revealed is that] the history of Panhellenism was not always a rosy one. We are forced, in the end, to confront the fact that man did not, at least in Classical Greece, learn to live in harmony with his neighbour unless he was compelled to do so’ (Miller 1990b:8). There are two basic parameters in this argument; the first is that the tradition of Pan Hellenic truce during the time of Pan Hellenic festivals has been rather an idealised and romantic conception of the 19th-century which has not always corresponded with reality. In essence, as Nemea proves, ‘peace in the ancient world was an elusive goal’ (Miller 1990c:193). Yet, this image of ancient Greece, which is different and “*other*” from the one we were used to believing in, does not necessarily signify and altogether ascertain the ‘otherness’ of the ancients and their irrelevance to the present. For the excavators of the site, the acquired evidence and its interpretation is still ideologically and socially pertinent for ‘solutions to [problems of peace keeping] in ancient Greece provide lessons in international relations for our society. It would be a happy result of the Nemea project if we have made those lessons more widely known’ (Miller 1990c:194).

So, the historic and scientific value of the site and of its museum subsequently shape its social bearings that are epitomised in the following humanistic statement<sup>25</sup> of Mr. Rudolph A. Peterson, benefactor of the museum [Plate 93]:

‘each generation of mankind has striven to pass this little planet earth on to their children in a better condition than they found it. The efforts and the aspirations, the successes and the failures of past generations provide a lamp to guide our steps into the future. In a very real sense through the long march of mankind, we are one with the people who lived, laboured, and created here. This is the true import of history and the significance of this site’.

### ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’

Alternative ways of approaching the material and presenting it to the public centre around three different but inter-connecting angles. The first is archaeological and concerns the past; the second is museological related to the field of collection studies and concerns both past and present; finally the third is socio-political and concerns all three: past, present and future.

The archaeological perspective draws on recent archaeological studies regarding the social values underlying ritual behaviour at inter-state sanctuaries, and the ways material goods could be used in this kind of context -that of inter-state sanctuaries (Morgan 1990; 1993)<sup>26</sup>. Dating and narrative history give way to questions of process and change. Archaeological finds are considered sources of social information and products of social behaviour, and this is in fact the major focus of social archaeology (see also Shanks 1992:110-111). In this philosophical framework, specific questions can be answered through archaeology, and conceptual divisions can develop within museum presentations. Some of them can be: Delphi and the institution of oracular divination as a tool for decision making within state governments; cult implication in the ordering of the social and political environment of emergent city-states; the social importance of formalised festivals; inter-state festivals as important contexts for the maintenance and display of *xenia* relationships; colonial activity in conjunction with the oracular institution; categorisation of sanctuaries according to their social and political function; elite activity; the individual's role as a citizen; sanctuaries as stages of inter-state politics; competitive emulation and rivalries; sanctuaries and local societies; slave labour that built the sanctuaries, and many others.

The museological perspective considers the function of the sanctuaries as repositories of hand-picked treasures of Greek art which by their mere quantity and quality converted those sanctuaries to early equivalents of the modern National Museums<sup>27</sup>. A large proportion of the metal resources available, during the Iron Age for instance, was directed towards contexts of material display, such as those of sanctuaries (Morgan 1990:195-196; Snodgrass 1980). Susan Pearce remarks, in connection with this analogue, that the temples of Olympia were the National (or even supra-national)



museums of their day or the National Museums are the Olympias of our day. They had the material and ideological requirements to eventually create a sense of the 'past with us' which was associated with various social demands and aspects of ancient life (Pearce 1995:107). They also marked the process of transferring lavish armour dedications from the private context of the grave to the public one of the sanctuary and indicated the process of defining the role of the individual within the emerging state (see Snodgrass 1980:57; Morgan 1990:19). In this respect, material evidence from sanctuaries such as Olympia and Delphi stand alongside literature and philosophy as an invaluable source of information about Greek society, the state and the individual. They also exemplify the origins of an enduring European tradition on collecting (see Pearce 1993; 1995).

Furthermore, sanctuaries such as Olympia, Delphi or Nemea prompt questions that have to do with the existing gap between the museum of today and the past. Today, material culture from those sites are to be found in the museum, but in the past were integral parts of religious sites and religious practices performed and experienced by hundreds of pilgrims. However, what do we really know about those pilgrims and their ways of viewing, both in physical and conceptual terms, what we today consider 'works of art'? What do we know about their purpose of visit, that is pilgrimage or tourism or both, to Pan-Hellenic sanctuaries that are today known world wide as venerated 'museum-sites' of the classical past?

'How sure can we be, in other words, about the gap that separates us and them, about what we share with the fifth-century BC visitors to these temples (pilgrims, tourists, worshippers, explores, antiquarians...?) and what sets us apart?' (Beard & Hendrson 1995:5).

These are indeed important issues of cultural history that should begin to be addressed in the museum, for they can most efficiently bring past and present closer together.

Finally, socio-political and cultural perspectives refer to the modern phase of the life history of the monuments. It starts from the early times of their rediscovery and continues by exploring their new functionality as elements of national and international political and economic ventures. This inner significance of a cultural heritage objects' biography is usually often excluded from archaeological exhibitions as too sensitive

and equivocal to be exposed to public scrutiny and judgement. Nevertheless, it is as authentic and valuable as their aesthetically sublime material existence.

Besides, as Stephen Weil has pointed out and Peter van Mensch has elaborated:

‘[...] concepts and relationships and not things alone lie equally at the heart of museum work.... [Museology’s purpose of action] serves in moulding the consciousness of the society through which it can stimulate communities within the society to link together past and present in the perspective of the future, and to identify themselves with indispensable structural changes and calling forth others appropriate to their particular socio-cultural context’ (van Mensch 1994:60-61).

## **Civic centres, the hearts of ancient cities - The Ancient Athenian Agora: site and museum**

### **MUSEUM HISTORY**

For many classical archaeologists, the discovery of the agora of a Greek or Roman city would certainly satisfy some of their primary goals of scientific research by providing tangible archaeological evidence for the understanding of how various social and political institutions, commerce, art, technology and cults functioned within that particular city (Camp 1992:14). With this rationale, the excavators of the Ancient Athenian Agora attested that the Athenian Agora and its discovery acquired an even more special importance in comparison to other civic centres [**Plate 100; Figures 22-23**]. They based their argument on the fact that most of the ancient Greek literary sources were Athenian in origin and thus provided a notable opportunity to shed unique light on the Agora and its buildings<sup>28</sup> (Camp 1992:15).

In addition, the Athenian Agora has served as the spatial and intellectual setting for many significant events and processes of Greek history, with the most celebrated one being the political institution of democracy to which we return when looking for the origins of Western culture. It would be in the Agora where the Athenian citizen could shape his public life and participate in the spectacular rise of artistic and intellectual



standards which preconditioned the development of the human mind and had a lasting impact on European culture (see Coulson 1993:5; Renfrew 1992:7; Travlos 1987:10). The following quotation by the current American resident director of the Agora excavations, John Camp II, outlines these beliefs and depicts them in the most glittering colours:

‘Nowhere is this remarkable history more richly illustrated than in the Agora. Within the great open square monuments were set up to commemorate her triumphs, along its edges were the civic buildings for the administration of her democracy, while beyond its borders crowded the houses and workshops of those who made Athens the foremost city of Greece. The archaeological exploration of the Agora of Athens has thus led to a greater understanding not just of a single site but of all aspects of Classical Greek civilisation’ (Camp 1992:18).

Research on the site started after the independence of Greece (1831) and the establishment of Athens as the capital of the modern Greek state (1834), but was of limited scale<sup>29</sup>. It was only after 1922, when a great influx of refugees from Asia Minor to Athens in search of a new land and home obliged the Greek government to take immediate action and decide to allot the area either for redevelopment or large-scale excavations (Camp 1990:35-37; Meritt 1984; Morris 1994b:34-35). However, the Greek state was then going through a serious crisis and its official archaeological institutions (Archaeological Service and Society) had not had the necessary means for the expropriation of the land<sup>30</sup> and the operation of extensive excavations<sup>31</sup>.

The American School of Classical Studies was then the only foreign school to be able to undertake the responsibilities of expropriation and excavation, having the financial backing of \$250,000 from John D. Rockefeller Jr. The excavations commenced in 1931, under Theodore Leslie Shear’s direction (Meritt 1984:175-202). Today, the research in Agora, which involved millions of dollars<sup>32</sup> and hundreds of people, is considered as ‘one of the great triumphs of urban archaeology of recent years’ (Renfrew 1992:7). It has brought to light remains from all periods of the city’s history, from Neolithic times to the present, whereas all the major buildings of various functions (administrative, legislative, judicial, commercial, social, and religious) of the Agora have been explored (see Camp 1990; 1992; Travlos 1971:1-27). The Agora excavations generated a wealth of material which, apart from the architectural remains, amounts to some one hundred and eighty thousand unearthed objects, forty books and four hundred published articles

written by some one hundred and ten different people (Camp 1992:9). In response to these achievements and also to the ideological dimensions of this archaeological enterprise, Morris suggested that 'the Agora excavation raised Hellenist archaeology and the professionalisation of the American School to new heights' (Morris 1994b:34-35).

The American School of Classical Studies, along with its commitment to the excavation project, was also responsible for the erection of a site museum and for the landscape management of the whole area under investigation. In 1946, the School had a special permit from the Greek government -not forgetting that Greece was then sorely tried by a civil war-, and began investigation in the site that had been chosen for the erection of the museum. However, the area west of the Aeropagus, was soon to be proved inappropriate due to the high density of important antiquities discovered underneath<sup>33</sup> (Camp 1990:130-135; 1992:172-175; Meritt 1984:175-202).

In 1949, after unsuccessful attempts to purpose build a museum [Figures 25-33] on the site due to the high density of antiquities found everywhere below ground, the School decided, with the approval of the Greek authorities, on the reconstruction of the Stoa of Attalos II which was located in the east edge of the Agora [Plates 101-105; Figure 24]. The building dated from the second-century BC and was built by Attalos II who ruled Pergamon from 159-138 BC. The decision to make available through restoration the largest and finest example of a stoa which would serve as a museum, storage and workplace arose as 'a terrific challenge' and 'the most monumental and daring undertaking to which the School had ever committed itself' (Meritt 1984:178, 182). This particular choice was based on the fact that the monument was the most impressive of the buildings of the second-century BC, with large spaces and sufficient original pieces remaining to ensure an accurate reconstruction<sup>34</sup>.

The building was reconstructed between 1952 and 1956 and on 3 September 1956 was dedicated to the Greek state for use as the Agora Museum<sup>35</sup>.

The systematic landscape development of the Athenian Agora [Figure 34] was also pioneer for that period (Camp 1990:37; Griswold 1953; Meritt 1984:188-190; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:326-335). In 1953, a prominent American landscape



architect, Ralph Griswold, was appointed with the task of transforming the whole site into a kind of archaeological park thus enhancing its historical significance<sup>36</sup>.

In June 1957, the Greek Archaeological Service took over the responsibility for the administration and safeguarding of both site and museum, whereas the American School retained control of the study collections and the excavation records.

#### MUSEUM MATERIAL

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the idea of erecting a purpose built museum for the site of Agora preceded the final reconstruction of Attalos Stoa [Figures 25-34]. In fact, there have been some architectural projects that, in the case of actual realisation, would have provided an early post-war example of museum architecture in Greece, carefully complying with the standards required by modern museography. However, they all remained on paper. The material wealth from the excavations of Agora eventually found shelter in the reconstructed Stoa of Attalos II which: ‘stand as a contribution of first rank to classical scholarship and as an expression of American friendship for Greece’ (Meritt 1984:63) [Figure 24].

To be able to fully comprehend the architectural profile and script of the building as well as the magnitude of its symbolism and dynamism as a cultural artefact *per se*, we should recollect what the museum theorists argue about the ritual character, setting and scenarios that art museums shape and express (also in Chapter Four).

Their argument develops from the realm of anthropology and sociology. It contends that although the museum is supposed to be a secular institution conveying ‘objective’ knowledge and preserving the community’s official cultural memory, in essence it is an excellent example of microcosms of rituals and values (Duncan 1995:8; see also Duncan & Wallace 1980). Museums resemble older ceremonial monuments, such as the Greco-Roman temples and treasuries, for they borrow certain of their architectural physical properties such as spaces of public ritual, long corridors and large halls for communal gatherings (Duncan 1995:10). Additionally, they enact and perform ritualised acts and offer ritual scenarios in the form of historical sequential narratives (Duncan 1995:12). Their enduring power emanates from their ability to create a sense

of enlightenment, of spiritual nourishment and restoration. They also invigorate by satisfying the age-old human yearning to communicate with immortal spirits and longing to contact an idealised past in order to vanquish or deny the inevitable fact of death (Duncan 1995:17). Their valuable observations originate from museum prototypes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which exalted classical scholarship to unprecedented heights as the *sine qua non* of western culture.

If all these postulates represent a group of universal survey museums that were created *in imitatio* of classical prototypes, they are all the more pertinent in the case of the Agora Museum which is not a glorious '*analogue*' of older forms but a concrete resurrection from an authentic ancient '*self*'.

The original building [Plate 103], which represents the fullest development of the architectural type of stoa, was a large colonnaded edifice of marble and limestone, measuring over 115m long by 2m wide, and rising to two storeys. There was a double colonnade downstairs with twenty-one rooms (shops) behind, and the same arrangement was repeated on the floor above (Camp 1990:130-135; 1992:172-175). The Stoa of Attalos, like the modern museum, was originally designed and constructed for the specific purpose of human contact and dialogue (Travlos 1987:10). The reconstruction<sup>37</sup> has been carried out in the same materials as the original, along with a fair amount of original pieces for didactic purposes. It offers visitors the ability to sense for themselves the effects of light, shadow, space, and air in an ancient stoa (Camp 1990:134-5; 1992:175; Thompson 1957:106).

However, the enthusiasm for the resurrection of the ancient monument was not unanimous. The exponents of the project (American archaeologists, architects and many Greek politicians) defended the undertaking on the grounds that the restored stoa in physical terms would once again delimit and define the Agora whereas in ideological terms it would serve as a symbol of democracy and as a dedication to the voice of freedom, both being common ideals between ancient and modern Greece and USA (American School of Classical Studies at Athens 1954:28-29; Thompson in *To Vima* 4/9/56:3-4; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:242-245). The opponents (state architects, archaeologists and left wing partisans) spoke for the presence of a 'counterfeit ancient building' (Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:217, 238, 245) and expressed their remorse for the scale, the methods, the accuracy and the motives of the reconstruction. They argued



that the restored building would compete for attention with the remaining monuments of the site and the Acropolis by its scale and whiteness of its exterior facades, and thus would forge a sort of 'positivist archaeological fallacy' by implying that the observable is by definition the significant and deserves to be historicised at the expense of the real original edifice and the other ancient monuments of the site (see *To Vima* 4/9/56; 9/9/56; *I Aygi* 17/9/58; cf:Snodgrass 1983:142). On an ideological<sup>38</sup> level, they discerned in the reconstructed stoa the reinforcement of the dominant state ideology and the rhetoric of western (American) imperialism and capitalism which was exemplified by the personification of American dollar donors of the museum as modern analogues of Hellenistic rulers (in the specific case Attalos II of Pergamos).

#### EXHIBITION MATERIAL

The Athenian Agora Museum houses all the finds from the excavations conducted on the site since 1931. From the one hundred and eighty thousand artefacts, less than two thousand are on display<sup>39</sup>, due to the lack of adequate exhibition space and possibly the unsuitability of the objects for public display (see Thompson 1957:106).

The representative selection of the finds for public display constitutes a unique assemblage of evidence for the study of the mechanics of public life in the ancient city state (see Camp 1990:191-272). In recent years, these didactic dimensions of the collections have been further enhanced by means of regular educational programmes organised and run by the Greek Ministry of Culture (Centre of Educational Programmes) for school groups<sup>40</sup>.

In the exhibition areas, there has been also care for the provision of informative secondary material whose quantity is surprising if one considers that the exhibition has been put together in the 1950s and since then has remained generally unaltered.

On the ground floor [Figure 24], from the twenty one original shops (Camp 1990:215-272), three at the south and one at the north end have been restored to their original form, whereas ten shops have been thrown together to form a continuous museum gallery.

The first room from the south is fitted out as a 'museum of the Stoa' or memorial room displaying three bronze plaques on the back wall commemorating the excavation of the Agora, the rebuilding of the Stoa of Attalos and the landscaping of the area (Camp 1990:130-135; 1992:172-175; Thompson 1957:104) [Plates 106-107]. In another room/shop, there is a representative collection of ancient wine amphoras (Camp 1990:216-219) that intends to briefly narrate the history of wine trade which has become the best documented chapter in the history of ancient commerce [Plate 108].

The main exhibition gallery runs in chronological order, beginning at the south entrance with the Neolithic and finishing at the north exit with the Ottoman period [Plates 109-113]. In general, the display emphasises chronology, typology, styles and wares. The great bulk of the displays dates to the classical period (5th-4th centuries BC) and is appraised as a 'valuable supplement to the ancient authors' (Camp 1990:238). These artefacts, as they are unique to the Agora, make up the most important part of the museum collection by illustrating civic life, legislation, administration, the judiciary, finance, war memorials, etc.

In general, the arrangement of the exhibition, apart from being linear and chronological, is to a considerable degree theme-oriented, a solution that is also imposed by the nature of the finds with their historical and associative rather than aesthetic values. In addition, there is a general evocative impression in the exhibition, originating from the artefacts themselves rather than from particular museographical solutions and dramatic scenographies. Indeed, objects such as infants' burials and grave offerings, everyday life, household, shopping lists and private messages inscribed or painted on sherds bring the visitors closer and to allow them to be more intimate with the ancient Athenian and his/her life and mind.

Besides, let us not forget what Anthony Snodgrass reassured in 1983: 'nowhere are the distinctive assets and liabilities of archaeology as a source shown up so conspicuously as in Greek and Roman history' (Snodgrass 1983:137).

However, the relationship between written texts and artefacts and their respective values as sources of evidence for the ancient world is still not clearly defined. In the past, archaeology has been underrated as the 'handmaid of history' (see T.J.Dunbabin in Arafat 1990:45). Prominent historians, such as Paul Cartledge, challenged the



significance of archaeological evidence at various levels by suggesting that: 'from archaeological evidence alone we may infer much about material techniques, a considerable amount about patterns of subsistence and utilisation of the environment, far less about social and political events, and least of all about mental structures, religious and other "spiritual" ideas and beliefs' (1979:9).

Traditional historical archaeologists frequently reinforced this interface of dependency by preferring narrative to analysis, by seeking to equate their archaeological discoveries with certain historical events and by effect making them speak in the guise of traditional historical language (Snodgrass 1983:144; 1985b:194-195).

In the present case, the existing extensive literary tradition specifically mentioning the Athenian Agora and its monuments shed unique light on the archaeology and topography of the site. The precise recording of stratigraphy and the material found in each layer has also allowed a detailed unravelling of the complicated architectural history of the Agora. The excavations in Agora have produced such an abundance of datable material that the basic chronology of Greek and Roman pottery follows the classification developed in Athens.

However, the archaeology of the Athenian Agora, due to this generated wealth of material, has been mainly artefactual and art-historical oriented (especially as regards fine pottery, trade pottery and lamps chronology and stylistic analysis): 'masking [thus] the need for any more explicitly theoretical approaches to the historical significance of the evidence' and the study of economic, social, cultural and demographic processes rather than historical events (Morris 1994b:34-35; cf:Snodgrass 1985b:194).

Regarding the exhibition of the Agora Museum and its philosophy, the excavated material has been conventionally used to supplement and illustrate the literature and history written by ancient authors, already known, albeit generally just implied in the conceptual space of the Agora museum exhibition (see picture book *The Athenian Citizen* 1960; Camp 1990:238). The common disposition to relate archaeological artefacts with certain historical events or personalities can be also observed in several cases as in the material that is supposed to be associated with Socrates' life and death<sup>41</sup>.

Nonetheless, the presentation of the past as a historical narrative stands as one of the most common ways of explaining man's history and the general public naturally prefers

it to a series of fragmented archaeological observations (see also Pearce 1992:206; Snodgrass 1985b:207).

#### MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

The Museum of Agora came into being in an era when Greece, after a World and Civil war, was in the process of social redevelopment and economic recovery as those were both indulged and confined by the pro-western ideological predisposition of the Truman Doctrine and the American financial backing of the Marshall Plan thanks to which the excavations of Agora and its museum variously benefited. Greece became thus a centre of world competition during the Cold War era and the Agora site, museum and material collections have been closely associated with what Artemis Leontis identified as 'capitalist neo-colonialist strategy' and Morris called as 'continentalist archaeology' (see Leontis 1991:4; Morris 1994b:11 respectively).

Parallel to this, just before and soon after the World War II, meaning the early period of the American excavations and (re-)creation of the Agora Museum, there had been a major effort on the part of Greek modernist intellectuals to redefine questions of national identity and tradition in order to surmount the political, cultural and geographical marginalisation of Neohellenism in western Europe (Tziovas 1989; cf: Leontis 1991:19). Thus, they aspired to distinguish 'Greek Hellenism' (or 'Greekness') from 'European Hellenism' by reinforcing the transcendent values of the former and highlighting its strategic role in western civilisation (Leontis 1991:x, 20; Tziovas 1989:51-53). Within this ideological spectrum of the early post-war era, 'every excavation and expropriation of land added to the image of Athens as a frozen point of departure for "Western civilisation"' (Morris 1994b:11). For Greek state officials<sup>42</sup>, the site and its museum represented a diachronic paragon as valuable and significant as 'a text of Platonic philosophy, an abstract from the Bible, a school or a church'. For those reasons, the Greek state expressed its immeasurable gratitude to the American School researchers who resurrected the site and thus contributed decisively to the revival of the birthplace of democracy and by extension to the protection of universal freedom, justice and solidarity.



In the course of the following decades, shifts in the cultural-epistemic and social level with the rise of post-modernism, the rejection of tradition and the increasing awareness about issues of gender as well as a general discharge of colonialist, racist, Eurocentric assumptions and the recent dissolution of the Cold War confrontation in the political sphere, effected the discourse of Hellenism (see also Chapter Three). In essence, they questioned its Hellenocentric and, by extension, Eurocentric idealisation by suggesting other global cross-cultural impulses and surrogates (see Morris 1994b:43; Renfrew 1994:157-158). The political and intellectual model and legacy<sup>43</sup> of Athenian classical democracy as well as the history of Athens and by extension the institutions or artefacts that conceptually and materially signify and represent them (i.e. the Museum of Agora and its collections), have been at the centre of this epistemic debate that recently gathered momentum with the celebrations of the 2500th anniversary<sup>44</sup> of the birth of democracy in Ancient Athens.

The objectors to classical democracy challenged the Athenian 'miracle' upon such issues as women's exclusion from the political citizenship, slavery and imperial ideology, although as Ober rightly points out: 'we would be indulging in absurdly anachronistic complacency if we were to refuse to learn from the Athenian experience of democracy on the grounds that their value system is at odds with that of the modern Western world' (Ascherson 1994; Fowler 1994; cf:Ober 1993:2).

The commemorations consisted of various travelling exhibitions to the USA [Plates 288-290] and Britain [Plate 291], and also archaeological and historical conferences<sup>45</sup> in Greece, USA and Britain on the theme of Athenian classical democracy and its archaeology and history in relation to issues of citizenship, freedom, equality, law and education, finance and ritual. The exhibitions<sup>46</sup>, organised with the collaboration of the Greek state, were put together largely from artefacts discovered in the Agora and housed in the Agora Museum whose social contribution, scientific impetus, historical *raison d'être* and political signification expanded thus beyond the geographical boundaries and ideological latitude of the particular site, city and country. The exhibitions intended, apart from a mere recycling of political messages regarding the long-standing ties that exist between Greece and the West (specially USA)<sup>47</sup>, to illustrate and tell the story of the development of democracy in Athens (Coulson

1993:5). Most significantly, they aimed, by means of tangible archaeological artefacts, to encourage citizens to forge a connection both with the citizens of Athens, and with those who were denied the status of citizenship, and in this respect to think seriously about the meaning of democracy and to help them refine their own understanding of the historical status and the future of democracy as a way of government and as a way of life (Ober 1993:3).

#### ‘ALTERNATIVE READINGS’

As mentioned earlier in Chapter Two, Hellenists have encountered outside their traditional disciplines (i.e. classics, iconology) the contributions of anthropology and semiotics in order to approach ancient civilisation, examine the social construction of reality of classical Athens and reveal the ways it functioned.

Specifically in relation to the Athenian democracy and the understanding of its discourse, which is closely associated with the material culture of the Agora Museum, Robin Osborne investigates it within a wider intellectual spectrum, based on the argument that the: ‘invention of democracy in Athens involved a significant increase in the extent to which the life of the Athenian citizen was ritualised’ and that in effect Athenian political activity was essentially secondary to religious activity by constructing ritual roles which all citizens not only could but were expected to follow (Osborne 1994b:2,4). This ritualisation extended into the whole range of public life, so much so that in order to: ‘be a good citizen and achiev[e] any success in public life depended on demonstrating a degree of mastery over the schemes and strategies of ritualisation’ (Osborne 1994b:7). Sequentially, this ritualisation of public life segregated and differentiated the individual’s public and political from his private and social identity, and thus provided the mechanisms for the differentiation of life of other excluded social groups (i.e. women, children and slaves).

In essence, Osborne proposes an interpretative scheme that aims to stimulate a new regard for Athenian institutions and by extension of material culture that relates to them (1994b:20). He approaches Athenian procedures and practices from a rationale that centres around the dignified:efficient::ritual:secular::public:private aspects of Athenian



society (see Osborne 1994b:2). He takes these binary oppositions further and correlates them with other mental and social splits such as state:individual, collective self:individual self, political:social, public rationality:private irrationality, ritual:profane, glorified:ordinary, dignified competition in public (e.g.. athletic games, dramatic events at festivals):violent competition in private, or state funeral ideology and practice:private funeral ideology and practice, etc. His most pertinent point is that: 'both dignified and efficient, both rational and irrational, can be found in all areas of public and private life at Athens, but that the efficient and rational depend upon and are mutually implicated in the dignified and irrational' (Osborne 1994b:3; see also Coleman & Elsner 1995:13-15).

Along with this alternative possibility of approaching the Athenian society and its material culture, there is also an analogous interplay of the notions of ritual:profane::public:individual, reinforced through and by the museum institution both as an architectural script and as a signifier of state ideology (see discussion further above). Thus, an investigation into the anthropology of ritual, associated both with the realm of Athenian archaeology and museum philosophy, could potentially finely reveal the manifold conceptual values of the Agora site and its museum and render them more pertinent for specialists and the general public.

## **Ancient Cemeteries and the Greek discourse of death - Kerameikos: Site and museum.**

### **MUSEUM HISTORY AND MATERIAL**

The ancient district of Kerameikos [Plates 114-115; Figure 35], an ideal location for potters and smiths by the banks of Eridanos stream, was situated on the north-west boundaries of the old city of Athens<sup>48</sup>. Here all the major roads from Piraeus, Eleusis and Boeotia converged, so that most ancient travellers entered the city by this way. In 479/8 BC, Kerameikos was divided by the City Walls, into two parts: inner and outer Kerameikos. The ancient cemetery, the most important of Attica with burials already

from the 12th century BC, led outside the Walls and extended alongside the two principal adjoining roads. Two of the highlights of the necropolis were the *Demosio Sema*, which was the official burial area of the Athenian war dead, reserved for state tombs and cenotaphs of individuals or polyandreia for groups of battle heroes as well as the tomb of Spartans who were killed in the battle of Piraeus in 403BC. Furthermore, the so-called Street of the Tombs was a planned funerary avenue on either side of which the cemetery was divided into plots and distinct terraces reserved for wealthy citizens.

Excavations in the area were started in 1863 by Greek state archaeologists (Knigge 1990:166-167; Kokkou 1977:270-273). In 1913, the Greek government decided to concede the scientific rights of the site for excavation and publication to the German Archaeological Institute. The first phase of research (1913-1930) directed by A.Brückner and H.Knackfuss and later K.Kübler, brought to light impressive monuments such as the Pompeion. The second period of excavations, which began in 1956 and is still going on now, was directed by D.Öhly and later by F.Willemsen and U.Knigge. It focused on the expansion of the investigations in the site as well as the reinvestigation, conservation and landscape management of old excavated areas. Today, the archaeological site of Kerameikos, although continuously and systematically excavated and studied, still depicts only a small part of the original geography and topography of the district in antiquity.

The site museum of Kerameikos [Plates 116-117; Figure 36], although it belongs to the Greek State which is responsible for its administration, owes its existence and maintenance to occasional private funding from abroad. The museum, located on the top of the low hill in the south of the Street of the Tombs, was founded in 1936, thanks to financial help by Dr.Gustav Oberländer, a German-American silk-stockings manufacturer [Plate 118]. In 1963, it was extended with the financial support of the Boehringer Association. Finally, in the early 1990s, there has been an extra addition of a roof over the front of the building. However, the museum is still too small to properly accommodate the abundant valuable and important finds of the site. Therefore, there is an urgent need for its immediate expansion (see Knigge 1983; 1990).

The museum building is a very simple one storey structure designed by the German architect Hans Johannes (Knigge 1990:167; Kokkou 1977:272) [Figure 36].



As in other site museums which are located in very close proximity with ancient monuments (i.e. Museum of Acropolis), the architectural script of the Museum of Kerameikos, by its size and undistinguished facade, is clearly designed to be 'non-visible'. In effect, its function as a museum is to reveal itself only through its contents. The original function of the museum was to store and safeguard the portable finds of the excavations from theft and destruction by atmospheric pollution which is especially high in the area. Its secondary aim was to provide a specialised audience with a brief idea of the life in antiquity, of the specific finds and the scientific progress on pottery conservation (Knigge 1983).

The landscaping of the site, supervised by Judith Binder in the 1950s, involved the plantation of trees and bushes to mark the topography as well as the replacement of original grave stelai by authentic casts *in situ*. This programme of casting replicas, started in the 1970s, and, after a long interruption, continues today, again thanks to private financial help deriving this time from the Theodor Wiegand Society (French 1993-94:9).

#### EXHIBITION MATERIAL

The museum collections include a number of splendid archaic grave stelai, a unique collection of Athenian geometric pottery, as well as an extensive collection of other vases and grave goods dating from 1200 BC to the Roman era [Plates 119-121]. The secondary material is almost non-existent, despite the importance of the collections and their social archaeological, anthropological and also art-historical significance. The philosophy of the exhibition is the traditional one of connoisseurship which is used for the presentation of both sculpture and pottery. In the former displays, we can possibly detect Gisela Richter's legacy on the field of sculptural studies, particularly with her work on *Archaic Gravestones of Attica* (1961). As discussed in Chapter Two, her objective was to trace the evolution and chronology of a group of artefacts, and in this case of the Archaic Attic Gravestones, analyse them individually and then place them in their respective and stylistic framework. In the language of museum exhibitions, this formalistic methodology translates into linear and chronological displays which do not

postulate any further knowledge on the part of the visitors but their sheer power of observation and aesthetic judgement.

Similarly, the exhibition rationale regarding the comprehensive vase collection, with the pottery groups, are presented as monolithic entities. Apart from the descriptive aim in showing stylistic changes and development, occasional emphasis is put on the attribution of vases to hands and workshops, and the definition of personal styles.

Thus, throughout the entire exhibition, we trace a deficiency or most likely an original lack of intention to use the material culture as a means for the writing of a sort of social history. There is not a single mention of funerary ideology and mortuary practice, demographic data, gender divisions nor of 'religious' and 'social' explanations of rituals and of their complementary interrelations.

The exhibition clearly provides only a one-sided view of the ways burial material culture can be used to supply knowledge, meaning and social-cultural relevance to a wider audience than that of art-historians.

#### MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

The ancient site of Kerameikos holds a distinctive spatial-geographical affiliation as well as spiritual counter-relation to the neighbouring sites of Acropolis and Ancient Agora. The spatial connection is obvious, as all three sites belong to a continuous archaeological and historical zone. The importance of this archaeological and historical continuum is further enhanced by the presence of Byzantine, ottoman and traditional neo-classical architecture which is represented abundantly in the traditional and highly tourist districts of Plaka and Monastiraki as well as in the regrettably socially deprived district of Psiri. However, this unified ideal picture of Ancient, Byzantine and Neo-classical Athens has been ravaged under the modern urban-planning anarchy and the ecological desolation of the city. In the post-war period, there have been several studies for the unification of all these areas in a single archaeological 'park' or 'open-air museum' which was considered essential for the social, urban and ecological restoration or even survival of the city. Discussions for the realisation of this endeavour started afresh in 1993 and continue at a slow rate of progress<sup>49</sup>.



On a spiritual level, Kerameikos and the sites of Acropolis and Ancient Agora interact within an ideological framework of opposed interrelations. Kerameikos symbolises the universe of the dead, the memory and the consciousness of the past and reflects indirectly on the profile of social structure and mentality, whereas the other two sites represent the world of the living, the sacred as well as the worldly and profane. Those divisions, which exercise a perennial hegemony on the human mind and life, are reflected in the archaeology and material remains of the sites which thus acquire further metaphysical and social-anthropological signification, apart from their mere aesthetic vigour and historical integrity.

For some: 'Kerameikos is the only place in Athens where one can recapture the feel of ancient times, walking along the Street of the Tomb on the ancient street level and seeing the ancient monuments still standing in their original places (...) However, it is a neglected district of the modern town (...) It is rather a "grey zone" awaiting rehabilitation' (Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:144).

As regards its relation to the discourse of Hellenism, Kerameikos has not taken any propitious and venerated position and in effect has appealed overwhelmingly to the classicists, archaeologists and anthropologists but to a much lesser degree to the masses.

#### 'ALTERNATIVE READINGS'

Since Gordon Childe's era, there have been interesting and fertile efforts to employ the sociological tradition and methodology on burial archaeology (D'Agostino & Schnapp 1982:17). Funerary deposits are particularly significant, for they are products of premeditated behaviour and intentional acts which function as symbolic signifiers of social structure, social institutions and ideology.

In what follows, some of the alternative ways of studying, interpreting and by extension displaying ancient necropolises and their material culture will be briefly reviewed.

The first approach is social-cultural and contextual and places social and archaeological context in the forefront of any analysis (Whitley 1994:52). Its rationale develops around the belief that 'funerary practices belong to particular complex living social systems and

can only be understood as parts of these wholes' (Morris 1987:211). It investigates the interconnections between the production, use and deposition of artefacts, and by relating archaeological context to social context, it endeavours to raise questions about process and change in order to understand the evolution of specific societal formations and institutions (i.e. see Morris 1987 and his thesis to interpret the emergence of the city-state in the mid-eighth century BC by using this kind of processual thinking). Furthermore, this social archaeological overture attempts to reach an understanding of the social structure 'by studying all aspects of death rites as integrated parts of ritual statements about the actors' perceptions of the world' (Morris 1992:xiii). In this respect, it recognises that the analysis of burials equates with the analysis of certain symbolic and culturally-determined perceptions about social structure, ranking and exclusion, daily life, relation of the dead with the living, rites of passage etc.

Ian Morris suggests that the best methodology for investigating death in order to achieve the former research objectives is to 'build a simplifying model from prior probabilities, establishing which way the burden of proof lies, and then to examine it in the light of the evidence, modifying, adjusting or discarding the original hypothesis as necessary'<sup>50</sup> (Morris 1989:298-299). The recognisable evidence might include some or all of the following categories: verbal testimony; direct observation of funerary practices; study of non-verbal records via imagery or pottery iconology and study of the material remains of the funerary activities or else the complete archaeological record (Morris 1987:36). Then this evidence can be viewed in the light of five separate but also interconnecting axes that discuss typology, social change through time, comparison with other archaeological contexts (i.e. sanctuaries), spatial relationships between contexts of deposition (i.e. dead:living:: sacred:profane::men:women::adults:children, etc.) and finally demography referring to age and gender (Morris 1992:24-29). Last but not least is the cognisance that rites take both archaeologically visible and invisible forms. For instance, as Morris rightly remarks: 'textiles...and the noise of mourners were probably crucial aspects of ritual statements in at least some periods, but cannot be excavated' (Morris 1992:13). This potential 'positivist fallacy of archaeology' has immediate effects on museum collections and exhibitions which are anyway full of invisible objects (van Mensch 1986:39) due to a combination of 'historical sedimentation' and act of 'musealization' (Davallon 1986b:244). The application of the



former approach to mortuary material culture within the museum space would demand a different use of the primary archaeological and secondary supportive material to the one experienced in the Kerameikos Museum. It would result in a contextual and didactic type of exhibition by transferring the centre of attention to concepts rather than objects and focusing on process rather than chronology and art-historical narrative.

The second alternative way of encountering mortuary material culture is even more interdisciplinary and aims at the creation of an 'archaeology and anthropology of mind' and to the reconstruction of ancient mentalities. Its theoretical setting draws from a philosophical spectrum ranging widely from generalising psycho-anthropological and structuralist principles to working on reception and literary theories (see Zeitlin 1991; Sourvinou-Inwood 1995a). This approach is concerned with many different conceptual aspects of ancient society especially cult, rituals, image-making and figural representations. In relation to the material retrieved from tombs and necropolises, it does not only use it as a trace and duplicate of the society of the living in the universe of the dead, but also as a departure for understanding 'the society as a whole, in the sum of its practices, institutions, beliefs...and its position...in relation to death -that is during its existence in the present, in the image it forms of its past, and in its expectation of the future - in brief, in its traditions, its life and its survival' (Vernant 1982 in Zeitlin 1991:76). In essence, it is concerned with a kind of: 'a "politics" of death, which every social group must initiate and continue according to its own rules' (Vernant 1982 in Zeitlin 1991:77). Additionally and in relation to the theories of reader-oriented literary criticism, it endeavours to fulfil the ideal of reading ancient texts and mortuary images through ancient eyes rather than through our contemporary culturally determined perceptions and biases (see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995a).

In order to accomplish these ultimate quests of investigating and understanding the ancient Greek human mind and reading the Greek discourse of death via texts and images, it is essential to reconstruct the historical and social milieu within which this human mind operated. At this point, the anthropological-historical meets the previously discussed social-contextual and shares with it many of the research goals and much of the evidential material (i.e. literary and archaeological evidence, spatial relations of contexts, demographic patterns). The historical-anthropological and receptive theories discuss the Greek death discourse by focusing on subject matters such as: grave

monuments as metonymic signs of the deceased and of the deceased's social persona in the world of the living; grave monuments as forms of social communication and memorials to the dead; forms of grave monuments<sup>51</sup> and their meaning; the dimension of signification of the '*agalma type*' (beautiful *kouroi*, *korai*, but also *stelai*) metaphorically representing the now perished beauty of the deceased; grave monuments (specially depicting lions, sphinxes, etc.) and their polysemic dimension of protection towards the deceased; vase imagery and its symbolism in relation to the deceased's social persona; anthropology of social personae and schemata as 'beardless young athlete'; 'young warrior'; 'bearded mature man as warrior'; 'married woman' (*gyne*); 'parthenos' (marriageable girl associated with the ideal of beauty and religion); changing demographic socio-economic, political, and intellectual realities<sup>52</sup> and their effect on funerary behaviour and many others (see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995a:141-147, 217-224, 275, 413-444).

The vitality of this approach and thematology, especially as regards museum exhibitions, lies on its ability to formulate abundant possibilities for dynamic and creative interpretations and reinterpretations of the mortuary material objects by the same or different viewers. It lies in the personal meeting between the object and the mind of the viewer (see Pearce 1992:219) which is anyway the key function of museum communication. It has the potential to generate exciting, both object- and concept-oriented exhibitions which provide encouragement for multiple dimensions of analysis and personal decoding and do not require previous specialised knowledge but rather a reflective, intuitive, restless human mind as regards such existential and timeless matters as those of life and death.

## Conclusions

In this chapter, site presentation and related museum exhibiting in a theoretical manner has been pursued to more clearly realise the diverse messages, values and intricacies that such places denote, more than any other category of museum institutions.

Maroevic, defining this museological particularity more explicitly, makes a distinction between the museum and the museological message. For him, the museum message is



formulated and expressed within the museum as the most common form of a museological institution, therefore it is connected to the museum as a system. On the other hand, the museological message is an elaborate version of the museum message. It is the: 'interpreted or spontaneous message of an archaeological site, a ruin, a historic building or a historic town, produced by using museographical aids and appliances, and has the meaning of a museological message as well as of the message created in the museum' (1995:30; for a similar interpretation see Bourdin 1986). The museological message springs from a combined interpretation that is based on the different values that heritage monuments entail.

In a like vein, Lipe (1984) talks about the acquired conceptual characteristics and values<sup>53</sup> of ancient sites and ranks them into four distinctive areas: aesthetic/artistic, associative/symbolic, historical/informational and economic/utilitarian values.

The first and the third set of values are straightforward. The aesthetic value might be conditioned by the changing systems and standards of individual or generally popular aesthetic valuation, whereas the historic or informational value obviously has to do with the formal safeguarding and promotion of the archaeological database.

The symbolic value, that can operate in a personal/individual or communal/national level, emanates from the secondary function of the monuments (the first refers to the original function of the site as sanctuary, necropolis, etc.) and their semantic and mental associations (see Eco 1987; Schnapp 1993:3). It derives from their ability to serve as tangible authentic relics and mnemonics of the past and also their ability to raise related emotional experiences to contemporary viewers<sup>54</sup>. What Eco points out regarding the importance of individual experience and symbolism is very much true and is worth quoting at some length:

'The ruins of the Greek[s] and Roman[s] [are seen] in terms of their secondary functions, in the light of notions like "paganism" and "classicism" [and we can add here the complex discourse of "Hellenism"] and the expression of a particular sense of harmony, rhythm, and monumentality (...) What is left is a series of connotations established by history and "carried" by the monument. We recognise these connotations in the monument because we are educated to the same symbolism. With its voracious vitality, history robs architecture of its meaning and endows it with new meaning. Some massive forms that have lost all original capacity to communicate, (...) now appear to be enormous messages, over



complex in relation to the actual information they can communicate to us. But they may spur us to find new meanings instead' (Eco 1987:298).

Similarly, Shanks accents the significance of this affective encounter with the past:

'The experience of heritage is about encounter and images. Not the objects and sites themselves so much as what they say of *us*, of national or local identity, what they symbolise and evoke. These are not primarily cognitive experiences where facts and knowledge about the past are acquired from the official learned guide book. They are affective. And like the disorder of memory, heritage is piecemeal (...) The power of heritage is that it is about signification - things meaning *for* what we are now' (Shanks 1992:106-108).

On a national or even supra-national level, the symbolic associations of an ancient national or global heritage site may also be politically recycled by potently fostering notions of cultural continuity, lineage and tradition, origin, identity, belonging and nationhood. It is where nationalism meets archaeology and vice versa. To this extent, archaeologists excavate, uncover and study glorious sites of the past in order to be able to reconstruct a past civilisation and relate it to later periods and the present by means of scientific dating. Hence, as Smith observes: 'in dating relics of past epochs, the archaeologist locates a community in its historic time, and in that sense provides a symbolic and cognitive basis of foundation for that community... and [also] reconstructs the modern community by altering its temporal perspective and self-view' (1995:14). In like manner, nationalists operate as 'social and political archaeologists whose activities consist of the rediscovery and reinterpretation of the ethnic past and through it the regeneration of their national community' (Smith 1995a:3)<sup>55</sup>.

Finally, it is hardly disputable that since early times archaeological sites have entered the market place of valued commodities and have become economically evaluated and recycled through networks of mass cultural tourism [Plates 122-123] and modern pilgrimage<sup>56</sup> (Lipe 1984; see also Boniface and Fowler 1993; Evans-Pritchard 1993:12; Horne 1984; 1992).

In relation to our specific case-studies in the Greek classical lands, this set of interconnected values can be alternatively epitomised under the single term of '*heterotopia*'<sup>57</sup> extensively used by Artemis Leontis (1991) in her study on the *Territories of Hellenism*. Leontis presents the politically and geographically circumscribed space of modern Greece with its ancient history as a counter-site to



European cities. She refers to it as an 'heterotopia', a real place 'of another order' that confirms, yet also counteracts the modern western hegemonic self-image and desire to find places of origin beyond its actual politically designated territory.

Thus, the numerous archaeological sites of classical antiquity and their site museums, which form spaces for the self-representation of both Western Civilisation and contemporary Greece as well as tourist attractions for European cultural travellers, are these 'heterotopias' of Hellas (Leontis 1991:181). Occasionally, however, and only by force of specific ideological predisposition within Greece, such as of those proposed by modernists in the Cold war era, the classical sites can be transmuted from 'heterotopias' to '*entopias*' that, in contrast with the former ones, recall mostly native and indigenous aesthetics and principles and support a national artistic tradition and nationalist state policy (Leontis 1991:28).

# THE PRODUCTION OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY ON THE PERIPHERY OF THE HELLENIC HEARTLAND. REGIONAL MUSEUMS

‘All our Provincial Museums are in a state of interim and abandonment’.

L.Savvidi, in *To Vima*, 6/10/57, 1, 6.

‘The abundance of excavations conducted over the last years and the fast developing field of museology urge [the competent authorities of the country] towards the general re-organisation of our museums, so that these will be able to satisfy current demands. The creation of regional museums will not only contribute to the development of tourism in the Greek provinces but equally to the raising of the cultural level of people in those lands’.

Anonymous, in *To Vima*, 8/7/59, 2.

‘So far we have not had any great Peripheral museums (...) Every large region will eventually have its own Peripheral Museum (...)’

Y.Tzedakis as quoted in E.Hatzioannou, in *To Vima*, 25/1/87, 55.

## Introduction

In Greece, concerns and care for the establishment of peripheral archaeological museums date back to 1834 with the implementation of the first national archaeological



decree. The first purpose built regional museum was erected in the town of Sparta (Peloponnese) in 1874-1876 (Kokkou 1977:304-312). Henceforth and alongside the gradual and final delineation of the Greek territories completed in 1948, the creation of new regional museums around the country proceeded at an expeditious pace and gathered momentum in the post-war<sup>1</sup> period (see Chapter One).

In 1931, the new term *Μουσείον Πόλεως* [City Museum] appeared in the archaeological legislation of the country, thus reflecting intentions to concur with fresh cultural and museological requisites, experiences and manners. The *Μουσείον Πόλεως* was defined as an institution of spiritual and cultural elevation which would display archaeological treasures in spacious purpose-built edifices and additionally care for the accommodation of various other activities and provisions (e.g. public library, study-rooms, conference hall, etc.)<sup>2</sup>.

Despite the large number of archaeological museums around Greece and the initially promising intentions of government and archaeology officials to produce a comprehensive model for the Greek City Museum, the actual museum reality has far from satisfied those original aims and objectives. According to a study which was conducted by the Greek archaeognostic journal *Hóroc* regarding the Greek Peripheral Museum, the majority of those institutions appear as micrographies of the National Archaeological Museum in terms of display strategies and philosophy (Tsaravopoulos 1983; 1985). This research aimed to pinpoint the reasons on account of which peripheral museums fell short of fulfilling their social role. It made sharp critiques of the monolithic character of regional museums as passive repositories of treasures as well as of the monotony and sameness of the archaeological display philosophy around the country. Additionally, it focused on the inadequacies and weaknesses that sprang from the centralised archaeological administration of the country and how these controlled the actual performance of peripheral museums. Further, it again stressed the present need to outline a comprehensive national museum policy. Other points raised in this report referred to a geographically uneven distribution of museums around the Greek provinces, an unsatisfactory and old fashioned museum architecture, and last but not least the tremendous impact of numerous post-war rescue excavations<sup>3</sup> upon the establishment and functions of the peripheral museum. Hence, regional museums, enriched constantly with new artefacts coming from the ongoing excavations, faced the

far-reaching repercussions of an archaeological system and legislation that acknowledged as a pressing priority the allocation of time and resources to the enterprise of rescue excavations. *Hóroc* offers some interesting statistics which recount that 16% of the displays in the peripheral museums remain as they were in 1960, 34% of the exhibitions are re-displays of the period 1960-1969, 22% of the period 1970-1979, and 28% of the period 1980 onwards (Tsaravopoulos 1985:158-159).

For this matter<sup>4</sup>, Anthony Snodgrass remarked in his book *An Archaeology of Greece; the Present State and future scope of a discipline* (1987; see also see Zapheirpoulou-Mitropoulou 1987:170-171) that:

‘the historically conscious visitor to Greece today is rightly impressed by the steady increase in the number of local museums and in the quality of exhibition. What he or she may not appreciate is that what is actually displayed is merely the beautiful tip of an unsightly iceberg. Almost every museum in Greece is compelled to conceal in its storerooms a mass, growing year by year at an alarming pace of material unsuited to exhibition, which is often unpublished and sometimes destined to remain so’ (1987:98).

To this line of observation, one can add the largely blurred social role of the peripheral museum and the frail relationship with its local public. In this respect, it is not uncommon to encounter incidents of neglect and disdain on the part of Greek citizens towards field and museum archaeology. This clash of interests, which has arisen between government agency and majority public opinion, comes either as a reaction against the bureaucratic mechanisms of the archaeological system that affect everyday life or as a result of lack of proper education on matters of culture, of historical consciousness and of links with the past and its material heritage, or even both.

With this set of remarks in mind, this Chapter proposes to discuss various issues involved with the actual and potential production of archaeological experience and historical knowledge in regional museums.

Greece [Figure 1] consists of various geographical areas and the regional disparities are still a major problem for the even development of the country (Commission of the European Communities 1990). Nonetheless, each one of these lands, with its particular socio-politico-economic features<sup>5</sup>, has provided its own contribution to Greek history



throughout the ages: 'Ancient and modern political boundaries and natural features dissect Greece and the islands into various units of analysis' (Kardulias 1994b:xx). These units are Peloponnese, Central Greece -including Thessaly, Akarnania, Boeotia, Attica and Epirus-, Macedonia, Thrace and the Aegean islands, themselves presenting unique insular settings which one can examine as distinct regions.

In this Chapter, material will be drawn from six regional museums. Overall, they cover several geographical units of the country, excluding the southern parts of Greece (Peloponnese, Crete, Dodecanese), the western islands of the Ionian Sea and the geographical 'core' of Attica. This intentional exclusion is either because these regions do not comprise interesting museological examples with potential to contribute and add useful points to the discussion, or because they have been fairly well covered previously when studying archaeological sites and museums of the Greek classical lands (see Chapters Five and Six), or indeed because the great bulk of their collections represents other periods and cultures (i.e. Cretan Minoan material culture).

In the course of the analysis, the intention will be to approach regional museums and their exhibitions from various interconnected angles and place necessary emphasis on all the factors that may intermingle with the existence, the character and the performance of those institutions. The aims are:

- 1) to examine the impact of post-war urbanisation<sup>6</sup>, expansion of rescue archaeology, heritage management and a growing tourist industry<sup>7</sup> on the actual field and museum archaeology theory and practice as appears in the various geographical peripheries of the country;
- 2) to view the specific Greek peripheral museums and their scientific and social identity within the spectrum of the centralist ideology of the modern Greek State and also within the broader socio-historical and geopolitical context of the regions wherein they exist;
- 3) in essence, this subject of inquiry is potentially much broader both in terms of space and time. So, in addition, we shall attempt to discuss the archaeological collections and the institutional roles of the case-studies, as these develop at present, through a core-periphery<sup>8</sup> that works at various levels of interaction. To put it more clearly, we shall reflect on the formation of relations between a certain core and certain

peripheries, by expanding the thinking across time and more precisely to the classical past. This will be in order to assess whether or not, and if yes, how these relations overtly or subtly affect the present archaeological interpretations, exhibition philosophies and narratives of the peripheral museums under study. However: ‘what is a periphery in one system can be a core in another’ (Cuncliffe 1993:53) and the: ‘nature of [] a centre, and where exactly it is to be located, is not a simple matter of fact and physical location, but of attitude and perception’ (Ucko 1989a:xii-xvi). So, for the interest of this study, inquiries can be addressed to the relationships between the Athenian city-state of the classical past and various geographical places or *ethnoi*, wherein the museum case-studies are to be located today, but which in the past came under the influence and control of the Athenian core and its cultural hegemony (i.e. Macedonia before the times of Philip II and Alexander the Great, Thrace, Northern Aegean). Other interactions could be between the Hellenic world as the core of the classical past, i.e. the Graeco-Macedonian centre (or European ‘Us’ of the present) and the non-Hellenic, Hellenized and Oriental peripheries of the classical past (or the European ‘Other’ of the present).

- 4) At the end of this chapter, some thoughts will be articulated as to how regional museums can put on displays and articulate messages that are socially and culturally more potent for the local communities whom they are expected to serve.

## **Macedonia and the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki**

### **MUSEUM HISTORY AND MATERIAL**

In 1985, Thessaloniki celebrated twenty-three centuries of continuous history. The archaeological sources, however, suggest that its history spans at least two thousand five hundred years before its founding in 315 BC (Tsimbidou-Avloniti 1988:99-100).

In 1913, most of ancient Macedonia was re-incorporated into modern Greece and so was Thessaloniki after centuries of Ottoman rule (since 1387). Today, Macedonia is the largest and most fertile area of modern Greece whereas Thessaloniki, capital of



Macedonia, is the second city of the country; it possesses its own cabinet-level Minister, the Minister for Northern Greece (and Western Thrace). This peculiarity in the current organisation of the Greek government indicates Macedonia's historical, political, economic and cultural importance, alongside its important strategic and sensitive character in the relationships both with the Athens-dominated government in the south and the non-Hellenic neighbours in the north (Borza 1990:5-8)<sup>9</sup>.

Macedonia, in contrast to the legendary and glorious Bronze Age and Classical archaeological sites of the Hellenic south, had not originally attracted intense interest in archaeological research for a number of reasons [Plate 136]. Today, the explosion of systematic and rescue excavations in the region alongside their outstanding results both in terms of wealth and quality of unearthed material and in terms of accumulated knowledge dramatically changed the state of archaeological affairs and historical research in Macedonia (Andronikos 1988:66). The days are long-gone when the archaeological collections of the region were piled up in a store-like manner, without classification or chronological order in historic buildings of the city<sup>10</sup> (Kordomenidis 1982:3-18).

State decisions about the erection of the first purpose built archaeological museum in Thessaloniki were originally taken in 1949, but were not carried out until 1961<sup>11</sup>. The original plan of the museum [Plate 124], designed by the Greek architect Patroklos Karantinos, covered in total an area of 4.400m<sup>2</sup> to be enlarged by a further 750m<sup>2</sup> after the extension of the building in 1979-80. The building [Figure 37], modern in style and functional in form, was inaugurated on 27/10/63, exactly fifty years after the liberation of the city from Ottoman rule. It opened regularly to the public only in 1971 (Kordomenidis 1982; Tzonis & Lefaivre 1984:116; cf:Andronikos 1965c; Kokkinis 1979:38-40). The permanent galleries and displays of the museum, however, underwent various stages of alterations which can be generally distinguished in two main periods: a) 1965-1978 was a period of re-organisation and division of the collections into the best and the rest. The museum's functions were relatively limited in range and did not aim and therefore did not succeed in outweighing its destiny and status as yet another local museum with representative collections from all periods arranged linearly in chronological order and typological groups (see *ADelt* 1963; Despinis 1969). As a result, visitors did not exceed the modest number of 20.000-25.000 per annum

(Kordomenidis 1982) b) since 1978, the museum's rebirth and advancement into an institution of national and international glamour and significance has taken place. New extensions were built as new archaeological collections of unique scientific importance and artistic value flooded the galleries of the museum and brought distinctive changes to its display priorities and philosophies. The temporary exhibition 'Treasures of Ancient Macedonia' [Plates 220-222], presented in the inner series of the museum's galleries during 9/8-20/9/1978, stands out as a museological landmark for this unprecedented change; for the first time, the then recent discoveries of M.Andronikos in the royal Macedonian tombs at Vergina, fascinating both in terms of artistic quality and historical significance, were put on display for public contemplation and admiration. A new record of visitors (approximately 400.000 people) rushed to see the exhibition and predetermined the future of Vergina and of the Museum of Thessaloniki, the repository of its treasures, as the new dreamlands of classical archaeology and cultural tourism in the Greek classical lands (see Chapter Ten).

In the years 1978-1995, the great bulk of the exhibitions consisted of the old collection of Roman sculpture and artefacts yielded from the site of Vergina, the late archaic-early classical cemeteries of Sindos, the late classical Macedonian tombs at Derveni-Sedes in 1962, the rescue excavations from various parts of Thessaloniki and the numerous and recent excavations in various Macedonian counties [Plates 125-135]. During the 1980s and 1990s, the museum, in collaboration with the Hellenic Ministry of Culture, prepared a number of block-buster loan exhibitions which aimed to render Macedonian archaeology and history -both past and present- known world-wide by touring museums in USA, Canada, Australia and Europe (Chapter Eleven) [Plates 258, 267-274, 275-280].

## EXHIBITION MATERIAL

### *The Sindos Gallery*

In the small inner series of galleries [Plates 127-129; Figure 38], where the landmark exhibition 'Treasures of Ancient Macedonia' was originally presented back in 1978, a new exhibition took shape and opened to the public in 1982. The exhibition consists



entirely of objects excavated in the important cemetery of Sindos. In toto, one hundred and twenty one graves were excavated, documented and after the completion of the research, re-buried with only a stone sarcophagus remaining in open air as a reminder of the rescue operation that took place there. Half of the graves were unlooted, and their contents<sup>12</sup>: ‘constitute one of the most remarkable and impressive discoveries in the history of archaeological research (...) bearing witness to an exceptional flourish of the settlement to which the cemetery belonged’ (Despoini 1993:162).

In the actual exhibition of the Thessaloniki Museum, the finds of thirty six graves are displayed in sixty two showcases in a simple contextual manner. Basically, what differs from other displays of burial material culture (i.e. Museum of Kerameikos, Museum of Ioannina and the Vitsa displays) is that each burial group of finds is presented individually in one or more showcases that are arranged circularly on both sides of the gallery. In essence, the objects are not contextualised; instead, they become icons of art and of technological excellence, displayed and elevated in a highly aesthetic setting, but still in splendid isolation and remoteness from their original environment. Regarding the actual interpretation of the site, the displays rest mute; no attempt has been made to reflect upon its historical significance, its social structure, ethnic descent and human dimension of the material. Clearly, in style and methodology, the arrangement of the material brings to mind parallels of certain archaeological publications, namely the catalogue which is undoubtedly the most common and one of the most traditional categories of classical archaeological texts.

### *The ‘Thessaloniki from the Prehistoric Period to Christianity’ Gallery*

In the outer series of the galleries that encircle the interior courtyard, in room 4 [Plate 130; Figure 39], a new permanent exhibition was installed in 1985, specially prepared for the occasion of the 2300 year celebrations of the establishment of the city by Kassandros in 315 BC. The main aim of the exhibition is to offer a possibility to the citizens and visitors of the city to follow the historic development of Thessaloniki diachronically through the didactic display of original objects (Vokotopoulou 1986a:11). The arrangement, which is chronological (typical!!) and thematic, is organised on the basis of seven individual units: 1) Thessaloniki from time immemorial

to 315 BC; 2) Hellenistic Thessaloniki (318-168 BC) with emphasis on the historical background, the administration, the urban planning, the public buildings, the sanctuaries and Sarapeion, the Macedonian vaulted tombs and the cemeteries and their chronology, topography, content, archaeological value and social significance; 3) Roman Thessaloniki (187 BC-c.305 AD) references to the political and military character of the period, numismatics, minting and coinage, political institutions and administration, social institutions, religion, urban planning, public buildings, cemeteries and sculpture; 4) Religion and the sanctuary of Sarapeion; 5) Political and social institutions during the Hellenistic and Roman Times - Minting; 6) Roman Agora-Public buildings; 7) Private residences (see also *Thessalonike*).

### *The Vergina & Derveni Gallery*

Room 9 [Plates 131-134; Figure 40] of the new extension is probably the most celebrated gallery and the most glorious shrine of the museum. Over recent years, it has proved to be the focal point in everybody's museum visit to Thessaloniki and a new archaeological dreamland for cultural pilgrimage. Outside the gallery, at the end of an elevated corridor, one must stop, read, look and dream ; here, there is a number of large colour photographs, informative and exceptionally evocative, presenting the interiors of the famous Royal Tomb II as found unplundered at the time of the great discovery. In addition, two large texts give briefly general and emotional descriptions of the Macedonian Tomb façades and of the Contents of the Vergina Tomb II; another colour photograph depicting a general view of the Vergina site and a model of the Royal Tomb are unique opportunities to get a vague grasp of the specific historic landscape.

The exhibition message right from the start is clear; archaeology is a fascinating and romantic discipline, whereas the archaeological discoveries themselves: 'link past and present, reaching out from incessant passing of the momentary present, bridging the chasm between past and present' (Shanks & Tilley 1992:70).

In the 'gallery-shrine' itself, numerous spectacular golden, silver and bronze displays occupy the space of forty three showcases. It is, however, case no.10 that yields an unusual display for the standards of traditional exhibitions of classical art; this consists entirely of the remains of the deceased in Tomb II that Andronikos identified as the



skeleton of Philip II himself. Thus, here, the visitor is given a unique opportunity to experience a closer encounter with history and with some of its most legendary personalities: the king of Macedonia that fought against the Athenians, the father of Alexander the Great, the national hero himself! Beyond this exceptional historical encounter, the rest is less about interpretation of historic process and stimulation of historic memory and more about art, treasures, and adoration of the splendour of a high, long-gone culture. The displays are magically seductive and strangely neutral, whereas the threads of history are left dangling without connection<sup>13</sup>. And as the verse of the poet recites:

Phantoms and fabrics, luxury and lips, buried  
and the curtains of pain spread wide open  
to reveal, naked and indifferent, the tomb.  
(G.Seferis, *Engomi*).

#### MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

The Museum of Thessaloniki stands out among the other Greek peripheral museums; in truth, its diverse role in the scientific research agenda, the socio-historical context and political arena of the region has certainly moved it up beyond its status as a peripheral institution into a kind of National Museum of Macedonian Archaeology.

This observation certainly requires a proper justification. Let us then review the special temporal and spatial circumstances that conditioned the direction Macedonian archaeology has taken in the course of the last two centuries [Plate 136]. Distinctively, it is on the basis of this review that we must assess and appreciate the social, political, archaeological and museological significance of the Museum of Thessaloniki in the present.

Both in ancient Greece and in the present (nineteenth and twentieth-centuries), the nationality of the Macedonians has been a matter of intense scholarly and political debate. The views expressed are basically three: the first recognises the Macedonians as Greeks; the second denies that they were Greeks and the third adopts an intermediate position. However, as contemporary scholars of great expertise on ancient Macedonia (i.e. N.G.L. Hammond, M.Sakellariou, R.M.Errington) skilfully explain, the term ‘barbarians’ with which the ancient Macedonians were belittled by a number of ancient

writers referred to their way of life and their institutions which were those of the *ethne* ruled solely by a king and monarch and not of the city-state; it did not implicate matters of linguistic differences and speech, for the Macedonians were basically a Greek-speaking people who unfortunately remained silent about themselves (Hammond 1989:12-15,19; see also Errington 1990:3; Sakellariou 1992b:48-63). Thereby, all ancient allegations (i.e. by Thucydides, Demosthenes, Isocrates) that the Macedonians were non-Greeks had their origin in Athens at the time of the struggle with Philip II; thus, they appeared as a consequence of the political controversy and disagreement of the south with the Macedonian north. It was only later in the period of the Successors that Greeks and Macedonians merged and raised a common voice against the native peoples of Egypt and Asia and then against the Romans (Borza 1990:5-8; Errington 1990:4; Hammond 1989:19-20).

However, in the past decade, a new scholarly literature, that is rapidly growing, suggests that cultural and linguistic variation is not endowed with a determining role in the definition of ethnicity and that the construction of group identity is multidimensional and historically contingent (see Jones & Graves-Brown 1996:4-9; and also Graves-Brown 1996; Jones 1996; Renfrew 1996). Nonetheless, the question of the actual ethnic origins of the ancient Macedonians, whether it can or cannot be resolved in a conclusive manner (Borza 1990:90-97; Errington 1990:3), is featured here, for it had far-reaching repercussions on the history and progress of Macedonian historical and archaeological studies during the nineteenth- and twentieth-century. As we shall see, ancient Macedonian ethnicity turned out to be a contested terrain not only of the past but also of the present by becoming the crux of a larger modern political matter of national identities in the modern Balkans<sup>14</sup>. Besides, it is a very common phenomenon shared by many groups throughout Europe, that archaeological 'cultures' and 'ethno-histories', and in this case the Macedonian culture and ethno-history, take imminent political roles as indicators of ethnicity and as legitimators of the claims of modern groups to territory and influence (Shennan 1989:6). It is also a truism, which became much more evident in the context of the social and political developments taking place in Europe since 1989, that questions of identity re-emerge much more fiercely at times of socio-cultural changes and shifting power relations among newly arisen communities (Jones & Graves-Brown 1996).



Hence, an array of complex factors has shaped the course of Macedonian studies in the modern era<sup>15</sup>.

In the nineteenth-century, when Macedonia still laid beyond the boundaries of the Greek State, scholarly tradition and political predisposition of international classical scholarship were the main denominators for the early stage of Macedonian studies. The rich ancient Athenian literacy, together with the indisputable cultural significance of the great centres of Classical Greece in the south, had shaped the form that classical scholarship -and later public interest and tourism- has taken in the course of its history. Great Bronze Age and classical lands such as Knossos, Mycenae, Athens, Olympia, Delphi, Delos, etc. had traditionally received much more, almost exclusive, scholarly and public attention compared to the frontiers and peripheries of the Greek world such as Epirus, Thessaly, Macedonia and Thrace. For the Athenian literary tradition and propaganda that have pervaded Western education and culture, these areas were: 'to be forever relegated to the half-light of the barbarian world' (see Borza 1990:3). Nonetheless, as Borza argues, nineteenth-century international political theory and practice did not dismiss Macedonian 'culture' altogether but rather approached Macedonia largely in terms of political and 'missionary history'. For instance, Prussian intellectuals and politicians used and abused the Macedonian political and military paradigm as a historical analogy and justification for the strengthening and adoration of the Prussian dynasty -which later reappeared in the guise of *Führerprinzip*-, the unification of the German states and the consequent imperialistic spread of their own *Kultur* (Borza 1990:7).

Moving on to the early twentieth-century, with the decay of the Ottoman Empire, various local communities and ethnic populations, encouraged by the intervention of the Great Powers and with the support and irredentist visions of their affiliated nation-states (i.e. Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and later Yugoslavia), set out to finally resolve the so-called 'Macedonian Question'<sup>16</sup> and the allocation of portions of Macedonia to the various ethnic groups and nations involved. Thus, it was not at all odd that the unsettled territorial position of modern Macedonia and its precarious political fate hindered intensive studies of the region until the end of the Greek Civil war in 1949.

After the 1950s, however, once the political status of Macedonia had been determined, the 'Macedonian Question' lost its old intensity and gave way to a period of relative

stability. From then on, major developments characterise Macedonian archaeology (Borza 1990:17). The first was the explosion of scholarly research, especially so in one of the most misconstrued domains of the classical discourse, the Hellenistic period. Second, in contrast to what had been experienced before in the archaeological history of southern Greece, most of this research has been conducted by Greek archaeologists<sup>17</sup>.

In parallel, recent global social and political changes and developments (i.e. the idea of a unified Europe) as well as debates in the discourse of identity and particularly in the definition of European identity revealed tensions between pluralism and anti-pluralism, multiculturalism and monoculturalism, heterogeneity and homogeneity. This new state of affairs seriously affected world archaeology and put firm pressure on academic communities to reassess the classical world and to re-evaluate the classical discourse. Hence, various authors have recently set forth to re-interpret the nineteenth and twentieth-century Graeco-Macedonian archaeology from an alternative postmodernist perspective (see Alcock 1994:171ff; Cartledge 1993; cf: Jones & Graves-Brown 1996; Kristiansen 1996). As advocates of a new agenda of the archaeological discourse, they aspired to review contested notions and terrains of classical scholarship, such as archaeological approaches to imperialism, colonialism, construction of cultural identity, ethnicity, nationalism, plurality and multiculturalism, Europeanism etc. In essence, they embarked on a new intellectual and social-psychological analysis of the various political, ideological and social polarities of the ancient Greek world in general, and Graeco-Macedonian world in particular through which the flame of Hellenism and civilisation was carried along to what we define today as Europe. They also focused on the representation of these 'derogatory' polarities in the archaeological and literary record of the region and on their ideological appropriation for the construction of ethnic, local, national and supra-national identities and politics. These dichotomies can be epitomised in the following pairs:

West	East
Europe	Orient
Eurocentrism	Orientalism
Hellenocentrism	Orientalism
European identity	non-European identity
Greeks	non-Greeks
common descent	cultural differentiation
dominant	dominated
civilisation	barbarism



liberalism	fundamentalism
democracy	despotism
Self	Other

To all these developments that changed, or have a strong hand in changing, the course of the Macedonian studies, we can add some more. Essentially, most of them involve the historical *topos* of Vergina, with its complex symbolism; by extension, they implicate the Museum of Thessaloniki wherein rest and shine most of the movable material remains at Vergina.

The significance of the archaeological research in Vergina operates on various levels and towards different directions. At the epistemological level, the excavation of the Macedonian royal tombs at Vergina in 1978 by Professor M.Andronikos caused surprise and excitement<sup>18</sup> by giving a more physical aspect to the historical place of Philip II and of Alexander the Great. His discoveries brought to light three fourth-century BC tombs, two of which were un plundered with classical wall paintings of exquisite taste and quality of preservation and a variety of grave goods of unmatched extravagance and wealth; no less significant was the recovery of a number of late fourth and early third centuries BC tombstones bearing incised Greek names of Macedonian deceased and of their relatives (for the history of excavations in Vergina, see Andronikos 1984; 1993; Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 1993). Vergina offered a full range of materials (i.e. architecture, painting, human remains, metalwork, jewellery, armour, pottery) that contributed significantly to our understanding of Ancient Macedonia, beyond what was already known through legends myths and biased literary sources. Furthermore, Andronikos anticipated the beginning of a modern archaeological and historical debate by identifying one of the three tombs and its human remains as the burial of Philip II, by proposing that Vergina should be identified with Aegae, the ancient capital of Macedonia<sup>19</sup> and by formulating sound arguments about the Greekness of ancient Macedonians on the basis of the rich corpus of Greek names incised upon carved funerary marbles (Andronikos 1984).

From a cultural and political perspective, Vergina, Thessaloniki's central regional museum and in general all the regional archaeology both concealed and reflected a serious international issue in the sensitive Balkan peninsula, especially as this gathered

momentum after the resurgence of the 'Macedonian Question' in a new guise that followed the break-up of the former Yugoslavia and the declaration of autonomy of its southernmost republic, hitherto known as the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Since 1991, FYROM (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) and Greece entered a long and fiercely contested national dispute with patriotic and nationalist dimensions that involved the re-negotiation of Macedonia's classical and Hellenistic past in the context of the modern present. Cherished historical pictures and freshly unearthed material remains of the Macedonian past acted as symbols of complex and on-going political and national struggles to re-shape the contours of the past, present and future Macedonian landscape (see Kofos 1990; Silberman 1989). However, as a Greek archaeologist at the service of the nation put it in 1992 during his 'patriotic', albeit distinctively ideologically vested, address on the Macedonian cause:

'[one does not need to look] at dusty libraries to learn who the Macedonians were (...) We have to dig this earth. History is carried inside everybody. The holy grounds are inside our souls (...) Because undoubtedly, in order to move forward, we need strong foundations. And the foundations of Greece are here. It is her history, her museums, [and] her archaeological sites (quoted in Karakasidou 1994:42).

In the course of the Greek reaction against the appropriation and falsification of its national monuments and historical heritage by neighbour states, a single historical symbol has taken centre-stage by its adoption as the device of the new flag of FYROM (for the period 1992-1995); the symbol was the 16-pointed sun or star that Manolis Andronikos, after his discoveries at Vergina, identified as the emblem of the royal house of ancient Macedonia. Hence as K.S. Brown observed in his scholarly consideration of the new Macedonian flag and the issues that it has raised:

'a symbol empowered by archaeology is today a token by which present regimes claim stewardship of the past and thus gain legitimacy and authority' (Brown 1994:785).

For all the reasons mentioned above, the Vergina excavations aroused considerable popular consciousness and public interest. By means of both its scientific merit and its cultural dimension, it contributed first to a modern popularisation of archaeology among the Greek people and secondly to a general awareness of the interdependence of academic and broader social and political processes. This archaeological 'fever'



endured and was systematically reinforced by the excavators of Vergina and other Macedonian sites with the recovery of new important findings, with their frequent reports and interviews in the mass media and popular magazines, with the preparation of various exhibitions in Greece and abroad and the publication of lavishly illustrated academic and popular books. Surprisingly, in the Macedonian ‘big-digs’ (i.e. Vergina, Pella, Dion), time and painstaking effort and not lack of state finance were the main problems (Silberman 1989:26). The large infusion of excavation funds generously provided by the Greek government was another aspect of the post-1978 era of Macedonian archaeology; it resulted to some substantial degree, not least due to the fact that Constantine Karamanlis, who was a Macedonian native and prime minister (1974-1980) at the time of the great discoveries, that people saw in the ‘Tomb of Philip’ a way to boast of and enhance both Greek and Macedonian prestige.

However, the Vergina legend and its aftermath occasionally caused some scepticism and disbelief among certain quarters regarding:

- 1) the manner in which archaeological research is professed, conducted and valued in Greece. In the late 1980s, an interesting dispute emanated from the biting phraseology and caustic slogans (i.e. ‘Vergina syndrome’) of a Greek university academic who described and condemned the modern phenomena of ‘treasure hunting’ and ecstatic exaltation of the archaeological find by members of the Greek archaeological community (Zois 1987; 1990:105-110; cf:Konstantios 1988:54-55; Petrakos 1995a:97);
- 2) the relationship of Vergina with the official state archaeology was judged by others through the destruction of its historic landscape and the gradual channelling of its material culture to the central Museum of Thessaloniki<sup>20</sup> (Martos 1993). At stake were heavy contentions about modern appearances of a so-called cultural ‘elginism’ (*αρχαιοθηρία-αρχαιομεταφορά*), albeit this time as performed by the Hellenic state and not by some opportunist foreign antiquarians. Other matters were involved such as archaeological decontextualisation, destruction of historic memory, lack of social elevation, cultural appropriation, cultural centralism, central economic exploitation of antiquities to the detriment of the peripheries from where they originated (i.e. Vergina and its local community). Nonetheless, no matter how reasonable and rightful this protest may have originally been, the ostentatious, daring and costly

pioneer museum projects that are currently under way in Vergina will soon render it null and void, at least insofar as the specific historical topos of Vergina is concerned<sup>21</sup>;

- 3) a third argument pointed at the traditional ways frequently employed by archaeological museums to communicate the logic of the spectacular and unique masterpiece-display at the expense of the ordinary and non-spectacular, albeit historically significant archaeological artefact; the argument was also about how museum philosophies contributed to a distorted picture of the historical reality by presenting and fostering in visitors predetermined ideas about material valuation and set ideologies of museum visiting which in most cases produced an incoherent, ungrounded and morbid relation of the individual to the historic, social and anthropological information and a public misunderstanding of the archaeologist's role and his subject domain (Papadopoulos 1986; see also Hourmouziadis 1984; Photiadis 1985).

## **Epirus and Aegean Thrace - The Archaeological Museums of Ioannina and Komotini**

### **MUSEUM HISTORIES**

Epirus at the north-western corner of mainland Greece is a land of Greek and Roman antiquities, Byzantine Churches and ruined mosques and minarets. In terms of history, it meant different things at different times. Originally, it was the habitat of fourteen tribes; later expanded or contracted under the influence of the Athenian city-state, the political administration of Philip II of Macedonia, the Roman Empire, Byzantium, Turkish Empire and Ali Pasha. In 1878, the Congress of Berlin assigned Epirus to Greece, but the region remained under Ottoman rule until 1913 when it was eventually liberated by the Greek army (see Hammond 1967:3; Foss 1978).

If we exclude the sites of ancient Dodona and Roman Nicopolis, wherein extensive excavations were undertaken by the Athens Archaeological Society soon after the liberation of Epirus in 1913, systematic archaeological research in the rest of the



Epirote region started only in the early post-war period. Thus, Epirus was a 'new country' for the archaeological discipline, albeit as interesting and historically significant as the other Greek lands (Vokotopoulou 1973:11). The post-war excavations<sup>22</sup> shed a new light on Epirus' ancient history, as old theories suggesting its general political and cultural backwardness during the antiquity have gradually been refuted. The ancient sanctuary of Dodona has been very important, for 'research there [led] to the deepest roots of ancient Hellenism' (Dakaris 1971:91-92). Finds from the site 'bear the stamp of primitive Hellenism' and seem to have been connected with the first Hellenic tribes of Indogermanic origin who arrived in Epirus around 1900 BC. (Dakaris 1971; 1993a; also Hammond 1967). Another important and impressive site is the Necromanteion of Ephyra which yields enough clues to understand in some substantial detail the ceremonial rituals and rites of passages the pilgrims were going through in their mission to consult with the souls of the dead and to involve transformations of their personal inner state and outer status (Dakaris 1993b). Finally, excavations in the geometric to the late classical cemeteries and settlement of Vitsa offered a variety of fresh archaeological evidence regarding the ethnic, cultural, social and political structures of the Epirote tribe of Molossoi (Vokotopoulou 1986a).

Since the early 1970s, representative finds from all these sites have been on public display in the Museum of Ioannina. The Museum [Plates 137, 138-142; Figures 41-44], which is still today the only peripheral archaeological institution in the entire region of Epirus, was built in 1963-1966 and opened in 1970. It is general in character and includes both archaeological finds representing the entire region of Epirus in time and space and a small, albeit inconsonant modern art collection of minimal interest.

Aegean, present-day Greek, Thrace at the north-eastern corner of mainland Greece is but a small part of a large territory of ancient Thrace, which extended from the shores of the Aegean, the Hellespont and the Bosphoros and from the coast of the Euxine Pontus to neighbouring Macedonia. Its advantageous position between Europe and Asia linking West and East proved to be both a boon and bane for its development. On one hand, Thrace grew as a centre for the circulation and diffusion of men, goods, ideas and cultures but on the other it became a theatre of war and a target of enemy incursions. Greek archaeologists and historians who study the area recognised the following as:

‘the most important chapters in the centuries-long history of Thrace’: the life and culture of prehistoric man, the influences of the Mycenaean civilisation, the ethnogenesis and dispersion of the Thracian tribes, the common root-stock of Greeks and Thracians, the Thracians in Greek mythology, the founding of the Greek colonies, the Persian campaigns in Thrace and Greece, the founding of the Odrysian state, the Hellenization of the Thracians, the diffusion of Greek language, religion, art, the annexation of Thrace to the empires of Philip II and Alexander the Great, the kingdom of Lysimachos, the activity of Philip V, the interventions of the Romans, the annexation of Thrace to the Roman Empire (Triantaphyllos 1994:35; see also Bakirtzis & Triantaphyllos 1990; Bakirtzis 1994; Papoulia et al 1994). Furthermore, in the aftermath of the spread of Christianity and the shift of the centre of cultural gravity and administration to Byzantium in AD 330, Thrace envisaged an immense development and became the only cultural and ethnological centre of Hellenism until the Fall of Constantinople in 1453. Indeed, today many scholars assert that: ‘Medieval Hellenism is associated with the flowering of Northern Hellenism, and especially of Thrace, in the same way as the Hellenistic era is associated with Macedonia, the Classical with Athens, and the Mycenaean with Peloponnese, Crete and Cyprus’ (Papoulia 1994:24).

In the mid-nineteenth century, the Christian population of Thrace was influenced by a diversity of internal and external factors, as it was very much bound up with the broader political aims of the collapsing Ottoman Empire, as well as with the peculiar ethnological regime in the wider Thracian area where Greeks, Bulgarians, Jews, Armenians and Muslims coexisted (Vakalopoulos 1994:223). Almost a century later, during the Balkan wars and the First World War, Thrace, similarly to Macedonia and Epirus, was at the epicentre of the vital interests of the Balkan states. The Greek liberation campaigns of 1920-1922, the disastrous outcome of the Asia Minor campaign in 1922, and the final regulations of the status of territorial sovereignty in Thrace as enforced by the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 conferred on Greece the keeping of its sovereign rights in virtually all the Aegean islands and in the western sector of Thrace (Svolopoulos 1994; Vakalopoulos 1994). Furthermore, the Treaty adopted the measure of the compulsory exchange of Christian and Muslim populations ‘in a period [which was] dominated by the desire to accommodate the principle of nationalities’ and to secure ‘the reinforcement of the native population element in the territory of Greece’



(Svolopoulos 1994:267). Western Thrace was subject to the same general norm but because of special local circumstances, the Treaty stipulated an exception and provision was made for the Muslims to stay in western Thrace in order to ensure that Greeks remained in Constantinople. Thus, Greek Thrace became the most heterogeneous and multicultural region of Greece; today, the Muslim minority numbers approximately 120.000 persons, that is one third of the region's population [Plate 149].

In post-war years, Thrace's development was slow and interwoven with various factors, e.g. depopulation, sensitive geopolitical position, diplomatic hardships (between Greece, Turkey and Bulgaria), geographical remoteness, social structures and economic stagnation. Nonetheless, nowadays, historians and political analysts are more optimistic as they observe that: 'Thrace is for the first time in its recent history, the object of fertile interest not only for Greece but also for the European Union, of which it is the easternmost and most sensitive province', and predict that: '[its] geopolitical position, a factor that contributed in the past to its isolation and marginalisation could in contrast contribute today to the region's upgrading' (Svolopoulos 1994:283-284).

With this general framework of the complex socio-historical and political realities that took shape in the region in mind, one would rightly wonder what was really the role of archaeology in the delineation of history in Thrace. From various accounts on this matter, we can distinguish two main periods in the region's archaeological exploration: a) from the mid-nineteenth century to 1923. This was the romantic period of Thracian archaeology that aimed to promulgate cultural education among the enslaved Greeks of the region, to nurture their national consciousness and establish the logic of historical rootedness and an unbroken line of continuity<sup>23</sup>; b) from 1923 to today. During this period, archaeology in Greek Thrace matured gradually and became more systematic and scientific. A multiplicity of rescue and systematic excavations has been undertaken by Greeks and foreigners in the many ancient towns of the region<sup>24</sup>. The scale and dynamism of the archaeological research had a large impetus; in the late 1960s the need for the founding of a local museum was apparent. The Museum of Komotini [Plate 143; Figures 45-47], which is still today the only archaeological museum in the whole of mainland Greek Thrace, was inaugurated in 1969 and opened to the public in 1976 (Pentazos 1976; 1977; Sarla-Pentazou & Pentazos 1986; Kokkinis 1979:29-30; Bakirtzis & Triantaphyllos 1990:42-48). The main aim of the museum was to present

the history and civilisation of Greek Thrace from the Prehistoric to the Byzantine Period. In general, the intention was to organise an educational and informative exhibition in the space of aesthetically pleasing museum galleries and in consent to the local Ephor's view that:

‘the opening of a museum, like the creation of a school, does not simply constitute a mere public duty; rather, it is a political act and responsibility of the state, for schools and museums provide the means towards [collective] recognition of cultural achievements and sound founding of individual freedom’ (Pentazos 1976:181-182).

#### MUSEUM MATERIALS

In terms of their architectural script and identity, the Museums of Ioannina (1965) [Plates 137-138; Figures 41-44] and Komotini (1967) [Plate 143; Figures 45-47] could not have followed more parallel paths; both have been designed by Aris Konstantinidis, one of the most important Greek architects of the early post-war period, who succeeded in establishing a Greek ‘system’ of architecture with many successors and imitators.

Konstantinidis’ plans for these two peripheral institutions embodied all the theoretical lines of his philosophy and represented the prototypes for many succeeding museum buildings around the country (Philippidis 1984:283-289, 370-374).

The Museum of Ioannina has been composed in such a way as to offer continuity of interior and exterior spaces, designed to make the atria extensions of the galleries, and thereby to demonstrate alternative and simple, though not simplistic or monotonous, counter solutions to the old and conventional museum styles (Anonymous 1967; Tzonis & Lefaivre 1984:120).

The Museum of Komotini, which is smaller in scale, espoused a general layout, structural system and arrangement of rooms that are akin to the ones of the former institution. Again, the focal idea of the design was based on an alternation of indoor and outdoor spaces forming an organic ‘aesthetic’ whole (Anonymous 1972).

Konstantinidis’ architecture was an intriguing amalgam of several tendencies. In the late 1930s, he turned his back on all western or local “isms” (neo-classicism, populism,



modernism) and sought an architecture ideologically purified, close to the natural environment, realistic, 'true and necessary' to the actual Greek way of life (see Fessa-Emmanouil 1987:103-106; Philippidis 1984; 1989). In general, his projects bear various 'functionalist-rationalist' and 'critical-regionalist' characteristics (Tzonis & Lefaivre 1984:19-20), from which we can isolate a couple that are also relevant to Greek archaeology as conducted during the same post-war period: a) Konstantinidis tried to create icons which expressed the aspirations of Greece through objective science and progressive technology; b) a possible result of this approach was that his works had in general a Spartan character. These tendencies, in some respect, keep pace with the inclinations of post-war Greek archaeology to become more scientific, objective and technically progressive, and thus its transformation to a neo-positivistic, empirical, pragmatic and inductive, though hard and prosaic, discipline. From this perspective, therefore, both museums, by virtue of their 'Spartan character', were more likely to be the ideal settings for an analogous presentation of pragmatic and objective displays.

#### EXHIBITION MATERIALS

In the Museum of Ioannina, the exhibition space [Plates 138-142; Figure 44] is divided into five rooms wherein artefacts are arranged according to chronological order and excavated units<sup>25</sup> (see also Vokotopoulou 1973:22).

There is a fair amount of secondary material, but all written information is conventional and markedly modest in its theoretical orientations and enquiries; in essence, it provides either traditional linear accounts of the regional history from the Palaeolithic Period to the Roman Era, or purely descriptive and factual narratives of the excavating history of a site or of its architectural remains and their evolution in time. As for references to the traditional culture-historical approaches, these can indeed be witnessed in the introductory text; therein, cultures, ethnic tribes and people are presented as spatially and temporally bounded, continuous and unified entities that bear witness to the diachronic existence of the Epirote region and its particular affiliations with the culturally, politically and socially progressed Hellenic south (mainly Corinth and Athens).

Likewise, in the Museum of Komotini [Plates 144-148; Figure 47], the organisation strategy of the exhibition<sup>26</sup> was based on the judgement that: 'the exhibits [should be chosen] with the aim of presenting the most important works in each category, while at the same time representing the most significant sites during the different eras' (...) 'in order to present a complete picture of the history and art of each excavated site' (Bakirtzis & Triantaphyllos 1990:42; Pentazos 1976:185-6). Some effort however has been placed again upon combining a topographical arrangement according to sites with chronological order, and thus covering the most important 'chapters' in the history of ancient Thrace. In 1991-92 and on the occasion of an International Congress on Ancient Thrace and Greek civilisation, an additional exhibition<sup>27</sup> was prepared to present the new excavations and finds of various Thracian sites [Plate 148].

In general, much of the historical narrative of the 1970s exhibition is constructed upon ancient testimonies, mythological stories, information on the ethnonyms, movements and fusion of the various tribes as well as general views regarding the acculturation process that took place during the great Golden Age of the Hellenic colonisation in Thrace. Apart from the historical accounts, emphasis is also put on the history of the excavations and their overall results as exemplified in gathered data and subsequent interpretations on the architectural structures, town topography, economy (i.e. economy, husbandry, commerce), demography, religious and burial customs, social structures and political systems. Nonetheless, traditional problematic preconceptions, such as those concerning the relation of Hellenic:non-Hellenic populations, the inter-societal linkage between core:peripheries::coloniser:colonised::free citizens:unfree slaves<sup>28</sup>, or the established past and present literary prejudices regarding the superiority of Greek literacy:negative connotations of non-Greek illiteracy (oral tradition), remain totally unchallenged (see Alcock 1993;1994; Thomas 1989; Cartledge 1993).

In the 1990s exhibition, the textual narratives are fairly altered to become more empirical, particularistic, descriptive and factual, markedly more technical and less interpretative. In its general style, it notably echoes one of the most common categories of published archaeological texts, namely the preliminary reports which stand as largely undigested, unreflective accounts of what has gone on over the past excavation seasons (Dyson 1995).



In addition to all these, and taking into account recent statistics of the Museum of Komotini on the markedly poor numbers of its museum visitors per year<sup>29</sup>, it would be fair to raise some doubts and address questions in respect to this institution's meaningful role and effective operation within the wider socially multicultural<sup>30</sup> environment it is called to perform [Plate 149].

#### MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

Siân Jones says in her examination of the common and dominant discourses of identity which have characterised myths of origin and historical continuity during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (1996:63):

‘There is always a tension between past and present in archaeological interpretation; between the past meanings and processes which we wish to reconstruct from the material remains, and the meanings which we wish these remains to reveal to us in the present. This tension is nowhere greater than in accounts of past cultural groups. The critical role of the past in the assertion and legitimisation of group identities often leads to a problematic slippage between contemporary concepts of group identity and the mapping of past groups in archaeology’.

Her observations, that generally tally with other contemporary, historically situational concepts of culture and identity (see the entire volume by Graves-Brown & Jones & Gamble 1996; see also Kohl & Fawcett 1995a; 1995b; Trigger 1995), are likely to be most relevant and useful in our understanding of the ways archaeology has been approached in the regions of Epirus and Greek Thrace and actually presented in the Museums of Ioannina and Komotini.

As we have mentioned above, in the twentieth century, much of the historical and archaeological study of the Epirote land, undertaken by both Greek and foreign scholars, has been oriented towards the discovery of sufficient and conclusive evidence that would enable them to challenge and dismiss various ancient, and fairly biased, testimonies regarding the non-Hellenic descent of the Epirote tribes (see Hammond 1967; Dakaris 1971:91-92). Likewise, the ethno-historical mapping of ancient Thrace has been of great significance, albeit of additional ideological and cultural complexity in view of the sensitive geopolitical position and political legitimisation of the region in the present.

Thrace in a broad sense is a vague and precarious term, referring back to both ancient mythological tradition and certain literary sources, whereas the ethnic name of Thracians itself is associated with and characterises a non-Hellenic people. The particular difficulties that arise in the process of defining Thrace as a historical unit lie mostly in the fact that scholars do not know whether Thrace is an actual ethnonym or a conventional naming characterising all those tribes who inhabited the eastern half of the Balkan peninsula and arrived at a particular level of social and cultural development. In the historical period, during which we have more information on the Thracians, Thrace was no longer a geographical unit from the ethnological viewpoint; rather, and after the Greek colonisation, it was substantially extended to constitute a region inhabited by many people (see Papoulia 1994:15). Hence, over the past years, a number of Greek scholars have acknowledged the need to trace the movement, the dispersal, the fusion, the installation of the Thracian tribes and their religious, economic and cultural development. They have made an effort to succeed in this task by searching beyond the absence of written evidence or the fragmentary information of ancient authors and thus transcending traditional culturally determined preferences and value judgements as well as derogatory polarities such as those of 'Civilisation' versus 'Barbarism'; thus they transcended conceptions of 'otherness' and 'primitiveness' that shaped national and supra-national myths of origin and dominated Western thought henceforth (Kristiansen 1996). In this new frame of mind: 'the history of ancient Thrace [would be] as much the history of tribes and groups of tribes which led to the founding of the Odrysian kingdom and of successive smaller states as it [would be] the history of all the Greek cities, the history of Thracian Greeks' (Papoulia 1994:22; see also Triantaphyllos 1994:47).

Having said that though, a lot of the excavating projects, research objectives and archaeological interpretations of the region have focused on the investigation of the phases in the evolution of the Hellenisation of the Thracians by the Greeks and in essence on the specific 'assimilation' and 'acculturation' processes that took place during the gradual induction of Thrace into the Greek world and the realm of Hellenic civilisation. Thus, there is the overriding view that this evolution, which had already started during the Mycenaean period through a network of mutual cultural relations between the Mycenaean world and the Thracians, matured during the Greek



colonisation in the Aegean area and on the shores of the Black Sea alongside the expansion of Athenian might and hegemony. In subsequent periods, it evolved further with the exercise of a Macedonian policy of Hellenisation and the eventual political inclusion of the Thracian tribes into the Macedonian kingdom. Finally, it gathered momentum and prolonged, after the Romanisation of the northern regions, the spread of Christianity and the shift of the Hellenic core to neighbouring Byzantine Constantinople (Pelekidis 1994; Papoulia 1994:22-24).

Taking these tendencies into account, we could argue that much of the production of Thracian (as well as Epirote) archaeology and historical narratives has been based on the common logic of long genealogies, unbroken linear historical continuity with a unitary origin and frequently a Golden Age, which in this case amounts to the centuries during which the Hellenisation of Thrace gathered momentum and evolved.

However, this sort of approach is certainly not a unique phenomenon in Greek archaeology. According to a large and fast growing contemporary body of scholarly literature on ethnicity and the archaeological approaches to cultural identities, there is a prevailing view that: 'group identities [whether they be European, national, or ethnic] are, typically represented as unified, monolithic wholes, with linear and continuous histories which in turn are used in the legitimisation of claims to political autonomy and territory within the prevailing ideological climate of ethnic nationalism' (Jones 1996:62; see generally Graves-Brown & Jones & Gamble 1996; Shennan 1989). In fact, the particular appropriation of the cultural past in the new ideal of the Unified Europe, which is being constructed as a unified entity with a unilinear continuous history, constitutes the most current and exemplary paradigm of this long established, albeit parochial, cultural-historical approach (Shore 1996; Kristiansen 1996).

In addition, this new body of theoretically informed analysis of cultural identity seeks to challenge static functional conceptions of cultural groups and their self-generated histories. In essence, it subjects nationalist claims about the permanent status of identity and territory to continuous scrutiny, mainly by suggesting that it is misleading to believe that identity is unilinear and monolithic; instead, it is rather dynamic, fluid, multidimensional, historically contingent, embedded in economic and political relations rather than merely cultural ones (Jones & Graves-Brown 1996; Jones 1996; Renfrew 1996). It also argues that archaeologists should introduce more wide-reaching changes

into their analytical frameworks when exploring processes of acculturation. They should adopt new theoretical, diachronic and contextual frameworks for the analysis of identity in the past that would be flexible enough to explore a plurality of alternative associations of identity and/or shifts in the expression of ethnicity, history and place. Furthermore, they should allow a better understanding of the ways multiple narratives of the past have been and are negotiated both in the past and in the present, either within or beyond museum walls (see Jones 1996).

## **Thessaly and the Archaeological Museum of Volos**

### **MUSEUM HISTORY, MATERIAL AND ENVIRONMENT**

•

In Central mainland Greece, Thessaly, with its plains forming the bed of an ancient inland sea and a prosperous and rich agricultural land, is yet another archaeologically and historically opulent region of the country. Thessaly especially stands out as one of the most important geographical areas for the research of the Palaeolithic and Neolithic Age<sup>31</sup> and the study of the Early Christian, Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Period in Greece. However, what still remains as a general observation is that, when compared to the other regions of Greece, Thessaly does not have any magnificent monuments of Classical antiquity to flaunt<sup>32</sup>.

Today, disproportionately to its large geographical size and archaeological wealth, there are only two operating archaeological museums in Thessaly (Volos, Larissa). Throughout the post-war period, the Museum of Volos was the only organised archaeological museum in the entire Thessalian region.

Established in 1909 thanks to private sponsorship by Alexios Athanasakis, the museum [Plate 150; Figure 48] had as its prime purpose, to protect and display a unique collection of approximately three hundred painted funerary stelae from the cemetery of ancient Demetrias [Plate 151]. The neo-classical architectural style of the building with its simple, austere, almost temple-like façade and its symmetric plan depicted the typical official building programme in Thessaly from 1881 -when the region again



became part of Greece- to the first quarter of the twentieth century (see Malakassioti 1990; Kokkou 1977:308).

In quick succession, the museum gathered findings from all the excavations that had started in various sites of Thessaly since the beginning of the century<sup>33</sup>. Thus the museum was soon called upon to surpass its original purpose (the exhibition of the painted funerary stelae) and to set a new and more all-encompassing aim to present the regional history and archaeology to a wider audience<sup>34</sup>.

In 1961 the first major post-war re-display of its collections was put together by the Ephor D.Theocharis (Theocharis 1963) [Plates 151-152]. Later on in 1975, G.Hourmouziadis, Theocharis' successor in the direction of the Ephorate, authored a new and altogether vanguard re-display of two galleries, based on his belief in a more 'democratic', accessible and educative museum generating active rather than passive visitor-recipients of the past (Hourmouziadis 1976; 1980; 1984; 1987) [Plates 153-160].

#### EXHIBITION MATERIAL

The exhibition galleries of the Museum of Volos, in their present order, combine more than one display style and philosophy and impart a vivid chronicle of the various post-war re-display efforts that have been realised in their premises.

Galleries Two and Four represent the first post-war re-display conducted by D.Theocharis (1961)<sup>35</sup>. They contain a number of splendid funerary stelae from ancient Demetrias, selected finds of the Bronze and Iron Age (mainly vases of various shapes and styles), and representative finds of the Hellenistic and Roman Period (e.g. glass vessels, vases, terracottae, golden jewels, coins, etc.) [Plates 151-152]. Therein, the aesthetic presentation and philosophical arrangement of the displays does not divert from the standard art historical manner that has dictated classical archaeology during its two-century long tradition, and has been tediously reproduced and perpetuated in a great number of museum exhibitions in Greece.

Galleries Three, Five and Six, organised by G.Hourmouziadis in 1975, however, signal a departure from traditional ways of museum exhibiting and represent the example of

vanguard museum theory and practice *par excellence* in post-war Greece. Gallery Three is entirely dedicated to the display of the Neolithic Thessaly (c.6000-3000 BC.) and its material culture [Plates 153-157]. Galleries Five and Six contextually display grave groups and grave goods from the Mycenaean to the Hellenistic Period (2nd millennium-3rd century BC) [Plates 158-160].

Some of the prime aims of the display author can be epitomised into the following: a) avoid stereotypical approaches based on chronological order and topographical determination; b) select displays on their historical, social and educational rather aesthetic or artistic merit and thus subvert conservative patterns that present the Museum as an institution for the sanctification and adoration of high art; c) instead redirect the crux of the exhibition philosophy from the cult of the high art into a humanising and re-peopling narration and so transform the Museum into a cultural institution of the history of civilisation of mankind. In essence, the aim is to: 'inform the visitor about the relation between the ancient artefact and the place where it once belonged' (Malakassioti 1987); d) also, propose alternative museum aesthetics by introducing different museographic means that have been fairly subversive for the time (i.e. in the use of the light and materials, the abolition of the showcases, etc.) e) eventually open up communication between the material culture of the ancient past, the museum staff and the museum audiences; essentially subdue certain limitations imposed by the need for a specialised education on the part of the museum visitors and thus propose and promote a museum language and visual system that would be much closer to the everyday experiences of the average museum visitor<sup>36</sup> (Hourmouziadis 1976; 1980; see also Andronikos 1976; Malakassioti 1987; 1990).

Thereby, the space of Gallery Three [Plates 153-157] is divided into three conceptual categories that conditioned Neolithic everyday life, namely space organisation of the Neolithic settlements, food production and ideology (Hourmouziadis 1976; see also Malakassioti 1987; 1990). Thus, authentic Neolithic finds, alongside secondary material (i.e. photographs, drawings, over-sized topographical maps, models, reconstructed excavation stratigraphy etc.) were gathered together and placed accordingly in order to register Neolithic life in its various sub-systems. They witness architectural construction activities, agriculture, animal husbandry, fishing, crafting or expressions of ideology etc. and thus construct a particular humanising narrative within a concrete



human context. Thus, the functions of the objects are indicated and the processes that necessitated their creation are exposed. However, the 'systems' in this context are not possibly conceived as merely holistic functionalist devices that maintain a predefined stability and equilibrium. Rather, they are perceived as entities that embody the driving force of the productive process: 'In this capacity, within the given social formation, they are able to transform themselves as well as to reproduce themselves with the intervention of ideology and they have a definite historical content' (Kotsakis 1991:77).

Overall, the displays are brought back to life, set in a context: 'as if they had not lost their soul: the grain is in the pots, the tools are ready to be used' (Malakassioti 1987). The visitor is offered the opportunity to leave the museum with an idea of how Neolithic settlements operated in terms of economy (infrastructure) and also with an understanding of the contextual placement of artefacts within Neolithic society. Textual information is scarce, notably no technical and stylistic terminology is to be found anywhere in the exhibition captions, as commonly happens in most traditional archaeological exhibitions. Hence, the objects have to cope with a double task, as visual incentives and as interpretative 'texts', open to every individual's personal appreciation (visual and cognitive). Thereby, one can still argue about the cognitively static character of the Neolithic Gallery and the insufficient coverage of issues concerning the superstructure of the society, including ideology and meaning of objects. In reality, the gallery is transformed into 'a slice in the past', a 'frozen moment' without any obvious connections with the future development of the area, without regard to the historical depth which may have brought characteristic objects into being.

In Galleries Five and Six [Plates 158-160], the original intention of narrating the life in ancient Thessaly in a similar and systematic manner was hindered due to the inadequacy of material and the historic information. Instead, what was decided to be briefly chronicled there was the burial customs of the ancient Greeks by means of a contextual arrangement of a number of grave groups and grave goods dating from the Myceanaen Period to the Hellenistic Age. Therein: 'the graphical output and representation [of the graves and grave goods] with their vases, their jewellery and their armours set in their funerary context ... [near the dead, so that he can use them in Hades] ... have the purpose of emphasising their functional part as offerings and to indicate their social meaning' (Malakassioti 1987). Gallery Five operates basically as an

induction room to the humanising narrative that is there to follow. Gallery Six, however, is a situational display, a kind of 'period room', which sets the objects in a context of contemporary artefacts and burial features; it is 'a photograph', a 'replica', or even a "*simulacrum*" of the past, an exact copy of an original which never existed (Shanks & Tilley 1992:73-79; see also Pearce 1992:207-209). However, through the recreation and simulation of authentic burial groups, the visitor is essentially encouraged to decode and understand meanings through experience of context and get a grip on what it was like to 'die' in the past. In contrast with the great majority of archaeological arrangements in Greek museums, herein what is promoted is not admiration and the cult-value of archaeology; rather it is communication and the associative-value of the artefact. A number of museum theorists hold that the absence of a living constituent agent is one of the deficiencies of the situational displays. However genuine this feeling may be, in the Volos Gallery human absence is partially but effectively surmounted by the presence of the non-living. Surprisingly for the first time in the museum space, the burial groups re-incorporate their human remains within their original contexts. Again, no matter how illusive the humanist idea of revisiting and understanding the past is, some uphold that: 'across time and space, people are essentially the same and can therefore achieve an understanding of each other' (Pearce 1992). In this case, death as a universal and timeless truth and matter offers all possibilities of making this sort of connection among the museum audience, be it specialised or not. Besides: 'grave goods [are] the stuff of museums. The furnishings for the afterlife signify immortality and we are spellbound' (Cameron 1995:49).

The seeds of this good work have also borne fruit in the subsequent exhibition practices of the Museum of Volos [Plates 161-162]. In this sense, Gallery One or the D.Theocharis Room, with its temporary displays and the wide use of supplementary material (i.e. photos, slides, topographic maps, contextual display, brilliant texts and unconventional display cases) depicts the most recent efforts (1985) of museum staff to inform the visitors of the recent rescue excavations carried out by scientific personnel of the Ephorate and to promptly place this unearthed material on public display and public understanding (Malakassioti 1987; 1990).



## MUSEUM SIGNIFICANCE

Overall, Hourmouziadis' re-display in the Museum of Volos stands out in the history and present reality of Greek Archaeological Museums as an archaeological and museological paradigm, distinct in its conception, daring, potent and effective in its realisation. However, it seems that its legacy in the Greek museum theory and practice of succeeding years has not been equally perpetual and forceful. Whether this is due to the regional character of the Museum of Volos and its limited vigour to exercise influence nation-wide, or due to the altogether bold and innovative spirit of the re-displays themselves, one cannot precisely assess. It may well be another facet of the broader theoretical void that deplored classical archaeology in general and Greek archaeology in particular, and deprived it of its social and anthropological dimensions and meanings.

Hourmouziadis' particular style and philosophy marked a departure from traditional ways of archaeological writing and museum exhibiting and proved to be unique and utterly pioneering in the 1970s. Most of his theoretical principles and sociological doctrines regarding the role of the museum in society have been mentioned at length in Chapter One, and so it is not necessary to repeat them here. These principles are relevant not only to the specific case-study and its particular contribution to the museum world of the country; but also, to a broader quandary regarding the kinds of roles, functions, methods and intellectual choices that usually render a peripheral museum, or indeed any museum in Greece, either an ageing institution completely unrelated to the needs of present day life or a people-oriented cultural centre integrated and meaningful within the wider society.

The redisplay of the Museum of Volos is G.Hourmouziadis' museological archetype and *magnum opus*. Although its realisation preceded the final formulation of his museum theories in the 1980s, it undoubtedly manifested the nucleus of his theoretical underpinnings and exemplified his more empirical propositions regarding the museum processing of educational and aesthetic information.

## The Eastern Aegean and the Archaeological Museums of Samos and Lemnos.

### MUSEUM HISTORIES AND MATERIALS

‘Light and colour, variety and contrast, austerity and wealth are the distinctive traits of the Aegean. Here nature and man worked together in close harmony to create the very centre of Hellenic civilisation. A *Greek sea*, the Aegean lies between Europe and the East. With its hundreds of islands, large and small, in a remarkable unit extending from the eastern shore of the Greek Mainland to the coast of Asia Minor, for six thousand years the Aegean has been not only the bearer of messages from one continent to another, but also a source of inspiration and creativity, founding and defending its own civilisation - a civilisation it later bequeathed to mankind’.

This is how the Publisher of a recent monumental work on Aegean civilisation prefaces the volume to its readers (Rayias 1994:25). In his introduction he encapsulates a constellation of features and ideas that have been evoked time and again in a great number of historical and cultural studies, literary and visual arts as well as museum exhibitions on the theme of the Aegean world.

Indeed, the Aegean, as a territory and cornerstone of Hellenism and as a mighty Hellenic symbol both in space (‘land’) and time (‘history’), has been a master narrative of Modern Greek History and Archaeology. The Aegean landscape, with its distinct and authentic aesthetics, has been idealised and received a near paganlike worship (see Leontis 1990; 1991:21). Parallel to this, the Aegean has been presented as having had an instrumental role in providing the geographical and cultural link between East (Anatolia) and West (Greece and Europe) and in metabolising and assimilating cross-cultural influences to local idioms. It had also manifested a unique capacity to reproduce, maintain and reassert the ‘traditions of the ancients’ diachronically and within the physical, social and intellectual context of the Neohellenic people.

In what follows, the task will be to cast some light on the historical, geopolitical, economic, symbolic and cultural transcendental values of the Aegean and on how these intermingle with the presentation of history and archaeology in a couple of regional archaeological museums.



For the purposes of this inquiry, the Museums of Samos and Lemnos which are geographically located in the Eastern Aegean have been selected for analysis. Thus they potentially embody a number of inherently distinct features and metaphors, since the Eastern Aegean is physically closer to the shores of Asia Minor which stands out as one of the most glorious in the past, albeit now lost territories of Hellenism that are situated beyond the geographical boundaries of modern Greece.

Samos is one of the largest islands in the Aegean and the one which has the narrowest distance from neighbouring Turkey [Figure 1]. In antiquity, Samos was one of the richest and most powerful city-states in Archaic and Classical Greece. It seems, however, that the production of Samian history has been affected in the past by the force of several ideologies which have subsequently confined it to a limited and eclectic number of historical events and narratives. According to G.Shipley this piecemeal constellation of Samian history is limited to isolated passages of ancient poets and historians, a glorious Archaic tyranny, the Samian role in the Ionian revolt against the Athenian hegemony, three or four grand monuments<sup>37</sup> and some world-class sculptures, unearthed by excavators. In his view, the ideologies that deprived Samian history of its full breadth and regional character were the Athenocentric (not surprising given what has been already discussed in this chapter), the Ionophobic ('no need to write real history about those distant, un-Athenian, and effete East Greeks, especially since they rebelled against Pericles') and the perception of the Archaic and Classical periods as well as of the cultural categories of art and poetry as the most pre-eminent in Greek history (Shipley 1987:vii). Notwithstanding, Shipley foresees and himself contributes to a paradigm shift, that translates into the writing of a full history of Samos, both internal and external, and to a wholesale diversity of the Greek world and its history through regional studies.

Similarly to Samian history, Samian archaeology has in the main been directed at a national and international pursuit of the recovery of Heraion, one of the important sanctuaries of the ancient Greek world, yet of a more local than pan-Hellenic radiance. As H.Kyrieleis, the German excavator of the site, puts it: 'the history of the city-state of Samos is reflected in the development of Heraion as worked out from archaeological research' (1993:126).

The first systematic excavations in the Heraion were carried out in 1890-92 by the Greek archaeologists Th.Sophoulis and P.Kavvadias under the auspices of the Greek Archaeological Society in Athens. The history of those first undertakings is greatly significant for the understanding of the island's current position in Greek archaeology and its cultural politics.

Samos provides a typical example of how politics can interface with archaeology, especially when small states, such as the Samian Republic, recognise that one of the avenues to reach an international recognition is by showing flagrant interest in the protection of their cultural property and by trying to attract foreign expeditions to their lands (see Kalpaxis 1990). During this first period of excavations, Samos, although culturally affiliated with Greece, was still not united with her historical motherland; in fact, since 1830 Samos has been semi-autonomous and ruled by a Turkish-appointed Greek governor. This time-span is known as the period of Hegemony. Annexation to Greece came only in 1912.

Large-scale excavations started again in 1910-1914 and were directed by Theodor Wiegand under the auspices of the Königliche Museen zu Berlin. According to Th.Kalpaxis, however, since 1900, politics have essentially determined the fate of the excavations in Heraion, either overtly or covertly. Specifically in his research, he argues that decisions on archaeological matters were not always merely driven by the Samian Republic's concern for the survival of the island's antiquities; often it was foreign politics, international diplomacy, German cultural imperialism, let alone a quest for a desirable re-union with Greece which would effectively condition whether it would be the Archaeological Society at Athens or the Germans who could conduct excavations at Heraion (Kalpaxis 1990). As it turned out, research continued later from 1925 to today under the auspices of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens<sup>38</sup>.

Regarding the local Archaeological Museum of Samos, the first steps<sup>39</sup> towards its establishment had already been taken in the second half of the nineteenth-century. Since 1912, the collections, which have rapidly increased, have been placed in a new Neo-classical building bequeathed by Alexander Paschalis. In 1979, the German Public Benefit Foundation Volkswagen offered 800.000 Deutsch Marks to the Greek state for the erection of a new and modern-looking building to serve as an extension of the former one. Work started in 1980 and was completed seven years later (Zapheirpoulou



1987). In 1987, the new extension was inaugurated by the President of the Federal Republic of Germany Richard von Weizsäcker. Since then, the Museum of Samos has actually extended into two buildings [Plate 163].

Lemnos is an island situated in the middle of the North Aegean, midway between Mt. Athos and Asia Minor. Like Samos, the island joined the Greek kingdom only after the Balkan Wars (1912-1913). Samos and Lemnos alike are part of those Greek borderline islands that have traditionally been the focus of dispute over sovereign rights between the Greek and Turkish governments.

In antiquity, according to literary sources, traditions and archaeological evidence, Lemnos was inhabited, colonised or subsequently conquered by the wild-voiced Sinthians, the Minyans of Thessaly, the Tyrrhenians, the Persians, the Athenians, the Spartans, the Athenians again, the Macedonians under Philip II and Alexander the Great and later the Romans and the Athenians. In Byzantine Times it belonged administratively to the 'Thema' of the Aegean and was an Episcopal See. It was settled by Venetian merchants in the 11th and 12th centuries, whereas during the following centuries rule alternated between Venice, Genoa and the Turks (*XX' Ephorate* 1993:12-21).

In terms of archaeology, Lemnos is particularly interesting and rich<sup>40</sup>. The settlement of Poliochni, for instance, situated on the eastern coast of the island opposite Troad, is one of the most significant sites of the Early Bronze Age in the northern Aegean. A large part of the settlement has been revealed, with its several phases of architectural and cultural development. This proto-urbanistic settlement, which for some stands out as the first town of Europe (Dumas 1994a) spanned the whole of the third millennium BC which was a prime period for Lemnos. Archaeological evidence suggests that the island of Lemnos played an extremely important role in the framework of the so-called Trojan Civilisation during that Early Bronze Age. Thanks to its ideal geographical location at the cross-roads between Asia and Europe, it contributed largely to the transmission of metallurgical technology, products and ideas through the Aegean (see *XX' Ephorate* 1993:32-43; Benvenuti 1994:10-18; Boulotis 1994a:19-27). Poliochni was discovered in 1930 by the Italian Archaeological School at Athens and since then it has been investigated in two subsequent excavation projects (1931-1936, 1951-1956).

The Archaeological Museum of Lemnos opened for the first time in 1961 (Kokkinis 1979:227) [Plate 164; Figure 49]. However, efforts to found it date back to 1930. Since 1961, the museum has occupied an old neo-classical mansion which was originally the Turkish Commandery during the Ottoman Period. In 1991 the first post-war exhibitions were dismantled so that repair could be made on the fabric of the building. The opportunity was taken to prepare extensive redispays using many of the new finds hitherto to be found only in store rooms that were inaccessible to the general public. According to the Ephor who was responsible for the new museum arrangement: 'the archaeologists face[d] the challenge of the redisplay while trying to cope with the demands of modern museological perceptions and the arrangement of the material in a building of a different chronological and architectural style' (see Archontidou-Argyri 1994b:105-106).

#### EXHIBITION MATERIALS

The Museum of Samos houses outstanding finds mostly from the 7th-6th centuries BC from the ancient sanctuary of Heraion. The new building is reserved entirely for the display of magnificent Ionian-Samian marble statuary of the Archaic and Classical periods (Zapheirpoulou 1987:503) [Plates 165-167]. The star exhibit is a majestic five metre tall kouros discovered in the Sacred Way of the Heraion in three pieces, unearthed respectively in three different excavation periods (c.580BC) [Plate 167]. The most important fragment was the left thigh found in 1974 which had a dedicatory inscription. The colossal torso of the statue was discovered later (1980) and in 1984 the statue was completed with the discovery of the face of the kouros. This newly found 'master-piece' of Samian Art is about three times life-size and is thus by far the largest statue of this type and the earliest piece of monumental East Ionic sculpture ever found in Greece in such an excellent state of preservation (see Kyrieleis 1993:149-152). In fact, special arrangements had to be made in the course of the museum building's construction in order to accommodate the special technical needs of this gigantic display<sup>41</sup>.

As for the organisation and philosophy of the sculptural galleries, there is nothing new that one can say, apart from once more acknowledging the great impetus that certain



aesthetic art historical perceptions and theories had upon museum culture. These perceptions refer to the implementation of certain exhibition modes that endorse a number of classicist, romantic and aesthetic ideals and suggest the display of 'authentic'- 'high art' Ancient Greek Sculpture as objects of contemplation, veneration as well as icons of spiritual life and thus of cultural elevation. In this respect, the recent display of Samian sculpture, on top of white pedestals, in ordered sequence and within a deliberately neutral environment totally devoid of any written or other contextual information, does not divert from well-known conventional modes that one can come across in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens, the Acropolis Museum and so many other museums around Greece and abroad. In the gallery there is no information even about the giant kouros. However, many things can surely be said about him ranging from its art historical analysis and comparisons with monumental Egyptian sculpture, its physical presence in the environment of the Heraion, its significance and meaning as seen both by its donor and the visitors of the sanctuary, to the features and symbolism that the sculptural type of kouros embodies, especially when it is of such gigantic size. Nonetheless, in a period of distinct cultural and epistemic changes that have started to infringe even into the traditional field of classical art and archaeology, the recent re-display of the Samian sculpture appears prosaic and played out. Only the gigantic kouros is there to arouse emotion and attract attention, surely both in local people and tourists regardless of their cultural habitus and education, by its mere breath-taking majestic size and 'Archaic smile'.

In the old Paskallion building of the museum, on the other hand, the collections are certainly of a more modest size but still fairly unique in their materials and nature. In the five galleries of the museum, the visitor can see an abundance of small finds and votive offerings, mostly of the 7th-6th centuries BC which represent the period of great prosperity of the island [Plates 168-172]. Apart from a collection of bronze votive offerings that were found in great numbers during excavations and represent standard rich donations to the sanctuary, there are also other plain inconspicuous finds which have been described by the excavators as 'votives of the common people' that is to say: 'objects that point to a lower class of donors because of their rustic style or low commercial value' (Kyrieleis 1993:135). To this category belong terracotta and wood statuettes, plain wooden bowls and plates. There were also rare and strange natural

objects such as a branch of coral, a piece of a stalactite, and chunks of rock crystal, probably dedicated to the goddess as curiosities. The Archaic wooden objects found in the Heraion [Plate 171], which survived thanks to the permanently waterlogged earth in and around the wells, are themselves unique in the annals of Greek excavations and in the museum collections around the country. Many of them represent little boats and thus reproduce the shape of Greek warships and trading vessels in simplified form. Other typical votive objects in the Heraion are peculiarly shaped little wooden stools. Finally, the museum has also a rare and rich collection of imported items from foreign countries, especially from Egypt and the Near East. In fact, no other archaeological excavation in Greece has produced anything like the number and variety of imports found in the Heraion of Samos (ibid. 140-143).

Since all the finds and exhibits come from the same archaeological site, a decision was taken to enhance the didactic dimensions of the displays and arrange them thematically in order to accentuate the importance of the collections and the particular character of the sanctuary (Giannouli 1993). For this purpose, on display there are many more finds from the Archaic period, the Golden Age of Samos than from any other. The ground floor operates as an induction area for the familiarisation of the visitor with the particularities of Heraion as a sanctuary [Plates 168-169]. Therein, it has been attempted to chronicle the development, glory and decay of the sanctuary which also mirrored the history of the entire island itself, through a selected number of representative finds and a wealth of relevant information provided in written texts that are placed inconveniently above the showcases around the walls of the galleries. The panels are also enriched with the incorporation of photographs of individual objects, general views, topographical and geographical maps of the site, the island and the wider region of the Mediterranean. The themes of the texts are written in Greek, English and German, and thus the thematic division of the finds are as follows: The Heraion in the Classical Period, Samos and the Rest of Greece, Foreign Relations, Samian Trade, Votives in Heraion, Worship and Sacrifice, The Heraion in the Hellenistic Period, and finally Samos in Imperial Times and Late Antiquity.

On the upper floor, the displays are arranged in three galleries [Plates 170-172]. The central hall contains the remarkable collection of wooden finds, with no further thematic or conceptual explanations. Other galleries present numerous votive offerings



of various materials, shapes and chronologies. The organisation follows the same general patterns that we have seen in the re-display of the ground floor, meaning objects arranged in thematic units and accompanied by lengthy panels and other complementary material.

In general, thanks to a combination of brief historical narratives and archaeological interpretations, the display authors manage to disseminate a fair amount of information about the history and evolution of the sanctuary and relate it to the actual objects on display. Nonetheless and despite the observation that certain ideologies such as the Athenocentric or Ionophobic do not appear in the space of the particular exhibition, the production of history and archaeology in the Museum of Samos carries along some other traditional biases of classical archaeology. We know, for instance, that classical archaeologists have authored a specific 'vision of a Greece where noble souls debated great thoughts surrounded by elegant marble structures rather than the probable Mediterranean reality of crowded streets, noisy shops, and vociferous and often unpleasant inhabitants' (Dyson 1995:35-36). In essence, they have, through excavation, recreated an urban world which was largely focused around religious and political ceremonial centres, rather than around houses, shops and farmsteads. Hence, they have failed to acknowledge the great importance of the rural world for the life of any city-state. In addition, their time authoring has often produced a canonical, albeit very limited reconstruction of the ancient cities that focused on the cultural superiority of certain historical periods, i.e. the Archaic or Classical, and disregarded or downgraded others. These space and time biases are indeed accommodated and reinforced both in the production of Samian history and the display of the Samian archaeology in the particular museum under study. An alternative approach would be to produce a regional history that would be something more than an analytical compendium of evidence. It would be to try to explain long-term trends and attitudes and thus to try to produce a total history of the island as determined not only by political events, but also by the geography and socio-economic systems (Shipley 1987:3).

In the Museum of Lemnos, the exhibition aims to trace the history of the island and to present it in a chronological order by using some of the most representative archaeological finds that have been unearthed during the various excavations around Lemnos. Special care was taken to produce a scientific and resourceful exhibition, both

aesthetically pleasing thanks to modern looking showcases and tasteful case and room interiors and intellectually vigorous thanks to an abundance of secondary material such as texts, passages from ancient authors, drawings, maps, slides, photographs or even background classical music and a comment book for visitors (Archontidou-Argyri 1994b; see also Archontidou-Argyri 1993a for a similar exhibition in the Museum of Mytilene at Lesvos). The ground floor is mainly dedicated to the Prehistoric period with finds and information about Poliochni and its various phases of development conventionally identified by different colours [Plates -173-174; Figure 49]. In general, emphasis is put less on demography and ideology and much more on the history of the discovery of the site, its scientific dating by the excavators, the evolution of technology, architectural planning and proto-urbanisation and on various features that substantiate comparisons between Poliochni and the neighbouring Troy located directly opposite 40 miles across the sea. As it is well-known, Troy became one of the most famous and romantic discoveries of nineteenth-century Classical archaeology and ranks alongside Mycenaean civilisation in the popular imagination; therefore, its possible connections with the site of Poliochni are an invaluable tool for raising excitement and interest among visitors to the museum, either local or tourists that certainly have heard about Troy in one way or another.

On the first floor, the visitor encounters some one thousand objects that narrate the history of the island from the Archaic down to the Hellenistic period [Plates 175-179; Figure 49]. Again chronological order dictates the arrangement of the displays alongside divisions according to topography, provenance and typology of the artefacts from various sites around the island i.e. the sanctuary at Kabeirio, the cemeteries and Temple of Great Goddess at Hephaistia, the sanctuary of Artemis at Myrina and the coroplastic-pottery workshops discovered in Myrina and Hephaistia. In general, emphasis is on the history of specific sites and of their excavation, topography and technology but also on the mythology associated with the island, the Athenian hegemony and rule in the island, public administration under the Athenian *klerourchoi*, funerary rites and rituals, religion of the Lemnians, etc.

Undoubtedly, the overall aesthetic and intellectual result of the exhibition in Lemnos Museum reflects a painstaking effort on behalf of the Ephorate staff in opening up the museum to the public sphere and disseminating the archaeology of the island to non-



specialist audiences. The storyline is organised and clear, albeit very much in accord with the standard codes of academic historical narrative and modes of museum presentation. In essence, these codes circumscribe the full potentials of historical writing into a kind of cause-effect extraction of information from the material evidence; hence, they approach archaeological objects as merely supplementary illustrative material without any active role of their own. This is easily observed in the exhibition of Lemnos wherein the real objects from the real past merely turn into a series of three dimensional photographs with accompanying notes and references within a general context that does not fail to remind the visitor of the familiar formats of museum guidebooks.

Pearce, Shanks and Tilley make a number of illuminating observations about the production of historical narrative in museums which seemingly chart the overriding philosophy of the Samos and Lemnos Archaeological Museums. They suggest that:

‘The past (the signified) is what objects incarnate, but what it signifies is our idea of the past as it seems now, in our present, the past tied down in the narrative of the exhibition. So in exhibitions of this kind we have a double problem: objects subordinated to the narrative presented primarily in terms of classic written historiography; and objects shorn of their potential multiplicity of meanings so that they can be integrated into the chosen narrative (...) The objects only come into their own when history is presented in technological terms and then they are detached from their social matrix, leaving the viewer not with any feeling for the past itself, but only with the past in terms of the present. The past becomes a sequence of meaningless detached moments, a string of empty instants, themselves turned into commodities which can be sampled whenever a viewer chooses to spend some time’ (Pearce 1992:206).

‘In the absence of their determinate social context the meaning of the artefacts lies in their abstract objectivity. The artefacts are objects. Archaeological history stands before the visitor as fetishised objectivity, a detached objectivity mysterious to the visitor, truly fetishistic. As a coded set the objects are raw data, objective substance, ready to be worked up into descriptive archaeological narrative’ (Shanks & Tilley 1992:70).

## MUSEUM ENVIRONMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

‘The *Aegean* has no screen; it never acquired one. It is led, whether by matter or spirit, it is of no importance, to what is essential. What is everything -for whatever the incomprehensible presumably represents- is limpidity: the possibility of seeing through the first and the second and the third and the umpteenth level of one single reality, the one-dimensional and at the same time polyphonic point of their *metaphorical significance*’ (Elytis 1994:30) [emphasis added].

As mentioned earlier, the Aegean region, throughout the centuries, has acquired distinct historical, national, economic, cultural significance and ideological qualities for the Greeks. The main task, therefore, is to assess how these dimensions interrelate, directly or not, with the prescribed roles and functions of the regional archaeological museums, and specifically of those to be located at the Eastern part of this ‘loud-roaring’ and ‘gleaming’ Aegean sea. This assessment will be pursued in three subsequent steps: a) in the first, we shall attempt a very brief synopsis of the various cultural achievements that it is believed occurred in the space of the Aegean during the antiquity; b) at a second stage, we shall focus on what the Aegean has traditionally stood for in the history, culture and economy of Modern Greece, and more precisely since 1922, when the irredentist ideal of *Megali Idea* (Great Idea) came to a tragic end; c) finally, using all the above as a baseline, we shall draw out the significance of the museum case-studies in their diverse dimensions and peculiarities.

Starting with the Aegean in antiquity, archaeological evidence confirms that for thousands of years it served as a cross-road for the diffusion of goods, ideas and peoples. The Aegean was the natural setting wherein the Minoan, Cycladic and Mycenaean civilisations developed and gathered momentum. It became a place for the transmission and development of metallurgy, seafaring, trade and proto-urban planning. Later, it served as the bridge between mainland Greece and the shores of Asia Minor (Ionia) where the first Greeks, the Ionians, settled at the end of the second millennium BC. Therein and thereafter, major cultural achievements took shape such as the rise of reason (*logos*), anthropocentrism and early individualism, the promotion of scientific knowledge, poetry and historical narration, the formulation of the pre-Socratic philosophy of Ionia and the creation of Ionian art. For many, the Aegean essentially set



the material and intellectual foundations upon which the 'Athenian Miracle' would be built (Andronikos 1994; Doumas 1994b).

Thus, as a whole, the Aegean has been perceived as the vantage point for the cultural life of the entire Greek nation and as a prime contributor to the formation of the Greek ethnic notion and its subsequent constitution as a proper nation (Svoronos 1994:72). It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the Aegean has traditionally been considered a source of inspiration and creativity for the Hellenic *ethnos*, an 'epicentre of Greek civilisation' and a mighty symbol of Hellenic being and identity. In modern Greek history, the Aegean, similarly to other Greek lands such as those of Macedonia, Thrace or Asia Minor, turned out to be one of those Greek territories -and we use this term in both its geographical and rhetorical resonance (see Leontis 1990; 1991)-, where Hellenism's sovereign meaning has been broadly contested and whose older layers of culture have been implemented by Neohellenism in order to define its national and cultural past and legitimise its political present. In this context, well-grounded archaeological interpretations have been articulated to foster legitimate national pride, ethnic awareness and communal solidarity (see Silberman 1995).

This special ideological and symbolic position of the Aegean had a distinct and ubiquitous impetus after 1922 which essentially stands out as a crucial turning point in the twentieth-century conception of Hellenic territory and Neohellenic culture. In 1922, with the defeat of the Greek forces in Asia Minor by Kemal Atatürk, Greece lost access to the once Hellenised space of Constantinople, Eastern Thrace and Asia Minor. Thereafter, the old national vision to define and re-unite the geographical boundaries and 'Diaspora' of the Hellenic nation is replaced by an intellectual and moral mission to expand and promote the cultural horizons and perennial values of Hellenism and 'Greekness', both in the past and in the present (Leontis 1991).

Henceforth: 'this [Aegean] sea constitute[d] the easternmost borders of Hellenism, it [was] what join[ed] mother Greece to the lost lands of Asia Minor, a place at once both mythical and real' (Yiatromanolakis 1994:445). In addition, the Aegean landscape in many ways achieved a new aesthetic and moral apotheosis, for it signified a shift in the way the continuity of Hellenism was represented, namely exemplified through a parallel experience of the Hellenic landscape. In this sense, the freshly ascribed metaphoric power of the Aegean light and sea came to represent the supremacy of 'an aesthetics of

native authenticity' which turned out to be one of the latest aspirations of 'Greekness' and 'Neohellenism' (Tziovas 1989:73; cf:Leontis 1990; 1991:21ff).

In fact, this modernist conception regarding the influence of Greek (and of the Aegean in particular) climate and geography on cultural orientation, on the development of an autochthonous aesthetic and on the preservation of the age-old Hellenic tradition was to a great extent an intellectual manifesto formulated by the Greek poets and artists of the Generation of the 1930s. In essence, though, the same narrative has been reproduced and reinforced ever since in the cultural politics of the region.

At the economic level, moreover, this excellent combination of Aegean landscape and history has offered the basic properties for the formulation of master narratives in the service of various tourist enterprises that began to thrive in the region in the 1950s and ever since. The veneration of the Aegean as an idyllic setting, which bears perpetual classical signs and traditions, has repeatedly constituted a basic motto and advertising asset in the Greek National Tourist Board's and other tourist operators' efforts to attract western tourists as secular pilgrims to the Aegean landscape, sea and light. For R.Eisner, who wrote on the History and Literature of Travel to Greece, there are two distinct groups of tourists to this Antique Land: the first belong to a category we can call eco-tourists who seek a new Romanticism: 'in its degenerate state .... [which] descends remotely from the passion for "irrational" Greece as instanced in the writings of Nietzsche, Rohde and others'; the second group are cultural-tourists seeking a new Classicism 'in its degenerate state ... [which] descends remotely from the cool appreciation of "rational" Greece as instanced in the writings of Winckelmann, Goethe, and others' (Eisner 1993:244-245). In either case, the excesses of mass tourism are more ubiquitous than ever before in this cultural park of Europe<sup>42</sup>. Various tourist slogans [Plate 180] such as 'Greece-the European's European Vacation' (1988)<sup>43</sup>, 'Priceless. Greece. It all starts here'<sup>44</sup> (1990) or 'Hellas. A never-ending story' (1996)<sup>45</sup> and 'Visit the birthplace of Sun Line Cruises. Oh yes, and civilisation, philosophy, democracy and architecture' (1996), always accompanied by splendid photographs of picturesque Aegean scenery, once more illustrate the appropriation of the Hellenic generally, and the Aegean specifically, past culture and landscape for the realisation and satisfaction of utilitarian and economic interests in the present. And as Silberman argues regarding the politics and poetics of all archaeological narratives in general:



‘from trends emerging in the last decade of the twentieth century, [another] type can be added to B.Trigger’s typology of alternative archaeologies (i.e. alongside the nationalist, colonialist and imperialist). [That] is the kind of ‘touristic archaeology’ in which attendance figures and revenue expectations are no less significant than scholarly insights’ (Silberman 1995:261; see also Trigger 1984).

In the light of all the above, it is not difficult to perceive that the museums and excavated sites of the Aegean occupy crucial, albeit intricate, junctures and play conspicuous and powerful roles in the present. But what exactly are the fine-grained textures and roles of the Museums of Samos and Lemnos -representing the Eastern Aegean- within the general spectrum of the Aegean cultural politics as this has been schematically outlined above?

As has been said before, the new extension of Samos Museum was opened on 26/6/1987, within a climate of: ‘unique and unprecedented enthusiasm and emotion’, whereas its inauguration symbolised: ‘the advent of a new life’ for the local community of the island (*Samiakon Vima* 1987:1). The Museum was inaugurated by the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, Richard von Weizsäcker in the presence of the Samian local authorities, the Greek Minister of the Aegean, the Greek Minister of Culture M.Mercouri, and many archaeologists, German and Greek. During the ceremony, which concomitantly celebrated 150 years of German archaeological research in Greece, various speeches were read aloud whose contents were indicative of the missions, ideals and interests the Museum of Samos was called on to perform, transmit and delineate (see Katimertzi 1987; the local newspapers *Samiaki* 29/6/1987 and *Samiakon Vima* 29/6/1987; see also Hatzioannou 1985c; 1986).

The German President, for instance, stressed the perpetual values of Greek civilisation, the Hellenic rooting of the European Union, and the significant role of classics in German education and European culture as a whole. The Greek Minister of Culture focused on the Greekness of the Aegean civilisation and on Samos’ diachronic presence and role in the cultural evolution and political stability of the region; finally she did not fail to acknowledge the Germans’ great contribution to the archaeological research and study of the island through their excavations and the creation of the museum. The Minister of the Aegean and the Local Authorities’ messages were similar, albeit twisted towards more politically direct issues, such as the Greekness of the Aegean, the borderline character of Samos and the indisputable Hellenic sovereignty of the island

and of the Aegean sea as a whole, in view of Greece's poor relations with neighbouring Turkey as caused partly by their conflicting claims in the Aegean (see Coufoudakis & Kourvetaris 1988). Finally, the German archaeologist-director of the excavations at Heraion, H.Kyrieleis, chose to speak more about archaeology and the cultural, educative and scientific significance of the museum for both local people and the many foreign tourists that flock to Samos every year.

Similarly, the Museum of Lemnos -and indeed any museum in the frontier area of the Eastern Aegean- represents for politicians, archaeologists and the people alike an alternative source of cultural armouring which is often a more efficient form of defence than the military postings that are so conspicuously present in the region (Archontidou-Argyri 1993b; Boulotis 1994b:95; see also the newspaper *I Aygi*, 21/1/79:4).

Taking all the above into account, if we were to outline the potential significance and prescribed roles of the Museums of Samos and Lemnos with broad brush strokes, we would expect them to lean on the implementation of those various meta-narratives, such as: classicism, German (or Italian) romanticism, particularism and idealism of classical Greece and archaeology, aesthetics, education, but also the fostering of Greek national and Aegean identity, national ideologies past and present, national sovereignty and political security, international diplomacy and economic growth mainly through the development of the tourist industry<sup>46</sup>.

## Conclusions and 'alternative readings'

Throughout this Chapter, the intention has been to paint a fairly broad picture of regional archaeological affairs in Greece which would be the necessary intellectual and ideological framework with which to get to grips with the plethora of roles Regional Museums set themselves, consciously or not. To accomplish this, much emphasis was put on:

1. understanding and outlining the particular socio-historical and geopolitical context of the regions within which the specific regional museums exist and operate;



2. exploring how various factors such as regional or national politics, scholarly traditions, cultural ideologies and economic growth affect the production of history and archaeology in the periphery of the Hellenic heartland and by extension the modes of 'writing' history and archaeology in the respective local museums.
3. Essentially, the overall task was to review the: 'systems, histories, genres and architectonics of [regional museum] exhibitions' (Ferguson 1996:176). Further, it was to investigate whether these exhibitions aimed to produce merely humanistic, classicist, empirical and objective narrations, which were mostly about the past, or if they also acknowledged that heritage and heritage interpretation is as much about the present as the past.

The study of six regional Greek museums suggested that:

1. in the great majority, they reproduce traditional display strategies (i.e. objects as art and treasures, or objects as illustrated narratives) with only one case diverting from conventional theoretical patterns (Volos). All case studies are characterised by various degrees of sophistication which however, merely lean on the implementation of museographic styles, rather than new philosophical approaches.
2. We have nonetheless discussed the importance of cultural politics in the shaping of regional archaeologies. This interconnection is left out of the exhibitions' intellectual space and so is not made available for public judgement, understanding and dialogue.
3. Other important matters are similarly excluded from Greek regional museums, in spite of their role and significance in the formative process of local audiences' perceptions regarding their heritage, its value, the need for its conservation and the people who are officially designated to perform it for the benefit of all society (i.e. archaeologists). Some of these subjects, that rest 'invisible' in Greek regional exhibitions are:
  - a) the discipline of archaeology, its methodology, its purpose, its ethics, its value in society;
  - b) the process of creating an archaeological record (e.g. excavation, conservation, identification, description, dating, etc.);

- c) the process of constructing an archaeological interpretation that leads to a publication and/or museum construction of the past;
- d) the crucial interference of the human factor (i.e. archaeologists, historians, etc.) in the construction of the past;
- e) the recognition that ‘there is never one simple story, nor one solid narrative, but many’ (Kavanagh 1996b:xiii);
- f) the inherent social nature of archaeology and its position in modern society, together with the value of heritage and the need to preserve it for the future;
- g) the darker sides of ourselves and our pasts (e.g.. slavery, imperialism, human sacrifices, etc.).

We can possibly argue that museums and regional history in Greece, as in many other countries<sup>47</sup>, have not mixed as well as one would wish for. Many regional archaeological museums in the country present some aspects of regional archaeology and overlook many others. For instance, most of the museums end their historical narration by the end of the Hellenistic or Roman era, as if history and human presence suddenly stops in these lands. Further, the term City Museum might have been recognised in Greek legislation for several decades now (since 1931) but practice suggests that city museums as such, presenting all sides of urban or semi-urban life both historic and contemporary, have still not come into their own.

To paraphrase David Fleming’s recent statement about city museums, Greek regional museums are merely *in* cities or regions, but they should soon adopt the role of being *of* cities or regions and entering into dialogue *with* cities or regions (Fleming 1996:133). To be able to cope with the history of ancient cities and regions, museums must reconsider the essence of their role as gateways to these areas’ history and people and find: ‘the courage to grasp the opportunities to make histories in museums both extraordinary and empowering’ (Kavanagh 1996b:xiv).



# GREEK PRIVATE COLLECTING OF ANTIQUITIES AND THE MUSEUM; TWO COLLECTORS, TWO MUSEUMS AND THEIR TALES.

Two of the most dynamic museums of this country are the Benaki Museum and the Goulandris Museum of Cycladic Art. These private institutions, whose founding was prompted by private collectors, are excellent examples that most of the state archaeological museums should follow.

M.Tiverios, in *To Vima* 13/2/94, B11/41

## Introduction

In the process of describing a museum, more often than not the analysis of its collection stands as a primary requisite and as a museological exercise of cardinal importance. Museum collections, however, have not been created all of a sudden within the space of a single day. They form part of a more general evolutionary process and dynamic, that determines the development of every entity in this world.

The act of collecting is, as John Elsner recently put it: ‘the desire of the Museum.... [and] the process of the museum’s creation, the living act that the museum embalms’ (1994:155). As a process and act of material accumulation, it bears its own history, attributes and values so much so that it merits a thorough and multifarious investigation

in its own right (see Pearce 1991; 1992; 1995). Nonetheless, Elsner and Cardinal in their important publication on *The Cultures of Collecting* (1994) and Pearce in her recent seminal book *On Collecting. An investigation into collecting in the European tradition* (1995) remind us that the history of collecting in the West has tended to assent to a rather narrow or elitist outlook as a mere assessment of the sociology and the history of taste. Thus, the field of Collection Studies has concentrated its interest on objects valued as 'high art'; moreover, it has been organised on discipline-based typologies and taxonomies and has devoted too much concern to descriptive histories, collectors' biographies and periods, Schools and studios (see also Bayley 1991; Chambers 1984; Haskel & Penny 1981; Muensterberger 1994; Pomian 1990).

Collecting, however, is a very complex undertaking that postulates compound theorising both on its nature and on its various dimensions. It has diverse meanings both at the level of the individual and of the wider culture (see Danet & Katriel in Pearce 1994a:235). Nowadays, theorists on collection studies (e.g. Krzysztof Pomian and Susan Pearce) suggest that the collecting process must be investigated as an institution coextensive with man both in terms of space and time. They argue that its history should be explored by considering certain geographical, political, social, religious, symbolic and economic accounts alongside intellectual conditions and histories of art and the sciences (Pearce 1995; Pomian 1990:4-6). For instance, Susan Pearce works towards a perception of the collecting process as practice, as poetic and as politics. First, she approaches collecting as practice and as part of a long-term history which stresses the context of the collecting act and the interaction between collections and contemporary social and intellectual conditions. She proceeds further by analysing collecting as poetic and as an individual experience that has profound significance upon the meaning, the symbolic dimensions and social practices that collectors encompass in their collecting activity and its material outcome. Last but not least, comes the analysis of collecting as politics or as an expression of cultural power, ideology and as a dynamic agent able to generate change. The following phrases in fact expose in a crystalline manner this new approach on collecting; they are worth quoting in full as the ideas that are put across here will form the theoretical core of what will be discussed below:



If practice shows us what kinds of meanings objects and collections have been given in social tradition, and poetics tells how individuals have worked within and through these institutions to make meaning for themselves, a discussion of the politics of collecting brings these two together to show why and how collected objects are subject to different valuations and the importance which this has. Politics asks questions like: by whom and how are collecting values recognised? What is the ideal career of a collection? and, How does our judgement of material change (Pearce 1995:33).

### **The Canellopoulos and Goulandris Museums; Studying private collecting of antiquities in a Greek context.**

This Chapter endeavours to present and analyse two Greek archaeological museums which, founded in the 1970s and 1980s, aimed to display and promote in public two private collections of Greek antiquities that have been put together respectively by two wealthy Greek couples. They have both been called after their founders' names, chiselled above the museum entrances, as explicit memorials of their collecting activities which have been situated in the spatial and temporal environment of inter- and post-war Greece. More specifically, this study will present the Paulos and Alexandra Canellopoulos' Museum [Plates 183-187, 197] and the Nicholas P.Goulandris' Foundation-Museum of Cycladic [and Ancient Greek] Art [Plates 191-196, 199-200].

In the course of presenting these two cases of private collecting and museum-making in Greece, the theoretical lines of modern collecting studies as mentioned briefly above will be followed. Alongside this, there will be an attempt to structure the discussion on a step-by-step footing of thought that will enable a view and understanding of the two collectors and the museums that now house their collections within a general intellectual, social, historical and museological context. Thus, this chapter will address a number of issues such as the process of collecting, the process of transition from collection to museum and of museum exhibiting, collecting ethics as well as the character and content of Ancient Greek Art collecting. Moreover, it seeks to construct alternative ways of seeing that focus on, and potentially reveal the personal reality of

the collector as well as principles of material valuation in relation to issues of aesthetics, provision of knowledge and definition of the national and cultural 'self' ('collecting as poetics and politics'). Finally, it will attempt to reflect on how we can construct alternative modes of presenting private collections of ancient Greek Art in the Museum by concentrating on the moral, intellectual and social attitudes that empowered them with, or deprived them of monetary, collective, symbolic and/or epistemological value.

Let us turn now to the specifics of the two case-studies. At first, we shall explore 'the personal circumstances and life histories' of the two collecting couples taking into account several parameters such as their motives for pursuing collecting, the process of selecting the specific collections and their modes of collecting. Then, the process of the collections' transition from the private sphere of the collector to the public domain of the museum will be traced. Discussion of their evolution, their new identity and presentation within the scientific context of the museum will then follow.

#### COLLECTORS' HISTORIES

Pearce, following a psychoanalytical approach lists sixteen possible motivations for collecting: leisure, aesthetics, competition, risk, fantasy, a sense of community, prestige, domination, sensual/sexual gratification, desire to reframe objects, the pleasing rhythm of sameness and difference, ambition to achieve perfection, extending the self, reaffirming the body, producing gender-identity, and achieving immortality (Pearce 1992:48-66; for discussion of this list see Bal 1994:103-105; see also Muensterberger 1994:73; Crettaz & Détraz 1982:206). Paulos Canellopoulos can be considered a typical example of a traditional collector-aesthetician/connoisseur [Plates 181-182]. Born in Athens in 1906, Paulos came from an extremely wealthy and politically conservative family, his father and uncle being the founders of Greek Industry<sup>1</sup>. Under his family's influence, he acquired a humanistic traditional education imprinted with all the classical values and principles of Hellenism. At the age of sixteen, Paulos went to Germany to continue his studies in Roman law, Classics and Art. He was happy studying what he most liked until his father, planning the future of his companies, ordered him to change discipline and study chemistry which was more useful for the family's industrial



business. Being away from his country he felt even more lonely, unhappy and nostalgic. Apart from his personal unhappiness, he was further emotionally affected by the war and the historical hardships his country was going through with the devastating defeat of 1922 in Asia Minor, the fall of the vision of the 'Great Idea' as the driving force for the unification of Hellenism and the subsequent national ideological vacuum. It was exactly at that time that Canellopoulos started his collecting by purchasing two Byzantine icons from a co-patriot that was leaving Germany. Canellopoulos said about this first acquisition in a text written in 1962:

I did not have any thorough knowledge of [Byzantine] iconography then but I was moved by the Greek icons. I took the decision to purchase these two icons from my pocket-money. I was spurred by two motives. The first was my will to help my friend who used to ask me to his house for lunch on Sundays and the second was a kind of nostalgia for my native land which urged me to acquire something totally of its own (quoted in Panaretou 1990:9) [the original in Greek].

We can infer that these first two icons represented a form of insurance and re-assurance in war times and of a powerful help in keeping personal and national stress and uncertainty under control. Paulos' collecting hobby gradually became a habit, a vital need, an addiction and a passion (see Rigby & Rigby 1944:14; Muensterberger 1994:9). His loyalty to the ancient Hellenic spirit along with his deep religiousness resulted in a clear understanding and acceptance of the Helleno-Christian principles. Within this frame of mind, the selection process he pursued directed him to beautiful, rare or more common objects of Greek art that assisted his quest: 'to show the unbroken continuity of Greek artistic genius in the long march of the Greeks (..). as well as its consistently high quality, its ever changing capacity, its imaginative abundance' (Brouskari 1985:5).

Thus, we can gradually draw the threads of Canellopoulos' collecting profile together. It seems that in his collecting, apart from a certain 'aesthetic disposition' that partakes of a late nineteenth century museum culture, the sense of community, the 'desire to identify with an era and place' (Belk 1990:149) and the national diachronic lineage were equally driving forces. The objects of his collection bear witness, become introductions to history and turn into 'sacred icons' capable of generating veneration. They are even attributed qualities of living organisms, often human as the collector witnesses in them the revival of the Ancient Greek and Byzantine spirit (see Ellen

1988:223). Rigby and Rigby (1944:54) also say something that is relevant in Canellopoulos' collecting pursuit:

‘when the desire for immortality is broadened to include not only the individual but the race as well, it exercises an equally important, though somewhat different, influence over collectors. From this root stems all ‘historic sentimentalism’ - the collecting of ancestors and of those ancestral relics which we call heirlooms; out of it grows the familiar worship of the old which is one of the commonest marks of a large class of collectors; and here belongs that seeker of substantial contact with the human past who is antiquarian, archaeologist, or historian’

Furthermore, Canellopoulos' collecting was a form of play with classification and an escape from the ‘role obligations and the serious business of everyday life, in which the individual is free to develop an idiosyncratic symbolic world’ (Danet & Katriel in Pearce 1994a:222) Thus, his material collections operated as a means towards the enlargement and enhancement of his self-definition.

The collection itself contains approximately six thousand objects of the Hellenic world, extending from the prehistoric period to the present day, among which Byzantine icons hold an outstanding position [Plates 183-187]. In addition, there are: the Geometric artefacts (mostly pottery and figurines) from Attica, Melos, Cyprus, the objects of the Archaic period (pottery, bronze and gold ornaments, figurines) of workshops from Attica, Crete, Corinth and the East, the classical and Graeco-Roman art (various styles of pottery, bronzes of various functions, terracottas, the most prominent being the so-called ‘papades’ and ‘Tanagraeans’ from Boeotia, marble sculpture, busts, instruments, glass vessels, mirrors, coins and others), the Greek jewellery of the Classical and Hellenistic period, and the objects from the Near and Middle East (mainly bronze statuettes of Egyptian gods) (Brouskari 1976; 1985; Kokkinis 1979; Parlas 1972).

For the Goulandris couple and their collecting choices and motives, again both emotional and cognitive elements surface and condition their act of collecting [Plates 188-190]. Dolly Goulandris [Plate 190] frequently pointed out that she and her husband started to collect antiquities, mainly small objects of the classical period, without any specific aim, as amateurs: ‘driven by curiosity and admiration, to which were soon added a mounting enthusiasm and interest in the past of Greece’ (Goulandris 1987:74). The first objects of the collection were some ancient Greek vases of the fifth century



BC. Fairly soon, the collectors' interest concentrated on Cycladic material which became a passion with fetishistic dimensions. Their collection was:

‘the outcome of a dream, transformed into a passion, a dream that [became] a reality only through sustained and determined effort, an unfaltering quest for the desired object’ (D.Goulandris quoted in Doumas 1983:7).

Their painstaking collecting gradually attained a systematic character that eventually led to great international recognition of the collection and its transition to a museum. The whole collection incorporates approximately eight hundred items, acquired gradually over twenty five years [Plates 191-196]. The classical collection amounts to some three hundred small and monumental works of ancient Greek art of various materials: clay, gold, bronze, glass and marble. Many of the clay objects -statuettes of humans and animals, vases and vessels of everyday use from various places, are important examples of the civilisations of the second millennium BC. The majority however date to the first millennium BC and all demonstrate the evolution of Greek art and help one comprehend aesthetic tastes as well as religious and social aspects of everyday life in Greek antiquity. The classical collection, however, has gradually taken a kind of back seat to the Cycladic section of the Goulandris collection (Quenroe 1987:80). The latter is recognised as the largest and most important of its kind after the corresponding collection in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens.

So, similarly to Paulos Canellopoulos, the Goulandris couple embarked on a quest for the diachronic continuity and integrity of Hellenic civilisation down to the present. Their quest, however, operated in a different fashion. Interestingly, they did not highlight the classical artefacts of the collection and thus did not explicitly empower the Classical Model. Rather, they chose to bring the pivot of aesthetic and cultural classical Hellenic ideals back to Cycladic art which turned out to be the artistic focus of their entire collecting mission, ideology and process.

Cycladic art was originally deemed as ‘barbarian’, ‘ugly’, ‘primitive’, ‘tribal’, ‘the ‘Other within’ the canons and domain of the Classical. Nonetheless, after the Second World War, it gradually attracted the archaeological interest of scholars and the aesthetic appraisal of the collectors/connoisseurs who saw it as a precursor to Western art and civilisation. Still, even this cultural and ideological position appears to be challenged. On one hand, a number of distinguished scholars assert that: ‘these

Cycladic marble maidens [do] mark the birth of western art. For we see in them some of those same qualities which so delight us in the korai of the Acropolis' (Colin Renfrew quoted in Gill & Chippindale 1993:647). On the other hand, recent studies have questioned this historical connection between the Classical Kouros and the Cycladic figures. Developed within a post-colonial and post-modernist rubric, these scholarly trends have altogether translated the previous attribution of classical lines to the Cycladic 'idols' as an attempt to privilege Greece and sustain a Pan-European history instead of other non-European cultures from the Near East, Anatolia and Egypt and an alternative thesis upon the superiority of Oriental and Afro-Asiatic traditions (Gill & Chippindale 1993; cf. Bernal 1987; 1991).

At this point, having Canellopoulos' Byzantine collection of icons in mind, it is important to note that the Byzantine heritage and material culture have also been contested issues in the early history of modern Greek society. In the nineteenth-century, the promotion of classical heritage was so ideologically unwavering and symbolically significant for the modern Greek state and intellectuals that the Byzantine past was completely overshadowed. This original indifference for Byzantium was not simply a matter of taste, i.e. Byzantine art seen and described as 'the ultimate barbarisation of the art' (Baroutas 1991-2:213-214). In reality, it had deep roots in the political and socio-historical circumstances that emerged and prevailed in the wake and aftermath of the Greek War of Independence (1821). The hostility towards this part of Greek heritage was due to the fact that Byzantium was connected with corruption, wretchedness and the age of slavery in the official state ideology and Greek intellectual consciousness. However, this attitude became milder from about the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, when a new ideological tenet supporting the unbroken continuity of the Hellenic nation from the past throughout the modern present gathered momentum (Augustinos 1989). Nonetheless, as recent research suggests, the Byzantine past never managed to dominate as classical antiquity did for:

'even in the late nineteenth-century, Byzantine art could not stand on its own and was thought to need improvement, according to classical aesthetical principles. [Thus] the conflict between these two pasts was not a fair fight, more a fight on unequal terms' (Yalouri 1993:38).



## MUSEUM HISTORIES

When we come to discuss any collection's rite of passage from the collector's private space to the museum, issues of immortality and collection transition also intersect with the so-called strategies of collection closure and completion (Danel & Katriel in Pearce 1994a).

For Canellopoulos' collection, two events led to this closure. One was his gradual blindness that isolated him visually from the material world. Another was the eventual inadequacy of his private house to accommodate his voluminous collection. His collected antiquities, thus, experienced this transition into the museum and became sacred durables. In other words, they experienced a second rite of passage, the first being their entry into the collection. For Halpin 'the aesthetization and museumization of ethnographic [and in this case archaeological] fragments is predicated on a certain kind of violence' (1990:30). At the time of transition, only a small part of the collection escaped this 'violence' by remaining in Canellopoulos' private house. We don't have enough information about the original context of the artefacts as they come mostly from unsystematic excavations via the art market. We also have very few clues about the arrangement of the collection in his house. From some photos, it seemed that the collection has grown up around the collector as an extension of his physical person and social character. In the museum, however, the case was different as we shall see below. The Paulos and Alexandra Canellopoulos' Museum was inaugurated on 7 July 1976 [Plate 197]. The reason for its establishment was to preserve the collection in its materiality partially intact and render it public. In essence, the most fundamental objective of the Canellopoulos Museum was to narrate Greek Art. It was to proclaim the unbroken continuity of Greek artistic genius and highlight the aesthetic diachronic appeal and qualities of Hellenic art and craft throughout the centuries. The extent to which it succeeded in being a good communicator of all these messages to the general public is another matter to be tackled below.

The strategy of closure in the Goulandris collection is more subtle than the one observed in the Canellopoulos collection. The main reason for this is that both parts of the Goulandris collection, i.e. Cycladic and Classical, continue to expand. The cycladic part is enriched mostly by means of direct purchases from international auction houses. The

classical collection indirectly attains further dynamism through other chronologically concurrent private collections that enter the museum as generous bequests on behalf of other collectors (Eutaxias, Politis, Alivizatos, etc.). The transition of the collection from the private sphere to the museum originated in the late 1970s, during a lengthy public presentation of the collection to museums within and outside Greece (Benaki Museum in Athens, USA, Japan, France, Britain, Brussels). In fact, a collection of posters that have been produced in the course of the exhibition's tour in its pre-museum era rests today in the museum entrance as a reminder and signifier of this transition [Plate 198]. The N.Goulandris Museum of Cycladic [and Ancient Greek] Art was inaugurated on 20 January 1986 [Plates 199-200]. It is, however, interesting to note that today the importance of the Goulandris Cycladic collection and the gradual shift of the collectors' passion for Cycladic figurines and vessels resulted in the final identification of the institution as mainly a Museum of Cycladic Art (Lemos 1992).

At first glance, the missions of both museums seem alike. Goulandris' Museum aims to share a private collection with the general public and to inform, educate and entertain both specialist and lay visitors. It also assists the country in its efforts to repatriate antiquities from abroad by purchasing illegally exported artefacts, repatriating them and displaying them in the Greek homeland. Furthermore, according to the Articles of the Museum's foundation (no. 2, Statute 1610/1986), the institution focuses on the study of the Aegean civilisation and of the Greek prehistoric and classical art as well as their dissemination and promotion. The Museum tries to accomplish all these ambitious goals by means of museum display, promotion of scientific research, publications, travelling exhibitions abroad, lectures, conferences and dynamic continuation of collecting activities etc. (Marangou 1991:20).

As parallel and similar as the original life histories of the two collections might have been, their successive museological profiles and destinies may at first glance appear strikingly different. The turning point for the fate of the two collections most probably rested in the different institutional type of the museums that housed them. The Canellopoulos collection turned out to be entirely state patronaged with all the ideological and practical pitfalls which such an administrative arrangement entailed. The Goulandris collection, in contrast, being installed in a purpose-built museum erected on private initiative and funding had the *a priori* advantage of enjoying the



administrative freedom and flexibility that private resources usually connote [Plate 201].

#### MUSEUM MATERIALS AND ENVIRONMENT

Apart from their different institutional classification, their architectural scripts are also unlike. The Canellopoulos Museum occupies the space of a beautiful Neo-classical building, erected at the end of last century as a private bourgeois residence [Plate 197]. The architectural profile of the museum reflects the artistic and ideological traits of Historicism and Greek Neo-Classicism which themselves have been the offspring of radical historical and political changes, namely the creation of modern Greece and the revival of Hellenic cultural identity. In parallel, this Neo-Classical style coincides with the general ideological 'doing-code' of the institution aiming to reflect the traditional classical humanistic and bourgeois social predisposition of the specific collector. Thus, the Canellopoulos Museum reflects values and prototypes of the era of Classical modernity and the museographic principles and practices of the late nineteenth century-early twentieth century (see Brouskari 1985:6; Fessa-Emmanouil 1987:99; Philippidis 1984:69-72).

The Goulandris Museum and its main edifice, in contrast, is chronologically and morphologically distant from the Canellopoulos Museum [Plate 199]. It was designed in the 1980s by Yannis Vikelas, an eminent Greek architect who belongs to the post-functionalist period of architecture that draws from a wide array of traditions (i.e. classicist, vernacular, modernist etc.) (see Philippidis 1984:368). The Goulandris building, however, also makes a statement about issues of cultural tradition and national character by recalling the Greek insular architectural tradition. As Dolly Goulandris put it: 'it had to be a rather special building: Cycladic art is so simple and abstract it requires a very special treatment. We wanted the building to be simple and of white marble in order to remind the visitors of the objects it housed and be in harmony with them' (1987:4). The Goulandris Museum is a modern institution that belongs to its era. This modernity is transmitted both through the museographic edifices of the building, the exhibition hardware, the commitment of the institution towards archaeological public education through leisure but also most importantly through the Cycladic

artefacts, the most eminent part of the collection. The Cycladic idols influenced many artists of the twentieth century with their purity of line, their simplicity and eternal modernity that 'speaks to the viewer' without exacting a prior academic knowledge. Hence, it appeals to modern aesthetic sensibilities and signifies changing collecting predisposition and fashion in art.

Despite any clear and present differences regarding the collecting attitudes of these collectors and the strategies of transition of their collections to the museum, one must not fail to note one important fact. Both museums operate within the principles of western society<sup>2</sup>. They emerged in the temporal context of the post-dictatorial and modern democratic era in Greece (1974 onwards), that opened up new possibilities for political, economic, social and cultural restoration and uplift. They also operate within the 'context' of our post-modern era that seems to be a period of 'crisis' for the eternal classical ideals and related disciplines due to the gradual disappearance of the social arrangements, and those of Modernity, which had made Hellenism an important academic discourse. Today, in the late twentieth-century, there is an increasing tendency in the contemporary scholarship to accentuate the "otherness" and "remoteness" of ancient Greeks rather than their powerful legacy of western culture.

#### EXHIBITION MATERIALS

When it comes to the actual museum presentation of the collections, the overall philosophical approach is clearly tradition bound, despite any differences we may notice in the types of museographical devices that are put in use.

In the Canellopoulos exhibition, the general intention was to use simple materials and methods in as many low tones as possible in order to maintain the simplicity and directness of the artefacts as narrators of Greek art [Plates 183-187]. The display was not left to free design and evolutionary innovations but 'respected' the spirit and form of the architecturally "traditional" house. The display author's aim was to transmit to the visitor the emotion that [Greek art] deserves (Brouskari 1976:135-136). Again, when it comes to issues of strategy, style, technique and space morphology, the Canellopoulos exhibition follows conservative patterns. It belongs to a taxonomic



and typological type of exhibition based on a chronological and classification order. The focus is towards a simple aesthetic mode and creation of a didactic display, although the latter is far from being satisfactory. The objects remain static as they do not engage the visitor with any explicit interaction. It generally presents knowledge as resolute and does not leave room for alternative individual 'readings'. The museum is inactive and silent. Thus, it remains scientifically and socially conservative in the backstage of modern museological practice.

The Goulandris exhibition of classical antiquities, in contrast, uses a notably different and more modern museum environment and museographical devices to display artefacts very similar in quality and type [Plates 192-196]. The purpose was to display the collection to its best advantage. According to the collector: 'the display of the objects was governed by three principles: it had to be aesthetically attractive, educational, and scholarly' (Goulandris 1987:75). The resulting display incorporates a chronology allowing for the highlighting of certain objects and the grouping and rearrangement of others to produce a survey of the classical arts (Marangou 1985). However, the overall philosophy of the Goulandris exhibition unravels in a like manner with the Canellopoulos display. Both case-studies narrate linear histories of art given in a series of spatial snapshots arranged in chronological, geographical and typological units. They draw on a long established classical art historical tradition which assesses first the aesthetic qualities and the moral values of an artwork and regards the museological artefacts as objects of contemplation. They display the Ancient Greek past as exhibited Ancient Greek material culture. They are entirely object-oriented, exploiting the obvious aesthetic values of the displays which are left to speak for themselves without the interference of any socially or historically meaningful concepts and interpretation. History is self-evidential and *a priori* incorporated within the objects. In a remarkably indirect way, the objects are enrolled to narrate intentions, values, attitudes, messages, emotions or agendas of the makers and societies that they brought into being and also to expose an evolving system of thought, political or social attitudes. Their archaeological narrative is implied but not made explicit. Both exhibitions are indeed very much tradition laden and share many of the defining assumptions that conventional classical art history entails (i.e. particularism, neo-positivism, emphasis on particular material

categories, classification, systematisation, dating, rationalisation and autonomy of the aesthetic).

For the display of the Cycladic collection, the designers chose a dark grey colour for the walls and a dark blue Greek suede for the interior of the cases. [Plate 191] As exact information about the Cycladic civilisation and its chronology is still largely elusive, the arrangement of the displays has deliberately avoided strict chronological placements of the objects or interpretations about their function and symbolism. Rather, the design and display of the Cycladic collection has been conceived with the intention of creating an effect and air of wonder and mystery and thus giving the visitor the feeling of entering a crypt (Quenroe 1987:79). Besides, this: 'is what the Cycladic collection is all about' (Goulandris 1987:75). This is what lured the Goulandris couple into collecting it. It is an amalgam of mystery, wonder and beauty. And so, it seems that the overall display of these unique idols managed to merge in a successful, albeit somewhat refined, manner their public museum viewing with the original motivations and aesthetic predilections of the collectors.

Pearce, throughout her seminal study on collecting, develops and elaborates the argument that the social character of knowledge and the integrity of its historical and emotional contexts is as important for our understanding as the context of knowledge as such. Within this frame of thinking, the character of collecting is seen to be at least as important as the content (Pearce 1995). From this perspective, both case-studies seem to overemphasise the material element and its aesthetic value whereas they make only indirect references to the collectors through the inscription of their names in chiselled stone. They disregard them totally as artefacts *per se*. They stand as yet another two of many art historically compelled classical archaeological exhibitions and, thus miss a great opportunity to feature character and content together.

Taking this observation as a main point of departure, we could propose an alternative way of seeing that makes the collectors' organising principles and motives in the process of their collecting explicit. This provides a golden opportunity to encompass: 'the museum's mandate and the collector's rationale [as poetics and politics] within an accessible "storyline"' (Mayer 1994:32). It will also help us to assess the significance of both museum institutions and of their collections from a different and innovative perspective.



## MUSEUM SIGNIFICANCE AND 'ALTERNATIVE READINGS'

For our specific case-studies, this storyline could be built upon the two main systems (collecting as poetics and collecting as politics) as proposed by Susan Pearce. The first reveals the personal reality of the collector and the way we have pursued its analysis throughout this paper. The second discusses principles of material valuation in relation to the issues of aesthetics, provision of knowledge and definition of the national and cultural 'self'.

For the politics of material valuation<sup>3</sup> in its aesthetic and scientific dimensions, Pearce provides a schematic representation which is easily operative to any type of collection and thus also to the Canellopoulos and Goulandris Museums (1995:283-289' 290-307). In this scheme there are four quadrants named as authentic masterpiece, authentic artefact, spurious masterpiece and spurious artefact that structure most of our notions of material culture [Figure 50]. The intrinsic and more interesting possibility of this scheme is that objects can move within the four quadrants and, by doing so, can bring change to the system of material valuation via several mechanisms that relate to it (i.e. art market, collectors, scholarship, museum collections, public interest) In this system of values, Ancient Greek art as 'high' culture in the long-term has mostly occupied the masterpiece/authentic quarter. As was mentioned earlier, Byzantine and Cycladic Art have moved there in more recent years as a result of epistemological and socio-historical re-orientations and modern shifts of taste [Figures 51-52]. More ordinary material culture of these periods occupies the artefact/authentic quarter as carrier of 'known' or 'said to be' authentic information (the former by means of systematic excavations, and the latter due to uncontrolled excavations). Antiquities of unknown provenance can easily move from the quarters of authentic to the quarters of spurious, after further inspection and laboratory testing.

The employment of this scheme in the course of a museum presentation of a private collection, both in relation to the collector's rationale and choice and to the museum's mission, carries great potential and importance. It creates an alternative way of displaying objects by concentrating on the moral, intellectual and social attitudes that empowered them with or deprived them of monetary, collective, symbolic and/or

epistemological value. Within this intellectual spectrum and in response to a recently raised argument which holds that the 'collectors of antiquities are the real looters.... by creating a market demand for antiquities' (Elia 1993:69), the museums of private collections face the challenge of engaging in a public dialogue that should address issues such as collecting ethics and practices as well as the museum's appropriative discourses and cultures<sup>4</sup>.

Moving on to the politics of identity, Pearce rightly remarks that:

any self-conscious definition of 'self' with all that this implies can only be achieved in relation to a perceived 'other', which is seen as different, as inferior, unpleasant and dangerous (...) Historically speaking, the cultivation of such sharp edges has been a recurrent characteristic of the European past (1995:308).

She structures the relationship between the European 'Us' and the non-European 'Other' against two axes, namely time and space by way of a scheme that closely matches the progress of these two parameters (1995:312-314) [Figure 53].

Taking into consideration that both the Canellopoulos and Goulandris collections address issues of identity and present a sort of interplay with the 'non-European Other', Pearce's scheme provides a significant contribution to our alternative way of 'exhibition seeing'. The national narrative in the Canellopoulos exhibition, is straightforward [Figure 54]. It is Classical/Hellenic and Byzantine/Christian and the collection in its great bulk consists of material culture of the 'Us'. Yet, it also includes some few objects of the 'barbaric' and non-Christian 'other', primarily artefacts of the Near and Middle East (mostly Egypt and Mesopotamia) and some miscellaneous cups influenced from Ottoman Art.

For the Goulandris collection the case is slightly more complex [Figure 55]. Here, there is the uncontroversial classical collection and also the cycladic material that, according to the scholarly debate, is on a cultural borderline, either as a geographical and cultural forebearer of the classical and European 'us' or as a cultural contemporary and offspring of the Levantine 'other'.



## Conclusions

To sum up briefly, this Chapter has attempted to support a view that a general interpersonal and cultural perspective, instead of a mere art historical approach, has the ability to more vividly put across the collector's message, the collection's meaning and museum's narratives. Furthermore, it makes explicit the politics of the past and collecting by addressing certain controversial issues and making them available for public judgement and understanding.

It is time for both scholarly disciplines (i.e. Greek archaeology) and the museum to develop grand gestures and desires for self-reflection and self-examination, in other words an awareness for the need to examine the concrete practices in which scholars, private collectors and museums engage. Indeed, an archaeological exhibition could become much more meaningful would it emphasise authorship and changing perceptions of the artefactual past and allow or stimulate the museum goer to think about the meaning of things and the ways the past is being collected and re-constructed.

Recent museum exhibitions of private collections of classical antiquities (e.g. *Vases and Volcanoes. Sir William Hamilton and his Collection*, on view in the British Museum between 13 March and 14 July 1996) encourage the hope that this transformation in the field is indeed underway:

The history of museums is a rewarding field of enquiry for understanding the many different ways that objects have been seen and valued in the past. Not least, it can provide fresh insight into our own way of seeing (Jenkins & Sloan 1996:9).

This is what the display authors of *Vases and Volcanoes* tell us in the Foreword of the splendid exhibition catalogue. With this statement, we could not agree more.

# SHAPING ARCHAEOLOGISTS; THE ROLE OF UNIVERSITY MUSEUMS OF ARCHAEOLOGY

The University Museum at Athens is a prototype museum of an exclusively didactic nature (...) Regarding the cast collections, there are cases whereby these are considered as important for the history of art as original sculpture. Cast collections are the best tool for the teaching of archaeology and indeed for a more direct [both in physical and conceptual terms] acquaintance of the student with its subject matter.

Ch. Kiosse, in *To Vima*, 17/4/94, G24.

## Introduction

The aim of this Chapter is twofold: firstly, to review the nature, prospects and perspectives of university archaeological education in Greece and to investigate its interrelation with museum practice within the original environment of its initiation, that is the University Museum.

The university museums of Athens and Thessaloniki are two out of the only three Greek museums<sup>1</sup> that accommodate plaster cast collections today. Therefore, they provide a unique opportunity. The second aim of this Chapter is to study the changing definitions of Classical scholarship and Classical art, through the parochial history of casts and their changing values through the times. In essence, there is here the chance to discuss the problematic and paradoxical status of this specific group of artefacts and



thus again address, as in Chapter Eight, issues of material valuation and of changing taste and appreciation (casts vs originals) of classical art.

## **Greek (classical) archaeology in the Greek University**

Recent post-processual work on archaeology suggests (Shanks 1992:192) that archaeological teaching in general should combine an array of communicative and analytical skills in order to enable the archaeological discipline to become more self-reflective and meaningful for the present. In this respect, university archaeological education is not only about pure academic orientation, factual archaeological analysis or abstract theorising but also about social and cultural politics and ethics.

In Greece, as was discussed in Chapter Two, archaeological practice has largely evolved and matured within a certain ideological and theoretical apparatus that determined the form and type of the respective education and training at the university and practical experience at the State Archaeological Service or research and academic career. This framework springs from two major parameters. The first parameter is externalist and points out the primacy of the national and political dimension of archaeological science in the Greek homeland which results in the transformation of archaeological practice into a patriotic duty. Thus, the issue of studying antiquity in depth has not been considered urgent or absolutely necessary, for the prime aim of Greek archaeologists was the disclosure of data that justified the valuation of Greek civilisation as classical and exemplary (Kalpaxis 1993:38-40; Kotsakis 1991; 1993). The second parameter is internalist and alludes primarily to the specific affinity of Greek archaeology with the German art historical tradition, enhanced further by a special relation with other archaeognostic disciplines and a deep knowledge of the Hellas (ελληνομάθεια) (Editorial *Horoc* 1984:7-9). It also draws substantially from the post-war impulse for factual, hard and neo-positivistic archaeological scientism achieved via the accumulation of empirical and excavation data.

For this same matter, a number of Greek University teachers (Kalpaxis 1993; Kotsakis 1993; Zois 1990:115-135; 36-42) strenuously reproached the traditional approach of the Greek state as regards the teaching of archaeology, for it has encouraged a passive

transference of a ready-made scholarly product rather than an active participation in the genesis of archaeological knowledge. They further expressed strong disapproval of the way classical archaeology is undervalued by being merely taught as the classical history and geography of the country.

All the above points are directly reflected in the thematic and theoretical predilection of the various archaeological curricula that have been designed and enforced by the four Greek Universities and Departments of Archaeology (Athens, Thessaloniki, Ioannina, Crete). To this extent, all the four departments of Archaeology and History of Art demonstrate an overt bias towards Greek archaeology and within it towards certain periods (i.e. late Bronze Age and Classical)<sup>2</sup> and theoretical dispositions (i.e. German art historical tradition). As is voiced by representative members of the teaching staff, the University of Athens bases its theoretical spectrum on the notion that the more archaeognostic the curriculum is, the better the education and training of future Greek archaeologists (Lambrinoudakis 1993:35-37). The University of Thessaloniki is certainly more conscious of the social role of archaeology and of the vast potential that emerges from its interaction with other sciences besides the ever praised archaeognostic sources (e.g. anthropology, natural sciences, computing etc.)(Kotsakis 1993:41-44). To some degree, it recognises the significance of inter-disciplinarity and acknowledges the need for a sound theoretical basis in archaeological research.

What happens in the Greek departments of archaeology is directly related to the work progress and theoretical innovation or stagnation of the Greek Archaeological Service. Until recently, the direction of the Archaeological Service was controlled by university professors. Through the system of exams largely conducted by university professors, and the subject matter asked as exam material for the appointment of state archaeologists, one can see what the Archaeological Service expects from its future practitioners and the kind of work they will be engaged in.



## Greek University Museums of Archaeology - The examples of Thessaloniki and Athens

### MUSEUM HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT

Both University Museums of Thessaloniki and Athens, with their didactic collections of pottery and plaster casts, are material outcomes of a twentieth-century collecting activity, and thus it can be argued that, on a strictly chronological basis, they do not coincide with the long European tradition (seventeenth to nineteenth-centuries) of university museums. Possible reasons for this delay or original neglect were the country's wealth of original classical antiquities and the importance that was ascribed to them by the Greek state (Kourou 1994).

The history of the University Museum of Thessaloniki [Plates 202-206] and its collection is very much related to the establishment and history of the specific university itself and owes its existence to Professor K.Romaïos (Stefanidou-Tiveriou 1982:9-10; 1987:5; 1991; cf.Petrakos 1993a). In the years 1928-1936, the expansion of its collection of plaster casts from marble and clay originals, of replicas from bronze works, together with the collection of some originals - mainly pottery and clay figurines- grew prodigiously. Today, its plaster cast collection includes 360 copies of sculpture, 300 casts of coins, and 100 copies of metal objects, mainly prehistoric.

Its collection of authentic terracottas is small but representative of all periods, workshops and styles (see brief catalogue Stefanidou-Tiveriou 1982). They belong to the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic and Roman period, whereas very few are prehistoric.

In the years 1975-1982, Professor G.Despinis conducted a redisplay of the collections, but the museum remained inaccessible for students and the general public. Only in 1990 did it open after rearrangement, refurbishment and construction of a small lecture theatre for the purposes of seminars and lectures [Plate 204].

According to Stefanidou-Tiveriou, who is tutor and keeper of the collections (1987:5; 1991), the museum endeavours to offer opportunities to the students of archaeology to study ancient Greek and Roman sculpture, ancient pottery and minor arts. Also by

means of its casts, it seeks to provide the opportunity to come into closer contact with many important monuments that are housed in other museums of the country (National, Acropolis, Delphi, Piraeus, Olympia) and abroad (Berlin, Copenhagen, Munich). In essence, the University Museum seeks to become an important institution within the academic community as well as beyond, for the aesthetic amusement and instruction of the general public. Although still not fully appreciated and used, the museum collections bear great potential for the satisfaction of educational and scientific purposes.

The Museum of Athens was inaugurated in 1994, although the collecting activity of the University dates back to the 1930s. The museum contains a collection of fifty four plaster casts of Classical, Hellenistic and Roman sculptural originals [Plates 207-210], a collection of fragmentary or complete pottery groups of cross-cultural, cross-regional and diachronic character [Plate 211] as well as a collection of replicas of Byzantine mosaics and wall frescoes (see Kiosse 1994b; Kourou 1994; Palaggia & Palaiokrassa 1990; Petrakos 1993a). Its cast collection has not been a product of systematic and conscious collecting but the material outcome of scarce donations by the Archaeological Service (1938), the National Archaeological Museum (1939), the First Ephorate of Antiquities and the Archaeological Receipts Fund (1988-1989). The original purpose of those that put the collection together was to collect plaster casts of expatriated original classical statues. Later the collection was given a broader spectrum by also containing copies from Greek museums outside Athens (Palaggia & Palaiokrassa 1990).

In contrast, the collection of ceramic groups has systematically aimed at covering temporal (from Prehistory to the late Hellenistic Period) and regional gaps (i.e. covering the wider region of Aegean and Near East) [Plate 211]. The prime purpose of the collection is didactic, thus contributing to a balanced educational system that brings the archaeological object to the centre of the educational process (Kourou 1994).



## MUSEUM AND EXHIBITION MATERIALS

The museum collections of the University of Thessaloniki are situated in the cultural and commercial centre of the city, in the new premises of the School of Philosophy. The architectural script of the building is modern, functional but rather plain and undistinguished. The collections are displayed in the space of two big rooms of the lower ground floor (Stefanidou-Tiveriou 1987:5).

Informative and educational texts panels, drawings of pottery typology and excavation stratigraphy, topographic maps and photographs from stratigraphic layers and finds are to be found only in the small scale exhibition about Nea Agchialos, Sani and Carabournaki which is located in the centre of Gallery B [Plate 206]. The text and the supportive material seems like a concise version of an excavation diary or a site report. The description, although quite detailed and scientific, focuses almost entirely on the finds (mainly pottery sherds) that were found in each stratigraphic layer, and on their dating and typology. Although the exhibition indirectly exposes the archaeological techniques and methodologies applied in the field, namely excavations, surveys etc., it does not seem to refer to any specific theoretical model and does not attempt any holistic interpretation of the archaeological sites under enquiry.

As for the plaster cast collection, it presents a bias towards free-standing statues and reliefs whereas the examples from architectural groups are very few [Plates 204-205]. In general, they are displayed linearly in a kind of circuit around the walls of the gallery, in a more or less chronological sequence in order to clearly illustrate the development of ancient Greek sculpture and the stylistic particularities of each individual artistic era, and thus conform with the traditional art historical approach and research philosophy. Either consciously or simply out of necessity, casts and originals, even if they belong to different artefact groups, are mixed together, for their prime role after all is to be didactic for the student of archaeology and not necessarily to be pleasing to the senses and artistic consciousness of the visitors.

In a very similar manner, the collections of the University Museum at Athens are accommodated in the premises of the new university campus. The architectural script of the eight story building is modern, notably spacious but dry and unattractive. In the

galleries, there is strict division of space between the cast collections and the rest of the authentic displays. The plaster casts, mainly of free-standing originals, are sparsely arranged in a loose chronological order and decorative fashion, around a central open atrium that allows further observation of the casts from many different angles and from above, by means of balcony-like corridors located on the fourth floor [Plates 207-209]. In this presentation, there are also two small didactic displays to present replicas of ancient tools used for the carving of marble and to explain the pointing technique [Plate 210] which is one of the main methods of reproducing of copies and plaster casts (see Jones 1990:252).

The exhibition of the ceramic groups, arranged in chronological and regional typology, has resulted from the work of the previous year's archaeology students in relevant advanced seminars and therefore bears a kind of temporary character as it is meant to serve the needs of successive generations of students [Plate 211].

The philosophy of the exhibition aims to fulfil current educational needs on the understanding of regional development and cross-regional influence of pottery groups in the Mediterranean region.

#### MUSEUM SIGNIFICANCE

Recently, there have been some voices within Greek archaeological academia suggesting that the traditional view of the universities was simplistic and old fashioned and excluded Greek archaeology from the international theoretical trends by ascribing it a regional and marginal character (Kotsakis 1993:43; see also above).

This is reflected implicitly and explicitly in both university museum exhibitions. Of course, one can argue very rightly that the limited resources and small scale collections of the museums are counter-productive as they do not encourage efforts for essential theoretical innovation in the course of setting up a didactic display for and by students. Still, it remains apparent that what should come first is an essential re-orientation of university archaeological curricula in Greece that will provide novel intellect to the courses and embrace many other aspects of the discipline apart from the mere empirical training on dating, style and typology.



As for the plaster cast collections, it seems that their status and placement within a current post-modern system of material valuation is uncertain. In plain numeric terms, the collection in Thessaloniki is much more systematic and comprehensive than the one in Athens that has many gaps and is devoid of coherence and serial sequence. Yet, as the General Secretary of the Greek Archaeological Society once put it: 'they both look like a few sparse pages of a dictionary' (Petrakos 1993a:156).

In terms of their value, it seems that the predilection of Greek academia conforms more to a late nineteenth-century classicist rationale that approached casts as 'specimens' to fulfil special epistemological, educational and other scientific functions<sup>3</sup>. In contrast, they do not seem to accord with the post-modern tenor in the field of collection studies that views plaster casts as examples of the History of Taste and signs of a past devotion to the Antique. This is so, for this devotion to the classical past has never faded in Greece but is omnipresent.

#### 'ALTERNATIVE READINGS'

Let us discuss the interrelation between cast collections, classical scholarship and systems of material valuation.

Mary Beard offers some very interesting accounts of the history of plaster casts, by referring specifically to the Museum of Classical Archaeology in Cambridge. To use her words (Beard 1993:5):

'the parochial history of [the] casts turns out to be bound up with changing definitions of Classical scholarship and Classical art, and of the educational institutions and museums within which those disciplines were practised (...) Straddling those disputed boundaries between the *real* and the *fake*, the *object of aesthetic admiration* and the *educational aid*, the *product of Greek genius* and the *work of mechanical reproduction*, casts represented a particularly powerful locus for dispute and negotiation; and they acted as particularly powerful symbolic tools for defining and policing the boundaries on and across which they sat' [emphasis in the original]

From this commentary, we can immediately assess the complex and paradoxical nature of these artefacts which have been in flux within the individual quadrants of material valuation, namely authentic or spurious art, authentic or spurious historical artefact (see

Clifford 1988; Pearce 1995). Throughout the last two centuries, they offered an interesting interplay between contrasting notions of originality and authorship versus copy and replica, of valued art versus spurious art, of didactic tool versus sign of changing taste and appreciation.

Firstly, the question of original versus copy<sup>4</sup>, 'with all the nuanced intermediaries of adaptation, imitation, inspiration and pastiche' (Ridgway 1994:763; see also Bartman 1992; Krauss 1989:8-10; Ridgway 1984; 1989; Stewart 1990:25) has always been a central issue in the study of classical sculpture. It was first approached in the traditional manner by Adolf Furtwängler<sup>5</sup> in the late nineteenth-century and by many of his followers who regarded copies merely as sources for reconstructing the lost masterpieces of the Greek art (Bartman 1992:2). With the passage of time and the new archaeological finds, this approach proved to be misleading and speculative, for it became clear that copies modelled at times centuries after the creation of an original statue cannot accurately reproduce the visual appearance of that original. .

More recently, under the effect of post-structuralist thinking, these strict and conventional hierarchies between original:authentic and copy:inauthentic have been overturned by another array of questions regarding the copies' world (Bartman 1992:3; Krauss 1989:8). These questions ask not only what was being copied but also the whys, hows and whos of the copying as an enterprise with artistic, economic and social dimensions and significance in its own right. Because of their perplexing character and position in the system of material valuation, copies, imitations and replicas have occasionally been confused and associated with fakes: or 'as [] inherently second-rate and potentially shady' classes of objects (Jones 1990:29).

Nevertheless, cast replicas of major sculptural works of the Antiquity have been produced quite legitimately for centuries and gathered momentum in the eighteenth and nineteenth- centuries, responding to a double role both as copies and also as prestigious art works of a classical past (Connor 1989:187; Gratziou 1991; Pearce 1995:463-466). Originally, their role was to generate public delight and aesthetic edification. Soon, they were conferred mainly, and later only, with educational, informative and epistemological values as they proved to be important evidence for the classical archaeologist or art historian (Bury 1991). On a more general ideological and political level, they even attained a paradoxical superiority over their respective originals: for



‘[their] sheer *unoriginality* (...), their “not-being-Greek”, could keep the conscience clean’ (Beard 1993:4).

Nevertheless, we should stress that, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, cast collections were mostly held within the universities and university museums, and had directly and exclusively educational aims and directions. Thus, within the space of the museum as *locus* of scholarship, they were associated with a disciplined programme of instruction in classical archaeology occasionally bearing analogies with the laboratory assets of the natural sciences (Beard 1993:3). In this sense, they were valued from ‘works of art’ to some sort of ‘specimens’ (Beard 1993:18). Their exclusion from the General Museum of True Art as inauthentic versions of originals inferred the advent of their story of decline and marginalisation and generally the changing conceptions and theories regarding ‘Art’ and ‘artistic value’ (Beard 1993:20; Connor 1989:123, 194). For Beard, the reasons for the casts’ marginalisation were not simple and uniform everywhere. It might have been due to the coming of the ‘Age of Art Deco, (...) of modernism (...) and (...) fashionable minimalism’ (Jenkins 1992:229), or to individualistic needs for self-symbolism and definition in a rapidly changing world. Most likely, it was just as equally due to a general epistemic change and transition from classicism to modernity (Beard 1993:22).

Likewise, in the late twentieth century when we are experiencing a transition from modernity to an eclectic post-modernity, cast collections and their placement within the system of material valuation are once more on shifting ground. Their value is not so much aesthetic or educational and informative as mostly symbolic and associative of a past devotion to the antique and also indicative of a broad contemporary expansion of historical consciousness and interest in collection studies and the History of Taste (see Beard 1993:22; Bury 1991:121; Howard 1991:208-209; Pearce 1995:464). They stand either as: ‘stylish reminder[s] of [past] attitudes’ (Bury 1991:121) and as: ‘documents of the taste and traditions of our forefathers’ (Howard 1991:208-209) or: ‘they are sustained by their own myth; by the contact they offer with the past world (...) They are sustained by our myth that they *were* once “education”’ (Beard 1993:22).

## Conclusion

So, an alternative exhibition philosophy based on the history of material valuation, as discussed in Chapter Eight and here, can certainly bring a fresh insight into this group of artefacts. Firstly, it can make their role both as museum and archaeological objects far more interesting and exciting for students and future practitioners of the archaeological discipline. Secondly, it can enhance the role of University Museums, which are the natural hosts of these collections, and render their contribution in the shaping of future archaeologists' knowledge and experiences of their discipline more explicit and valuable.



# ON GREEK TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS OF CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AND THEIR POETICS; ALTERNATIVE ROUTES INTO THE RE-PRESENTATION OF THE ANCIENT GREEK PAST.

‘Undoubtedly, the need to present [publicly the material evidence of the past] must be fulfilled mainly through permanent museum exhibitions. *Periodic [i.e. temporary] exhibitions*, however, also have the potential to enhance the experience of the monuments. [Some of these exhibitions could concentrate on] efforts to gather together and study related pieces of art, or on the systematic presentation of aspects of ancient life based on material that resides in various museums, (...) etc. For these reasons, these kinds of exhibitions are organised in our country. The export of *short-life exhibitions abroad* is an extension of the former type of museum undertaking’.

V.Lambrinoudakis, in *To Vima* 22/3/92, p.B4/30 [emphasis in the original]

### Introduction

In Chapters Five to Nine, attention has been concentrated exclusively on the exploration of permanent exhibitions of classical archaeology in Greek museums. This has been the most traditional category of museum exhibiting in the country, in terms of its long

history, let alone its theoretical orientations and more often than not its museographical renderings.

In this section and the following chapter, two other complementary categories of museum exhibiting and communication will be critically analysed, namely the temporary archaeological exhibitions at home and the travelling loan exhibitions abroad. Although they have existed in the museum agendas of archaeology professionals in the country since the early post-war periods, both types of exhibitions only emerged in the late 1970s as distinct categories with tangible practical paradigms. Thereafter, they developed swiftly and at a steady pace. In many ways, their life histories have run parallel as on more than one occasion the same exhibitions have been presented both at home and abroad with similar arrangements or slight shifts of theoretical orientation.

Manifestly, these short-life museum presentations enriched Greek museum practice with numerous examples from whose gamut it is only possible to examine a representative sample for the purpose of this study. Thus, from the ever expanding corpus of temporary and travelling exhibitions, nine representative examples will be presented from each category [Appendix 3].

In the following chapter, all efforts will concentrate on the investigation of the poetics and politics of the travelling exhibitions abroad. In the present section, the intention is to sketch the general tendencies of the classical tradition and archaeological scholarship in Greece within the span of the last two decades, as these have been administered through the choice of themes, the range of philosophies and museological strategies employed in the setting up of temporary displays.

The chosen case-studies will be conventionally divided into three broad periods that ante- and post-date the cultural milestone of 1985, when a number of temporary exhibition events was organised in Athens on the occasion of the celebrations that surrounded the proclamation of the city as cultural capital of Europe for that year. Thus, the three periods will be as follows: a] 1970s to early 1980s. The early period; b] 1985. A creative and fruitful year; c] 1986 to today. The later period.



## The early period (1970s -early 1980s)

### EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT

Some points in favour of the great scientific possibilities that could potentially emerge from the preparation of temporary displays of archaeology, had already been advocated in 1967 during the First Panhellenic Congress of the Association of Greek Archaeologists which, among other topics, explored many practical aspects of archaeological heritage management and post-war museum reformation in the country. A specific constellation of ideas were voiced regarding the usefulness of temporary exhibitions on themes such as the development of ceramic art or the typology of stone tools (Theocharis 1984:81). Essentially, the potential of this type of museum category was then evaluated in view of its ability to serve particular scientific interests of practitioners and students of archaeology rather than cultural needs of ordinary museum audiences.

Nonetheless, as long as general museum reformation in Greece was going strong during the fervent early decades of the post-war period, the preparation of temporary exhibitions was not quite considered as a priority. This was partly due to the fact that the great majority of museum buildings in the country was not architecturally prepared to host such ventures of a temporary nature<sup>1</sup>. Space was limited and was inevitably reserved for permanent displays.

In the 1970s, however, when conditions were conducive to the setting up of temporary displays, a series of events took place, almost exclusively in the two big urban centres (i.e. Athens and Thessaloniki) and their principal archaeological institutions (i.e. National Archaeological Museum and Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki). This would indeed prove to be a recurrent museum practice in subsequent years.

In 1978, the National Archaeological Museum at Athens launched a number of temporary exhibitions: 'on the private life of the ancient Greeks (...) so as to bring the ancients nearer to [the modern Greeks]' (Philippaki 1979:200). This venture of the largest museum in the country originated from a then generally growing conviction that:

‘museums should take a greater part in education and the popularisation of archaeology. Cultural exhibitions, i.e. exhibitions dedicated to aspects and ways of life characteristic of a people or a whole civilisation, could make a very important contribution to this effort’ (ibid.). Essentially, the original intention was to approach the ancients from a cultural perspective and view them in a more familiar and warm manner. In this way, both archaeology and the museum could dynamically re-enter the public sphere and benefit from people’s interest and support. The themes chosen to actualise this endeavour were simple, *a priori* popular and intellectually accessible to non-specialist audiences.

The first in the series was entitled ‘The Child of Antiquity’ (opened on 17/8/1978) and naturally its great appeal was that as a theme it could touch the right personal chords given that the experiences and memories of childhood were often influential factors in the later life of any individual [Plates 212-217]. In fact, the exhibition was organised as part of the Greek contribution to the manifestations of the International Year of the Child (1979) and in this framework it aimed primarily to offer today’s children: ‘the smile of the children who have lived in this corner of the earth’ many centuries ago (Philippaki 1979). Moreover, it sought to transmit grand messages about the needs of the modern: ‘troubled, violent and bewildered age to revive the Hellenic spirit, from which the civilisation of modern Europe descended, [and] maintain those ideals which had no national frontiers and were the common inheritance of the civilised world’ (ibid.). Here, it would be probably worth noting that in 1979 Greece was just on the eve of its full accession to the European Union. Thus, narratives on the excellence and legacy of the ancient Greek civilisation to the European and indeed Western world would be a common denominator in many temporary archaeological exhibitions in the country and in most of the travelling exhibitions abroad, as we shall see in some detail in Chapter Eleven.

The second exhibition in the series was on ‘The Ancient Greek Musical Instruments’ (12/9-30/12/1979) [Plates 218-219]. Again this display was part of a wider manifestation of the International Musical Day. In 1980, a third exhibition on ‘Ancient Medical Instruments’ was arranged as an adjunct event to an International Medical Symposium held in Athens during that year. However, a complete absence of any



bibliographical or photographic material excludes any possibility of drawing specific comments on this particular exhibition.

During the same period 1978-1980, the magnificent golden treasures at Vergina and other remarkable finds from numerous archaeological sites in the north of the country had taken archaeological 'excitement' and public interest to unprecedented heights, both at local and national level. Parallel with this and in the light of the new practical needs that arose regarding the accommodation of numerous new displays, the completion of the post-war reformation of the Museum of Thessaloniki was then well under way (see Chapter Seven). In this context, the new finds lent wings to the realisation of two major temporary exhibitions which were timely mounted in 1978-1980. Their aim was to mark the new era of the museum and to satisfy scientific needs and public curiosity regarding the new sublime finds. In various ways, these two illustrious exhibitions, that enjoyed immense popularity<sup>2</sup>, publicity and state support, provided the material core for the subsequent formation of a number of permanent galleries in the museum and travelling exhibitions abroad (see Chapters Seven & Eleven).

The exhibition 'Treasures of Ancient Macedonia' opened on 8/8/79, with the full support of the Ministries of Culture and Macedonia and the indefatigable efforts of all the senior staff of the Ephorate (Yalouris 1978:10) [Plates 220-222; Figure 56]. Subsequent to its opening, it took part in the European competition for the annual Museum Award. This was in recognition of its significance as the first temporary exhibition of ancient Greek art with a special subject (and of such breadth and international magnitude) ever to have been organised in a Greek Museum. The exhibition 'Alexander the Great, History and Legend in Art', on view between July and September 1980, was equally dazzling and of great public appeal<sup>3</sup>. Its travelling version entitled 'The Search for Alexander' will hold a significant place in the following chapter, and so there is no need to expand further here.

## EXHIBITION MATERIALS AND 'ALTERNATIVE READINGS'

The organisation and philosophy of the 'Child in Antiquity' exhibition sprang largely from the idea that in temporary exhibitions, the selected topic should be presented to the general public in the simplest possible way and within a suitable warm and familiar atmosphere that would stimulate rather than hinder personal contact between the visitors, the objects and the concepts they conveyed (Philippaki 1979:202). In this respect, attention was summoned towards the awakening of emotions that directly emanated from original artefacts and which would 'bring the world of Greek children to life' (ibid.200-201), and much less towards teaching the general public or the provision of study material for the specialist. The idea was to convey simple messages about the world of the ancient Greek child and bridge the past with the present by stressing the sameness of this remote world to the: 'children's world of yesterday and to some degree even that of children today, poor and dry though it has become through technology' (ibid. 200-201). So, the thread of the exhibition's master narrative relied entirely on the visitor's -adult rather than child- ability to recognise certain features in the objects on display and associate them with his/her own personal experiences from childhood. The objects, mostly of modest artistic quality, were clay statuettes, terracottas, small marble reliefs and small clay vases which represented children, their toys and their pet animals and were divided into small subject units, such as birth, nursing, playing, religious festivals, schooling and death [Plates 212-217].

Despite the moving inclusion of the topic that rendered the ancient child archaeologically 'visible' and the specific thematic divisions and descriptions within it, which indeed crossed the stereotypical and conventional art-historical threshold of the foregoing and other contemporary displays of archaeology, the 'Child in Antiquity' reinforced many of the archaeological conventions of the study of the child and childhood in ancient societies. It approached the subject by mostly exploring the ideal images of childhood (e.g.. playtime and feeding) by pointing at artefacts (e.g. toys) that specifically illustrated these aspects of children's daily life. Current post-processual and feminist theorising<sup>4</sup>, in contrast, proposes a number of alternative ways through which we can meaningfully access the world of children. Certainly, one would plunge into a kind of scholarly anachronism, should one attempt to analyse the philosophy and



intellectual framework of the 'Child in Antiquity' exhibition of the late 1970s based on social archaeological theories developed or indeed still under formulation in the 1990s. Nonetheless, new ideas in this field of research are worth mentioning, even in a sketchy manner, for they can suggest how we could alternatively understand and visualise ancient childhood in the space of other museum exhibitions that are yet to come. This need is enhanced even more by the nature of childhood and various issues related to this distinct social category which are right at the heart of many current debates about the need to protect children in our own society (see Sofaer Derevenski 1994a:2).

Current views advocate that first and foremost, effort should be made in defining the meaning of the term 'child' and the biological, cultural and social configurations of this specific category in the past, for previous attitudes have been culturally loaded and have interpreted childhood based on western notions of the standard compartmentalisation of the human cycle. To this definition of the notion of 'child' and 'childhood' is also related an effort to re-investigate the position of children in ancient societies. In essence, this re-investigation can open up new challenging questions regarding ancient economies, social structures and divisions of labour in terms of age and gender. It can also introduce a fresh understanding of the children's socio-economic role and allow them to be regarded as both producers and consumers of material culture, rather than as merely passive and unproductive recipients. More specifically, in relation to the ancient Greek child and the reconstruction of its past, some of the areas that could be explored include gender divisions of labour, gender definition in children and ideology, social identity and status and socialisation of children in a number of different contexts. Other topics include the children's social and economic roles in the household and the community, affective relations of children with their peers and adult members of the household, the relationship of slaves and children and their effects, the characteristic attitudes of childhood, (although one certainly must not lose sight of the fact that most sources referring to childhood were male members of the Athenian elite), rites of entry into the family and ritual acts marking processes of integration into the adult community, child death, exposure of new-borns and infanticide as a measure to control gender growth and optimum size of the family, and many others (see Golden 1990).

Turning, now, to the 'Ancient Greek Musical Instruments' exhibition, this was similarly organised in sub-themes whose nature was basically dictated by the types and characters

of the available relevant material on display (see also Comotti 1989). This included figurines of female dancers, figurines of gods holding musical instruments, bronze rattles, flutes, lyres, a prehistoric bone lyre, an ancient carapace of turtle, vases from the Geometric to Hellenistic period with iconographic depictions of ancient musical instruments, a Neo-Attic sarcophagus with Dionysiac scenes, etc. [Plates 218-219].

Despite the fact that most of the basic ingredients for the pictorial representation and conceptual understanding of the subject matter were at hand (i.e. an interesting collection and basic information), distinct didactic impulse and museographical imagination that would render the topic more accessible and appealing to a non-specialist audience were undoubtedly missing. The remarkably static character of the display was *ad hoc* contradictory to the dynamism and multi-sensory expanse of the overall theme, which was music, poetry and dance. Music was viewed but not listened to or experienced. And yet, simple solutions, such as the inclusion of recorded experimental ancient Greek music as a background sound or even the incorporation of an even more dynamic audio-visual medium that would bring both sound and image closer to life, could easily overcome this problem.

In essence, however, with reference to both the 'Child' and 'Musical Instruments' exhibitions, it is important to note that the restricted budgets for the preparation of those early temporary displays in the National Museum was one of the factors responsible for their museographically uninspired and arid character. There may have been some exhibition posters produced and limited publicity attained through the Press<sup>5</sup>, but on the whole marketing was hardly part of the agenda.

That was not exactly the case for the 'Treasures of Macedonia' exhibition whose overall artistic, scientific, political and economic (i.e. tourism) significance and more organised public promotion were enough to ascribe to it the attribute of a pioneering and prototype temporary exhibition among other contemporary ventures in this specific museum category [Plates 220-222; Figure 56]. Certainly, the uniqueness and abundance of the displays and the public fascination with them helped a lot. Also, the fact that the organisers sat down and produced clear statements regarding the aims and objectives of the exhibition as well as the production of supplementary material (e.g. catalogue, leaflets, etc.) was an important step forward for its success (see Rhomiopoulou 1978a; 1978b; 1978c). In addition, another significant factor was the



rejection of the conventional method of showing metalwork in chronological order arranged by categories in vast cases standing in row as in a parade. Instead, preference was given to a careful and 'scientific' arrangement of the finds in geographical districts and in burial groups (most of them coming from tombs or graves). In fact, in subsequent museum presentations of the material, either in the same museum or abroad, this categorisation became a standard practice and a museological vogue. Last but not least, special care has been taken with the aesthetic embellishment of the environment within which the objects would be staged. This interest translated into attempts to create the impression of an underground chamber tomb or generally of an enclosed reliquary containing the Macedonian ancestral heritage which would evoke deeper emotional responses and aesthetic admiration regarding the beauty, variety and functionality of the displays (see Rhomiopoulou 1978a; 1978c).

#### EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE

In essence, the long-term value of these museum undertakings or of any other that occurred during the same period stems from their contribution towards laying the foundation stones of the later development of temporary exhibitions which became a distinct, meaningful and important independent museum category. The various practical issues and intricacies involved in the preparation of temporary displays, such as the lack of space provision for temporary exhibits, the restricted budgets, or the outdated museographies, suggested a new set of requirements that Greek archaeological museums would have to meet and satisfy from then on.

### **1985, a creative and fruitful year**

#### EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT

In 1985, with the proclamation of Athens as first European cultural capital, the public presentation of archaeology benefited from a fever of creativity regarding short-life projects that were staged in various venues around the city. The international magnitude

of the whole event and its political and cultural significance and symbolism at home brought a pleasant breeze of change to what concerned the preparation, production and final realisation of temporary archaeological exhibitions. Special financial aid, provided mostly by central government but also by corporate sponsorship<sup>6</sup>, as well as the appointment of interdisciplinary teams of experts were two of the principal driving forces that transformed temporary exhibitions from self-indulgent scholarly exercises into public events with 'well-considered educational purposes' (Tzedakis 1988:17).

Furthermore, as the framework within which all the exhibitions were to operate was that of the celebration of European history and culture, most of these short-life displays were first and foremost meant to serve as bearers of a particular cultural and ideological message as regards the historical and current position of Greece within the community of its European counterparts. In this respect, the thread that conceptually tied many of these projects together had been woven, as one would naturally expect, and based on a series of humanistic narratives regarding classical ideals and values, the ancient Athenian democracy, classical education, philosophy, arts, urbanisation as well as notions of Europeanism, cross-cultural communication and co-operation.

Two of the most interesting and relevant examples that could be included in the corpus of the case-studies, are the exhibitions 'Democracy and Classical Culture', staged in the National Archaeological Museum between 21/6-20/10/1985 [Plates 223-230] and the monumental 'Greece and the Sea', put up by the Ministry of Culture in collaboration with the Benaki Museum in a specially arranged Exhibition Hall belonging to the Port of Piraeus Authorities (inaugurated on 14/7/85) [Plates 231-233]. Other interesting cases, that followed the same line of thinking towards the forging of 'links between the past and present, between Greece and the rest of Europe' (Mercouri 1987a:5), were a series of four displays on the architecture and planning of Athens from Prehistory down to today<sup>7</sup>. Also exciting for the history of archaeology was the exhibition on 'Troy, Heinrich Schliemann's excavations and finds' whose symbolic role was not only confined to narrating the early history of Mycenaean archaeology and the legendary life of its father and founder, but also expressed the history of: 'common European origin and the ideal for common European future'<sup>8</sup> and the 'close cultural links between the Greek and German people'<sup>9</sup>.



## EXHIBITION MATERIALS AND 'ALTERNATIVE READINGS'

The 'Democracy and Classical Culture' exhibition was the first exhibition of the National Museum that aspired to describe the origins of a historical phenomenon rather than to limit its scope to presenting certain groups of material culture of either artistic, stylistic, functional or other pertinence. That the exhibition was first and foremost concept rather than object-oriented was its great merit and long-term impact as concerns the philosophy of temporary archaeological exhibiting in the National Archaeological Museum [Plates 223-230].

In brief, the 'Democracy and Classical Culture' exhibition set out to reveal the conditions surrounding the development of the democratic polity in classical Athens and the legacy the latter imprinted both on the Athenian political and cultural institutions as well as on the history of political and intellectual thought as this developed in the West theretofore (Mercouri 1985a:7; Organising Committee 1985:11-12; also Hatzioannou 1985a:23). With the genesis of classical democracy and classical tradition as the master theme, the exhibition was divided into five sub-themes and gallery sections: democracy, philosophy, athletics, poetry and music/dance. This was indeed an exciting subject, traditionally placed at the forefront of classical research and discourse, with an abundance of ancient and later literary and archaeological material one could draw from in order to structure it conceptually and figuratively for the purposes of the exhibition. Timely, fitting and idealised as it might have been in the context of the celebrations of Athens as European Cultural capital, undoubtedly the 'Democracy and Classical Culture' could still be a fascinating theme, even more so today in the context of new theories and contemporary challenging debates and research regarding the nature, eternal presence and symbolism of Athenian democracy, classical tradition and Hellenism as a whole.

With specific regard to the museographical presentation of the theme, the massive shift of orientation from previous exhibition styles towards more appealing gallery environment and modernised software provided an extra asset to the charm of the event. Finally, the generosity with which textual information, illustrative material, educational publications (i.e. exhibition catalogue) and other promotional products (e.g. poster, leaflets etc.) have imbued the archaeological core of the display, conveyed a more

general optimism regarding the changing role of the Greek archaeological museum as being a more 'democratic' and 'public' rather than elitist state apparatus.

In 'Greece and the Sea', the theme and exhibition scope was similarly self-evident but also very ambitious in its historical and chronological breadth, its exceptional material expanse (approximately 1125 objects) and spaciousness of the provided display area. The exhibition focused on how Greece: 'had always lived with the sea, from the sea, through the sea' (Mercouri 1985a:5), covering the whole historical spectrum of the country, extending from the Neolithic age to the present and thus ultimately shedding light on the fundamental characteristics of the long trajectory of Hellenism through the centuries [Plates 232-233].

The diachronic historical presentation of the maritime presence of Greece, and the importance of the sea for Greece and its civilisation was composed of four parts, albeit not of equal value and size in terms of gallery space. The first and most extensive section was on antiquity from the prehistoric period to the end of the Roman empire, to be followed by the smaller chapters on the Byzantine period from the founding of Constantinople until the end of Byzantine empire, the Ottoman period of occupation till the War of Independence and the period of modern Greek state from its establishment to the present. Each one of these categories had various sub-themes<sup>10</sup> covering all the important events in the historical march of Hellenism from the social, economic, cultural, artistic to the legendary (Delivorrias 1985a; 1985b; 1987; see also Editorial 1985:12; Hatzioannou 1985b:12). To maximise the inherent historical values of the objects on display and optimise the conceptual accessibility of the various sub-themes, the organisers of the exhibition included an equal number of panel texts offering introductory notes on each period and a significant amount of supplementary pictorial and written material. Technically, the signage of the exhibition was direct and efficient, and there was also the intention to offer an overall poetic environment both in a literal and metaphoric sense. The former was achieved by inserting into each thematic unit a brief extract from Greek poems on the subject of the sea; the latter had more to do with the aesthetic appraisal and design of the exhibition which was fashioned in various tones of blue and dreamlike effects of lighting to: 'produce an impression of lightness and fluidity: a sense of floating across the sea' (Delivorrias 1987:16-17).



## EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE

In short, we can argue that 1985 occupied centre stage in the new cultural dynamics and emerging landscapes of museum exhibiting of archaeology in Greece. By virtue of a wealth of temporary displays realised during that year and of their modern and creative museum re-conceptualisations, the public museum presentation of archaeology ventured to enter upon new conceptual, methodological and aesthetic tracks. Exhibitions such as the 'Democracy and Classical Culture', the 'Greece and the Sea' or even the 'Troy, Heinrich Schliemann's excavations and finds' not only provided some correctives to previous public notions that perceived the museum as being more or less a vestige of intellectual seclusion and bewilderment, but also broke new ground and dictated essential parameters for longer-term and more enduring displays.

### **The later period (1986 to today)**

## EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT

In the years following the special celebrations of the Cultural Capital, many more temporary exhibitions have been put on public view. Surveying the history of these events, we have not failed to take note of the striking fact that these displays in their great majority, if not indeed in their absolute totality, have been exclusively hosted in Athens. Typically, the National Archaeological Museum has taken the lion's share in the organisation of the high-profile exhibitions.

With reference to the choice of themes, a new and diverse repertoire was now put on the pedestal, covering various fields of interests and chronological periods from the exploration of ancient worlds, ancient lives and specific sites to the foundations of classical ideals of Hellenism, the history of archaeology and specific archaeological private collections. Exhibition titles thus ranged from the 'Mycenaean World. Five centuries of Early Greek Culture' (15/12/88-31/3/89, National Archaeological Museum), the 'Neolithic Culture in Greece' (February 1996-February 1997, Goulandris Museum), 'From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece' (20/3-30/6/95,

National Archaeological Museum), 'Eleutherna' (1994, Goulandris Museum) to the 'Mind and Body. The Athletic Contests in Ancient Greece' (15/5/89-15/1/90, National Archaeological Museum) and the 'Troy, Mycenae, Tiryns, Orchomenos. The 100th Anniversary of Schliemann's death' (15/6-2/9/90, National Archaeological Museum), 'Delphi. In the Sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research' (September-December 1992, Benaki Museum) and the 'Minoan and Hellenic Civilisation from the Mitsotakis Collection' (12/11/92, Goulandris Museum).

Some of the above exhibitions have originated from specific historical and cultural conditions and events whereas others have emerged as the culminated efforts of contemporary scientific interest in corresponding topics.

In order to survey the conceptual and aesthetic landscape of temporary museum exhibiting in this period, touching upon the particulars of representative examples in terms of theme selection, range of philosophies and museological styles, four case-studies will be singled out as a source of reference. These are the 'Mind and Body', the 'Eleutherna', the 'Delphi' and the 'Radical Women in Ancient Greece' exhibitions, for they can potentially satisfy requisites for the formation of a certain analytical framework as defined above.

Before turning to the presentation of archaeology in the context of these exhibitions, a few comments regarding the environment within which they emerged can be included by a way of a short introduction.

The 'Mind and Body. The Athletic Contests in Ancient Greece' was a 'sumptuous' exhibition that grew as an integral part of Greece's bid to host the centenary of the modern Olympic Games in 1996 (Serwint 1990:504) [Plates 234-237]. The Ministry of Culture decided to organise the exhibition and name it so, based on the belief that: 'the central idea characterising the Olympic Ideal was the simultaneous cultivation and identification of these two concepts' (Mercouris 1989:13). In fact, the 'Mind and Body' was a striking cultural venture that was structured in three sections and simultaneously presented in three different venues: the first<sup>11</sup> of the three was the archaeological part that looked at the ancient origins of Olympism.

In the 'Delphi. In the sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research' exhibition, one can easily guess the reasons that prompted its realisation by just reading



the exhibition title [Plates 238-242]. The display was in fact included in a wider programme of Franco-Hellenic celebrations that provided, apart from the museum presentation, the publication of a fascinating volume<sup>12</sup> on the history of the French excavations and restorations on the site, a conference, a series of public lectures and a concert. To stress the cultural, international and diplomatic significance of the whole celebrations and this museum exhibition in particular, it is worth noting that the display was organised by the French Archaeological School and the Centre National de Recherches Scientifiques, was sponsored by Air France and the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and above all was placed under the auspices of the Presidents of the French and Hellenic Republics, a diplomatic and cultural alliance that was symbolically depicted with the use of the French and Greek national flags in the entrance of the exhibition.

With reference to the 'Eleutherna' exhibition, the preparation of the display resulted directly from recent and unusual archaeological discoveries in the homonymous Cretan site [Plates 243-247; Figure 57]. In 1990 and subsequent years, a certain degree of excitement, mostly located in archaeological quarters, arose after the unearthing of some late Geometric burials that according to the excavator represented an example of a decapitated slave funeral on the pyre of his lord and thus evidenced archaeologically and materially relevant passages from the great Homeric Epics regarding the ceremonial burials of heroes and the practice of human sacrifice of slaves or enemies in their honour<sup>13</sup>. Thus, the archaeological, literary and anthropological significance, quite apart from the enigmatic and even romantic dimension of the whole subject and of the specific finds provided a set of fascinating ingredients for a public museum presentation and dramatisation of the discovery that was also furnished with a significant amount of raw data and archaeological scientific inferences.

Finally, the 'From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece', compared to the previous topics, was the result of a less clear-cut mix of motives [Plates 248-250]. A general interest in the expanding field of women or rather gender studies, the predominantly female composition of the organising exhibition team approaching issues of ancient Greek life from a feminist perspective, let alone the conceptualisation of the exhibition in memory of a renowned female Greek personality that of M.Mercouri Minister of Culture who had passed away a year to the day of the opening

of that temporary display, may have been some of the reasons that prompted the theme choice.

#### EXHIBITION MATERIALS AND 'ALTERNATIVE READINGS'

In the 'Mind and Body. The Athletic Contests in Ancient Greece' exhibition [Plates 234-237], more than two hundred authentic objects from twenty Greek and five European Museums were put together to: 'remind [the modern people] of the true meaning of "competition" as conceived by the ancient Greeks and as adopted by the Europeans in the creation of their own civilisation'(Spathari 1989). This statement epitomises the essence and ideological scope of the whole event which notably centred around the presentation of the characteristics of Greek athletic competition in antiquity and the unveiling of the close relationship between Greek philosophical values and the athletic ideal to wider non-specialist audiences<sup>14</sup>. In other words, the exhibition set out to explore the origins of a 'miracle', that is 'the miracle of the Human Body and Human Spirit that inspires and creates' (Mercouri 1989:11), from a humanistic and clearly idealised, moralising perspective. Thus, provided with a historical narrative, a factual archaeological and literary story-telling, the visitor was guided through a series of galleries to explore the subject in depth thanks to an ordered sequence of themes and a unique collection of 'real' things (i.e. bronze statuettes, vases, marble and bronze sculptures, terracotta figurines, seal stones, grave stelae, coins, goldwork, etc.). In brief, this sequence textually and pictorially presented the athletic contests in the Aegean during the Bronze Age, contests in mythology, the dual function of gymnasia in athletics and education, the athletic cultural program of the panathenaic festival, the history and archaeology at Olympia as well as the format of the Olympic Games, Delphi and the Pythian festival, the founding of the Isthmian games and the sanctuary of Poseidon at the Isthmus, the ancient site of Nemea and its athletic games, the nature of the athletic events at panhellenic competitions (preparation, training, events as running, pentathlon, discus throwing, javelin throwing, long jump, wrestling, pankration, boxing, chariot racing etc.) and finally some reflections on and views of victorious athletes.

This was indeed a detailed coverage of the subject, particularly with regard to its geographical range (i.e. ancient Olympia, Athens, Delphi, Nemea, Isthmia, etc.) and



philosophical expanse. Nonetheless, the exhibition would have gained further theoretical breadth, if the ‘what, when, where, who and why’ of ancient athletics had been treated in greater detail and if the history, ‘rise’ and ‘fall’, in essence the sociology of the athletics had been treated in relation to the wider socio-political, cultural, economic and topographical history of the various cities themselves (see Kyle 1987). If this kind of theorising was too comprehensive and difficult to sufficiently and successfully implement in the space of a museum exhibition, as one could possibly counter argue, at least some efforts could have been made towards the clearer unveiling and thus understanding of the distinct differences that existed in antiquity between athletics, sport and physical education. These distinctions, suggesting, for instance, that Greek athletics entailed competition for a prize and that participation whose nature was not necessarily recreational or enjoyable, would in effect touch upon an array of interesting, and certainly heated issues in the context of contemporary debates regarding such matters as over-professionalism, rewards, over-specialisation and extreme commercialisation in the modern twentieth century Olympic Games.

In connection with this contemporary significant issue on the decline of athletics as a result of excessive professionalism as opposed to the idealised and recommended model of athletic amateurism, some recent scholarly studies put forward the argument that the study of ancient athletics has traditionally, thereby influentially viewed early Greek athletics through a romantic and value-laden lens. The argument goes on to suggest that the history of athletics has suffered from an excess of antiquarianism plus a ‘classicist bias’ against professionalism, as modern notions of amateurism and concerns about money have blurred historians’ visions in an obvious preference for amateurs over professionals (Kyle 1987:3, 124-154). This idealisation of the ancient Greek past, ancient athletics and amateurism as well as of the ‘innocent’ history of this humanistic institution was indeed the main thrust behind the “Mind and Body” exhibition, not only in its archaeological reading but also in its historical and artistic versions which we mentioned briefly above. The central narrative of the exhibition was thus structured upon the premise that the modern rendering of the ancient athletics had lost its true character and that modern Greece and Hellenism, as legitimate heir of the glorious and glorified ancient Greek past and in respect of this past, bear the moral obligation to reinstate the inseparable, albeit now dissipated relationship between mind and physical

exercise<sup>15</sup>. That was the overriding intellectual framework and moralising and romantic spirit of the exhibition.

If one was then to search for new and reflexive ways of looking at and representing the past, one would not necessarily find them in the theoretical structure and suggestive or challenging messages of the exhibition. Instead one would rather accredit merit to the museographical articulation of the exhibition's sequence of narratives. Apart from the aesthetically pleasing environment that was very much in keeping with the design of the 'Democracy and Classical Culture' exhibition, the distinct use of didactic plaster models and the quality of the displays, the educative dimensions of the exhibition were substantially enhanced by the use of multi-media technology which was introduced for the first time into a Greek museum exhibiting via a series of touch screens that provided supplementary information on specific objects on display and specific themes.

Information technology was also an integral part of the exhibition 'Delphi. In the sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research' [Plates 238-242]. Essentially, the display consisted of four kinds of materials: first a series of photographic and textual data all reproduced for the specific needs of the exhibition [Plates 239-240]; secondly a couple of plaster models of the sacred precinct and gymnasium (in scale of 1:100 and 1:300 respectively) [Plate 241]; thirdly two sets of computers providing further information on various themes<sup>16</sup> related to the history and scientific exploration of the site; and finally an audio-visual apparatus, a kind of interactive multi-media game, that aimed to recreate for the visitor the experience<sup>17</sup> of seeking and receiving an oracle by the renowned Pythia of Delphi [Plate 242].

No original ancient objects were included in the display, but that limitation did not hold back the large potential and interest the theme of the exhibition naturally contained. The material was arranged in two large sections with numerous sub-themes that reflected the history of Delphi before and during the Great Excavation as well as its history in the aftermath of the Great Excavation as exemplified through architectural restitution, consolidations and restorations. Some of the more interesting sub-themes concerned the transformation of the site from a modern village (Kastri) to a famous classical dreamland of classical scholars, travellers and pioneer archaeologists before the French archaeological venture set off in 1892, the French expropriation of the site, the life and



death of the village Kastri, the technology of the Great Excavation, the first magnificent finds as well as the establishment of the first museum on the site (see also French Archaeological School at Athens. National Centre of Scientific Research of France 1992).

The very great merit of this exhibition was that it centred attention not on the past, as most archaeological exhibitions tend to do, but on the process of uncovering this past and the history of these workings. In this respect, it not only underlined the intrinsic value and need for searching for the origins and development of the archaeological discipline to certain specialised quarters (i.e. archaeologists, historians) but also exposed them vividly to general audiences that only rarely get closer insights into the process of 'writing' archaeology. If we were to correct something in this exhibition, it would be the absence of focus on the more socio-political impasse and theoretical-epistemological dimensions of archaeological exploration in Delphi. These, for instance, would include references and inferences on the international politics of the site on the eve of the French Great Excavation, the gradual impact of tourism on Delphi, the current state of affairs as regards the ways local people perceive their heritage and classical tradition, let alone the position and potential of Delphi and its material culture in contributing to contemporary archaeological theorising and discourse.

By and large, however, this exhibition, alas only of a temporary nature, was an invaluable asset to the interpretation of the recent history of Delphi and thenceforth, by way of wishful thinking, must certainly occupy some space among the permanent displays of the homonymous site museum one day.

The 'Eleutherna' exhibition was also a kind of a monographic display that drew its impetus exclusively from the scientific impact of fascinating discoveries at the homonymous site [Plates 243-247; Figure 57]. The exhibition narrative was however typically conventional and essentially deployed through an aesthetic, and occasionally contextual arrangement of authentic objects and the use of secondary textual information and plaster models that were exclusively located in the first introductory gallery of the exhibition space [Plates 243-245]. For the uninitiated visitor this was clearly not an easy exhibition to read through and understand in its full meaning, or indeed its fascinating and romantic dimensions as described in the previous section. The only way, ingenious and direct but otherwise contrary to the generally very

‘scholarly’ framework of the exhibition, that the visitor could get a grip on the excavation’s and display’s salient scholarly interest was through a collection of newspaper clips that, in the introductory gallery, reported the exciting chronicle of the discovery at the time of its happening and its aftermath [Plate 245].

Finally, the ‘From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece’ [Plates 248-250], one of the latest in the series of exhibitions in the National Archaeological Museum, asserted that the: ‘great deal of attention [that] has been focused in recent years on women in antiquity... in the wake of the feminist movement’<sup>18</sup> had dynamically started penetrating and influencing Greek scholarship and by extent certain forms of museum exhibiting<sup>19</sup>.

The exhibition was structured on the premise that: ‘women in Greek mythology and by extension in Greek art and epic and tragic poetry, play[ed] a leading role of great importance, highly charged with meaning... in contrast to the position of [real historical] woman in society ... who did not seem to correspond to that occupied by the brilliant, outstanding female figures of legend’ (*Medea-Sappho* 1 & 2). So taking the Greek myth as the central point of departure, the exhibition sought to explore and present an array of different, alternative female characters and female properties who each entailed a special symbolic value and uniqueness that made them distinct but also united within the female communities of the legend and also within the societal environment of real living women. Thus in essence, the organisers of the exhibition aimed to establish ancient Greek women’s identity through ancient Greek mythological story-telling and symbolic metaphors. Ultimately, they proposed that in this thread of symbolic metaphors of female characteristics and nature: ‘women of all periods continually [could] find fragments of their own form’ (ibid.), and so in this sense they could potentially project onto and draw their own experiences from the women of ancient Greek legends and history.

The story-line thereby built upon a series of sub-themes that were dedicated to single female radical personalities -most of whom were legendary and mythical heroines of divine or royal descent-, and to the diachronic symbolic metaphor they were held to represent, such as: Eurynome and Pandora, the creation myths; Medea, the price of wisdom; Clytemnaestra, the queen; Phaedra the despair; Sappho, the [real] voice of the



woman; Helen, the woman; Electra, the woman of grief; Antigone, the courage of self-denial; Ariadne, the abandonment; Iphigeneia, the offering of virgin; Circe, the allure of the sorceress; Atalanta, the strength; Alcestis, the love that conquers death; Diotima or concerning Love; Amazones, the characters of strength in myth.

To articulate the stories and symbolisms that personified every female character, an extensive amount of information was drawn from the existing ancient literary sources and knowledge, e.g. myths, tragedies, comedies, epic and lyric poetry etc., and archaeological material, mostly depictions on vases and their particular imagery. Both these text narratives based on literary testimonies, which were regrettably reproduced to excessive length via a 'book on the wall' format, and the rich collection of relevant archaeological evidence used as mere decorative illustration, had been placed within an evocative and suggestive gallery environment, which was painted symbolically in a dark red colour, the colour of 'blood, of murder, of sacrifice and of love' (ibid.) that women of the Greek myth signified through their actions.

Were we, now, to inspect the theoretical impulse of this exhibition from a broader perspective, we would try to do so by determining its particular position within the historiographical scholarship<sup>20</sup> and tradition of the history of women. This endeavour, in fact, is potentially of wider interest, for: 'this part of ancient history has firm links with general tendencies in classical scholarship and history on the one hand and with contemporary views on gender and society on the other'<sup>21</sup>.

First and foremost, the exhibition's great value was that it brought ancient woman to the centre of attention, both scholarly and public. That is to say that it aimed to break free from traditional and outmoded inclinations of classical scholarship that have otherwise taken a distinctively dim view of the position of the ancient Greek women.

Until quite recently, assessments regarding women's roles and status in ancient Greece and primarily ancient Athens, as the surviving literary testimonies speak mostly about the latter, have been blurred or even hampered by an impelling urge to maintain the idealised view of classical Athens, classical democracy and ideals of individual freedom. An in-depth historical evaluation of women simply did not fit into the general historical picture of a democratic Athenian society (Blok 1987:17-18). Since the 1970s, however, the study of gender in classical antiquity has undergone rapid and wide-

ranging development; and it is in this epistemological context that the 'From Medea to Sappho' exhibition itself belongs. Nonetheless, in this exhibition some conventional frameworks are still present. For instance, the story-line almost entirely touched upon famous mythological rather than ordinary women of ancient Athens, or other city-states. Thereby, apart from unquestionably accepting how much we can learn about Greek women on the basis of the mythological evidence<sup>22</sup>, the exhibition also failed to confront challenging questions concerning the position of real women in the reality of everyday life and the overall organisation of social and cultural life generally. In this sense, it missed the chance to bring forward and discuss women's roles not merely as a moral issue, but alternatively as a political, social, cultural and ethical one. Contemporary scholarship, instead, tends to go beyond issues of morality, pointing out the need for new approaches and programmes towards women's history (Blok 1987; Katz 1995). These programmes, for instance, propose a viewing and rapprochement of women not in isolation from the historical picture, but rather from a wider socio-cultural perspective. The study of gender roles and structures of sexual symmetry or asymmetry tends now to be the locus of concern and research priority.

Another possible critical comment with regard to the narratives of the exhibition and the way these have been articulated relates to the omitted fact that the great majority of the ancient testimonia we have about women have been written by men, and in effect carry inherent biases (Ridgway 1987; Versnel 1987). Certainly, men's voices are in themselves interesting but only after acknowledging their social context and imbuilt preconceptions (Blundell 1995). Another challenge, where the exhibition did not respond as sufficiently as current trends in gender studies would prescribe, was the practice of introducing interdisciplinary methodologies and anthropological comparisons<sup>23</sup> into other pre-industrial or modern societies, i.e. Mediterranean cultures<sup>24</sup>, in an effort to make inferences about women in classical antiquity and provide more solid and convincing arguments.

By and large, however, the epistemological and social value of gender studies or indeed of any museum exhibitions that explore aspects of this increasingly interesting and expanding field of scholarship can be somewhat epitomised in the two following passages extracted from essays that were written at the dawn and in the present acme of related research:



‘The story of women in antiquity should be told now, not only because it is a legitimate aspect of social history, but because the past illuminates contemporary problems in relationships between men and women’ (Pomeroy 1975:xii);

‘Women’s stories are “culturally determined”, in the sense that they cannot be understood without a background of historical/ethnographic knowledge. But they are not fully determined. I suggest that the reader should experiment, in looking at the exhibition *Pandora’s Box*<sup>25</sup>, with reading, or looking, against the grain both of ancient Greek culture and of our own. Readers I suggest should ask how these images could be read to subvert conventional understandings of ancient Greek society as “male dominated”, not in order to produce a blander and more comforting picture of our own Classical ancestors, but in order to take a more critical look both at the stories we tell about them and at the stories we tell about ourselves’ (Humphreys 1995:109).

#### EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE

Looking back at the exhibitions realised in this later period, there is no doubt that a substantial increase has been made in the number of displays, the growth of their thematic range and the improvement of their communicative potential. Yet one would still expect some sharpening of the methodological reflectiveness.

## Conclusions

In this section, many archaeological themes, theories and intellectual approaches were discussed only to lead us to the following conclusions. So in short, there is a need for:

1. more precise policies on temporary exhibitions that would actually accord with the etymology of the word periodic that is usually used for temporary displays, which connotes an event that happens occasionally and at fairly regular intervals;
2. expansion of temporary exhibitions nation-wide and not only in Athens;

3. the establishment of a platform for more experimental, suggestive, innovative, reflective exhibitions. In a word, there is a need to introduce more pluriformity, a tendency that can lead ancient history to a great variety of topics and approaches;
4. the viewing of the ancient world from a new perspective by reconsidering the function of the source material, the pluriformity of methods and conceptions and the diversity of perceptions of antiquity. Also, it is necessary to look at ancient Greece through new lenses, fuelled by advances in anthropology, semiotics, psychology, social history etc.;
5. application of various contemporary theories that have impact on the traditional field of classical archaeology from other disciplines. In this frame of mind, there is a need to provide groundbreaking work, theoretically, museologically and museographically speaking;
6. more productive diversity and openness in the re-reading of exhibitions;
7. development of new methods and new forms of expressions and innovatory and socially meaningful and provocative themes, both with a historical and contemporary touch. In other words, efforts should be geared towards:
8. adoption of themes and forms that are critical of mainstream practice and of classical archaeology and open to dialogue and public debate;
9. continuing to provide valid alternatives to conventional themes and forms of museum exhibition making in the hope that they will have more a enduring effect on the permanent styles and modes of articulating messages to the public.



# TREASURES, HEROES, MIRACLES: THE POETICS AND POLITICS OF TRAVELLING EXHIBITIONS OF GREEK CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY ABROAD

‘The export of our antiquities is a political issue; it is the mirror of our prosperity, our face to the world beyond the national borders, as we live again in the era of the prevailing dogma “We belong to the West”. This is, however, just one part of the problem. For, independently of course of the fact that the exportation of antiquities is in accord with the interests of one particular class and kind of politics, the main objection should not focus on the argument that Greek antiquities must never travel anywhere. Besides, examples of various civilisations are constantly becoming known thanks to mutual cultural exchanges between countries. It would be inappropriate to keep the culture of Greece within its narrow geographical borders (...) The problem arises when we talk about the exportation of unique objects, and indeed of the heritage of a country that has bitter experiences in its dealings with foreigners and the centralisation of power (...) The government forgets that the unique objects of civilisation belong to the entire ethnos [nation] and not to the political party that is currently in office’.

L.Moschona, in *I Aygi*, 3/12/78, 4.

‘The Greek people, who with the outbreak of the Second World War and while sending their children to the front lines of the battlefield, were also concerned about the fate of their antiquities, must now face some bitter truths about the serious peril that threatens our antiquities. Driven supposedly by patriotism, some officials plan to send dozens of ancient works of art from the collections of our museums, and of course not from the reserves or second class collections but the most splendid, on transatlantic trips in order to “project Greece” and to

operate as “heralds of our rights” (...) Is it, or is it not, an example of high Greeklingsm and indignity, that instead of being their guardians, we send magnificent and glorified objects abroad in a servile manner?’

S. Karouzou, in *To Vima*, 29/5/77, 4.

‘The antiquities as pedlars. A letter from a Kouros...

What surprise, horror, and wrath we felt when the incredible news arrived to our unshaken eternity: it was no longer the foreigners, the freebooters, the dealers, but the *Greek state* itself, the state of our “ancestors” that planned to up-root and expatriate us. Of course, it will not sell us; it will *only* lend us as second-hand utensils... How could you possibly, you proud offspring of resounding ancestors, bring into the market our *ancestral* heritage? (...) For *honour*, then, you send us suppliant to the courts of the “powerful”? But what kind of honour? To show the foreigners how great the *ancient* Greeks were? They already know this and they are tired of hearing it time and again. It would be much more useful to prove to them how great the *modern* Greeks are (...) Or perhaps again, you would like to point out that Greece continues to be the “cultural school” of the world and to maintain the *education* of the modern “barbarians”, rendering them familiar with her achievements? But this sort of education is more proper and correct when conducted in the *topos* [place] wherein these works of art were born (...) And then again, you who fight for your tourism, why would you divest Greece of its tourist “magnet” orphaning the country of so much of its worthy monuments (...) We heard them saying: “*National reasons*” demand our presentation abroad in order to promote the Greek name and the *Greek rights* in a period that is crucial for the *topos* [land]. And we, who are not familiar with the secrets of high diplomacy, wonder and ask you: Do you *really* expect us to succeed, we the fleshless and voiceless ambassadors, in matters where those with flesh and voice failed? Do you *really* expect that our exhibition in Museums will *influence* foreign *public opinion* in favour of “our rights”, and that (...) visitors, by looking at a statue of Nike, or a Kouros, a vase will consider at once (of course with the assistance of clever Greek propaganda) that Cyprus is Greek, the Aegean belongs to Greece, that NATO oppresses the Greeks, that Carter mocks Greece (...). Your recourse into projecting the “Greek Art of the Aegean Sea”, for instance, would not be taken as a confession that you cannot currently prove the Greekness of the Greek Sea, and therefore you summon up “arguments” from the depths of centuries (...) We do not ask you anymore to consider our physical integrity, nor even our existence which are both under threat. We do not ask you to avoid disgracing the creations of your ancestors with these humiliating tours. We ask you to avoid disgracing *yourselves*.... For you will not only take a *lamentable* action, but also an action which is *futile* and *vain*’.

M. Ploritis in *To Vima*, 19/11/78, 1,18.



## Introduction

The use of artworks as symbolic carriers, vehicles of ideological messages and heralds of national rhetoric as well as the conduct of international politics through touring museum exhibitions is a globally established phenomenon. Brian Wallis and Balfe Huggins who study cultural exchanges between the USA and several other countries (i.e. Turkey, Egypt, the former-Soviet Union, Mexico, India, China, Japan) interpret such ‘cultural festivals’ as engines of cultural global diplomacy and self-promotion or more crudely as acts of ‘selling nations’ to the USA (Wallis 1994). Their instrumental importance, as Balfe Huggins suggests, lies in the fact, that

‘[these exhibitions] were widely publicised both as “apolitical” art having historical significance, and as having inherently political importance for their very “apoliticality”!’ (Balfe Huggins 1987:208-209).

In Greece, this category of museum exhibition [Appendix 4] was officially and legally introduced as an integral part of the national cultural policy and archaeological agenda in the late 1970s. In 1977, the law previously banning the export of Greek excavation finds before their thorough examination and publication was rescinded and replaced by new legislation (Act No. 654/1977) which allowed the export of antiquities for the exclusive purpose of temporary exhibitions abroad. This legal amendment opened up wide avenues for the preparation of a series of touring archaeological exhibitions to foreign museums all around the globe (Petrakos 1982:85-86; see also Dimakopoulou & Lapourtas 1995). At the same time, however, a great turmoil of reactions and controversy arose across the spectrum of Greek society (e.g. politicians, archaeologists, other intellectuals and the Greek people), and formed ethical dilemmas and divisions within Greek Archaeology that are still ardently present and pending.

By today, the cultural institution of touring exhibitions has been well established in the country and the list of examples, either as high profile spectacles or as lower-key undertakings, is far too long to be presented and analysed in an exhaustive manner (see Appendix No.). Some of the loan exhibitions, however, offer a genuine opportunity to discuss an array of significant and heated issues related to the official writing and museum presentation of classical archaeology as designed and performed by Greek state officials and archaeology practitioners for international consumption abroad.

Thus, in what follows, we shall plunge into an exploration of the poetics of certain travelling exhibitions of classical archaeology, mainly by looking at their history, their archaeological ordering and chosen narratives as well as their museological and museographical physiognomy and its development in the course of time. Further, we shall attempt to cast some light into the politics of the travelling exhibitions of classical archaeology. Here, the term politics is used in a broader sense to include a host of complex and diverse issues, that can be potentially viewed through interconnecting angles. These are: a) the use of archaeology and museum exhibiting by national governmental cultural and foreign affairs policies; b) the symbolic, ontological, epistemological and economic value of the classical past in modern Greek society; c) the formation of a certain national Greek identity for international consumption abroad; d) the ethical issues entangled around the preservation, protection and exportation of national heritage; and e) the official considerations of the Greek archaeologists and the Greek people on all these matters, as have been variously and often fervently manifested before and after the preparations and export of touring exhibitions abroad.

Thus this study, by outlining and examining the philosophical, ideological, epistemological and socio-political dimensions of touring exhibitions based on a number of representative examples, hopes to add to the relevant debate which has been a component of Greek archaeological affairs and museum exhibiting since 1977 and has generated an abundance of texts in the national Press and archaeological journals of the country<sup>1</sup>. Also, it endeavours to offer some sophisticated and comprehensive insights into the study of this museological phenomenon that would go beyond a simple enumeration of reasons pointing in favour or against the organisation of touring exhibitions, and thus beyond a mere chronicle of: 'unproductive contentions of perturbing reactions' (Delivorrias 1992a, b) that occasionally determined the tone and orientation of the discussion.

For the purposes of the analysis, eight case-studies have been chosen to portray the points briefly outlined above. These case-studies will be mainly arranged in chronological order, though alternative classifications, for instance according to exhibition destinations (i.e. Europe, USA, Australia, Canada, etc.) and subsequently according to the different cultural and social habitus of the intended audiences which is equally interesting and valid. Here, a broad chronological arrangement is preferred, for



it will help us to study the development of the institution of touring exhibitions, locate it within the specific socio-historical context from which it emerged and thus treat it as an historical phenomenon in itself.

In what follows, the case-studies will be presented in two broad periods which are conventionally divided in order to trace the early and later routes of controversy that traditionally has vested the export of touring exhibitions abroad. So, we can discern: a] the period of pioneer exhibitions and the early controversy (1979-1982); b] the expansive period (1982-to today).

## **The period of pioneer exhibitions and the early controversy (1979-1982)**

### **EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT**

The prehistory of loan exhibitions of Greek antiquities to foreign countries was already almost a century old when the issue re-emerged at full speed in the archaeological and cultural affairs of the country in the late 1970s<sup>2</sup>.

In 1979, France and the USA were the first countries to benefit from the new Greek legislation allowing the provisional export of Greek antiquities for temporary exhibitions and cultural exchanges that was put into force two years before. The 'Mer Égée, Grèce des Îles' or in its English version the 'Greek Art of the Aegean islands' was the first exhibition of this kind outside Greece [Plates 254-257; Figure 58]. Initially, it was hosted in the Museum of Louvre in Paris (from 26/4-3/9/79) and the Metropolitan Museum in New York (1/11/79-10/2/80), but later went on temporary viewing in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens (June 1980) and the Pushkin and Hermitage Museums in USSR (27/1-8/3/81 and 10/4-25/5/81). The initiative for the theme of the exhibition came from the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs (in 11/5/78) and was brought under the Central Archaeological Council's judgement by the then General Inspector of Antiquities (N.Yalouris). The whole archaeological undertaking was put under the auspices of both Presidents of the Greek and French Republics, Mr.Constantinos Tsatsos and Mr.Valéry Giscard d'Estaing. In contrast, the

subsequent presentation of the exhibition in New York was kept, in terms of bilateral diplomacy, in strikingly less formal tones.

Generally, it would not be an overstatement to argue, that this exhibition, from its early genesis to its final realisation, stood out as a rich and interesting object of the museum, cultural and political history of Greece, for it came to exemplify the early impassioned debate that was aroused between the advocates of cultural exchanges and its many opponents. In the years 1977-1979, the decision of the right-wing government to export some 170 antiquities from several Greek museums for this exhibition on Aegean civilisation created a turmoil of reactions that has been vividly captured in the numerous headlines and features of the national Press [Plates 251-252], and manifested through public discussions, strong protests, and photographic exhibitions that intended to familiarise the general public with the issue and raise its sensibility towards the exportation of its cultural patrimony<sup>3</sup>.

On one side, the argument of the right wing political leaders focused on the eminent role the antiquities could perform in the promotion of the country's national rights and interests among the international community, especially in moments historically crucial for the fate of the country. In other words, antiquities could now be part of the government's hardsell cultural policy. In essence, they envisaged the use of antiquities as cultural ambassadors abroad and their symbolic capital as a means for the promotion of international attention towards Greece. This attention would potentially bear fruits on many levels, namely political, national, cultural and last but not least economic with the boosting of local tourism. Besides, the huge success of similar cultural ventures such as the 'Treasures of Tutankhamun', the 'Treasures of Early Irish Art' or the 'Splendour of Dresden' undertaken by other countries (i.e. Egypt, Ireland, Germany) in the USA at approximately the same time, added weight to the Greek government's cultural logic.

However, in this kind of official rhetoric, archaeologists and cultural organisations and societies primarily replied by expressing their deep concerns regarding the safety and security of valuable and unique antiquities during their transportation and touring for years in host museums abroad, and argued that the extended absence of famous monuments abroad would undermine the development of cultural tourism at home. They also feared the creation of a precedent for further and more extensive exportations of antiquities in the future. In essence, however, the divide was greater and touched



upon a host of other matters, with largely political undertones. Many intellectuals, political parties of the opposition and other organisations translated the new legislation and the governmental determination to go ahead with its plans for exportation as an exercise of political oppression of the Greek people and as an example of the government's servility to foreign powers, foreign imperialists (personified in the American nation and its politicians), NATO and the monopolies of the EEC. Feelings of generalised discontent for the 'indignity'<sup>4</sup>, the 'sacrilege'<sup>5</sup>, the 'national humiliation as guardians of the ancestral past'<sup>6</sup>, the 'insulted pride'<sup>7</sup>, the 'politics of window-dressing'<sup>8</sup> and the 'commodification'<sup>9</sup> and 'selling-out of antiquities'<sup>10</sup> that suggested 'a great poverty of mind and hypocrisy'<sup>11</sup> ran high between 1977-1979.

In February 1979, the reaction against the 'kidnapping of the gods'<sup>12</sup> turned to an unprecedented 'battle of the amphoras'<sup>13</sup> staged in the island of Crete, where the people of Herakleio city demonstrated solidly with general strikes and massively manifested their opposition to the government's plans to include in the exhibition of the Aegean civilisation Minoan objects from the collections of the local archaeological museum. As the contemporary Press and later research suggested, the 'battle for the amphoras' came to symbolise not only a dispute about ancient artefacts but also the opposition and resistance of ordinary people to the antipopularist policies of the right wing government that had been ruling the country since 1974, against its foreign politics of dependence performed via the exportation of valuable and unique antiquities abroad, even for the purposes of temporary exhibitions, and last but by no means least against the USA and its military presence on the island (Editorial 1979d, e; Kakaounakis 1979; Scholiastis 1979; see also Hamilakis & Yalouri 1996; Oionoskopou 1988).

It is very important to bear in mind that after the end of the Second World War, Greece's future was determined from a Western perspective, defined by the USA, within the framework of a modern world united on a global scale (Toynbee 1981:270; Tsoukalas 1981). In the post-1974 period, Greek foreign policy sought greater independence from the pro-American attitudes of the past. After its presentation in Paris, 'Greek Art of the Aegean Islands' was the first of four exhibitions sent by the Republic of Greece to the USA. In the political context of their redefined relationship, this and the other exhibitions, that we shall see below, acted as cultural exchanges

between Greece and the USA and were seen, accordingly, as highly political acts of dubious motives and repercussions.

The political pressures and tensions, in and around which that maiden voyage of Greek antiquities took shape, indicated how the appropriation of the symbolic and/or economic capital of the ancient Greek past would be a driving force that weaved back and forth in the great majority of the other touring exhibitions that were yet to come.

In late 1980, with an explosion of publicity, yet another more spectacular and glittering venture of this kind was launched between the Greek Ministry of Culture and various museums in the USA. The exhibition was called the 'Search for Alexander' and was presented in the National Gallery of Washington (16/11/80-5/4/81) and subsequently in the Chicago Art Institute (14/5/81-7/9/81), Museum of Fine Arts in Boston (23/10/81-10/1/82), the Fine Arts Museums M.H. de Young Memorial Museums in San Francisco (19/2/82-16/5/82) and finally in the Metropolitan of New York [Plate 258]. The exhibitions the 'Treasures of Macedonia' and 'Alexander the Great, History and Legend in Art' were the two rather illustrious predecessors of the 'Search for Alexander' presented first in the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki (see Chapter Ten). All three exhibitions, however, had a common material nucleus out of which they developed into blockbuster super shows both in Greece and USA; among other artefacts, they consisted of approximately one hundred objects of rare Greek art most of which dated to the ancient Kingdom of Macedonia in the late Classical and Hellenistic periods. The centre and masterpieces of the show were some of the newly unearthed glittering golden treasures of a Vergina royal tomb which, according to their excavator's then provisional, but still today sustained, interpretation belonged to the father of Alexander, Philip II (see Chapter Seven).

The history of the romantic 'Search for Alexander' has been equally as controversial as the Aegean exhibition, both at home and abroad but for different reasons however. Sorting through the layers of controversy, it can be said that at home this focused mainly on the exportation of truly unique and extremely valuable finds, recently unearthed from the Greek Macedonian soil and thus insufficiently documented and researched. In addition, the fact that only a few Greeks had had the chance to view the Vergina finds in Thessaloniki during the two temporary shows added substantial strength to the overall rightful argument of this venture's opponents<sup>14</sup>. Abroad, the



critics centred around the sponsors' degree of involvement in the overall design and marketing of the exhibition, the connection and inconsistency between the title and the content of the show and last but not least the politics of the Greek government regarding Macedonia and the implications this held for the ways archaeological narratives had been shaped in the space of this museum exhibition (see Albright 1980; Green 1989; Trustman 1980).

Before turning to look at the anatomy of the Aegean and Alexander shows (their aims and political rhetoric as well as the way archaeology had been presented respectively to their French and American audiences), it is worth noting that most of the venues that hosted these shows belong to a category of institutions that has been called "Universal Survey Museums" (Duncan & Wallach 1980; Duncan 1995). The Louvre [Plate 253], the Metropolitan of New York, the Washington Gallery and the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and also the Chicago Art Institute and the San Francisco Museum, represent public art galleries that have been structured according to monumental ceremonial forms of the past, with façades and interior spaces resembling Greek or Roman temples. Their architectural script and their sacralised collections of high art provide a central ritual scenario and content. This is mainly induced through a secular pilgrimage to the lands of western art history and by equation to the history of western civilisation. In this organising principle, Greek classical art, Greek civilisation along with Rome and the Italian Renaissance have been traditionally accorded: 'privileged places as *the* defining moments of a universally attainable principle of civilisation' (Duncan 1995:49). These museums' master narrative is based on the construction of a certain art-historical narrative which primarily dictates the aesthetic contemplation and worship of unique art, and in our case ancient Greek art, and aims much less at the presentation of objects as historical or archaeological information.

It is with this ceremonial architectural script and ideological frame in mind that we must now turn and view the two case-studies.

## EXHIBITION MATERIALS

The theme of the ‘Mer Égée Grèce des Îles’ was the Aegean art, history and civilisation from the beginning of the third millennium BC to the end of the classical era (ca.323 BC) [Plates 254, 256-257; Figure 58]. The official intention of the exhibition was to refresh younger Westerners’ consciousness of their indebtedness to Greek civilisation and the legacy of the Greek classical past<sup>15</sup>. The second, value-laden aim of the exhibition was associated with the strategically important location of the Aegean islands and the Greek government’s aspiration to denote the Greekness of the Aegean civilisation both in the past and in the present. The political and national connotations of the exhibitions can be perceived clearly by recalling the bilateral relations of Greece and Turkey and the issues that defined the dispute of both parties in the Aegean (Clogg 1993:174; Kourvetaris & Dobratz 1987:105-112). In this manner, Greek archaeology and museum displays were first called upon to abandon their innocence and to make political statements concerning territoriality in the region across time.

These official intentions notwithstanding the highly politicised climate that surrounded the exhibition were made clear exclusively through the selection of the exhibition’s title and the behind-the-scenes stories that conditioned this choice<sup>16</sup>, various statements of Greek politicians<sup>17</sup> and archaeology curators both French<sup>18</sup> and Greek, the presence of the Greek and French Presidents of the Republics at the opening of the exhibition [Plates 256-257], the decoration of the Parisian streets in the colours of Greece and France [Plate 255], and the commentary of the Press<sup>19</sup>, rather than the narrative of the exhibition *per se*.

This, instead, maintained an aura of neutrality which was shaped and enhanced by the arrangement of the displays according to traditional periodisation and art-historical canons. The exhibition’s narrative developed based on a progressive itinerary to Aegean art and so aesthetics was the overall organising principle with emphasis centred on the scholarly unfolding of correct chronological, typological and stylistic orders. As for the museographical skills of the exhibition, again, there was not much innovation (Kounenakis 1979; Pagourelis 1979d-e).



The 'Search for Alexander', also the title of a docu-drama series on British and American television and of a popular historical biography written by Robin Lane Fox, was a romantic super show which embraced a number of motives [Plate 258]. Using its high aesthetic and sheer box-office appeal, the exhibition organisers -both Greeks and Americans- attempted to present an exhibition based equally on golden treasures of exquisite artistry and on the legend of Alexander the Great, the historical Macedonian superstar, whose name has captivated people everywhere for many centuries. The 'Search for Alexander' was conceptualised as 'a search in reverse chronology, starting with the present, where we all live biologically and searching backward into the cultural heritage in which we live culturally and intellectually' (Carter-Brown 1980:6).

The exhibition, that brought together art from the lifetime of Alexander the Great and the age he introduced, was organised into three broad segments: a] Alexander the Great from the Present to Antiquity; b] The Image of Alexander in Antiquity and c] The Ethos of Macedonia in the Age of Alexander.

Specifically, the first section developed out of a photographic and audio-visual introduction that explored the world's persistent fascination with Alexander and the legends that surrounded him. This itinerary was grouped into four comprehensive categories which were presented in reverse chronology, namely popular imagery, renaissance and baroque, medieval and Asian.

The second section of the show considered Alexander and his imagery in the more immediate context of the antique world by focusing on representative authentic examples from the hero's portraiture, coinage as introduced by him and his various successors and various other objects that presented him in human roles as hunter, warrior, heroic ruler or even god.

The last section of the exhibition aimed to evoke Alexander's origins by focusing upon northern Greece, exploring the world of his native region and concluding with the royal cities of Pella and Aegae. To fulfil this objective, the organisers felt that they should begin with a general discussion on the geography, history, politics, cities and burial customs of the region. To illustrate all these aspects of Macedonian life, they used some spectacular treasures of all materials, shapes and forms that the Macedonian soil had generously unearthed during the post-war period. Finally, this search into the imagery

and ethos of Alexander as well as the material culture of his own time and place was to reach its climax towards the end of the exhibition wherein all the spotlights were concentrated on a selection of treasures all discovered within the royal tomb that, according to a number of scholars, belonged to Alexander's father, Philip II.

Looking at the various critiques written at the time of the exhibition and later, the feeling was that the aims of the exhibition were in reality at odds with the overall end result. The argument was that this inconsistency arose mainly from the fact that distinct: 'divergence on that murky no-man's-land [emerged] where scholarship, politics and corporate finance manoeuvre for advantage' (Green 1989:153; see also Trustman 1980).

Thus, the focus of the sponsors' attention throughout the exhibition promotion, and the other adjunct activities and commercial products was Alexander the Great himself for they sensed that only his legendary personality could provide an excellent and romantic marketing formula for selling the show to the American audience and lure the crowds, in the same way that the Egyptian Tutankhamun exhibition managed to do so well earlier in 1977-1978.

Conversely, the museum authorities preferred to focus on unique and authentic archaeological objects rather than the man himself, presenting the achievements of ancient Macedonia which modern archaeology has revealed to the world.

In between these two parties was the Greek government whose main concern was to put Macedonia dynamically on the scholarly archaeological, political and tourist map and to no less an extent demonstrate the Greekness of the Macedonian region in the past and the present. As already mentioned in Chapter Seven, Macedonia had traditionally been a bone of political and ethnic contention in the Balkans, whereas scholarly and economically speaking (i.e. tourism) it has been less favoured compared to the celebrated classical sites of the south. The Greek officials hoped that the new spectacular Macedonian treasures could correct this historical and academic injustice. So from their ideological viewpoint, the 'search' for Alexander was the search for ourselves, as modern Greeks, as Europeans and particularly as Westerners. The significance of this search centred on the continuity between ancient and modern Greek culture. The effort to prove the unbroken continuity of the nation echoed the main



ideological tenet of the nineteenth century and its use of 'historicism'. Thus, history and the material evidence of the past were to solve practical, 'national' problems. Subsequently for the Greek party, this exhibition was invoked to address questions of ethnic identity within the general spectrum of the totality of Greek national identity, in particular, in relation to the Macedonian Question that has never ceased to be part of the national political agenda.

To combine all these different motives was not easy. The problem most frequently mentioned about this particular exhibition was its misleading title which was regarded as 'little short of wilful misrepresentation' (Green 1989:152) and as 'true excess baggage' (Trustman 1980:78).

The title promised that Alexander would be central to the spectacle, but the show presented a curious mixture of legend and history by bringing together the history of an idea -the idea of Alexander- and archaeological evidence establishing a historical period. Many critics<sup>20</sup> of the exhibition argued that the show had hardly any functional connection with Alexander and that the visitors expecting to find him would abstractly associate the objects to the hero discovering him only through Macedonia where he came from. To use one museum and art analyst's words, this exhibition was a typical example of: 'an object lesson in archaeology. The romance lies in attributing to discoveries history or legends; the reality is that archaeologists uncover, for the most part, objects that remain anonymous' (Trustman 1980:78). In this same frame of mind, various academics and others, prior to the exhibition's opening and in its aftermath, caustically observed that what the exhibition offered them was a discovery of Philip II: 'and they were not even sure about that' (Green 1989:164). This last comment, however, is particularly significant, for it touches upon controversial issues surrounding not only this specific museum venture but much of what constitutes the current nucleus of Macedonian Greek scholarship. In essence it raised the question of whom the Vergina finds originally belonged to, thus challenging the official interpretation of the Greek excavators and Greek politicians who, motivated by ethnic and political as much as academic considerations, welcomed the Vergina finds with special vigour and financial care.

## EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE

Most of what concerns the poetics and politics of these two pioneering travelling exhibitions of Greek archaeology abroad has been in one way or another examined above. When it comes to assessing their significance, this can be viewed firstly by looking at their popularity and secondly and most importantly by estimating their long term contribution to the institution of cultural exchanges in the country.

The Aegean exhibition, both in France and even more so in the USA, attracted the attention of the mass media with special TV programs dedicated to Aegean art and history. It also attracted a relatively satisfactory number of museum visitors<sup>21</sup>. Some doubts, nevertheless, were expressed about the overall cultural and political achievements of the venture, for, despite the Greek officials initial hopes, neither a cultural nor a political explosion followed the opening of the exhibitions at home or in the host countries. From a political point of view, the Greco-Turkish dispute over the Aegean has been sustained, and at times has been dangerously escalated (Pagourelis 1979c, e).

The 'Search for Alexander' was a big-budget show that received even more media superlatives and built even more upon an array of adjunct activities and promotional products (e.g.. an academic symposium, lectures, films, books, gift goods and museum reproductions, social events, etc.). Beyond any dispute, it carried all the ingredients, namely some unique and beautiful pieces of classical Greek art and a historical superstar, that were necessary for a successful recipe on blockbuster museum shows. Nonetheless, chronologically, it came at an unfortunate time, too soon after the greatest blockbuster exhibition on record, the fabulous and glittering 'Treasures of Tutankhamun'. Compared to Tutankhamun, Alexander appeared as a lesser rival and the show was a smaller, lower-key exhibition.

But above anything else, the great legacy of both the Aegean and Alexander exhibitions was that they forced politicians, archaeologists, other intellectuals and people in general back in Greece to think about the value of their national heritage and to set heated issues and realities related to Greek heritage management, museums and protection of cultural property within a new and challenging perspective. And no matter how much



turmoil and anxiety challenges bring, they also have the dynamism to create the necessary conditions for modernisation, progress and development.

## **The expansive period (1982-to today)**

### EXHIBITION HISTORIES AND ENVIRONMENT

After the turmoil of the late 1970s, in the 1980s the travelling exhibitions expanded on an impressive scale, not only in quantity but also in the range of themes, largesse of geographical destinations, with loan shows staged all around the world (i.e. most European countries, Canada, Australia, Japan, USA) and diversity of venues (i.e. modern or traditional museums, galleries, Renaissance palaces or churches).

When it comes to the selection of topics, Macedonia remained very much at the top of the thematic list, with narratives on Athenian classical art, democracy and the Olympic Athletic ideal following closely. In addition, other politically neutral topics also came to the fore, such as the enduring maritime might of Greece, the Eros in ancient Greece and the life in the Mycenaean Age.

In June 1985, the concept of an annual European City of Culture was launched by the European Union's cultural ministers. Greece joined in the festivities by supplying exhibitions to a number of European Cultural Capitals.

The first cultural capital of Europe was the classical city of Athens, followed in 1986 by Florence, the capital of Renaissance (Katimertzi 1986:23). This was a symbolic succession that aimed to signify the continuity and expansion of the western cultural spirit and arts. Greece sent to Florence a big project entitled 'Athens and Florence' which consisted of three exhibitions, all presented in the superb fifteenth-century Palazzo Strozzi. The first<sup>22</sup> of the exhibitions was called 'From Myth to Logos. The human figure in Greek Art (8th-6th cent. BC.)' (16/9-16/11/86) [Plate 259] which was in many aspects different to the previous Aegean and Macedonian museum ventures. The exhibition, composed of a distinctively reduced number of artefacts, presented two

periods of Greek culture, the Geometric and Archaic, which were less known and earlier than the one Westerners have learned to identify with Greece, meaning the Golden Age of Pericles (see Mercouri 1986:9). The philosophical rationale of the exhibitions was geared towards the then newly-fashioned theoretical predilections and museological concerns of the Greek Ministry of Culture for producing historical rather than aesthetically spectacular displays, with a well-considered educational purpose (Tzedakis 1988:17). As for the political message, this was infused in the combined Italian and Greek rhetoric for the legacy of the Greek antiquity and Italian Renaissance in western culture and civilisation.

In 1987, when the cultural capital moved to Amsterdam, the overriding aim and the message of the Dutch was to bring modern Europeans closer together and enhance their understanding regarding national identities, cross-national similarities and divergence (Varopoulou 1987; also van Thijn 1987) [Plates 260-262]. Greece responded suitably to this invitation with a monumental exhibition on 'Greece and the Sea', put up by the Ministry of Culture in collaboration with the Benaki Museum, which in a much more extensive version had already been presented two years before in Piraeus (see Chapter Ten). The exhibition subsequent to its opening in the sixteenth-century Nieuwe Kerk (New Church), a highly prestigious historical landmark of the city which was exclusively reserved for the royal coronation ceremonies and highly esteemed cultural events as exhibitions, enjoyed a warm embrace by the Dutch public and the national media (Makken 1987; see also Kalogeropoulou 1987b). It also came to 'admirably' illustrate the close bonds existing between Holland and Greece, for in the words of the Mayor of Amsterdam (van Thijn 1987:15):

'Our [Dutch] achievements as a maritime nation led many writers to compare the 17th century -the Golden Age of the Dutch Republic- to the Golden Age of Athens. Athens the birthplace of democracy, achieved great prosperity as a result of her contacts with faraway lands, just as Amsterdam did two thousand years later'.

Two years later in Paris, on the occasion of the double festivities as European Cultural capital of 1989 and as civic capital of a nation celebrating a bicentenary since the French Revolution, Greece decided to send an exhibition, altogether different to any other organised previously. The exhibition was called 'Eros Grec. Amour des Dieux et



des Hommes' (Greek Eros. The Love of Gods and Humans) and was presented in the Galleries Nationales du Grand Palais (6/11/89-5/2/90) [Plates 264-266]. The exhibition was devoted to the ancient Greek spiritual and physical expressions as well as the imagery of love. Drawing from a number of original pieces of pottery and sculpture both of aesthetically majestic and humbler quality, the subject was approached, rightly, from an anthropological or even structuralist perspective. It did not aim to provoke or shock but to enlighten modern westerners about the ancient Greeks' morals and practice regarding sexuality and its various forms, and by extension make them reflect on existential and timeless human matters such as the pursuit for love and happiness (Pasquier 1989; 1990; Tzedakis 1989-1990:10).

Cheered by the majority of the French national and local newspapers<sup>23</sup> for the freshness of its theme that broke through centuries of Judaeo-Christian Puritanism and taboos, the 'Eros Grec', 'revolutionary' (Hans 1990) in its own way did not however escape some controversy back in Greece, for the 'unbearable lightness of its theme'. Some people felt that the Greek Ministry could have done much better by sending an exhibition, on let's say Athenian democracy or classical values, rather than on a subject that was too 'senseless' and certainly misplaced within the general programme of celebrations for the bicentenary of the French Revolution (Petrakos 1991; see also Katimertzi 1989c).

Moving, now, beyond European borders, in 1988-89 and 1993 after years of negotiations with Australian and Canadian officials, the Greek government coordinated the preparation of two blockbuster exhibitions to these countries. Both were on the theme of Macedonian civilisation and were composed of numerous, dazzling and unique objects in silver and gold, some of which had never left the country before.

'Ancient Macedonia' [Plates 267-274; Figures 59-60] was hosted in three Australian Museums during 1988-1989<sup>24</sup> and four years later 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand' (Greek Civilisation. Macedonia, Kingdom of Alexander the Great) [Plates 275-280; Figures 61-62] was presented in the wonderful Marché Bonsecours, a neo-classical building of the beginning of the nineteenth century in Montréal, Canada (7/5-19/9/93). Both exhibitions were promoted as great super shows and authentic experiences of Greek civilisation<sup>25</sup>, with big-budget promotions, intense marketing and associated media events.

Yet, as the 'Search for Alexander' had already proved in the early 1980s, politics in Macedonian archaeology were pre-eminent, especially so in the late 1980s and early 1990s when the Macedonian Question entered a new dramatic phase after the dissolution of the Yugoslavian state (see also Chapter Seven). The case of 'Ancient Macedonia' exhibition, in particular, stands out as an excellent example for the study of the relations that arise between politics, international diplomacy, archaeology and museum exhibiting.

Australia is a country with diverse ethnic backgrounds which include, amongst others, substantial Greek and Slavo-Macedonian minorities. For years, the relations between these two communities have been tense over issues of ethnicity, the definition of Macedonian identity, the appropriation of the Macedonian past and the interpretation of its material cultural remains. The definition of Macedonia is a sensitive subject between the two communities, as both sides claim the right to the term 'Macedonia'. So, on the eve of 'Ancient Macedonia' opening in various Australian museums, the divide that separated the two communities re-emerged forcefully. Slavo-Macedonian reactions over the title of the exhibition fuelled tensions between the Greek and Slavic communities in Australia and initiated an unprecedented diplomatic row between the Australian and the Greek prime-ministers. The Greek prime minister called off the exhibition after Australia asked for the word Macedonia to be dropped from the title to avoid causing offence to Australia's Slavo-Macedonian community and defend Australia's multicultural policies. Finally, the exhibition was reinstated after the Australian government assured Greece it wanted the exhibition under its original title (see Bone 1988a, b; Bone & Maslen 1988; Cunningham & Whelan 1989). The exhibition opened in its first venue in 1988, amidst ethnic demonstrations of anger and grief<sup>26</sup> by the Slavo-Macedonian side and welcoming messages of pride and joy [Plate 274] by the Greek-Australian communities<sup>27</sup>.

In terms of audience attendance, the 'Ancient Macedonia' attracted approximately 181,000 and the mystic and scenographically innovative 'La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand' lured some 300,000 in the four months of its presentation.



In 1988-1989, five American museums in Washington, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Chicago and Boston<sup>28</sup> hosted the exhibition 'The Human Figure in early Greek art', the third such archaeological venture to be sent to the USA from Greece [Plates 281-287]. In essence, the exhibition was an extended and improved (in terms of number and aesthetic quality of displays) version of the Florentine 'From Myth to Logos'. Reading the introductory panel of the exhibition, we can get a brief picture of the intellectual messages the display wanted to put across (see also Carter-Brown et al 1988:10-11; Tzedakis 1988:17):

'During a critical evolutionary period that spanned nearly five hundred years, from the late tenth to the early fifth century BC, there occurred in Greece a discovery that charted the course for the subsequent development of Western art. Greek artists learned to represent the human figure in a naturalistic way. This accomplishment, which we tend to take for granted, is the bedrock on which European representational art has been based for more than two thousand years. *The Human Figure in Early Greek Art* refocuses our attention on these formative centuries, revealing to us how artists learned to show man as if he were alive. This exhibition of art from the Geometric through the Archaic periods illustrates the achievements that prepared the way for the high classical style of the fifth century giving us the opportunity, in spite of historical distance, to assist at the birth of humanism'.

At the political and cultural levels, the exhibition was also part of a 'new language to be explored' (Mercouri quoted in Gamarekian 1987), a new policy of cultural exchanges and promotion of international friendship between nations launched by M.Mercouri, the then Greek Minister of Culture, whose main motto was 'nuclear disarmament-cultural rearmament' (Mercouri quoted in Katimertzi 1988a, b).

The 'Human Figure' was not connected with financial corporations and grand projects in order to produce a blockbuster show. Although it was of a lower profile in terms of marketing, it still harboured some political aspirations by playing a key part of M.Mercouri's campaign to repatriate the Elgin Marbles and to promote the erection of a new museum of the Acropolis as well as Greece's candidacy to host the Centennial Olympic Games of 1996 (Addams Allen 1988; Katimertzi 1988a, b; Gamarekian 1987).

Finally, the exhibition 'The Greek Miracle. Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy. The Fifth-Century BC', travelled from Greece to the USA in 1992-1993, to be part of the commemorations of 2500 years since the birth of democracy. First it was staged in the National Gallery of Art, Washington DC (22/11/92-7/2/93) and then



moved to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (11/3-23/5/93) [Plates 288-290; Figure 63].

This was an unprecedented exhibition of the finest examples of original sculpture from fifth-century BC Greece, the golden age that traditionally is believed to have given birth to a new tradition of art and government, that of Democracy. According to the introductory note by American President George Bush in the catalogue of the exhibition, the 'Greek Miracle' reproduced (in Buitron-Oliver et al 1992):

'long-standing ties that exist between the United States and Greece ... (the) alliance, where modern Greece stands as a valued partner, that helps to defend and to promote human rights around the globe, while ensuring the collective security of Europe'.

In some ways, the 'Human Figure in Early Greek Art' and the 'Greek Miracle' can be seen to form a single exhibition, in two parts, whose overriding message was epitomised by the sequence of equations:

Birth/discovery of humanism = birth/discovery of rationalism and naturalism = birth/discovery of democracy = birth/discovery of Western culture = birth/discovery of ourselves (Greek, European, Western and civilised).

The exhibition, presenting thirty four pieces of unique classical Greek sculpture, proved to be one of the most controversial of the travelling displays and provoked similar reactions to the ones associated with the very first loan exhibitions abroad. There are a number of possible reasons for the largely ambivalent reception received by this exhibition. Firstly, the loans themselves were absolutely unique, in archaeological terms, and of high artistic value. Therefore, the decision to export them, even for the purpose of a high-profile loan exhibition, outraged Greek archaeologists and intellectuals, let alone the Greek people who were closely following the development of the case thanks to the extensive coverage given by both written and electronic media<sup>29</sup>. Thus, it proved once more that issues such as the exportation of antiquities, the formation of national display policies and cultural politics are so complex and equivocal that they need to be thoroughly discussed and studied.

The theme of the 'birth of democracy' reactivated latent foreign opposition to the concept of the supremacy of the Greeks. For many opponents of Eurocentrism and thus for many upholders of Afrocentric ideas, the 'Greek Miracle' exhibition directly connoted the long standing homonymous slogan, that of 'Greek Miracle', that



represented the notion of western appropriation of ancient cultures for the sake of its own development (see Liverani 1996:422-3). According to its critics, the exhibition reflected a Victorian sentiment (Morison, *Financial Times*, 19 March 1993:13; see also Hughes 1993:49), a marble stereotype, representing to the public: 'the Greek culture of their schooldays, classicism in the Winckelmann sense' (Wills 1992:47-48) and prompting complaints of an overall conceptual naiveté.

In terms of internal politics and foreign policy, at the time of the exhibition, national attention was concentrated on the Greek position on the Macedonian Question. This provoked a ferment of reactions both within and outside the country. As a result, the exhibition's motives were viewed by some (see Hedges 1993) as an exercise in political propaganda, a political show coloured by Greek chauvinism.

#### EXHIBITION MATERIALS

When it comes to the interpretation of archaeology and arrangement of the displays, most exhibitions conformed with the standard practice of following chronologically linear narratives occasionally enriched by thematic sub-categories and a good dose of supportive historical information and photographic illustrations. In most cases, the simultaneous co-existence of splendid and aesthetically unique objects on the one hand and a more ordinary jungle of typicality -carrier of historical information on the other, guided the exhibition organisers to adopt strategies of presentation that would be more akin with the production of didactic rather than simply aesthetic displays.

In the exhibition from 'Myth to Logos' there was a progressive unfolding of historical and art-historical narration [Plate 259]. The structure of its extended version 'The Human Figure in Early Greek Art' was very similar although there was some extra emphasis on specific categories of material culture such as the Bronze Statuettes, Athenian Pottery, Sculpture kouroi and korai, following clearly standard canons of the classical art-historical discourse. For the uninitiated, this 'instructive and moving' (Dorsey 1988) exhibition might have looked 'not so easy' (Brenson 1988), stunning and adventurous as the glittering gold of the Pharaohs (Brenson 1988; Dorsey 1988; Proctor 1988). So either one ought to 'take the time to do it justice' (Dorsey 1988) and 'see it at

least twice for lessons unfolded slowly' (Richard 1988) or else 'for those yearning for immersion in the glory that was Greece may leave the show still hungering for more' (ibid.).

The anthropological exhibition of 'Eros le Grec', was a singular venture [Plates 264-266]. Deployed within five galleries museologically inspired by neo-classical decor and design, it touched upon themes such as the Eros in Greek mythology; Eros and the gods; Eros and marriage; Eros and the status of women in ancient Greece; Eros and symbolism; Homosexuality; Eros and philosophy; Eros and Love. Daring in its conception and realisation, it stands out as a paradigm for a fresh theoretical conceptualisation of archaeological travelling exhibitions which unfortunately, though, did not have any continuation.

In Australia and Canada, the exhibitions' hosts were reluctant to measure the success of the exhibitions in political terms. As Michel Lambert, head of the Palais de la Civilisation (Montréal), put the case: 'we just steer clear of any current political situation and deal entirely with the past. It's safer' (quoted in Brownstein 1993).

They preferred a populist and politically uncontroversial marketing of the exhibitions. They stressed, through spectacular displays, the purely commercial value of Greek archaeology, presenting the artefacts as valuable trade commodities, as the object of tourism, and as unique and shining treasures of silver and gold [Plate 270]. The Greek organisers were not opposed to this approach: they also saw the *objets d'arts* of classical antiquity as the mainstays of national tourism. As Evans-Pritchard (1993:27) says: 'tourism, archaeology and nationalism are historically linked in complex ways; archaeology has been used by nationalism and popularised by tourism'.

Local press coverage of the exhibitions was very revealing about the marketing attitudes of the local curators (cf. Anonymous .1988; 1989a; 1989b; and Collins 1989; Messaris 1989): 'gold treasures from Greece', 'days of glory' or 'priceless treasures and glittering history' are typical of the media's characterisations. Further, the humorous and pithy 'Indiana Jones would kill to see this exhibition' suggests that archaeology, and in this case archaeological exhibitions, are about romance, excitement, mystical traditions and objects as ends in themselves (see also Gowlett 1990:157) [Plates 271-273].



Individual artefacts and images formed the centrepieces of the exhibitions and became symbolic and commercial principals representing an entire ancient culture (Evans-Pritchard 1993:23). As in the maiden 'Search for Alexander', the creative power and unique virtue of this culture was personified in the sublime personality of Alexander the Great [Plate 280]. Greece was projected as a heroic nation, with an omnipresent ability to communicate intrinsic and ideologically validated messages world-wide.

In Australia, the exhibition comprised six groups divided traditionally on the basis of thematic or chronological criteria [Plates 267-270; Figure 59]. In Montréal, the Canadian team was less conventional in the structure of the archaeological narratives and indeed much more inventive and imaginative in the selection of museological strategies and museographical techniques (see Bakounakis 1993; Lepage 1993; Laurier 1993) [Plates 276-280; Figures 61-62]. The visit was structured upon an interchange between authentic Macedonian artefacts and museum *simulacra*, essentially between authentic history and museum hype. It was a romantic journey in the course of which the organisers hoped to 'bring Ancient Greece back to life' (quoted from the exhibition leaflet). More precisely, the storyline and trip into the rediscovery of ancient Macedonia was divided into two main sections: the genesis and formation of Macedonia (14th-6th cent. BC) and the development of Macedonia into a mighty kingdom (5th-2nd centuries BC).

At the entrance, the visitors come face to face with a portrait of Aristotle and are called upon to reflect on the Aristotelian philosophy and its influence upon western thinking as a whole. Then, visitors start their imaginary trip in a gallery designed to transmit messages about the presence of mythology in Greek imagery, religion and its influence in the Macedonian culture. An authentic bronze portrait of Zeus, the father of the Olympian gods, and a reconstructed version of the sacred oak tree of the god, within a background that presents wall-size scenographic images of Mount Olympos, are used to transmit these messages. Audiovisual narratives complete the experience which in reality is designed to operate as an introductory contemplation on the role of Zeus in the future and fate of the Macedonian kingdom. What comes after is a dense display of Macedonian coinage and other objects within glass showcases, along with a relief map of the region and texts. Here the message is about the origins of Macedonia as a geographical, economic, political and social entity. Then, the visitor finds himself in an

archaeological site, a Macedonian tumulus, exposed there in the open air, provided of course that special lighting effects recreate this sort of experience of daylight and blue sky. Here burial goods of the Bronze and Geometric periods are not conventionally displayed within glass cases; instead they are placed underground as they would indeed be found by the excavator or now by the visitor-discoverer. At the end of this first section of the visit, the visitor can read and learn about the characteristics of the archaic period and of its art before going through a monumental colonnade-gate to find himself in a entirely black, undecorated gallery that operates as a metaphorical purgatory. In this room, defined by the simplicity of absolute darkness and the effects of exalting artificial lighting, gold and silver objects from the archaic period of Macedonia are exposed for a unique contemplation by the beholder.

The second section of the exhibition gives equal emphasis to the reign and legacy of Philip II and Alexander the Great both during the Hellenistic period and the Greek civilisation as a whole. The first step of this historical itinerary starts with suspense and with a fascinating discovery, that of the Vergina royal tombs as narrated by the excavator himself via a multimedia device. What follows is the splendid discovery *per se*, a faithful full size reconstruction of the Tomb II, that of Philip II. After that section, the visitor finally reaches an area which, devoted to both royal father and son, is paved with flagstones and filled with showcases arranged in a way to symbolise the original placement of colonnades in the Royal palace in Pella. Here, the predominant elements are the portrait of Alexander, some grave stelae and smaller artefacts of various shapes and materials. The voyage into the rediscovery of ancient Macedonia is finally completed with a more conventional didactic presentation of drawings and maps that help the visitor to understand the breadth of Alexander's conquests and the splendour of his empire.

#### EXHIBITION SIGNIFICANCE

To assess the significance of the exhibitions sent on the occasion of the Cultural Capital of Europe, a starting point is a consideration of the overall aims and objectives of these ventures as a unified category. In brief, we can argue that their purpose was to project Greek identity, its multi-faceted cultural profile as well as its European self. In this,



Greece's individual search for a national identity is harnessed to the pursuit of the cultural elements that represent a common historical identity with other European nations. Greece, as other member-states of the European Union, is challenged to choose which of her national symbols and historic myths are more likely to testify to a unified European spirit and to reactivate shared 'memories' among the members of the European 'family of cultures' (Smith 1992). This means that Greek culture is engaged in an assessment of whether the timeless values of its ancient self are still intelligible and valid to the rest of the world. As the institution of the Cultural Capital of Europe has become fully established, it supplies a context within which cultural exchanges and exhibitions can acquire the required legitimacy, endorsement of values and ideological eminence. In Melina Mercouri's words (1987b:13):

'This annual event which focuses our attention on those deep-rooted intellectual and artistic bonds which link the countries of Europe, quite apart from official approval, drew impressive response from the public at large. As long as the human community feels the urge to search for points of reference in a common cultural heritage, there is no doubt that the institution of a yearly 'Cultural Capital of Europe' will acquire greater and deeper significance while steadily broadening its horizons'.

However, established cultures may be essentially antipathetic to the development of a wider, cosmopolitan culture. This fact - together with the evolutionary undertones of recent interpretations of nationalism - poses problems for the proposition of a pan-European identity. Smith's comment, for instance, is unhesitating (1992:62):

'The link with the distinctive pre-modern past serves to dignify the nation as well as to explain its mores and character. More important, it serves to 'remake the collective personality' of the nation in each generation. Through rituals and ceremonies, political myths and symbols, the arts and history textbooks -through these links with a community of origin, continually reshaped as popular 'ethno-history', are reforged and disseminated. In this respect, national identifications possess distinct advantages over the idea of a unified European identity'.

It is within the framework of this ideological quandary that one must consider the Greek travelling exhibitions in Europe. Since the project of European integration and unity was begun, Greece's contribution to related cultural events must be viewed in relation to the question of what constitutes 'Greekness', but also 'Europeanness'.

In contrast, the rhetoric used to describe the Macedonian exhibitions in Australia and Canada, with regard to both political and commercial factors, differs from the idiosyncrasies of the European case-studies discussed above. Both events, as 'exhibitions of ancient passions' (Bone & Maslen 1988; see also Brownstein 1993; Montpetit 1993) and as arenas of political and ethnic controversy, were state-sponsored in an attempt to confront anti-Hellenism and to redefine the dynamics of the Greek Diaspora. They were exercises in mass communication: their task was largely informative and instructive. Their archaeological claims about the character of ancient Macedonia form part of a modern ethnic struggle which is chronicled daily not only in Greece, but also in Australia and Canada, the second homelands of large numbers of Greek emigrants (Just 1989:86). The political statements of these exhibitions were about identity. First, they projected the 'Greekness' of European identity, the 'Europeanness' of Greek identity and, furthermore, the 'Europeanness' of Australian and Canadian cultures, embodied in the eternal ideals of Hellenism (see Bakoyannis 1993a). More particularly, they raised issues about the historicity of cultural and ethnic Macedonian identity, both ancient and modern, a controversial subject per se. Their tokens were pervasively political and their overall perspective was an ethnic one, depicting the world of Hellenism as the totality of the nation (Augustinos 1989:27). Within this framework, the displays acted as signs of historical truth and ethnographic maps of the past.

Ultimately and with regard to the museological significance of the travelling exhibitions in the long run, we can readily argue that they signalled the beginnings of a new museum culture in Greece. The need for the adoption of a new museological mentality in order to cope with the demands of ambitious museum projects for international consumption abroad, somewhat, also provided the conceptual conditions for a slow, but steady modernisation of museum practice in Greece, primarily regarding the preparation of temporary exhibitions, but also the reformation of permanent displays mainly in a number of smaller and regional museums.

This modernisation could apply to various aspects of museum practice from:

1. the introduction of aesthetically more pleasing museographies;



2. the efforts towards further intellectual accessibility of the collections which previously and conceptually were the privilege of an educated elite;
3. the enhancement of the educational role of archaeological museums;
4. the introduction of marketing and better visitor services (e.g.. exhibition catalogues, books, educational programmes, etc.);
5. the interest and aspiration to attract bigger audiences;
6. the public understanding of the value of the past.

Travelling exhibitions, one way or another, promoted these changes, but there is still a huge amount of work to be done for a more speedy and qualitative reformation of the general museum culture in the country, not only from an empirical but even more importantly from a theoretical perspective.

## Conclusions

Looking back to all that has been argued throughout this chapter, it should now be clear that the poetics and politics of travelling museum exhibitions of classical archaeology as a whole are complex, equivocal, obscure but also intriguing and potentially revealing as to the ways archaeology is called to serve national, economic and other official aspirations. As morally neutral as museum exhibitions can be in principle, in practice they do make moral and political statements. They are privileged arenas for projecting the self, social or national (Karp 1991:14-15). In these same directions, Silberman (1990:103) suggests that:

‘Rarely are archaeological finds consciously suppressed or distorted. Rather, it is through the selection of certain sites and the presentation of certain classes of artefacts in museums and travelling exhibitions that a nation's modern archaeological authorities can subtly and effectively shape the ancient, symbolic image that the nation presents to the world’.

As a result of this ideological position, it can be argued that the past is not reconstructed but written according to its interpreter's ideology. One can certainly further

attest that there is no 'absolute exhibition' and that museums should not become 'repositories of immobilised received opinions' (Gathercole 1983:42).

The chosen case-studies exposed current affinities to the ways classical Greek archaeologists produce archaeological accounts and meanings. The totality of the exhibitions' narrative totalises Greece across time and space and universalises timeless values which were generated in the Greek lands but were afterwards appropriated by the western human universe and became immortal and unjudged.

In some ways, when reflecting on the politics and poetics of travelling museum exhibitions of classical archaeology, we are reminded of Pausanias' *Description of Greece* and his construction of Classical Greece as an immense imaginary museum consisting of fetishised monuments and as an embodiment of a personal and collective identity (see Jacob 1986; Habicht 1985; Elsner 1992; 1994).

Elsner, discussing the general norms of a travel-writer's thinking and by extension the Pausanian description of the *monumenta* from the past of his own culture and ethnography of self, interprets the monument as epitomiser, as accessible miniature and metonym for the race, the culture, the way of living, the rationality, moral and essence of the people who represent the described Other or Self of the travel-writer (Elsner 1994:228). It is in this way that monuments acquire their historical dimension, and objects become history. He continues by highlighting the monuments' varied acquired dimensions through the passage of time and their contribution to the creation of the notion of historical continuity:

'[monuments] encapsulate identity by embodying the past as it exists in the present. Any monument, by being simultaneously a legacy of the past and a fact of the present, historicises the Other [and the Self] by naturalising it in terms of a narrative of lineage' (Elsner 1994:229).

Similarly, the narrative of lineage, or else of historical continuity is a significant ideological tool used by current exhibition authors. As an ideological discourse, it has already appeared during our discussion on the historical background that shaped the legacy of the classical past (see Chapter Three).

Greek display authors nowadays operate within the ideological and political context of Greece as a full member of the European cultural community. They design travelling museum exhibitions which function as textbooks illustrated with authentic artefacts and



as a mirror of Greece. Through their archaeological and museum interpretation, they suggest established ways of viewing Greek art, and propose a certain journey around Greece. They proclaim that they, as well as their co-patriots, are heirs of (many) distinctive past(s), being also part of the European family of cultures. They project a given collective national identity. They are selective by picking particular exhibition themes and artefacts which will illustrate their archaeological writings. Even the museum curators are subjective, for they become products of their own times. The displayed museum artefacts of the classical past act as the cultural signifiers of glorified territories. So, the museum exhibitions of classical archaeological material are often organised according to a nostalgic, 'mnemotechnical' ideology. They also appear as reactions against cultural isolation, concurrent geopolitical conflicts and anti-Hellenic affiliations initiated from abroad. They address their messages to a certain audience which is also comprised of potential travellers-tourists around Greece. In this way, the displayed artefacts, apart from being mediums of archaeological accounts, are often transformed into trade commodities.

Yet, in our post-modern era, the theoretical positioning and ideological orientations of classical archaeology and classical ideals are being put under further scrutiny and occasionally open criticism (Dyson 1993). Even the European origins of Greek civilisation have been seriously questioned (Bernal 1987; 1991).

What should be strongly stressed by way of conclusion is that classical archaeologists and display authors as well as practitioners of other archaeognostic sciences must adopt a critical attitude to their role as official readers and writers of historic narratives. The examination of the use of the past in a historical perspective always helps to elucidate previous realities and in effect facilitate the decoding of hidden messages to current representations. By developing a critical consciousness and understanding of their role and by opening up a dialogue especially within the space of museum exhibitions, they can potentially set new agendas and socially meaningful archaeological quests. To this end, they can possibly encourage and produce additional ideological dimensions and indeed more reflexive, introspective and challenging writings of archaeological exhibitions. To finish with, here is Elsner's valid suggestion regarding the Pausanian text (Elsner 1994:253):

‘Art as text becomes an Other whose value is its place in the creative dialectic that its Otherness constructs with the self of the writer and audience’.



# **ARCHAEOLOGICAL DISCOURSES AND MUSEUM CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE PAST; AN OVERVIEW.**

### **Looking back at the aims of this study.**

This study put forward an argument for the importance of studying museum constructions of the past in relation to the intellectual histories of archaeological scholarship involved with the investigation of material culture of the past.

Informed by post-structuralist theories in the fields of archaeology and museology, this study essentially proposed to investigate why museum representations of the past come to look the way they do through a critical analysis of the discourse of archaeology, that is the disciplinary poetics and socio-politics of archaeology.

Furthermore, it argued that museum receptions of the Greek classical past and the discipline of classical archaeology, with its abundance of original material, its vast body of scholarly production, let alone its key role in the genesis of European thought and archaeological discipline as such, provided a fertile ground for exploring the above supposition.

For it has been recognised that: ‘there are much more complex issues of appropriation at stake in displays of Classical art and material culture: not so much the museum’s own appropriation of a foreign past [i.e. when referring to museum institutions outside Greece], but the history of appropriation embedded within the ancient world itself, and

embedded in the stories of (and behind) the objects on display' (Beard & Henderson 1994:9).

Thus, classical archaeological discourse and museum representations of the classical past in post-war (1950s onward) Greece were examined in order to understand the architectonics of their interrelation in their various scholarly, socio-historical, political, ideological and economic dimensions.

Essentially, the writer sought to unmask how the long standing intellectual tradition of classical archaeology and its operation within a certain historical, cultural and political context informed or even governed museum constructions of the Greek classical past and their varied receptions from audiences in Greece and beyond, both in the past and in the present.

More specifically, this study elaborated on this issue by shedding light on the process of production through which Greek museum exhibitions construct, order, represent and interpret the classical past. Thirty four case-studies were selected and provided ample material to proceed beyond the strictly empirical analysis and experience into further philosophical reflection and theorising.

National, Site, Regional, Private and University Museums together with temporary and travelling exhibitions were placed under an imaginary microscope and thoroughly examined to demonstrate how master narratives of classical archaeological discourse have been for so long endorsed and perpetuated by the Greek Museum discourse. Some of these grand narratives were and still are: aesthetics and wonder, art, connoisseurship, evolution and judgement of styles, veneration of artefacts, knowledge of the Antique, positivism, closed and fixed narrations of the past, humanism, Classicism, Romanticism, Western and Greek Hellenism, foundation myths of Euro-American civilisation, material superiority and cultural supremacy. In fact, some of these attitudes are clearly present in the mode of presentation found in all of the world's big international art museums (Shanks 1996:59).

The examination of the case studies proved most revealing and empowering for making some general observations regarding the poetics and politics of scholarly traditions and the manner in which these traditions lead to specific cultural appropriations and constructions of the past in museum displays (see Chapters Five to Eleven).



Unquestionably, this type of exploration and the revelations it subsequently yields must not bring astonishment or bewilderment. Is it not only natural that the development of a discipline is seen to be influencing all forms and types of related disciplinary production?

In social sciences, however, this interrelation has not been so straightforward and explicit. As mentioned in Chapter One, it is not so long ago that archaeologists started reflecting on the history of their own discipline and making a case for the importance of studying the sociology and systems of archaeological production and knowledge. It is similarly quite recently that museum theorists have begun questioning the poetics and culturally specific politics of the museum and its media of communication, including exhibitions, and thus examining the museum's own position towards certain concepts and practices, such as those of the cultural appropriation of knowledge and power, authorship and interpretation, selection, identity and difference, ownership and readership, multivocality, subjectivity and/or objectivity, relativity and self-reflectiveness.

In line with these innovative intentions to understand the archaeology of knowledge, this study also set out to show how such a theoretically and historically informed approach to museum constructions of the past, Greek classical and other, could potentially bring new impetus to archaeological exhibitions, their themes and forms of expression.

In the preceding chapters, that is Chapters Five to Eleven, a number of 'alternative readings' of the classical past in Greek museum exhibitions were proposed, after reviewing the particular nature of the collections, the socio-historical profile of their host museums and some of the theories that are currently emerging and empowering the field of classical scholarship (see also Chapter Two). Indeed, as many scholars working in the field have been reasserting over the past few years, there is potentially a vast range of archaeologies of Greece which are now challenging the scholarly and ideological establishment of classical scholarship and hopefully will carry on doing so in the future (Morris 1994b; Shanks 1996). In accordance with this view, this study attempted to provide some 'alternative readings' to museum displays, not as a way to propose and impose 'a string of [new] dogmatic assertions about what [archaeologists

and museum authors] should do next' (Morris 1994b:45), but rather as a way to illustrate that there is no singular archaeology of the classical past but rather a multitude of questions one can pose about the classical world and its reception over many centuries which respectively demand a host of different approaches.

In this process of opening up the classical world and classical heritage, or indeed any other scholarly field such as history, anthropology or ethnography, into multi-layered theorising and problematisation, 'museums are capable of being at the cutting edge of [disciplinary] discourses' (Kavanagh 1996b:xii). It is now time for both scholars and museum authors to take up the task of studying their subject matter from many viewpoints and interconnecting angles. If this is a call to arms for more scholarship and experimentation, museums and exhibitions can be the bulwark for new ways of working and problematising the past and its material culture, which will be made accessible to the mass of people and thus to society as a whole. For as it has become more recognised by museum theorists over the last few years: 'the museum visitor is capable of being gloriously subversive in the messages taken from exhibitions or thoroughly disempowered by omissions, oversights and generalities' (Kavanagh 1996b:xi; also Porter 1995:369-375).

Should it be asked to provide some tentative suggestions, by way of concluding this study and pointing the way ahead in the immediate future, these could be epitomised by the following set of tasks and forms of determination: 'Re-figuring the past', 'Showing the invisible / Speaking the unspoken', 'Exhibiting disciplinary discourses / Exhibiting the museum'.

The individual parts of this set of propositions have often been touched upon in the course of the theoretical investigation of the discourse of the museum (Chapter Four) and the subsequent analysis of the case-studies. These tasks, bonded together in a chain-reaction interdependency, can be equally enrolled in the changing landscapes of both disciplinary and museum worlds. They are explicit enough to avoid the creation of perplexity and misapprehension, and flexible and adaptable enough to avoid closure, authority and authorship.



## Looking forward - the road ahead.

### ‘RE-FIGURING THE PAST’

‘Re-figuring the past’ can be of direct relevance both to the surviving residues and records, material or other, of past societies and to the ways we create meanings out of them in the present and future.

Ian Morris, in his study of the History of Greek Archaeology, urges for a re-figuring of the past and uses the word in two senses: first, that of changing those aspects of the record which are shown to have significance and by extension the ways of writing about this past. In other words, he feels we should ‘adopt the historian’s role [and...] treat the evidence as the means rather than the end; concentrate on the social roles of material culture in antiquity, even if this means that we spend more time talking about objects which have not survived than those which have’ (1994b:45-46). This new problematisation eventually leads to a reflection upon the changing cultures of viewing the past and how this shift has roots directly planted in the particular temporal, intellectual and social contexts.

The second sense Morris ascribes to the words is that of re-peopling and re-humanising the past, that is re-introducing real people into the past rather than continuing to approach the works of men merely as ‘typological ciphers (...) and walking cultures’ (Arafat 1990:n.18); the latter has been a long enduring practice in Greek archaeology and resulted in a systematic dehumanisation of the past and of its intellectual landscape (Morris 1994b:9, 45-46; 1994c:4, 7).

Underlying these propositions is also the presumption that ‘any re-figuring of the intellectual landscape of archaeology involves asking unsettling questions about what and whom, the subject is for; and perhaps in accepting and trying to make the best of a plurality of answers’ (Morris 1994c:4).

This is where re-figuring implicates and engages people not only of the past but also of the present. These present-day humans can be divided into two broad groups: firstly, the ‘experts’ of archaeological or other disciplinary fields (e.g. archaeologists, museum

authors, heritage interpreters, etc.) who are called upon to think introspectively about their prescribed roles and identities in the discipline and in society as producers and disseminators of historical knowledge, collective consciousness and sets of experiences. Secondly, the public and society at large (e.g. museum visitors, non-visitors, tourists, etc.) are called upon to break free from their stereotyped roles as passive recipients and consumers of closed disciplinary narratives and actively manifest their own needs, expectations and ways of viewing heritage matters.

### ‘SHOWING THE INVISIBLE / SPEAKING THE UNSPOKEN’

Earlier in this study (Chapter Four), it was explained how the museum is a state apparatus that selects, collects, acquires, stores and ‘musealises’ material culture and retains certain objects to the state of ‘visible’ and leaves others to the state of ‘invisible’.

Archaeological discipline and museums alike have gradually grown to be cultural institutions that practice processes of inclusion and exclusion, which work in at least two ways. Firstly, the physical direction which may result in the survival and discovery of objects created from more enduring materials and to the extinction and silence of other more perishable objects that have not been as lucky as the previous ones. The physical direction may also relate to specific collecting and display policies, with some objects being considered as collectables and some others as non-collectables, as well as some objects being exposed to viewing in the main galleries of the museum and others kept locked up in storerooms, these ‘Aladdin’s caves of history’s debris’ (Beard & Henderson 1994:20).

Second direction is the conceptual one which may translate into the treatment and presentation of specific sets of themes and approaches in archaeological writings and museum exhibitions and into the avoidance of dealing with other more difficult and darker sides of ourselves and our pasts (e.g. slavery, gender divisions, racism, etc.).

There is more to a museum object and a museum exhibition than meets the eye. As Mary Beard and John Henderson (1994:20-23), together with other archaeology and museum theorists have recently attempted to demonstrate vividly through a number of



very insightful or even subversive essays and temporary exhibitions (see Chapter Four of this study):

‘there are all kinds of other things *concealed* by the museum, *not seen* by most visitors; and that concealment (like not touching) is a structural element in the way museum displays worked, not simply a trigger for the visitors’ frustration (...) Display is not a neutral, natural “given”. It involves a set of choices taken by curators (normally unseen), on principles that were also unseen by most visitors’ (...) If all is not visible, then the visitor can rely on the museum to speak the truth about what is not seen’.

Understanding the implications brought in by this polarity between visibility and invisibility, voices and silence, is crucial in order to start deciphering a discourse, be it archaeological or museum, and providing a wholesale exposure of its mechanics, its rhetoric and power.

#### ‘EXHIBITING DISCIPLINARY DISCOURSES / EXHIBITING THE MUSEUM’

There is not really much new in saying that temporary and changing exhibitions are more able to express different and shifting viewpoints and histories, than the fixed ‘permanent’ displays that usually articulate and embody more traditional codes and means of representation both with regard to content and form. We have already had the chance to mention how a number of temporary exhibitions, realised over the last few years, have attempted an exploration into the ‘discourse of the museum’ and have proved that this original and introspective quest for the genesis of museum constructions can actually be part of the museum’s representational agenda and ‘spectacle’.

An installation staged in Maryland Historical Society (Baltimore) in 1992 and conceived by Fred Wilson, an artist, is a most vivid and exciting example of these shifting views regarding museum exhibiting. Wilson called this installation *Mining the Museum* because it could mean ‘mining as in goldmine, digging up something, or it could mean blowing up something, or it could mean making it mine’. So he: ‘just looked at every object, and tried to pull from the objects what they were about, what they told [him] about the institution and the museum (...) [For him] the whole exhibition was about looking at objects found in museums, just taking them out and putting them on view’

(Karp & Wilson 1996:255). Thereby, he experimented with the ways objects could transcend the state of material objectivity and conceptual neutrality in order to expose discourses of cultural viewing, cultural politics, appropriation, authorship and authority.

So, the way ahead is to render museums: 'sites where one not only asserts things but where there is also the possibility of questioning those very assumptions. This is the only way in which we can build a multicultural [and multivocal] polity, one in which we not only have many cultures, but in which it is possible to be part of more than one culture' (Karp & Wilson 1996:267).

Paraphrasing the working title of Wilson's exhibition, we can say that throughout this study we have discussed ways of how we can understand *Mining [of] the Classical Greek Past*, both outside and inside museum walls. Mining the classical past as a goldmine of magnificent treasures, values and venerated traditions; digging up this past as a way to bring it back into light and articulate interpretations about what happened in the past and how we get to know about it; blowing up the classical past not as a recognition of its decline and devalued relevance to contemporary society and its values but as a means to provide a more plural and reflective understanding of the classical past and classical heritage; and finally mining it as a way to make it and feel it as 'mine' and 'ours', for the classical past is after all deeply embedded in our culture and heritage as a whole.



# NOTES

## 1. Introduction

1. Maniatakos 1954:3.
2. Savvidi 1957b:1, 6.
3. Kalligas 1962:5.
4. Lydakis 1964:2
5. Editorial 1975:2.
6. Mantas 1977:4.
7. Editorial 1980e:4.
8. Katimertzi 1982:5.
9. Georgousopoulos 1982:1, 5.
10. Yilopoulou 1984:12.
11. Editorial 1984:4.
12. Bakogiannopoulou 1986a:38.
13. Bakogiannopoulou 1989:54.
14. Eugenidou 1990:59.
15. Papadopoulou & Papagiannidou 1991:B12/46.
16. Goulandri & Delivorrias 1992:38.
17. Skaltsa 1993:B3/35.
18. Shanks gives the following definition for the meta-narrative: 'It is a grand system, often taking form as a structure of emplotment, but may also be a body of theory or explanation, often approaching myth, which lies in the background of particular accounts and provides a general orientation framework and legitimation, conferring meaning' (1996:58).

## 2. Classical Archaeology of Greece. Some insights into the development of a discipline

1. Seymour Howard (1990:12-14) also a useful source as he provides some explanatory definitions of the terms 'Antiquity', 'Classic[al]' and 'Classicism'.
2. Beazley was reluctant to explain his method in his own writing. Nevertheless there have been some occasions when he shared his views, particularly as regards his methodology for distinguishing style and the individual painter's hand. In "Citharoedus", an article published in the *JHS*, as early as 1922, he wrote:

'A few words will suffice for the technique of the painting: most of the points will be clear from the reproductions. Only parts of the contours are

lined in with relief lines: on the obverse, the face and neck, the fingers of the right hand with the plectrum, the inner outline of the left thumb, the feet, and portions of the cithara; on the reverse, the forehead and nose, the neck, part of the right shoulder, the right hand, the right side of the body where it is bare, the feet, the lower edge of the himation, and the part of the himation on the lower half of the right-hand side of the picture. The folds of the chiton on the obverse, and the minor folds of the himation, in the region of the elbow, on the reverse, are in brown; in brown also are the minor internal markings of both bodies, including the man's nipples; the hair and eyelashes of the musician; and the loose ends of the instructor's hair and beard. The space between the two lines immediately above the fringe of the apron is filled in with brown. Ankles and nostrils are rendered by relief lines. Red is used for the wreaths and the plectrum cord....' (Beazley 1922:74)

and further on he concludes:

'We found that the vases which exhibited the system [of renderings] had more than this in common: they showed, as a group, a liking for a certain choice and use of patterns, for certain principles of decoration, for a certain relationship between contour and background, for lines and curves of certain kinds. The system of rendering was not easy to separate from the other elements of design: it was, from one point of view, their vehicle, and from another, a collateral expression of artistic will' (Beazley 1922:90).

In addition, we have supplementary information (a talk he gave at a Conference on 'The future of Archaeology' in 1943) upon his proposed methodological tools that a student of classical archaeology, particularly of Greek vase painting, had to use in order to exercise his skills in distinguishing one style from another:

'If you wish to learn to distinguish one style from another, my advice will be one word: draw: draw freehand; make sketches of the shape, of the general composition, and of separate details (for details not despising the magnifying glass): and draw the details larger than the original. Draw the details separately, and do not try to fit them in on top of your tough general sketch....The working-up will take a long time; but when you have drawn one vase you know it well, and you have learned a great deal about all vases. Draw: the hand remembers as well as the eye' (Beazley 1943 in Kurtz 1989:101-102).

3. Indicative is the following passage:

'The new classical canon prefers texts that illuminate the personal and the inevitable, above all love and death, the realms where political power should least interfere. The Hermeneutic. The canon in classical studies has changed and so have the techniques whereby we approach and talk about that canon. Traditional textual criticism and literacy persists in classics but even classicists have come to think about their texts in new ways' (Connor 1989:31).

4. The problems of the organisational structure of archaeology and conduct of archaeological research in Greece have been often covered and analysed, by Greek archaeologists and journalists alike, in the Greek press, throughout the post-war period. See for instance in chronological order: Savvidi 1957a-b; Eustathiadis 1964; Garidi 1967; Kontoleon 1975a; 1975b; Moschona 1977; Politopoulou 1977; Andronikos 1980; 1983; 1990a; 1990b; Pallas 1982; 1990; Bakogiannopoulou 1986b; 1987; Papadopoulou 1991.



5. See for instance a related criticism by Christos Karouzos in his letter of 23/7/45 (Petrakos 1987a:172-178).
6. According to Embree (1989:31), substantive research means the study that includes both methodologies of data collection as well as analysis and the theorising of explanatory models. Further, the theoretical archaeology in its narrow signification can be called a theorising activity; it focuses on explanatory models but keeps the data associated with specific empirical concerns clearly in view. Theorising efforts of this kind along with more strictly empirical efforts together comprise theoretical archaeology in its strict or proper signification.
7. Morgan 1990; Whitley 1991; 1994.
8. Hoffmann 1988; 1994.
9. Hall 1991; Osborne 1994a; Goldhill & Osborne 1994a.
10. *ibid.*
11. A term coined by Shanks who described and compared Snodgrass' soft processualism to Ian Morris' (student of the former) quantitative processual approaches (1996:132-138).
12. For the term, see Shanks 1996:132-138. For the practitioner, see Morris 1987; 1992.
13. Shanks 1992:85-95; forthcoming.
14. See Bintliff 1991a; 1991b; Knapp 1992.
15. Rowlands, Larsen & Kristiansen 1987.
16. Alcock & Cherry & Davis 1994; Alcock 1994; Bintliff & Snodgrass 1985; 1988; Cherry & Davis & Mantzourani 1991; Cherry 1994; Davis 1994; Kardulias 1994a; Kardulias 1994b.

### **3. Ancient Greece and its material culture; some insights into the cultural politics of a venerated heritage**

1. Recently and especially in the last couple of years, a mass of literature has appeared on the subject of nationalism, ethnicity and the formation of cultural identities, approaching these phenomena both from theoretical and empirical perspectives. Significantly, the same trend has become strongly planted in the field of archaeology and is exemplified on a handful of collective volumes that tackle the subject of nationalism, cultural identities and archaeology. These are the volumes by Atkinson, Banks & O'Sullivan 1996; Díaz-Andreu & Champion 1996; Kohl & Fawcett 1995a; Graves-Brown, Jones & Gamble 1996.
2. For a different approach, see Cartledge 1993.
3. At this point, one could refer to the opening speech of Nikolaos Zachariadis, Secretary of the Communist Party of Greece (KKE), given on the occasion of the Seventh Party Congress in October 1945 (quote from Xydis 1969:245, note 87 and originally published in the left newspaper *Rizospastis*, 6/10/1945):

‘Our own mission is to prove that in spite of the fact that we exist in the same spot and that our language is derived from ancient Greek, the Greek nation, ethnologically and socially, has no relation with the regime and the slave society of racial discrimination that prevailed in ancient Greece (...) nor with the barbarism of Asiatic despotism and of serfdom which characterised the empire of the East Roman state. Our own mission is to prove that the nation is a historical category which appeared and

developed with the appearance and development of capitalist relations of production (...)'.

However, this position was later renounced by fellow communists, as one can read in the daily newspaper *I Aygi* [The Dawn] (see for instance Eleutheriou 1977:1, 14).

4. The literature, scholarship and public debate that arose in the aftermath of *Black Athena's* first publication in 1987 is truly vast. Those interested in reviewing the arguments and counter-arguments surrounding Bernal's main thesis, should start by reading his book and then *Arethusa's* special issue published in 1989, Lefkowitz 1992; 1993; 1997; Shanks 1996:87-91 and the edited volume by Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a wherein there are a number of most interesting papers such as Baines 1996; Coleman 1996; Hall 1996; Jenkyns 1996; Lefkowitz 1996; Liverani 1996; Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996b; MacLean Rogers 1996; Morris 1996; Norton 1996; Palter 1996; Tritle 1996; Vermeule 1996. Further, the Internet and especially the sites [athena@info.harpercollins.com](mailto:athena@info.harpercollins.com) and <http://www.harpercollins.com.basic> offer an on-line access to this on-going debate.

#### **4. Studying the discourse of Greek archaeological museums and exhibitions; a model of analysis**

1. There are certain definitions for the museum as an institution that help to denote its mission and designate its functions and priorities. Two of the most widely accepted definitions are the International Council of Museums's, adopted in 1974 and the Museums Association's, approved in 1984:

'[A Museum is] a non-profit making, permanent institution, in the service of society and its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for the purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of man and his environment' (ICOM Code of Professional Ethics, 1986).

'A museum is an institution which collects, documents, preserves exhibits and interprets material evidence and associated information for the public benefit' (Museums Association Annual Conference, 1984).

2. See Alexander 1979; Impey & MacGregor 1985; Hudson 1987; Hooper-Greenhill 1992.

3. A National Museum is an institution housing a usually vast number of national collections of great works of art. According to David Wilson (1992:81-85), there are national museums which are largely monolithic institutions, representing a vast repertoire of scholarship and expertise. Their displays, which usually exceed the limits of mere national collections, become emblems of their universality (cf: British Museum, Museum of Louvre, the Metropolitan Museum of New York, etc.). Alternatively, there are also the State Museums of National culture which express the history of the country in which they are located. They possibly serve patriotic purposes with sometimes nationalistic dimensions and run on scholarly lines for an interested audience. Finally, within the classification of National museums come those with very specialist collections for which Wilson thinks that their function is more important than their collections as their mission is to serve the national and international academic community by offering high levels of academic knowledge.

4. Some Regional Museums may possess collections of national or international importance while others may reflect purely local community interests (Loughbrough 1992:101-111). Sometimes, a highly centralised administrative political system impedes the flexible and independent operation of these institutions.



5. Their mission is self-explanatory, that is to house, preserve, display and interpret artefacts derived from the neighbouring archaeological or historical site.
6. A private, or independent museum, strictly speaking is one that is not directly administrated by any central or local government agency (Cossons 1992:112-118). Most of them are thematic rather than multi-disciplinary, although this is not a rule. They frequently focus on subject areas that are not at all, or at least adequately represented in state museums. Finally, they are self-financed and as a result very strongly market-oriented. In Greece, the very few private archaeological museums are strictly related to the collecting activity of wealthy and socially influential individuals.
7. The University Museums are institutions whose collections are usually accumulated in order to contribute to the teaching and research functions of a university department (Warhurst 1992:93-100). They place different emphasis on the standard functions of the museum and usually operate for the benefit of a campus population. They are owned, housed, administrated and financed by a parent university.
8. For literature on museum architecture, one could start by reading Crimp 1987; Davis 1990; Duncan 1995; Duncan & Wallach 1980; Pevsner 1976; Searing 1986; Summerson 1963.
9. The paradigmatic Altes Museum in Berlin (1823-30), designed by Karl Friedrich Schinkel, embodied perfectly the idea of a museum-sanctuary (Pevsner 1976:124-138; Searing 1986:16-18; Crimp 1987). This museum 'sanctuary' as Schinkel called it (see Crimp 1987:65):
 

'would contain the prize work of monumental classical sculpture, chosen irrespective of historical sequence, mounted on high pedestals between huge columns, bathed in a dim light from high above. The spectator's mood thus prepared, he would be ready for his march through the history of man's striving for Absolute Spirit'.
10. See a paradigm provided by the National Museum of Roman Art in Merida that was designed by Jose Rafael Moneo in the 1980s (Davis 1990:190).
11. Non-purpose built museums can house their collections in authentic ancient monuments or in old restored buildings of relevant or extraneous history and character. The debate about the transformation of old buildings into museums and the subsequent disputable relationship between the building's form and museum's function is a long enduring one (Burcaw 1983:148).
12. Three critical moments can be ascribed to the development of Greek architecture which could then also be traced in the country's museum architecture (Philippidis 1984; Fessa-Emmanouil 1987). The first 'Grecian', established in the second quarter of the 19th century and related to the movement of Greek Enlightenment, is the complex offspring of European neo-classicism. It carries all the ideological connotations embodied in the Museum-Palace, reinforced further by the domestic patriotic/nationalistic sentiment that its architectural achievements were actually erected in the country-generator of the classical past and ideals. In brief, it stands as the 'revival' of Greece's glorious architectural past and as part of the whole utopian plan for the country's westernisation.
13. The second movement, expressed mainly in the 1910s-1920s under the name 'Neo-vernacular' or 'populist', has been the ideological adversary of the previous one, by reviving Greece's real indigenous tradition (both insular and mainland) as a way of resistance to the West's cultural imperialism and as a search for ethnic identity.
14. The third movement has been the Greek conversion of European Modernism, either expressed as a functional-rationalistic trend or denoted as a critical-regionalist aspiration (Tzonis & Lefaivre 1984:16-23). Its agents were influenced markedly by the vernacular

architecture of the Aegean islands and the avant-garde ideology of industrialised Europe. Yet, this anti-historical modern line, fairly applied to museum buildings of the post-war period, consciously overlooked the country's divergent historical and architectural past. Although widely introduced to archaeological museums in Greece also due to its concurrence with the contemporary need for many new museum buildings -some of which have been considered as stylistic paradigms for the whole movement-, they did not give satisfactory answers to the issue of museum building communication and ideology in Greek society and Greek landscape.

15. For the study of museum language as part of the museum discourse, one should start by reading Coxall 1990; 1991; 1995; Beard & Henderson 1994; also Devenish 1990; Sorsby-Horne 1980; Serrell 1983; Kentley & Negus 1989; McManus 1989.

## **5. National and supra-national "shrines" of Greek (classical) art; The National and the Acropolis Museums in Athens.**

1. There is also an increasing literature on the role of archaeology in the formation of national identities and nationalism. See for instance Atkinson & Banks & O'Sullivan 1996; Friedman 1992; Graves-Brown & Jones & Gamble 1996; Hamilakis & Yalouri 1996; Kohl & Fawcett 1995; Kristiansen 1993; Lowenthal 1988; MacConnell 1989; Silberman 1989; Trigger 1984.

2. See the newspaper *I Aygi*, [The Dawn] 21/5/91, p.18 and the speech delivered by Tzannis Tzannetakis, Minister of Culture for the time, in the National Archaeological Museum in May 1991, on the occasion of the celebration of the International Day of Museums. For the post-war re-opening of the National Museum and its importance for the cultural revival of the country, see also newspaper articles in *To Vima* [The Tribune] 15/1/48, p.2; 7/9/50, p.1-2; *I Aygi* 18/4/1959, p.3, etc.

3. Philippidis 1994:287.

4. Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:390.

5. Tournikiotis (ed) 1994.

6. *ibid.*

7. *ibid.*

8. *ibid.*

9. Rhodes 1995:1-2.

10. Murray 1994:212-213.

11. Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:390. It is also indicative of this attribute that a number of ceremonies of national and cultural significance symbolically took place time and again on the site of the Acropolis: on 10/9/1834, a ceremony was held to inaugurate the restoration campaign by resetting a column drum in the north colonnade of the Parthenon; in 1933, the centennial celebrations of the liberation of Athens took place on the Acropolis on Easter Day chosen for the symbolic connotations of the Resurrection; similar celebrations were repeated later on 12/10/1944 after the liberation of the country from the Nazi rule.

12. Leontis 1991:190; see also Fitzgerald 1995; Kondaratos 1992:20-53; Kücker 1991:21; McNeal 1991; Philippidis 1994:280-309; Wilford 1995.

13. For the international breadth of the architectural competition held for the design of the New Acropolis Museum, and the universalism of the museum itself, see for instance Hollein 1991a:24; Kalogeras & Papalexopoulos 1992.



14. For the National Archaeological Museum as the prototype of 'a classical museological perception in Greece', with all the merits and demerits this nomination connotes, see Tsaravopoulos 1985:149 and various newspaper articles in *Ta Nea* [The News] 4/2/89, p.25/3; *I Aygi* 7/2/82, p.5; 12/8/84, p.12, 21.

15. Reviews of the history of both museums during this period are provided with detail elsewhere (see Kokkou 1977:195-201, 201-258; Gazi 1993:139-154, 155-174; see also Augouli 1994).

16. The first plans of the museum were drafted in 1834 by the German architect Leo von Klenze, the designer of the Glyptothek and the Alte Pinakothek in Munich and renowned advocate and practitioner of romantic classicism. However, neither Klenze's plans nor the submitted plans for the 1858 specially organised public architectural competition were implemented, the latter ones on the grounds that they were inappropriate to the Greek landscape and spirit. In 1861, however, given the ideological and cultural significance of the museum's construction for the nation, the Ministry of Education decided to present the entries of the competition in a special exhibition open to the public and ordered the reproduction of the judging committee's (Royal Academy of Arts in Munich) long report in the Athenian press of the time (see Kokkou 1977:210, n.4 and 211, n.1; Gazi 1993:68). Soon after, the German architect Ludwig Lange, a professor at the Munich Academy and designer of the Leipzig Museum, was commissioned to prepare the plans of the museum.

For a discussion of the specific terms and instructions on the National Museum's construction as outlined by the official texts of the public competition (Government Gazette, No.30, 31.7.1858), and the results of the competition, one can find a long detailed description in Kokkou 1977:208-221.

17. Government Gazette, A, 152, 9/8/1893. This resolution was supplemented in 1910 by another royal decree which appended a number of guidelines regarding the general collecting policy of the National Museum (Governmental Gazette A, 332, 30/10/1910).

18. See the leaflet produced for the National Archaeological Museum by the TAP (1995).

19. Between 1903 and 1906, a new elongated wing, and vertical to the main body of the museum was added to the building's east side. Years later, between 1932 and 1939, a more radical decision resulted in the erection of a two-storey cluster of galleries with two interior courtyards, again set at the east side of the Museum. However, the new extension, designed by a Greek architect, G.Nomikos, although resolving the problem of space, proved somewhat detrimental to the overall architectural coherence and style of the museum. With some of the attractive features of the old plan sacrificed for the new needs, some senior museum archaeologists of the National Archaeological Museum at times expressed their dissatisfaction towards the aesthetics of the new extension which looked cold, impractical and uninspired in pseudo-classicist and conventional lines (Karouzou 1967:xiv; 1982:7).

20. For the measures taken regarding the protection of the antiquities at the outbreak of the war and the fate of the National Archaeological Museum during this time, see Karouzou 1967; 1984a; 1984b; Kokkou 1977:252-254; Petrakos 1994:81-105; 1995a:108-110; *To Vima* 2/4/1967, p.12; Weinberg 1948.

21. Artemis Leontis defines the Acropolis Museum as: 'an heterotopia within an heterotopia' (1991:276-277, n.39). For the use of this term and its meaning with regard to various archaeological sites of Hellenism, see Chapter Six.

22. For von Klenze's restoration and preservation programme on the Acropolis and the other purist interventions at the Acropolis monuments, see Bouras 1994a:319; Mallouchou-Tufano 1994a:185-186; 1994b:71-85; McNeal 1991:50; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:12, 217, 226-236; Philippidis 1994:302-304. For the archaeology and its operation within a certain socio-political climate of that period, see Kardulias 1994d:39-55.



23. In 1888, a second museum, nicknamed 'Mikro' (Little Museum) was constructed to the east of the first museum according to the plans of the excavation architect George Kawerau, whereas a new extension was also decided later in 1914. Eventually, this extension, that provided the unification of the two buildings, the construction of a new gallery for the display of the vases and bronzes and of a series of sheds on the south and east sides of the edifice, was realised much later after the end of the Second World War (Kokkou 1977:200).

24. For a detailed analysis of the exhibitions' layout, organisation and hardware during this period, see Gazi 1993:142-154; 160-174.

25. For the Acropolis Museum's first displays, for instance, we read in a post-war museum catalogue that

'the works of art were stifled by being jammed together, sometimes even one on top of another. In many cases the shelves reached all the way to the ceiling and the antiquities were placed so closely together that all sense of individuality was lost. Moreover, in keeping with the neo-classical tradition, the wall had been painted a deep Pompeian red which caught the eye and emphasised the whiteness of the sculpture while flattening out the volumes' (Brouskari 1974:13-14).

For the National Archaeological, similar criticism focused on specific aesthetic choices taken for the presentation of sculpture and pre-historic (Mycenaean) art. Some critiques remarked, for example, that the curators misused the authentic sculpture of the ancient world as mere decoration. By placing the statues in a symmetrical order and against the walls, they attempted to create 'avenues made of statues' with elaborate perspectives. By exposing solely the front side of the objects, they forged a relief impression instead of revealing and exalting the statues' real plastic values on all sides (Langlotz 1954 in *To Vima*, 21/2/1954, p.3, 6; see also Karouzou 1956:850).

With regard to the arrangement of the Mycenaean Hall in the National Archaeological Museum, the feeling was that 'a grey Victorian rigidity weighed heavily on the antiquities'. Specifically, the objections originated in relation to the ways the secondary material (i.e. heavy wooden showcases) and the general decoration of the gallery (i.e. walls and ceiling) with patterns of the Mycenaean art were used at the expense of the aesthetic autonomy of the collections and of their artistic value (Karouzou 1957:1204).

Finally, criticism concentrated on the high density of the displays which started becoming fairly conspicuous in the early decades of the twentieth-century (Karouzou 1967:xiv; 1982:7).

26. Republished in the newspaper *Aion* 3610/3.8.1881. See also Philippidis 1994:296.

27. The Karouzos couple's work and legacy with regard to the post-war regeneration of the National Museum has been time and again appraised both in academic articles and the Press. Here is a selection of the most characteristic commentaries: For Christos Karouzos see Dontas 1987; Kunze 1981; Petrakos 1995a; Sakellariou 1987; Kalligas in *To Vima* 15/1/48, p.2; Papanoutsos in *To Vima* 7/9/50, p.1,2; Also *To Vima* 13/5/54, p.3; 4/9/56, p.1,2; 4/4/67, p.1,2; 31/3/67, p.2; 1/4/67, p.2; in *I Aygi* 31/3/1967, p.2. For Semni Karouzou, see Andronikos in *To Vima* 9/4/1989, p.58; Langlotz *To Vima* 21/2/1954, p.3,6.

28. Some of their first tasks concentrated on the repair of the long-neglected museum building, the unpacking and cleaning of thousands of long-stored objects, the provision of temporary shelf spaces, the creation of permanent storage space, the replacement of the old wooden roof, the refurbishment of old stands and cases and the making of new ones (Karouzou 1956; Kokkou 1977:256; Vanderpool 1949; Weinberg 1948; Anonymous 1951:134-135).

29. *To Vima* 15/1/48, p.2; Weinberg 1948.

30. *To Vima* 11/9/56, p.2



31. The so-called 'Little Museum' as well as a small section of the main building were taken down, whereas the space gained was used to expand the museum. Two large storerooms were erected in front of and behind the new part of the building. Inside, some of the previously dividing walls were demolished to resolve two of the most serious structural problems of the museum, these were the lack of adequate space and the system of gallery lighting. At the same time, urgent and extensive conservation work was being undertaken in order to extract old, decayed and inappropriate iron joints from many sculptural pieces of the collections and replace them with bronze ones.

32. For the coverage of the opening, see the Press of the time: *I Aygi* 4/8/56, p.2; *To Vima* 11/9/56, p.2. Also see Miliadis' article wherein he explains his exhibition rationale, Miliadis 1957.

33. On September 11th, 1956 the first three galleries opened to the public presenting a re-installation of the Parthenon Frieze, the Athena-Nike parapet frieze, the Erechtheion frieze (displayed for the first time ever) and various archaic poros pediment groups. On July 20th, 1959 (*To Vima* 21/7/59, p.2.) the long awaited galleries with the pediments from the pre-Pericleian buildings and the famous archaic Korai opened. On December 12th, 1964, the post-war re-display was completed with the public opening of two more galleries (see *I Aygi* 9/12/64, p.2; *To Vima* 6/12/64, p.11/6 and 9/12/64, p.2. See also *ADelt* 18, Chronika, 1963:10-11; *ADelt* 19, 1964:20-21; *ADelt* 20, 1965:21); one gallery was devoted to the restored Gigantomachia pediment of the Old Temple of Athena and the other to sculpture of the 'Severe Style'.

34. Apart from the expected subjection of the Acropolis site and surrounding environment to wear and tear from traffic and the mass of tourists, one technological, let alone initially controversial, development that came along with the post-war increase of tourists was the 'Sound and Light' (*Son et Lumière*) evening show that was developed primarily in France. Aiming at boosting the site as a tourist attraction, it has been performed in the Acropolis since 1959. The originality of the performance comes from the presentation of selected highlights of Athenian history by means of spectacular illumination of the Acropolis monuments, ever-changing lighting effects and narrators. Regarding the controversy arising after the introduction of the show in the late 1950s, one can read in Leontis 1991:276-277; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:377-378; Philippidis 1994:298 and the newspapers *Eleftheria* 30.5.1959, 3.6.1959, 5.6.1959, 10.6.1959; *I Aygi* 28/5/59, p.2; 31/5/59, p.2; *To Vima* 10/1/59, p.5; 21/3/59, p.1,2.

35. There is an increasing literature on the subject: see Korres et al 1983; Korres et al 1989; Korres 1989; Bouras 1994a; Economakis (ed) 1994 wherein an exhaustive coverage of the restoration issue.

36. For the Acropolis site and its cultural management, see *To Vima* 25/12/57, p.3-4; 12/4/59, p.5-6; 2/9/62, p.6; 13/12/87, p.57; 13/9/92, p.45. For the damage to the Acropolis monuments caused by oxidation, subsequent expansion of the ironwork and pollution, the Unesco report, as well as the restoration measures undertaken since 1965, see for instance *To Vima* 25/5/65, p.4; 23/6/71, p.4; 24/6/71, p.4; 25/6/71, p.4; 26/6/71, p.4; 27/6/71, p.11; 29/6/71, p.4; 30/6/71, p.4; 1/7/71, p.4; 1/8/71, p.9; 20/5/84, p.20; 9/11/86, p.41; 15/1/89, p.47; 19/3/89, p.51; 9/4/89, p.57; 16/4/89, p.57; 11/2/90, p.57; 29/3/92, p.30; 5/4/92, p.44; 3/7/94, p.41; 31/3/96, p.68. Also the newspaper *I Aygi* 5/1/75, p.7; 26/10/90, p.11; 6/11/90, p.9; 2/12/90, p.22.

37. For the issue of the Parthenon Marbles and their repatriation, the literature is equally vast. For instance, Browning 1984; Gazi 1990; Greenfield 1990; Hitchens 1987; Merryman 1985. For the coverage of the issue in the Press, see *To Vima* 23/12/62, p.1; 30/12/62, p.5; 16/7/67, p.11/7; 4/1/87, p.33; 19/5/91, p.35. *I Aygi* 28/7/57, p.1,5; 15/8/57, p.1,7; 24/1/82, p.6; 4/8/82, p.7; 28/8/85, p.48; 3/11/85, p.38; 10/11/85, p.27; 18/1/87; 9/8/87, p.15. *Ta Nea* 7/4/87; 27/9/91.

38. See *To Vima* 29/12/84, p.8.



39. For a vivid description of the scale of the problem and its repercussions in the presentation of archaeology in the 'stifling museum', see the article of 15/5/94 in *To Vima* p.G8.

40. These are epitomised in a series of educational programmes prepared and conducted in the CAS and *in situ*, the special cast collections of the Parthenon sculptures, the plaster models of the Acropolis buildings and a number of fascinating displays, remarkably illustrated, on the conservation and restoration work undertaken on the site during the nineteenth and twentieth century down to the present.

In brief, the CAS acts as the Educational Centre of the First Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in Greece and prepares a wide range of educational activities and exciting programmes for the wider public, and specially for school children, interested in archaeological, historical, architectural and artistic subjects related to the Acropolis. Furthermore, the CAS hosts a number of unique displays: an important cast collection of the Parthenon sculptures, that is the metopes, the frieze and the pediments that aims to provide a comprehensive view of the renowned sculptures including all those which are presently housed in museums around the world (arranged on the ground floor); a unique didactic collection of models and drawings representing the state of the Acropolis rock during successive historical periods (Neolithic, Archaic, Classical and Medieval); the exhibition 'Acropolis: Conservation, Restoration and Research' whose purpose is to disseminate information to specialists and non-specialists about the work accomplished by CCAM since 1975. Part of this display contains unique photographic evidence of the conservation and restoration work executed in the nineteenth and early twentieth century which gave the Acropolis its present form. Other special presentations on the same (second) floor, which are richly documented and illustrated with a series of drawings and models concentrate on specific aspects of the conservation work in progress on the site. These displays, which are updated every two to three years, aim to project a comprehensive view of the recent research carried out on the archaeology, architecture, and history of the buildings. Finally, the visitor can also see the special exhibitions 'From Pentelikon to the Parthenon' and 'Terracotta Tiles from the Athenian Acropolis'. The first illustrates through reconstruction drawings and models, the phases a piece of marble underwent from the moment it was chosen at the quarry to the moment of its final finishing on the surface of the temple itself. The second presents some general information on the construction of ancient roofs, the composition, decoration and polychromy of ancient terracotta tiles in antiquity.

For the Educational Programmes of the CAS, there is already a large amount of material in the form of articles, leaflets, museum kits, video-tapes etc. For a detailed coverage of the centre's educational activities, see Hatziaslani 1994:92-99; also Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:372-373 and the special issues of the journal *Archaiologia* no.38, March 1991; no.52, September 1994.

41. In 1976 and 1979, the Ministry of Culture held two national architectural competitions where the open area within the building block currently housing the CAS was offered as a site for the new museum. Both competitions were unsuccessful in finding a solution due to the restricted nature of the site in relation to the building programme.

42. To this proclamation 1,270 architectural practices from 52 countries all over the world responded, including 156 from Greek architects. Finally, 438 studies from 26 countries were submitted. The first stage closed on the 28th of April 1990, with awards going to 24 studies of which 10 were selected to proceed to the second stage.

43. For the history of the competition, its results, its significance and its aftermath, see the volume *Acropolis*; See also Kondaratos 1992; Garfield 1992; Geoffroy 1992; Haskaris 1991; Hollein 1991a; 1991b; Kalogeras & Papalexopoulos 1992; Korres 1992; Kotionis 1994; Papathanassopoulos 1995; Papoulias 1991; Philippidis 1991; 1992; Simeoforidis 1990; 1991; *Tefchos* Editorial Board 1991; Tournikiotis 1992.



Regarding the announcement of the project by the Ministry of Culture and its coverage in the Press, see *Ta Nea* 30/9/1976; 21/11/86; 7/8/87; 2/4/88, p.27 ; *I Aygi* 25/1/89, p.9; *To Vima* 14/5/89, p.67; 11/11/90, p.28; 18/11/90, p.48. Regarding the debate arising during and after the international competition, see *To Vima* 1/10/89, p.57; 29/4/90, p.57; 17/2/91, p.47; 17/3/91, p.34; 7/4/91, p.29; *I Aygi* 2/2/91, p.13; 13/3/91, p.11; *Eleutherotypia* 13.3.91; 25/9/93, p.48; *I Kathimerini* 4/10/92, p.21; *Ethnos* [The Nation] 25/9/93, p.41; *Ta Nea* 1/10/92.

44. The Prehistoric Collection consists of unique works of art representing the major civilisations that flourished in the area of the Aegean from the 6th millennium BC to about 1050 BC. It includes objects from the Neolithic, Early and Middle Bronze Age (5th-2nd millennia BC) from Central Greece, Thessaly, Lemnos and Troy, all displayed in the long narrow Room Five on the ground floor. To the right, the visitor can admire the celebrated Hall of Mycenaean Antiquities (Room 4), wherein chief among the splendid treasures are the contents of the six shaft graves from Grave Circle A at Mycenae and the objects from Vaphio. Here, the interested visitor is really spoiled for choice: gold diadems, cups arms, fine vases, dagger blades inlaid in gold, silver and niello, portrait masks in gold leaf, silver rhytons, various golden ornaments, engraved gems, gold pins, gold breastplates, a rock-crystal duck vase, painted decorated plaques, stele, bronze mirrors with ivory handles, various ivory objects, clay tablets with inscriptions in Cretan Linear B script, small varied and graceful pottery, etc. The famous collection of figurines and other objects from the Early and Middle Cycladic periods (3rd-2nd millennia BC) are on display in Room 6, whereas the superbly preserved large-scale wall-paintings from Thera are available for public admiration in room 48 on the first floor.

The Sculpture Collection presents the development of ancient Greek sculpture from the 8th century BC to the end of the 4th century BC. The sculptures comprising the Collection number some eight thousand pieces (Rhomipoulou 1995:107). Many of them are masterpieces and landmarks in the history of art such as the series of Kouroi and the series of Classical grave reliefs, that come from Athens and other parts of Greece-Thessaly, central Greece, the Peloponnese, Crete and the Aegean islands. They enable the visitor to form a satisfactory idea both of the development of sculpture and of the particular features of the various local workshops. This remarkable collection spreads over most of the ground floor galleries, through which the visitor can saunter following a chronological progression, starting from Geometric monumental pottery and Archaic sculpture in Room 7 of the north wing and finishing with sculptures by Greek workshops of Roman times (2nd-5th centuries AD) in rooms 31-33 of the south-west wing. In fact, this exhibition of Greco-Roman Sculpture, opened on April 13th, 1993, is the most recent example of post-war display re-organisation in the Museum. Its display-authors claim also to have achieved a long awaited completeness with regard to the amount and diversity of the Roman material on display. A first attempt to mount a similar exhibition dates back in 1968/1971-1982 and was located in the area of the museum now devoted to temporary exhibitions (Rhomipoulou 1995; not dated; see also *I Aygi* 12/8/84, p.12,21).

The Bronze Collection, in galleries 36-39, is famous mainly for its unique, large-scale original statues, such as the Poseidon from Artemision, the Boy from Marathon, the Youth from Antikythera, and the "Jockey Boy" from Atremision (in prominent position in room 21), and also for smaller-scale works, such as the famous instrument from Antikythera, figurines and vases. The majority of the bronzes were dedications in the major Greek sanctuaries of Zeus at Dodona, of Athena on the Acropolis, of Zeus at Olympia, of Apollo at Ptoon in Boeotia, of Zeus Thaulios in Thessaly, and others.

The Egyptian Collection, whose re-display in galleries 40-41 is also one of the most recent in the museum (early 1990s), consists of objects dating from the Predynastic period (5000 BC) to the time of the Roman conquest.



Finally, the Collection of Pottery and Miniature Objects occupies most of the first floor of the new wing's space (rooms 49-56). The collection covers the entire course of Greek pottery from the 11th century BC to Roman times and various regional workshops (i.e. Attic, Corinthian, Boeotian, Lakonian, Island and Ionian). The series of white-ground lekythoi, geometric, black-figure and red-figure vases make the collection unique.

45. See Karouzos 1981:142-168; Langlotz 1954 in *To Vima* 21/2/1954, p.3, 6; Vanderpool 1949; Weinberg 1948; *To Vima* 16/3/1950, p.3; 25/3/53, p.3; 3/9/53, p.3; 21/2/1954, p.3,6; 18/3/1954, p.1; 13/5/54, p.3.

46. e.g. the famous Dipylon amphoras and craters, the Analatos Hydria, other vases of the Orientalising style from Attica, Boeotia, and the islands, the Daedalic statue of Nikandra (c.650BC), a Daedalic Melian Amphora depicting the god Apollo and the Muses on a chariot and in front of them the goddess Artemis and her deer, the grave stele of Kitylos and Dermys from Tanagra (c.600 BC).

47. e.g. the daedalic seated figure from Hagiorgitika (c.640-630 BC) facing at the door side the seated figure from Asea of Arcadia, the Kouros from Melos in a predominant position in the gallery, a number of bronze figurines dated to the 7th century BC, the Dipylon Head and hand from a gigantic kouros (c.620-610 BC), a lion bronze head from the Heraion of Samos, other smaller bronze figurines, vases, the clay metopes from Mycenae and Thermon of Aitolia, the large vases from Vari of Attica with mythological scenes, the Nessos amphora, the limestone head of Kouros from the Sanctuary of Apollo in Ptoon of Boeotia (580-570 BC), etc. (Gallery Two).

Also the Nike of Delos (c.550 BC), the upper part of a grave stele from Attica (c.560 BC), the stele of Aristion, various complete Attic vases, the wonderful archaic bases with depiction of athletic activities, the statue of Aristodikos (c.500 BC), a small bronze figurine of Apollo from Laconia (c.500 BC), etc. (Gallery Three).

48. e.g. the great bronze statue of Poseidon from the sea off Artemision Cape, smaller bronze figurines in individual pedestals in the centre of the room such as the handsome head of Zeus from Olympia. Also, the 'Autostephanoumenos' stele from Sounio (c.470 BC), the 'Kritian Boy' and several later Korai on temporary loan from the Acropolis Museum, the statue of Apollo of Omphalos, a grave stele from Akarnania, reliefs sculptures from the base of the statue of Nemesis from Ramnous, architectural elements and pedimental sculpture from the Temple of Hera at Argos, a seated female figure from Sounio (c.440 BC), the magnificent grave stele from Salamina (c.430 BC), the stele of Diotima from Mantinea of Arcadia (c.420-400 BC).

49. Savvidi in *To Vima* 13/5/1954, p.3; see also M.Kalligas in *To Vima* 15/1/48, p.2; *I Ayxi* 18/4/1959, p.3.

50. In 1954-1956, four new galleries opened, in the repaired first floor of the new wing, to house part of the magnificent vase collection of the museum (see *To Vima* 25/3/53, p.3; 3/9/53, p.3; 18/3/54, p.1; 21/2/54, p.3,6; 24/3/56, p.2). They included vases from the Early Geometric to the Archaic period as well as a variety of artefacts from various regions and sanctuaries of the country. On 23/2/1957, the so-called Altar Gallery, with grave and votive sculptures of various periods and regions, opened in rooms 34-35 that connected the old museum with the new wing (*To Vima* 23/5/57, p.2.). The display was arranged around an ancient altar which was placed in the centre of the gallery in such a way as to suggest an open air sanctuary. As more galleries were completed, access to the museum was, for the first time after the wars, reinstated through the main gate.

On 17/7/57 the long awaited re-display of the Prehistoric Galleries opened, the organisation, layout and appearance of which was utterly altered compared to the previous prehistoric display (*To Vima* 2/6/57, p.3; 17/7/57, p.3). From an aesthetic perspective, the use of a neutral



gallery environment, the introduction of full height free-standing showcases and the placement of the most splendid treasures on vertical vividly and variably coloured panels stood out as the most innovative features of the display. From a scientific perspective, the arrangement of the artefacts according to provenance and excavation groups in order to present an overview of the Mycenaean civilisation with an emphasis on technology, ideology and art, brought some theoretical freshness to the display which received credit both from specialists and the Press (Karouzou 1957:1203-1205; Sakellariou 1987:1136-1138). From the early days of its opening, the exhibition enjoyed popularity, with some one thousand admission tickets being issued on Sundays and Thursdays when the entrance was free and some five hundred per day for the rest of the week (*To Vima* 31/7/57, p.4).

Other galleries, opening at a steady pace in subsequent years, presented:

- a) Archaic sculpture (1958-1960) (see *To Vima* 13/12/58, p.4; 13/4/60, p.3; 14/5/60, p.9);
- b) the Stathatos collection (1957) (see *To Vima* 23/5/57, p.2).
- c) the Karapanos collection (1959) (see *To Vima* 29/12/59, p.1; 8/1/60, p.3; 24/1/60, p.3,4);
- d) a selection of White Lekythoi (1959) (see *ibid.*) and
- e) classical pottery of Attic and provincial workshops (1961-1962) on the first floor (see *To Vima* 3/3/61, p.2; 5/3/61, p.7; 20/3/62, p.5.);
- f) Classical Grave Stele and outstanding early to late classical sculpture (1961-1963) (see *To Vima* 3/3/61, p.2; 5/3/61, p.7; 20/3/62, p.5; 17/10/63, p.4) and
- g) finally representative examples of Hellenistic sculpture (1966) (see *To Vima* 31/8/66, p.2; *I Aygi* 1/9/66, p.2.).

51. Brouskari 1974:13-15; Touloupa 1991; *I Aygi* 4/8/56, p.2; 9/12/64, p.2; *To Vima* 11/9/56, p.2; 21/7/59, p.2; 6/12/64, p.11/6; 9/12/64, p.2.

52. Leontis 1991:3 in her interpretation of Seferis 1986:38-39.

53. Some specific events such as the celebration of the International Week of Museums on 6-14/10/1956 co-ordinated by UNESCO-ICOM on the theme '*The importance of the museum for general education*', and the First Congress of the Association of Greek Archaeologists held in Athens in 1967, can give us some further indications about the archaeologists' and state's general concern regarding the educational role of museums in the early post-war era. Some of the resolutions of the conference, for instance, asserted that Greek museums failed to perform their educational roles satisfactorily and most of the time operated as mere depositories of ancient treasures (*Proceedings* 1984:570). Others suggested that the exhibitions of art works in Greek Archaeological Museums would always yield a main principle, that was the elevation and promotion of the "Hellenic" element, with Hellenic means of realisation, simplicity and austerity. As for the educational role of the museum, the proposition was that this would be enhanced by means of temporary displays on themes such as the development of ceramic art or the typology of stone tools, which would be of great benefit for the student of art and the researcher alike (Theocharis 1984:81). See *To Vima* 3/6/1956, p.5; *To Vima* 31/3/1967, p.2; *Proceedings* 1984.

54. *ibid.*, note 44. Also K.Tsatsos, Minister of Education in 1949 as cited in Vanderpool 1949.

55. *I Aygi* 18/4/59, p.3.

56. Petrakos 1995a:110.

57. *I Aygi* 4/8/56, p.2.

58. Touloupa 1991:25-26.

59. *To Vima* 9/8/53, p.3.

60. For instance, in 1944, Karouzos addressed a long letter to the Greek prime minister (G.Papandreou), in which submitted his personal accounts regarding the problems of Greek archaeology and Greek museology. He felt it should be geared to please the contemporary aesthetic requirements of the modern people and satisfy and promote public education (see Petrakos 1995a:77). Later on in 1948, he had the chance to re-address publicly the same views in a letter protesting against a governmental proposal to co-ordinate the selling of duplicate Greek antiquities from the collections of Greek museums in order to raise some extra income in times of general economic deprivation of the country after the wars (see Karouzos in *To Vima* 12/9/48 and 14/9/48; also reprinted in Karouzos 1995:238-247). See also Miliadis 1957:19.

61. In some instances, Karouzos referred to the so-called 'illustrated classics' or rather 'classical authors illustrated' and the danger that might arise from these sort of popularised forms of archaeology and art (Karouzos 1981:140).

62. Source: National Statistics Service.

Year	National Archaeological Museum		Acropolis	
	Total Admissions	% of national admissions to museums	Total Admissions	% of national admissions to archaeological sites
1974	282,885	26.9	718,793	24.3
1975	389,308	24.4	933,719	22.7
1976	538,674	24.0	1,248,930	22.0
1977	565,294	17.9	1,269,409	24.3
1978	656,973	18.7	1,468,724	23.6
1979	716,297	19.1	1,502,095	22.0
1980	665,834	17.2	1,409,358	21.7
1981	632,131	18.6	1,313,071	21.1
1982	600,601	18.7	1,232,437	20.3
1983	579,318	21.1	1,201,985	19.7
1984	773,284	24.3	1,455,014	20.1
1985	787,902	22.2	1,628,119	21.0
1986	617,907	19.2	1,353,229	19.0
1987	584,334	17.5	1,417,298	19.1
1988	547,911	16.8	1,374,685	18.5
1989	512,615	15.8	1,352,508	18.8
1990	485,402	15.2	1,402,367	19.0

63. Philippidis 1994:296; *To Vima* 6/7/86, p.38; 22/1/89, p.54.

64. *ibid.*

65. *I Aygl* 12/8/1984, p.12, 21.

66. *To Vima* 15/5/94, p.G8.



67. *I Aygi* 7/2/1982, p.5; see also 12/8/1984, p.12, 21. This passage is worth quoting at length:

'It seems that our museums have not been meant to be visited by the public - at least the Greek public- but merely to store statues and relics of the past. They are treasure repositories and not cultural centres (...) The people have associated the "museums" with cold, inhospitable and out-dated institutions, and they are not wrong (...) The lack of cohesion and spirit in exhibition organisation and approach arises as the most obvious pressing weakness, as if the majority of Greek museums have originated from the National Archaeological Museum's nowadays dull prototype and exhibition rationale (...) This museum's post-war exhibition had followed a bourgeois pre-war ideology that disregarded uneducated people and targeted merely the initiated and knowledgeable of art (...) Today this museum smothers. The repainting of its walls, or the opening of a cafeteria or a shop for the sale of replicas will not prove to be solutions to the problem (...) The demand is also not for more exhibits but better ones. The Archaeological Museum is a labyrinth (...) The displays remain silent and un-interpreted (...) [Perhaps] this Museum will not change. It is a museum-monument of classical museological philosophy, a museum Pan-Hellenic and irreplaceable!'

68. That was the title of a temporary exhibition that opened on March 18th, 1991 in the National Gallery of Athens. The exhibition was devoted to the international competition for the New Acropolis Museum. It presented all the studies submitted and aimed at making public opinion sensitive to the future of the Acropolis Museum. As mentioned above, a similar type of public exhibition, devoted to the international competition for the National Archaeological Museum, was organised in 1861.

69. With regard to the location of the museum, the Competition Organiser chose three sites: the Dionysos site which proved to be, according to the jury, an unconvincing site due to the size of the plot and the restrictions there for the protection of the landscape. The Koile site was the one on which most of the architects attempted to conduct a dialogue between the Museum and the natural rock surface, thus respecting the special nature of the hollow. Finally, the solution on the Makryianni site aimed at associating the Museum with the opposite rock of the Acropolis while at the same time juxtaposing it against a neutral urban environment (Philippopoulou-Michailidou 1991:7).

## **6. Classical sites of Hellenism as sacred landscapes and archaeological heterotopias; Conceptual values, museological messages on site and in the museum.**

1. Cleere (1984b:125; 1989b; cf: Ucko 1989b:xi-xii) approaches the matter of legislation and protection of archaeological heritage from three interconnecting angles: first the form that such protection takes according to the general administrative and legislative maxims and thus social, political conditions and historical circumstances of the country; secondly, the intentions behind such protection and thirdly the relative effectiveness of its application. Thus, as the question of protection of archaeological monuments develops an intrinsic relevance with political, educational, economic and scientific aspects of the country's life, by effect it becomes far more complex than a mere, albeit already perplexing, debate upon the level and the sort of human intervention to the current material condition of ancient monuments. For instance, the matter is a highly contentious field and revolves around the endless scientific



dilemma of preservation versus conservation of ancient monuments (see Cleere 1989b:13; Pearce 1990b:173). The preservation ethics are defended by the 'purists' who favour the concept 'preserved as found' whereas conservation and anastylosis involve the creation of a new context for the monument by rendering it from a ruin with no life beyond its bygone history to a functional and utilitarian edifice with a modern historical phase no less valued and authentic than its previous ones (see Pearce 1990a:173). We shall tackle this interesting and provocative issue of adaptive reuse more specifically below, when analysing the case of the Museum of Athenian Agora which is housed in an extensively reconstructed original Roman building (Stoa of Attalos) located within the ancient site.

It becomes obvious, therefore, that it would be interesting and revealing to analyse Greek archaeological legislation by taking into account all these parameters, especially nowadays given that the amendment of this legislation attracts afresh the attention of politicians, specialists and general public in the country (see Gratziou 1985; Kotsakis 1994; Petrakos 1993b; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:205-246).

The archaeological legislation that is still in force in Greece dates back to 1932 (law 5351/1932, the so called *Περί Αρχαιοτήτων*) and is old fashioned with many omissions and ambiguities. For the study of Greek Archaeological legislation see Doris 1985; Petrakos 1982; See also Dimacopoulou & Lapourtas 1995; Fatouros 1986; Gratziou 1985; Ladas 1986; Mouliou (in press); Pantos 1993; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:210-212; Pararas 1986; Petrakos 1993b; Voudouri 1992; Voulgaris 1986; Vouyoucas 1986; Vrellis 1994; 1995.

2. Cultural resource management stands almost as a synonym for the terms Heritage Management or Management of monuments in landscape. There is an extensive literature on the subject. To mention only some of them: Cleere 1984a; 1989a; Harrison 1994b; Middleton 1994; Pearce 1990b; Robinson 1994; Smith 1994; Ucko 1989b; Uzzell 1994; Velarde 1994.

3. Shafer nich (1993:43) informs us that, in 1949, UNESCO published a report on the nature of and need for what it called '*museums of the monument*'. Three years later, the French translated the term into '*le musée de site*' which appeared in the international journal *Museum* in 1955. In 1982 the ICOM published a report on Archaeological Site Museums, defining a site-museum as: 'a museum conceived and set up in order to protect natural or cultural property, movable and immovable, on its original site, that is, preserved at the place where such property has been created or discovered'.

Additionally, Luginbuhl (1992: 6) discusses the Granada Convention of 1985, (Article 1.3), wherein sites are considered important for the aesthetic, scientific, historical, technical, archaeological and social interest that they call forth. More specifically sites are defined as: 'combined works of man and nature, being areas which are built upon and sufficiently distinctive and homogeneous to be topographically definable and are of conspicuous historical, archaeological, artistic, scientific, social or technical interest'.

4. According to a questionnaire produced by a study group of ICOM-ICOM that works on the theme of 'Site and archaeological reconstruction museums' and applied to twenty seven different countries, Greece was found to have 34 site museums, 18 urban and 1 rural, 15 religious places, 6 necropolis, 6 other, 18 prehistoric, 20 protohistoric, 30 of antiquity, 11 of middle age and 1 modern (Berger, M.T. & Colardelle, M., 1994: Study group of ICOM-ICOM on the theme 'Site and archaeological reconstruction museums', (unpublished). In 1995, official information was given by the then Minister of Culture, Mr.Th.Mikroutsikos, that in Greece there were as many as two thousand five hundred known archaeological sites (Mikroutsikos 1995).

5. For the site of Ancient Olympia, see bibliographical note in Yalouri & Yalouris 1991:179-182, and the more recent one in Ostby 1993:200-203.



6. For the site of Delphi, see Bommelaer, J.F., (1991): *Guide de Delphes. Le Site*, Ecole Française d'Athènes, Sites et monuments VII, along with the cited bibliography, and the more recent Ostby 1993:203-206.

7. This is a comment retrieved by the Blue Guide, which is a popular, but well written, detailed and accurate touristic publication; see Barber 1987:443.

8. There are detailed essays on the history of the site during the first period of its rediscovery, starting in the 15th century when the location was identified by Cyriakus of Ancona (see Picard & Pentazos 1992; Picard 1992).

9. The entire village of Kastri built over the site had to be bought for 500.000 gold francs and rebuilt in close proximity.

10. The Greek prime minister Charilaos Trikoupis thought of awarding to the French the right to excavate Delphi in exchange of an agreed Treaty of commerce that would introduce an unusually low import tariff on the raisins of Corinth which provided 10% of the wine consumed in France (Amandry 1992; Arnush 1994; Etienne 1992:105-107; Dassios 1992). In the course of the negotiations, the Americans tried to gain control over the site, and the tensions, that arose, threatened to turn the whole situation into an international incident (see Sherman Sheftel 1979). Norton, accounting for the interests of the American party, accused that: 'the Americans had been made the tools of a crafty combination for the Greek advantage' (see Sherman Sheftel 1979:8). Yet, apart from the Greek efforts to secure a beneficial treaty of commerce, it is useful to remember that the country was then in political and diplomatic flux over national matters. Greece was seeking French diplomatic assistance in the Berlin congress (1878) where the fate of Thessaly and its annexation with the Motherland was at stake (see Picard & Pentazos 1992; Amandry 1992; Picard 1992; Pentazos 1992b). Finally, the archaeological contract with the French would secure employment for the Greek work-force, revival of local trade, increase of public land, enrichment of the national museums, and the fame of Greece world-wide (Pentazos 1992a).

For the French, the rights to excavate Delphi symbolised a national and scientific victory against Germany, especially after the tension of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 (Etienne 1992:104). In relation to this tension, it is interesting to add that in the long debate over the site, the site of Olympia and the relevant contract, that Greeks and Germans had signed regarding its excavation, served as negotiating factors on behalf of the French.

11. The Nemean Games were held for the first time in 573 BC, in Nemea. Yet, in the 5th-century BC and through the remainder of antiquity (apart from a short period between 330-270 BC), the city of Argos took over the control of the games.

12. It might be possible to think of the Nemean oikoi as storerooms, embassies or meeting halls constructed by different city-states for their citizens as participants in the Nemean Games, and not simply as treasuries (see Marchand 1990:118-120).

13. Information acquired after a personal communication with Mr. N. Yalouris on 23/12/92.

14. The group of Hermes with baby Dionysos was found in the Temple of Hera in 1877. It has been attributed to the famous sculptor Praxiteles and is one of the best preserved and venerated, albeit debated classical statues. Its attribution to Praxiteles has been problematic and a furious and still unresolved controversy has been initiated over this matter (see Stewart 1990:177), with some scholars defending its status as an original by Praxiteles dated in 340-330 BC (Kokkorou-Aleura 1990:200; Yalouri & Yalouris 1991:156-157) and others suggesting a later dating (?300-250 BC) and a reattribution to the circle of his sons (i.e. Kephisodotos II) and followers (Stewart 1990:177-178).



15. The pedimental sculptures illustrate in the east side the chariot-race between Oinomaos and Pelops, and in the west the fight between the Lapiths and Centaurs during Peirithoos' wedding. The metopes depict the Twelve Labours of Herakles.

16. The restored group as presented in the exhibition is published by Ashmole, B. and Yalouris, N. (1967): *The Sculptures of the Temple of Zeus*, Phaidon Press, London. In fact, scholars have argued for over a century about who goes where, and over seventy articles and books have been devoted to the subject. Stewart in his recent monumental work on Greek Sculpture (1990:142-146) follows the arrangement as suggested by Ashmole and Yalouris.

17. Starting from left to right (from west to east), Gallery I includes Neolithic and Early Helladic to Early Geometric stone, clay and bronze objects from the Altis. The collection includes grave goods from sub-Mycenaean chamber tombs, bronze tripods and handles of cauldrons of excellent workmanship, whereas in the centre of the gallery stands a Geometric horse in solid bronze. In gallery II, there are objects of the Geometric and Early Archaic periods, such as bronzes, terracottas, orientalising bronze plaques, griffins, armour and weapons displayed in type groups and morphological order, shields and corselets on the wall, cases of greaves, lances, and helmets below; an archaic bronze breast-plate, the restored monumental disk-shaped acroterion from the Heraion and the colossal limestone head of Hera, probably from the cult statue are also here on view. In gallery III, the late Archaic bronze and clay statuettes, tripods, marble and poros sculptures (most of them from the pediments of Treasuries) and a selection of pottery take their place. In gallery IV, we have a variety of objects of 'severe' and classical style, most prominently the vigorous clay group of Zeus and Ganymedes, the Miltiades' helmet from the spoils captured by the victorious Athenians in the Persian wars, and various objects from Pheidias' (the famous sculptor) Workshop. As we move on, in galleries VI-VII, we can see some bronze and marble statuettes of the late Classical and Hellenistic periods, whereas in Gallery VII, the great Hermes of Praxiteles is to be viewed and venerated in sacred isolation from the other displays, signalling thus the zenith of a visual crescendo on works of ancient Greek art. As we go along the east wing of the museum, we pass through the Room (IX) of Roman sculpture to end up in the Gallery X, the so-called Gallery of the Olympic Games. It includes bases of statues and dedications of Olympic victors, disks, stengides, jumping weights (halteres), clay and bronze statuettes of athletes, horsemen etc., dating from the Geometric to the Classical period.

Finally, the famous statue of Nike of Paionios, that has been inaccessible to the public since 1982, was reinstated, on 9/10/1994, after its successful restoration by the sculptor Stelios Triantis. It received a warm greeting on the scale of a national archaeological celebration by the specialists and news press (from *I Kathimerini* [The Daily] 11/10/94:15; *Ethnos* 1/10/94:31; *Ta Nea tis Technis* 1994, November, etc.). The statue is located in a new gallery, painted in blue to symbolise the sky where the victorious Nike came from.

18. A report, made out by the archaeologist Christos Karouzos and the architect Anastasios Orlandos on 11/9/1940, summarises the problems that occurred during the new arrangement of 1936-1940 (see Picard et al 1992:237).

19. Between 1968-1974, the Ephor Vasileios Petrakos arranged the small finds in chronological order and classes in the Hall of the Cases. This stereotyped approach is occasionally imposed by the nature of the material and existing available information, as happened with the metal objects. As most of them come from the dump deposit along the Sacred Way, there is little contextual evidence with which to date them and we are therefore dependent upon stylistic criteria alone (see Morgan 1990:138). In 1974, a new gallery housed the unique chryselephantine objects and the silver bull that were discovered in 1939 near the Stoa of Athenians. In 1978-79, the Ephor Petros Themelis worked on the new, more accurate, presentation of the Daochos monument. In 1981, a strong earthquake (a recurrent natural phenomenon in the area) resulted in the closure of the Gallery of the Treasury of Siphnians for many months. Finally, in the same year, a rearrangement of the anteroom, with its division into



two parts and the creation of different entrance and exit, resolved major problems of visitors' circulation within the museum. During the period 1982-1992, under the direction of the Ephor E. Pentazos, there have been some additional changes with the intention of bringing together finds that belong to the same period but which have been previously displayed in a sparse manner in different galleries (Pentazos 1992c:69-70).

20. The concept of a reconstructed Temple of Zeus at Nemea has always been in the minds of the American archaeologists that excavate and study the site, particularly for scientific reasons. The local villagers also dreamed of a reconstruction of the temple for economic and touristic related reasons (Miller 1983:11). In 1983, the Benaki Museum in Athens together with the American School of Classical Studies housed an exhibition concerning the Temple of Zeus, its past and present perspectives and its future prospects for a physical reconstruction. The exhibition contained the detailed studies that have been conducted for the Temple of Zeus throughout the years and aimed to present to the Greek public the most complete picture of the monument and to create an awareness of the need for an immediate restoration of the building (see the Exhibition catalogue edited by Cooper, Miller, Miller, Smith 1983).

21. According to Professor Miller, his original endeavour was to have a museum (exhibition) within the archaeological zone, in a more immediate and close relation with the monuments. As this was not feasible, his alternate choice for the exhibition was to show in detail and simultaneously relate and cross-compare the various ancient monuments that are *in situ* with their representations on the model situated in the exhibition area in front of the picture window. Under ideal financial conditions, the alternative of a short-term exhibition with audio-visual supporting material and changing temporary themes would be preferable to a long-term (permanent) and static display (information given during a personal communication with the excavator in November 1992).

22. It is worth-mentioning that Melina Mercouri referred to the Olympic International Committee's decision as: 'the victory of Coca Cola over Parthenon' (Leontis 1991:224).

23. The contract was signed by the Minister of Culture T. Tzanetakis and Juan Antonio Samaranch, president of the Olympic Committee, on 31/8/90 as a symbolic gesture of universalism on behalf of the Greek state (for a detailed description of the contract and its terms, see Petrakos 1991a:114-118; for the export of antiquities abroad see Petrakos 1991b). The contract was then ratified by the Central Archaeological Council on 2/7/91. For the state officials, it was interpreted as an example of a new aggressive cultural policy, promoting the Museum of Olympia, but mostly fostering the national interests of the country. In reality, what the Greek officials did was to use archaeological objects as economic and symbolic commodities for the satisfaction of their political endeavours. It is worth quoting a relevant statement voiced by the then Minister of Culture:

'In the case of the Museum of Lausanne, we have to deal with a national battle in which we have been armed with an enduring cultural panoply and superiority, ever since antiquity. In an era in which national borders are being abolished, and in which there is a cosmogony all around us, the promotion of our national identity is a matter of high political duty...' (Kathimerini 19.7.91 in Petrakos 1991c:137).

The national press, on the other hand, became the platform of resistance on behalf of the archaeologists (see *To Vima* 14/7/9; 28/7/91; *Ta Nea* 22/10/91 and many others). A sample of the many combative titles are: 'Government-Elgin', 'Culture S.O.S.', 'the State as illicit trader of antiquities', 'Ancient spirit immortal... and Swiss' and many others (see Petrakos 1991c:138).

24. The statistics are indicative of the development on the touristic front. In 1936, during the month of August, 335 visitors arrived on the site, whereas in 1990, during the same month, the numbers were increased to 103.100 visitors (Bommelaer & Pentazos & Picard 1992:264). For



the changes and distortions an archaeological site undergoes with mass tourism generally, see Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:359-360.

25. This statement is incised on a dedicatory plaque, displayed in the entrance hall of the Museum of Nemea.

26. As regards the archaeology of sanctuaries, Morgan follows De Polignac's line of research and theoretical explanation. de Polignac (1984) is the first to incorporate the phenomenon of the explosion in the number of sanctuaries into his explanation of the emergence of the polis. He looks at the formation of the Greek state from a social, ideological and spatial perspective, by explaining the new social relationships of the community in conjunction with a re-definition of sacred and profane space (see also Whitley 1991:40).

27. Wang Hongjun, Curator in the Museum of Chinese History, counter-proposes the Temple of Confucius, founded in 478 BC on the sage's former residence in Qufu, as the earliest museum of the world (Hongjun 1994:72). Furthermore, Alain Schnapp reports some very interesting finds from Mesopotamia and discusses their relevance and importance in relation to the origins of the Museum and to an early human interest in and curiosity for the past (Schnapp 1993:32).

28. There are seven hundred references in which the ancient authors specifically mention the Agora and its monuments, Pausanias' accounts in the *Periegesis of Greece* are the most important sources.

29. Small scale excavations had been undertaken by the Greek Archaeological Society (1859-1912) and by the German Archaeological Institute (1896-1897) which helped the researchers to identify the location of the Agora north of the Acropolis and the Aeropagus, which was later in 1934 reaffirmed by the extensive and systematic excavations of the site conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Yet in the nineteenth-century, a substantial part of the site of Agora still served as a residential area.

30. The residents of Agora in the 1920s were approximately seven to ten thousand. After the expropriation of the land by the American School of Classical Studies, 365 buildings were demolished despite the strong opposition from the displaced locals (Morris 1994b:34-35).

31. Compare the similarities with the site of Delphi and the history of its excavation by The French Archaeological School.

32. The excavations of Ancient Agora, apart from the original generous gift by John Rockefeller, profited from the additional private financial support of the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

33. The selected area west of Aeropagus revealed a number of classical private houses and shops as well as a trapezoidal enclosure later identified as the Strategeion, the headquarters of the generals (Meritt 1984:175-202).

34. John Travlos, the architect of the Agora excavations, was responsible for the scientific accuracy of the restoration that was supervised by the Department of Restoration of the Ministry of Education headed by Professor Orlandos.

35. The ceremony of inauguration, which coincided with the celebrations for the 75th anniversary of the American School, took place in the presence of the Greek Royal family, many visiting scholars and hundreds of people (Meritt 1984:61-64; Thompson 1957).

The general public and the national press on its behalf had shown a vivid interest for the scientific work of the American School especially in relation to the Agora excavations and the reconstruction of the Stoa of Attalos II. See for instance the articles of the central liberal newspaper *To Vima* which applauds the undertaking, on 10/1/50, 30/3/50, 25/6/50, 20/8/50, 5/2/53, 26/3/53, 5/11/54, 24/2/55, 27/8/55, 31/8/56, 2/9/56, 4/9/56, and the left wing



newspaper *I Aygi* which expounds acute criticisms on 19/8/56, 4/9/56, 6/9/56, 3/8/57, 17/9/58, 18/9/58.

36. Griswold, following a conservative approach to landscaping, decided that wherever plants were known to have existed in antiquity the same varieties were to be replanted as near as possible in their original locations. Generally, the aim was that the planting and all the other elements of the landscape (i.e. fences, walls, walks, steps and benches) would be designed as a background to the structural antiquities, having as their sole purpose the embellishment, protection and provision of access to the Agora and its adjacent areas (Griswold 1953:3). The Preliminary report for the landscape development conducted by Griswold in 1953 contains recommendations for matters such as the purpose of the landscape management, entrances, walks and steps, base grading, drainage, water supply, planting, estimate of cost, estimate of the number of trees, shrubs, vines and wild flower plants needed. In total, the proposal makes provision for the planting of two hundred and one major trees, one hundred and twenty one minor ones, six thousand shrubs and vines, and four thousand five hundred wild-flowers, in an area that covers 9000m<sup>2</sup>.

37. Papageorgiou-Venetas states that the Stoa of Attalos, as one sees it now, contains less than 10% of the original material (1994:158).

38. For the ideological debate over the reconstructed Stoa of Attalos II, as expressed by left wing partisans see the newspaper *I Aygi* 19/8/56, 4/9/56, 6/9/56, 3/8/57, 17/9/58, 18/9/58.

39. The great bulk of the finds are closed off from the public by means of a screen of translucent glass in aluminium frames, located in the upper storey of the stoa. However, provision has been made in the basement and in the upper storey for the storage of the finds in glass-doored cabinets under conditions which permit them to be readily accessed and studied by scholars.

40. There are some interesting publications for children concerning the Ancient Athenian Agora and its museum, prepared by the Centre of Educational Programmes of the Greek Ministry of Culture. See also the well-conceived, colourful and entertaining guide book of Ancient Agora for the age-group 10-15 years old by Vetsis, K. & Decastro, M (1989): *Stin Agora ton Arxaion Athinaion* [At the Agora of Ancient Athenians], Gnosi, Athens.

41. This material includes finds such as hollow bone eyelets for laces and iron hobnails used for shoemaking from a cobbler's shop where it is established that Socrates used to meet students that were too young to enter the Agora as well as finds like thirteen small medicine bottles used possibly as containers of poisonous substances, found in a cistern from a building identified as the state prison where Socrates was put to death.

42. These ideas were expressed by Konstatinos Tsatsos, representative of the Greek state during the opening ceremony and inauguration of the Agora Museum (see *To Vima* 2/9/56:3). Later, after the collapse of the Colonels' regime in 1974, the abolition of the monarchy and the restitution of democracy in Greece, K. Tsatsos became the first president of the Hellenic Republic.

43. As Paschalis Kitromilides suggested (1985b:15): 'to follow the course of Athenian political ideals in the post-Classical era and during ensuing centuries is a venture not far removed from narrating the history of political thought'. Since there are numerous brilliant studies on the subject, we believe that it is more appropriate to simply refer to some of them rather than repeat certain mundane commonplaces. Thus, for the reforms and tradition of Athenian democracy during the revival of political humanism, Enlightenment, major revolutions (French and American), and the nineteenth and twentieth-centuries, see Hansen 1989; 1994; Kitromilides 1985b; Morris 1994b:29-31 which all have further comprehensive bibliographies.

44. The celebrations concerned the democratic reforms of the Athenian statesman Cleisthenes that took place in Athens in 508/507 BC. However, when assessing the Athenian democracy,



modern political theorists would not speak about the Cleisthenic reforms but they would refer either to the Periclean or the Athenian democracy in the age of Demosthenes (Hansen 1994; Hornblower 1994). Cleisthenes found favour with the historians, only after George Grote in 1847 published the third and fourth volumes of his *History of Greece*. In fact, Hornblower explains the Cleisthenes' popularity among historians in the last decade of the twentieth century as a result of the greater scientific study of the non-literary tradition, namely the study of the 'history and archaeology' (including epigraphy) of the Athenian Democracy (Hornblower 1994:v).

45. Between 4-6 December 1992, an international conference was organised by the American School of Classical Studies in Athens with the theme 'The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy'. It addressed questions such as 'did the political organisation of the Athenian city-state in the fifth and fourth centuries BC affect its physical remains', 'what aspects of the archaeological record are peculiarly democratic' and 'to what extent were the form and content of late archaic and classical art conditioned by the constitution' (Coulson & Pallagia 1994:v). Other conferences were held in Washington DC between 16-18/4/93 and at Christ Church, Oxford on 27-31/7/93 on the 'History and Archaeology of Athenian Democracy'.

46. The exhibitions were the 'The Greek Miracle, classical sculpture from the dawn of democracy, the fifth century BC' in the National Gallery of Art, Washington (22/11/92-7/2/93) and Metropolitan Museum of New York (11/3-23/5/93), and one organised by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 'Birth of Democracy, An exhibition celebrating the 2500th anniversary of Democracy', National Archives, Washington DC (15/6/93-2/1/94) and Royal Museum of Scotland (4/2-17/4/94). Apart from the first blockbuster exhibition whose theoretical orientation was exclusively art-historical, the other two arranged their displays according to the following themes: Athens before democracy (The Athenian aristocracy), Solon the lawgiver, tyranny, overthrow and revolution, the Cleisthenic reforms: creation of the democracy (the ten new tribes), the political organisation of Attica: demes and tribal representation, Athenian democracy: legislature (The ekklesia, citizens' assembly), the Boule (senate), the prytaneis (executive committee of the senate), Athenian democracy: judiciary (the popular courts), the jury, the speakers, the verdict, the protection of democracy (ostracism), politics: the ostracism of Themistokles, the Athenian army, the Athenian navy, administration and bureaucracy, state religion: the archon basileus, criticism of democracy (Sokrates), theatre, the unenfranchised I -women, the unenfranchised II- slaves and resident aliens, sources and documents, the founding fathers of Athenian democracy, democracy from the past to the future.

It is noteworthy that the subject of Athenian Democracy was also prominent in 1985, in the programme of events commemorating the designation of Athens, Cultural Capital of Europe. Two exhibitions drew their material and philosophy from this theme: the 'Democracy and classical culture' (21/6-20/85, National Archaeological Museum, Athens) and 'Athens in Prehistory and Antiquity, Exhibition on Architecture and City Planning 15th century BC-6th century AD' (1985, Athenian Agora Museum).

47. The messages of the Greek Prime Minister and American President in the catalogue of the exhibition 'Greek Miracle, classical sculpture from the dawn of democracy, the fifth century BC' are indicative:

'Only in Athens and in the United States has democracy lasted as long as two centuries on a continuing basis. That is why our two countries have special roles to play in nurturing the democratic system, the United States providing the political leadership and Greece the spiritual force to ensure that free men live in harmony everywhere' (Konstantinos Mitsotakis 1992)

and



'These sculptures might well be viewed as symbols of the long-standing ties that exist between the United States and Greece. It is my hope that each visitor to this exhibit will gain not only a deeper appreciation of ancient Greek sculpture but also a renewed sense of gratitude for our shared democratic heritage' (George Bush 1992).

48. For a detailed history of the site of Kerameikos and its topography see Knigge 1990 which includes further detailed bibliography. See also Travlos 1971:299-322.

49. For previous considerations and studies regarding the formation of a unified archaeological park and the need for the establishment of a Museum of the city of Athens, see Mathaiou 1984 and A.M. 1984. For the more recent discussion on the same matter, see the national press (i.e. *To Vima* 21/3/93 and 4/4/93). The last project suggests the unification of the following areas: Academy of Plato, Demosio Sema, Sacred Way, Theseio, Ancient Agora, Roman Agora, Monastiraki Square, Plaka, Acropolis, district of Makrigianni (approved location for the New Museum of Acropolis), Hill of the Nymphs (near Pnyx), Olympieion (Temple of Olympian Zeus in Ilissos), Arditos Hill, Panathenaic Stadium (the venue of the first modern Olympic Games) and Zappeio Megaron. See also Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994:xxiii.

50. Sourvinou-Inwood rejects this methodology on the grounds that 'the fundamental flaw of this strategy is that, precisely because of the inadequacy of the evidence, it is especially vulnerable to radical distortion through the intrusion of culturally determined assumptions' (1995a:413). She proposes a counter- methodology of research whose fundamental principle is the separate and independent analysis of the relevant grids of evidence in order to avoid the interference of biases, 'self-validation' and 'hidden circularity' (1995a:300).

51. Grave monuments take many different forms in the archaic period: they can take the form of a vase, a mound, a built tomb, an unworked stone, or a proper stele, with or without sculpted decoration, with or without a sphinx (or lion, siren, and other animals or monsters), supported on a capital crowning the stele. They also take the form of a statue either kouros (standing naked young man), kori (standing young draped woman), standing draped males, seated figures, etc. Some of these monuments carried inscriptions, some images, and some both (see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995a:141ff).

52. Sourvinou-Inwood suggests the rise of the polis, the emergence of individualism and other intellectual developments of the archaic world as some of the factors that affected death-related behaviour and attitudes (see 1995a:413-444).

53. For a discussion on the use of value systems in archaeology, see Carman 1990; 1995b; Bower 1995; Darvill 1995; Firth 1995; Luginbuhl 1992:9; Pearce 1990b:170-172; Smith 1994:302; Thompson 1979.

54. On this matter regarding the significance and real impact of personal emotional experience with the ancient monument, Beard (1992:527) holds a different view. For her, the museum objects and the on-site ancient monuments in the same respect retain only a very fragile control on our visual senses. She explains the existing but not easily perceived lapse of ancient monuments from their viewers as an effect of modern tourism and popular history that necessitated the production of guide books wherein material remains were frozen into written text and rendered the visit to an archaeological site to an exercise in decoding this text.

55. Anthony D. Smith is an eminent theorist of nationalism and has written widely on this matter. In one of his recent articles ['Gastronomy or geology? The role of nationalism in the reconstruction of nations', *Nations and Nationalism*, 1(1), 1995, 3-23], he considers and reviews the debate over whether a nation is a modern and constantly changing formation or an immemorial, unchanging communal essence. He uses metaphors and calls 'gastronomical' and 'geological' the two currently prevailing theories that have seen nations to be composed of discrete elements and of a variety of ingredients with different provenance or to be understood



only by grasping the contours of much earlier formations. For him, the answer to the debate lies in a synthetic model that questions primarily the value of the past and its place in the life of modern nations.

56. For some theoretical insights on Pilgrimage and Tourism see Smith, V.L., (ed) (1978): *Hosts and Guests, The Anthropology of Tourism*, Blackwell, Oxford and Smith, V.L., (1992): 'Pilgrimage and Tourism: The Quest in Quest, Introduction', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.19, 1-17. See also Coleman & Elsner 1995; Horne 1984; Urry 1990.

57. The term first appeared in a lecture by Michel Foucault in 1967 which was entitled *Des Espaces Autres*. It means literally a 'place of another order': a real place that is conceived as being otherwise and existing outside normative social and political space. Thus, they may refer to colonies, to places set apart within a certain community (e.g. prisons, nursing homes) or in relation to our case-studies to places instituted either elsewhere or within, which enclose in one location artefacts from all cultures and all times, and thus purportedly save these from extinction (libraries, museums, archaeological sites) (see Leontis 1991:179-180).

## 7. The production of history and archaeology on the periphery of the Hellenic heartland. Regional Museums

1. Around the beginning of the twentieth-century, there were archaeological museums in Corinth, Nauplio, Chalkis, Thebes, Corfu, Thera, Lycosoura, Myconos, Tegea, Herakleion (Crete), Volos. In the aftermath of the end of World War II, new museums were erected in Veroia, Ioannina, Thessaloniki, Kavala, Samothrace, Chios, Samos, Argostoli, Thebes, Argos, Peiraeus etc. (Kokkou 1977:304-312).

2. F.E.K. A', No. 86, 7 July 1931, Statute 5081 of 20 July 1931, 'Περί Ιδρύσεως Μουσείων Πόλεων' [For the establishment of City Museums]; see Kokkou 1977:308, n.4.

3. According to an official report drawn up by the Ministry of Culture and recently published in the popular archaeological journal *Archaiologia*, vol.56 (1995), more than 450 excavations are currently under way in sites all around the country, whereas conservation and restoration works are presently being undertaken to more than 500 monuments; at the same time, the state provides funding for a restricted number of museum projects (e.g. twenty five projects for museum extensions or restoration and fourteen studies for the erection of new museums).

4. For similar problems of coping with the fallout from large-scale urban excavations, with the idea of the 'provincial museum as a universal *omnium gatherum* for its catchment area' and with acquisition, preservation and disposition policies of the archaeological provincial museum, as those which occur in the UK, see Longworth, I., (1994): 'Museums and Archaeology: Coping with the Chimaera', 1-8, in Gaimster, D., (ed): *Museum Archaeology in Europe, Proceedings of a conference held at the British Museum 15-17 October 1992*, The Museum Archaeologist 19, Oxbow Monograph 39.

5. For more explicit definitions of regions based on physiographic features and socio-politico-economic factors, see Kardulias (1994b:xx) who draws from scholars such as Marquardt & Crumley (1987) and Gamble (1986).

6. Between 1951 and 1971 in Greece, the proportions of the urban and rural populations were reversed, from 38% and 48% to 53% and 35% respectively. Between 1961 and 1971, the population of Greater Athens increased by 37% and during the following years by a further 19%. Post-war Greece experienced a momentous urbanisation which gave rise to the impoverishment of the rural areas from their human resources, from a financial development



and a necessary cultural evolution. Some statistical data are helpful to fully apprehend the uneven distribution of population around the country:

**TABLE 1**  
Population movements since the Second World War  
(After Clogg 1993:232, Table 3)

	1971 (% CHANGE)	1981 (% CHANGE)
Greater Athens	+37.1	+19
Central Greece and Euboea	+2.2	+11
Peloponnese	-10.0	+3
Ionian islands	-13.2	-1
Epirus	-12.0	+5
Thessaly	-4.4	+5
Macedonia	-0.3	+12
Thrace	-7.6	+5
Aegean islands	-12.5	+3
Crete	-5.5	+10
Greece, total	+4.5	+11

**TABLE 2**  
Current population of Greece by region (in %)  
(see the newspaper *To Vima* 15/10/95)

Eastern Thrace	5.56	Western Greece	6.92
Central Macedonia	16.66	Central Greece	5.68
Western Macedonia	2.85	Attica	34.34
Epirus	3.39	Peloponnese	5.92
Thessaly	7.16	North Aegean	1.94
Ionian islands	1.89	South Aegean	2.51
Crete	5.26		

7. In 1938, approximately 100.000 tourists visited the country annually. By 1961, this number had increased fivefold, and towards the end of the 1960s twenty-fold. (Mouzelis 1978:25). Greek archaeology and its monumental material culture was called upon to satisfy the demands of the state for economic development by means of the tourist industry. Greece, indeed,



established a post-war reputation as a historical and archaeological dreamland, a haven both for cultural and recreational tourism.

8. The core-periphery modelling, from which part of our analysis draws in order to structure and obtain theoretical vigour and integrity, has achieved considerable intellectual popularity from the early 1970s in a variety of academic fields such as political theory, geography and historical sociology (see Wallerstein 1974 and his work on the modern world systems). It grew out of a demand to explain broader changes in Western thinking about the human environment, contemporary political structures and social progress. In the archaeological applications, the interest has focused more on the growth and nature of long-distance interactions and their potential for generating social and cultural changes, on the interrelationship of cycles of economic activity in spatially distant areas, and on diachronic patterns in the location of power centres (Champion 1989b:1-21; see also Bilde et al 1993; Shanks 1996:161). For the delineation of the related questions and arguments, most useful and inspiring was the following literature on core-periphery thinking: Alcock 1993; Bilde et al 1993; Champion 1989b; Rowlands 1987; Shipley 1993; Ucko 1989a.

9. The only other region of the country to possess its own ministry is the Aegean.

10. In Byzantine Rotunda for the period 1912-1917, and in Yeni Tzami, a large mosque, for the period 1917-1962.

11. See Vokotopoulou 1986b. The national press of the time, as usual, reflects the general interest in and concern for the immediate solution to the problem of state protection of the Macedonian antiquities. For the erection of the archaeological museum in Thessaloniki and the national and scientific importance of the project, it is interesting to read an article published in the newspaper *To Vima* as early as on 7/12/1950 with the title: 'What happened to the project for the erection of the Thessaloniki Museum. Care with actions not only with words'.

12. In brief, they contained a host of southern pottery mostly Attic, Corinthian and Ionian in provenance, large quantities of gold and silver jewellery, iron and bronze armoury, bronze utensils, rare miniature iron models of furniture, spits and chariots, and last but not least, sheet-gold ornaments covering the mouth of the dead and impressive gold masks which bring to mind the famous funerary masks from Mycenae (Andronikos 1988; Despoini 1993, *Sindos*). Although the formal publication of the excavations is still under way and there is no conclusive interpretation of the site, there have been nevertheless some preliminary accounts that can be useful to the cause of this presentation. These can be summarised in the following points: the grave goods are unlike anything found west of the Axios river (Macedonia) in the late Archaic period; a large number of objects is imported from southern Greece; many suggest influence by the East (i.e. Thrace, East Greece, Asia, or even further east), whereas the miniature furniture echoes Near eastern or Egyptian parallels; the abundance of golden grave goods and armoury also propound an elite and warrior class with possessions of disposable wealth. All these lead to a basic question regarding the ethnic identification of the inhabitants (pre-Macedonian, Macedonian, Edones a Thracian tribe rival to Macedonians?) of the nearby settlement, which however cannot receive a conclusive answer due to the insufficient evidence (Borza 1990:88-89; Hammond 1989:43).

13. For a different contextual presentation of the Vergina material culture in the future Museum of Vergina, see Mikroutsikos 1995; Dimakopoulos 1995.

14. For the history and identity of Macedonians as a subject of heated dispute in the past and present, see Kitromilides, P., (1990): 'Imagined communities and the origins of the national question in the Balkans', 23-66 and Kofos, E., (1990): 'National heritage and national identity in nineteenth and twentieth century Macedonia', 103-141 both in Blinkhorn, M. & Veremis, Th., (eds): *Modern Greece: Nationalism and Nationality*, ELIAMEP, Athens.; see also Poulton, H., (1995): *Who are the Macedonians?*, Hurst & Company, London, and Danforth, L.M., (1993): 'Claims to Macedonian identity', *Anthropology Today*, Vol.9(4), 3-10.



15. For a detailed and balanced account of the history of Macedonian studies, see Borza 1990:3-21.

16. The 'Macedonian Question' has been a very complex and sensitive issue in the twentieth-century politics of the Balkans and a great amount of ink has been spilt upon this matter. For a detailed description of the 'Macedonian Question', see the paper by Kofos 1990:103-141 (see further above, n.12) and Kofos 1992 (Kofos, E., (1992): 'The Macedonian Question in our time', 502-509, in Sakellariou, M.B., (ed): Macedonia, 4000 years of Greek History, Athens, Ekdotiki Athinon).

17. e.g. names such as K.Romaios, M.Andronikos, G.Bakalakis, K.Despinis, D.Lazarides, Ch.Makaronas, D.Padermalis, J.Vokotopoulou, M.Siganidou worked for the Archaeological Service, Archaeological Society or universities.

18. The public interest that arose in the aftermath of the Vergina discoveries was of an unprecedented scale and vigour. The national press has explicitly reflected the pulse and excitement of the Greek people by covering closely the chronicle of the Vergina excavations and dedicating lengthy and detailed reports on the site, garnished occasionally by the lively descriptions of the excavator himself. See for instance the national newspapers *To Vima* 18/11/77, 12/9/78, 11/9/83, 25/9/88 and *I Aygi* 8/12/77, 30/8/78, 10/9/83, 28/11/84.

19. Many of his Greek colleagues, the Greek government and many foreign scholars (i.e. Hammond) agree largely with Andronikos' interpretations. However, some Greek scholars (i.e. Faklaris 1994) and a number of foreign scholars either propose various alternative explanations or are more sceptical about the positivist fallacies the site and its findings may entail. Along these lines, Borza for instance argues that: 'we are tantalised by the proximity of material remains and documentary evidence and risk the temptation to associate this extraordinary array of goods with events in the lives of some of the most important people of the era' (1990:256-266).

20. For this same disputed issue, up-dated information is obtained through the writings of the national press. See, for instance, an article entitled '*Veroia demands the treasures of Vergina back*' published in *To Vima* (5/7/79), or a more recent one in the newspaper *Ta Nea* (14/1/93) that refers to a previous decision of the State, already taken on 23/8/88 to erect a site museum at Vergina. However, according to the newspaper, the museum will not incorporate the Vergina treasures, which will remain in Thessaloniki, but it will rather focus on the History of the excavations.

21. The Ministry of Culture has recently lodged a new pilot-programme aiming at the cultural and tourist development of a major archaeological zone in Macedonia that incorporates the sites of Pella, Vergina and Dion. A great part of this project concerns the site of Vergina which according to the Ministry is one of the most important archaeological landscapes of Greece. Thus, the state interest and care will soon be translated into the following major archaeological and museological enterprises: a] site conservation, arrangement, landscaping and interpretation in the area of the Great Tumuli to become accessible and intelligible to a wider public. This project is expected to be completed by the early months of 1996 and to cost approximately 400 million drachmas; b] transformation of the Royal Tombs of the Great Tumuli into a Museum, wherein many of the authentic objects, presently in the Museum of Thessaloniki, will be displayed as they have been originally discovered *in situ*. This undertaking is expected to cost 300 million drachmas and be finished by mid-1996; c] the erection of a site museum to be dedicated to and named after M.Andronikos. In accordance with a new museum philosophy and policy gradually developed by the Ministry of Culture, the new museum will incorporate a large area with multiple functions (exhibition galleries, offices, study-rooms, libraries, laboratories, store-rooms, documentation centre, a large lecture room, guest-rooms, as well as educational areas, libraries and labs for the operation of various programmes for children etc.). The overriding purpose of the exhibitions and arrangement of the displays will be to present



the history of Vergina which was the most important Macedonian town and the administrative, religious, cultural and political centre of Macedonia during the archaic and classical periods. In tandem with this, apart from the presentation of Vergina during the antiquity, special provision and care will be taken of the exhibition of modern art in order to render the diachronic continuation of the Hellenic civilisation clearly perceivable to every visitor to Vergina.

In general, the overall aim of the Ministry is to transform the site of Vergina into a cultural lung for the wider area. Thus alongside the museum and the Tombs, there are additional plans for the erection of a Macedonian Centre for the Conservation and Study of Antiquities, a modern open-air theatre and of a University Centre that will be administered by the University of Thessaloniki. This undoubtedly pioneering, ambitious and promising project, which will hopefully be ready by the end of 1999, is expected to cost approximately four billion drachmas (c.£11,000,000), a large amount of the money coming entirely from Public Investments (see Mikroutsikos 1995:87-90).

22. A proliferation of new data, dating as far back as the Palaeolithic-Neolithic Periods (e.g. excavations of the British Archaeological School in Kastrisa and Asprokhaliko) was made available to Greek and foreign archaeologists working in the region. From the various excavated sites, three should be especially mentioned: a] the ancient sanctuary of Dodona is the oldest oracle in Greece. This mysterious and remote sanctuary proved to be one of the most interesting of its kind in the country, during successive excavation periods (e.g. 1875, 1913, 1929-1933, the post-war period, directed by C. Carapanos, G.Soteriades, D.Evangellides, S.Dakaris respectively), b] the Necromanteion of Ephyra (or Sanctuary of Persephone and Hades) which is sited on a hill, above what in ancient times was the mouth of the Aheronta, the mythical Styx, river of the underworld. The remains of the sanctuary were investigated in 1958-1964 and 1976-1977 under the auspices of the Athens Archaeological Society; c] the geometric-to late classical cemeteries of Vitsa which were discovered in 1965 during digging operations for the construction of a new cistern in the nearby village. The rescue excavation of 1965 was followed by subsequent systematic excavation periods that recovered the extensive ancient South and North Cemeteries with finds ranging from the 9th to the 4th centuries BC, and the ancient settlement of Vitsa.

23. These ideals were exemplified through the founding and activities of the famous 'Greek Literary Society of Constantinople' in 1861 and of the 'Thracian Phil-Educational Society of Rhaideustos' in 1871, the creation of the first notable collections of sculptures, inscriptions and coins by the former institutions and the Archaeological Museum of Constantinople, as well as the various excavation, documentation and publication projects undertaken by the 'Society for the Encouragement of Hellenic Studies in France' in 1867, the 'Russian Archaeological Institute at Constantinople' in 1894 and the French and Austrian excavations in Samothrace (1866, 1873-1875) (Bakirtzis 1994:151-154; Triantaphyllos 1984).

24. These ancient towns were Stryme, Abdera, Mesembria, Maroneia, Samothrace and elsewhere (see Kranioti 1984; Triantaphyllos 1984; Tsatsopoulou-Kaloudi 1984; Sarla-Pentazou & Pentazos 1984). In the 1970s, attention also turned to the mountainous region of Rhodopi, where there was evidence of continuous occupation since the installation of the first Thracian tribes up until the present day with the villages of the highland Muslim Pomaks. Archaeological research was intensified in the 1980s after the expression of a special state interest in the archaeological research of Thrace which was translated into the generous funding of archaeological activities in the region (Bakirtzis 1994:151-154; Bakirtzis & Triantaphyllos 1990:6; Triantaphyllos 1984).

25. Starting from right to left in the Museum of Ioannina, we can see stone tools from the Cambridge University excavations in the Palaeolithic caves at Asprokhaliko and Kastritsa (case 1); Neolithic and Bronze Age finds mainly from cist tombs (cases 2-3); Protogeometric vases from the region of Agrinion (case 4); a number of finds from the cemeteries of Vitsa (cases 5-9); vases and terracotta figurines of Persephone, a unique windlass mechanism, small



vessels for libations to the dead and bigger pots, lekanes for the oblation of cereals to the gods of Hades, all from the Nekyomanteion of Ephyra (case 10); finds from many sites around the region and Epirote coins (cases 11-15); votive bronze offerings (i.e. eagles, warriors, lions), fragments of legs of bronze tripods which surrounded the sacred oak and oracular tablets of lead with engraved oracular enquiries from the Sanctuary of Dodona (cases 16-20). The oracular tablets, which were submitted by individuals or groups, cities or tribes, are of exceptional interest and value for the amount of information they can offer. In the east wall of the room, we can also see on display the central part of a door from the Bouleuterion. Noticeable is the absence of pottery and sculptural finds. In Gallery B, there are a few examples of ancient Greek and Roman marble sculpture from a number of coastal settlements of Epirus, whereas in the corridor there are some inscriptions, architectural elements and grave goods from the cemetery of Michalitsi. In Gallery D, there are objects from the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine period, together with recent finds from the excavations of the Ephorate in the cemeteries of Pogoni, Vitsa and Dourouti. Finally, Galleries C and E accommodate the collection of modern paintings and sculpture.

26. Some of the most significant archaeological objects on permanent display are sculptures of Ionic art, which was born in the east Aegean and was then diffused by the colonists of Thrace; other examples of Ionian art, like vases, figurines, jewellery, coins, sarcophagi, funerary stelae, grave goods from the excavated towns of Maroneia, Mesembria, Abdera, Strymi, and Dikaia; further, on display are some inscriptions that give an insight into the political, social, religious and economic life of the inhabitants of ancient Thrace. Finally, a number of Early Christian, Byzantine and Post-Byzantine finds are included to represent their respective epochs, but in a very brief and haphazard manner.

27. The aim was to present some few hundreds of objects (app.400) and general outlines of the excavation projects developed in the area during the years 1980-1991, and thus to provide the wider archaeological community of the Congress and together with any visitors to the museum rapid access to important discoveries. Eight of these archaeological projects are specially highlighted in the space of the exhibition (e.g. the sites of Kalyva, Linos, Abdera-Polystilon, Marone, Mesembria, Makri, Trajanoupolis, Paliapolis-Samothrace). The displays are presented in a notably more modern environment and include objects such as: Corinthian archaic pottery, clay figurines, archaic glass vessels, Hellenistic and Roman iron spearheads, stone spheres of catapults, clay loom weights, spindle whorls, gold and silver jewellery, bronze artefacts etc. alongside concise texts and excavation or aerial photographs of the sites.

28. According to P.Cartledge (1993:53-54, 138), Thrace and Thracians had come to be associated peculiarly with slavery in Classical Greece. For instance, he cites particularly Herodotus who had mentioned that poor Thracians used to sell their surplus children to slave-traders; he also points to a further confirmation of the importance of Thrace as a source of the Athenians' servile population, namely that Thratta (Thracian female) was a standard 'stage' name for a female slave and Getas (from a Thracian people) a male equivalent (ibid., 139).

29. According to statistics provided by the Ephorate of Komotini, in 1991 a total of 545 persons visited the museum (February and March the worse months with only 8 persons each, August the best with 152), whereas in 1992 the numbers increased slightly to a total of 604 visitors (November and December the worse months with only 23 persons each and July the best with 166). However in reality, these numbers could be even more meagre, considering the fact that the great majority of visitors are composed of school groups and soldiers whose attendance is on a compulsory and not voluntary basis.

30. See for instance the recent temporary exhibition in the Museum of London, the 'Peopling of London; 15.000 years of settlement from overseas'. The project of the museum was designed to attract and involve entire segments of the city's multicultural population that have never before been represented or set foot in the museum. For further reading, see Merriman 1995; Merriman & Poovaya-Smith 1996.



31. Despite the fact that since the dawn of this century the research priorities of regional archaeology have been systematically concentrated on the exploration of the Neolithic Age, a number of rescue excavations yielded at times ample evidence for the existence of numerous Mycenaean settlements (i.e. Iolkos, Nileia) and important Archaic and Classical towns (i.e. Pherae, Larissa, Dimitriada-Pagases, Pharsala, Trikki, etc.).
32. Gallis 1990:7; for the archaeological research in Thessaly see the special volume of *Archaiologia* 34, 1990 and Hourmouziadis et al 1982 wherein there is a further bibliography.
33. Some of the Greek and foreign archaeologists that conducted and directed excavations in Thessaly were the following: C.Tsountas, V.Stais, K.Kourouniotis, A.Arvanitopoulos, N.Verdelis, D.Theocharis, G.Hourmouziadis, A.Wace, M.S.Thompson, Y.Béquignon, Fr.Stählin, V.Milojčić etc.
34. However, according to a report published in the interwar period, the documentation and conservation of the collections as well as the arrangement of the archaeological displays in the Museum of Volos were still far from satisfying the basic standards; in fact in 1926, the deplorable condition and organisation of the museum store-rooms and exhibition galleries impelled the then newly appointed Ephor to issue a strongly-worded protest and eventually to turn down his post in Volos (see an article by Karouzos, Ch., (1926): 'Ta Eparxiaka Mouseia' [The Regional Museums], *Laiki Phoni Volou*, 24-26 April 1926. See also Petrakos 1995a:26, 38-39).
35. For the first post-war re-display of the Museum of Volos in 1961, see the newspaper articles in *To Vima*, 24/9/61, p.3 and 8/10/61 p.7, *I Kathimerini* 29/12/61. See also Theocharis, D., (1963): 'Mouseion Volou', *ADelt* 18, B1, 132-133; Kokkinis 1979:17-18.
36. The Museum of Volos uses an additional way of and asset to opening up a dialogue with its visitors. This is exemplified through the use of a Visitors' Comments Book that is to be found in the entrance/exit of the museum building.
37. Herodotus for instance expressed his admiration from three splendid Samian monuments: the harbour mole, the Tunnel of Eupalinus and the Heraion, a sanctuary dedicated to Hera (see Shipley 1987:1; Rihll & Tucker 1995; also Kyrieleis 1993 and Østby 1993 wherein there is a further bibliography for the sanctuary).
38. As it turned out, research continued later from 1925 to the outbreak of the Second World War under the auspices of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens and Ernst Buschor's direction. In 1951, the work was resumed by the same Institute and the subsequent directions by E.Buschor, E. Homann-Wedeking and H.Kyrieleis (1951-1961, 1961-1975, 1975 onwards respectively). During all those decades of research, ample evidence has been gathered for the beginning and the end of the Hera cult and also for its history over a period of one and a half millennia. However, as the excavator himself admits: 'this picture is certainly still incomplete and thrown off balance by the random nature of the finds' (Kyrieleis 1993:126; see also Østby 1993:219-220 for detailed bibliography regarding the sanctuary).
39. The first steps towards the establishment of the Samos Archaeological Museum were taken on 12/8/1859 when the Samian parliament decided that it should be housed in a public building in the main city of the island (Chora). By 1870, however, the museum was essentially disused due to the desertion of the city itself. Later in 1875, the museum collections started gradually to be re-gathered in the garden of the Governor's House in the new capital of the island (Vathy). Thereafter, strict and protective measures for the monuments have been progressively enforced to crack down on the looting and illegal export of antiquities from the island; among those measures was the official decision to establish a proper central Archaeological Museum in Vathy. The collections were housed in the premises of one of the most traditional institutions of Samian public education, namely the Pythagorean Gymnasium. Another decision to erect a modern drill-hall near the Museum of Samos exemplifies the classicist



ideology of those times whose baseline was that the combination of education with athletics (mind and body) was to play a central role, both functional and social, in Samian society and youth (see Kalpaxis 1990:45).

40. Other important sites excavated by the Italians, which yielded an abundance of material concerning the history of the island, were the city of Hephaistia with continuous habitation from the Chalcolithic period to Byzantine times, and the Sanctuary of Kabeiroi possibly the first such sanctuary with the oldest Telesterion in the Greek region (see *XX'Ephorate* 1993:52-59, 60-65; Beschi 1994:31-37). Excavation research during the last decade at Myrina, another site and the first most important city on Lemnos, has also revealed ample data and cast more light on the history of the island (Archontidou-Argyri 1994a).

41. For instance, some of the special arrangements for the incorporation of the statue into the museum building, which were really costly app. 250.000 deutch marks or 52.000.000 drachmas, were as follows: the floor was scooped out; a glass window was placed on the roof for better lighting of the kouros; the kouros was placed on top of a special base that incorporated a rotating mechanism so that the statue could be turned around to offer a better idea of its plasticity.

42. In a recent publication about *Tourism in Greece. Aegean Sea in the Year 2010* (1994) we read:

‘Tourism. Aegean Light and sea scent. The heart of Greece throbbing over the waves of the Aegean, a unique sea, a sea with 3,000 islands on which cultures thrived and legends were born. A complex of unique natural beauty, which today serves as a pole of attraction to millions of tourists. Hundreds of thousands of people come every year to enjoy and live through the uniqueness of the Aegean. UNESCO has called it the cultural park of Europe and placed it under its patronage. Here lie the roots of Hellenic culture, here thrived the Hellenic Spirit which spread across the world. Archaeological monuments dating back to the 15th century BC, virgin natural beauty, a mild climate, architecture that stands out, combine to make of the Aegean a special proposition in the realm of beauty and aesthetics’.

43. See for instance, the tourist slogans for 1988 which were targeted not only at Europeans but at Americans also who like ‘to emulate Europeans whom they see as more sophisticated, eclectic and experienced travellers’ (Eisner 1993:256). Some of the slogans read as follows:

“*Greece-The European's European vacation'... Why the land of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle is preferred by smart travellers?... After you've had your breath taken away by the Parthenon at sunset. After you've been dazzled by a white-washed village overlooking a turquoise sea. After you've enjoyed the comedy of Aristophanes or the drama of Sophocles in a two-thousand year-old theatre. After all this, Greece has so much more. No wonder travellers who know Europe best -the Europeans- preferred Greece as their first vacation choice in a recent survey'.*

44. The slogan of the Greek National Tourist Organisation in 1990 was fairly similar:

‘*Priceless. Greece- It all starts here.... Behold Greeks bearing gifts, libations for the Gods. Priceless art in a country where simple pleasures cost precious little. See these ancient Minoans in Athens' National Archaeological Museum. Perhaps before lunch at a friendly outdoor cafe. The price may remind you of ancient times as well. Great art, fine dining, stimulating encounters. Memorable nourishment for both body and soul. Where else but Greece? In Athens you're only a scenic drive, or short flight away from the rest of the land where Western Civilisation began. Only a cruise away from*



such fabled Greek isles as Santorini, Rhodes, Kos, Skiathos or Naxos. So when you decide where to spend your holiday in Europe this year, come to an affordable country that will satisfy your mind as well as your body. 2500 years ago we discovered that man's happiness has more to do with this sense of place in the universe than with his worldly goods. Freedom, Democracy, the Olympics -and a great vacation. Any way you look at Greece, it's priceless'.

45. The Greek National Tourist Organisation's latest slogan as appeared in *The Guardian* of 9/3/96 read as follows:

*'Hellas. A never-ending story....* From the traditional alleys to the deserted beaches of the islands, Greece reveals a different story at every turn. Feel the never-ending presence of a glorious civilisation against the backdrop of spectacular scenery and you'll realise you've embarked on a never-ending vacation'.

46. If at the turn of the century, the Samian Hegemony was largely dependent on international diplomacy and on the satisfaction of German cultural imperialism in its national quest for the maintenance of its autonomous status or further its re-unification with Greece, at present the situation is certainly different, but somewhat still connected to the politics of the past. Today, it is the economic growth that determines many of the positions of the Samian local authorities. More precisely, the Samian economy is increasingly dependent on package tourism. Not surprisingly the clientele is overwhelmingly German, but also Scandinavian and Dutch. Thus, as Silberman put it recently: 'whether [an archaeological] site will succeed as a major tourist attraction will depend not only on the finds and presentation, but also on the vagaries of tourist flow, airline fares, etc.' (1995:260).

47. For studies on the making of histories in city museums, see Kavanagh 1996b; Fleming 1996; Hebditch 1995; Johnson 1993; 1995; Collins 1995; Galla 1995.

## **8. Greek private collecting of antiquities and the museum; Two collectors, two museums and their tales.**

1. For a short biography of Paulos Canellopoulos, see Panaretou 1990.

2. For the definition of 'West' as a historical and ideological, and not a geographical, construct against which people and places can be defined, see Hall & Giben 1992:276-278.

3. For a complementary discussion on the application of the value system in archaeology, see Carman 1990; 1995b, 1996; Bower 1995; Darvill 1995; Firth 1995; Thompson 1979.

4. For collecting ethics in general or specifically in relation to the collecting of Cycladic art, see Elia 1993; Ford 1984; Gill & Chippindale 1993; Renfrew 1993; Tiverios 1994; Vitelli 1984. For the museum and cultural appropriation see Beard & Henderson 1994.



## 9. Shaping archaeologists; the role of University Museums of Archaeology

1. The third is the cast collection of the Parthenon marbles possessed by the First Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in Athens and displayed in the Centre for Acropolis Studies.
2. Statistics say that the University of Athens appoints four teachers for prehistoric archaeology, twelve for classical and seven for Byzantine, whereas the University of Thessaloniki appoints six, eleven and six respectively (Hamilakis 1993:47-50).
3. For instance, the General Secretary of the Archaeological Society, Dr.V.Petrakos, ardently supports the idea of a Casts only Museum on the grounds that they can fulfil one or all of the following roles (Petrakos 1993a:54-157):
  - (a) special epistemological, namely the collection of copies of a category of monuments that cover a specific area of archaeology, e.g. copies of the Parthenon Marbles or of the Acropolis generally. These types of collections are useful for the study of a specific subject (see the current work of the Committee for the Restoration of the Acropolis Monuments).
  - (b) educational for the training of archaeology students, namely the collection of copies of ancient sculptural pieces that are stone marks for the development of ancient Greek art. An up-to-date Handbook of Ancient Greek Art with a full list of all the stone marks in the development of Ancient Sculpture would provide guidance for the making of such a collection
  - (c): informative, giving for instance a complete collection of copies from originals that have been illegally exported from Greece and are to be found in museums and private collections abroad.
4. Bartman defines the copy as the work of art that deliberately recalls an earlier image by reproducing its salient formal and iconographic features -its pose, composition, ponderation, proportions, facial type, hairstyle, costume, and other attributes. In her view, size is not a factor in determining whether or not a statue qualifies as a copy.

## 10. On Greek temporary exhibitions of classical archaeology and their poetics; alternative routes into the re-presentation of the ancient Greek past

1. The archaeological journal *Hóroc* in its national survey regarding the various resources of regional museums in Greece reported that from eighty two archaeological museums that have been contacted only two had special areas designed to receive temporary exhibitions (Museums of Ioannina and Chios) (Tsaravopoulos 1985:156).
2. According to some sources, the exhibition 'Treasures of Ancient Macedonia' was visited by 160,000 people during the span of eight months (August 1978-March 1979). From that number, 60,000 were students from public and high schools as well as from other educational institutions (Rhomipoulou 1978b:193). The exhibition 'Alexander the Great, History and Legend in Art' was of equal success with 100,000 visitors within three months (*ADelt* 1980:360).
3. See *ADelt* 1980:360; ; Editorial 1980a:5; Gousidis 1980; Platanos 1980:4.
4. See Sofaer Derevenski 1994a; 1994b. Also Beaumont 1994; Golden 1990.
5. See Editorial 1978b; 1978c; 1979l.

6. According to a report the whole budget for the Athens, European Cultural Capital was 5.9 in million, of which 88% came from central government, 1% from EEC and 10% from sponsorship. Also the report states that they organised some 102 exhibitions (of course not all of them archaeological) and the visitors went up to 700,000 (Bailey 1995).

7. According to one of the exhibition organisers, the central purpose of those events was to turn the spotlight on the evolution of the city that has had a life of 5,000 years and whose cultural heritage and intellectual and artistic traditions overlap at many points with those of Europe as a whole (Patelarou 1987:7). The exhibition was composed of four sub-exhibitions, hosted in various buildings around the city which were to be used as exhibition sites for the first time, on the following themes:

- Athens in Prehistory and Antiquity
- Athens from the end of the Ancient Era to Greek Independence
- Athens, a European Matter
- Athens 1900-1985: Architecture and Planning.

8. As phrased by the German Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time, Hans Dietrich-Genscher 1985:7.

9. As stressed by the then Greek Minister of Culture, M.Mercouri 1985a:5. See also Aslanis 1985.

10. The sub-themes were:

- 1] The dawn of the Bronze Age in the islands and coastal regions of the Greek world.
- 2] The expansion and impact of the Minoan world
- 3] The splendour of the Mycenaean civilisation
- 4] The Greek presence in the Mediterranean as reflected in Geometric and Orientalising art
- 5] The geography of the Greek world in the archaic era
- 6] The Persian Wars and Athenian supremacy at sea
- 7] The conquests of Alexander the Great and the distinctive traits of the Hellenistic age
- 8] Roman supremacy and the resilience of Hellenism
- 9] The transitional period from Roman to Byzantine world rule
- 10] Byzantine opposition to Arab expansion
- 11] The gradual infiltration of the West, the loss of maritime supremacy and the final decline of Byzantium
- 12] The Greek world caught in the struggle between Turks and Venetian for maritime control
- 13] The growth of trade and shipping, leading to the thriving economy of the 18th century
- 14] Maritime contribution to the War of Independence
- 15] From sail and wind to engine and steam during the formative years of the modern Greek state
- 16] The sea as a source of inspiration in modern Greek art
- 17] The spectacular rise of Greek shipping.

11. The second, staged in the National Gallery, was the historical part that looked at the modern revival of the Olympic Idea along with the historical and cultural environment that gave it birth but also the artistic scene of Greece on the eve and aftermath of 1896 when the



first modern Olympic Games took place in Athens. This part was entitled 'Mind and Body. The Revival of the Olympic Idea, 19th-20th century' (For more details see *Mind and Body 1*; Also Katimertzi 1989a-b). The third part, presented in Zappeion Hall a building which was built at the time of the revival of the Games in Athens, was the link between the idealised past and the modern present. This exhibition was called 'Mind and Body. Athletics and motion in contemporary Greek art'. By bringing together a collection of works of contemporary Greek artists who 'inspired by athletic competition and the spirit imbuing it, continued the work of their ancestors, depicting moments from modern athletics' (Spathari 1989), it meant to add to the overall humanising spirit of the three-fold 'Mind and Body' exhibition. (For further information about this specific display, see *Mind and Body 2*; and specifically Eliopoulou-Rogan 1989; Spathari 1989. Also Katimertzi 1989a-b).

12. Picard & Pentazos 1992. For a Press coverage of the celebrations, see for instance Katimertzi 1992b; Kiosse 1992b.

13. See Stabolidis 1994. See also Editorial 1994a,b; Kiosse 1990; 1991; 1994a.

14. See Serwint 1990; Tzachou-Alexandri 1989:16-17; See also Katimertzi 1989a-c; Lambraki-Plaka 1989.

15. See for instance the various statements by the organisers of the exhibitions: Delivorrias 1989:16-17; Filaretos 1989; Kandylis 1989; Mercouris 1989:13.

16. Some of the themes that one could explore further were: historic travellers to Delphi (e.g. Pausanias in the second century AD, Spon & Wheler in 1678, Chenavard in 1843, others at the end of the 19th century); excavations (passages from the diary of the excavation, topographical studies, descriptions of the precinct, re-composition of the history of the city, sanctuary and oracle based on written sources, etc.); reconstructions of the buildings (general views, Archaic Period, Votive offerings, Treasuries, general plans and topographical maps);- sculpture (Pre-Archaic, Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, Roman based on examples); Delphi and Greece (Amphictyonies, votive offerings).

17. The visitor, for instance, could pursue a step-by-step experience into oracle seeking that was exemplified by a number of important tasks that he should first complete successfully such as entrance to the Temple, purification, Kastalia spring, offerings to the god, sprinkling of the goat, posing questions to Pythia on various subjects such as: wisdom, happiness, destiny, health, power, wealth, warfare. For every category a sample of characteristic answers was provided in the fashion of original Pythian responses.

18. See Ridgway 1987:399; For women and gender studies in relation to Greek antiquity, there is now abundance of relevant literature: see for instance Blok & Mason 1987; Blundell 1995; Cohen 1989; de Forest 1993; Fantham et al 1994; Hawley & Levick 1995; Keuls 1985; Lefkowitz 1986; Lefkowitz & Fant 1982; Peradotto & Sullivan 1994; Reeder 1995a.

19. For museum exhibitions on women of classical antiquity and in British history museums, and their representations, see respectively Reeder 1995a; and Porter 1994; 1996.

20. For a detailed study of the historiography of the history of women in antiquity, see Blok 1987; also Versnel 1987.

21. *ibid.*:1-2; see also Reeder 1995b.

22. In this matter, there is no clear consensus in the current literature. Thus, we have some scholars arguing that: 'the subject of women in mythology offers better value to the student of mythology than to the student of women' (Dowden 1995:56) and others reasserting that 'the myths and rituals depicted in Classical art offer particular insight into the values and concerns that surrounded woman in Classical Greece' (Reeder 1995b:7) and also that 'today we [should] view myth as a traditional story that can express individual and collective apprehensions which can communicate social values' (Reeder 1995c:13).

23. For comparisons of ancient Athenian society or other Greek societies with other pre-industrial and sex-segregated societies, see Cohen 1989; Katz 1995; Versnel 1987:67, 69-70; Zweig 1995:36.

24. For an opposite viewpoint that warns against the current eagerness to compare ancient Athenian society with "Mediterranean societies" including modern Greece, see Sourvinou-Inwood 1995b:111-120.

25. The *Pandora. Women in Classical Greece* is a new permanent exhibition at the Walter's Art Gallery in Baltimore, Maryland, USA. The exhibition endeavours to explore the position of women in classical antiquity by looking at two age-old metaphors for women that pervade Greek myth and religion: the first metaphor presents women as containers likening them with the earth and the womb; the second metaphor equates women to animals of the wild which carry instinctive and unpredictable knowledge. The exhibition is accompanied by a superb catalogue, Reeder 1995a.

## 11. Treasures, Heroes, Miracles; The poetics and politics of travelling exhibitions of Greek classical archaeology abroad

1. The literature on the professional-archaeological as well as public view and reactions regarding the institution of touring exhibitions abroad is abundant. Most of the views have been disseminated through the national Press. Here, just a small sample can be given: Bouras 1978; Delivorrias 1992a; Editorials 1963a; 1978a; 1978d-k; 1979a-k; 1991a, h-j; 1992; Efstathiadis 1978a-b; Hatzidakis 1978; Kalligas 1952; Kakaounakis 1979; Karouzou 1977a-b; 1978; Kiosse 1992a; Koltsaki 1978; Konstantinou 1978; Kounenakis 1979; 1980a-c; 1981; Lambrinoudakis 1992a; Mantzoulinou 1978; Moschona 1978; Pagourelis 1979a-e; 1980a-b; Papagiannidou 1992; Papoutsanis 1979; Phalireas 1978; Platon 1978; Ploritis 1978; 1979; 1991; 1992a-b; 1993; Sarri 1978; Sarris 1978; Scholiastis 1979; Tassios 1978; Varoufakis 1978; Xydis 1978; Xyggopoulos 1978;

Other sources are: Delivorrias 1992b; Despinis 1992; Dontas 1992; Doris 1981; Editorial 1991b-g; Hamilakis & Yalouri 1996; Iakovidis 1992; Karagiorga 1992; Karouzos 1952 reprinted in Karouzos 1995; Lambrinoudakis 1992b; Oionoskopou 1988; Papapanos 1992; Papapostolou 1992; Petrakos 1982:79-92; 1991a-c; 1992a-c; Sakellariou 1992c; Ziro 1992.

2. Petrakos, in his historical review of the cultural institution of travelling exhibitions abroad, mentions particularly that in 1877 the then Greek Minister of Education asked the Archaeological Society at Athens to permit the export of Greek antiquities, and indeed of the recent splendid finds of Schliemann in Mycenae, to Paris for the purpose of the International Exhibition that was to be hosted in the French capital the following year. His request was then unanimously thrown out. Later, in 1939-1940, the Metaxas' totalitarian regime was the first to send original sculptural works of ancient Greek art abroad for the New York World Fair. The adventures of those antiquities, whose return to Greece was delayed for years due to the outbreak of the war, gave rise to the formation of a central argument from those parties that later opposed any plans for the exportation of Greek antiquities outside the country (1982:79-92; 1991).

3. In January 1979, the Panhellenic Cultural Movements organised a photographic exhibition presenting the objects that were to form the core of the Aegean exhibition in Paris and New York. Hosting the exhibition was a gallery in Pireaus and plans provided for the touring of the display in various other cities around the country in order to raise a national awareness about the matter (see Editorial 1978j; 1979c).

4. Karouzou 1977a



5. *ibid*
6. *ibid.*
7. quoted in Oionoskopou 1988
8. Sarri 1978
9. Konstantinou 1978
10. Karouzou 1977b
11. Sarris 1978.
12. quoted in Oionoskopou 1988
13. *ibid.*
14. See Editorial 1978a; 1979a-b, i; 1980c; Efstathiadis 1978a-b; Kounenakis 1980a-c; Pagourelis 1980b.
15. The words of the curator of the Louvre, in the introduction to the exhibition catalogue, are more than revealing (Villard 1979:19):

‘Even if Greek pupils still learn today what previous generations of the cultured world knew, it could not be said that the mass of tourists who visit Greece are always conscious of this pilgrimage which they are making to the sources of our civilisation: ancient Greek, ancient history are scarcely taught any more and the modern world, cut off from its roots, even if generally interested in vanished cultures, no longer necessarily knows now to honour the Hellenic past, although it has provided fundamental concepts within literature, in scientific, philosophical and political thinking, as well as in art; it is perhaps, not entirely pointless to at least remind the world of this default’.

16. For instance, some newspapers reported that there has been disagreement between the Greek and French as well as American parties regarding the exact phrasing of the exhibition’s title, after some pressure imposed by the diplomatic circles of Turkey. So, although the French title eventually connoted more clearly the Greek position towards the Greekness of the Aegean, the American version was more neutral. However, even this mildness of tone regarding the equation ‘Greece-Aegean-islands’ was indicative and politically coloured, for it revealed the Americans’ intention to be politically “neutral” towards both their Greek and Turkish allies (Editorial 1979h; Pagourelis 1979e).

17. According to the Greek Minister of Culture, in his speech during the opening of the exhibition in New York:

‘The Greek homogeneis of America must feel especially satisfied that this special period of our civilisation originated in the Aegean which never ceased in the course of millennia to have a magnificent culture and artistic production not only during antiquity but also during the Hellenistic, Byzantine and modern period (...) The cultural exchanges of our country and people with such a bright past and present, open up a wider scope for recognition and supremacy in a variety of cultural and national matters with which Hellenism is currently faced (...)’ (as quoted in Kounenakis 1979).

18. The political connotations regarding the present status of the Aegean were not absent even in the French curator’s introductory note in the catalogue of the exhibition:

‘Greece had offered us a formidable honour by entrusting our museum with the inauguration of its new policy regarding cultural exchanges: this policy will not fail to familiarise the international world with the Greek people and

their problems, both present and past, which have been so important and intimately connected with the history of the entire humanity' (Villard 1979:19).

- 19. See Editorial 1979h; Kounenakis 1979; Pagourelis 1979b-c, e.
- 20. Albright 1980; Green 1989; Trustman 1980, wherein further references.
- 21. According to data provided by the Museum of Louvre, Dept. of Greco-Roman Art. From the total of 112.533 visitors, some 101.216 (89,9%) had paid for a ticket and the rest 11.317 (10,0%) had free admission.
- 22. The other two were the Byzantine exhibition on 'Frescoes and Icons from Greece (10th-17th centuries)' and the distinctive for the originality of the topic, 'Editorial activity of the Greeks during the Italian Renaissance'.
- 23. Chevrillon 1989; Cornet 1989; Gibson 1989; Hans 1990; Lamien 1990; Marcq 1990; Thuillant 1989-1990.
- 24. These were the Museum of Victoria, Melbourne (25/11/88-19/2/89), the Queensland Museum, Brisbane (11/3-30/4/89) and the Australian Museum, Sydney (20/5-23/7/89).
- 25. 'Experience the authentic' was a recurrent motto in the marketing of the exhibition 'Ancient Macedonia' in the Queensland Museum. Their promotional messages went something like this:

'For seven weeks you can renew the Expo feeling at the biggest exhibition of its type ever to visit Australia at the modern Queensland museum, you will have a once in a lifetime opportunity to:

SEE stone	6,000 years of original gold, silver and other objects from the age to 148 BC in Ancient Macedonia, over 500 original items, including 140 gold objects. Many of the ancient artefacts have not been exhibited before, even in Greece.
EAT	authentic Greek food
DRINK	authentic Greek wine
LISTEN	to authentic Greek music
EXPERIENCE	the atmosphere of a Greek tavern
DANCE	authentic Greek dances
ENJOY	an array of authentic Greek cultural activities
BUY	Greek momentos of your visit'.

- 26. See a quotation written by a representative of the Slavic community regarding the Macedonian Question:  
  
'There have been concerted attempts recently to disseminate information to the broad community in this country and elsewhere which serves no worthwhile purpose other than simple political ambition, opportunism or expediency within the ambit of advancing narrow nationalistic interests. Macedonians themselves are all too aware that the ultimate aim of such political machinations is to deny the existence of the distinct Macedonian



ethnicity and the valued contribution that people of this background continue to make wherever they may reside' (Miloshevski 1989).

27. See the response by a representative of the Greek community:

'It is unfortunate that one ethnic minority in our community -the Slavomacedonian, does not share in the greeting of this rare, historic exhibition which traces a Hellenic existence. The Slaves arrived in the region after the 7th century AD to partially co-inhabit the region. It is therefore, historically unwarranted and unnecessary to damage the relations between the Greeks and the Slavs... We encourage our fellow Australians to visit the exhibition and share our cultural heritage which although Hellenic in origin belongs to the entire world. Our Macedonian forefathers Alexander the Great and Aristotle are now in Australia to enhance once more the Greek civilisation' (as quoted in Anonymous 1988).

See also Georgiou 1989; Messaris 1988; *O Kosmos* 25/8/88.

28. The museums were: the National Gallery of Art, Washington (31/1-12/6/88), The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, Missouri (16/7-2/10/88), the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (13/11/88-15/1/89), The Art Institute of Chicago (18/2-7/5/89) and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (7/6-3/9/89).

29. For the reactions provoked by the exhibition 'The Greek Miracle', the interested reader can study the following sources:

Bakoyannis 1993b; Bistika 1992; Butteriss 1986; Delivorrias 1992a; 1992b; Despinis 1992; Dontas 1992; Editorial 1991a; 1991b; 1991g; 1991i; 1992; Huges 1993; Iakovidis 1992; Ignatiou 1992a; 1992b; Karagiorga 1992; Katimertzi 1992a; Kiosse 1992a; Lambrinoudakis 1992a; 1992b; Montpetit 1993; Papagiannidou 1992; Papapanos 1992; Papapostolou 1992; Petrakos 1992b; 1992c; Ploritis 1992a; 1992b; 1993; Rebeyrol 1993; Sakellariou 1992c; Wills 1993.

## APPENDIX ONE

### Catalogue of the State Archaeological Museums in Greece; their distribution in the twenty five\* (25) Ephorates of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (EPCA)

#	Museum	Ephorate	Geographical Region
1	National Archaeological Museum	Special Category	Athens
2	Numismatic Museum	Special Category	Athens
3	Epigraphic Museum	Special Category	Athens
4	Museum of Acropolis	A EPCA	Athens
5	Museum of Athenian Agora	A EPCA	Athens
6	Canellopoulos Museum	A EPCA	Athens
7	Museum of Kea	A EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
8	Centre for Acropolis Studies	A EPCA	Athens
9	Museum of Piraeus	B EPCA	Piraeus
10	Museum of Marathon	B EPCA	Attica
11	Museum of Amphiareion	B EPCA	Attica
12	Museum of Aegina	B EPCA	Saronic Gulf
13	Museum of Poros	B EPCA	Saronic Gulf
14	Museum of Salamina	B EPCA	Saronic Gulf
15	Museum of Akharnai	B EPCA	Attica
16	Museum of Kythira	B EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
17	Museum of Vrauron	B EPCA	Attica
18	Museum of Kerameikos	C EPCA	Athens
19	Museum of Eleusina	C EPCA	Attica
20	Museum of Nafplio	D EPCA	Peloponnese
21	Museum of Epidaurus	D EPCA	Peloponnese
22	Museum of Ancient Corinth	D EPCA	Peloponnese
23	Museum of Isthmia	D EPCA	Peloponnese
24	Museum of Nemea	D EPCA	Peloponnese
25	Museum of Argos	D EPCA	Peloponnese
26	Museum of Sparta	E EPCA	Peloponnese
27	Museum of Tripoli	E EPCA	Peloponnese
28	Museum of Astros Kynourias	E EPCA	Peloponnese
29	Museum of Lycosoura	E EPCA	Peloponnese
30	Museum of Tegea	E EPCA	Peloponnese
31	Museum (Neolithic) of Diros	E EPCA	Peloponnese
32	Museum of Patra	ST EPCA	Peloponnese



#	Museum	Ephorate	Geographical Region
33	Museum of Thermo	ST EPCA	Stereia Hellas
34	Museum of Agrinio	ST EPCA	Stereia Hellas
35	Museum of Argostoli	ST EPCA	Ionian Islands
36	Museum of Ithaka	ST EPCA	Ionian Islands
37	Museum of Ancient Olympia	Z EPCA	Peloponnese
38	Museum of Chora (Triphylia)	Z EPCA	Peloponnese
39	Museum of Corfu	H EPCA	Ionian Islands
40	Museum of Thebes	Θ EPCA	Stereia Hellas
41	Museum of Delphi	I EPCA	Stereia Hellas
42	Museum of Chalkida	IA EPCA	Euboea
43	Museum of Eretria	IA EPCA	Euboea
44	Museum of Karystos	IA EPCA	Euboea
45	Museum of Skyros	IA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
46	Museum of Ioannina	IB EPCA	Epirus
47	Museum of Nikopolis	IB EPCA	Epirus
48	Museum of Volos	IC EPCA	Thessaly
49	Museum of Almyros	IC EPCA	Thessaly
50	Museum of Lamia	ID EPCA	Stereia Hellas
51	Museum of Larissa	IE EPCA	Thessaly
52	Museum of Thessaloniki	IST EPCA	Macedonia
53	Museum of Kilkis	IST EPCA	Macedonia
54	Museum of Polygyros	IST EPCA	Macedonia
55	Museum of Dion	IST EPCA	Macedonia
56	Museum of Pella	IZ EPCA	Macedonia
57	Museum of Verroia	IZ EPCA	Macedonia
58	Museum of Florina	IZ EPCA	Macedonia
59	Museum of Vergina Tombs	IZ EPCA	Macedonia
60	Museum of Kavala	IH EPCA	Macedonia
61	Museum of Thassos	IH EPCA	Macedonia
62	Museum of Serres	IH EPCA	Macedonia
63	Museum of Amphipolis	IH EPCA	Macedonia
64	Museum of Philippi	IH EPCA	Macedonia
65	Museum of Komotini	IO EPCA	Thrace
66	Museum of Samothrace	IO EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
67	Museum of Mytilini	K EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
68	Museum of Lemnos	K EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
69	Museum of Samos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
70	Museum of Naxos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
71	Museum of Paros	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
72	Museum of Tinos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
73	Museum of Melos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
74	Museum of Kimolos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
75	Museum of Siphnos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
76	Museum of Apeiranthos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
77	Museum of Thera	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
78	Museum of Syros	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
79	Museum of Delos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
80	Museum of Mykonos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
81	Museum of Andros	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
82	Museum of Rhodes	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)

#	Museum	Ephorate	Geographical Region
83	Museum of Kos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
84	Museum of Kalymnos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
85	Restored Roman House	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
86	Museum of Symi	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
87	Museum of Amorgos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
88	Museum of Kastellorizo	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
89	Museum of Herakleion	KC EPCA	Crete
90	Stratigraphy Museum of Knossos	KC EPCA	Crete
91	Museum of Ayios Nikolaos	KD EPCA	Crete
92	Museum of Siteia	KD EPCA	Crete
93	Museum of Chania	KE EPCA	Crete
94	Museum of Rethymno	KE EPCA	Crete
95	Museum of the Fortress in Pylos	Ephorate of Underwater Antiquities	Peloponnese

\* In Greece, there are twenty five Ephorates of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, one Ephorate for Underwater Archaeology, one for Speleology and Palaeoanthropology, thirteen Ephorates of Byzantine Antiquities and eight more of Modern Monuments. The Ephorates of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities are always numbered and identified by the letters of the Greek alphabet and the Greek numbering system [e.g. A, B, Γ, Δ, E, ΣΤ, Ζ, Η, Θ, Ι, ΙΑ, ΙΒ, (etc.), Κ, ΚΑ, ΚΒ, etc.].

## Catalogue of the State Archaeological Collections. in Greece; their distribution in the twenty five\* (25) Ephorates of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (EPCA)

#	Archaeological Collection	Ephorate	Geographical Region
1	Arch. Collection of Megalopolis	E EPCA	Peloponnese
2	Arch. Collection of Gytheion	E EPCA	Peloponnese
3	Arch. Collection of Dhimitsana	E EPCA	Peloponnese
4	Arch. Collection of Savros	ST EPCA	Ionian Islands
5	Arch. Collection of Ilida	Z EPCA	Peloponnese
6	Arch. Collection of Distomo	I EPCA	Stereia Hellas
7	Arch. Collection of Lydoriki	I EPCA	Stereia Hellas
8	Arch. Collection of Galaxidi	I EPCA	Stereia Hellas
9	Arch. Collection of Aidhipsos	ΙΑ EPCA	Euboea



#	Archaeological Collection	Ephorate	Geographical Region
10	Arch. Collection of Arta	IB EPCA	Epirus
11	Arch. Collection of Alexandroupolis	IΘ EPCA	Thrace
12	Arch. Collection of Traianoupolis	IΘ EPCA	Thrace
13	Arch. Collection of Mithymna	K EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
14	Arch. Collection of Eressos	K EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
15	Arch. Collection of Pythagoreion	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
16	Arch. Collection of Ikaria	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
17	Arch. Collection of Serifos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
18	Decorative Arts Collection of Kos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
19	Epigraphic collection of Kos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
20	Arch. Collection of Astypalaia	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
21	Arch. Collection of Archanes	KC EPCA	Crete
22	Arch. Collection of Gortys	KC EPCA	Crete
23	Stoa of Sculpture in Gortys	KC EPCA	Crete
24	Arch. Collection of Ierapetra	KD EPCA	Crete
25	Arch. Collection of Myrtos	KD EPCA	Crete
26	RENE PUANX Collection	Ephorate of Underwater Antiquities	Peloponnese

## APPENDIX TWO

### Catalogue of the fenced archaeological sites in Greece; their distribution in the twenty five\* (25) Ephorates of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (EPCA)

#	Archaeological site	Ephorate	Geographical Region
1	Areopagus Hill	A EPCA	Athens
2	Acropolis	A EPCA	Athens
3	South slope of Acropolis	A EPCA	Athens
4	Theatre of Dionysos	A EPCA	Athens
5	Ancient Athenian Agora	A EPCA	Athens
6	Roman Athenian Agora	A EPCA	Athens
7	Temple of Apollo, Aegina	B EPCA	Saronic Gulf
8	Temple of Aphaia, Aegina	B EPCA	Saronic Gulf
9	Marathon	B EPCA	Attica
10	Sounio	B EPCA	Attica
11	Vrauron	B EPCA	Attica
12	Amphiareion	B EPCA	Attica
13	Ramnous	B EPCA	Attica
14	Kerameikos	C EPCA	Athens
15	Temple of Olympian Zeus	C EPCA	Athens
16	Eleusina	C EPCA	Attica
17	Ancient Corinth	D EPCA	Peloponnese
18	Nemea	D EPCA	Peloponnese
19	Stadium of Nemea	D EPCA	Peloponnese
20	Isthmia	D EPCA	Peloponnese
21	Lerna	D EPCA	Peloponnese
22	Sikyon	D EPCA	Peloponnese
23	Mycenae	D EPCA	Peloponnese
24	Palamidi	D EPCA	Peloponnese
25	Tiryntha	D EPCA	Peloponnese
26	Ancient Epidaurus	D EPCA	Peloponnese
27	Asini	D EPCA	Peloponnese
28	Heraio of Monastiraki	D EPCA	Peloponnese
29	Dendra	D EPCA	Peloponnese
30	Kechrees	D EPCA	Peloponnese



#	Archaeological site	Ephorate	Geographical Region
31	Heraio of Perachora	D EPCA	Peloponnese
32	Ancient Agora of Argos	D EPCA	Peloponnese
33	Acropolis of Sparta	E EPCA	Peloponnese
34	Pellana	E EPCA	Peloponnese
35	Vapheio	E EPCA	Peloponnese
36	Amykles	E EPCA	Peloponnese
37	Diros Cave	E EPCA	Peloponnese
38	Menelaion of Sparta	E EPCA	Peloponnese
39	Mantineia	E EPCA	Peloponnese
40	Orchomenos	E EPCA	Peloponnese
41	Tegea	E EPCA	Peloponnese
42	Episkopi	E EPCA	Peloponnese
43	Gortyna	E EPCA	Peloponnese
44	Odeion of Patra	ST EPCA	Peloponnese
45	Oiniades	ST EPCA	Stereia Hellas
46	Roman Villa in Kefallonia	ST EPCA	Ionian Islands
47	Ancient Olympia	Z EPCA	Peloponnese
48	Ilida	Z EPCA	Peloponnese
49	Temple of Apollo at Bassae	Z EPCA	Peloponnese
50	Palace of Nestor, Triphylia	Z EPCA	Peloponnese
51	Mauvrommati	Z EPCA	Peloponnese
52	Orhomenos	È EPCA	Stereia Hellas
53	Kavireion	È EPCA	Stereia Hellas
54	Delphi	I EPCA	Stereia Hellas
55	Dodona	IA EPCA	Epirus
56	Kassopi	IA EPCA	Epirus
57	Necromanteion of Ephyra	IA EPCA	Epirus
58	Sesklo	IC EPCA	Thessaly
59	Dimini	IC EPCA	Thessaly
60	Kallithira	IC EPCA	Thessaly
61	Thermopylae	ID EPCA	Stereia Hellas
62	Ales	ID EPCA	Stereia Hellas
63	Citadel of Lamia	ID EPCA	Stereia Hellas
64	Olynthos	IST EPCA	Macedonia
65	Dion	IST EPCA	Macedonia
66	Pella	IZ EPCA	Macedonia
67	Edessa	IZ EPCA	Macedonia
68	Vergina	IZ EPCA	Macedonia
69	Leukadia of Naousa	IZ EPCA	Macedonia
70	Thasos 1	IH EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
71	Thasos 2	IH EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
72	Philippi	IH EPCA	Macedonia
73	Amphipoli	IH EPCA	Macedonia
74	Mesimvria	IÈ EPCA	Thrace
75	Abdhera	IÈ EPCA	Thrace
76	Samothrace	IÈ EPCA	Thrace
77	Traianoupolis	IÈ EPCA	Thrace
78	Mytilini	K EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
79	Ay.Paraskevi of Lesvos	K EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
80	Asclepieion of Paros	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)

#	Archaeological site	Ephorate	Geographical Region
81	Delion of Paros	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
82	Ancient Thera	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
83	Delos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
84	Phylakopi	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
85	Kionia, Tinos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
86	Akrotiri, Thera	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
87	Eupalineion, Samos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
88	Heraion, Samos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
89	Thermes, Samos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
90	Iria, Naxos	KA EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
91	Palace of the Knights, Rhodes	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
92	Castle, Rhodes	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
93	Ialyssos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
94	Kamiroi	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
95	Lindhos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
96	Asclepeion, Kos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
97	Roman House, Kos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
98	Castle, Kos	KB EPCA	Aegean (Sea)
99	Palace of Knossos	KC EPCA	Crete
100	Tylissos	KC EPCA	Crete
101	Palace of Phaistos	KC EPCA	Crete
102	Ay.Triadha	KC EPCA	Crete
103	Gortys	KC EPCA	Crete
104	Archanes	KC EPCA	Crete
105	Bathypetro	KC EPCA	Crete
106	Nirou Chani	KC EPCA	Crete
107	Idhaio Andro	KC EPCA	Crete
108	Palace of Malia	KD EPCA	Crete
109	Diktaio Andro	KD EPCA	Crete
110	Palace of Zakros	KD EPCA	Crete
111	Lato, Kritsa	KD EPCA	Crete
112	Gournia	KD EPCA	Crete
113	Aptera	KE EPCA	Crete
114	Armenoi	KE EPCA	Crete
115	Monastiraki	KE EPCA	Crete
116	Phalassarna	KE EPCA	Crete



## APPENDIX THREE

### Catalogue of temporary exhibitions of Prehistoric and Classical antiquities in Greece (1978-1997)

#	Exhibition title	Date	Venue	Major exhibition
1	The Child in Antiquity	1978-1979	Athens	*
2	The Ancient Greek Musical Instruments	1979	Athens	
3	Treasures of Ancient Macedonia	1979	Thessaloniki	*
4	Ancient Medical Instruments	1980	Athens	
5	Greek Art of the Aegean Islands	1980	Athens	
6	Alexander the Great. History and Legend in Art	1980	Thessaloniki	
7	Prima Italia	1981	Piraeus	
8	The Tyrannicides	1983	Chios	
9	The Acropolis from the Middle Ages to today	1983	Athens	
10	The Acropolis of Athens: Conservation, Restoration, Research 1975-1983	1983	Athens	
11	Democracy and Classical Culture	1985	Athens	*
12	Greece and the Sea	1985	Athens	*
13	Athens in Prehistory and Antiquity. Exhibition on Architecture and City Planning, 15 <sup>th</sup> c. BC-6 <sup>th</sup> c. AD	1985	Athens	*
14	Troy-Heinrich Schliemann's excavations and finds'	1985	Athens	*
15	Cyprus; 9000 Years of History is being looted	1985	Athens	
16	Danish Research in Lindhos, Rhodes	1985	Rhodes	
17	Hundred years of Italian excavations in Crete	1985	Crete	
18	The Birth of Writing	1985-1986	Athens	
19	The Birth of Writing	1986	Crete	
20	Thessaloniki from the Prehistoric Period to Christianity	1986	Thessaloniki	*

#	Exhibition title	Date	Venue	Major exhibition
21	Research of the British School at Athens in Crete	1986	Athens	
22	Homer's Iliad	1986-1987	Athens	
23	British School at Athens: 100 Years in Greece	1987	Athens	
24	Travelling with the boat of Keryneia in myth and in time	1987	Athens	*
25	Weights, Measures and Standards	1987	Athens	
26	The Birth of Writing	1987	Patra	
27	The Birth of Writing	1987	Agrinio	
28	Thirty years of excavations at Pella	1987	Thessaloniki	
29	Numismatic Museum; A century old history	1988	Athens	
30	Ancient city of Rhodes	1988	Rhodes	
31	Homer's Iliad	1988	Florina	
32	Macedonian Art from the Mycenaean Period to Alexander the Great	1988	Thessaloniki	*
33	The Birth of Writing	1988	Athens	
34	Homer's Iliad	1988-1989	Mytilini	
35	Roof tiles from the Acropolis	1988-1989	Athens	
36	Lighting: From Antiquity to the Age of Electricity	1988-1989	Larissa	
37	Mycenaean World. Five centuries of Early Greek Culture	1988-1989	Athens	*
38	Palaeolithic Research in Fiskardho	1989	Kefallonia	
39	Mind and Body. The Athletic Contests in Ancient Greece	1989-1990	Athens	*
40	Schliemann: Troy, Mycenae, Tiryns, Orchomenos	1990	Athens	*
41	Diachronic History of the Olympic Games	1990	Athens	
42	Cycladic Civilisation; Life and Art in Naxos (3 <sup>rd</sup> millennium BC)	1990-1991	Athens	*
43	Macedonian Art from the Mycenaean Period to Alexander the Great	1992	Athens	
44	Minoan and Hellenic Civilisation from the Mitsotakis Collection	1992	Athens	*
45	Delphi. In the Sources of Apollo. A century of French Archaeological Research	1992	Athens	
47	The Birth of Democracy	1993	Athens	
47	Eleutherna	1994	Athens	*
48	Attic Pottery	1994-1995	Athens	



#	Exhibition title	Date	Venue	Major exhibition
49	From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece	1995	Athens	*
50	Ancient Greek Art from the Collection of Stavros S.Niarchos	1995-1996	Athens	*
51	Neolithic Culture in Greece	1996-1997	Athens	*
52	The Aidonia Treasure. Seals and Jewellery of the Aegean Late Bronze Age	1996-1997	Athens	*
53	Archanes	1997	Athens	*
54	The Italian presence in Dodecanese for the period 1912-1945. Archaeological Research- Conservation- Architectural selections	1997	Athens	

## APPENDIX FOUR

Catalogue of travelling exhibitions of Prehistoric and Classical antiquities which have been jointly or mainly organised by the Hellenic Ministry of Culture (1979-1997)

#	Exhibition title	Date	Venue	Major exhibition
1	Mer Égée, Grèce des Iles	1979	Paris, FRANCE	*
2	Greek Art of the Aegean Islands	1979-1980	New York, USA	*
3	Greek Art of the Aegean Islands	1980	Moscow, RUSSIA	*
4	In Search for Alexander	1980-1981	Washington, USA	*
5	In Search for Alexander	1981	Chicago, USA	*
6	In Search for Alexander	1981-1982	Boston, USA	*
7	In Search for Alexander	1982	San Francisco, USA	*
8	In Search for Alexander	1982	New Orleans, USA	*
9	In Search for Alexander	1982-1983	New York, USA	*
10	In Search for Alexander	1983	Toronto, CANADA	*
11	The Acropolis of Athens: Conservation, Restoration, Research 1975-1983	1985	Moscow, RUSIA	
12	The Acropolis of Athens: Conservation, Restoration, Research 1975-1983	1985	London, UK	
13	The Acropolis of Athens: Conservation, Restoration, Research 1975-1983	1985-1986	Amsterdam, HOLLAND	
14	The Acropolis of Athens: Conservation, Restoration, Research 1975-1983	1986	Paris, FRANCE	
15	From Myth to Logos; The Human Figure in Early Greek Art	1986	Florence, ITALY	*
16	Danish Research in Lindhos, Rhodes	1986	Copenhagen,	
17	Athens, Prehistory and Antiquity	1986-1987	Melbourne, AUSTRALIA	
18	Athens, Prehistory and Antiquity	1987	Stockholm, SWEDEN	
19	Travelling with the boat of Keryneia in myth and in time	1987	Lisbon PORTUGAL	
20	Greece and the Sea	1987	Amsterdam, HOLLAND	*



#	Exhibition title	Date	Venue	Major exhibition
21	The Human Figure in Early Greek Art	1988	Washington, USA	*
22	The Human Figure in Early Greek Art	1988	Kansas City, USA	*
23	The Human Figure in Early Greek Art	1988-1989	Los Angeles, USA	*
24	The Human Figure in Early Greek Art	1989	Chicago, USA	*
25	The Human Figure in Early Greek Art	1989	Boston, USA	*
26	Exhibition about the Olympic Games 'Greece, Culture, Sports'	1988	Brisbane, AUSTRALIA	
27	Exhibition about the Olympic Games 'Greece, Culture, Sports'	1988	Seoul , S.KOREA	
28	Macedonian Art from the Mycenaean Period to Alexander the Great	1988	Bologna, ITALY	
29	The Mycenaean World. Five centuries of Early Greek Culture	1988-1989	Berlin, GERMANY	*
30	The Mycenaean World. Five centuries of Early Greek Culture	1992	Madrid, SPAIN	*
31	Ancient Macedonia	1988-1989	Melbourne AUSTRALIA	*
32	Ancient Macedonia	1989	Brisbane AUSTRALIA	*
33	Ancient Macedonia	1988-1989	Sydney AUSTRALIA	*
34	Eros Grec, Amour des Dieux et des Hommes	1989-1990	Paris, FRANCE	*
35	Mind and Body. The Athletic Contests in Ancient Greece	1990	Lausanne, SWITZERLAND	*
36	Mind and Body. The Athletic Contests in Ancient Greece	1990	Tokyo, JAPAN SWITZERLAND	*
37	Creta, the Cradle of Europe	1990	Duisburg, GERMANY	
38	Athens: The birthplace of democracy	1990	Dallas City, USA	
39	Schliemann: Troy, Mycenae, Tiryns, Orchomenos	1990-1991	Berlin, GERMANY	*
40	The Greek Miracle. Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy. The Fifth-Century BC'	1992-1993	Washington, USA	*
41	The Greek Miracle. Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy. The Fifth-Century BC'	1993	New York, USA	*
42	La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand'	1993	Montréal, CANADA	*
43	Birth of Democracy, An exhibition celebrating the 2500th anniversary of Democracy	1993-1994	Washington, USA	

#	Exhibition title	Date	Venue	Major exhibition
44	Birth of Democracy, An exhibition celebrating the 2500th anniversary of Democracy	1994	Edinburgh, UK	
45	Macedonians. The Northern Greeks	1994	Hannover, GERMANY	*
46	Macedonians. The Northern Greeks	1994-1995	Copenhagen, DENMARK	*
47	Macedonians. The Northern Greeks	1995	Marseille, FRANCE	*
48	Macedonians. The Northern Greeks	1995-1996	Rome, ITALY	*
49	Macedonians. The Northern Greeks	1996	Buenos Aires, ARGENTINA	*
50	Macedonians. The Northern Greeks	1996-1997	Florida, USA	*
51	Delphi. Oraket am Navel der Welt	1996	Karlsruhe, GERMANY	*
52	Macedonians. The Northern Greeks	1997	New Delhi, INDIA	*
53	Architectural Models of Antiquity	1997	Barcelona, SPAIN	



# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A

- A.M. (1984): 'To Mouseio Athinon, oi Arxaiologoi kai i Iera Odos' [The Museum of Athens, the archaeologists and the Sacred Way], *Horoc*, 2:234-237.
- Addams Allen, J., (1988): 'Korai make first trip to America', *The Washington Times*, 7/1/88:E1, E11.
- Albright, T., (1980): 'A supershow search for Alexander the Great', *World*, 27/7/1980:41-43.
- Alcock, S.E., (1993): 'Surveying the peripheries of the Hellenistic world', in Bilde et al 1993:162-175.
- Alcock, S.E., (1994): 'Breaking up the Hellenistic world: survey and society', in Morris 1994b:171-190.
- Alcock, S.E., Cherry, J.F., Davis, J.L., (1994): 'Intensive survey, agricultural practice and the classical landscape of Greece', in Morris 1994b:137-170.
- Alexander, E.P., (1979): *Museums in Motion*, The American Association for State and Local History, Nashville.
- Alexander, G., (1982): *The Prelude to the Truman Doctrine. British Policy in Greece 1944-1947*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Alpers, S., (1991): 'The Museum as a way of seeing', in Karp & Lavine 1991:25-32.
- Althusser, L., (1971): 'Ideology and ideological State Apparatuses', 127-186, in *Lenin and Philosophy*, Monthly Review Press, New York.
- Amandry, P., (1992): 'Anaskafes stous Delphous kai korinthetaikes stafides: istoria mias diapragmateusis' [Excavations in Delphi and Corinthian raisins: the story of a negotiation], in Picard & Pentazos 1992:77-126.
- American School of Classical Studies at Athens (1954): *The Athenian Agora, A Guide to the Excavations*, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens.
- American School of Classical Studies at Athens (1960): *The Athenian Citizen*, Picture Book, No.4, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens.
- Ames, K.L., (1992): *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes*, University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver.
- Andreadis, G., (1989): *Ta Paidia tis Antigonis. Mnimi kai Ideologia stin Neoteri Ellada* [Antigone's children. Memory and Ideology in Modern Greece], Kastaniotis, Athens.
- Andronikos, M., (1965a): 'To Mouseio tis Olympias' [The Museum of Olympia], *To Vima*, 14/2/65: II/6.
- Andronikos, M., (1965b): 'To Mouseio tis Agoras kai i zoi ton Athinaion' [The Agora Museum and the life of Ancient Athenians], *To Vima*, 21/2/65:II/6.

- Andronikos, M., (1965c): 'To Mouseio Thessalonikis', *To Vima*, 28/11/65:III/9.
- Andronikos, M., (1966): 'K.A.Romaïos', *NE*, 940, 1/9/66:5-6.
- Andronikos, M., (1967): 'K.A.Romaïos', *Ellinika*, 20:283-286.
- Andronikos, M., (1970): 'Sir John Beazley', *Ellinika*, 23:434-440.
- Andronikos, M., (1976): 'Ena archaiologiko mouseio' [An archaeological museum], *To Vima*, 19/7/1976:1, 5.
- Andronikos, M., (1980): 'Archaiologika' [Archaeological matters], *To Vima*, 13/11/80:1, 6.
- Andronikos, M., (1983): 'Archaiologia. Eurimata kai methodos' [Archaeology. Finds and methods], *To Vima*, 16/10/83:4.
- Andronikos, M., (1984): *Vergina*, Ekdotiki Athinon, Athens.
- Andronikos, M., (1986): *O Platon kai i Techni, Oi Platonikes Apoyeis gia to Oraio kai tis Eikastikes Technes* [Plato and the Art; the platonic views on beauty and the visual arts], Nefeli, Athens, 3rd edition (1st in 1952).
- Andronikos, M., (1987): 'O Christos Karouzos kai i glossa' [Christos Karouzos and the language], *NE* 1987:1144-1148.
- Andronikos, M., (1988): 'Archaeological discoveries in Macedonia', in *Ancient Macedonia*:63-67.
- Andronikos, M., (1989): 'I archaiognostiki ereuna' [The archaeognostic study], *To Vima*, 24/9/89:58.
- Andronikos, M., (1990a): 'I Archaiologiki Ypiresia. Ena meizon problima (1)' [The Archaeological Service. A major problem (1)], *To Vima*, 1/7/90:B14/48.
- Andronikos, M., (1990b): 'I Archaiologiki Ypiresia. Ena meizon problima (2)' [The Archaeological Service. A major problem (2)], *To Vima*, 8/7/90:B14/48.
- Andronikos, M., (1993): 'Archaeological discoveries in Macedonia', in Vokotopoulou 1993:5-11.
- Andronikos, M., (1994): 'The contribution of the Aegean islands to the artistic development of the ancient world', in Elytis et al 1994:81-120.
- Anonymous, (1951): 'Athens: The National Museum's new gallery', *Archaeology*, 4, 3:134-135.
- Anonymous (1953): 'O romantismos kai i archaiologia' [Romanticism and archaeology], *To Vima*, 29/3/53:4.
- Anonymous (1959): 'Idryontai mouseia se eparchiakes poleis' [The establishment of museums in provincial towns], *To Vima*, 8/7/59:2.
- Anonymous (1967): 'Museum at Jannena', *ArchThem*, 1:192-197.
- Anonymous (1972): 'Museum at Komotini', *ArchThem*, 6:151-155.
- Anonymous (1978): 'Koitzontas me istoriki euaisthisia tin kefali tis koris apo tin Tegea' [Looking at the head of Kore from Tegea with historical sensitivity], *I Aygi*, 1/9/78: 4.
- Anonymous (1988): 'The Treasures of Macedonia. The ride of Greece', *The Age*, 24/11/88.
- Anonymous (1989a): 'Rare chance to view treasures', *The Gosford Star*, 25/5/89.
- Anonymous (1989b): 'Wealth of ancient culture on display', *The Sun*, 10/3/89.
- Antonakakis, D., (1992): 'I kritiki ton kriton' [The Comments of the jurors], *ThChT*, 23, 87-88.



- Appadurai, A., (1986): *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Arafat, K.W., (1990): 'Fact and artefact: Texts and achaeology', *Hermathena*, vol.148:45-67.
- Arafat, K.W., (1992): 'Pausanias' attitude to antiquities', *BSA*, 87:387-409.
- Archaiologia* Special Issue (1991): Ekpaideutikes Mouseioskeues [Educational Museum Kits], *Archaiologia*, 38.
- Archaiologia* Special Issue (1994): Oi Ekpaideutikoi Miloun gia tin Acropoli [The Teachers speak about the Acropolis], *Archaiologia*, 52, 7-93.
- ADelt* (1983): 'I eforeia proistorikon kai klassikon arxaiotiton; mouseiakes ergasies' [I ephorate of prehistoric and classical Antiquities, museum operations], *ADelt*, 38:186.
- Archontidou-Argyri, A., (1993a): 'Mouseio tis Mytilinis' [Museum of Mytiline], *Archaiologia*, 46:87-88.
- Archontidou-Argyri, A., (1993b): Personal Communication in June 1993.
- Archontidou-Argyri, A., (1994a): 'I Myrina ypo to fos ton anaskafon' [Myrina under the light of excavations], *Archaiologia*, 50:50-55.
- Archontidou-Argyri, A., (1994b): 'To Archaiologiko Mouseio tis Limnou' [The Archaeological Museum of Lemnos], *Archaiologia*, 50:105-106.
- Arethusa*, (1989): 'The challenge of "Black Athena"', Special Issue.
- Arnold, C.J., (1986): 'Archaeology and history: the shades of confrontation and cooperation', 32-39, in Bintliff, J.L. & Gaffney, C.F., (eds): *Archaeology at the Interface: Studies in Archaeology's Relationships with History, Geography, Biology and Physical Science*, BAR International Series 300.
- Arnush, M.F., (1994): 'La Redécouverte de Delphes, Book Review', *AJA*, 98(1):170-171.
- Art Journal* (1982): 'The crisis in the discipline', 42, No.4, Winter 1982.
- Ascherson, N., (1994): 'Blueprints for democracy: the Greeks had a machine for it', *The Independent for Sunday*, 6/3/94.
- Ashmole, B. and Yalouris, N. (1967): *The Sculptures of the Temple of Zeus*, Phaidon Press, London.
- Ashmole, B., (1972): 'Sir John Beazley 1885-1970', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol.LVI:443-461.
- Aslanis, I., (1985): 'Foreward', in *Troia*:10-11.
- Atkinson, J.A., Banks, I., O'Sullivan, J., (eds) (1996): *Nationalism and Archaeology: Scottish archaeological forum*, Cruithne Press, Glasgow.
- Augouli, M., (1994): 'The first Greek museums and national identity', in Kaplan 1994:246-265.
- Augustinos, G. (1989): 'Culture and authenticity in a small state: historiography and national development in Greece', *East European Quarterly* XXIII(1):17-31.
- Azoulay, A., (1994): 'With open doors: Museums and historical narratives in Israel's public space', in Sherman & Rogoff 1994a:85-109.

## B

- Baeumer, M.L., (1986): 'Klassizität und republikanische Freiheit in der ausserdeutschen Winckelmann-Rezeption des späten 18. Jahrhunderts', 195-219, in Gaechtens, T.W., (ed): *Johann Joachim Winckelmann 1717-1768*, Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag.
- Bailey, M., (1995): 'What use are the cities of culture?', *The Art Newspaper*, No.46, March 1995.
- Baines, J., (1996): 'On the aims and methods of Black Athena', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:27-48.
- Bakalakis, G., (1990): *Oinos Ismarikos B*, University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki.
- Bakirtzis, Ch. & Triantaphyllos, D., (eds) (1990): *Thrace*, Cultural Guides I, The ETBA Cultural Foundation, Greek National Tourism Organisation, Athens.
- Bakirtzis, Ch., (1994): 'Byzantine Thrace (AD 330-1453)', in Papoulia et al 1994:151-209.
- Bakogiannopoulou, S., (1986a): 'Ta mouseia den einai mausoleia!... I Ellada einai gemati apo arxaiotites alla oi Ellines den tis gnorizoun' [The Museum is not a mausoleum...Greece is full of ancient monuments but the Greeks do not know them], *To Vima*, 6/7/86:38.
- Bakogiannopoulou, S., (1986b): 'Anaskafes met'empodion' [Excavations with obstructions], *To Vima*, 21/12/86:39.
- Bakogiannopoulou, S., (1987): 'Stin "oura" gia tin dimosieusi ton archaiologikon meleton' [Queing for the publication of archaeological studies], *To Vima*, 18/1/87:51.
- Bakogiannopoulou, S., (1989): 'Ta agalmata niouthoun monaxia. Oi Ellines snomparoun ta mouseia, akomi kai tora pou den plironoun eisitirio' [The lonely statues. The Greeks treat the museums snobbishly, even now that there is no admission fee], *To Vima*, 22/1/89:54.
- Bakounakis, N., (1993): 'Alexandros o Makedon kataktitis kai tou Kanada' [Alexander the Macedonian, conqueror even of Canada], *To Vima*, 23/5/92:52.
- Bakoyannis, D., (1993a): 'Untitled welcome note', in Vokotopoulou 1993:not-numbered.
- Bakoyannis, D., (1993b): 'Greece's cultural heritage', *Time*, 8/2/93, No.6:4.
- Bal, M., (1994): 'Telling objects: a narrative perspective on collecting', in Elsner and Cardinal 1994:97-115.
- Bal, M., (1996): 'The discourse of the museum', in Greenberg & Ferguson, & Nairne 1996:218.
- Bal, M., Bryson, N., (1991): 'Semiotics and art history', *The Art Bulletin*, Vol.LXXII (2):174-208.
- Balfe Huggins, J., (1987): 'Artworks as symbols in international politics', *The International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 1(2):195-217.
- Barber, R., (1987): *Blue Guide, Greece*, A. & C. Black, London.
- Baroutas, K., (1991-2): 'O dialogos gia tin byzantini techni stin Ellada ton 19o aiona kai i apokatastasi tis' [The dialogue about byzantine art in Greece during the nineteenth century and its reconstitution], *Byzantinos Domos*, 5-6:209-233.
- Bartman, E., (1992): *Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature*, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition, Vol. XIX, E.J.Brill, Leiden, New York, Koln.



- Batchelor, R., (1986): 'Not looking at kettles', *Museums Professionals Group News*, 23:1-3.
- Bayley, S., (1991): *Taste; The Secret Meaning of Things*, Faber and Faber, London, Boston.
- Beard, M., (1986): 'Signed against unsigned', *TLS*, 12/9/86:1013.
- Beard, M., (1991): 'Adopting an approach II', in Rasmussen & Spivey 1991:12-35.
- Beard, M., (1992): 'Souvenirs of culture: deciphering (in) the museum', *AH*, 15(4):505-532.
- Beard, M., (1993): 'Casts and cast-offs: The origins of the museum of classical archaeology', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 39, 1-29.
- Beard, M., Henderson, J., (1994): ' "Please don't touch the ceiling": the culture of appropriation', in Pearce 1994b:5-42.
- Beard, M., Henderson, J., (1995): *Classics. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Beardsley, M.C., (1966): *Aesthetics from Classical Greece to the Present, A Short History*, MacMillan Company, New York.
- Beaton, R., (1988): 'Romanticism in Greece', 92-108, in Porter, R., Teich, M., (eds): *Romanticism in National Context*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Beaumont, L., (1994): 'Child's play in classical Athens', *History Today*, Vol.44, 8:30-35.
- Beazley, J.D., (1922): 'Citharoedus', *JHS*, 42:70-98.
- Beazley, J.D., (1956): *Attic Black-figure Vase Painters*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Beazley, J.D., (1963): *Attic Red-figure Vase Painters*, Vol. 1-3, 2nd edition, 1st edition in 1942, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Beazley, J.D., (1971): *Paralipomena, Addition to Attic Black-figure and Red-figure Vase Painters*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Belcher, M., (1991): *Exhibitions in Museums*, Leicester University Press, Leicester & London.
- Belcher, M., (1992): 'Communicating through museum exhibitions', in Thompson et al 1992:649-659.
- Belk, R., (1990): 'Possessions and the extended self', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15:139-168.
- Benson, J.L., (1980): 'Introduction', ii-xxiii, in Buschor, E.: *On the Meaning of Greek Statues*, Transl. by J.L.Benson, The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.
- Benvenuti, A.G., (1994): 'Poliochni, exinta xronia anaskafikis ereunas' [Poliochni, sixty years of excavational research], *Archaiologia*, 50:10-18.
- Beraha, E.N., (1988): *Exhibitions as Artefacts*, MA Dissertation, University of Leicester, Dept. of Museum Studies, Leicester.
- Bérard, C., Bron, C., Durand, J.L., Frontisi-Ducroux, F., Lissarrague, F., Schnapp, A., Vernant, J.P. (1989): *A City of Images, Iconography and Society in Ancient Greece*, translated by Deborah Lyons, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Berger, J., (1972): *Ways of Seeing*, BBC and Penguin Books, London.
- Berger, M.T. & Colardelle, M., (1994): Working party of ICMAH-ICOM on the theme "Site and archaeological reconstruction museums", unpublished.
- Bernal, M., (1986): 'Black Athena denied: the tyranny of Germany over Greece and the rejection of the Afroasiatic roots of Europe: 1780-1980', *Comparative Criticism*, 8:3-69.



- Bernal, M., (1987): *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic Origins of European Civilisation, Volume 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece*, Free Association, London.
- Bernal, M., (1988): 'The British utilitarians, imperialism and the fall of the ancient model', *Culture and History*, 3:98-127.
- Bernal, M., (1989): 'Classics in crisis: An outsider's view in', in Culham & Edmunds 1989:67-74.
- Bernal, M., (1991): *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic Origins of European Civilisation, Volume 2: The Archaeological and Documentary Evidence*, Free Association, London.
- Bernal, M., (1994): 'The image of Ancient Greece as a tool for colonialism and European hegemony', in Bond & Gilliam 1994:119-128.
- Beschi, L., (1994): 'To iero ton Kabeiron sti Limno' [The sanctuary of Kabeiroi on Lemnos], *Archaologia*, 50:31-37.
- Bieber, M., (1977): *Ancient Copies: Contributions to the History of Greek and Roman Art*, New York University Press, New York.
- Bilde, P., Engberg-Pedersen, T., Hannestad, L., Zahle, J. & Randsborg, K., (eds) (1993): *Centre and Periphery in the Hellenistic World*, Aarhus University Press, Aarhus.
- Binford, L.R., (1962): 'Archaeology as anthropology', *American Antiquity*, 28:217-225.
- Binford, L.R., (1983): *In Pursuit of the Past*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Bintliff, J., (ed) (1991a): *The Annales School and Archaeology*, Leicester University Press, Leicester & London.
- Bintliff, J., (1991b): 'The contribution of an *Annaliste* / structural history approach to archaeology', in Bintliff 1991a:1-33.
- Bintliff, J., (1993): 'Why Indiana Jones is smarter than the post-processualists', *NAR*, 26(2):91-100.
- Bintliff, J., Snodgrass, A., (1985): 'The Cambridge/Bradford Boeotia expedition: the first four years', *JFA*, 12:123-161.
- Bintliff, J., Snodgrass, A., (1988): 'Mediterranean survey and the city', *Antiquity*, 62:57-71.
- Bistika, E., (1992): 'Simeiomatario' [Notebook], *I Kathimerini*, 15/11/92:2.
- Bittel, K., (1990): 'The German perspective and the German archaeological institute', *AJA*, 84:271-277.
- Blinkhorn, M., Veremis, T., (eds) (1990): *Modern Greece: Nationalism and Nationality*, Sage - ELIAMEP, London and Athens.
- Blok, J., (1987): 'Sexual asymmetry. A historiographical essay', in Blok & Mason 1987:1-57.
- Blok, J., & Mason, P., (eds) (1987): *Sexual Asymmetry, Studies in Ancient Society*, Gieben, Amsterdam.
- Blundell, S., (1995): *Women in Ancient Greece*, British Museum Press, London.
- Boardman, J., (1973): 'Trading on classic ground', *Encounter*, XL, no.4:67-69.
- Boardman, J., (1974): *Athenian Black Figure Vases*, Thames & Hudson, London.
- Boardman, J., (1975): *Athenian Red Figure Vases: the Archaic Period*, Thames & Hudson, London.
- Boardman, J., (1985): 'Hundred years of classical archaeology in Oxford', in Kurtz 1985:43-56.



- Boardman, J., (1988): 'Classical Archaeology: whence and whither?', *Antiquity*, 62:795-797.
- Boardman, J., (1989): *Athenian Red Figure Vases: the Classical Period*, Thames & Hudson, London.
- Bohrer, F.N., (1994): 'The times and spaces of history: representation, Assyria, and the British Museum', in Sherman & Rogoff 1994a:197-222.
- Bommelaer, J.F., (1991): *Guide de Delphes, Le Site, Sites et Monuments VII*, Ecole Francaise d' Athenes, De Boccard, Paris.
- Bommelaer, J.F., Pentazos, E., Picard, O., (1992): 'La cite aujourd'hui; essai de Bilan', in Picard & Pentazos 1992:262-290.
- Bond, G.C., Gilliam, A., (eds) (1994): *Social Construction of the Past. Representation as Power*, One World Archaeology No.24, Routledge, London.
- Bone, P., (1988a): 'Macedonians to hold a vigil by candlelight', *The Age*, 19/11/88.
- Bone, P., (1988b): 'President greeted with joy and mourning', *The Age*, 25/11/88.
- Bone, P., Maslen, G. (1988): 'An Exhibition of ancient passion', *The Age*, 19/11/88:3.
- Bonfante, L., (1981): 'Margarete Bieber (1879-1978): An archaeologist in two worlds', in Richter Sherman & Holcomb 1981:239-274.
- Boniface, P. & Fowler, P.J., (1993): *Heritage and Tourism in 'the Global Village'*, Routledge, London.
- Borbein, A.H., (1986): 'Winckelmann und die klassische archaeologie', in Gaetgens, T.W., (ed): *Johann Joachim Winckelmann 1717-1768*, Felix Meiner Verlag, Hamburg.
- Borza, E.N., (1990): *In the Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Borza, E.N., (1992): 'Manolis Andronikos, 1919-1992', *AJA*, 96:757-758.
- Boulotis, Ch., (1994a): 'Koukonisi' [Koukonissi], *Archaiologia*, 50:19-27.
- Boulotis, Ch., (1994b): 'Mouseio istorias paidikou paixnidion kai bibliou sti Myrina. Mia idea pragmatonetai' [The museum of history of children's toys and books at Myrina. A realised idea], *Archaiologia*, 50:95-99.
- Bouras, Ch., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 6/12/78.
- Bouras, Ch., (1989): 'O Miliadis kai i syntirisi ton mneimeion tis Acropoleos' [John Miliadis and the preservation of the Acropolis Monuments], *Archaiognosia*, 4, 1988-9:117-125.
- Bouras, Ch., (1994a): 'Restoration work on the Parthenon and changing attitudes towards the conservation of monuments; a theoretical contribution to restoration work today', in Tournikiotis 1994:310-339.
- Bouras, Ch., (1994b): 'Current problems of restoration on the Acropolis', in Economakis 1994:101-103.
- Bourdieu, P., Darbel, A., (1991): *The Love of Art. European Art Museums and Their Public*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Bourdin, A., (1986): 'Exposer les centres anciens: L' histoire en "vraie grandeur", in Davallon 1986a:69-82.
- Bowen, J., (1989): 'Education, ideology and the ruling class', 161-86, in Clarke, G.W., (ed) (1989): *Rediscovering Hellenism: the Hellenic Inheritance and the English Imagination*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Bower, M., (1995): 'Marketing nostalgia', in Cooper, Firth, Carman & Wheatley 1995:33-39.
- Boylan, P., (1995): 'Reflecting the state of the nation', *MJ*, Vol.95, 2:24-25.
- Brenson, M., (1988): 'Human figures enshrined by the early Greeks', *The New York Times*, 14/2/88:29, 34.
- Briggs, W.W., Calder III, W.M., (eds) (1990): *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia*, Garland Publishing, Inc, New York & London.
- Brilliant, R., (1973): *Arts of the Ancient Greeks*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.
- Brouskari, M., (1974): *The Acropolis Museum. A Descriptive Catalogue*, TAP, Athens.
- Brouskari, M., (1976): 'Mouseio Paulou kai Alexandras Kanellopoulou' [The Paulos and Alexandra Canellopoulos' Museum], *AAA*, Vol.ix, no.2:130-152.
- Brouskari, M., (1985): *The Paul and Alexandra Canellopoulos' Museum; A Guide*, TAP, Athens.
- Brown, K.S., (1994): 'Seeing stars: character and identity in the landscapes of modern Macedonia', *Antiquity*, 68:784-796.
- Browning, R., (1984): 'The case for the return of the Parthenon Marbles', *Museum* 36:38-41.
- Brownstein, B. (1993): 'Exhibition on Alexander's Macedonia is simply great', *The Gazette*. 7/5/1993:D1.
- Buckley, A.D., (1996): 'Why not invent the past we display in museums?', in Kavanagh 1996a:42-53.
- Budd, R.W. & Ruben, B.D., (eds) (1979): *Beyond Media, New Approaches to Mass Communication*, Hayden Book Company, inc., New Brunswick.
- Buitron-Oliver, D. et al., (ed) (1992): *The Greek Miracle, Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy. The Fifth Century BC.*, National Gallery of Art, Washington 22/11/1992-7/2/1993, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 11/3-23/5/1993., National Gallery of Art, Washington.
- Burcaw, G.E., (1983): *Introduction to Museum Work*, Second Edition, American Association for State and Local History, Nashville.
- Bury, M., (1991): 'Plaster and marble, The classical and neo-classical portrait bust (The Edinburgh Albacini Colloquium): introduction', *JHC*, 3, 2:121-124.
- Bush, G., (1992): 'Preface' in Buitron-Oliver et al 1992:not-numbered.
- Butteriss, K. (1986): 'Atene a Firenze', *Testata Firenze City*, Data Settembre 1986.

C

- Calder III, W.M., (1990): 'Introduction', in Briggs & Calder III 1990:xiv-xviii.
- Cameron, D.F., (1995): 'The pilgrim and the shrine: The icon and the oracle: a perspective on museology for tomorrow', *MMC*, Vol.14, No.1:47-55.
- Camp, J.M., (1990): *The Athenian Agora, A Guide to the Excavation and the Museum*, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens.
- Camp, J.M., (1992): *The Athenian Agora, Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*, New aspects of antiquity, 2nd edition (first in 1986), Thames and Hudson, London.



- Candylis, G., (1991): 'Jurors' Comments', in *Acropolis*:21.
- Canellopoulos, P., (1990): *Skepseis* [Thoughts], Athens.
- Carman, J., (1990): 'Commodities, Rubbish and Treasure: Valuing archaeological objects', *ARC*, 9, 2:195-207.
- Carman, J., (1995a): 'Interpretation, writing and presenting the past', in Hodder & Shanks 1995:95-99.
- Carman, J., (1995b): 'The importance of things. Archaeology and law', in Cooper, Firth, Carman & Wheatley 1995:19-32.
- Carman, J., (1996a): *Valuing Ancient Things. Archaeology and Law*, Leicester University Press, London.
- Carman, J., (1996b): 'Unfolding museums: storylines for the future', *MR*, 2, 1:1-8.
- Carpenter, T.H., (1989): *Beazley Addenda*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Carter Brown, J., Wilson, M.F., Powell III, E., Wood, J.N., Shestack, A., (1988): 'Foreword', in Sweeney et al 1988:10-11.
- Carter-Brown, J., (1980): 'Foreword', in Yalouris & Rhomiopoulou 1980:6-8.
- Cartledge, P., (1979): *Sparta and Lakonia*, Routledge, London.
- Cartledge, P., (1986): 'A new classical archaeology?', *TLS*, 12 September:1011-1012.
- Cartledge, P., (1993): *The Greeks: a Portrait of Self and Others*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Chambers, G.R., (1984): 'Archaeology, antiquities and taste', *ARC*, 3, 1:19-28.
- Champion, T.C., (ed) (1989a): *Centre and Periphery. Comparative Studies in Archaeology*, Unwin Hyman, London.
- Champion, T.C., (1989b): 'Introduction', in Champion 1989a:1-21.
- Chaudron, M., (1995): 'La réponse des publics à l'offre multimédia', *Musées et Collections Publiques de France*, No.209, 4:10-23.
- Cherry, J.F., (1994): 'Regional survey in the Aegean: The "new wave" (and after)', in Kardulias 1994a:91-112.
- Cherry, J.F., Davis, J.L., Demitrack, A., Mantzourani, E., (1991): *Landscape Archaeology as Long-Term History: Northern Keos in the Cycladic Islands from Earliest Settlement to Modern Times*, UCLA Institute of Archaeology (Monumenta Archaeologica 16), Los Angeles.
- Chevillon, O., (1989-1990): 'Untitled', in Eros:9.
- Christenson, A.L., (ed) (1989a): *Tracing Archaeology's Past; the Historiography of Archaeology*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale and Edwardsville.
- Christenson, A.L., (1989b): 'The past is still alive: The immediacy problem and writing the history of archaeology', in Christenson 1989a:163-168.
- Chrysafis, K., (1987): 'I archaiotita anamesa stous mythous kai tin pragmatikotita' [Antiquity between the legends and the facts], *I Aygi*, 6/9/87:24.
- Chrysos, E., (ed) (1996a): *Enas Neos Kosmos Gennietai. I Eikona tou Ellinikou Politismou sti Germaniki Epistimi kata ton 19o ai* [A New World is Being Born. The Image of Hellenic Civilization in the German Science during the 19<sup>th</sup> Century], Akritas, Athens.
- Chrysos, E., (1996b): 'Novus Incipit Orbis. Eisagogi sti thematiki tou synedriou' [Novus Incipit Orbis. Introduction to the themes of the conference], in Chrysos 1996a:13-24.



- Clarke, D. L., (1968): *Analytical Archaeology*, second edition in 1978, Methuen, London.
- Cleere, H., (ed) (1984a): *Approaches to the Archaeological Heritage*, New Directions in Archaeology, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Cleere, H., (1984b): 'World cultural resource management: problems and perspectives', in Cleere 1984a:125-131.
- Cleere, H., (ed) (1989a): *Archaeological Heritage Management in the Modern World*, One World Archaeology, Unwin Hyman, London.
- Cleere, H., (1989b): 'Introduction: the rationale of archaeological heritage management', in Cleere 1989a:1-19.
- Clifford, J., (1988): *The Predicament of Culture, Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts, London.
- Clogg, R. (1993): *A Concise History of Greece*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Cohen, D., (1989): 'Seclusion, separation and the status of women in classical Athens', *Greece & Rome*, Vol.xxxvi, No.1:3-15.
- Coleman, J.E., (1996): 'Did Egypt shape the glory that was Greece?', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:280-302.
- Coleman, S., Elsner, J., (1995): *Pilgrimage, Past and Present. Sacred Travel and Sacred Space in the world religions*, British Museum Press, London.
- Collingwood, R.G., (1939): *An Autobiography*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Collingwood, R.G., (1946): *The Idea of History*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Collins, A.M., (1995): 'The city is the museum', *MI*, 187, No.3:30-34.
- Collins, K., (1989): 'Gold treasure from Greece's days of glory', *Sunday Mail*, 26/2/89:5.
- Commission of the European Communities (1990): *Community Support Framework 1989-1993. Greece* (for the development and structural adjustment of the regions whose development is lagging behind), ECSC-EEC-EAEC, Brussels, Luxembourg.
- Comotti, G., (1989): *Music in Greek and Roman Culture*, Transl.by R.V.Munson, Baltimore and London, The John Hopkins University Press, originally published in 1979 as *la Musica nella cultura greca e romana*.
- Connor, P., (1989): 'Cast-collecting in the nineteenth century: scholarship, aesthetics, connoisseurship', 187-235, in Clarke, G.W., (ed): *Rediscovering Hellenism; The Hellenic Inheritance and the English Imagination*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Connor, W.R., (1989): 'The new classical humanities and the old', in Culham & Edmunds 1989:25-38.
- Constantine, D., (1984): *Early Greek Travellers and the Hellenic Ideal*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Cook, R.M., (1972): *Greek Painted Pottery*, 2nd edition, 1st edition in 1960, Methuen and Co Ltd, London.
- Cooper, F.A., Miller, Stella.G., Miller, St.G., Smith, C., (eds) (1983): *The Temple of Zeus at Nemea: Perspectives and Prospects, A Guide to the Exhibition*, Benaki Museum, Athens.
- Cooper, M.A., Firth, A., Carman, J., Wheatley, D., (eds) (1995): *Managing Archaeology*, Routledge, London.
- Cornet, J.P., (1989): 'Eros ou les manières de la liberté', *Le Quotidien de Paris*, 14/11/89:26.
- Cossons, N., (1992): 'Independent museums', in Thompson et al 1992:112-118.



- Cotton, J., Wood, B., (1996): 'Retrieving prehistories at the Museum of London: A gallery case-study', in McManus 1996:53-71.
- Coufoudakis, V. & Kourvetaris, G.A., (1988): 'Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean: A region in turmoil', *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, Vol.16:147-153.
- Coulson, W.D.E., (1993): 'Athens and America', in Ober & Hedrick 1993:4-5.
- Coulson, W.D.E., Pallagia, O., Shear, T.L. Jr, Shapiro, H.A., Frost, F.J., (eds) (1994): *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, Proceedings of an International Conference celebrating 2500 years since the birth of democracy in Greece, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 4-6/12/92, Oxbow Monograph 37, Oxford.
- Courbin, P., (1982): *Qu' est-ce que l' Archéologie?*, Payot, Paris.
- Coxall, E., (1990): 'Interpreting women's heritage', *Conference Paper to Interpreting Women's Heritage*, Edinburgh, April 6-8.
- Coxall, E.,(1991): 'How language means: alternative view of museum texts', in Kavanagh 1991:83-99.
- Coxall, E., (1995): *Studies in Museum Language*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Oxford Brookes University.
- Crettaz, B. and Détraz, C. (1982): 'Georges Amoudruz (1900-1975), un collectionneur-chercheur', in Hainard, J. and Kaehr, R., (eds): *Collections Passion*, exposition du 5-6-au 31-12-1982 au Musée d'ethnographie, Neuchâtel, Suisse.
- Crimp, D., (1987): 'The Postmodern museum', *Parachute*, 46, March-May:61-69.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., Hermanson, K., (1995): 'Intrinsic motivation in museums: why does one want to learn?', in Falk & Dierking 1995:67-77.
- Culham, P. and Edmunds, L., (eds) (1989): *Classics, a Discipline and Profession in Crisis*, University Press of America, Lanham, MD.
- Cunliffe, B., (1993): 'Core-periphery relationships: Iberia and the Mediterranean', in Bilde et al 1993:53-85.
- Cunningham, J., & Whelan, J., (1989): 'It's all Greek, except to the Macedonians', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 19/5/89.



- D'Agostino, B. & Schnapp, A., (1982): 'Les morts entre l'objet et l' image', in Gnoli & Vernant 1982:17-25.
- Dakaris, S., (1971): *Archaeological Guide to Dodona*, Cultural Society of "The Ancient Dodona", Athens.
- Dakaris, S., (1993a): *Dodoni* [Dodona], Ministry of Culture, TAP, Athens.
- Dakaris, S., (1993b): *To Nekyomanteio tou Aheronta* [Necromanteion of Aheronta], Ministry of Culture, TAP, Athens.
- Danet, B. & Katriel, T., (1994): 'No two alike: play and aesthetics in collecting', in Pearce 1994a: 220-239.
- Danforth, L.M., (1993): 'Claims to Macedonian identity', *Anthropology Today*, Vol.9(4):3-10.

- Daniel, G., (1975): *A Hundred and Fifty Years of Archaeology*, first published in 1950, Duckworth, London.
- Danish National Museum (1993): *Museum Europa. An Exhibition About the European Museum from the Renaissance to our Time*, 19 June- 24 October 1993, Nationalmuseet, Copenhagen.
- Darvill, T., (1995): 'Value systems in archaeology', in Cooper, Firth, Carman & Wheatley 1995:40-50.
- Dassios, F., (1992): 'I peripeteia tis sumbasis apo ellinikis pleuras (1881-1891)' [The ventures of the contract as viewed from the Greek part], in Picard & Pentazos 1992:127-141.
- Davallon, J., (ed) (1986a): *Claquemurer, Pour Ainsi Dire, Tout l'Univers, La mise en Exposition*, Centre Georges Pompidou, Centre de Creation Industrielle, Paris.
- Davallon, J., (1986b): 'Gestes de mise en exposition', in Davallon 1986a:241-266.
- Davis, D., (1990): *The Museum Transformed; Design and Culture in the Post-Pompidou Age*, Abbeville Press, New York.
- Davis, J.L., (1994): 'Regional studies in Greece: A *Vade Mecum*?', in Kardulias 1994a:389-405.
- de Forrest, M., (ed) (1993): *Woman's Power, Man's Game. Essays on Classical Antiquity*, in Honor of Joy K.King, Bolchazy-Carduce Publishers, Wauconda.
- De Montebello, Ph., (1994): *The Met and the New Millennium, A Chronicle of the Past and a Blueprint for the Future*, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
- de Polignac, F. (1984): *La Naissance de la Cité Grecque, Cultes, Space et Société, VIIIe-VIIe Siecles avant J.-C.*, Editions la Decouverte, Paris.
- Dean, D., (1994): *Museum Exhibition, Theory and Practice*, Routledge, London.
- Deetz, J., (1977): *In Small Things Forgotten*, University of California Press, California.
- Delivorrias, A., (1985a): 'Introductory note', in *Greece and the Sea* 1:8-9.
- Delivorrias, A., (1985b): 'Ellada kai thalassa' [Greece and the sea], *Anti*, 295, 29/7/85:50-51.
- Delivorrias, A., (1987): 'Introduction', in *Greece and the Sea* 2:16-17.
- Delivorrias, A., (1989): 'Introduction', in *Mind and Body* 1:16-17.
- Delivorrias, A., (1992a): 'I ekthetiki politiki tis Elladas' [The exhibition policy of Greece], *To Vima*, 22/3/92:30.
- Delivorrias, A., (1992b): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:32-36.
- Deloche, B., (1989): *Museologica; Contradictions et Logique du Musée*, Collection museologia, 2nd edition, W.Mnes, Savigny-le-Temple.
- Despinis, G., (1969): 'I epanekthesis ton glypton eis to mouseion Thessalonikis' [The redisplay of sculpture in the museum of Thessaloniki], *AAA*, II, 2:173-177.
- Despinis, G., (1987): 'Meletes tou Ch.Karouzou gia tin klassiki plastiki' [Ch.Karouzos' studies on classical sculpture], in *NE*, 1987:1131-1135.
- Despinis, G., (1992): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:50-56.
- Despoini, A., (1993): 'The Ancient cemetery at Sindos', in Vokotopoulou 1993:162-169.
- Devambez, P., (1969): 'Christos Karouzos (1900-1967)', *RA*, 1:115-116.



- Devenish, D., (1990): 'Labelling in museum display', *IJMMC*, 9(1):63-72.
- Diamantouros, P.N.I. (1983): 'Ellinismos kai ellinikotita' [Hellenism and hellenicity], in Tsaousis 1983a:51-58.
- Díaz-Andreu, M., (1993): 'Theory and ideology in archaeology: Spanish archaeology under the Franco régime', *Antiquity*, 76:74-82.
- Díaz-Andreu, M., Champion, T., (eds) (1996): *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, University College London Press, London.
- Dimacopoulou, A., Lapourtas A., (1995): 'The legal protection of archaeological heritage in Greece in view of the European Union legislation: a review', *IJCP*, Vol.4.2:311-323.
- Dimakopoulos, I., (1995): *Kelyfi Prostasias en eidei Tymvou: Vergina* [Tumulus-like protective shells in Vergina], Greek Ministry of Culture, TAP, Athens.
- Dontas, G., (1979): *The Acropolis and its Museum*, Clio Editions, Athens.
- Dontas, G., (1987): 'O Christos Karouzos kai to Ethniko Archaialogiko Mouseio' [C.Karouzos and the National Archaeological Museum], *NE*, 122:1444, 1116-1118.
- Dontas, G., (1992): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:36-40.
- Doris, E., (1985): *To Dikaion ton Archaeotiton, Nomothesia - Nomologia - Ermineia* [The Law of Antiquities. Legislation -Case Law- Interpretation], Athens - Komotini, A.N.Sakkoulas Publications.
- Doris, M. (1981): 'O Kritikos laos kerdise tin politistiki tou machi' [The people of Crete won a cultural fight], in *Politismos kai Koinoniki Exelixi* [Civilization and Social Progress], Gnosi, Athens.
- Dorsey, J., (1988): 'A centuries-long pursuit of perfection', *Sun*, 31/1/88:1M, 6M.
- Doumanis, O.B., (ed) (1984): *Post-War Architecture in Greece, 1945-1983*, Architecture in Greece Press, Athens.
- Doumas, Ch., (1983): *Cycladic Art, The N.P.Goulandris Collection*, The Trustees of the British Museum, London.
- Doumas, Ch., (1994a): 'I pyrotechnologia sti Limno tis proimis epochis tou chalkou' [The fire technology on Lemnos in the early bronze age], *Archaiologia*, 50:28-30.
- Doumas, Ch., (1994b): 'The early Aegean and its contribution to the development of western thought', in Elytis et al 1994:425-432.
- Dowden, K., (1995): 'Approaching women through myth: vital tool or self-delusion?', in Hawley & Levick 1995:44-57.
- Duclos, R., (1994): 'Postmodern/Postmuseum. New direction in contemporary museological critique', *MR*, 1(1):1-13.
- Duncan, C. & Wallach, A., (1980): 'The universal survey museum', *AH* 3, 4:447-469.
- Duncan, C., (1991): 'Art museums and the ritual of citizenship', in Karp & Lavine 1991:88-103.
- Duncan, C., (1995): *Civilizing Rituals Inside Public Art Museums*, Routledge, London.
- Dunnell, R.C., (1984): 'The Americanist literature for 1983: a year of contrasts and challenges', *AJA*, 87:521-544.
- Dyson, S.L., (1981): 'A classical archaeologist's response to the new archaeology', *Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research*, 242:7-13.

- Dyson, S.L., (1989a): 'The role of ideology and institutions in shaping classical archaeology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries', in Christenson 1989a:127-135.
- Dyson, S.L., (1989b): 'Complacency and crisis in late twentieth century classical archaeology', in Culham & Edmunds 1989:211-220.
- Dyson, S.L., (1993): 'From new to new age archaeology: archaeological theory and classical archaeology - a 1990s perspective', *AJA*, 97, 195-206.
- Dyson, S.L., (1995): 'Is there a text in this site?', in Small 1995a:25-44.

E

- Eco, U., (1987): *Travels in Hyperreality*, Essays translated from the Italian by William Weaver, Picador, Pan Books, London.
- Ecole Française d' Athènes (1991): *Guide de Delphes, Le Musée*, Ecole Française d' Athènes, Sites et Monuments VI, De Boccard, Paris.
- Economakis, R., (ed) (1994): *Acropolis Restoration. The CCAM Interventions*, Academy Editions, London.
- Editorial (1963a): 'Oute ton Ermi oute tipota allo' [Neither the statue of Hermes nor anything else], *To Vima*, 14/11/63:2.
- Editorial (1963b): 'Ilthan na zitisoun ton Ermi tou Praxitelous' [They came to ask the statue of Hermes of Praxitelis], *To Vima*, 7/12/63:5.
- Editorial (1975): 'Ekstrateia gia tin kaliteri organosi ton mouseion' [Campaign for a better organisation of our museums], *I Aygi*, 1/2/75:2.
- Editorial (1978a): 'Ekthesi ellinikon arxaiotiton sto Parisi' [Exhibition of Greek antiquities in Paris], *To Vima*, 31/5/78:5.
- Editorial (1978b): 'To paidi kata tin archaiotita' [The Child in antiquity], *To Vima*, 17/8/78:5.
- Editorial (1978c): 'Ekthesi me thema "To paidi stin archaiotita"' [An exhibition about "The Child in Antiquity"], *To Vima*, 20/8/78:9.
- Editorial (1978d): 'Epimenei stin exagogi arxaiotiton i kuvernisi' [The government insists in the export of antiquities], *To Vima*, 30/11/78:5.
- Editorial (1978e): 'Kai monadika erga stis arxaiotites pou tha "exathoun"' [Unique objects amongst the antiquities that are to be "exported"], *To Vima*, 2/12/78:5.
- Editorial (1978f): 'Prepei ta arxaia na exoun tin tyxi ton metanaston;' [Must the antiquities have the fate of the immigrants?], *To Vima*, 3/12/78:12.
- Editorial (1978g): 'Ogkoutai to kuma diamarturion enantion tis exagogeis archaion' [The rising tide of protests against the export of antiquities], *To Vima*, 12/12/78:5.
- Editorial (1978h): 'Paraitithike o genikos epitheoritis archaiotiton' [The General Inspector of Antiquities resigned], *To Vima*, 15/12/78.
- Editorial (1978i): 'Tha anatheorithei o katalogos ton archaiotiton' [The list of antiquities to be reconsidered], *To Vima*, 20/12/78:17.
- Editorial (1978j): 'Untitled' , *To Vima*, 30/12/78:5.



- Editorial (1978k): 'Na mi fugoun sto exoteriko ta eurimata tis Verginas' [The finds of Vergina must not go abroad], *I Aygi*, 23/11/78:4.
- Editorial (1979a): 'Eidikes epitropes gia tin prostasia ton archaiotiton' [Special Committees for the protection of antiquities], *To Vima*, 4/1/79:5.
- Editorial (1979b): 'Tha mataiothei i exagogi me kathe nomimo meso' [The exportation will be call off with every legitimate way], *To Vima*, 12/1/79:5.
- Editorial (1979c): 'Na staloun antigrafa ton archaion' [Send copies of the original antiquities], *To Vima*, 18/1/79:5.
- Editorial (1979d): 'Se agonistiki kinitopoiisi oi katoikoi tou Irakleiou gia na apotrepsoun tin exagogi archaiotiton' [In a rally the citizens of Herakleio to stop the exportation of antiquities], *To Vima*, 14/2/79.
- Editorial (1979e): 'Den tha fugoun apo to Irakleio o archaiotites' [The antiquities will not be removed from Herakleion], *To Vima*, 2/3/79:1, 5.
- Editorial (1979f): 'Feugoun telos tis ebdomadas oi archaiotites' [At the end of the week the departure of the antiquities], *To Vima*, 14/3/79:5.
- Editorial (1979g): 'Kai stin Athina tha parousiastei i ekthesi ton archaiotiton' [The exhibition of antiquities will be also presented in Athens], *To Vima*, 21/3/79:5.
- Editorial (1979h): 'I ekthesi archaiotiton allazei kai pali titlo' [The exhibition is again changing title], *To Vima*, 22/3/79.
- Editorial (1979i): 'Emporopaniguris me erga archaias ellinikis technis etoimazetai stin Ameriki' [A Trade fair with works of ancient Greek art is being prepared in America], *To Vima*, 26/7/79:5.
- Editorial (1979j): 'Aurio sto Metropolitan oi ellinikes archaiotites' [Tomorrow in the Metropolitan the exhibition of Greek antiquities], *To Vima*, 23/10/79:5.
- Editorial (1979k): 'Ti tha meinei gia na blepoun oi episkeptes sta mouseia', [What will remain in the museums for the visitors to see?], *I Aygi*, 6/1/79:4.
- Editorial (1979l): 'Proistorika mousika organa sto mouseio' [Prehistoric Musical Instruments in the Museum], *To Vima*, 19/9/79.
- Editorial (1980a): 'Pagkosmio endiaferon gia tin ekthesi M.Alexandrou' [Global the interest in the exhibition of Alexander the Great], *To Vima*, 19/7/80:5.
- Editorial (1980b): 'Anazitontas ton Alexandro...' [In search of Alexander], *To Vima*, 19/10/80:5.
- Editorial (1980c): 'Kai sto Mitropolitiko to 1982 i ekthesi Megalou Alexandrou' [The exhibition of Alexander the Great will also be presented in the Metropolitan Museum in 1982], *To Vima*, 8/11/80:5.
- Editorial (1980d): 'Poios euthunetai gia tin upovathmisi tis ekthesis tou Aegaiou' [Who is responsible for the downgrading of the exhibition on the Aegean Art?], *I Aygi*, 4/7/80:4.
- Editorial (1980e): 'Ypotupodis i arxaiologiki paideia stin Ellada' [The archaeological education in Greece is underdeveloped], *I Aygi*, 5/11/80:4.
- Editorial (1981): 'I Aigaiopelagitiki techni sto Mouseio tou Leningrand' [The Aegean Art in the Museum of Leningrand], *To Vima*, 11/4/81.
- Editorial (1984): 'I kardia ton mouseion upoleitourgei' [The heart of the museums malfunctions], *I Aygi*, 6/12/84:4.

- Editorial (1985): 'O Ellinas Odysseas se 1500 ekthemata' [The Greek Ulysses in 1,500 exhibits], *To Vima* 12/7/1985:12.
- Editorial (1988): 'Oi Amerikanoi gia tin ekthesi archaiotiton' [The Americans for the exhibition of antiquities], *I Aygi*, 20/2/88:9.
- Editorial (1991a): 'Tora to lene epithetiki polistiki politiki' [Now they call it aggressive cultural policy], *To Vima*, 8/12/91:9.
- Editorial (1991b): 'Oi ektheseis' [The exhibitions], *O Mentor*, 17:110-113.
- Editorial (1991c): 'I symvasi' [The contract], *O Mentor*, 17:114-118.
- Editorial (1991d): 'I apofasi' [The decision], *O Mentor*, 17:119-120.
- Editorial (1991e): 'Meta to Mouseio tis Lozannis' [After the Museum of Lausanne], *O Mentor*, 17:121-127.
- Editorial (1991f): 'O Typos' [The Press], *O Mentor*, 17:134-138.
- Editorial (1991g): 'Ekthesi, Daneismos kai dorea archaion' [Exhibition, donation and loan of antiquities], *O Mentor*, 17:102-109.
- Editorial (1991h): 'Elliniko edafos to Mouseio Olympiakon Agonon sti Lozanni' [The Museum of Olympic Games in Lausanne will be Greek territory], *I Aygi*, 14/6/91:19.
- Editorial (1991i): 'Oxi sto xenitemo ton archaiotiton' [No to the up-rooting of antiquities], *I Aygi*, 29/6/91:17.
- Editorial (1991j): 'Mia kali idea' [One good idea], *I Aygi*, 17/7/91:11.
- Editorial (1992): 'Oi archaiologoi epimenoun' [The archaeologists insist], *I Aygi*, 13/2/92:11.
- Editorial (1994a): 'Tafikes pyres stin Eleutherna' [Funeral pyres in Eleutherna], *I Kathimerini*, 18/2/94:15.
- Editorial (1994b): 'O marturikos thanatos mias doulis prin apo 2.800 chronia' [The torturing death of a slave some 2.800 years ago], *I Eleutherotypia*, 18/2/94:50.
- Editorial *Hóroc* (1984): 'I archaiologia simera. Diapistoseis kai prooptikes' [Archaeology today. Findings and perspectives], *Horoc*, 1:9-14.
- Edlund, I.E.M., McCann, A.M., Richter Sherman, C., (1981): 'Gisela Marie Augusta Richter (1882-1972): scholar of classical art and museum archaeologist', in Richter Sherman & Holcomb 1981:275-300.
- Edmunds, L., (1989): 'Introduction', in Culham & Edmunds 1989:ix-xxviii.
- Efstathiadis, S., (1978a): 'Oristiki einai i apofasi gia tin apostoli ellinikon archaiotiton stin Ameriki' [The decision for the dispatching of Greek antiquities to America], *To Vima*, 14/6/78:1.
- Efstathiadis, S., (1978b): 'Ekthesi me ta eurimata tis Verginas stin Ameriki' [Exhibition with the finds of Vergina in America], *To Vima*, 13/10/78:5.
- Eisner, R., (1993): *Travelers to an Antique Land, The History and Literature of Travel to Greece*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Eleutheriou, L., (1977): 'I archaioelliniki dimokratiki klironomia kai to kommounistiko kinima tis xoras' [The Ancient Greek democratic heritage and the communist movement of our country], *I Aygi*, 3/1/77:1, 14.
- Elia, R., (1993): 'A seductive and troubling Work', *Archaeology*, January-February:64-69.
- Eliopoulou-Rogan, D., (1989): 'The mind and the body. Athletics and motion in contemporary Greek art', in *Mind and Body* 2:25-31.



- Ellen, R., (1988): 'Fetishism', *Man* 23:213-235.
- Elliot, R. et al, (1985): 'Towards a material history methodology', *Material History Bulletin* 22, Fall:31-40.
- Elsner, J. and Cardinal, R., (eds) (1994): *The Cultures of Collecting*, Reaktion Books, London.
- Elsner, J., (1990): 'Significant details: systems, certainties and the art-historian as detective', *Antiquity*, 64:950-2.
- Elsner, J., (1992): 'Pausanias: A Greek pilgrim in the roman World', *Past and Present*, 135:3-29.
- Elsner, J., (1994a): 'From the pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: monuments, travel and writing', in Goldhill and Osborne 1994a:224-254.
- Elsner, J., (1994b): 'A collector's model of desire: The house and museum of Sir John Soane', in Elsner and Cardinal 1994:155-176.
- Elsner, J., (1996): 'The "new museology" and classical art', *AJA*, 100:769-773.
- Elytis, O. et al (eds) (1994): *The Aegean. The Epicentre of Greek Civilisation*, Melissa, Athens.
- Elytis, O., (1994): 'Draft for an introduction to the Aegean world', in Elytis et al 1994:27-30.
- Embree, L., (1989): 'The structure of American theoretical archaeology: a preliminary report', in Pinsky & Wylie 1989:28-37.
- Errington, M.R., (1990): *A History of Macedonia*, Transl.by C.Errington, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Etienne, R. & Etienne, F., (1992): *The Search for Ancient Greece*, English Translation, Thames and Hudson Ltd., London.
- Eugenidou, D., (1990): 'Oi managers tou politismou' [The managers of culture], *To Vima*, 8/4/90:59.
- Eustathiadis, M., (1964): 'Zitountai archaiologoi...' [In need of archaeologists], *I Aygi*, 19/7/64:5.
- Evans-Pritchard, D. (1993): 'Ancient art in modern context', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20:9-31.

JF
----

- Faklaris, P.B., (1994): 'Aegae: determining the site of the first capital of the Macedonians', *AJA*, 98:609-616.
- Falk, J.H., Dierking, L.D., (1992): *The Museum Experience*, Whalesback Books, Washington, D.C.
- Falk, J.H., Dierking, L.D., (eds) (1995): *Public Institutions for Personal Learning: Establishing a Research Agenda*, American Association of Museums, Washington DC.
- Fantham, E., Peet Foley, H., Boymel Kampen, N., Pomeroy, S.B., Shapiro, H.A., (eds) (1994): *Women in the Classical World. Image and Text*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Fatouros, A.A., (1981): 'Building formal structures of penetration: The United States in Greece, 1947-1948', in Iatrides 1981:239-258.

- Fatouros, A.A., (1986): 'La protection et le commerce des biens culturels dans le cadre du Droit International et du Droit Communautaire: Une perspective Grecque', *Révue Internationale de Droit Comparé*, No special,, Vol.8., 461-479, Journées de la Société de législation Comparée, 3es Journées Juridiques Franco-Helléniques, Thessalonique 1-4/10/86.
- Fatouros, D., (1991): 'Jurors' comments', in *Acropolis*:23-24.
- Ferguson, B.W., (1996): 'Exhibition rhetorics: material speech and utter sense', in Greenberg & Ferguson, & Nairne 1996:175-190.
- Fessa-Emmanouil, E., (1987): *Ideological and Cultural Issues in the Architecture of Modern Greece, 1827-1940*, Athens.
- Figueira, T., (1989): 'The prospects for ancient history', in Culham & Edmunds 1989:369-381.
- Filaretos, N., (1989): 'The olympic games and the olympic idea', in *Mind and Body* 1:18-19.
- Finley, M.I., (1986): *The Use and Abuse of History*, Hogarth Press, London.
- Finzi, C. (1986): 'Grecia classica e bizantina a Palazzo Strozzi', *Testata il Tempo Data* 26 Settembre 1986.
- Firth, A., (1995): 'Ghosts in the machine', in Cooper, Firth, Carman & Wheatley 1995:51-67.
- Fitzgerald, G., (1995): 'The cult and culture of classical sites: The Parthenon fiasco', *Public Culture*, 8:177-185.
- Fleming, D., (1996): 'Making city histories', in Kavanagh 1996a:131-142.
- Ford, R.I., (1984): 'Ethics and the museum archaeologist', in Green 1984:133-142.
- Foss, A., (1978): *Epirus*, Faber, London.
- Foucault, M., (1970): *The Order of Things*, Tavistick, London.
- Foucault, M., (1972): *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Pantheon, New York.
- Foucault, M., (1977): 'Nietzsche, genealogy, history' in Bouchard, D.F., *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Fowler, J., (1994): 'Democracy? Well, hardly', *The Herald*, 10/2/94.
- Frangoudaki, A., (1992): 'Diglossia and the present language situation in Greece: A sociological approach to the interpretation of diglossia and some hypotheses on today's linguistic reality', *Language in Society* 21:365-381.
- French Archaeological School at Athens. National Centre of Scientific Research of France (CNRS) (1992): *Delphoi, Stis Piges tou Apollona. Enas Aionas Gallikon Arxaiologikon Ereuneon* [Delphi. In the Sources of Apollo. A Century of French Archaeological Research], EFA, Athens.
- French, E.B., (1993-1994): 'Archaeology in Greece 1993-1994', *Archaeological Reports*, 1993-1994, No.40:3ff.
- Friedman, J., (1992): 'The past in the future: history and the politics of identity', *American Anthropologist*, 94(4):837-859.
- Funke, P., (1996): 'I archaia Ellada: ena apotychimeno ethnos;' [Ancient Greece: a failed nation?], in Chrysos 1996a:83-106.
- Furtwängler, A., (1964): *Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture: A Series of Essays on the History of Art*, edited by Oikonomides, A.I.N., Argonaut Publishers, Chicago.
- Furtwängler, And.E., (1990): 'Adolf Furtwängler', in Briggs & Calder III 1990:84-92.



## G

- Galinsky, K., (1993): *Classical and Modern Interactions, Postmodern Architecture, Multiculturalism, Decline and Other Issues*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Galla, A., (1995): 'Urban museology: an ideology for reconciliation', *MI*, 187, No.3:40-45.
- Gallis, K., (1990): 'Afieroma sti Thessalia' [A special edition for Thessaly], *Archaiologia*, 34:6-8.
- Gamarekian, B., (1987): 'The wind they call Mercouri', *The New York Times*, 1/10/87:A14.
- Gamble, C., (1986): *The Palaeolithic Settlement of Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Garfield, D., (1992): 'Athens: The presence of absence', *Museum News*, September/October 1992:39-41.
- Garidi, E., (1967): 'I archaiologiki ypiresia na enischuthei' [The Archaeological Service must be developed], *I Aygi*, 19/3/67:7.
- Gathercole, P., (1983): 'Museums and people', *ARC*, 2, 1:41-43.
- Gazi, A., (1990): 'Museums and national cultural property II. The Parthenon Marbles', *MMC*, 9:241-255.
- Gazi, A., (1993): *Archaeological Museums in Greece (1829-1909); The Display of Archaeology*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Leicester University, Dept. of Museum Studies, Leicester.
- Gazi, A., (1994): 'Archaeological museums and displays in Greece (1829-1909); A first approach', *MR*, 1(1):50-69.
- Geertz, Cl., (1985): 'Waddling in', *TLS*, 7 /6/85:623-624.
- Gehrke, H.J., (1996): 'Anazitontas ti chora ton Ellinon: Epistimonika taxidia kai i simasia tous gia tin ereuna kai tin antimetopisi tis archaioellinikis istorias ston 19o aiona' [In search of the land of Greeks: Scientific journeys and their significance for the study and management of ancient Greek history in the 19<sup>th</sup> century], in Chrysos 1996a:59-82.
- Gellner, E., (1983): *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Genscher, H.D., (1985): 'Untitled', in *Troia*:7.
- Geoffroy, B., (1992): 'Le Nouveau Musée', *Archéologia*, 280, 32-33.
- Georgiou, B., (1989): 'Makedoniki klironomia kai tautotita' [Macedonian heritage and identity], *O Kosmos*, 18/5/89:11.
- Georgousopoulos, K., (1982): 'Mouseio kai scholeio' [The Museum and the school], *To Vima*, 10/8/82:1, 5.
- Gerakis, M., (1980a): 'Kerameikos. Okto aiones thanatou paradomenoi stin siopi' [Kerameikos. Eight centuries of death put to silence], *To Vima*, 27/9/80:5.
- Gerakis, M., (1980b): 'Ilthe i seira ton Ellinon na thaumasoun tin "Techni tou Aigaiou"' [It is Greeks' turn to admire the "Aegean Art" exhibition], *To Vima*, 14/6/80:5.
- Giannouli, V., (1993): Personal Communication, KA' Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, May 1993.

- Gibson, M., (1989): 'Eros and the unconscious in Greek art', *International Herald Tribune*, 10/12/89.
- Giddens, A., (1984), *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Giddens, A., (1990): *The Consequences of Modernity*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Gill, D. & Vickers, M., (1989): 'Pots and kettles', *RA*, 297-303.
- Gill, D.W.J. & Chippindale, C., (1993): 'Material and intellectual consequences of esteem for cycladic figures', *AJA*, 97:601-659.
- Ginzburg, C., (1983): 'Clues: Morelli, Freud, and Sherlock Holmes', 81-118 in Eco, U. & Sebeok, T.A., (eds): *The Sign of Three: Dupin, Holmes, Peirce*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Givens, D.R., (1992): 'The role of biography in writing the history of archaeology', 51-66, in Reyman, J.E., (ed) (1992): *Rediscovering our Past. Essays on the History of American Archaeology*, Avebury.
- Gnoli, G. & Vernant, J.P. (eds) (1982): *La Mort, les Morts Dans les Sociétés Anciennes*, Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l' Homme, Cambridge.
- Golden, M., (1990): *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.
- Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R., (eds) (1994a): *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R., (1994b): 'Introduction: programmatic and polemics', in Goldhill & Osborne 1994a:1-11.
- Gombrich, E.H., (1977): *Art and Illusion; A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation*, Phaidon Press.
- Goulandri, A., Delivorrias, A., (1992): 'Na zontanepsoun ta mouseia' [Let's revive the museums], *To Vima*, 17/5/92:38.
- Goulandris, D., (1987): 'The Museum of cycladic and ancient Greek art', *Museum*, 154:74-76.
- Gousidis, D., (1980): 'O Alexandros allaxe to prosopo tis Istorias' [Alexander changed the face of history], *To Vima*, 20/7/80.
- Gowlett, J.A.J., (1990): 'Indiana Jones: crusading for archaeology?', *Antiquity*, 64:157.
- Gratziou, O., (1985): 'Archaiologikos nomos tou 1932; To aparchaiomeno organo prostasias ton mnimeion' [Archaeological Legislation of 1932; An old fashioned means for the protection of antiquities], *Anti*, 295:52-53.
- Gratziou, V., (1991): 'Gia to mouseio ekmageion tou panepistimiou Thessalonikis' [For the cast museum of the university of Thessaloniki], *TOMH 301*, 3:43-44.
- Graves-Brown, P., (1996): 'All things bright and beautiful? Species, ethnicity and cultural dynamics', in Graves-Brown et al 1996:81-95.
- Graves-Brown, P., Jones, S., Gamble, C., (eds) (1996): *Cultural Identity and Archaeology. The Construction of European Communities*, Routledge, London.
- Greek Ministry of Culture, ICOM-National Hellenic Committee, International Cultural Corporation of Australia (1988): *Ancient Macedonia, An Exhibition Catalogue*.
- Greek Ministry of Culture / ICOM-National Hellenic Committee (1995): *From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece*, Exhibition Leaflet, Athens.



- Greek Ministry of Culture / ICOM-National Hellenic Committee (1995): *Apo ti Mideia sti Sapfo. Anupotaktes Gynaikes stin Archaia Ellada* [From Medea to Sappho. Radical Women in Ancient Greece], Exhibition Catalogue, Athens.
- Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Benaki Museum (1985): *Greece and the Sea. A Short Guide*, Piraeus.
- Greek Ministry of Culture and Science General Direction of Antiquities and Restoration (1978): *Treasures of Ancient Macedonia*, Exhibition Catalogue, TAP, Athens.
- Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Direction of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (1985): *Democracy and Classical Culture*. Exhibition Catalogue, Athens.
- Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Direction of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (1985): *Troy, Heinrich Schliemann's Excavations and Finds*,. Exhibition Catalogue, Athens.
- Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Direction of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (1987): *Athens in Prehistory and Antiquity. Exhibition on Architecture and City Planning, 15<sup>th</sup> century BC-6<sup>th</sup> century AD*,. Exhibition Catalogue, Stoa of Attalos, Athens.
- Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. National Gallery and Alexander Soutzos Museum (1989): *Mind and Body. The Revival of the Olympic Idea 19th-20th Century*, Athens.
- Greek Ministry of Culture and Science. Zappeion Megaron (1989): *The Mind and the Body. Athletics and Motion in Contemporary Greek Art*, Athens.
- Greek Ministry of Culture, TAP (1985): *Sindos, Exhibition Catalogue*.
- Greek Ministry of Culture, TAP (1986): *Thessalonike from the Prehistoric Period to Christianity, Exhibition Catalogue*.
- Greek Ministry of Culture. Exhibition Centre of Florence (1986): *From Myth to Logos; The human figure in Greek art (8th-6th cent.BC)*, Exhibition catalogue, Greek Ministry of Culture .
- Greek Ministry of Culture, Benaki Museum, National Foundation de Nieuwe Kerk in honor of Amsterdam (1987): *Greece and the Sea*, Exhibition catalogue .
- Greek Ministry of Culture, National Hellenic Committee - ICOM (1990): *Ta Mouseia tis Thessalonikis* [The Museums of Thessaloniki], International Day of Museums, 18/5/1990.
- Greek Ministry of Culture (Directorate of Museum Studies) (1991): *The New Acropolis Museum, International Architectural Competition*, (Exhibition Catalogue), Ministry of Culture.
- Green, E., (ed) (1984): *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*, The Free Press, New York, London.
- Green, P., (1989): 'The Macedonian Connection', 151-164, in *Classical Bearings. Interpreting Ancient History and Culture*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Greenberg, R., Ferguson, B.W., Nairne, S., (eds) (1996): *Thinking about Exhibitions*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Greenfield, J., (1990): *The Return of Cultural Treasures*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Griffo, M. (1986): 'Firenze getta un ponte verso Atene', *Testata il Giornale* Data 23 Settembre 1986.
- Griswold, R., (1953): *Preliminary Report for the Landscape Development*, Agora excavations, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, unpublished, Athens.
- Gruneau, R., (1984): 'Commercialism and the modern Olympics', in Tomlinson & Whannel 1984:1-15.

## H

- Habicht, C., (1985): *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Hall, E., (1996): 'When is a myth not a myth? Bernal's "Ancient Model"', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:333-348.
- Hall, J., (1991): 'Practicing post-processualism; classics and archaeological theory', *ARC*, 10(2):155-163.
- Hall, M., (1987): *On Display, A Design Grammar for Museum Exhibitions*, Lund Humphries, London.
- Hall, S. & Giben, B., (eds) (1992): *Formations of Modernity*, Polity Press/Open University/Blackwell, Oxford and Cambridge.
- Halpin, M.M., (1990): *Fragments - Reflections on Collecting*, Note No.31., University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology, Vancouver.
- Halporn, J.W., (1989): 'Foreign schools and American classical education', in Culham & Edmunds 1989:305-315.
- Hamilakis, Y., (1993): 'I didaskalia tis archaiologias sto elliniko panepistimio' [The teaching of archaeology in Greek Universities], *Archaiologia*, 46:47-50.
- Hamilakis, Y., Yalouri, E., (1996): 'Antiquities as symbolic capital in modern Greek society', *Antiquity*, 70:117-129.
- Hammond, N.G.L. & Scullard, H.H., (1970): *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd edition., Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hammond, N.G.L., (1967): *Epirus*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hammond, N.G.L., (1989): *The Macedonian State, Origins, Institutions and History*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hans, C., (1990): 'L'amour, toujours', *Paris Normandie*, 26/1/90.
- Hansen, M.H., (1989): *Was Athens a democracy?*, Royal Danish Academy, Copenhagen.
- Hansen, M.H., (1994): 'The 2500th Anniversary of Cleisthenes' Reforms and the Tradition of Athenian Democracy', in Osborne & Hornblower 1994:25-37.
- Harrison, R., (ed) (1994a): *Manual of Heritage Management*, Butterworth and Heinemann, London.
- Harrison, R., (1994b): 'Case study 26.2, London's Tower Bridge', in Harrison 1994a:315-319.
- Harth, D., (1994): 'Über die geburt der antike aus dem geist der moderne', *IJCT*, Vol.1(1):89-106.
- Haskaris, Y., (1991): 'Anastrofi sto noima enos ideatou mouseiou' [Return to the Meaning of an Ideal Museum], *Tefchos*, 5:4-6.
- Haskel, F. and Penny, N., (1981): *The Most Beautiful Statues: The Taste for Antique Sculpture 1500-1900*, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
- Hatziaslani, C., (1994): 'Educational programmes on the Athenian Acropolis', in Economakis 1994:92-99.



- Hatzidakis, M., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 8/12/78:3.
- Hatzidakis, M., (1987): 'Christos Karouzos', in *NE*, 1987:1119-1120.
- Hatziioannou, E., (1985a): 'Ena taxidi stis piges tis Dimokratias' [A trip to the sources of democracy], *To Vima*, 16/6/85:23.
- Hatziioannou, E., (1985b): '35 aiones 'Ellada kai Thalassa'' [35 centuries Greece and the Sea], *To Vima*, 10/4/1985:12.
- Hatziioannou, E., (1985c): 'Mia stegi gia ton kouros, sto Mouseio tis Samou' [A roof for the kouros in the museum of Samos], *To Vima*, 29/9/1985:19.
- Hatziioannou, E., (1986): 'To megalytero agalma, enas olokliros kouros; Me enomena pleon to kefali and to soma, to aristourgima tis Samou einai etoimo na ektethei sto koino' [The biggest statue, an entire kouros; after the unification of the head with the body, the masterpiece of Samos is ready for its display], *To Vima*, 27/7/1986:33.
- Hatziioannou, E., (1987): 'Tha gemisoume mouseia' [We shall fill museums with visitors], *To Vima*, 25/1/87:55.
- Hawkes, T., (1977), *Structuralism and semiotics*, Methuen and Co Ltd, London.
- Hawley, R., Levick, B., (eds) (1995): *Women in Antiquity. New Assessments*, Routledge, London.
- Hebditch, M., (1995): 'Museums about cities', *MI*, 187, No.3:7-11.
- Herzfeld, M., (1982): *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Herzfeld, M., (1987): *Anthropology Through the Looking Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hinsley, C.M., (1989): 'Revising and revisioning the history of archaeology: reflections on region and context', in Christenson 1989a:79-96.
- Hitchens, C., (1987): *The Elgin Marbles: Should They Be Returned to Greece?*, Chatto & Windus, London.
- Hodder, I., (1982): *Symbols in Action*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hodder, I., (1986): *Reading the Past*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hodder, I., (1988): 'Material culture texts and social change: a theoretical discussion and some archaeological examples', *Proceedings of Prehistoric Society*, 54:67-75.
- Hodder, I., (ed) (1991): *Archaeological Theory in Europe*, Routledge, London.
- Hodder, I., Shanks, M., Alexandri, A., Buchli, V., Carman, J., Last, J., Lucas, G., (eds) (1995): *Interpreting Archaeology, Finding Meaning in the Past*, Routledge, London.
- Hoffmann, D., (1994): 'The German art museum and the history of the nation', in Sherman & Rogoff 1994a:3-21.
- Hoffmann, H., (1977): *Sexual and Asexual Pursuit: A Structuralist Approach to Greek Vase Painting*, London Royal Anthropological Institute, London.
- Hoffmann, H., (1979): 'In the wake of Beazley', *Hephaistos*, 1:61-70.
- Hoffmann, H., (1988): 'Why did Greeks need imagery?', *Hephaistos*, 9:143-162.
- Hoffmann, H., (1994): '*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*: the imagery of heroic immortality on Athenian painted vases', in Goldhill and Osborne 1994a:28-51.



- Holden, D., (1972): *Greece Without Columns: The Making of the Modern Greeks*, Faber & Faber, London.
- Hollein, H., (1991a): 'Jurors' comments', in *Acropolis*:24.
- Hollein, H., (1991b): 'O perivolos kai i megali aithousa. Mia syzitisi gia to neo mouseio tis Acropolis me ton Hans Hollein' [The "enclosure" and the "big hall". A conversation about the new Acropolis museum with Hans Hollein], *Tefchos*, 5:7-18.
- Homann-Wedeking, E., (1966): 'Ernst Buschor', *Gnomon*, 38:221-224.
- Hongjun, W., (1994): 'Museum and regional history and culture - also the first museum in the world and the origin of museum', 70-73, in *Museum and Community I*, Symposium, Beijing, China, September 1994, ISS, ICOFOM Study Series 24.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E., (1991): 'A new communication model for museums', in Kavanagh 1991:49-61.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E., (1992): *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*, Routledge, London.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E., (ed) (1995): *Museum, Media, Message*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Hornblower, S., (1994): 'Preface', in Osborne & Hornblower 1994:v.
- Horne, D., (1984): *The Great Museum: The Re-presentation of History*. London: Pluto Press.
- Horne, D., (1992): ' "Reading" Museums', 62-74, in Boylan, P., (ed): *Museum 2000: Politics, People, Professionals and Profit*, Routledge, London.
- Hourmouziadis, G., (1970): 'Stoicheia pneumatikis zois tou neolithikou anthropou stin Ellada' [Evidence for the Neolithic man's spiritual life in Greece], 80-86, in *Historia tou Ellinikou Ethnous*, Vol.A, Ekdotiki Athinon.
- Hourmouziadis, G., (1976): 'Mouseio Volou' [Museum of Volos], *AAA*, IX, 1:1-13.
- Hourmouziadis, G., (1980): 'Mouseio: scholeio i naos?' [Museum: school or temple?], *ThChT*, 38-42.
- Hourmouziadis, G., (1984): 'Scholia stin Elliniki mouseiologia' [Comments on Greek museology], *Epistimoniki Skepsi*, 18:15-20.
- Hourmouziadis, G., (1985): 'Gia ta Ellinika mouseia' [About the Greek museums], *Epistimoniki Skepsi*, 21:71-72.
- Hourmouziadis, G., (1987): 'Ta Mouseia sti synchroni koinonia' [The Museums in modern society], 167-171, in TAP (ed) (1987): *Ergo kai Leitourgia Mias Ypiresias Gia tin Prostatia ton Mnimeion Simera*, [Work and Operation of a Service for the Protection of Historical Monuments in the Present], Ektakto Synedrio Syllogou Ellinon Archaialogon gia ton Organismo tis Archaialogikis Ypiresias (9-13/3/84), Athens.
- Hourmouziadis, G., Asimakopoulou-Atzaka, I. & Makris, K.A., (eds) (1982), *The Story of a Civilization / Magnesia*, Kapon, Athens.
- Howard, S., (1990): *Antiquity Restored, Essays on the Afterlife of the Antique*, IRSA, Vienna.
- Howard, S., (1991): 'Ancient busts and the Cavaceppi and Albacini casts', *JHC*, 3, 2:199-218.
- Hudson, K., (1987): *Museums of Influence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hughes, R. (1993): 'The Masterpiece road show', *Time*, 48.
- Humbert, J.M., (1995): 'Ägyptomanie, la déclinaison viennoise', *Musées et Collections Publiques de France*, No.209, 4:42-45.
- Humphreys, S.C., (1995): 'Women's stories', in Reeder 1995a:102-110.



## II

- Iakovidis, S., (1992): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:57-58.
- Iatrides, J., (ed) (1981): *Greece in the 1940s: a Nation in Crisis*, University Press of New England, Hanover, New Hampshire.
- ICOM Code of Professional Ethics, 1986.
- Ignatiou, M., (1992a): 'Ena "trito elliniko thauma" archise stis IPA' [A third Greek Miracle started in USA], *Ethnos*, 18/11/92.
- Ignatiou, M., (1992b): 'Anthellinismos apo tous *Times* gia to thauma' [Anti-hellenism from *The Times* regarding the "Greek Miracle" Exhibition], *Ethnos*, 23/11/92:35.
- Impey, O. & MacGregor, A., (1985): *The Origins of Museums*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Ioannides, A., (1988): 'Klasiki archaiotita kai fasismos', [Classical antiquity and fascism], *Archaiologia*, 27:16-21.
- Iser, W., (1974): *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*, trans C.Masksey and R.Macksey, John Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

## II

- Jacob, C. (1986): 'Voyages dans le musée: itinéraire archéologique dans la culture grecque', in Davallon 1986a:23-41.
- Jenkins, I., (1988): 'Adam Buck and the vogue for Greek Vases', *Burlington Magazine*, 130 (June):448-457.
- Jenkins, I., (1992): *Archaeologists and Aesthetes, in the Sculpture Galleries of the British Museum 1800-1939*, British Museum Press, London.
- Jenkins, I. & Sloan, K., (eds) (1996): *Vases and Volcanoes. Sir William Hamilton and his Collection*, The Trustees of the British Museum, British Museum Press, London.
- Jenkyns, R., (1991): *Dignity and decadence; Victorian Art and the Classical Inheritance*, Harper Collins Publishers, London.
- Jenkyns, R., (1996): 'Bernal and the nineteenth century', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:411-420.
- Johnson, N., (ed) (1993): *Reflecting Cities*, The Museum of London, London.
- Johnson, N., (ed) (1995): 'Discovering the city', *MI*, 187, No.3:4-6.
- Jones, M., (ed) (1990): *Fake? The Art of Deception*, Exhibition Catalogue, British Museum Publications, London.
- Jones, S., (1996): 'Discourses of identity in the interpretation of the past', in Graves-Brown et al 1996:62-80.

- Jones, S. & Graves-Brown, P., (1996): 'Introduction. Archaeology and cultural identity in Europe', in Graves-Brown et al 1996:1-24.
- Just, R. (1989): 'Triumph of the ethnos. History and ethnicity', 71-88, in Tonkin, E., McDonald, M. et al., (ed) (1989): *History and Ethnicity*, Routledge, London.
- # K
- Kakaounakis, N., (1979): 'Dothike anastoli sti fugadeusi ton archaiotiton' [The government cooled-off the exportation of the antiquities], *To Vima*, 1/3/78:1, 5.
- Kakridis, F., (1996): 'I Germaniki diacheirisi tis Ellinikis klironomias' [The German management of Hellenic heritage], in Chrysos 1996a:25-40.
- Kakridis, I.Th., (1987): 'O Christos Karouzos os philologos' [Christos Karouzos as philologist], *NE*, 1987:1142-1143.
- Kallegia, A., (1993): *Olympia*, Giannikos & Kaldis, Athens.
- Kalligas, M., (1948): 'To anoigma tou Ethnikou Archaialogikou mouseiou' [The opening of the National Archaeological museum], *To Vima*, 15/1/48:2.
- Kalligas, M., (1952): 'O daneismos archaiotiton dia tin ekthesi ellinikis technis eis Amerikin' [The loan of antiquities for the exhibition of Greek art in America], *To Vima*, 13/4/52:3.
- Kalligas, M., (1962): 'Ta mouseia stin epochi mas' [The museums in the modern world], *To Vima*, 16/9/62:5.
- Kalligas, P., (1991): 'The new Acropolis museum', in *Acropolis*:9-10.
- Kalogeras, N., (1991): 'Jurors' comments', in *Acropolis*:26.
- Kalogeras, N., Papalexopoulos, D., (1992): 'Apo to eniaio mi ktirio sto pantachou paron ktirio' [From the non-building to the omnipresent one], *ThChT*, 23:71-75.
- Kalogeropoulou, A., (1987a): 'O Christos Karouzos upodeigma ithous kai anthropias' [Christos Karouzos as example of ethos and humanity], *NE*, 1987:1121-1123.
- Kalogeropoulou, A., (1987b): 'To ugro stoicheio stin Istoria kai ton politismo tis Elladas' [The sea in the history and civilisation of Greece], *I Kathimerini*, 10/11/87.
- Kalpaxis, T., (1990): *Archaiologia kai Politiki I, Samiaka Archaialogika 1850-1914* [Archaeology and Politics I, Samian Archaeology 1850-1914], Crete University Press, Rethymno.
- Kalpaxis, T., (1993): 'Klassiki archaiologia sto panepistimio tis Kritis' [Classical archaeology in the university of Crete], *Archaiologia*, 46:38-40.
- Kalpaxis, Th., (1996): 'Epirroes tis Gallogermanikis antiparathesis tou 19ou aiona stin kataskeui tis eikonas tis archaias Elladas' [The influence of the Gallo-Germanic conflict in the 19<sup>th</sup> century on the formation of the image of Ancient Greece], in Chrysos 1996a:41-58.
- Kandyli, G., (1989): 'Cultural olympics. A form of interview', in *Mind and Body* 1:42.
- Kaplan, F.E.S., (ed) (1994): *Museums and the Making of "Ourselves", The Role of Objects in National Identity*, Leicester University Press, London & New York.
- Karagiorga, T., (1992): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:59-61.



- Karakasidou, A.N., (1994): 'Sacred scholars, profane advocates. Intellectuals molding national consciousness in Greece', *Identities*, 1(1):35-61.
- Kardulias, N., (ed) (1994a): *Beyond the Site: Regional Studies in the Aegean Area*, University Press of America, Lanham, MD.
- Kardulias, N., (1994b): 'Preface', in Kardulias 1994a:xix-xxvii.
- Kardulias, N., (1994c): 'Paradigms of the past in Greek archaeology', in Kardulias 1994a:1-23.
- Kardulias, N., (1994d): 'Towards an anthropological historical archaeology in Greece', *Historical Archaeology*, 28 (3):39-55.
- Karouzos, Ch., (1926): 'Ta eparchiaka mouseia' [The regional museums], *Laiki Phoni Volou*, 24-26 April 1926.
- Karouzos, Ch., (1966): 'K.A.Romaïos', *NE*, 940, 1/9/1966:3-5.
- Karouzos, Ch., (1981): *Archaia Techni* [Ancient Art], Ermis, Athens.
- Karouzos, Ch., (1989): 'Christos Tsountas', *Mentor*, 15-18.
- Karouzos, Ch., (1995): *Mikra Keimena* [Short Essays], ed. by Petrakos, V., Athens Archaeological Society, No.149., Athens.
- Karouzou, S., (1956): 'I nea aithousa tou ethnïkou mouseïou' [The new gallery of the national museum], *NE*, 59, 695:849-855.
- Karouzou, S., (1957): 'Oi archaioteroi ellinikoi politismoï' [The oldest Greek civilizations], *NE*, 62, 723:1203-1205.
- Karouzou, S., (1967): *Ethnikon Archaïologikon Mouseion, Syllogi Glypton* [National Archaeological Museum. Sculpture Collection], General Direction of Antiquities and Restorations, no.13, Athens.
- Karouzou, S., (1977a): 'O ekpatriismos ton archaïon kallitechnimaton...' [The expatriation of ancient artworks...], *To Vima*, 29/5/77:4.
- Karouzou, S., (1977b): 'Yvris, proskynisi kai xepoulima' [Blasphemy, submission and sell-out], *To Vima*, 21/7/77:4.
- Karouzou, S., (1978): 'To xerizoma ton ergon' [The up-rooting of the artworks], *To Vima*, 22/12/78:7.
- Karouzou, S., (1982): *Ethniko Mouseio. Genikos Odigos* [National Museum. General Guide], Ekdotike Athinon, Athens.
- Karouzou, S., (1983): *Peripatoi stin Italia* [Promenades in Italia], Ermis, Athens.
- Karouzou, S., (1984a): 'Viomata kai mnimosina' [Experiences and commemorations], *Horos*, 2:1-61.
- Karouzou, S., (1984b): 'To ethnïko mouseio apo to 1941' [The national museum since 1941], in *Proceedings* 1984:52-63.
- Karp, I. (1991): 'Culture and representation', in Karp & Lavine 1991:14-15.
- Karp, I., Kreamer, C.M., Lavine, S.D., (eds) (1992): *Museums and Communities. The Politics of Public Culture*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington and London.
- Karp, I., Lavine, S.D., (eds) (1991): *Exhibiting Cultures. The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington and London.
- Karp, I., Wilson, F., (1996): 'Constructing the spectacle of culture in museums', in Greenberg & Ferguson, & Nairne 1996:251-267.

- Katimertzi, P., (1982): 'Ta mouseia mas einai gia to ... mouseio! Den noiazontai gia tin pliroforisi kai to plisiasma tou koinou' [Our museums are for ... the museum. They don't inform nor approach the public], *I Aygi*, 7/2/82:5.
- Katimertzi, P., (1986): 'I elliniki prosfora stin politistiki poli tis Florentias' [The Greek contribution to Florence cultural capital], *I Aygi*, 14/9/86:23.
- Katimertzi, P., (1987): 'Ena mouseio gia tin techni tis Ionias' [A museum for the Ionian art], *I Aygi*, 27/6/1987:11.
- Katimertzi, P., (1988a): 'To "filokaloumen met'euteleias" sti chora tis afthonias' [The "appreciating even the less worthy" in the country of affluence], *I Aygi*, 24/1/88:19.
- Katimertzi, P., (1988b): 'To anexichniasto chamogelo tou Thesea' [The inscrutable smile of Theseus], *I Aygi*, 31/1/88:19.
- Katimertzi, P., (1989a): 'Diethnes endiaferon gia tin ekthesi Pneuma kai Soma' [International interest for the exhibition The Mind and the Body], *Ta Nea*, 8/6/89.
- Katimertzi, P., (1989b): 'Archaio pneuma athanato' [Ancient immortal spirit], *Ta Nea*, 16/5/89:6.
- Katimertzi, P., (1989c): 'Ethnos erotikon' [Nation of love], *Ta Nea*, 31/10/89:29.
- Katimertzi, P., (1992a): 'Kai o Pheidias sti IPA' [Even Pheidias will go to the USA], *Ta Nea*, 11/2/92.
- Katimertzi, P., (1992b): 'O Galloi epistrefoun sto kentro tou kosmou' [The French return to the centre of the world], *Ta Nea*, 11/9/92:35.
- Katsounaki, M., & Vatopoulos, N., (1993): 'O meteoros politismos tou 1992' [The dangling civilisation of 1992], *I Kathimerini*, 3/1/93:14.
- Katz, M.A., (1995): 'Ideology and "the status of women" in ancient Greece', in Hawley & Levick 1995:21-43.
- Kavanagh, G., (ed) (1991): *Museum Languages: Objects and Texts*, Leicester University Press, Leicester.
- Kavanagh, G., (ed) (1996a): *Making Histories in Museums*, Leicester University Press, London.
- Kavanagh, G., (1996b): 'Preface', in Kavanagh 1996a:xi-xiv.
- Kennedy, G.A., (1994): 'Shifting visions of classical paradigms: The "same" and the "other"', *IJCT*, Vol.1(1):7-16.
- Kentley, E., & Negus, D., (1989): *Writing on the Wall, A Guide for Presenting Exhibition Text*, National Maritime Museum, London.
- Keuls, E.C., (1985): *The Reign of the Phallus. Sexual Politics in Ancient Athens*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Kidd, B., (1984): 'The myth of the ancient games', in Tomlinson & Whannel 1984:71-83.
- Kilian, M., (1988): 'From Greece with love', *Chicago Tribune*, 4/2/88.
- Kiosse, Ch., (1990): 'Deirotomitheis sidiro' [The beheaded], *To Vima*, 4/11/90:28.
- Kiosse, Ch., (1991): 'Thysia i poini o apo kefalismos?' [Sacrifice or punishment the decapitation?], *To Vima*, 1/9/91:34.
- Kiosse, Ch., (1992a): 'Ektheseis mias allis poioutas' [Exhibition of another quality], *To Vima*, 9/2/92.



- Kiosse, Ch., (1992b): 'To xroniko tis megalis anaskafis' [The chronicle of the Great Excavation], *To Vima*, 20/9/92:B12/20.
- Kiosse, Ch., (1994a): 'Oi archaioi nekroi pou ... miloun' [The ancient deceased who ... talk], *To Vima*, 13/2/94:21.
- Kiosse, Ch., (1994b): 'To mouseio tis diplanis portas' [The next door museum], *To Vima*, 17/4/1994:G.24.
- Kitroeff, A., (1990): 'Continuity and change in contemporary Greek historiography', in Blinkhorn & Veremis 1990:143-172.
- Kitromilides, P.M., (1985a): 'The last battle of the ancients and moderns: ancient Greece and modern Europe in the neohellenic revival', *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*, 1:79-91.
- Kitromilides, P.M., (1985b): 'The model of Athenian democracy as a political ideal in the post-classical era', 15-25, in (1985): *Democracy and Classical Culture, Exhibition Catalogue*, National Archaeological Museum, 21/6-20/10/85, Athens.
- Kitromilides, P.M., (1990): 'Imagined communities and the origins of the national question in the Balkans' in Blinkhorn & Veremis 1990:23-66.
- Kitromilides, P.M., (1991): 'O Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos kai i istoriki suneidisi tou Ellinismou' [K.Paparrigopoulos and the historical consciousness of Hellenism], *To Vima*, 27/10/91:38.
- Knapp, A.B., (1992): 'Archaeology and *Annales*: time, space and change', 1-21, in Knapp, A.B., (ed) (1992): *Archaeology, Annales and Ethnohistory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Knigge, U., (1983): 'Kerameikos: Oi ergasies tou Germanikou Archaialogikou Institutou' [Kerameikos and the German Archaeological Institute], *Archaiologia*, 6:25-31.
- Knigge, U., (1990): *O Kerameikos tis Athinas, Istoria - Mnimeia - Anaskafes* [Kerameikos of Athens, History - Monuments - Excavations], Krini, Athens.
- Kofos, E., (1990): 'National heritage and national identity in nineteenth and twentieth century Macedonia', in Blinkhorn & Veremis 1990:103-141.
- Kofos, E., (1992): 'The Macedonian question in our time', in Sakellariou 1992a:502-509.
- Kohl, P.L. & Fawcett, C., (eds) (1995a): *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kohl, P.L. & Fawcett, C., (1995b): 'Archaeology in the service of the state: theoretical considerations', in Kohl & Fawcett 1995a:3-18.
- Kokkinis, S., (1979): *Ta Mouseia tis Ellados* [The Museums of Greece], Estia, Athens.
- Kokkorou-Aleura, G., (1990): *I Techni tis Arxaias Elladas* [The art of Ancient Greece], Kardamitsas, Athens.
- Kokkou, A., (1977): *I Merimna Gia tis Archaiotites stin Ellada kai ta Protia Mouseia* [The Care for Antiquities in Greece and the First Museums], Ermis, Athens.
- Koltsaki, Z., (1978): 'Oi thisauroi tis Verginas stin Ameriki' [The treasures of Vergina in America], *To Vima*, 5/11/78:14.
- Kondaratos, S., (1992): 'I atychis ekbasi tou diagonismou kai oi euthunes agonotheiti kai kriton' [The unfortunate outcome of the competition and the responsibilities of both the Ministry and Jury], *ThChT*, 23:78-79.
- Konstantinopoulos, G., (1989a): 'Xethavontas and thavontas to parelthon mas (1)' [Unearthening and burying our past (1)], *Anti*, 398:50-52, and 399 (for part B'):46-49.



- Konstantinopoulos, G., (1989b): 'Xethavontas and thavontas to parelthon mas (2)' [Unearthing and burying our past (2)], *Anti*, 399:46-49.
- Konstantinou, I., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 8/12/78:3.
- Konstantios, D., (1988): 'Peri archaiologikon sundromon' [On archaeological syndromes], *Anti*, 368:54-55.
- Kontis, I., (1964): 'I prostasia ton mnimeion apo xthes mexri simera' [The protection of monuments from yesterday to today], *To Vima*, 7/7/64:3.
- Kontoleon, N., (1975a): 'I Archaiologiki Ypiresia kai ta provlimata tis (1)' [The Archaeological Service and its problems (1)], *To Vima*, 9/1/75:4.
- Kontoleon, N., (1975b): 'I Archaiologiki Ypiresia kai ta provlimata tis (2)' [The Archaeological Service and its problems (2)], *To Vima*, 10/1/75:4.
- Kontoleon, N., (1984): *Anaskafai-Archaiologia kai Archaia Techni* [Excavations-Archaeology and Ancient Art], Horos, I Mikri Bibliothiki, Athens, (1st edition in 1973).
- Kordomenidis, G., (1982): *Ta Mouseia tis Thessalonikis* [The Museums of Thessaloniki], Thessaloniki.
- Korres, M., (1989): *Meleti Apokatastaseos tou Parthenonos* [Study for the Restoration of the Parthenon], vol.2b, Ministry of Culture, Committee for the Conservation of the Acropolis Monuments, Athens.
- Korres, M., (1992): 'O tropos ekthesis ton archaion sto neo Mouseio' [Exhibiting the antiquities in the New Acropolis Museum], *ThChT*, 23:76-78.
- Korres, M., (1994): 'The restoration of the Parthenon', in Economakis 1994:110-149.
- Korres, M., Bouras, Ch., (1983): *Meleti Apokatastaseos tou Parthenonos* [Study for the Restoration of the Parthenon], Ministry of Culture, Committee for the Conservation of the Acropolis Monuments, Athens.
- Korres, M., Toganidis, N., Zambas, K., Skoulikidis, Th, (eds) (1989): *Study for the Restoration of the Parthenon*, vol.2a, Ministry of Culture, Committee for the Conservation of the Acropolis Monuments, Athens.
- Kotionis, Z., (1994): 'Mia "thrausmatiki" afigisi kato apo tin Akropoli' [A "fragmental" narration on the slopes of the Acropolis], *I Kathimerini*, 16/10/1994:13-15.
- Kotsakis, K., (1991): 'The powerful past: theoretical trends in Greek archaeology', in Hodder 1991:65-90.
- Kotsakis, K., (1993): 'Archaiologiki Ypiresia kai panepistimio Thessalonikis' [Archaeological Service and the university of Thessaloniki], *Archaiologia*, 46:41-44.
- Kotsakis, K., (1994): 'Poios fovatai tin ereuna' [Who is fearing the research], *To Vima*, 14/8/94:B2/B3, 22-23.
- Koumanoudis, S., (1984): *I Elliniki Archaiologia* [Greek Archaeology], Keimena, Athens.
- Kounenakis, P., (1979): 'Politistikes proektaseis tis ekthesis sti N.Yorki' [The cultural dimensions of the exhibition in New York], *I Aygi*, 1/11/79:4.
- Kounenakis, P., (1980a): 'Poios egguatai gia tin asphaleia ton eurimaton tis Verginas?' [Who guarantees for the safety of the Vergina finds?], *I Aygi*, 11/5/80:4.
- Kounenakis, P., (1980b): "Duo chronia tha periodeuei o "M.Alexandros" stis IPA" [Two years the exhibitions of Alexander the Great will be touring in the USA], *I Aygi*, 15/11/80:4.



- Kounenakis, P., (1980c): 'Politikoi oi logoi tis periodeias tou M.Alexandrou stin Ameriki' [The reasons of the Alexander the Great exhibition's touring in the USA are political], *I Aygi*, 23/11/80:4.
- Kounenakis, P., (1981): 'ESSD kai IPA thaumazoun ta ellinika archaia' [The USSR and the USA admire the Greek antiquities], *I Aygi*, 22/4/81:4.
- Kourou, N., (1994): 'Diamesogeiaiko kai diachroniko tmima' [Cross-Mediterranean and diachronic section], in *Diamesogeiaiko kai Diachroniko Tmima, Didaktikes Sylloges Kerameikis*, Tomea Archaiologias Panepistimiou Athinon, unpublished catalogue.
- Kourvetaris, Y. A., Dobratz, B. A. (1987): *A Profile of Modern Greece in Search for Identity*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kranioti, L., (1984): 'Strymi, mia thasitiki apoikia' [Strymi, a Thacian colony], *Archaiologia*, 13:65-70.
- Krauss, R.E., (1989): 'Retaining the original? The state of the question', 7-11, in *Retaining the Original; Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, Symposium Papers VII, Studies in the history of Art, Vol.20, National Gallery of Art, Washington.
- Kristiansen, K., (1993): '“The strength of the past and its great might”; an essay on the use of the past', *JEA*, Vol. 1, 1:3-32.
- Kristiansen, K., (1996): 'European origins - “civilisation” and “barbarism”', in Graves-Brown et al 1996:138-144.
- Kunze, E., (1981): 'Christos Karouzos', in Karouzos 1981:xi-xxxi.
- Kurtz, D.C., (1975): *Athenian White Lekythoi*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kurtz, D.C., (ed) (1985): *Beazley and Oxford*, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Monograph Number 10, Oxford.
- Kurtz, D.C., (ed) (1989): *Greek Vases, Lectures by J.D.Beazley*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kurtz, D.C., Beazley, J., (1983): *The Berlin Painter*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kyle, D.G., (1987): *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, E.J.Brill, Leiden.
- Kyrieleis, H., (1993): 'The Heraion at Samos', in Marinatos & Hägg 1993:125-153.
- Kücker, W., (1991): 'Jurors' comments', in *Acropolis*:21.

IL

- La Société du Palais de la Civilisation. Marché Bonsecours (1993): *La Civilisation Grecque. Macédoine Royaume d'Alexandre le Grand*, Marché Bonsecours.
- Laberge, C., (1995): 'Egyptomania, réflexions d'un architecte-muséographe', *Musées et Collections Publiques de France*, No.209, 4: 30-33.
- Ladas, P., (1986): 'Le commerce des biens culturels en droit privé hellénique', *Revue Internationale de Droit Comparé*, No special, Vol.8., 407-419, Journées de la Société de législation Comparée, 3es Journées Juridiques Franco-Helléniques, Thessalonique 1-4/10/86.
- Lambraki-Plaka, M., (1989): 'To pneuma i/kai to soma' [The mind and/or the body], *To Vima*, 21/5/89:57.

- Lambrakis, C., (1953): 'Sovaroï kindynoi gia tous thisaïrous tis Acropolis' [Serious perils for the treasures of Acropolis], *To Vima*, 9/8/53:3.
- Lambrinoudakis, V., (1992a): 'Archaia ellinika erga sto exoteriko' [Ancient Greek objects abroad], *To Vima*, 22/3/92:30.
- Lambrinoudakis, V., (1992b): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:43-51.
- Lambrinoudakis, V., (1993): 'I ekpaideusi tou epistimonikou prosopikou tis Archaïologikis Ypiresias, I periptosi ton soudon archaiologias sto panepistimio Athinon' [Studies in archaeology in Athens university], *Archaïologia*, 46:35-37.
- Lamien, E., (1990): 'Eros dans tous ses ébats', *Gai Pied*, 4-11/1/90:61-63.
- Langer, E.J., (1993): 'A mindful education', *Educational Psychologist*, 28(1):43-50.
- Langlotz, E., (1954): 'I nea ekthesis ton archaiotiton eis to ethnikon mouseion ton Athinon' [The new display of antiquities in the national museum at Athens], *To Vima*, 21/2/54:3, 6.
- Laurier, M., (1993): 'Onze siècles d'histoire étalés sous nos yeux', *Le Devoir*, 7/5/93:B10
- Lavine, S.D., Karp, I., (1991): 'Introduction. Museums and multiculturalism', in Karp & Lavine 1991:1-9.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., (1986): *Women in Greek Myth*, Duckworth, London.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., (1992): 'Not out of Africa', *The New Republic*, 10/2/92:29-36.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., (1993): 'Ethnocentric history from Aristobulus to Bernal', *Academic Questions*, Vol.6(2):12-20.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., (1996): 'Ancient history, modern myths', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:3-23.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., (1997): 'Poioi polemoun tin klassiki Ellada' [Who oppose to classical Greece], *To Vima*, 13/7/97:30.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., Fant, M.B., (1982): *Women's Life in Greece and Rome*, Duckworth, London.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., & MacLean Rogers, G., (eds) (1996a): *Black Athena Revisited*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill & London.
- Lefkowitz, M.R., & MacLean Rogers, G., (1996b): 'Preface', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:ix-xiv.
- Leigh Fermor, P., (1966): *Roumeli: Travels in Northern Greece*. Harper & Row, New York.
- Lembruck, M., (1974): 'Phychology:perception and behaviour', *Museum*, 26, iii-iv:191-204.
- Lemos, I., (1992): Personal communication in the museum of cycladic art, on 2/11/1992.
- Leontis, A., (1990): 'Minor field, major territories: dilemmas in modernizing Hellenism', *JMGS*, Vol.8:35-63.
- Leontis, A.S., (1991): *Territories of Hellenism: Neohellenic Modernism, Nationalism and the Classical Tradition*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, The Ohio State University.
- Lepace, J., (1993): 'Alexandre le Grand et la Macédoine. La dernière exposition du genre à Montréal?', *La Press*, 8/5/93:E12.
- Levi, P., (1986): 'Beazley and Oxford, a review', *Oxford*, Vol.38, no.2:66-69.
- Levi-Strauss, C., (1972), *Structural Anthropology*, Penguin Press, Allen Lane, London.
- Lipe, W., (1984): 'Value and meaning in cultural resources', in Cleere 1984a:1-11.



- Lissarague, F. & Thelamon, F., (eds) (1983): *Image et Céramique Grecque*, Université de Rouen, Rouen.
- Lissarrague, F., (1990): *The Aesthetics of the Greek Banquet*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Liverani, M., (1996): 'The bathwater and the baby', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:421-427.
- Longworth, I., (1994): 'Museums and archaeology: coping with the chimaera"', 1-8, in Gaimster, D., (ed): *Museum Archaeology in Europe, Proceedings of a Conference Held at the British Museum 15-17 October 1992*, The Museum Archaeologist 19, Oxbow Monograph 39.
- Lord, L.E., (1947): *A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1882-1942: An Intercollegiate Project*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Loughbrough, B., (1992): 'Local authority museums and galleries', in Thompson et al 1992:101-111.
- Lowenthal, D., (1985): *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lowenthal, D., (1988): 'Classical antiquities as national and global heritage', *Antiquity* 62:726-35.
- Luginbuhl, Y., (1992): 'Heritage landscape - definition and identification. The work of the council of Europe specialist group', in *Management of Public Access to the Heritage Landscape*, Architectural Heritage, No.24, Council of Europe.
- Lullies, R. & Hirmer, M., (1957): *Greek Sculpture*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Lumley, R., (ed) (1988): *The Museum Time Machine*, Comedia/Routledge, London.
- Lydakis, St., (1964): 'Archaia mnimeia kai morphosi' [Ancient monuments and education], *To Vima*, 17/11/64:2.

M
---

- MacConnell, B.E., (1989): 'Mediterranean archaeology and modern nationalism: a preface', *Revue des Archeologues et Historiens d'Art de Louvain*, 22:107-113.
- Macdonald, S., (1996): 'Theorizing museums: an introduction', in Macdonald & Fyfe:1-18.
- Macdonald, S., Fyfe, G., (eds) (1996): *Theorizing Museums*, Blackwell / The Sociological Review, Oxford.
- MacDonnell, D., (1986): *Theories of Discourse. An Introduction*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- MacLean Rogers, G., (1996): 'Multiculturalism and the foundations of western civilization', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:428-443.
- Makken, B., (1987): 'Griekenland toont kunst van de zee', *De Standaard*, 19/11/87.
- Malakasioti, Z., (1987): *Archaeological Museum of Volos*, Ministry of Culture, TAP, Athens.
- Malakasioti, Z., (1990): 'To Archaialogiko Mouseio tou Volou' [The Archaeological Museum of Volos], *Archaiologia*, 34:109-111.
- Malina, J., & Vasicek, Z., (1990): *Archaeology Yesterday and Today*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Mallouchou-Tufano, F., (1994a): 'The Parthenon from Cyriacus of Ancona to Frederic Boissonas: description, research and depiction', in Tournikiotis 1994:162-199.
- Mallouchou-Tufano, F., (1994b): 'The history of interventions on the Acropolis', in Economakis 1994:69-85.
- Maniatakos, G., (1954): 'I vradeia anasygrotisis ton mouseion vlaptei tin anaptyxi tou tourismou' [The slow-reorganisation of the museums hampers the touristic development], *To Vima*, 19/5/54:3.
- Mantas, G., (1977): 'Mouseio gia olo ton lao' [Museum for all the people], *I Aygi*, 3/9/77:4.
- Mantzoulinou, A., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 6/12/78.
- Maranda, L., (1991): 'Untitled', 69-72, in *The Language of Exhibitions*, Symposium, Basic Papers, Vevey Switzerland, October 1991, ICOM, ICOFOM.
- Marangou, L., (1985): *Archaia Elliniki Techni, Syllogi N.P.Goulandri* [Ancient Greek Art, N.P.Goulandris' collection], N.P.Goulandris Foundation-Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, Athens.
- Marangou, L., (1987): 'Christos Karouzos', *NE* 1987:1124-1130.
- Marangou, L., (1991): *To Idryma N.P.Goulandri, Apo tin idiotiki syllogi sto Mouseio Kukladikis Technis*, [N.P.Goulandris' Foundation, From the private collection to the Museum of Cycladic Art], N.P.Goulandris Foundation-Museum of Cycladic and Ancient Greek Art, Athens.
- Marchand, J., (1990): 'The Oikoi I', in Miller 1990a:117-127.
- Marcq, M., (1990): 'Dans les boudoirs de l'Eros Grec et des objets interdits africains', *La Voix du Nord*, 14/1/90.
- Marinatos, N. & Hägg, R., (eds) (1993): *Greek Sanctuaries, New Approaches*, Routledge, London.
- Maroevic, I., (1983): 'The museum item- source and carrier of information', *Informatologia Yugoslavica*, 151-3:237-248.
- Maroevic, I., (1995): 'The museum message: between the document and information', in Hooper-Greenhill 1995:24-36.
- Marquardt, W., & Crumley, C., (1987): 'Theoretical issues in the analysis of spatial patterning', 1-18, in Marquardt, W., & Crumley, C.,(eds): *Regional Dynamics: Burgundian Landscapes in Historical Perspective*, Academic Press, Orlando.
- Martos, D., (1993): *To Zitima tis Epistrofis ton Archaioiton, Apo ton Elginismo stin Anasugkrotisi tou Istorikou Chorou tou Ellinismou* [The Issue of the Repatriation of Antiquities. From the Elginism to the Reconstruction of the Historic Space of Hellenism], Gordios, Athens.
- Mathaiou, A., (1984): 'I Iera Odos, to archaiologiko provlima kai oi archaiologoi ton Athinon' [The Sacred Way, the archaeological problem and the archaeologists of Athens], *Anti*, 262:42-45.
- Mathaiou, A., (1987): 'Stephanos N. Koumanoudis', *Horos*, 5:913.
- Mayer, C., (1994): "'We have these ways of seeing....'", *MR*, 1(1):31-41.
- Mayer, C., (1995): *Metaphors and Ways of Seeing: A Study of the Permanent Exhibition*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Leicester, Dept. of Museum Studies, Leicester.



- McManus, P., (1989): 'Oh, yes they do: how museum visitors read labels and interact with exhibit texts', *Curator*, 32(3):174-189.
- McManus, P., (ed) (1996): *Archaeological Displays and the Public. Museology and Interpretation*, Institute of Archaeology, University College London, London.
- McNally, S., (1985): 'Art History and Archaeology', 1-21, in Wilkie N.C. & Coulson, W.D.E., (eds): *Contributions to Aegean Archaeology: Studies Presented to William A. McDonald*, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- McNeal, R.A., (1991): 'Archaeology and the destruction of the later Athenian Acropolis', *Antiquity*, 65:49-63.
- Meltzer, D.J., (1981): 'Ideology and material culture', 113-125, in Gould, R.A., Schiffer, M.B., (eds) (1981): *Modern Material Culture, the Archaeology of Us*, Academic Press, New York.
- Mercouri, M., (1985a): 'Untitled' in *Democracy*:7.
- Mercouri, M., (1985b): 'Untitled' in *Troia*:5.
- Mercouri, M., (1985c): 'Untitled' in *Greece and the Sea 1*:5.
- Mercouri, M., (1986): 'Untitled', in *Myth/Logos*:9.
- Mercouri, M., (1987b): 'Untitled', in *Athens*:5.
- Mercouri, M., (1987b): 'Untitled', in *Greece and the Sea 2*:13.
- Mercouri, M., (1988): 'Untitled', *To Vima* 12/6/1988:42.
- Mercouri, M., (1989): 'Untitled' in Tzachou-Alexandri 1989:11.
- Mercouris, S., (1989): 'Prologue', in *Mind and Body 1*:12-13.
- Meredith, J., (1990): 'The Aesthetic artefact: an exploration of emotional response and taste in archaeology', *ARC*, 9, 2:208-217.
- Meritt, L.S., (1984): *History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1939-1980*, American School of Classical studies at Athens, Princeton.
- Merriman, N., (1991): *Beyond the Glass Case: the Past, the Heritage and the Public in Britain*, Leicester University Press, Leicester & London.
- Merriman, N., (1995): 'Hidden history: the Peopling of London project', *MI*, 187, No.3:12-16.
- Merriman, N., Poovaya-Smith, N., (1996): 'Making culturally diverse histories', in Kavanagh 1996a:176-187.
- Merryman, J.H., (1985): 'Thinking about the Elgin Marbles', *Michigan Law Review*, No.83:1881-1923.
- Messaris, J. (1988): 'Macedonia: The truth will prevail', *O Kosmos*, 25/8/88.
- Messaris, J. (1989): 'The gold of Macedonian Hellenism glows at the Australian museum', *O Kosmos*, 18/5/89:15.
- Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (1979): *Greek Art of the Aegean Islands*, Exhibition Catalogue, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
- Metzler, D., (1983): 'J.J. Winckelmann (1717-1768)', *Hephaistos*, 5/6:7-17.
- Middleton, V., (1994): 'Vision, strategy and corporate planning: an overview', in Harrison 1994a: 3-11.
- Mikroutsikos, Th., (1995): 'Ypourgeio politismou. Politistiki klironomia' [Ministry of Culture. Cultural heritage], *Archaiologia kai Technes*, 56:87-90.

- Miles, R., et al (1988): *The Design of Educational Exhibits*, 2nd edition, Unwin Hyman, London.
- Miliadis, I., (1957): 'Ena kainourio mouseio ginetai...' [A new museum is being created], *Architektoniki*, 3, 19-20:75.
- Miliadis, I., (1964): 'Ena mouseio gennietai' [A museum is being born], *To Vima*, 6/12/64:II/6.
- Miliadis, I., (1989): 'Pos ton nomizoun kai pos eine o archaiologos' [The archaeologist; how he is considered and how he is], *O Mentor*, 5:11-15.
- Miliadis, I., (not dated): *The Acropolis*, M.Pechlivanidis and Co Ltd, Athens.
- Miller, St.G., (1983): 'Acknowledgements', 11-12, in Cooper, F.A. & Miller, Stella.G. & Miller, St.G. & Smith, C., (eds) (1983): *The Temple of Zeus at Nemea: Perspectives and Prospects, A Guide to the Exhibition*, Benaki Museum, Athens.
- Miller, St.G., (1984): *Nemea*, American School of Classical Studies, Athens.
- Miller, St.G., (ed) (1990a): *Nemea, A Guide to the Site and Museum*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford.
- Miller, St.G., (1990b): 'Introduction', in Miller 1990a:1-12.
- Miller, St.G., (1990c): 'Epilogue', in Miller 1990a:193-194.
- Miloshevski, T., (1989): 'Source of considerable controversy', *The Advertiser*, 19/8/89.
- Ministère de la Culture de Grèce, Direction des Antiquités, Ministère de la Culture, de la Communication, des Grands Travaux et du Bicentenaire, Réunion des Musées Nationaux (1989-1990): *Eros Grec, Amour des Dieux et des Hommes*, Catalogue de l'exposition.
- Ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Éditions de la Réunions des Musées Nationaux (1979): *Mer Égée, Grèce des îles*, Catalogue de l'exposition, Paris.
- Mitsotakis, K., (1992): 'Preface', in Buitron-Oliver et al 1992:not-numbered.
- Moebius, H., (1968): 'Christos Karusos', *Gnomon*, 40:524-526.
- Montebello, de Ph., (1979): 'Foreword', in The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 1979:10-11.
- Montpetit, C., (1993): 'La Grèce antique, toujours d'actualité!', *Le Devoir*, 7/5/93.
- Morelli, G., (1897): *Della pittura italiana: Studii storico critici-Le gallerie Borghese e Doria Pamphili in Roma*. Treves, Milan.
- Morgan, C., (1990): *Athletes and Oracles; The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Morgan, C., (1993): 'The origins of pan-Hellenism', in Marinatos & Hägg 1993:18-44.
- Morison, P. (1993): 'Moved by the Greek miracle', *Financial Times*, 19/3/1993.
- Morris, I., (1987): *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City State*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Morris, I., (1989): 'Attitudes towards death in archaic Greece', *Classical Antiquity*, 8:296-320.
- Morris, I., (1992): *Death-ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*, Key themes in Ancient History, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Morris, I., (ed) (1994a): *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies*, New Directions in Archaeology, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Morris, I., (1994b): 'Archaeologies of Greece', in Morris 1994a:8-47.



Morris, I., (1994c): 'Introduction', in Morris 1994a:3-7.

Morris, S., (1995): 'From modernism to manure: perspectives on classical archaeology', *Antiquity*, 69:182-185.

Morris, S., (1996): 'The legacy of Black Athena', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:167-174.

Μοσχονά, Λ., (1977): 'Απρόσταυτοι ουσιαστικά η αρχαιολογική μας κληρονομία' [Our archaeological heritage is essentially unprotected], *Ι ΑΥΓΗ*, 10/11/77:5.

Μοσχονά, Λ., (1978): 'Οι αρχαιοτήτες δεν ανήκουν στο όμμα που κυβερνάει' [The antiquities do not belong to the government that is in force], *Ι ΑΥΓΗ*, 3/12/78:4.

Μοσσε, Γ.Λ., (1985): *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe*, Howard Fertig, New York.

Μουλιού, Μ., (in press): 'The protection of archaeological heritage in Greece. National legislation and ratified international conventions; A synopsis.', in Phelan, M. & Boylan, P., (eds): *International Protection of Cultural Property*, Kalos Kapp Press, Evanston, Illinois.

Μουζελίς, Ν.Π., (1978): *Modern Greece: Facets of Underdevelopment*, Macmillan, London.

Μυνστερμπεργερ, Β., (1994): *Collecting: An Unruly passion*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Μurray, Ο., (1994): 'Anastylosis and Historical Integrity', in Economakis 1994:212-213.

Museums Association Conference (1984).

## N

*Νέα Εστία* (1987): "Αφιερώματα στον Χρήστο Καραούζο", [Special edition for Christos Karouzos], 1444, 1/9/1987.

Νίκας, Ε., (1959): 'Το Εθνικό μουσείο' [The National museum], *Ι ΑΥΓΗ*, 18/4/59:5.

Νικολακόπουλος, Π., (1992): 'Η κριτική των κριτών' [The comments of the jurors], *ΤηχΗΤ*, 23:97-98.

Norton, R.E., (1996): 'The tyranny of Germany over Greece?', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:403-410.

## O

Ober, J., (1993): 'Introductory remarks. The Athenian revolution', in Ober & Hedrick 1993:1-3.

Ober, J., Hedrick, C.W., (eds) (1993): *The Birth of Democracy, An Exhibition Celebrating the 2500th Anniversary of Democracy*, at the National Archives, Washington, D.C., 15/6/93-2/1/94, The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, the National Archives, Washington, D.C., the Ministry of Culture of Greece, Athens.

- Oikonomaki-Brunner, Y., (1991): 'D.Pikionis: I diamorfosi enos topiou' [D.Pikionis. The landscaping of a site], *Tefchos*, 5:74-83.
- Oionoskopou, M., (1988): 'Exagogi archaiotiton' [Export of antiquities], *Anti*, 365:48-51.
- Olsen, B., (1990): 'Roland Barthes: from sign to text', in Tilley 1990a:163-205.
- Organising Committee of the Exhibition (1985): 'Democracy and classical culture', in *Democracy*:11-12.
- Orlandos, A., (1969): 'To erghon tou Kendrou Ereuvnis tis Ellinikis Laographias kata tin pendikotaetian apo tis idriseos aftou (1918-1968)' [The work of the Research Centre of Greek Folklore since its establishment (1918-1968)], *Epetiris tou Kendrou Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laographias*, 20-1:5-14.
- Osborne, H., (1968): *Aesthetics and Art Theory: An Historical Introduction*, Longmans, London.
- Osborne, R., (1985): 'The myth of propaganda and the propaganda of myth' *Hephaistos*, 4(5-6):61-70.
- Osborne, R., (1994a): 'Looking on Greek style. Does the sculpted girl speak to women too?', in Morris 1994a:81-96.
- Osborne, R., (1994b): 'Ritual, finance, politics: an account of Athenian democracy', in Osborne & Hornblower 1994:1-21.
- Osborne, R., & Hornblower, S., (eds) (1994): *Ritual, Finance, Politics*, Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Østby, E., (1993): 'Twenty-five years of research on Greek sanctuaries: a bibliography', in Marinatos & Hägg 1993:192-227.
- Owen, J., (1996): 'Making Histories from Archaeology', in Kavanagh 1996a:200-215.
- Owoc, M.A., (1989): 'Reading, writing, and the resurrection of the subject', *ARC*, 8, 2:165-174.



- Pachygianni-Kaloudi, F. & Miller, St.G. (1991): 'Mouseio Nemeas' [Museum of Nemea], *Archaiologia*, 40:89-90.
- Pagourelis, V., (1979a): 'Aeroporikos sti Gallia tha taxideusoun ta archaia' [By air will travel the antiquities to France], *To Vima*, 23/1/79:5.
- Pagourelis, V., (1979b): 'Entono to galliko endiaferon gia tis archaiotites' [The French interest in the antiquities is profound], *To Vima*, 27/4/79:5.
- Pagourelis, V., (1979c): 'Mia euprosopi parousia sto Louvro sen apotelei kai politistiki ekrixi' [A respectable presence in Louvre does not also mean a cultural explosion], *To Vima*, 2/5/79:5.
- Pagourelis, V., (1979d): 'Egkainiastike i ekthesi ellinikon archaiotiton' [The exhibition of Greek antiquities has been inaugurated], *To Vima*, 25/10/79:5.
- Pagourelis, V., (1979e): 'To Aigaio ton nision sti Nea Yorki' [The Aegean of the islands in New York], *To Vima*, 1/11/79:5.



- Pagourelis, V., (1980a): 'Dimosiotita kai episimotita gia tin ekthesi tou Alexandrou' [Publicity and formality for the exhibition of Alexander the Great], *To Vima*, 14/11/80:5.
- Pagourelis, V., (1980b): 'Politistikes antallages, oikonomikes drastiriotites kai i ethniki provoli' [Cultural exchanges, economic activities and the national promotion], *To Vima*, 22/11/80:5.
- Palaggia, O. & Palaiochrassa, L., (1990): *Katalogos Ekmageion Archaion Ellinikon kai Romaikon Glypton* [Catalogue of Plaster Casts of Ancient Greek and Roman Sculptures], University of Athens, Archaeological Museum, Athens.
- Pallas, D., (1982): 'Ellines archaiologoi. Autoi pou vriskoun kai frouroun tis rizες tou politismou mas...' [Greek Archaeologists. Those who find and guard the roots of our civilization....], *I Aygi*, 14/2/82:5.
- Pallas, D., (1987): 'Key-note speech of the president of organizing committee', 17-21, in International Council of Museums. Hellenic National Committee (ed) (1987): *Praktika A Synantisis Mouseiologias. To Mouseio sti Synchroni Koinonia, Athina, 29-31 Oktovriou 1984* [Proceedings of the 1st Meeting of Museology. The Museum in Contemporary Society, Athens, 29-31 October 1984], Athens.
- Pallas, D., (1990): 'Gia mia anadiorganosi tis Archailogikis Ypiresias' [For a re-organisation of the Archaeological Service], *I Aygi*, 19/8/90:19.
- Palter, R., (1996): 'Eighteenth-century historiography in Black Athena', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:349-402.
- Panaretou, A., (1990): 'Prologos' [Preface] in Canellopoulos 1990:7-23.
- Panofsky, I., (1939): *Studies in Iconography*, Reinhart and Winston, New York.
- Pantos, A.P., (1985): 'Ta ellinika archaiologika mouseia' [The Greek Archaeological Museums], *Horoc*, 3:179-184.
- Pantos, P., (1993): 'I Archailogiki Ypiresia sti dekaetia tou 1990' [The Greek Archaeological Service in the 1990s], *Archaiologia*, 46:11-15.
- Papacosma, S.V., (1983): 'The historical context', 30-42 in Clogg, R., (ed): *Greece in the 1980s*, Macmillan Press Ltd, London.
- Papadopoulos, S., (1986): 'To mi entyposiako eurima sto Mouseio' [The non-spectacular archaeological find in the Museum], *Anti*, 311:50-52.
- Papadopoulou, M., (1991): 'Perimenontas tous archaiokapilous' [Waiting for the looters of antiquities], *To Vima*, 9/6/91:B3/26-27.
- Papadopoulou, M., & Papagiannidou, M., (1991): 'Oi lavyrinthoi kai ... oi mitoi' [Labyrinths and Ariadne's clues], *To Vima*, 23/6/91:B12/46.
- Papageorgiou-Venetas, A., (1994): *Athens. The Ancient Heritage and the Historic Cityscape in a Modern Metropolis*. The Archaeological Society at Athens Library, No.140, Athens.
- Papagiannidou, M., (1992): "I elliniki archaiotita stis IPA" [The Greek antiquity in the USA], *To Vima*, 15/11/92:7.
- Papandreou, A., (1975): 'Emeis kai oi Archaioi', [Ourselves and the Ancients], *I Aygi*, 25/5/75:8.
- Papanoutsos, E., (1950): 'To mouseio mas' [Our Museum], *To Vima*, 7/9/50:1, 2.
- Papapanos, K., (1992): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:40-43.

- Papapostolou, I., (1992): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:20-24.
- Papathanassopoulos, G., (1991): *The Acropolis. A New Guide of the Monuments and Museum*, Krene Editions, Athens.
- Papathanassopoulos, Th., (1995): 'I aisthisi tis spatialis' [An Air-view of Akropolis], *Archaiologia*, 54:86-95.
- Papoulia, V., (1994): 'Introduction. Ancient Thrace as a historical unity', 13-33, in Papoulia et al 1994:13-33.
- Papoulia, V., Meraklis, M., Symeonidis, C., Korres, T., Hatzopoulos, K., Hidioglou, P., (eds) (1994): *Thrace, General Secretariat of the Region of East Macedonia-Thrace*, Idea Advertising-Marketing SA, Athens.
- Papoulias, C., (1991): 'Erichthoneion mouseio Acropoleos' [The Erichthoneian museum of the Acropolis], *Tefchos*, 5:55-67.
- Papoutsanis, G., (1979): 'Pos sunevisan ta gegonota tou Irakleiou' [How the incidents of Herakleio came to fore], *I Aygi*, 4/3/79:3.
- Pararas, P., (1986): 'Le Contentieux administratif de la protection des biens culturels en Droit Hellénique', *Révue Internationale de Droit Comparé*, No special., Vol.8., 307-315, Journées de la Société de législation Comparée, 3es Journées Juridiques Franco-Helléniques, Thessalonique 1-4/10/86.
- Parlas, K., (1972): 'Enas thisauros sti diathesi ton Athinaion' [A Treasure at the disposal of the Athenians], *To Vima*, 16/6/1972:4.
- Pasquier, A., (1989): 'Eros Grec. Amour des dieux et des hommes', *Le Petit Journal des Grandes Expositions*.
- Pasquier, A., (1990): 'Eros Grece. Amour des dieux et des hommes', *Archéologia*, No.253, Janvier 1990:18-27.
- Patelarou, M., (1987): 'Untitled' in *Athens*:7.
- Patsalidis, S., (1993): 'Of Grecian Woes', *Time*, 1/2/93, no.5, 6.
- Pearce, S., (1986a): 'Objects, high and low', *MJ*, 86(2):79-82.
- Pearce, S., (1986b): 'Objects as Signs and Symbols', *MJ*, (4):131-135.
- Pearce, S., (1986c): 'Thinking about things: Approaches to the study of artefacts', *MJ*, 82(2):198-201.
- Pearce, S., (1987a): 'Museology, museums and material culture: some thoughts', *International Committee for Museology Study Series*, 12.
- Pearce, S., (1987b): 'Exhibiting material culture; some thoughts on interpretation and legitimacy', *IJMMC*, 6, 181-186.
- Pearce, S., (ed) (1989): *Museum Studies in Material Culture*, Leicester University Press, Leicester & London.
- Pearce, S., (ed) (1990a): *Objects of Knowledge*, New Research in Museum Studies, An International Series, No.1, Athlone Press, London.
- Pearce, S., (1990b): *Archaeological Curatorship*, Leicester University Press, London.
- Pearce, S., (1991): 'Collecting reconsidered', in Kavanagh 1991:135-153.
- Pearce, S., (1991-2), *Museum Studies Notes*, Material Culture I & II, Leicester University, Leicester.



- Pearce, S., (1992): *Museums, Objects and Collections: A Cultural Study*, Leicester University Press, Leicester & London.
- Pearce, S., (1993): 'Towards modernist collecting: some European practices of the long term', *Nordisk Museologi*, 2:87-98.
- Pearce, S., (ed) (1994a): *Interpreting Objects and Collections*, Leicester Readers in Museum Studies, Routledge, London.
- Pearce, S., (ed) (1994b): *Museums and the Appropriation of Culture*, New Research in Museum Studies, An International Series, No.4, The Athlone Press, London & Atlantic Highlands, N.J.
- Pearce, S., (1995): *On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition*, Routledge, London.
- Pelekidis, Ch., (1994): 'The Greeks in Thrace', 98-113, in Papoulia, et al 1994:98-113.
- Pentazos, E., (1976): 'To Mouseio Komotinis' [The Museum of Komotini], *AAA*, IX, 2:180-192.
- Pentazos, E., (1977): 'Mouseio Komotinis. Epanekthetikes ergasies' [The Museum of Komotini. Re-display activities], *AAA*, X, 1:73-77.
- Pentazos, E., (1992a): 'I thesi ton Delphon stin archaia elliniki thriskeia' [Delphi and Greek Religion], *Archaiologia*, 44:41-46.
- Pentazos, E., (1992b): 'Delphi, milon tis Eridos: Stigmiotypa' [Delphi, The apple of discord: Snapshots], *Archaiologia*, 44:64-65.
- Pentazos, E., (1992c): 'To Mouseio' [The Museum], *Archaiologia*, 44:67-71.
- Pentazou, M., (1992): 'I istoria tou ierou kai tou manteiou ton Delphon' [The history of the sanctuary and the oracle of Delphi], *Archaiologia*, 44:47-50.
- Peponis, J., and Hesdin, J., (1982): 'The layout of theories in the natural history museum', *9H* 2, 3:21-5.
- Peradotto, J., (1989): 'Texts and unrefracted facts: philology, hermeneutics and semiotics', in Culham & Edmunds 1989:179-198.
- Peradotto, J., Sullivan, J.P., (eds) (1984): *Women in the Ancient World*, The Arethusa Papers, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Petrakos, V. (1982): *Dokimio gia tin Archaiologiki Nomothesia* [An essay on archaeological legislation], Athens, Ypourgeio Politismou kai Epistimon, Ministry of Culture, Athens.
- Petrakos, V., (1987a): 'Ideografia tis en Athinais archaiologikis etaireias' [Ideography of the archaeological society in Athens], *Archaiologiki Efimerida*, 25-197.
- Petrakos, V., (1987b): *I en Athinais Archaiologiki Etaireia, I Istoría ton 150 Chronon tis, 1837-1987* [The Archaeological Society in Athens; The History of 150 Years, 1837-1987], Athens.
- Petrakos, V., (1991a): 'I sumvasi' [The contract], *Mentor*, 17:114-118.
- Petrakos, V., (1991b): 'Ekthesi, daneismos kai dorea archaion' [The exhibition, loan and donation of antiquities], *Mentor*, 17:102-109.
- Petrakos, V., (1991c): 'O typos [The press], *O Mentor*, 17:134-138.
- Petrakos, V., (1992a): 'I ekthesi tis N.Yorkis tou 1939' [The exhibition of New York in 1939], *O Mentor*, 22:138-139.

- Petrakos, V., (1992b): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:25-31.
- Petrakos, V., (1992c): 'Epilogos' [Epilogue], *O Mentor*, 20:90-92.
- Petrakos, V., (1993): 'To Mouseio ekmageion' [The cast museum], *O Mentor*, 27:154-157.
- Petrakos, V., (1993): 'To neo peri archaiotiton sxedio nomou' [The new archaeological legislation], *O Mentor*, 27:159-161.
- Petrakos, V., (1994): 'Aphieroma. Ta archaia tis Ellados kata ton polemo 1940-1944' [Special issue. The antiquities of Greece during the war 1940-1944], *O Mentor*, 31:69-182.
- Petrakos, V., (1995a): *I Peripeteia tis Ellinikis Archaialogias ston Vio tou Christou Karouzou* [The Adventures of Greek Archaeology As Seen Through C.Karouzos' Life], Archaeological Society, no.150, Athens.
- Petrakos, V., (1995b): 'Scholia sti suzitisi' [Comments on the discussion], *O Mentor*, 33:1-4.
- Petrakos, V., (1995c): 'Ekthesi peri tis ellinikis archaiologias' [Report about the Greek Archaeology], *O Mentor*, 33:6-17.
- Petrakos, V., (1995d): 'Ta prosopa pou epidroun stin elliniki archaiologia' [The personalities that influence the Greek archaeology], *O Mentor*, 34:61-72.
- Petropoulos, J.A., (1978): 'The modern Greek state and the Greek past', in Vryonis 1978a:163-176.
- Petsas, F., (1983): *Delphi, Ta Mnimia kai to Mouseio* [Delphi, The Monuments and the Museum], Krini, Athens.
- Pevsner, N., (1976): *A History of Building Types*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Pfeiffer, R., (1976): *History of Classical Scholarship. From 1300 to 1850*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Phalireas, V., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 7/12/78.
- Philippidis, D., (1984): *Neoelliniki Architectoniki* [Modern Greek Architecture], Melissa, Athens.
- Philippidis, D., (1989): 'O Architekton Aris Konstantinidis' [The architect Aris Konstantinidis], *Anti*, 395:50-53.
- Philippidis, D., (1991): 'To Mouseio pou kanenas den ithele' [The Museum that nobody wanted], *Anti*, 463:58-60.
- Philippidis, D., (1992): 'Ta poleodomika tou neou Mouseiou' [The urban planning issues], *ThChT*, 23:80-84.
- Philippidis, D., (1994): 'The Parthenon as appreciated by Greek society', in Tournikiotis 1994:278-309.
- Philippopoulou-Michailidou, E., (1991): 'A competition: inception and continuation', in *Acropolis*:7-8.
- Phillipaki, B., (1979): ' "The child of antiquity", an exhibition organized by the National Museum, Athens, for the international year of the child. The exhibition contained objects from Ancient Greece which are related to children', *Museum*, Vol. XXXI, 3:200-202.
- Photiades, A.D., (1988): 'Na vlepei ti thalassa' [Let it better have a view to the sea], *To Vima*, 12/6/88:43.



- Photiadis, Th., (1985): 'Gia ta Ellinika mouseia' [About the Greek museums], *Epistimoniki Skepsi*, 21:68-71.
- Picard, O. & Pentazos, E., (eds) (1992): *La Redécouverte de Delphes*, (in French and Greek), De Boccard, Paris.
- Picard, O. et al (1992): 'Enas aionas ergasion' [A centenary of research], in Picard & Pentazos 1992:205ff.
- Picard, O., (1992): 'Delphi', *Archaiaologia*, 44:9-40.
- Pinsky, V. and Wylie. A., (eds) (1989): *Critical Traditions in Contemporary Archaeology*, New Directions in Archaeology, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Platanos, V., (1980): 'Pagosmia proti gia to Mega Alexandro' [World Premiere for Alexander the Great], *I Aygi*, 26/6/1980:4.
- Platon, N., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 7/12/78.
- Ploritis, M., (1978): 'Ta Archaia gyrologoi...' [The antiquities as peddles...], *To Vima*, 19/11/78:1,18.
- Ploritis, M., (1979): 'Irakleis kai Irakleiotas' [The people of Irakleion], *To Vima*, 4/3/79:1, 18.
- Ploritis, M., (1991): 'Olympismos kai exostrakismos. Mouseio olympiakou agonon kai ellinikis dropis' [Olympism and ostracism. The museum of olympic games and the Greek shame], *To Vima*, 14/7/91:11.
- Ploritis, M., (1992a): 'Oi feugouses' [The departing antiquities], *To Vima*, 3/5/92.
- Ploritis, M., (1992b): 'Poioi atychoun. Peri exagogis archaiotiton' [Who is unfortunate. On the exportation of antiquities], *To Vima*, 24/5/92:15.
- Ploritis, M., (1993): 'To boulouki', [The travelling troupe], *To Vima*, 17/1/93:17.
- Podro, M., (1982): *The Critical Historians of Art*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
- Politis, A., (1993): *Romantika Chronia: Ideologies kai Nootropies stin Ellada tou 1830-1880* [Romantic Years: Ideologies and Mentalities in Greece of 1830-1880], Etaireia Meletis Neou Ellinismou kai Mnimeion, Athens.
- Politopoulou, M., (1977): 'Anagkaia i susti anadiorganosi tis Archaialogikis Ypiresias' [Necessary the proper re-organization of the Archaeological Service], *I Aygi*, 1/4/77:4.
- Pollis, A., (1992): 'Greek national identity: religious minorities, rights and European norms', *JMGS*, Vol.10:171-198.
- Pollitt, J.J., (1972): *Art and Experience in Classical Greece*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pomeroy, S.B., (1975): *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*, Schocken Book, New York & London.
- Pomian, K., (1990): *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice, 1500-1800*, trans. Elizabeth Wiles-Portier, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Porter, G., (1994): *The Representation of Gender in British History Museums*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Leicester, Dept. of Museum Studies, University of Leicester. Leicester.
- Porter, G., (1996): 'Seeing through solidity: a feminist perspective on museums', in Macdonald & Fyfe 1996:105-126.
- Potts, A., (1982): 'Winckelmann's construction of history', *AH*, 5(4):377-407.

- Potts, A., (1994): *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Poulton, H., (1995): *Who are the Macedonians*, Hurst & Company, London.
- Preziosi, D., (1989): *Rethinking Art History, Meditations on a Coy Science*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
- Preziosi, D., (1992): 'The question of art history', *Critical Inquiry*, 18:363-386.
- Proceedings of the First Congress of the Association of Greek Archaeologists* (1984), 30/3-3/4/67, Athens.
- Proctor, R., (1988): 'Show traces evolution of figure in Greek Art', *The Richmond News*, 30/1/88.
- Prown, J., (1982): 'Mind in matter: an introduction to material culture theory and method', *Winterthur Portfolio* 17, 1:1-19.
- Puchner, W., (1996): 'Oi ideologikes vaseis tis epistimonikis enasxolisis me ton elliniko laiko politismo ton 19o aiona' [The ideological basis of the scientific preoccupation with the Hellenic popular culture in the 19<sup>th</sup> century], in Chrysos 1996a:247-268.

## Q

- Quenroe, E., (1987): 'Museum of cycladic and classical art', *Museum*, 154:77-81.

## R

- Rasmussen, T. & Spivey, N., (eds) (1991): *Looking at Greek Vases*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Raubitschek, A.E., (1963): 'Ernst Buschor, Necrology', *AJA*, 67:421.
- Rayias, G., (1994): 'Preface', in Elytis et al 1994:25.
- Rebeyrol, Y., (1993): "Le miracle grec", *Le Monde*, 17/3/93.
- Reeder, E.D., (ed) (1995a): *Pandora. Women in Classical Greece*, The Trustees of the Walters Art Gallery in association with Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Reeder, E.D., (1995b): 'Preface' in Reeder 1995a:7.
- Reeder, E.D., (1995c): 'Introduction. An overview' in Reeder 1995a:13-18.
- Renfrew, C., (1980): 'The great tradition versus the great divide: archaeology as anthropology?', *AJA*, 84:287-298.
- Renfrew, C., (1989): 'Comments on archaeology into the 1990s', *NAR*, 22(1):33-41.
- Renfrew, C., (1992): 'General editor's foreward', in Camp 1992:7-8.
- Renfrew, C., (1993): 'Collectors are the real looters', *Archaeology*, May-June:16-17.
- Renfrew, C., (1994): 'The identity of Europe in prehistoric archaeology', *JEA*, Vol.2, 2:153-173.



- Renfrew, C., (1996): 'Prehistory and the Identity of Europe', in Graves-Brown et al 1996:125-137.
- Rhodes, R.F., (1995): *Architecture and Meaning on the Athenian Acropolis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Rhomiopoulou, A., (1978a): *Treasures of Ancient Macedonia, Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki*. An Exhibition leaflet, Ministry of Culture and Science General Direction of Antiquities and Restoration, Athens.
- Rhomiopoulou, A., (1978b): 'Treasures of Macedonia. The exhibition of ancient metalwork in the archaeological museum of Thessaloniki', *AAA*, XI, 2:190-194.
- Rhomiopoulou, A., (1978c): 'Introduction', in *Treasures*:13-17.
- Rhomiopoulou, A., (1995): 'I nea pteryga ton romaikon glypton sto ethniko archaiologiko mouseio' [The new wing of roman sculpture in the national archaeological museum, Athens], *Archaiologia*, 56:107-108.
- Rhomiopoulou, A., (not dated): *Roman Sculpture*, Ministry of Culture, National Archaeological Museum, TAP, Athens.
- Richard, P., (1988): 'Greek figure show: art's coming of age', *The Washington Post*, 29/5/88:5H, 10H.
- Richlin, A., (1989): "'Is classics dead?'" The 1988 women's classical caucus report', in Culham & Edmunds 1989:51-65.
- Richter Sherman, C., (1981): 'Widening horizons (1890-1930)', in Richter Sherman & Holcomb 1981:27-59.
- Richter Sherman, C., Holcomb, A.M., (eds) (1981): *Women as Interpreters of the Visual Arts, 1820-1979*, Contributions in Women's Studies, No.18, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut.
- Richter, G.M.A., (1961): *The Archaic Gravestones of Attica*, Phaidon Press, London.
- Richter, G.M.A., (1968): *Korai: Archaic Greek Maidens*, Phaidon Press, London.
- Richter, G.M.A., (1970): *Kouroi: Archaic Greek Youths, A Study of the Development of the Kouros Type in Greek Sculpture*, 3rd edition, 1st edition in 1942, Phaidon Press London.
- Ridgway, B.S., (1984): *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: The Problem of the Originals*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Ridgway, B.S., (1986): 'The state of research in ancient art', *The Art Bulletin*, 68 (1):7-23.
- Ridgway, B.S., (1987): 'Ancient Greek women and art: The material evidence', *AJA*, 91(3):399-409.
- Ridgway, B.S., (1989): 'Defining the issue: The Greek period', 13-26, in *Retaining the Original: Multiple Originals, Copies and Reproductions*, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, Symposium Papers VII, Studies in the history of Art, Vol.20, National Gallery of Art, Washington.
- Ridgway, B.S., (1994): 'The study of classical sculpture at the end of the 20th Century', *AJA*, 98(4):759-772.
- Rigby, D. and Rigby, E., (1944): *Lock, Stock and Barrel: The Story of Collecting*, J.B.Lippincott, Philadelphia, PA.
- Rihll, T.E. & Tucker, J.V., (1995): 'Greek engineering. The case of Eupalinos' tunnel', 403-431, in Powell, A., (eds): *The Greek World*, Routledge, London.

- Robertson, M., (1971): 'John Davidson Beazley', *Gnomon*, 43:429-432.
- Robertson, M., (1983): *Addenda*.
- Robertson, M., (1985): 'Beazley and attic vase painting', in Kurtz 1985:19-30.
- Robertson, M., (1991): 'Adopting an approach I', in Rasmussen & Spivey 1991:1-12.
- Robinson, K., (1994): 'Selling the heritage product', in Harrison 1994a:381-399.
- Romaïos, K., (1955): *Mikra Meletimata* [Small Studies], Etaireia Makedonikon Spoudon, Thessaloniki.
- Rosenberg, P., Thomson, S.L., Seipel, W., (1995): 'Editorial, autour d'une exposition', *Musées et Collections Publiques de France*, No.209, 4:4-5.
- Rowlands, M., (1987): 'Centre and periphery: a review of a concept', in Rowlands, Larsen & Kristiansen 1987:1-11.
- Rowlands, M., (1994): 'The politics of identity in archaeology', in Bond & Gilliam 1994:129-143.
- Rowlands, M.J., Larsen, M., Kristiansen, K., (eds) (1987): *Centre and periphery in the Ancient World*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Royal Ontario Museum (1976): *Communicating with the Museum Visitor: Guidelines for Planning*, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, Canada.

S

- Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, Ch., (1993): 'Aegae- The old capital and royal burial ground of the Ancient Macedonians', in Vokotopoulou 1993:36-37.
- Sakellariou, A., (1987): 'O Christos Karouzos kai i proistoriki syllogi tou ethnikou mouseiou' [Christos Karouzos and the prehistoric collection of the national museum], *NE*, 122, 1444:1136-1138.
- Sakellariou, M.B., (ed) (1992a): *Macedonia, 4000 Years of Greek History*, Ekdotiki Athinon, Athens.
- Sakellariou, M.B., (1992b): 'The inhabitants', in Sakellariou 1992a:44-63.
- Sakellariou, M.B., (1992c): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:62-63.
- Sarla-Pentazou, M., Pentazos, E., (1984): 'Maroneia', *Archaiologia*, 13:44-49.
- Sarla-Pentazou, M., Pentazos, E., (1986): *Mouseio Komotinis* [Museum of Komotini], Gannikos & Kaldis, Athens.
- Sarri, L., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 6/12/78.
- Sarris, F., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 7/12/78.
- Savvidi, L., (1954): 'Nea ekthemata tou Archaiologikou Mouseiou eis ta duo aithousas pou inoixan chthes' [New exhibits in the two new galleries of the National Archaeological Museum which opened yesterday], *To Vima*, 13/5/54:3.



- Savvidi, L., (1957a): 'Den tha yparchoun archaiologoi met'oligon eis tin Ellada' [Soon they will be no more archaeologists in Greece], *To Vima*, 9/10/57:1, 5.
- Savvidi, L., (1957b): 'Mia archaiologiki chora opou leipoun ta mouseia' [An archaeological country without museums], *To Vima*, 6/10/57, 1, 6.
- Schefold, K., (1969): 'Christos Karusos' aesthetik", *ADelt*, Meletai, 24a:230-239.
- Schiffer, M., (1972): 'Archaeological context and systemic context', *American Antiquity*, 37:156-165.
- Schiffer, M., (1987): *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Schindler, W., (1990): 'Ernst Buschor', in Briggs & Calder III 1990:13-16.
- Schlereth, T.J., (ed) (1982): *Material Culture Studies in America*, American Association for State and Local History, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Schlereth, T.J., (1989): 'American material culture technique: historical museum exhibit review, Appendix 3', 233-237, in Schlereth, T.J.: *Artifacts and the American Past*, 1st edition in 1980, AASLH, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Schnapp, A., (1993): *La Conquête du Passé: Aux Origines de l'Archéologie*, Carré, Paris.
- Scholiastis (1979): 'To vathytero noima tis machis ton amforeon' [The deeper meaning of the battle of the amphoras], *I Aygi*, 4/3/79:3.
- Schärer, M., (1994): 'Museology: the exhibited exhibition - a museological experiment', *MMC*, 13(2):215-219.
- Schärer, M., (1996): 'Museology: the exhibited man/thing relationship - a new museological experiment', *MMC*, 15(1):9-20.
- Searing, H., (1986): 'The development of a museum typology', 14-23, in Stephens, S., (ed): *Building the New Museum*, The Architectural League of New York, Princeton Architectural Press, Princeton, N.G.
- Seferis, G., (1981a): 'Theophilos' [1947], in *Dokimes*, Vol. I:458-466, Athens, Ikaros.
- Seferis, G., (1981b): 'Delphi' [1961], in *Dokimes*, Vol. II:36-152, Athens, Ikaros.
- Seferis, G., (1986): *Meres* [Days], Volume V, 1 January 1945-19 April 1951, Ikaros, Athens.
- Serrell, B., (1983): *Making Exhibit Labels: A Step-by-Step Guide*, AASLH, Nashville.
- Serwint, N., (1990): 'Mind and body. Athletic contests in ancient Greece, ed. by Olga Tzachou-Alexandri... Book review', *AJA*, 94 (3):507-508.
- Shafernich, S., (1993): 'On-site museums, open-air museums, museum villages and living history museums: reconstructions and period rooms in the United States and the United Kingdom', *MMC*, 12:43-61.
- Shanks, M., (1991): 'Some recent approaches to style and social reconstruction in classical archaeology', *ARC*, 10 (2):164-174.
- Shanks, M., (1992): *Experiencing the Past. On the Character of Archaeology*, Routledge, London.
- Shanks, M., (1996): *Classical Archaeology of Greece. Experiences of the Discipline*, Routledge, London.
- Shanks, M., (1997): 'Archaeological theory: What's on the Agenda?', *AJA*, 101(2):395-399.
- Shanks, M., (forthcoming): *Art and the Early Greek City State: an Interpretive Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Shanks, M. & Tilley, C., (1987): *Social Theory and Archaeology*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Shanks, M. & Tilley, C., (1989a): 'Archaeology into the 1990s', *NAR*, 22(1):1-12.
- Shanks, M. & Tilley, C., (1989b): 'Questions rather than answers: reply to comments on archaeology into the 1990s', *NAR*, 22(1):42-54.
- Shanks, M. & Tilley, C., (1992): *Re-Constructing Archaeology, Theory and Practice*, (2nd edn), Routledge, London.
- Shanks, M., & Hodder, I., (1995): 'Processual, postprocessual and interpretive archaeologies', in Hodder & Shanks et al 1995:3-29.
- Shay, T. (1989): 'Israeli archaeology - ideology and practice', *Antiquity* 63:768-376.
- Shennan, S.J., (1989): 'Introduction: archaeological approaches to cultural identity', 1-32, in Shennan, S.J., (ed): *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, One World Archaeology, 10, Unwin Hyman, London.
- Sherman Sheftel, P., (1979): 'The Archaeological institute of America, 1879-1979, a centennial review', *AJA*, 83:3-17.
- Sherman, D.J., Rogoff, I., (eds) (1994a): *Museum Culture. Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*, Routledge, London.
- Sherman, D.J., Rogoff, I., (1994b): 'Introduction: frameworks for critical analysis', in Sherman & Rogoff 1994a:ix-xx.
- Shingley, G., (1987): *A History of Samos, 800-188 BC*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Shingley, G., (1993): 'Distance, development, decline? World-systems, analysis and the "Hellenistic" world', in Bilde et al:271-284.
- Shore, C., (1996): 'Imagining the New Europe: identity and heritage in European Community discourse', in Graves-Brown et al 1996:96-115.
- Silberman, N.A., (1989): *Between Past and Present: Archaeology, Ideology and Nationalism in the Modern Middle East*, Holt, New York.
- Silberman, N.A., (1990): 'The politics of the past: archaeology and nationalism in the Eastern Mediterranean', *Mediterranean Quarterly*, (1):99-110.
- Silberman, N.A., (1995): 'Promised lands and chosen peoples: the politics and poetics of archaeological narrative', in Kohl & Fawcett 1995a:249-262.
- Silverstone, R., (1988): 'Museums and the media, a theoretical and methodological exploration', *IJMMC*, 7:231-241..
- Simeoforidis, Y., (1990): 'Mouseio i supermarket' [Museum or super-Market], *To Vima*, 29/4/90:57.
- Simeoforidis, Y., (1991): 'To "topio" enos architektonikou diagonismou' [The "landscape" of an architectural competition], *Tefchos*, 5:19-27.
- Sinclair, A., (1989): 'Writing Arc-haeology', *ARC*, 8, 2:159-164.
- Skaltsa, M., (1993): 'Mouseiaki politiki stin Ellada' [Museum policy in Greece], *To Vima*, 31/10/93:B3/35.
- Skiotis, D., (1978): 'The nature of the modern Greek nation: the romaic strand', in Vryonis 1978:155-162.
- Skopetea, E., (1984): *To Protypo Vasileio kai i Megali Idea* [The Model Kingdom and the "Great Idea"], University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki.



- Skorda, D., (1992): 'Stin "ieran gan" ton Delphon' [The sacred land of Delphi], *Archaiologia*, 44:5-55.
- Small, D.B., (ed) (1995a): *Methods in the Mediterranean. Historical and Archaeological Views on Text and Archaeology*, E.J.Brill, Leiden, New York and London.
- Small, D.B., (1995b): 'Introduction', in Small 1995a:1-22.
- Smith, A.D., (1986): *The Ethnic Origin of Nations*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Smith, A.D., (1991): *National Identity*, Penguin Books, London.
- Smith, A.D. (1992): 'National identity and the idea of European unity', *International Affairs*, 68(1):55-76.
- Smith, A.D., (1995a): 'Gastronomy or geology? The role of nationalism in the reconstruction of nations', *Nations and Nationalism*, 1(1):3-23.
- Smith, A.D., (1995b): *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Smith, L., (1994): 'Heritage management as postprocessual archaeology?', *Antiquity*, 68:300-309.
- Smith, V.L., (ed) (1978): *Hosts and Guests, The Anthropology of Tourism*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Smith, V.L., (1992): 'Pilgrimage and tourism: the quest in quest, introduction', *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.19:1-17.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1964): *Early Greek Armour and Weapons*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1971): *The Dark Age of Greece*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1977): *Archaeology and the Rise of the Greek State*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1980): *Archaic Greece. The Age of Experiment*, Dent, London.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1983): 'Archaeology', 137-184, in Crawford, M., (ed): *The Sources of History: Studies in the Uses of Historical Evidence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1985a): 'The new archaeology and the classical archaeologist', *AJA*, 89:31-37.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1985b): 'Greek archaeology and Greek history', *CA*, vol.4, no.2:193-207.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1986a): 'A salon science?', *Antiquity*, LX:193-198.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1986b): 'Interaction by design: the Greek city -state', in Renfrew, C. & Cherry, J., (eds): *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-political Change*, 47-58, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1987): *An Archaeology of Greece; the Present State and Future Scope of a Discipline*, Volume 53, Sather Classical Lectures, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1991): 'Structural history and classical archaeology', in Bintliff 1991a:57-72.
- Snodgrass, A.M., (1994): 'Response: the archaeological aspect', in Morris 1994a:197-200.
- Snodgrass, A.M. & Chippindale, Ch., (1988): 'Classical matters', *Antiquity*, 62:724-725.
- Sofaer Derevenski, J., (1994a): 'Editorial', *ARC*, 13, 2:1-5.
- Sofaer Derevenski, J., (1994b): 'Where are the children? accessing children in the past', *ARC*, 13, 2:7-20.

- Sorsby, B., Horne, S., (1980): 'The readability of museum labels', *MJ*, 80(3):157-159.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C., (1991): *Reading Greek Culture*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C., (1995a): "*Reading*" *Greek Death; To the End of the Classical Period*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C., (1995b): 'Male and female, public and private, ancient and modern', in Reeder 1995a:111-120.
- Spanomaridis, A., Zachariadis, I., (1992): 'I kritiki ton kriton' [The Comments of the jurors], *ThChT*, 23:100.
- Sparkes, B.A., (1996): *The Red and the Black*, Routledge, London.
- Spathari, E., (1989): *Mind and Body*, Greek National Tourist Organization, No.12, April 1989.
- Spencer, N., (ed) (1995): *Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology. Bridging the "Great Divide"*, Routledge, London.
- Stabolidis, N., (1994): *Eleutherna. Apo ti Geometriki kai Archaiki Nekropoli. Tafikes Pyres kai Omirika Epi* [Eleutherna. From the Geometric and Archaic Necropolis. Funeral Pyres and Homeric Epic], University of Rethymno Press, Rethymno.
- Stefanidou-Tiveriou, T., (1982): *Pilina Eidolia* [Clay Figurines], Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki, Cast museum of the School of Philosophy, Thessaloniki.
- Stefanidou-Tiveriou, T., (1987): *Ekmageia I* [Plaster Casts I], Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki, Cast Museum of the School of Philosophy, Thessaloniki.
- Stefanidou-Tiveriou, T., (1991): 'Synenteuxi....' [Interview to the journal regarding the cast museum of the School of Philosophy, Aristoteleio University of Thessaloniki], *TOMH* 301, 3:45-47.
- Stewart, A. (1990): *Greek Sculpture, An Exploration*, Vol.I, II, Yale University Press, New Haven, London.
- Stone, P.G., (1994): 'Introduction: a framework for discussion', in Stone & Molyneaux 1994:15-28.
- Stone, P.G., & Molyneaux, B.L, (eds) (1994): *The Presented Past, Heritage, Museums and Education*, One World Archaeology, No.25, Routledge, London.
- Summerson, J., (1963): *The Classical Language of Architecture*, University Paperbacks, Methuen & Co Ltd, London.
- Svolopoulos, K., (1994): "Western Thrace in the body of the Greek state", in Papoulia et al 1994:267-285.
- Svoronos, N., (1985): 'Towards nationhood, the survival of the Hellenic spirit', 281-286, in Browning, R., (ed): *The Greek World, Classical, Byzantine, Modern*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Svoronos, N.G., (1992): *Episkopi tis Neoellinikis Istorias* ['A Survey of Modern Greek History'], Athens: Themelio.
- Svoronos, N.G., (1994): 'A retrospective of Aegean history', in Elytis et al 1994:33-80.
- Swain, S., (1996): *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*, Clarendon Press, London.
- Sweeney, J., Curry, T., Tzedakis, Y., (eds) (1988): *The Human Figure in Early Greek Art* (Exhibition Catalogue), Greek Ministry of Culture, Athens, National Gallery of Art, Washington.



Swiecinski, J., (1977): 'Form, composition and contents in museum exhibitions', 55-69, *The Problems of Contents, Didactics and Aesthetics of Modern Museum Exhibitions*, Institute of Conservation and Methodology of Museums, International Museological Seminary.



Taborsky, E., (1990): 'The discursive object', in Pearce 1990a:50-77.

Tanner, J., (1994): 'Shifting paradigms in classical art history', *Antiquity*, 68:650-655.

Tanner, J., (1996): 'Book review on flesh and the ideal: Winckelmann and the origins of art history by Alex Potts', *AJA*, 100 (3):631-632.

TAP (ed) (1987): *Ergo kai Leitourgia Mias Ypiresias Gia tin Prostasia ton Mnimeion Simera*, [Work and Operation of a Service for the Protection of Historical Monuments in the present], Ektakto Synedrio Syllogou Ellinon Archaialogon gia ton Organismo tis Archaialogikis Ypiresias (9-13/3/84), 167-171.

Taplin, O., (1989): *Greek Fire*, Jonathan Cape, London.

Tassios, Th., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 8/12/78:3.

Tatsios, T.G., (1984): *The Megali Idea and the Greek -Turkish War of 1897: the Impact of the Cretan Problem on Greek Irredentism 1866-1897*, Boulder, East European Monographs 156, Colorado.

*Tefchos* Editorial Board, (1991): 'Editorial', *Tefchos*, 5:2-3.

Themelis, P., (1981): *Odigos tou Mouseiou Delphon* [Guide of the Museum of Delphi], Ekdotiki Athinon, Athens.

Theocharis, D., (1963): 'Mouseion Volou' [Museum of Volos], *ADelt*, Chronika B1:132-133.

Theocharis, D., (1984): 'Eidikai sullogai i mouseia eidikon kateuthynseon' [Special collections or museums of special directions], in *Proceedings* 1984:80-85.

Thomas, J., (1990): 'Same, other, analogue: writing the past', 18-23, in Baker, F., & Thomas, J., (eds): *Writing the Past in the Present*, Saint David's University College, Lampeter.

Thomas, R., (1989): *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Thompson, H.A., (1957): 'Reconstruction of the Stoa of Attalos', *Hesperia*, XXVI:103-107.

Thompson, J.M.A. et al (eds) (1986): *Manual of Curatorship, A Guide to Museum Practice*, 2nd edition, 1st in 1984, Butterworth, Heinemann, London.

Thompson, J.M.A. et al (eds) (1992): *Manual of Curatorship, A Guide to Museum Practice*, 3rd edition, 1st in 1984, Butterworth, Heinemann, London.

Thompson, M., (1979): *Rubbish Theory: the Creation and Destruction of Value*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Thorpe, B., (1851): *Northern Mythology*, Vol.1, London.

Thuillant, P., (1989-1990): 'Mythologie et civilisation: Eros Grec...', *L'Amateur d'Art*, Dec.89-Jan.90:19.

- Tilley, C., (1989): 'Archaeology as socio-political action in the present', in Pinsky and Wylie 1989:104-115.
- Tilley, C., (ed) (1990a): *Reading Material Culture*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Tilley, C., (1990b): 'Michel Foucault: towards an archaeology of archaeology', in Tilley 1990a:281-347.
- Tilley, C., (1991): 'Interpreting material culture', 185-194, in Hodder, I., (ed) (1991): *The Meaning of Things*, Routledge, London.
- Tiverios, M., (1993): 'O archaiologos-epistimonas' [The archaeologist-scientist], *To Vima*, 28/3/93:B5 31.
- Tiverios, M., (1994): 'Idiotikes archaiologikes sylloges' [Private archaeological collections], *To Vima*, 13/2/94:41.
- Tomlinson, A., (1984): 'De Coubertin and the modern Olympics', in Tomlinson & Whannel 1984:84-97.
- Tomlinson, A. & Whannel, G., (eds) (1984): *Five Ring Circus, Money, Power and Politics at the Olympic Games*, Pluto Press, London.
- Touloupa, E., (1991): 'Jurors' comments', in *Acropolis*:25-26.
- Tourism in Greece, Aegean Sea in the Year 2010* (1994), Kapa Publications, Athens.
- Tournikiotis, P., (1992): 'To pneuma tou diagonismou kai to neo Mouseio Akropolis' [The spirit of the competition for the new Acropolis Museum], *ThChT* 23:66-70.
- Tournikiotis, P., (ed) (1994): *The Parthenon and its Modern Impact in Modern Times*, Melissa, Athens.
- Toynbee, A. (1981): *The Greeks and their Heritages*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Travlos, J., (1971): *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Travlos, J., (1987): 'Foreword', in *Athens*:10-11.
- Triandafyllidou, A., (1997): 'Nationalism and the threatening other: The case of Greece', *The ASEN Bulletin*, No.13:16-21.
- Triantaphyllos, D., (1984): 'To istoriko tis archaiologikis ereunas' [The history of the archaeological research (in Thrace)], *Archaiologia*, 13:8-9.
- Triantaphyllos, D., (1994): 'Ancient Thrace', in Papoulia et al:35-97.
- Triesman, D., (1984): 'The olympic games as a political forum', in Tomlinson & Whannel 1984:16-29.
- Trigger, B. G. (1984): 'Alternative archaeologies: nationalist, colonialist, imperialist', *Man* (NS) 19(3):355-370.
- Trigger, B., (1985): 'Writing the history of archaeology', 218-235, in Stocking, G.W.Jr. (ed) (1985): *Objects and Others, Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, History of anthropology, Vol.3, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- Trigger, B.G., (1989a): *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Trigger, B.G., (1989b): 'Comments on archaeology into the 1990s', *NAR*, 22(1):28-31.
- Trigger, B., (1994): 'The coming of age of the history of archaeology', *JAR*, Vol.2, No.1:113-136.



- Trigger, B.G., (1995): 'Romanticism, mationalism and archaeology', in Kohl & Fawcett 1995a:263-279.
- Trikoukis, M., (1992): 'O Manolis Andronikos kai i makedoniki gi' [M.Andronikos and the macedonian land], *I Aygi*, 5/4/92:20.
- Tritle, L.A., (1996): 'Black Athena: vision or dream of Greek origins?', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:303-330.
- Trustman, D., (1980): 'Museums and hype: The Alexander show', *Atlantic Monthly*, vol.246, December 1980:71-79.
- Tsaousis, D.G., (ed) (1983a): *Ellinismos kai Ellinikotita* [Hellenism and Hellenicity], Estia, Athens.
- Tsaousis, D.G., (1983b): 'Ellinismos kai ellinikotita. To provlima tis neoellinikis tautotitas' [Hellenism and hellenicity. The problem of neo-hellenic identity], in Tsaousis 1983a:15-25.
- Tsaravopoulos, A., (1983): 'To Elliniko perifereiako mouseio' [The Greek peripheral museum], *Horoc*, 1:63-66.
- Tsaravopoulos, A., (1985): 'To Elliniko perifereiako mouseio. Ta apotelesmata tis ereunas' [The Greek peripheral museum. The results of the research], *Horoc*, 3:149-178.
- Tsatsopoulou-Kaloudi, T., (1984): 'I aigaiaki Mesimbria' [The Aegean Mesimbria], *Archaiologia*, 13:59-64.
- Tsimbidou-Avloniti, M., (1988): 'Thessaloniki', in *Ancient Macedonia*:99-100.
- Tsiomis, Y., (1992): 'I kritiki ton kriton' [The comments of the jurors], *ThChT*, 23:103-104.
- Tsoukalas, C., (1981): 'The ideological impact of the civil war', in Iatrides 1981:318-341.
- Tsoukalas, K., (1994): 'Ellin I Romios' [Hellenes or Romios], *To Vima*, 30/1/94:B4/34.
- Tsountas, Ch., (1981): *Istoria tis Archaiais Ellinikis Technis* [History of the Ancient Greek Art], 1st edition in 1928, G.Papakonstantinou, Athens.
- Turner, F.M., (1981): *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain*, CT. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Tzachou-Alexandri, O., (ed) (1989): *Mind and Body: Athletic Contests in Ancient Greece* (Exhibition Catalogue). Athens, The Greek Ministry of Culture and the National Hellenic Committee, ICOM, Athens.
- Tzedakis, Y., (1988): 'Introduction', in Sweeney et al 1988:17.
- Tzedakis, Y., (1989-1990): 'Untitled', in Eros:10-11.
- Tziovas, D., (1989): *Oi Metamorphoseis tou Ethnismou kai to Ideologima tis Ellinikotitas sto Mesopolemo* [The Transformations of Nationalism and the ideologeme of Greekness in the Period between the Two Wars], Odysseas, Athens.
- Tzonis, A. & Lefaivre, L., (1984): 'A critical introduction to Greek architecture since the second world war', in Doumanis 1984:16-23



Ucko, P.J., (1989a): 'Foreward', in Champion 1989a:ix-xvi.

Ucko, P.J., (1989b): 'Foreword', in Cleere 1989a:ix-xiv.

Ucko, P.J., (1996): 'Foreword', in McManus 1996:ix-xi.

Ulin, R.C., (1994): 'The anthropologists and the historian as storytellers', *Dialectical Anthropology*, 19:389-400.

Urry, J., (1990): *The Tourist Gaze. Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, Sage, London.

Uzzell, D., (1994): 'Heritage interpretation in Britain four decades after Tilden', in Harrison 1994a:293-302.

## V

Vakalopoulos, K., (1994): 'Thrace during the Ottoman Period (1354-1922)', in Papoulia et al 1994:211-265.

van Mensch, P., (1986): 'Museology and the object as data carrier', *Informatologia Yugoslavica*, 18 (1-2):35-43.

van Mensch, P. (1989): 'Museology as a scientific basis for the museum profession', 85-95, in van Mensch, P. (ed): *Professionalising the Muses, The Museum Profession in Motion*, AHA Books, Art History Architecture, Amsterdam.

van Mensch, P., (1990): 'Methodological museology; or, towards a theory of museum practice', in Pearce 1990a:141-157.

van Mensch, P., (1994): 'Towards a methodology of museology', 59-69, in *Object-Document ?*, Beijing, China, September 994, ISS, ICOFOM Study Series 23.

van Thijn, E., (1987): 'Untitled', in *Greece and the Sea* 2:15.

Vanderpool, E., (1949): 'Athens. The national archaeological museum', *Archaeology*, 2, 4:196-198.

Varopoulou, E., (1987): 'Ellada kai thalassa sti Nea Ekklesia' [Greece and the sea in Nieuwe Kerk], *To Vima*, 1/11/87:56.

Varoufakis, G., (1978): 'I exagogi ton archaion kai i euthini ton technikon' [The export of antiquities and the responsibility of the technical experts], *To Vima*, 22/12/78:7.

Velarde, G., (1986): 'Exhibition design', in Thompson et al 1986:394-401.

Velarde, G., (1994): 'Design-based interpretation', in Harrison 1994a:338-347.

Vergo, P., (ed) (1989): *The New Museology*, Reaktion Press, London.

Vermeule, E.T., (1996): 'The world turned upside down', in Lefkowitz & MacLean Rogers 1996a:269-279.

Vernant, J.P., (1980): *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, Brighton, Harvester.

Vernant, J.P., (1983): *Myth and Thought Among the Greeks*, Routledge, London.

Vernant, J.P., (1989): *L'Individu, la Mort, l'Amour*, Maspero. Paris.

Vernant, J.P., (1991): *Mortals and Immortals, Collected Essays*, (ed) Zeitlin, F.I., Princeton University Press, Princeton [N.J].



- Versnel, H.S., (1987): 'Wife and helpmate. Women of ancient Athens in anthropological perspective', in Blok & Mason 1987:59-86.
- Vetsis, K. & Decastro, M (1989): *Stin Agora ton Archaion Athinaion* [At the Agora of Ancient Athenians], Gnosi, Athens.
- Vickers, M., (1985): 'Artful crafts: the influence of metalwork on Athenian painted pottery', *JHS*, vol.105:108-128.
- Vickers, M., (1987): 'Value and simplicity: eighteenth century taste and the study of Greek vases', *Past and Present*, 116:98-137.
- Vickers, M., (1992): 'Greek vases, down Mexico way', *ARC*, 11(2):339-355.
- Vickers, M., Gill, D., (1994): *Artful Crafts. Ancient Greek Silverware and Pottery*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Villard, F. (1979): 'Introduction' in *Mer Égée*:19-23.
- Vitelli, K.D., (1984): 'The international traffic in antiquities: archaeological ethics and the archaeologist's responsibility', in Green 1984:143-155.
- Vogel, S., (1991): 'Always true to the object, in our fashion', in Karp & Lavine 1991:191-204.
- Vokotopoulou, J., (1973): *Odigos Mouseiou Ioanninon* [Guide of the Ioannina Museum], General Directorate of Antiquities and Restorations, Athens.
- Vokotopoulou, J., (1986a): *Vitsa, the Cemeteries of a Molossian Settlement*, Volume A, TAP, Athens.
- Vokotopoulou, J., (1986b): 'Ta prota 50 chronia tis eforeias klasikon archaiotiton Thessalonikis' [The first 50 years of the ephorate of classical antiquities in Thessaloniki], 1-65, in Municipality of Thessaloniki, (1986): *Thessaloniki Meta to 1912 [Thessaloniki after 1912]*, Symposium 1-3/11/85.
- Vokotopoulou, J., (ed) (1993): *Greek Civilization, Macedonia Kingdom of Alexander the Great, Exhibition Catalogue*, Marché Bonsecours, Montreal, 7/5-19/9/1993, Greek Ministry of Culture, ICOM-National Hellenic Committee.
- von Bothmer, D., (1985): 'Beazley the teacher', in Kurtz 1985:5-17.
- von Bothmer, D., (1987): 'Greek vase-painting: two hundred years of connoisseurship', in *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World*, 184-204, Colloquium Sponsored by The Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities and Symposium by the J.paul Getty Museum, J.P.Getty Museum, Malibu, California.
- von Bothmer, D., (1990): 'J.D.Beazley', in Briggs & Calder III 1990:1-6.
- Voudouri, D., (1992): *I Prostasia tis Politisikis Klironomias stin Prooptiki is Eniaias Evropaikis Agoras* [The Protection of Cultural Heritage in view of the Single European Market], Hellenic Centre of European Studies & Papazisis Publications, Athens.
- Voulgaris, J., (1986): 'Commerce et protection des biens culturels et Droit International Privé Hellénique', *Révue Internationale de Droit Comparé*, No special, Vol.8., 243-245, Journées de la Société de législation Comparée, 3es Journées Juridiques Franco-Helléniques, Thessalonique 1-4/10/86.
- Vouyoucas, C., (1986): 'La protection pénale des biens culturels en Droit Hellénique', *Révue Internationale de Droit Comparé*, No special, Vol.8., 445-459, Journées de la Société de législation Comparée, 3es Journées Juridiques Franco-Helléniques, Thessalonique 1-4/10/86.
- Vrellis, S.V., (1994): 'Schedia symvaseos Unidroit kai koinotikis odigias gia tin epistrofi politistikou agathon: parallili opisthodromisi?' [Draft Unidroit convention and draft European

directive for the restitution of cultural goods: a parallel retrogression?], 47-68, *Afteroma ston Andrea A.Gazi*, Sakkoulas Publications, Athens.

Vrellis, S.V., (1995): 'Zitimata diethnous prostasias ton politistion agathon' [Matters of International protection of cultural goods], 71-99, *Prosfora ston Hlia Krispi*, Sakkoulas Publications, Athens.

Vryonis, S., Jr., (ed) (1978): *The Past in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*, Byzantina kai Metabyzantina, Vol.1, Undena Publications, Malibu.

Wall, J., Tousignant, L., (1995): 'Évaluation d'Egyptomania, l'observateur passionné', *Musées et Collections Publiques de France*, No.209, 4:34-35.

Wallerstein, I., (1974): *The Modern World System I*, Academic Press, New York.

Wallis, B., (1994): 'Selling nations: international exhibitions and cultural diplomacy', in Sherman & Rogoff 1994a:265-281.

Walsh, K., (1992): *The Presentation of the Past. Museums and Heritage in the Post-Modern World*, Routledge, London and New York.

Warhurst, A., (1992): 'University museums', in Thompson et al 1992:93-100.

Weil, S.E., (1995): 'Speaking about museums: a meditation on language', 3-17, in Weil, S.E., (1995): *A Cabinet of Curiosities. Inquiries into Museums and their Prospects*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington.

Weinberg, S.S., (1948): 'Museums, Athens, Piraeus', *Archaeology*, 1, 3:148-149.

White, H., (1978): *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

White, H., (1987): *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Whitley, J., (1987): 'Art history, archaeology and idealism: the German tradition', 9-15 in Hodder, I., (ed): *Archaeology as Long-Term History*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Whitley, J., (1991): *Style and Society in Dark Age Greece, The Changing Face of a Preliterate Society 1100-700 BC*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Whitley, J., (1992/3): 'The explanation of form: towards a reconciliation of archaeological and art historical approaches', *Hephaistos*, 11/12:7-33.

Whitley, J., (1994): 'Protoattic pottery: a contextual approach', in Morris 1994a:51-70.

Whitley, J., (1996): 'Review on Shanks, M.: Classical archaeology of Greece: experiences of the discipline', *Antiquity*, 70:712-714.

Whitley, J., (1997): 'Beazley as theorist', *Antiquity*, 71:40-47.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U., (1982): *History of Classical Scholarship*, Transl. by A.Harris, Duckworth, London.

Wilford, J., (1995): 'New analysis of the Parthenon's frieze finds. It depicts a horrifying legend', *The New York Times*, 4/7/95:19, 21.



- Wiley, G.R. & Sabloff, J.A., (1974): *A History of American Archaeology*, Freeman, New York.
- Wills, G. (1992): 'Athena's magic', *New York Review of Books*, 47.
- Wilson, D.M. Sir, (1992): 'National museums' in Thompson et al 1992:81-85.
- Wilton, A., Bignamini, I., (eds) (1996): *Grand Tour. The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century*, Tate Gallery Publishing, London.
- Wiseman, J., (1983): 'Conflicts in archaeology: education and practice, *JFA*, vol. 10:1-9.
- Wolfflin, H., (1899): *Klassische Kunst*, 4th edition, Munich 1908; *Classic Art*, translation P. & L.Murray, London 1953.
- Wylie, A., (1989): 'Introduction: socio-political context', in Pinsky & Wylie 1989:93-95.

## X

- XX' Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities & Italian School of Archaeology in Athens, (1993): *Lemnos Archaeological Museum*, Ministry of Culture, XXth Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities and the Italian School of Archaeology in Athens.
- Xydis, A., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados;' [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 6/12/78.
- Xydis, S.G., (1969): 'Modern Greek nationalism', 208-258, in Sugar, P.F. & Lederer, I.J., (eds): *Nationalism in Eastern Europe*, University of Washington Press, Washington.
- Xyggopoulos, A., (1978): 'Prepei na taxidepsoun oi theoi tis Ellados; [Should the gods of Greece travel?], *I Kathimerini*, 7/12/78.

## Y

- Yalouri, A. & Yalouris, N., (1991): *Olympia, Odigos tou Mouseiou kai tou Ierou* [Olympia, Guide of the Museum and the Sanctuary], Ekdotiki Athinon, Athens.
- Yalouri, H.A., (1993): *Classical or Byzantine Heritage? Conflicting Pasts in Modern Greek Society*, Unpublished MPh Thesis, Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge.
- Yalouris, N. (1967): *The Sculptures of the Temple of Zeus*, Phaidon Press, London.
- Yalouris, N., (1973): 'To neon mouseion Olympias' [The new museum of Olympia], *AAA*, VI (1):55-65.
- Yalouris, N., (1978): 'Untitled', in *Treasures*:9-11.
- Yalouris, N., (1980): 'Alexander and his heritage', in Yalouris & Rhomiopoulou 1980:10-20.
- Yalouris, N. & Rhomiopoulou, K., (1980): *The Search for Alexander*, Exhibition Catalogue, New York Graphic Society, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Boston.
- Yiatromanolakis, Y., (1994): 'The Aegean and Greek literature', in Elytis et al 1994:433-448.

Yilopoulou, A., (1984): 'Ethniko archaiologiko mouseio: i ragismeni vitrina tou politismou mas' [The national archaeological museum, the cracked window of the Hellenic culture], *I Aygi*, 12/8/84:12.

## Z

Zapheiroulou, F., (1987): 'Samos', *ADelt*, 42, B2 (Chronika):503.

Zapheiroulou-Mitropoulou, M., (1987): *The Role and Development of Archaeological Museums in Greece*, MA dissertation, Leicester University, Dept. of Museum Studies, Leicester.

Zeitlin, F.I., (1991): 'Introduction', in Vernant 1991:3-24.

Zevi, B., (1991): 'Jurors' comments', in *Acropolis*:26.

Ziegler, C., Pantazzi, M., Humbert, J.M., (1995): 'Egyptomania, genèse d'une exposition', *Musées et Collections Publiques de France*, No.209, 4:6-9.

Ziro, D., (1992): 'Praktika' [Proceedings of a Special General Meeting 1992 of the Archaeological Society], *O Mentor*, 20:72-74.

Zois, A., (1987): 'To 'syndromo tis Verginas' kai alla' [The Vergina syndrom and other], *Anti*, 360:48-49.

Zois, A., (1990): *Archaiologia stin Ellada: Pragmatikotites kai Prooptikes*, [Archaeology in Greece: Realities and Perspectives], Polytypo, Athens.

Zweig, B., (1993): 'The only women who give birth to men: a gynocentric, cross-cultural view of women in ancient Sparta', in de Forrest 1993:32-53.