

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
MUSEUMS IN GREECE  
(1829-1909)  
THE DISPLAY OF  
ARCHAEOLOGY**

***Volume One***

- **Chapters 1-7**

***Andromache Gazi***

Department of Museum Studies

University of Leicester

1993

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUMS  
IN GREECE (1829-1909)  
THE DISPLAY OF ARCHAEOLOGY**

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

by

***Andromache Gazi***

Department of Museum Studies  
University of Leicester

© August 1993

# ABSTRACT

**Author:** *Andromache Gazi*

**Title:** *Archaeological Museums in Greece (1829-1909). The Display of Archaeology.*

This study examines the way in which the Greek archaeological heritage was presented through Greek archaeological displays of the period 1829-1909 and outlines the history of Greek archaeological museums during the above period.

The study starts by examining the impact that the West-European idealisation of ancient Greece had on the Greeks' perception of their own cultural past. It then looks at the Greek concepts of the Greek antiquity from the eighteenth century to the end of the period under study (1909). Effort is made to examine whether, or not, any obvious ideology was involved in the Greeks' attitude towards their antiquities, how this translated into practice and how it was promulgated through museum displays. This involves a delineation of modern Greek history and ideology, along with an outline of the first efforts to safeguard the antiquities before and after the formation of the modern Greek state. Emphasis is given to the official manifestation of ideology towards the antiquities, as this was expressed by the government and other authoritative institutions.

Within this frame, the study then outlines the museum concept in Greece, as expressed in museum legislation and in other relevant documents. It also outlines attitudes to museum displays, implicit in museum legislation and in the language used in museum publications.

The main part of the thesis "reconstructs" the displays of Greek archaeological museums during the period under study and provides a historical insight into museums' general development.

Finally, the theoretical intentions to museum displays are compared with their practical application in a detailed analysis, the ultimate aim of which is to show if museum displays reflected the ideological stance of the Greek state towards the Greek archaeological heritage or if they proliferated a different message.

*To the "hero builders" of Greek archaeology*

*In memoriam*



# CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

**Acknowledgements** ..... xiii

**List of Plans** ..... xv

**List of Figures** ..... xviii

**List of Abbreviations** ..... xxviii

**Preface** ..... xxix

**Map of Greece** ..... xxxi

**Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION** ..... 1

**Research Purpose** ..... 1

**Museums, Displays and the Creation of Meaning** ..... 4

**Reflections on Methodology** ..... 6

**Approaches to Museum Exhibitions** ..... 7

    Exhibitions as Artefacts ..... 7

    Exhibitions as Form ..... 9

    Exhibitions as Relations of Space ..... 10

    Exhibitions as Philosophy ..... 12

    Exhibitions Reconsidered ..... 22

**Research Context** ..... 23

**Research Programme** ..... 25

**The Use of Terminology** ..... 27

**The Use of Greek** ..... 29

**Thesis Outline** ..... 29

<b>Chapter 2: THE EUROPEAN DISCOVERY OF HELLAS</b> .....	32
Early Travellers and Antiquarians .....	32
The Age of Neo-Classicism .....	34
"Admirateurs Abusifs" .....	35
The Eve of the Greek Revival .....	37
Notes to Chapter Two .....	39
<b>Chapter 3: HELLENIC HERITAGE AND MODERN GREECE</b> .....	40
Intellectual Prelude .....	40
Ancient Greece in the Greek Consciousness .....	41
Early Measures for the Protection of the Antiquities .....	43
The Formation of Modern Greece and the Ideological Structure of the New State .....	44
Antiquities and Official Ideology .....	50
Greek Archaeology in Practice (1829-1909) .....	51
The Contribution of the Archaeological Society .....	55
Notes to Chapter Three .....	58
<b>Chapter 4: THE GREEK MUSEUM: A DISCUSSION ON PURPOSES AND INTENTIONS</b> .....	62
The Concept of the Early Museum .....	62
The Museum as Depository .....	62
The Museum as Educator .....	64
The Public Museum .....	64
The Museum in Legislation .....	66
The Display Concept .....	70
Conclusions .....	72
Notes to Chapter Four .....	74
<b>Chapter 5: DISPLAYING ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREEK MUSEUMS: THE PIONEER PERIOD (1829-1874)</b> ....	76
Introduction .....	76



The First National Archaeological Museum at Aegina .....	77
Historical Note .....	77
Displays .....	81
Discussion .....	83
The First Archaeological Museums in Athens .....	84
Introduction .....	84
The Theseion: Phase One (1834-1874) .....	86
Historical Note .....	86
Display Layout .....	88
Display Organisation .....	92
Display Hardware .....	93
Discussion .....	95
The Theseion: Phase Two (1874-1909) .....	96
Historical Note .....	96
Display Layout .....	96
Display Organisation and Hardware .....	98
Discussion .....	98
The Casts Museum .....	99
Historical Note .....	99
Display Layout .....	101
Display Organisation and Hardware .....	101
Discussion .....	102
The Museum at the University of Athens .....	103
Historical Note .....	103
Display Layout .....	104
Discussion .....	105
The Museum in the Varvakeion Lycaecum .....	107
Historical Note .....	107
Display Layout .....	108
Display Organisation .....	114
Display Hardware .....	115
Discussion .....	115
The Museum at the Polytechnic School of Athens .....	117
Historical Note .....	117
North Wing .....	121
South Wing .....	124
Discussion .....	127
Conclusions .....	128
Notes to Chapter Five .....	129

<b>Chapter 6: DISPLAYING ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREEK MUSEUMS: THE FORMATIVE PERIOD (1874-1900) / THE ATHENIAN MUSEUMS .....</b>	<b>139</b>
Introduction .....	139
The Acropolis Museum .....	139
Historical Note .....	139
Display Layout .....	142
Display Organisation .....	149
Display Hardware .....	150
Supporting Material .....	151
Discussion .....	152
The National Archaeological Museum .....	154
Introduction .....	154
Historical Note .....	155
Display Layout .....	160
Display Organisation .....	166
Display Hardware .....	167
Supporting Material .....	169
Display Environment .....	170
Discussion .....	172
The Numismatic Museum - Phase One: The Formative Period (1829-1843) .....	174
The Numismatic Museum - Phase Two: The Period of Scientific Classification (1843-1888) .....	175
1843-1856 .....	175
1856-1888 .....	176
The Numismatic Museum - Phase Three: The Display Period (1890-1909) .....	177
Historical Note .....	177
Display Layout .....	178
Display Organisation .....	178
Display Hardware .....	178
Discussion .....	180
The Epigraphic Museum .....	182
Historical Note .....	182
Display Layout .....	183
Discussion .....	184
Conclusions .....	184
Notes to Chapter Six .....	186

<b>Chapter 7: DISPLAYING ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREEK MUSEUMS: THE FORMATIVE PERIOD (1874- 1900) / THE PROVINCIAL MUSEUMS .....</b>	<b>199</b>
Introduction .....	199
The Sparta Museum .....	200
Introduction .....	200
Historical Note .....	201
Display Layout .....	202
Display Organisation .....	203
Display Hardware .....	204
Display Environment .....	204
Discussion .....	205
The Olympia Museum .....	206
Historical Note .....	206
Display Layout .....	208
Display Organisation .....	210
Display Hardware .....	211
Supporting Material .....	211
Display Environment .....	211
Discussion .....	212
The Amphiareion Museum .....	213
Historical Note .....	213
Discussion .....	213
The Eleusis Museum .....	214
Historical Note .....	214
Display Layout .....	215
Display Organisation .....	217
Display Hardware .....	217
Display Environment .....	217
Discussion .....	218
The Schematari (Tanagra) Museum .....	219
Introduction .....	219
Historical Note .....	219
On the Display .....	221
Discussion .....	221
The Local Archaeological Museum at Aegina .....	222
Historical Note .....	222
Display Layout .....	223
Display Organisation and Hardware .....	223
Discussion .....	223
The Syros Museum .....	224
Introduction .....	224
Historical Note .....	225
Display Layout and Organisation .....	228



Display Hardware .....	228
Discussion .....	229
The Epidauros Museum .....	230
Historical Note .....	230
Display Layout .....	231
Display Organisation .....	232
Display Hardware .....	233
Supporting Material .....	233
Display Environment .....	234
Discussion .....	234
Conclusions .....	235
Notes to Chapter Seven .....	238

VOLUME TWO

Contents .....	xxxiii
List of Plans .....	xxxvii
List of Abbreviations .....	xxxix
Map of Greece .....	xxxx

Chapter 8: DISPLAYING ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREEK MUSEUMS: THE EXPANSION PERIOD (1900- 1909) .....	246
Introduction .....	246
The Ancient Corinth Museum .....	246
The Thera Museum .....	247
Historical Note .....	247
Display Layout .....	248
Display Organisation and Hardware .....	249
Supporting Material and Museum Environment .....	249
Discussion .....	249
The Chalkis Museum .....	250
The Mykonos Museum .....	251
Historical Note .....	251
Discussion .....	252



The Nauplion Museum .....	253
The Delphoi Museum .....	254
Historical Note .....	254
Display Layout .....	256
Display Organisation and Hardware .....	258
Supporting Material .....	258
Display Environment .....	259
Discussion .....	259
The Chaeroneia Museum .....	260
Discussion .....	261
The Delos Museum .....	262
Historical Note .....	262
Display Layout .....	263
Display Hardware .....	264
Discussion .....	265
The Thebes Museum .....	265
Historical Note .....	266
Display Layout .....	267
Display Organisation and Hardware .....	268
Discussion .....	269
The Herakleion Museum .....	269
Historical Note .....	270
Displays .....	273
Discussion .....	274
The Lykosoura Museum .....	275
Introduction .....	275
Historical Note .....	275
On the Display .....	276
Discussion .....	277
The Corfu Museum .....	277
Introduction .....	277
Historical Note .....	278
The Tegea Museum .....	280
Historical Note .....	280
Display Layout .....	281
Display Organisation and Hardware .....	282
Supporting Material .....	283
Display Environment .....	283
Discussion .....	283
The Thermon Museum .....	284
The Volos Museum .....	285
Introduction .....	285
Historical Note .....	285
Displays .....	287

Display Organisation and Hardware .....	288
Supporting Material and Display Environment .....	288
Discussion .....	289
The Argostoli Museum .....	291
Introduction .....	291
Historical Note .....	292
Display Layout .....	293
Display Hardware and Supporting Material .....	293
Display Environment .....	294
Discussion .....	294
Conclusions .....	294
Notes to Chapter Eight .....	298

Chapter 9: THE DISPLAYS OF ARCHAEOLOGY: AN

ANATOMY .....

314

The Official View of Museums .....	314
The Facts .....	315
Theoretical Prerequisites for the Display of Archaeology .....	317
Display Practices and Patterns .....	318
Display Organisation .....	318
Display Hardware .....	319
Supporting Material .....	319
Display Environment .....	320
General Remarks .....	321
Display authors .....	323
Display Practices in West-European Museums (nineteenth-early twentieth centuries) .....	324
The Impact of West-European Approaches to Display in Greece .....	325
Displays' character .....	326
First Reading: Displays as Form and as Aesthetic Value .....	326
Second Reading: Displays as Function .....	329
Third Reading: Displays as Ideological Statements .....	330
The Public Response to Museums and Displays .....	333

Chapter 10: CONCLUSIONS .....

337



Appendix 1:	Model for Artefact Study by S. Pearce .....	343
Appendix 2:	Modified Version of S. Pearce’s Model for Artefact Study by Beraha .....	344
Appendix 3:	Sources .....	345
Appendix 4:	General Data on Museums .....	348
Appendix 5:	Geographical Distribution .....	350
Appendix 6:	Museums’ Character .....	353
Appendix 7:	Museum Building Types .....	355
Appendix 8:	Personnel of the Archaeological Service (1829- 1909) .....	357
Appendix 9:	Personnel of the Archaeological Society .....	359
Appendix 10:	Displays’ Profile .....	360
Appendix 11:	Studies of Greek Archaeologists .....	365
Appendix 12:	Display Authors .....	366
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....		368
PLANS .....		420

VOLUME THREE

List of Figures .....	xlii
List of Abbreviations .....	xlvi
FIGURES .....	472



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My first debt of gratitude is to my family -my mother and father, and my brother- for being there whenever I needed them and for their support, moral and of every other kind.

I would also like to acknowledge the generous help I received by the "A. S. Onassis Foundation" in the form of a grant (1989-1992) which made this project possible.

Warm thanks are due to my supervisor Professor Susan Pearce for all her advice and encouragement throughout the various phases this thesis had been in the making.

I am indebted to all those people and institutions, in Greece and abroad, who provided information, photographs and general help with my research. Among them Dr. W. von Eickstedt and Nelly Lazaridou of the German Archaeological Institut in Athens, and Alike Bikake of the Archaeological Society, Athens, deserve special mention.

I also thank Dr. Olga Tzachou-Alexandri, National Museum; Dr. Petros Kallighas and Ismene Triante, Acropolis Museum; Fani Constantinou, Benaki Museum; Dr. Dina Peppas-Delmouzou, Epigraphic Museum; Dr. Mando Oikonomidou, Numismatic Museum; the Phototheque of the French School of Athens; Mrs. Papaghele, Eleusis Museum; Dr. Margharita Koumouzele and Xene Arapoghianne, Olympia Museum; Dr. Nancy Bookides, American School of Classical Studies, Corinth Annex; Dr. Alexandra Christopoulou, Thebes Museum; Dr. Panos Chatzidakis, Delos Museum; Dr. Ch. Kritzas, Herakleion Museum; Dr. Th. Spyropoulos, E' Ephorate of Antiquities; Dr. Lazaros Kolonas, Στ' Ephorate of Antiquities; Louisa Kalokairinou, Historical Archive

and Museum, Herakleio; Elene Kosmetatou, Korghialenion Historical and Folk Museum, Argostoli; and Nikos Georghiades, Sparta. And also, Dr. Angheliki Kokkou; Dr. G. Despinis; Dr. H. Hubert; and my friends Domna Iordanidou, Maya Komvou, and Dr. Amalia Moser for various small "help-tasks" they carried out for me.

I should further like to acknowledge the valuable assistance of the personnel of the Benakeios Library, Athens, the Vikelaia Library, Herakleio, and the Municipal Libraries at Chalkis, Mykonos, Syros and Volos.

Special thanks are due to Geoffrey Stansfield for his moral support during my stay in Leicester, and to Sarah Hinds for her refreshing cheer and for preventing my maltreatment of the English language.

Finally, my sincere and warmest thanks to Dr. Nikos Frydas for easing some of the anxieties of my Ph.D. adventure and for the dedicated enthusiasm with which he provided his technical expertise in the printing of this thesis.

# LIST OF PLANS

See Volume Two, pp. 421-72

<b>Num- ber</b>	<b>Plan Description</b>
<b>1</b>	The Orphanage building at Aegina. Ground plan.
<b>2</b>	The Theseion. Ground plan.
<b>3</b>	Athens' market during the Turkish occupation period; the Oula Bei bath is shadowed.
<b>4</b>	University of Athens. Ground floor plan.
<b>5</b>	Varvakeion Lycaeum (drawing by P. Kalkos). Ground plan of the first floor.
<b>6</b>	Varvakeion Lycaeum. Ground Plan.
<b>7</b>	Polytechnic School. Ground floor.
<b>8</b>	Polytechnic School. North wing: The Mycenaean room in 1881.
<b>9</b>	Polytechnic School. North wing: The Mycenaean room.
<b>10</b>	Polytechnic School. North wing: The Egyptian room.
<b>11</b>	Polytechnic School. South wing: The Vases, Lamps and Jewellery room.
<b>12</b>	Polytechnic School. South wing: The Bronzes and Terracottas room.
<b>13</b>	Ground floor of the Acropolis Museum in 1881.
<b>14</b>	The Acropolis Museum after 1888.

Number	Plan Description
15	Klenze's drawings for the "Multitechnic" in Athens, 1836.
16	Lange's plan for the National Museum, 1860.
17	The west wing of the National Museum as completed by Kalkos in 1874.
18	Hansen's drawings for the National Museum on the south slope of the Acropolis in Athens.
19	The west wing of the National Museum in 1881.
20	The National Museum in 1888.
21	The National Museum in 1891.
22	The National Museum after its completion in 1889.
23	The National Museum in 1904.
24	The National Museum after the extension of 1903-1906.
25	University of Athens. Ground plan of the first floor.
26	The Academy of Athens. Ground floor.
27	Contemporary ground plan of the Epigraphic Museum; the rooms used by 1909 are 1-4.
28	Ground plan of the Sparta Museum.
29	Olympia Museum. Ground Plan.
30	Amphiareion. The museum is marked Ε.
31	Amphiareion. A 1884 draft design for the museum by Sp. Fintikles.
32	Eleusis excavations in 1883. The museum is marked ΜΟΥΣΕΙΟΝ.
33	Drawing of the Eleusis Museum by W. Dörpfeld in 1885.

Number	Plan Description
34	Eleusis. Plan of the site with the museum building on the left hand side: MOYΣEION.
35	Contemporary ground plan of the Eleusis Museum. Rooms I-V are the original ones.
36	Hermoupolis, Syros. Original ground floor plan of the Town Hall by E. Ziller (1873).
37	Epidauros. Partial view of the topographical plan of the site.
38	Thera Museum. Ground plan.
39	Chalkis Museum. Ground plan.
40	Mykonos Museum. Ground plan. Rooms 1-4 are the original.
41	Delphoi Museum. Undated plan of the facade and the roofs by A. Tournaire.
42	Delphoi Museum. Drawing of the principal facade by A. Tournaire.
43	Delphoi Museum. Facade and longitudinal section by Replat.
44	Delphoi Museum. Ground plan.
45	Delphoi Museum. Suggestion for the display by Replat.
46	Chaeroneia Museum. Ground plan.
47	Thebes Museum. Ground plan.
48	Lykosoura. Plan of the site in 1895 with the first store room marked MOYΣEION.
49	Thermon. Partial plan of the site and the MOYΣEION.
50	The Athanasakeion Archaeological Museum of Volos. Unpublished drawing of 8-12-1907 by I. Skoutares: facade and ground plan.
51	Volos Museum. Ground plan.



# LIST OF FIGURES

See Volume Two, pp. 474-662 ➡

Number	Figure Description
1	The West side of Hadrian's Library as a museum.
2	The Theseion <i>ca.</i> 1850-55. View from the South.
3	The Theseion's interior <i>ca.</i> 1870. South-western corner with the statue of Hermes from Atalante.
4	The statue of Hermes from Andros in the Theseion.
5	Panorama of Athens <i>ca.</i> 1880.
6	The Turkish bath at the Roman Agora: temporary Casts Museum.
7	The University of Athens <i>ca.</i> 1900.
8	The Varvakeion Lycaeam, Athens.
9	The first finds from Mycenae on temporary display, 1877.
10	The Polytechnic School of Athens <i>ca.</i> 1900.
11	Drawing of a cabinet for statuettes and other objects, commissioned by I. Demetriou for the display of his collection at the Polytechnic School of Athens.
12	Drawing of pedestals for statues, commissioned by I. Demetriou for the display of his collection at the Polytechnic School of Athens.
13	Drawing of a case for statues and mummies, commissioned by I. Demetriou for the display of his collection at the Polytechnic School of Athens.

Num- ber	Figure Description
14	Acropolis Museum. <i>Room I</i> . Herakles fighting the Lernaean Hydra (above); bull attacked by lion (below).
15	Acropolis Museum. <i>Room II</i> . The Triple-bodied monster.
16	Acropolis Museum. <i>Room IV</i> . Athena and Giant from the Gigantomachy pediment.
17	Acropolis Museum. <i>Room VI</i> .
18	Acropolis Museum. <i>Room VI</i> after 1904.
19	Acropolis Museum. <i>Room VII</i> .
20	Acropolis Museum. <i>Rooms VII</i> (right hand side at the back) and <i>VIII</i> (in the front).
21	Acropolis Museum. <i>Room IX</i> . Sculpture from the Ballustrade of the temple of Athena-Nike.
22	Acropolis Museum. <i>Room X</i> .
23	The National Museum <i>ca.</i> 1900.
24	The National Museum.
25	The National Museum, 1910.
26	National Museum. The <i>Large Mycenaean Hall</i> , 1910.
27	National Museum. Detail of showcase in the <i>Large Mycenaean Hall</i> .
28	National Museum. The Vapheio cup in the <i>Large Mycenaean Hall</i> .
29	National Museum. Detail of show case in the <i>Large Mycenaean Hall</i> .
30	National Museum. Detail of show case in the <i>Large Mycenaean Hall</i> .
31	National Museum. Detail of show case in the <i>Large Mycenaean Hall</i> .
32	National Museum. Showcases in one of the <i>side Mycenaean rooms</i> .
33	National Museum. <i>Archaic Room</i> : The Volomandra kouros.



Number	Figure Description
34	National Museum. <i>The Archaic Room</i> , 1910.
35	National Museum. <i>The Archaic Room</i> , 1910.
36	National Museum. <i>The Archaic Room</i> , 1910.
37	National Museum. <i>The Archaic Room</i> .
38	National Museum. <i>Archaic Room</i> , the Alxenor stele.
39	National Museum. <i>Archaic Room</i> , Apollo head.
40	National Museum. <i>Athena Room</i> , the Varvakeion Athena.
41	National Museum. <i>Athena Room</i> , the Varvakeion Athena, 1897.
42	National Museum. <i>Athena Room</i> , statue of Pluto.
43	National Museum. <i>Athena Room</i> , west side, Nike from Epidauros, 1900.
44	National Museum. <i>The Hermes Room</i> (before 1908).
45	National Museum. <i>Hermes Room</i> , head of Hera from the Heraion at Argos. Undated large postcard.
46	National Museum. <i>The Themis Room</i> .
47	National Museum. <i>The Poseidon Room</i> .
48	National Museum. <i>The Poseidon Room</i> , 1910.
49	National Museum. <i>The Kosmetes Room</i> .
50	National Museum. <i>Large Room of Funerary Reliefs</i> , 1910.
51	National Museum. <i>Large Room of Funerary Reliefs</i> .
52	National Museum. <i>Large Room of Funerary Reliefs</i> .
53	National Museum. <i>Room XI</i> (1900-1911).

Number	Figure Description
54	National Museum. <i>Room XI</i> , beginning of the century.
55	National Museum. <i>Room XII</i> . Datable before 1906.
56	National Museum. <i>Room XIII</i> .
57	National Museum. <i>First Bronze Room</i> , 1910.
58	National Museum. <i>First Bronze Room</i> , head of an athlete from Olympia. Undated large postcard.
59	National Museum. <i>Room XV</i> (Roman Funerary Reliefs).
60	National Museum. <i>Room XV</i> (Roman Funerary Reliefs).
61	National Museum. <i>Room XVI</i> .
62	National Museum. <i>Room XVII</i> , 1893.
63	National Museum. <i>First Vase Room</i> , 1910.
64	National Museum. <i>First Vase Room</i> , 1900.
65	National Museum. <i>Third Vase Room</i> , 1900.
66	The Academy of Athens ca.1900.
67	The Numismatic Museum at the Academy of Athens.
68	Numismatic Museum, Athens. Oak display cases.
69	Numismatic Museum, Athens. Coins cabinet.
70	Numismatic Museum, Athens. Display cabinets and tables.
71	Epigraphic Museum, Athens. Vassileios Leonardos reading an inscription.
72	Epigraphic Museum, Athens. Old display.
73	The Sparta Museum soon after completion.

Number	Figure Description
74	The back side of the Sparta Museum <i>ca.</i> 1890.
75	The Sparta Museum after the 1906 extension.
76	Sparta Museum, <i>the vestibule</i> .
77	The Sparta Museum.
78	The Olympia Museum in 1910.
79	The old Olympia Museum in 1977.
80	Olympia Museum. The <i>central hall</i> in 1888.
81	Olympia Museum. The <i>central hall</i> in 1888.
82	Olympia Museum. View of the central hall to the north; beginning of the twentieth century.
83	Olympia Museum. View of the central hall to the south; beginning of the twentieth century.
84	Olympia Museum. The Nike by Paeonios.
85	Olympia Museum. <i>West wing, room I ca.</i> 1909.
86	Olympia Museum. <i>West wing, room IV ca.</i> 1909.
87	Olympia Museum. <i>West wing, cabinet in room IV ca.</i> 1909.
88	Olympia Museum. <i>East wing ca.</i> 1909.
89	Olympia Museum. <i>East wing, room VII ca.</i> 1909.
90	Olympia Museum. <i>East wing ca.</i> 1909.
91	Amphiareion. The old museum.
92	Amphiareion. The old museum.
93	Eleusis. The old guard house and the new museum.

Number	Figure Description
94	Eleusis Museum. <i>Room II</i> ca.1895.
95	Eleusis Museum. <i>Room I</i> before 1913.
96	Eleusis Museum. Geometric amphora photographed in <i>room II</i> , before 1913.
97	Eleusis Museum. Geometric vase photographed in <i>room III</i> , before 1913.
98	Eleusis Museum. <i>Room III</i> before 1914.
99	Eleusis Museum. <i>Room III</i> at the begining of this century.
100	Eleusis Museum. <i>Room III</i> before 1905.
101	Eleusis Museum. <i>Room IV</i> ca.1892.
102	Eleusis Museum. The entrance before 1906.
103	The Eleusis Museum today.
104	The Schematari Museum today, facade.
105	The Schematari Museum today, back side.
106	Schematari Museum ca.1906-1907.
107	Aegina. The Governor's House.
108	Aegina Museum. The Sphinx from Kolona.
109	Aegina Museum. The Sphinx from Kolona.
110	Hermoupolis, Syros. The Town Hall.
111	Financial estimate for the installation of the museum of Syros in the Town Hall, 1900.
112	The Epidauros Museum in ca.1903.
113	Epidauros. Fragments in the old "museum" ca.1891.



Number	Figure Description
114	The Epidauros Museum in 1910.
115	Epidauros Museum in 1910. General view of the <i>second room</i> .
116	Epidauros Museum in 1910. General view of the <i>third room</i> .
117	Epidauros Museum, 1910. Reconstruction of the Thymele in the <i>third room</i> .
118	Epidauros Museum, 1910. Reconstruction of the Thymele in the <i>third room</i> .
119	Epidauros Museum, 1910. Reconstruction of the Thymele and of the temple of Artemis.
120	Epidauros Museum, 1910. Reconstruction of the Propylaia.
121	Epidauros Museum. General view of the <i>third room</i> .
122	Ancient Corinth. The first museum.
123	Ancient Corinth. The first museum.
124	Ancient Corinth Museum. <i>West room</i> .
125	Thera. The provisional "museum" in the cathedral in 1898.
126	Thera. The museum and the cathedral.
127	Thera. Partial view of the town with the museum.
128	Thera Museum. <i>Vestibule</i> ; the statue of Tyche and the altar of Augustus.
129	Thera Museum. <i>Sculpture room</i> , south wall.
130	Thera Museum. <i>Sculpture room</i> , west wall.
131	Thera Museum. <i>Sculpture room</i> , cabinet.
132	Thera Museum. <i>Inscriptions room</i> , west wall.

Number	Figure Description
133	Thera Museum. <i>Inscriptions room</i> , north wall.
134	Thera Museum. <i>Vase room</i> .
135	Thera Museum. <i>Vase room</i> , east wall.
136	Thera Museum. <i>Vase room</i> , west wall.
137	National Museum, Athens. Large Geometric amphora from Thera ca.1913.
138	Chalkis Museum. Post card, beginning of the twentieth century.
139	Mykonos. The museum and the city.
140	Mykonos Museum ca.1923.
141	Nauplion. The central square and the "Vouleutiko", first archaeological museum of the city.
142	Delphoi. The museum under construction.
143	Delphoi. The museum, ca.1906.
144	Delphoi Museum.
145	Delphoi Museum, <i>Treasury of the Athenians room</i> .
146	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room III</i> , 1910.
147	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room III</i> , altar from Marmaria.
148	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room IV</i> , 1910.
149	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room IV</i> .
150	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room VI</i> , 1910.
151	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room VI</i> , original fragments from the Treasury of the Siphnians.
152	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room VI</i> , original fragments from the Treasury of the Siphnians.

Number	Figure Description
153	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room VI</i> , part of the frieze from the Treasury of the Siphnians.
154	Delphoi Museum. <i>Room VI</i> , part of the frieze from the Treasury of the Siphnians.
155	Delphoi Museum. Reconstruction of the Treasury of the Shipnians. Post card, beginning of the twentieth century.
156	Delphoi Museum. The Sphinx of the Naxians. Post card, beginning of the twentieth century.
157	The Chaeroneian Lion.
158	The Chaeroneia Museum.
159	Delos. The museum in 1907.
160	Delos Museum, 1928. Delos Museum Archive.
161	Delos Museum, 1928.
162	Herakleion. The old casern.
163	Herakleion. The Venetian Loggia.
164	Herakleion. The central square and the museum.
165	Herakleion. The museum. Post card from the 1910s.
166	Herakleion Museum, view of the large room. Post card from the 1910s.
167	Herakleion Museum, partial view of the large room. Post card from the 1910s.
168	Herakleion Museum, view of the large room. Post card from the 1910s.
169	Herakleion Museum, partial view of the large room.
170	Herakleion Museum, frescoes from Knossos on the north wall of the central room in the 1920s.

Number	Figure Description
171	The Lykosoura Museum.
172	The church of Palaia Episkope at Tegea.
173	The Tegea Museum.
174	Tegea Museum, the <i>Alea</i> room in 1909.
175	Tegea Museum, the <i>Alea</i> room.
176	Tegea Museum, the <i>room to the right of the entrance</i> .
177	Tegea Museum, the backyard <i>ca.</i> 1909.
178	Tegea Museum, the backyard in 1909.
179	Thermon. The museum in 1915.
180	The Volos Museum in 1909.
181	Volos Museum, northeast corner of the <i>first room</i> in 1909.
182	Argostoli. The ex-Aglican church, first archaeological museum.
183	Argostoli. The first archaeological museum, interior.
184	Argostoli. The first archaeological museum, interior.
185	Museo Chiaramonti, beginning of the twentieth century.
186	Museo Capitolino, the philosophers' hall.
187	Naples, archaeological museum.
188	Altes Museum, Berlin. Sculpture gallery in the north hall of the ground floor.
189	Glyptothek, Berlin. The Rotunda.



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<b>ΑΔ</b>	<i>Αρχαιολογικό Δελτίο (Archaeological Bulletin)</i>
<b>ΑΕ</b>	<i>Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς (Archaeological Newspaper)</i>
<b>AJA</b>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<b>AthMitt</b>	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Athenisches Abteilung</i>
<b>BCH</b>	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</i>
<b>BSA</b>	<i>Annual Bulletin of the British School of Athens</i>
<b>DAI</b>	<i>Deutsches Archäologisches Institut</i>
<b>ΕΔΑΕ</b>	<i>Ενημερωτικό Δελτίο της Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας (Information Bulletin of the Archaeological Society)</i>
<b>EFA</b>	<i>Ecole Francaise d' Athènes</i>
<b>JHS</b>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<b>JIAN</b>	<i>Journal Internationale d' Archéologie Numismatique</i>
<b>IGIns</b>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae. Inscriptiones Insularum Maris Aegaei</i>
<b>KEA</b>	<i>Κρητική Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς (Cretan Archaeological Newspaper)</i>
<b>NAM</b>	<i>National Archaeological Museum (Athens)</i>
<b>ΠΑΕ</b>	<i>Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας (Minutes of the Archaeological Society in Athens)</i>
<b>RA</b>	<i>Revue Archéologique</i>
<b>RD</b>	<i>Royal Decree</i>
<b>SIMA</b>	<i>Studies in Mediterannean Archaeology</i>
<b>ΦΕΚ</b>	<i>Φύλλο Εφημερίδος Κυβερνήσεως (Government Newspaper Sheet)</i>

# **PREFACE**

The thesis comprises ten chapters of text, twelve appendices, bibliography, plans and photographs, bound in three volumes.

**Volume One** includes Chapters 1-7; **Volume Two** contains Chapters 8-10, along with the Appendices (1-12), the Plans (1-51) and the Bibliography, while **Volume Three** presents the Photographs (1-189).

**Chapter One** outlines the aim of the present study, gives the reasons for choosing museums and their displays as a focuss for research, examines contemporary approaches to exhibition analysis along with their relevance to the present research and clarifies questions of terminology.

**Chapter Two** outlines the evolution of West-European concepts of the Greek antiquity, from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century. This sets the frame for examining whether or not these concepts had any impact on Greece itself.

**Chapter Three** looks at the Greek perception of the Greek antiquity from the eighteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century and examines the official ideology to the antiquities within the context of modern Greek history. The chapter also presents the organisational frame for the protection of the antiquities in the country.

**Chapter Four** discusses how the "museum" was conceived in Greece during the period under study and examines the theoretical attitudes to the display of archaeology in museums.

**Chapters Five, Six, Seven and Eight** present the results of original work carried out by the author. The aim of these chapters is to "reconstruct" the

Greek displays of archaeology by putting together a plethora of data collected both from archives and from the field.

Chapter Nine constitutes a detailed analysis of display practices, which compares the theoretical intentions to museums and displays, as outlined in chapter four, with their actual application, as shown in chapters five to eight. The Greek displays of archaeology are assessed in terms of their aesthetic value, their function within the Greek society of the time and as ideological statements. Finally, the public response to museums and displays is briefly discussed.

Chapter Ten presents the conclusions.

The text is supported by twelve Appendices, which contain useful pieces of information on the sources studied by the author, the general development of Greek museums, the profile of archaeological displays, the display authors, etc.

The discussion on each museum is further supported by Plans and Figures which offer a visual representation of displays and which were, to a large extent, discovered by the author in various archives in Greece and abroad.

Finally, a map of Greece is provided in which all sites with museums, examined in this thesis, are marked.

# MAP OF GREECE



# **1 INTRODUCTION**

## **Research Purpose**

The purpose of this study is twofold. Firstly, the study is intended to provide a critical insight into the way the Greek archaeological heritage was presented through Greek museum displays of the period 1829-1909. Secondly, it is intended to outline the history of Greek archaeological museums during the above period. 1829 was the date of foundation of the first archaeological museum in the country. 1909 was chosen because it signals a major change in Greek political affairs (see p. 49) and because it marks the beginning of a period of decline in museum development, which followed a decade of rapid expansion in museum building.

Interest in this subject was first stimulated by the following question: What kind of attitudes, official or private, can be discerned towards the archaeological past and its material vestiges in Greece, a country where the distinctive nature of this past, that is its length, its cultural radiance and its international reputation, have given it a symbolic significance? The question becomes more important when one thinks of two further points: the effect that the particular view taken of ancient Greece in Western Europe had in the actual formation of the modern Greek state, and the fact that reminiscences of the Greek antiquity dominated the intellectual and the political life of the new state and imbued, in varying degrees, the consciousness of the modern Greeks. More specifically, then, the initial question was reformulated so as to



examine concepts of the Greek antiquity in nineteenth and early twentieth century Greece, and the ways in which these were promulgated in the country.

A complete study of this kind would require examining a broad variety of areas where attitudes to the archaeological past and its material vestiges are, or may be, manifested. For example, such a study would consider the management of archaeological resources in general (including archaeological legislation and administration, excavation rationales, protection of sites and monuments, the role of museums, display philosophies and practices), the purpose of archaeology as a field of study, along with the historical, socio-political and cultural context of the country at the selected period of time. It is obvious that an enquiry of this depth calls for a multidisciplinary approach which exceeds the limits of a doctoral thesis. However, the issues raised above, namely concepts of the Greek antiquity and attitudes, official or private, towards the archaeological heritage in Greece, can well be examined in reference to museums and their displays (for the use of the term "display" see p. 28). The reasons for this will be elaborated later in this chapter.

Let us first note that an analysis of this sort inevitably involves a discussion of ideological predispositions towards the archaeological heritage. The initial concern has been to examine whether, or not, any obvious ideology was involved in the Greeks' attitude towards their antiquities, how this translated into practice and how it was promulgated through museum displays. The term ideology needs some discussion here. Ideology is often considered to be a system of concepts, beliefs and values which distinguishes a certain historical period and a certain society. This is what Thompson (1984: 4) has called a "neutral conception" of ideology, a view which tacitly assumes a certain ideological coherence among the members of a society. Evidence, however, does not substantiate the view that certain values or beliefs are shared by all, or most, members of a society. On the contrary, different social

groups or individuals share differing views and values, and these operate towards sustaining asymmetrical relations of power within societies. This is the "critical conception" of ideology, a conception which views ideology as a process of maintaining domination (Thompson 1984: 4-5).

In the light of this, it becomes clear that we cannot discuss the ideological predispositions of the Greeks towards their archaeological heritage as if the Greeks were a unanimous body of people; rather, we must take into account variations of opinion and values as these were expressed by various groups of people (government officers, intellectuals, workers, countrymen and so on). For the purpose of this study, distinction is made between the official ideology, as expressed by the Greek government and other authoritative institutions, like the Archaeological Society of Athens, and the popular ideology, as expressed by members of the public. Unfortunately, although the official ideology to the antiquities is relatively easy to trace, through the study of formal documents, the popular ideology is very difficult to sketch, because of the extreme lack of sound evidence. (The validity of this remark will become obvious in later chapters). Consequently, and as a first step to the investigation of this subject, emphasis will be given to the official manifestation of ideology to the antiquities.

The present study centres around two axes: a level of intention, comprising all official expressions of ideology like the state policy and legislation or other authoritative documents; and a level of reality, comprising the application of such ideological concepts, especially in archaeological practices and museum displays, which by being "tangible" may reveal varied facets.

## Museums, Displays and the Creation of Meaning

The museum, it has been noted, is probably the main institutional connection between archaeology as a profession and a discipline, and wider society (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 68). The museum, on the other hand, belongs to what Althusser has termed "ideological state apparatuses"; that is, institutions, like schools and information and communication networks, which represent the dominant ideology and through which state authority is controlled and propagated (Meltzer 1981). In this respect, museums are susceptible to ideological manipulation. What they present about the past or how they tell their "story" is never neutral; rather, it may give us insights into concepts or attitudes towards this past, otherwise invisible.

Displays, in particular, are a mode of interpretation which may consciously try to promulgate an ideological message or may implicitly reflect an ideological system, through certain display elements or structures (Meltzer 1981). In this way displays become an entirely new ideological artefact, an ideological statement which requires analysis in its own right (Skramstadt 1978; Leone 1981; see also Pearce 1992: 136-43). As Leone (1981: 5) clearly puts it: "Once the material dug up is presented to the public, the entire presentation... becomes an entirely new artifact, a piece of modern material culture, one to be analyzed for what it tells about the culture creating it, not the past *per se*".

It follows from this that displays are part of present social practices which inevitably have a political or ideological character. It is important to remember that the display process always involves selection and that selection is always culturally specific: selection of material for inclusion to an exhibition is guided by criteria derived from the political ideology of the



display authors who, in turn, are conditioned by the specific ideological orientation of their time and society. We may further remark that, if selection is a first act of "appropriation", in an extended sense, then display is a second one because, as Baxandall (1991: 34) clearly puts it, "it is not possible to exhibit objects without putting a construction upon them". We thus come to understand why displays are not a reflection of the past, but of aspects of the present; they are an act of persuasion aimed at propagating a particular view of the past and so, by implication, a particular view of the present. Pearce (1990a: 158) interestingly remarks that "because exhibitions have to be intelligible to the visitors in the most basic sense, they tend to take a comfortable choice from the range of contemporary options". But, in this way, "they usually end up preserving stereotyped ideas about the past, and confirming a particular political view of the nature of the present".

This is a point of paramount importance for any discussion on museums, displays and interpretation because, as widely held among contemporary intellectuals, there is no such thing as a monolithic, universal and undifferentiated past; rather, concepts of the past change according to ethnic, cultural and gender political orientations (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 11; Pearce 1990a: 32, 157-58; see also, Layton 1989; Gathercole and Lowenthal 1990). Thus, the past has no fixed meaning; rather, meanings are always temporally constituted (Shanks and Tilley 1987: 20). As Tilley (1990c: 77) has argued, "meaning is something we create for our own times. It is something we typically tend to create out of the past and may actively use in forging the future".

If, then, we accept that displays are not so much a representation of the past, as they are a representation of their own time and culture, an analysis of display form and content could reveal invisible facets of ideology as well as the kind of "meaning" generated by them. Such an analysis seems well

justified if we consider that contemporary thinkers, like Foucault, have reminded us that the manner in which statements are made is as important as their propositional content (Tilley 1990b: 333). We are thus led to a discussion of methodology.

## **Reflections on Methodology**

The main question was how to approach Greek displays of the period defined for research (1829-1909) so as to proceed from a discussion of formal appearance to a discussion of meaning and significance; a discussion which would, hopefully, reveal attitudes towards the Greek archaeological heritage. A discussion of such breadth, however, can only be advanced if there is sound evidence to build upon. In other words, a discussion of exhibitions' meaning and significance presupposes that the first level of enquiry, which involves an exhibition's formal appearance (its external format) is known. This was not the case in this research as there was no previous work on Greek displays of the period under study. Consequently, it was clear that the present study should initially and primarily be concerned with gathering all relevant data about Greek archaeological displays so as to attempt to produce display "re-constructions". As it turned out, the body of display-data discovered exceeded all expectations, so that this first level of enquiry achieved a corresponding significance in the analysis.

The next level of enquiry, that of exhibitions' meaning and significance, requires an adequate methodology for the analysis of exhibitions. As it will be shown below (pp. 23-24), methodological aid could not possibly be sought for in relevant studies on Greek museums. A similar lack of analytical studies on old archaeological displays is observed in museum literature of other coun-

tries. Therefore, methodological help was sought for in contemporary thinking on exhibitions, an outline of which is provided in the next pages.

## **Approaches to Museum Exhibitions**

Contemporary thinking on exhibitions is, to a large extent, characterised by a conception of exhibitions as pieces of modern material culture in their own right. Within this context, it seems possible that the methods used for the study of material culture could be employed in exhibitions' analysis. Let us, then, begin with an outline of current thinking in this area, and see how this might be of relevance to the study of exhibitions.

### **Exhibitions as Artefacts**

By strict definition exhibitions are artefacts, since they too are man's creation. Exhibitions, just like artefacts, are meant to stay together for a certain period of time so as to fulfil a purpose or convey a message. Moreover, exhibitions have a process of construction, they have their own history, interpretative perspective, bias and limitations as artefacts do (Beraha 1988: 5-6). In the light of this, models for artefact analysis may be applied to the analysis of exhibitions.

Six major models for the study of artefacts have been published since the 1930s; they all suggest a scheme which enable the artefact student to start at a key point and move through a series of steps which culminate in the objects' significance. The first model was developed by Erwin Panofsky (1939) for the iconographical analysis of works of art. Panofsky distinguishes three stages in interpretation, each backed by statements about the relevant acts of interpretation. Panofsky's model helps the viewer understand a work of art not in its



formal sense but also, and more importantly, at the level of its intrinsic meaning.

Fleming's model (1974) classifies the basic properties of each object as: *history, material, construction, design and function*. It then sets four operations, namely *identification, evaluation, cultural analysis and interpretation*, to be performed on each of these properties.

Prown (1982), in his turn, suggested a threefold scheme for the study of objects which progresses from *description* through *deduction* to *speculation*.

Elliott's model, published in 1985, centres around concepts of *material, construction, function, provenance and value*. These properties are backed up by a list of questions intended to help the student proceed carefully through the research process (Elliott *et al.* 1985).

Two more models for object study were published in 1986. Batchelor's model (Batchelor 1986), intended to make the point that objects have not just one distinct significance, but they are capable of multifaceted interpretation.

Pearce's model (1986a) starts with the premise that all artefacts have a *material body, a history, a place in the environment, and a cultural significance*. An *interpretation* of the artefact's social role and an understanding of a wide range of its meanings, can thus be reached at through the sum of gathered information (Appendix 1).

What these models tell us is that, by analogy, the study of an exhibition may start at a pivotal point, move through a series of steps and culminate in the exhibition's significance and overall interpretation. A slightly modified version of Pearce's model has already proved to work well for the analysis of exhibitions as artefacts (Beraha 1988). The modified model, as used by Beraha (Appendix 2), distinguishes the following categories: **Exhibition Material:** (1) components (description of artefacts, secondary material and display hardware, space and circulation patterns); (2) characterisation (reconstruction

of brief, and style of presentation, typology sets); (3) provenance (of collection, secondary material, and hardware); **Exhibition History**: its own, previous, post opening (dating, previous activity on site, collection display history, post opening changes); **Exhibition Environment**: micro, macro (on site, location and audience, on map); **Exhibition Significance**: chosen theoretical system; and **Exhibition Interpretation**.

This is a comprehensive way of organising available information on exhibitions; it is obvious, however, that full-scale application of such a model may only be realised for a limited number of exhibitions. The number of museums examined in this thesis renders this impossible; yet the pattern adopted for the presentation of Greek displays draws considerably, if loosely, on the above model (see pp. 76-77).

## **Exhibitions as Form**

More specifically, then, an exhibition is initially approached by discussing its external or visual properties, the exhibition's presentational language. Broadly speaking, exhibition form pertains to the overall type of presentation, the display structure, the type of display hardware in use, the layout of space and the supportive information (including text and graphics). Although classification of exhibitions in the relevant literature, has shown that clear-cut distinctions between form and content are often difficult to draw (see Burcaw 1983: 115-23; Belcher 1991: 58-66; Velarde 1992: 660-69; also, Swiecinski 1977: 57), the following categorisations may be made.

In terms of type an exhibition may be factual (when it conveys information) or conceptual (when it presents ideas); aesthetic (if it is concerned with the effect of objects of beauty to the visitor) or evocative (when it arouses emotions in the visitor); didactic (intended for instruction and education) or entertaining. In terms of display structure, an exhibition may be



object-oriented (that is, reliant upon objects which form the basis of the concept, and which take precedent over any form of interpretive media), systematic (when objects are arranged according to an accepted system - typological, chronological or other), thematic (if the objects are selected in order to support a story-line) and so on.

With reference to the external form of exhibitions, it will be useful to remember that historically early ones were object-oriented and aesthetic (Swiecinski 1977: 58). The material was classified according to ideals of rigid taxonomies and displayed in a consistent, linear way (Saumarez Smith 1989: 19). This brings us to a discussion of exhibitions' spatial properties, an area which has recently yielded some interesting results.

### **Exhibitions as Relations of Space**

Pioneer research at the Royal Ontario Museum (ROM 1976), for example, has shown the crucial influence that the exhibition floor plan has on visitors' flow and viewing of the exhibits. Research of this kind was subsequently taken up by many museums, mainly in the United States and Britain (for the numerous publications see Pearce 1991). Here, however, we will concentrate upon research carried out by Peponis and Hedin in 1982, and its implications for the present study.

Peponis and Hedin (1982) studied the relationship between the spatial organisation of exhibitions and the transmission of scientific knowledge in relation to two galleries of the Natural History Museum in London. In simple terms, they found that a strongly axial layout corresponds to a classificatory scheme of knowledge, which is characteristic of older exhibitions (like the old Birds Gallery in the Natural History Museum, which Peponis and Hedin analysed in their paper) and may be paralleled to a classificatory table where artefacts may find their correct position; while a less structured spatial layout

presents knowledge as a proposition which may stimulate further thinking; here, knowledge is not presented as a well-known terrain, but as a field to be further investigated, a trend common in recent exhibitions (as in the case of the Human Biology Hall in the Natural History Museum).

Classification schemes of presentation, Peponis and Hedin (1982: 24) observe, occurred at an early phase of museum development, when the acquisition and the transmission of knowledge was seen as one and the same thing; when what the expert knew was the same classification that was made visible to the visitor. By contrast, modern exhibitions have introduced the concept of interpretation, which means that the knowledge transmitted to the public will never be in the form known to the experts. Old arrangements, the authors remark, seem uninviting because they merely display and do not explain and also because they are formal; while new arrangements try to make themselves more interesting and worth exploring by appearing to offer choice to the visitor. This relates to early displays of archaeology, most of which were characterised by their strict linear layout; a point we shall return to in chapter nine. Drawing on Peponis and Hedin's discussion, we may here observe that typologically classified archaeological displays reflected knowledge of things as understood by the expert. These points will prove useful in the overall assessment of the Greek displays in chapter nine.

By way of conclusion to the preceding two sections, we may say that an exhibition's analysis which is confined to its external form cannot help us understand the exhibition's intellectual intention and cultural significance. Nevertheless, as already noted, such an approach is imperative when an exhibition is "re-constructed" for the first time, as is the case with the displays of Greek museums examined here. A different level of analysis is required when attempting to reveal the underlying rationale of an exhibition. This

brings us to the question of exhibition philosophy, which depends on the interpretive stance of an exhibition to material culture.

## **Exhibitions as Philosophy**

The underlying rationale of an exhibition always draws explicitly and implicitly on a specific philosophical approach to material culture (Pearce 1992: 145). One can thus start by looking at the main philosophical parameters which have emerged in the study of material culture and see whether these might be of any relevance to exhibition analysis. We may distinguish among the historical perspectives (art-historical, socio-historical, behaviouralist) and perspectives which sprang from other disciplines, like anthropology (functionalism, structuralism), linguistics (semiotics), philosophy and literary theory (post-structuralism). Not all of these perspectives are relevant to the study of archaeological material and, therefore, to the present study, but a brief review of them is helpful in understanding the evolution of approaches to material culture, and, by analogy, to exhibitions.

### **▪ The Art-Historical View**

This approach to material culture studies artefacts for their intrinsic merit as objects (usually "fine art" objects). It centres around aesthetic and historical considerations with the emphasis laid, for example, on individual artists' biographies, an artefacts' novelty or innovative elements, and their worth as art as opposed to their social, cultural or political significance (Schlereth 1982: 40; also, Vergo 1989: 48). This is traditionally a fine and applied arts approach, but it has been largely applied to the material of classical archaeology.

As a result of the pervading influence of Winckelmann's idealised view of classical Greece and its subsequent impact on eighteenth-century classical scholarship (see chapter two), displays of classical archaeology as "art" prevailed throughout the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries and survived



well into the present century (Jenkins 1986; Walling 1987). "Here", Pearce (1990: 157) points out, "the aesthetic of exhibition depends upon the acceptance that objects embody a very particular kind of symbolic power with a universal significance, and that this is offered to a visitor not as an interpretation, but as a matter of faith". As the same author observed elsewhere (Pearce 1992: 203), exhibitions of this mode detach objects from time and place but re-constitute them as "objectified value". The underlying assumption is that objects speak for themselves once the viewer has developed the appropriate taste to appreciate them.

#### ▪ The Behaviouralist Perspective

The behavioural approach to material culture shifts the emphasis from high art to craft, and from the work of art to the worker behind it. This view emphasises the value of each individual in the workings of his/her community. Therefore, by studying and understanding a few such people as fully as possible we may be able to understand their community (Schlereth 1982: 57-63; also, Pearce 1992: 212-17). What is stressed here is the diversity of individual creativity (rather than its uniformity as the structuralists would require), and, in exhibitional language, this takes the form of "workshop reconstructions" of the kind which is often found in open-air historic museums.

#### ▪ The Cultural-Historical or Socio-Historical Outlook

Cultural historians attempt to recapture and reconstruct the origin and development of past historical periods and cultures. They may be divided between those who share a static approach and those who espouse a dynamic approach to the historical process. "Static reconstructionists", as Schlereth (1982: 46) calls them, study the anthropological "now" (that is, a culture as a frozen point in the past) and concentrate upon the rural past; in exhibition

terms, this approach has generated many outdoor living history museums and displays. The "process reconstructionists" (Schlereth 1982: 47), on the other hand, are interested in deciphering cultural change and regard material culture as expressions of recurring cultural processes.

In sharp contrast with art historians, cultural historians feel that the significance of objects as evidence of past life is slight. Artefacts are seen as only supplementary to the normal historical documentary sources. In exhibition terms, as, for example, in permanent displays of local history, objects tend to be marginalised and used as merely illustrative material (Pearce 1992: 203-207).

Underlying all three historical perspectives to material culture are ideological and political implications which are significant within the context of this study and will be discussed later in this chapter (pp. 18-19). Let us first shed some light to the intellectual tradition of functionalism and structuralism, which have been much more influential in the study of archaeology and in the practice of archaeological exhibitions.

#### ▪ The Functionalist Perspective

The interpretation of objects according to a materialist or functionalist stance was influenced by earlier anthropologists like Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, and shared some of the propositions first put forward by the environmentalists, namely the determining importance of the landscape in cultural formation.

For the functionalists, culture is primarily a means of adaptation to the environment, with technology being the primary adaptive mechanism and material culture the outcome. The main aim of a society, the functionalists maintain, is to continue to exist. To this end, all its institutions, including technology and material culture, embody a series of adaptations to the environment which enable this society to survive, in the same way that a



living organism survives through the interrelation of its various parts (Hodder 1982: 2; Pearce 1992: 146).

In other words, the functionalist approach regards material culture as the product of the interrelationship between environment and social organisation, and assumes that society merely produces its artefacts as a means to an end (Pearce 1986b). Artefacts are thus considered in terms of their adaptive relation to their environment. However, although artefacts appear to be essential to the social operation, they have little significance in their own right. They are seen as a mere reflection of the rationality and practicality of the participants in a culture (Schlereth 1982: 54), as the outcome of thoughts, feelings and decisions which have been taken elsewhere (Pearce 1992: 146). Similarly dismissed, within the functionalist thought, is the place of the individual, who is supposed to simply fill the role which society has ascribed to him/her.

Functionalist concepts are found behind many exhibitions in the archaeology and human history field, which present separate aspects of life of an ancient society (like craftsmanship, farming practices, building techniques) and try to explain how the artefacts are made and used so as to meet specific ends. The artefacts, that is, are seen as merely a mechanism for satisfying social needs so that all their symbolic behaviour is reduced to a utility value (Pearce, forthcoming). Exhibitions of this kind, Pearce (1990a: 156; 1992: 155-59) observes, are popular with both museum professionals and the public, since they are supposedly presenting "hard", and relatively uncontroversial, "facts" about the past.

In the sum, the functionalists view material remains as just a reflection of man's activities, as "fossilised action". "But", as Hodder has put it, "there is more to culture than functions and activities. Behind functioning and doing there is a structure and content which has partly to be understood in its own

terms" (Hodder 1982: 4). It is exactly this hidden structure that the structuralist theory attempts to unravel.

#### ▪ The Semiotic and Structuralist Approach

At a deeper level, objects are seen not to be the result of social activity the nature of which has been decided elsewhere but, on the contrary, one way in which social activity is created and expressed. Material culture is seen as one among several kinds of human activity, like language, kinship systems, myth and ritual, all of which are transformations of the same deep structures (see Pearce 1986c; 1987; 1989; 1992: 191). A structure is an underlying code or set of invisible rules according to which the visible order of the world is organised (for different meanings of "structure" see Hodder 1982: 7). Human consciousness, the structuralists believe, is structured according to unconscious, but fundamental and universal patterns. A careful decoding of these patterns may enable us to uncover the covert as well as the overt meanings of cultural systems (Schlereth 1982: 55).

Crucial to the structuralist thought is the proposition that any subject or object cannot be conceptualised in isolation, but only in relation to sets of binary oppositions. Binary oppositions are nothing more than sets of similarities and contrasts, like female:male, old:new, winter:summer and so on, considered in their synchronic, rather than diachronic, functioning.

The notion and the study of structures draws primarily on linguistic models and, in particular, on Saussure's distinction between *langue* (the range of vocabulary available in one society, which carries with it knowledge of vocabulary and grammar) and *parole* (the actual utilisation of the language, which involves selecting vocabulary and organising it according to grammatical rules). Communication is created only through an intelligible combination of vocabulary and grammar. In the same way, objects are codes or structures, which are legible only if organised into sets or categories of meaning.



As Pearce (1990b: 148) has shown, these distinctions can be fruitfully applied to the study of material culture, museum collections and exhibitions. So, for instance, the material which actually survives from the past after excavation (a part of the past's *parole*), will form the archaeologists' *langue*, selected elements of which will be worked upon with the rules of contemporary theory and practice in order to create the museum archaeologists' own *parole* -an exhibition. In this way, the exhibition is the final stage in a chain where the *parole* of the previous phase becomes the *langue* of the next and so on. Moreover, a distinction between similarities and contrasts such as urban:rural, work:leisure, life:death, and the like, often provide the axes around which many exhibitions are structured (Pearce 1992: 180).

Structuralist analysis is unable to account for the generation of change as it is basically ahistoric in nature. Furthermore, as in functionalism, but on a different level, the role of the individual is restricted; structuralism implies a set of cultural rules within which the individual plays little role (Hodder 1982: 8). Another limitation which is particularly relevant to the study of material culture, is that objects are denied any specificity outside the role which has been prescribed for them within the given, structured, social axes (Pearce 1992: 188).

In conclusion, the limitation of both functionalism and structuralism is their inability to explain particular historical contexts and the meaningful actions of individuals who construct social change within those contexts (Hodder 1982: 8-9). A different perspective is offered within the broad spectrum of the so-called post-structuralist approaches, which restore the object to its particular historical and ideological content. At a first level, this is achieved by looking at material culture as a medium which expresses relations of power and ideology.



### ▪ The Ideological/Political Approach

This considers the "meaning" of artefacts as related to their supposedly intrinsic historical or ideological content. Because of their genuinely intrinsic relationship to the past, artefacts are often used to authenticate present purposes or present political views. This may be achieved in a number of ways some of which are discussed below: displays of artefacts as relics; as art and treasure; as illustrations of a historical narrative; and, as a means to reconstruct the past. All four presentational modes are based on the assumption that artefacts are "the real thing from the real past" (Pearce 1992: 196). It is exactly the power of this assumption which makes exhibitions of this kind so prone to ideological manipulation and so influential in the eyes of the public.

Relics of the past, from the English crown jewels kept in the Tower of London to the humble remains of a soldier's uniform on museum display, are intrinsically attractive because of the historical associations they evoke, the history they seem to embody, and not for their own merits. They are the "tangible means by which past life may be selectively rearranged so that continuity is stressed while dislocation and fragmentation is denied" (Pearce 1992: 197-98).

Objects of artistic value are shown as treasures dislocated from their social context and the conditions under which they were created. They are presented as aesthetic icons to which visitors are expected to gaze with admiration, but not necessarily with understanding.

Objects used as the visual authentication of a historical narrative, are dismissed to a merely illustrative role. Here a story line, derived from documentary evidence, is offered to the viewer in terms of labels, graphics and re-creations; objects serve to simply verify historical evidence, they serve as "hard proofs" about the past, should anyone want to check the validity of the historical narrative on show. Within this approach, objects are denied their

potential multiplicity of meanings so as they can be integrated -as supporting casts- into the chosen narrative (Pearce 1992: 206). It has to be emphasised that this narrative is, more often than not, aimed at legitimating a present ideological purpose so that the exhibition becomes a basically political action.

Finally, objects may be used in re-creating the past, or a slice of it, in both museum and open air displays. Here the primary intention is to provide a feeling of "time" and "place", and so it matters little if the objects are not integrally related to each other or if the adversity of past life is hidden and, by implication, denied. The past is simply offered as a commodity to be consumed, not as a proposition intended for stimulating real interest in history (Pearce 1992: 207-208; Walsh 1992: 94-115).

Today, however, there is a growing recognition of the changing "status" and "meaning" of artefacts not only within various cultural contexts, but also within the museum or exhibition context (Saumarez Smith 1989: 12, 19; Vergo 1989: 46, 54). Museum professionals are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that exhibits are subject to multiple interpretations and shifting "meanings", and that the exhibition space is never neutral. Interestingly, it is exactly this supposed neutrality of exhibitions which makes them so powerful in terms of ideological and political use (*cf.* Olsen 1990: 196, on the "presumed innocence" of archaeology), a point we shall bear in mind for our analysis of the Greek archaeological displays. This changing self-awareness within the museum world, is clearly influenced by the intellectual trend of post-structuralism to which we must now turn.

#### ▪ **Post-Structuralist Thinking and its Contribution to Exhibition Theory and Practice**

While formerly being restricted to the domain of philosophy and literary theory and criticism, post-structuralism is increasingly being applied to the interpretation of other spheres of cultural production, such as material culture.

Crucial in understanding the post-structuralist thought is the notion of textualisation which is involved in our conception of the world and its products: to make objects intelligible we transfer them into words, which simply means that objects cannot be conceived outside language (Olsen 1990: 164). In fact, the linguistic production of material culture has to be taken seriously, because the meaning of material culture is created in the text. It does not reside outside the text; rather, in Tilley's words (1990b: 332-33), meaning resides in what the text does to material culture. A piece of past material culture, for example, becomes an archaeological object only in so far as it is realised as text (in site reports, catalogues, etc.). Therefore, the very identity of archaeology is inescapable from textualisation (Olsen 1990: 192). By analogy, all human phenomena may be deemed to have textual characteristics, and are thus susceptible to interpretation. Material culture can be seen as analogous to text, or rather, it can read as text. As Moore (1990: 11-12) has put it, material culture may be considered as a text precisely because it is the product of the inscription of meaning on the material world, just as a text is the inscription/fixation of discourse through writing.

At this point, it will be useful to remind that language may appear to operate at two levels. As Barthes has shown, there is a first order of language which contains the ordinary or manifest content, what he calls "denotation"; and a second order, "connotation", which would be the ideological (Bapty and Yates 1990: 8-9). To put it another way, denotation constitutes the plane of expression (the signified) while connotation constitutes the plane of content (the signifier) (Olsen 1990: 173). The suggestion that "connotation" conveys an ideological content will help us discuss the use of language in relation to the Greek displays in chapter four.

One of the fundamental positions of most post-structuralists is the notion that a text's, object's or act's "meaning" is not confined in the mind of the au-



thor/creator; rather, it is constantly re-defined within different contexts of use. The text/object is freed from the initial intentions of its author/creator, and it thus opens up to a multiplicity of meanings and competing interpretations. It follows from this, that a text/object/act is always open to a variety of different interpretations, all of which may be valid as far as they are backed by sound arguments.

Ricoeur, for example, has argued that things find their meaning only in their context of use, and the same idea is found in the work of Barthes, who holds that a material text opens itself to infinite readings as it continuously confronts new readers in altered historical situations. In other words, only the material signifier remains constant, the signifieds are repeatedly created and lost through the various re-readings (Olsen 1990: 199). Foucault has also stressed the importance of the historical context in interpretation and has further observed that meaning is to be found not only in the text's organisation and syntax, but also in the relation of the text to the world (Tilley 1990b: 332).

What this pluralism offers in relation to the study of past material culture, is the rejection of any authoritative and singular version of the past. Within the logocentric tradition of western philosophy, meaning has been regarded as preconceived and existing independently from the text. The new approach challenges the notion of one original, legitimate and pre-conceived meaning. It does not aim at closing the reading of a material text around an ultimate, hidden "meaning", but to appreciate its polyvalence and allow for various interpretations. We should further stress that, by rethinking the diachronic within the synchronic, the post-structuralists offer a return to time and history (Bapty and Yates 1990: 5), something which was despised, or at least neglected, by earlier approaches, like structuralism.

In brief, then, the contribution of thinkers like Ricoeur, Barthes, and Foucault to the study of a whole range of cultural products, including

exhibitions, is their emphasis on the importance of the social and historical context in understanding material culture and their insistence on the polyvalence of meanings to be read in it. These notions will prove useful in our analysis of Greek museum displays in chapter nine.

## **Exhibitions Reconsidered**

It seems that the ideas outlined above have found fertile ground among many museum professionals, who have gradually come to acknowledge the need for a more reflexive consciousness about the variety of methods for the display of objects. The validity of traditional approaches to display are put into serious question, as it is now widely accepted that any exhibition is but one among various, but equally legitimate, "ways of seeing" (cf. Berger 1972). It is equally well realised that each time an object is put on display it becomes a "new" object, since the exhibition environment create features which are novel to the object and have purely phenomenal character. Exhibits, in other words, are always conditioned by their exhibitional "frame", that is, their surroundings (Swiecinski 1987: 215). This point, in particular, is clearly made by Saumarez Smith (1989: 9-15) who, by considering three different examples from the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, shows how a museum can shift and adjust the meaning of an artefact by the way of its presentation and display.

An important aspect of this growing awareness of the nature of exhibitions is that curatorial monopoly over exhibition space and narrative tends to be re-examined. Over recent years, there has been an increasing appreciation of the role of the visitor/reader in interpretation, and of the fact that exhibitors are but mediators between the object and the spectator, who is now allowed more freedom to participate in the process of display (Saumarez Smith 1989: 19-20; Baxandall 1991; see also, Alpers 1991; Vogel 1991).

If the discussion on contemporary approaches to exhibitions has been relatively lengthy, this is because we need a frame of reference for understanding the nature and the function of older displays. What remains to be seen is how the various methods to the study of material culture and to exhibitions may help us examine the Greek displays of archaeology presented in this thesis. We may start by noting that more than one approaches may be operating simultaneously through the same exhibition. Therefore, an exhibition, just like an artefact, may be analysed in terms of its function within a broader cultural scene or in terms of its symbolic value as a message within a given society; it may also be seen as a reflection of political purposes, and so on. Nevertheless, it has already been said (p. 12), some perspectives are not appropriate to the analysis of the material examined here, either because they mainly apply to history exhibitions (behaviouralist, socio-historical) or because we lack the necessary detailed information for their adequate application (structuralism, semiotics). It thus seemed best to assess the Greek displays of archaeology (1829-1909) in terms of their aesthetic value, their function within the Greek society of nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and their nature as ideological statements, while bearing in mind some of the lessons learnt from the post-structuralist thinking.

## Research Context

As already stated, the present study is also meant as a general history of Greek archaeological museums. The need for such a delineation of museum history became evident during the early stages of data-collection. It was soon realised that no discussion of museum displays could develop without some basic knowledge of the historical development of the Greek museums. Yet despite



its significance, no systematic history of the Greek museums has ever been compiled.

In her pioneer book *The care of antiquities in Greece and the first museums*, Kokkou (1977, in Greek) provides a historical outline of the protection of antiquities in Greece, from the fifteenth century until our time, with the emphasis placed on the period before 1900. The book also presents the evolution of the first museums in the country, particularly in Athens, and as such has proved a valuable guide for the present research. A thesis submitted to the University of Leicester in 1987, deals mainly with the organisational frame of contemporary Greek museums and is of little relevance to the present study (Zaphiropoulou-Mitropoulou 1987). Finally, the two guides to Greek museums, a first brief listing by Karakatsane and Papadopoulos (1970) and Kokkines' (1979) comprehensive guide, serve only as reference sources.

Contextual information for the study of Greek museums can be provided by studies on the history of Greek archaeology. Work done in this area is limited to the history of the Archaeological Society of Athens, first outlined by Kastorches (1879) and Kavvadias (1900a), and recently exhaustively studied by Petrakos (1987a; 1987b), who has also published a short article on the first years of Greek archaeology (Petrakos 1988). To the same author we further owe the first book on Greek archaeological legislation (Petrakos 1982), a subject which was later elaborated by Dores (1985).

If a critical history of Greek archaeology is yet to be compiled, discussion of its theoretical trends and orientation has been even more delayed; the only significant contribution to this subject is the paper recently published by Kotsakis (1991).

## Research Programme

Intensive research all over Greece and abroad yielded a considerable number of original and hitherto completely unknown documents and photographs, which allow for a secure portrayal of the displays at that time. It should be stressed, however, that the fragmentary nature of the evidence does not help us draw conclusive remarks for many museums; the reader should bear in mind that what is presented here must in some cases be a preliminary effort to systematise the study of archaeological displays.

One of the major problems encountered by the author in this research was the lack of systematic archives and neglect in the organisation of existing ones. Archival material is in most cases unregistered or, occasionally, even ignored; much of the data presented here was discovered through personal determination and persistence, and the collaboration of some willing archaeologists and other individuals. Having said this, it is fair to add that this is a problem common to many countries, as museum historiography is still largely a neglected area of study or it has just started to attract scholarly interest (see Pearce 1990: 8; 1992: 115-17).

Research first concentrated on gathering all published information on the museums to be studied (Appendix 3). A broad category of documents was exhaustively examined: museum guides and catalogues, Greek and foreign archaeological journals, periodicals of general interest, travellers' descriptions and travellers' guides to Greece, newspaper articles, museum legislation, and general bibliography. Effort was also made to collect ground plans of all the museums examined here, a task which is almost fully accomplished.

The next phase of research focussed on unpublished sources of information, and proved more cumbersome for reasons outlined at the beginning of

this paragraph. Significant time was invested in studying the Archives of the Archaeological Society in Athens, and especially the personal "Service Diary" of Panaghiotes Eustratiades (a prominent figure of early Greek archaeology as will become evident throughout this thesis), which covers the period of his archaeological activity from 1863 to 1872. Eustratiades' archive is a priceless source of information on early Greek archaeology and museums, and its detailed study and subsequent publication should be seriously considered.

Outside Athens, important data was occasionally discovered in local archives, like the Historical Archive of Hermoupolis at Syros. Unpublished material was also examined, as each individual case permitted, in the archives of many museums and Ephorates of Antiquities in Greece; special mention should be made of the *Delos Archive* and the *Thebes Archive*, which contain detailed accounts of construction and installation works in the museums of Delos, Mykonos and Thebes. In most cases, however, museum archives, if they existed at all, did not yield any information on the period under study.

A third phase of the present research aimed at the collection, occasionally also the discovery, of photographic documents. The bulk of the photographs shown here come from the German Archaeological Institut in Athens, the Brandenburgisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege in Berlin, the Alinari photographic archives in Rome, and the Benaki Museum in Athens. A significant number of photographs, in the form of glass-plate negatives, were found in the photographic department of the National Archaeological Museum, while others were discovered in the archives of the Acropolis Museum. (The last two groups of photographs were uncatalogued and unnumbered). The remaining photographs were either traced in various archives in Greece and abroad or were reproduced from printed sources (books, periodicals, newspapers, encyclopaedias) by the author. Finally, an unexpected find was the series of



old post cards with museum views, discovered in antique shops in Athens and Herakleion.

## The Use of Terminology

At a very early stage of this study it became clear that the study of past museum practices could not be based on the application of contemporary museum terminology. For example, the distinction between "museum" and "collection" in nineteenth century Greece presents various difficulties, if only because of their interchangeable use at the time. The application of the terms "museum" and "collection" was not based on any consistent criteria and this often resulted in the same institution being referred to as both "collection" and "museum". For example, in *IIAE* 1876-77, p. 40, Chaeroneia and Tanagra were reported as "collections", whereas in this same issue, p. 42, they were transformed into "museums". Moreover, in *IIAE* 1897, p. 22, we read about the "collection" of Thebes; two years later (*IIAE* 1899: 54-55), it is referred to as the "museum" of Thebes without any changes having been reported in the meantime, while it was named "collection" once again later (*IIAE* 1901: 16; note that the first archaeological museum was built in Thebes in 1904).

In order for the data-base to be defined, some criteria for the attribution of the term "museum" had to be set. For the period examined here and for the purposes of this study, the basic requirements for the attribution of the term "museum" are the existence of a collection, some kind of permanent premises, a basic system of registration, some kind of display of the collections and provision for public accessibility. The term "collection" is here taken to mean a gathering of archaeological material mainly aimed at its security and preservation, without further provisions neither for display nor for public accessibility. Having said this, we should, however, note that even a

"collection" could at times fulfill some of the above-distinguished "museum" elements. Some collections, in the sense outlined above, are included here because the present study is also intended as a history of the development of archaeological museums in Greece.

The use of the terms "display", "exhibition" and "exhibit" may also prove cumbersome. The distinction made here is based on the semantic differences of the terms in English, as the relevant Greek term "ekthesis" (ἐκθεσις) is a neutral one, which may be attributed to both a "display" and an "exhibition". Moreover, due to the lack of specific application of these terms in the international literature of the period covered here, our discussion draws on contemporary definitions. Thus, "display" is a far more general term, which may be defined as simply as "the showing of objects" (Burcaw 1983: 5) and may refer "to an individual exhibit, group of exhibits or an entire exhibition" (Miles *et al.* 1988: 186). As Finlay (1977: 57) remarks, in his discussion of early twentieth century displays, the "display in those days was a function of the academic staff and their aim usually was to show as much as they could".

"Exhibition", on the other hand, is a much more specific term which usually refers to a series of displays which explore a particular theme and subthemes through objects arranged in ordered sequences and supported by interpretative aids. The chief components of such an exhibition are a concept or a story line (Alexander 1979: 175-176; Miles *et al.* 1988: 186). In the light of this, early presentations of archaeology in Greek museums are more appropriately titled "displays", and so this term will be used throughout this study. The term "exhibit" is here taken to mean "an object on display", in contrast to its contemporary sense of "exhibition" or unit within an exhibition (see Burcaw 1983: 6; Miles *et al.* 1988: 186).

Finally, a word on the terms "registration" and "cataloguing". It is clear to us today that the former is a way of securing the safe identification of each

particular object in a museum by assigning a permanent number to it, whereas the latter means classifying objects according to an organised system of categories, with descriptive details (for further discussion see Chenhall 1975: 8; Reibel 1978: 18, 20; Dudley *et al.* 1979: 21, 410, 414; Burcaw 1983: 5). As it reads in early reports on Greek museums, however, the term "catalogue" may be misleading. In most cases a "catalogue" was no more than a simple inventory and what was often meant by "cataloguing" was "registering" of objects. The reader is asked to keep these distinctions in mind.

## The Use of Greek

As a very large part of the source material and bibliographic references are in Greek, their best rendering in this thesis was a problem in itself. For reasons of consistency (with languages other than English) the Greek titles were not translated. It was further thought that this would be more convenient when tracing a bibliographic reference, the translated version of which would render this meaningless. Place names the Latin or English form of which has been so widely established that their transliteration would render them absurd to the British reader, have been used in their commonly accepted form (e.g. Acropolis, Corinth, Athens, etc.). The same rule has been applied to the names of some authors who have been known in the bibliography in a particular form of their own choice.

## Thesis Outline

Chapter two considers the evolution of West-European concepts of the Greek antiquity after the Renaissance. The precedence given to this subject was dictated by the fact that long before the modern Greek state was formed, in



1829, West-European perceptions of the Greek antiquity were already established. Consequently, it is important to examine whether, or not, these perceptions have had any impact on shaping the Greeks' attitudes towards their own cultural past.

Chapter three starts by looking at the Greek perception of the Greek antiquity from the eighteenth century to the end of the period under study (1909). It then tries to examine how ideological and theoretical attitudes translated into practice. This discussion involves a delineation of modern Greek history and ideology, along with an outline of the first efforts to safeguard the antiquities before and after the formation of the modern Greek state.

Chapter four is a theoretical discussion of the Greek archaeological museum, which mainly comprises a review of the museum concept in Greece as expressed in museum legislation and in other relevant documents. This is followed by an examination of attitudes to museum displays, implicit in museum legislation and also in the language used in museum publications. A study of the language used in museum literature is particularly crucial within the Greek context, as it reveals ideological intentions which are not explicitly expressed elsewhere.

After this contextual discussion, chapters five, six, seven and eight attempt to "reconstruct" the displays of Greek archaeological museums during the period under study and to provide a historical insight into museums' general development. The data is organised in a chronological sequence so that the evolution of museums in time is best illustrated and any changes or patterns are observed. Numbers in brackets refer to the photographs which are presented in volume two. Also included in the second volume are museum ground plans.

Chapter nine is a detailed discussion of museum displays. This mainly involves comparing the theoretical intentions to museum displays as outlined

in chapter four with their practical application, as shown in chapters five to eight. The final aim is to show if museum displays reflected the ideological stance of the Greek state towards the Greek archaeological heritage or if they proliferated a different message. And, if the latter is true, what was this message? This chapter also provides a final outline of museum development in the country, which is to a large extent based on the Appendices, and attempts to account for the public view of museums and displays.

Chapter ten draws all the above discussion together and presents the conclusive remarks.

## **2 THE EUROPEAN DISCOVERY OF HELLAS**

### **Early Travellers and Antiquarians<sup>1</sup>**

The memories of what is generally known as the ancient Greek world had to a great extent faded away even before the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and then almost vanished with the subjugation of the Byzantine Empire to the Ottomans. A tradition of Hellenic culture was, however, maintained by some Byzantine scholars, whose flight to the West had a considerable impact on the revival of classical studies in Europe during the Renaissance. By the end of the fifteenth century many works of influential ancient Greek writers had been translated into Latin. A first, an admiring and somehow nostalgic image of ancient Greece emerged. This would gradually lead to the formation of an idealised view of Greece, a view which later played a fundamental role in the establishment of the modern Greek state.

Nevertheless, although Europe started to cherish classical Greek literature and interest in Greece was growing, little was known of the actual state of the country, while the accounts of merchants and travellers to the East contained hardly any allusions to the contemporary land and its inhabitants. An exception to this rule were two Italian travellers, Christoforo Buondelmonti and Ciriaco de Pizzicoli; the former in his book on the Aegean islands provided much historical and archaeological information on the places he visited, whereas to "Ciriaco di Ancona", as he came to be known, we owe the first valuable descriptions and drawings of monuments at such an early era (Kokkou 1977: 16).



In the sixteenth century the development of trade in the East, helped by the foundation of the Levant Company in 1586 which diminished the dangers of travel in this part of Europe, brought about more opportunities for extending the knowledge of Greece (Spencer 1954: 27-30).

A shift in attention was first manifested in the seventeenth century; classical Greek antiquities became a "magnet" drawing more and more connoisseurs, artists and travellers of aristocratic descent to Greece. The fashionable continental "Grand Tour" -necessary supplement to a good education- gradually came to require a visit to Greece, which very often resulted in the formation of the first private collections in Europe. Until the seventeenth century Italy had predominantly attracted European collectors, since it was taken for granted that the Romans had amassed the finest examples of Greek art there. Now, however, the disadvantages of the Italian market (competition among European princes, expensive prices, danger of forgery) and the hope that something might still be left in Greece, made the latter a promising field for collectors, the British in particular, who saw Greece as a potential mine of archaeological treasures (Spencer 1954: 75; for the early collections in England see: Michaelis 1882; Poulsen 1923). Lord Arundel, for example, would be remembered as the man who desired "to transplant Old Greece into England" (Peachman 1662: 120; for Arundel and his collection, which later ended in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, see Haynes 1975). In France, Louis XIV organised special missions to Greece. In 1673-74, for instance, Marquis de Nointel explored the Aegean islands with a team of scholars and artists; among them was Jacques Carrey, the first artist to make detailed drawings of the Parthenon pediments (Tsigakou 1981: 15).

Later, the voyage to Greece of the French doctor Jacob Spon and the English naturalist George Wheler constituted a major step forward in the rediscovery of Greece; Spon and Wheler visited Athens in 1675-76, took

detailed notes of the ancient monuments and were the first to write about Greece in a manner combining scholarship and first-hand observation (Droulia 1968; Tsigakou 1981: 18). The Venetian occupation of Athens and the Morea towards the end of the century (1685-87) made some parts of Greece more accessible to Europeans; yet contemporary Greece was still largely viewed as reflecting the ideal of ancient Hellas.

## The Age of Neo-Classicism

The process of idealisation of ancient Hellas reached its peak during the eighteenth century. Antiquarianism and the expansion of European trade gave a new impetus to the search for classical Greece. Now Greek art was for the first time directly experienced through the discoveries of the large-scale excavations at Herculaneum, Pompeii and Paestum. In England some enthusiastic aristocrats formed the Society of Dilettanti with the aim of studying classical lands and antiquities and promoting the "Grecian taste" (see Cust 1914). Thus, in 1751 James Stuart and Nicholas Revett were sent to Athens in order to study and measure the monuments. Their illustrated, voluminous publications of Greek monuments, initiated with the *Antiquities of Athens* in 1762, led to a new understanding of Greek architecture and largely contributed to the formation of a Greek taste which would dominate Europe. The "Greek Revival style", manifest particularly in architecture, swept Europe (Crook 1972: 15-17; Jenkyns 1980: 1-12).

Yet while travel and topography attracted Englishmen to Greece, many renown German Hellenists (including Lessing and Goethe) never set foot there and to their mind Hellas became a sort of heavenly paradise. Johann Joachim Winckelmann, the most prominent and influential figure of eighteenth-century classical scholarship, developed his theories on the supremacy of ancient

Greek art without having visited the country (Butler 1935: 8-48; see his biography in Leppmann 1971). His conviction that good taste was born under the sky of Greece, as first developed in his 1755 book *Reflections on the Imitation of Greek Works in Painting and Sculpture*, was further elaborated in his famous *History of the Art of Antiquity* published in 1764. With Winckelmann's proclamations on the superior quality and creativity of Greek art "the process of idealisation of the Classical golden age had begun" (Tsigakou 1981: 20). Classical Hellas came to be viewed as the source of pure ideals, noble simplicity and moral supremacy; the age of neo-classicism was born.<sup>2</sup>

### "Admirateurs Abusifs"<sup>3</sup>

At the beginning of the nineteenth century travels to the eastern Mediterranean and Greece became fashionable partly because political events (the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars) had made a large part of Europe virtually inaccessible and partly because many travellers were now attracted by the prospect of scholarly research and of actually acquiring antiquities to an extent which was never experienced before (Angelomatis-Tsougarakis 1990: 3).

During the first two decades of the nineteenth century, Greek antiquities would, in a sense, become the apple of discord among foreign nationals travelling or residing in Greece. The Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier,<sup>4</sup> Louis Fauvel,<sup>5</sup> Georg Gropius,<sup>6</sup> Lord Elgin, to name but a few, were avid collectors who, favoured by the circumstances (e.g. the propensity of Turkish officials to bribery), pursued their activities to extremes. It comes as no surprise that many major European museum collections of ancient Greek art were formed precisely at that time as a result of excavation, purchase, or other means of



acquisition. Prompts like "take whatever you can, ... let no living nor dead obstruct you" (letter by Choiseul-Gouffier to Fauvel quoted in Kokkou 1977: 16) or "collect as much marbles as possible" by means "of assiduous and indefatigable excavation" which "ought to be pushed as much as possible, be its success what it may" (letter by Elgin to his agent Lusieri quoted in Hitchens 1987: 43), typified this sort of collecting spirit.

This period also saw a systematisation of archaeological and topographical studies, which almost always resulted in the removal of antiquities to European countries. The most conspicuous example were the excavations of Charles Cockerell, Haller von Hallerstein and their company at the temple of Athena Aphaia at Aegina and that at the temple of Apollo Epicurus at Vassae in Arcadia and the subsequent removal and sale of the sculptures to the Glyptothek in Munich and the British Museum respectively (Bracken 1975: 106-58; Stoneman 1987: 179-201). The extent of the dispersal of Greek antiquities is perhaps best reflected in Williams' exclamation: writing in 1820, he noted that "when all this is considered, it appears surprising that any valuable remains should still be found" in the country (quoted in Tsigakou 1981: 23; for an extensive account of the "archaeologising raiders" from 1440 to 1821, see Ghennadeios 1930).

Yet the travellers' interest in the actual state of the country and the people they encountered never constituted their principal concern. For most of them visiting Greece was like visiting an ideal so that, when on the spot, they were disappointed at not finding the idealised vision of the classical world. It was still the formalised, literary past, not the present, that was the attraction of Greece. Most painted views of early nineteenth century Greece, for example, constitute no more than visual clichés where vaguely defined landscape settings evoke the golden age through the representation of a temple, a column, or other architectural remains (Tsigakou 1981: 26-29). Modern Greece

and its inhabitants were in every situation compared with their ancestors and often found "degenerate" and "debased" (Angelomatis-Tsougarakis 1990: 58-59, 86-87).

## The Eve of the Greek Revival

European awareness of the existence of contemporary Greece would only come in the wake of the Greek uprising in 1821. Yet even the Philhellenic movement was to a large extent fuelled by the admiration for ancient Hellas, as many now felt morally obliged to help Greece in acknowledgement of her cultural contribution to Europe (on British Philhellenism, in particular, see Woodhouse 1969; St. Clair 1972). Moreover, the Greek struggle for independence exercised a strong influence on the imagination of many Romantic artists. This time, at least, the comparison with the ancestors could only be favourable, since modern Greeks were praised for fighting with the same heroism as their ancient forefathers. But, as Spencer (1954: 194) has put it, "the background to the more generous attitude to the modern Greeks was the idealisation of the ancient Greeks". In Reinach's (1883: 139) words, "Greece was saved in consideration of her past".

Had the Western idealisation of the Greek antiquity had any impact on the Greeks' perception of their past? It is often held that "the awe in which the Western world has held the classical tradition has shaped and reshaped Greek apprehension of their own past" (Lowenthal 1988: 733) or that a "sense of the past" was imported in Greece by Western Europe (Clogg 1992: introduction). There is much truth in this view. However, Greek awareness of the affinity of modern Hellenism with classical Greece was also conditioned by the Greek intellectual tradition (which stressed the idea of historical continuity) and the recollections of antiquity in folk legends (Demaras 1989: 259-60). What, then,

was the Greek attitude towards their past and how was it formed? These questions are examined in the next chapter.



## Notes to Chapter Two

1. European travelling to Greece has been the subject of many studies to date, the most exhaustive of which remains Simopoulos' (1970-75) three-volume, *Foreign Travellers to Greece* (in Greek; see Bibliography) with extensive references. Useful accounts also in Kokkou (1977: 5-26), Tsigakou (1981: 9-78) and Angelomatis-Tsougarakis (1990).
2. Reference to the extensive literature on neo-classicism would exceed the scope of this study. For a brief, comprehensive account the reader may consult Kalnein (1972). For the British neo-classical architecture, in particular, see Crook (1972).
3. Borrowed from Baelen (1956: 121).
4. Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier (1752-1817) toured the Levant and the Greek islands in 1776 and later published his memories in three volumes titled *Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce*. He was appointed ambassador to Constantinople in 1785 from where he sent Louis Fauvel to Athens as his artistic agent. He also acquired many antiquities in Constantinople, Smyrna, etc., which he housed in a "museum" upon his return to France early in the nineteenth century (Bracken 1975: 187-88; bibliography in Kokkou 1977: 16, n. 4).
5. Louis-Francois-Sebastien Fauvel, representative since 1780 of Choiseul-Gouffier and French consul in Athens from 1803, had formed the richest and better arranged collection of antiquities and acted as an agent for many European collectors. His house in the center of Athens was characterised as a museum and was visited by almost all foreign visitors to the city (Kokkou 1977: 20, where bibliography).
6. Georg Gropius came to Greece in 1803 and lived in Athens until his death in 1850. He served as consul of Britain and Austria and had one of the richest collections of antiquities in Athens (Kokkou 1977: 22, with bibliography).

### **3 HELLENIC HERITAGE AND MODERN GREECE**

The ideological manipulations of Greek antiquity in Greece is an issue central to any discussion of Greek history and society. What interests us here is to delineate the basic facets of these manipulations in order to set the frame for understanding the aims and the function of museums in nineteenth and early twentieth century Greece.

#### **Intellectual Prelude**

While Western Europe turned to Hellas for inspiration and admired everything Greek, the neo-Hellenic Enlightenment (*ca.* 1774-1821) prepared the ground for the intellectual revival of the nation.<sup>1</sup> This was a movement carried forward by Greek scholars who lived in Western Europe, in the Ionian Islands and in areas of the Ottoman Empire north and east of the line which would later constitute the boundary of the new Greek state. Inspired by intellectual developments and ideals in Europe, especially in France, they sought to employ Western thought (which included the glorification of classical Greece) in addressing the modern Greek condition (Petropoulos 1976: 22-24; 1978: 164).

Intellectual renaissance was seen as a means of achieving independence and establishing the interrupted links with ancient Greece. The sense of nationhood was bolstered by the notion that the modern Greeks were the direct heirs of classical Greek culture, which it was their role to recapture.<sup>2</sup> For the subjugated Greeks this turn to the ancestors meant liberalism,

democracy and independence from the church (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1977: 39, 41) and it became an ideological tool for overthrowing the social *status quo* (Andreades 1989: 62).

In the same liberal spirit, the restoration of the ancient Greek language was seen as a safe vehicle for the revived ancestral glory (Demaras 1989: 16-17, 63-66). The language question at the intellectual level needs not concern us here.<sup>3</sup> What is interesting is that the turn to ancient Greek was also espoused by non-intellectuals; thus, for example, at the turn of the century many people adopted ancient Greek names for their children or ships, or took a more ancient form for their family names (Demaras 1989: 58-60; also, Clogg 1976: 80-81; 1992: 28). This *mimesis*, which initially was only a means towards the ancient ideals (Demaras 1982: 172), would later become a means in itself and would degrade into conservatism (see p. 45).

The extent to which this "cultural ferment" had affected the great mass of the Greeks -the peasants and the urban artisans- is debatable, if only because of the extreme paucity of evidence. It is argued that the neo-Hellenic Enlightenment influenced only a small, if influential, circle of intellectuals (Clogg 1992: xix). In the same line, it has been suggested that consciousness of the ancestors and of their splendid works are difficultly observed at a lower, popular, level (Simopoulos 1986: 65-66). Whether this is true or not, it is hard to say given the scarcity of evidence and the lack of systematic research on the subject. Some evidence does exist, however, on how the Greek antiquity was understood by the people.

## Ancient Greece in the Greek Consciousness

While the intellectual activities of the diaspora Greeks sought to awake the nation, in Greece itself the memories of the ancient Greek world, extant



mainly in oral tradition and in the sight of monuments, nurtured a general respect for the ancient relics. The presence of the monuments had always been an important factor in confirming the sense of affinity with the past (Fletcher 1977: 157) and exercised a strong influence on the imagination of the Greeks.<sup>4</sup> Nineteenth century folk tradition often sees the monuments as living entities which exercise mysterious powers against anybody attempting to remove them. A *locus classicus* is the story of the *Caryatid* which Elgin removed from the Erechtheion; when the Turks, advised by him, tried to take down the other Caryatids at night, they were scared by the statues' sobs and cries and went no further (Kakrides 1989: 39-40).

Ancient relics were also thought of as guards and protectors of the land, whose removal causes catastrophe (Kyriakides 1965: 179). For example, the battered statue of "Demeter", half-buried in the fields of Eleusis, was revered by the peasants, who attributed to its magical powers the fertility of their land. In 1801 the Eleusinians strongly opposed Edward Clarke's attempts to remove the statue, fearing that the fertility of their land would cease and when he eventually managed to put it on board, they predicted the wreck of the ship which carried the statue (Stoneman 1987: 153-54; cf. the story cited in Andreades 1989: 279).

In the Greek consciousness the monuments were an indispensable element of the landscape, a "garment of the place" (in Makryghiannes' words, cited in Andreades 1989: 270) and as such should remain *in situ*. As we shall see, the monuments were indeed the reason for the very existence of modern Hellenism. Nothing expresses this view more eloquently than General Makryghiannes' later exclamation, "Even if you get ten thousand *talara* for these statues [he referred to two statues that some soldiers were about to sell to Europeans], never let them out of the country. For those we fought". To understand the significance of this remark we have to remember that

Makryghiannes was illiterate (he only learnt how to write in his old age, in order to compose his "Memoires"). This means that his perceptions are genuinely folk, they derive from the popular consciousness and the popular ideology. He was consequently more likely to echo the folk *psyche* and to express popular beliefs which had been silently recorded on the illiterate Greek soul over the centuries (see Simopoulos 1986: 74-75).

## Early Measures for the Protection of the Antiquities

In practical terms, however, the Greeks had limited means of safeguarding the monuments under the Ottoman rule. Often, the most effective way of protection was to use antiquities as construction material for contemporary buildings (AE 1854: 1204, n. 1; Ross 1863: 149); sometimes such walled-in pieces were venerated as bringing good luck to the house by being its guardians (AE 1856: 1378, n. 1). During the last decade before the Revolution, efforts to secure the antiquities were tackled in a more systematic way by the Elders of the local communities. Then, in 1813 some enthusiastic Greek patriots formed the "Philomousos Etaireia" (Friends of the Muses Society) with the aim of improving education and safeguarding the antiquities. The "Philomousos Etaireia" was the first to proceed with the gathering and purchasing of antiquities and even with some small-scale digging during the Revolution (Kalogeropoulou and Proune-Philip 1973). Their plans also included the establishment of a museum (see p. 63).

During the Revolution concern for the protection of the antiquities was manifested by both Greeks and foreign Philhellenes. In a very well-known instance, the Athenians sent a quantity of lead bullets to the Turks who were besieged in the Acropolis so as to prevent them from extracting the lead within the joints of the column slabs (Kokkou 1977: 36).

At the same time the Provisional Greek Government was particularly concerned with impeding the illegal removal of antiquities by European military officers or traders.<sup>5</sup> A series of recommendations to local authorities were issued (Volonakes 1939) and "all old antiquities" were pronounced "national" (Protopsaltes 1967: 24, no. 13). Finally, the Greek constitution, which was approved by the Third National Assembly in 1827, provided that "antiquities are not sold or removed from the state" (quoted in Kokkou 1977: 46). It may thus be said that the popular view which wanted the monuments *in situ* was now officially endorsed.

## **The Formation of Modern Greece and the Ideological Structure of the New State<sup>6</sup>**

With the Treaty of Adrianoupolis (1829) and the Protocol of London (1830) Greece was established as an independent state under hereditary monarchy. In the meantime the Third Greek National Assembly of 1827 had already elected Count Ioannes Capodistrias, former Minister of the Tsar, as Governor of Greece. Capodistrias, who arrived in Greece in January 1828, was saluted as liberator and saviour of the country (bibliography on his life in Kokkou 1977: 48). He struggled to create the basic institutions of the state in a country destroyed by years of war and he was specifically concerned with the establishment of schools and other intellectual institutions (see p. 77).

After the assassination of Capodistrias in 1831, the "Protecting Powers" (France, Britain, Russia) imposed a monarchical form of Government on Greece and young Otto, second son of King Ludwig of Bavaria, was appointed King of Greece. The arrival of Otto marked the beginning of a large-scale organisation of the new state. Up until 1835, however, the country was governed by a Regency council composed of Bavarians, who showed little



understanding and sensitivity towards Greek realities. They sought to fashion a monarchic state after the German model, despising the liberal spirit of the Greek revolutionary constitutions and assemblies. It was then that Athens became capital of Greece "in a move that symbolised the extent to which the cultural orientation of the new state was to be influenced and indeed distorted, by the burden of Greece's classical past", as Clogg (1979: 71) rightly remarks.

Indeed, the role of the Bavarians in shaping a specific attitude to the Greek past was of critical importance. Skopetea has clearly remarked how "in the spirit of their classicist preferences, but also -and more crucially- in their attempt to elicit a new loyalty from their subjects", the Bavarians "nurtured, with every means, the contentment with a helladic past" (Skopetea 1988: 177-78). The ideological implications of this attitude were to be far reaching and persistent. It is not coincidental, for example, that the shift of the Greek mind towards conservatism originated exactly in this period; for Demaras (1982) the pride for and imitation of the ancestors, which previously constituted a step forward, now becomes sterile admiration, a means in itself. The repercussions of this perspective, it should be stressed, were to be felt until much later, when the ideological orientation of the Greek state would be modified to include other periods of Hellenism as well (p. 49).

The entire ideological structure of the new state was based upon the memory of the ancient Greek world. The first decades after the establishment of modern Greece were marked by a preoccupation with confirming its classical origin, in an attempt to prove the "greekness" of the Greeks. This turn to the past -which at that time meant classical past- was ideologically and politically indispensable in asserting the Greek national identity and legitimating the existence of a Greek state after four centuries (Augoustinos 1977; Skopetea 1988). Let us not forget that the shaping and promotion of a national identity is one of the paramount aims of any new statal entity. The

only way for a new state to justify itself is through the continuous structuring of a distinctive national identity, and the subsequent standardisation of a national "tradition" as unique and crystallised (Tsoukalas 1984: 42). In the Greek case, the national tradition was, initially at least, the tradition inherited from ancient Greece.

Efforts to confirm the ancient origin of Greece were all the more imperative as the Philhellenic movement seemed to have lost momentum after the 1821 Revolution; Fallmerayer's theory that contemporary Greeks had not even a drop of ancient blood in their veins,<sup>7</sup> triggered fierce reactions. The 1830s, 1840s and 1850s were thus almost exclusively characterised by retrospection. It is not surprising that pre-scientific Greek archaeology developed along the same lines as folk studies and historiography, that is, with the intention of proving the Hellenic origin of Greece (Koumanoudes 1984: 16-17; for this orientation of early Greek folk studies see Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1977). It was within this context that the president of the Archaeological Society declared in 1840:

*"... the renaissance of the Greek nation... calls for one single quest... the quest, I say, for the antiquities and the preservation and repair [sic] of the wonderful works of our forefathers" (IIAE 1840: 2)*

In the light of this, we may easily understand why the ideological and political orientation of the new state largely depended on archaeology. From the state viewpoint the monuments were the only "ready" national symbols for use. Such, for example, was the meaning of the restoration of a Parthenon column drum to welcome Otto in Athens in 1835 (Skopetea 1988: 197). Archaeology could thus enter the political domain and play a crucial role in the early life of the country. "It is about time that the nation realises that it owes its political

existence to archaeology", noted K. Phrearites, Dean of the University, in 1868 (Phrearites 1868: 388).

The fact that Modern Greece owed its mere existence to the antiquities had been widely recognised ever since the establishment of the new state:

*"Gentlemen, it is to these stones, which thanks to Praxiteles, Pheidias, Ictinus, Agoracritus and Myron, are more precious than agate and diamonds, that we owe our political renaissance" (IIAE 1838: 34).*

With these words I. Rizos-Neroulos, minister of Education and president of the Archaeological Society, addressed the second meeting of the Society, held in the Parthenon in 1838. (The mere fact that the first meetings of the Archaeological Society were held on the Acropolis is eloquent). This recognition, however, charged Greece with the "moral duty" to prove herself worthy of her ancestral patrimony and to demonstrate to Europeans that their assistance was not in vain:

*"Gentlemen, we who boast about the heritage of our ancient excellence... would be considered unworthy of our autonomy..., if, once included among the civilised nations, would not turn our attention to these sacred fragments" (IIAE 1840: 21).*

This idea was persistently repeated throughout the nineteenth century (e.g., IIAE 1837: 6-7; 1838: 36; 1859-60: 4; 1865: 7; see also p. 50, below) and survived into the early twentieth century (Polites 1907: 159).

Let us here note that Greece was not the only European country to fetishise its past. The beginning of the nineteenth century was marked in Europe by an increase in nationalistic sentiment backed by the romanticism prevailing at the time. Archaeology was thus often enlisted to the service of



glorifying a past (Kotsakis 1991: 65-66). Furthermore, throughout Europe museums were recognised as appropriate institutions for the preservation of national heritage and the promotion of national consciousness (Selmeczi 1983; Lewis 1992: 28).

After Otto's expulsion from the country in 1863, the Danish prince George was appointed as King George I of the Hellenes. This was a period overwhelmed by the aspirations of the so called "Great Idea", that is the intention of equating the Greek state with the Greek nation through the incorporation of all people who were considered Greek within the frame of the Greek state.<sup>8</sup> The theoretical requirement of this aspiration was the restoration of Byzantium in the Greek consciousness, an intellectual process which had started in the 1840s and 1850s and culminated in the publication of the *History of the Greek Nation* by K. Papareghopoulos in 1860-1874 (see Kitromilides 1984: 32-33; Skopetea 1988: 251-71). To that date, prevalent theories on the classical inheritance of modern Greece could not but discard Byzantium as an unhappy period. Now the old suspicion would languish and Papareghopoulos' work would establish the diachronic continuity of Hellenism: ancient Greek world, mediaeval and modern (Demaras 1977: 474). It has rightly been observed that "Papareghopoulos' theory of historical continuity was an essential part of the nation-building ideology of a national community striving to conquer its national unity and seeking a historical basis for its national claims" (Kitromilides 1982: 8).

Nevertheless, as far as the monuments and museums were concerned, the repercussions of this change of attitude were not felt until much later. Towards the end of the century, the creation of Societies such as the Ethnological and Historical Society (1882), the Christian Archaeological Society (1884) and the Folk Society (1908; Kokkou 1977: 280; 283-84; 134 respectively) manifested a new interest for preserving a wider range of

monuments. Furthermore, in 1897 provision was taken for the foundation of the Fine Arts Museum (ΦΕΚ Α', 133, 19-9-1897). Yet it was not until 1914 that a Byzantine museum was legislatively established in Athens (Kokkou 1977: 285), and it may be argued that this date marks the total acceptance and incorporation of Byzantium in the Greek consciousness. It is significant to note that, despite the theoretical restoration of later phases in the history of Hellenism, the antiquity still remained a powerful model, a "title of honour" which contributed to strengthening the national self-respect every time this was needed. This may, in fact, explain why the scheme for a national identity based on ancient Greece was so persistent not only in the first half of the nineteenth century but even much later. It is against this background that we have to understand why Greek archaeological museums were exclusively oriented towards classical antiquity, even when the ideological perception of the Greek past was expanded to incorporate more recent periods of the nation's history.

On the political level, the second half of the nineteenth century saw the annexion of the Ionian Islands in 1864 and that of a large part of Thessaly in 1881, the bankruptcy of 1893 and the financial crisis which followed, and the Greek defeat by the Turks in 1897.

The beginning of the twentieth century in Greece was characterised by mobilisations aiming at curtailing the royal power and reforming the political life of the country. After the culmination of these attempts in the 1909 "Ghoudi revolt", Eleutherios Venizelos, one of the most prominent figures in the history of modern Greece, was recalled from Crete to undertake the reorganisation of the state (Dakin 1972: 183-189). A new era for the country would start.

## Antiquities and Official Ideology

In brief, central to the Greek ideology was the view of the monuments as paramount symbols of national pride and identity. This was a view influenced not only by the intellectual tradition of the neo-Hellenic Enlightenment and the popular beliefs, but also by the widespread position that the nation owed its renaissance to the antiquities:

*"We Greeks owe, to a large extent, our autonomy to our glorious name and the immortal monuments of art, which we inherited from our ancient ancestors... a sacred duty is imposed on us all to think of and guard the antiquities as sacred relics, if we want to prove to the civilised world that we became a independent State deservedly and that we deserve to be called Greeks" (Circular no. 11538, Guidelines on the application of the ΒΧΜΣ antiquities law, 1899)*

In this sense, the efforts to protect the monuments were not only necessary but, also, tinted by a moral connotation: that is, with the duty to prove the modern Greeks worthy of their heritage in the eyes of the world.

At this point it will be useful to take a closer look at the official view of the antiquities. Just what was this view and how it was expressed? Even a brief survey of the language used in reference to the antiquities is enough to show the dominant concept -mainly as exemplified by the Archaeological Society. The antiquities are described as: "Memoires of the ancestral glory" (AE 1837: 13); "Wonderful works of our forefathers", "heirlooms of our paternal wealth", "sacred fragments" (ΙΑΕ 1840: 2, 14, 21); "Relics of the ancestral art and glory" (ΙΑΕ 1859/60: 4); "Monuments of the art and life of



our great ancestors", "distinguished products of the incomparable art of our ancestors" (*IIAE* 1866: 3, 4); "Invaluable ancestral treasures" (*IIAE* 1888: 46); "Immortal monuments of art", "sacred heirlooms of antiquity" (Antiquities law of 1899); "Sacred relics of the Ancient Art" (Polites 1907: 159). In other words, the antiquities are conceived as magnificent remnants of a glorious past; they reflect the ancestors' incomparable art, so that they are seen and revered as sacred relics. The persistence of this view throughout the period which concerns us here is striking and has important implications for museum displays which will be discussed in chapter nine.

What has been examined so far was the theoretical side. How, if at all, did all these ideas materialise? Obviously, the protection of the monuments *in situ* was the one side of this effort, while the other one was the preservation and presentation of antiquities in museums. Before we turn to museums and their displays, let us shed some light on the organisation of archaeology in the Greek state.

## Greek Archaeology in Practice (1829-1909)

During the early years the main problem was how to protect the monuments, many of which had already been removed from the country or were seriously jeopardised by war, and prevent their illegal exportation from the country. In 1828 Capodistrias asked the Acting Delegates of the Aegean Islands to keep vigil in order that antiquities would not be exported from the country and that they would be ceded to the Government by their holders (Protopsaltes 1967: 39, no. 29). In 1829 the Fourth National Assembly ratified article 18 of the constitution passed by the Third Assembly at Troizena, which prohibited the export of antiquities.<sup>9</sup>

Despite all efforts the illicit export of antiquities was difficult to curb and the establishment of a "Public Museum of Archaeology" was proposed as a corollary step (see Protopsaltes 1967: 38-39, no. 28). The first National Archaeological Museum, conceived as a depository for all Greek antiquities, was founded at Aegina, then capital of Greece, in 1829 (see p. 77). At the same time a series of measures for protecting antiquities were circulated to provincial governors, who tried to sensitise local inhabitants on the value of antiquities. This was the first attempt to regulate all issues pertaining the protection of antiquities, such as prohibition of sale and export, cataloguing, ownership and excavation (Protopsaltes 1967: 142-45, no. 117). The adoption of these basic measures was followed by quite vivid archaeological activities and small scale excavations, the finds of which were sent to the museum at Aegina and were often accompanied by a brief report on their discovery. It is touching to see the care with which ancient remains are reported, objects described or clandestine activities pointed out.<sup>10</sup>

The Greek Archaeological Service was founded in May 1833 within the Ministry of Education (Kokkou 1977: 70-72). Headed by the Bavarian architect Adolf Weissenburg, it also comprised Kyriakos Pittakes,<sup>11</sup> the first Greek archaeologist, Ioannes Kokkones,<sup>12</sup> the first Greek pedagogue, and the German archaeologist Ludwig Ross,<sup>13</sup> each of whom was responsible for supervising a geographical department (Sterea Hellas, Aegean Islands and the Peloponnese respectively). In the years to come this structure would undergo dramatic changes, reflecting the crucial position of archaeology within the new state (Kokkou 1977: 73-74, 81-83).

In 1834 appeared the first archaeological law "On scientific and technological collections, the preservation of antiquities and their use" (ΦΕΚ Α', 22, 16-5-1834). Provision was made for the foundation of museums at the capitals of the provinces with the purpose of preserving objects of local value

(see p. 64). Although the main effort of the time was safeguarding and securing the antiquities, some major excavation and restoration works were also under way, especially on the Acropolis of Athens (Kokkou 1977: 77).

The year 1837 was marked by two events: the publication of the first Greek archaeological periodical entitled "*Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς*" (Archaeological Newspaper) and the establishment of the Archaeological Society, which was formed "to help in the recovery and restoration of the Greek antiquities" (Petrakos 1987a: 244). During those years financial limitations did not allow for purpose-built museums and finds were deposited into already existing ancient monuments or modern buildings (a practice which has been in use until recent days). Especially in Athens, where antiquities abounded everywhere in the city, one after the other ancient monuments, churches or contemporary buildings were used to house valuable ancient remains (see p. 85). In 1834 there already existed ten such depositories (Muller and Scholl 1843: 21).<sup>14</sup> As Reinach (1896: 76) commented, there was as yet no question of any classification or order whatsoever; the same Reinach had earlier been appalled by the way in which Pittakes juxtaposed fragments of every kind by means of plaster into wooden frames at the Pinakothèque (Reinach 1883: 148). The temple of Hephaistus, known as Theseion, was the only one among these places to be legislatively established as "Central Archaeological Museum" in 1834 (see p. 86).

Nevertheless, safeguarding the scattered all over the country antiquities was a cumbersome task for the newly established state. Severe measures were taken against illegal excavations and illicit export (Sylloghe 1905: 34-35), but clandestine digging, in particular, remained a real scourge. Reinach (1883: 140-41) described such appalling activities in the area of Tanagra (see also Kokkou 1977: 122-27; Petrakos 1987b, *passim*). Although condemnation was voiced from everywhere the situation was very difficult to fight.<sup>15</sup> One of the



major problems was the lack of archaeologists (*IIAE* 1871-72: 16; Kastorches 1879: 45; Kokkou 1977: 118-22), the other being limited financial resources. The state confronted the situation by entrusting the safeguard of antiquities into the hands of local authorities: police, civil servants, but mainly teachers.<sup>16</sup> This situation started changing only in 1871, when the Archaeological Society officially appointed ephors in the provinces for the first time (*IIAE* 1871-72: 16; Petrakos 1987a: 54; see p. 200).

In the meantime, the crucial and long-debated issue of building a central archaeological museum in Athens bore fruit with the foundation of the National Archaeological Museum in 1866 (see p. 157). Several archaeological collections, along with the first museums, were also founded all over Greece. Many decrees issued between 1885 and 1899 regulated the organisation of museums (Petrakos 1982: 185-92; see pp. 68-70). The first systematically organised excavations were undertaken, often in collaboration with the foreign archaeological schools which started to be established in Athens (Kokkou 1977: 130). In 1888 "*Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*" (Archaeological Bulletin), the Archaeological Service's periodical was first published. At the end of the century, a new archaeological law was passed in 1899. All antiquities were, once again, declared state property; "consequently the right and care for their discovery and preservation, collection and deposition in public museums lies with the state" (Article 1; quoted in Petrakos 1982: 141).

The first decade of the twentieth century was mainly characterised by a proliferation of museums (see chapter eight). We should also mention the organisation in Athens of the First Archaeological Congress in 1905, which comprised, among others, a section on "Excavations, Museums and Preservation of monuments" (Comtes Rendus 1905; Kokkou 1977: 136-38).

## **The Contribution of the Archaeological Society<sup>17</sup>**

Since its creation in 1837 the main scope of the Archaeological Society was to assist the Greek Government in the recovery and restoration of antiquities. The epitome of the Society's stance throughout the period under study was that accurate study of the monuments could be done later, whereas deterioration and damage of the antiquities was "an irreparable evil" which required immediate action (*IIAE* 1872-73: 5).

Priority was given to the Athenian monuments. The 1830s, 1840s and 1850s were characterised by large excavations, like the excavation on the Acropolis which started in 1839-40 and the first restorations, like that of the Parthenon and of the temple of Athena-Nike in the 1840s. In the meantime the Society proceeded with the purchase and collection of antiquities and with the establishment of the first museums, starting with the Casts Museum in 1846 (see p. 99).

Outside the capital the Archaeological Society sought to recruit members in the provinces, who would help in protecting the monuments there. Many teachers, in particular, were nominated members of the Society and local authorities were requested to provide an amount for the Society in their annual budget (*IIAE* 1859: 5, 6). Excavations expanded outside Athens from the 1860s onwards and in 1871 the Society organised the first inspections of antiquities in the Peloponnese and Sterea Hellas. In the wake of these activities several local collections of antiquities were formed. By 1875 seven "public museums" (for the indiscriminate use of the terms "museum" and "collection" at the time see p. 27) were reported and objects deposited in each one of them between 1871 and 1875 were recorded (*IIAE* 1874-75: 42-44).

From the very beginning the Society had realised that the appropriate formation of museums and their regular function required permanent employees and proceeded to the appointment of archaeologists as well as guardians of antiquities in many areas (Petrakos 1987a: 80, 101). Meanwhile, the Government was on several occasions urged to provide posts of ephors and curators of antiquities in the provinces at the Society's expense. Thus, in 1907 the Society was given the right to appoint curators in ten major museums (RD of 31 October 1907; *IIAE* 1907: 72-76). One of the Society's major contributions was also the provision of grants for young Greek archaeologists to be trained abroad (see Petrakos 1987a: 103, 105).

Of particular interest for the present study is the role of the Archaeological Society in museum development at the beginning of the present century (see pp. 246 & 295 and Appendix 4). The foundation of museums throughout the country was recognised as an effective means of protecting antiquities (*IIAE* 1900: 20), something which is clearly expressed in the following quotation:

*"The collection of... movable antiquities, the building of museums as well as the deposition and appropriate arrangement of these antiquities is our most compelling work, for before we undertake new excavations... we ought to secure those [antiquities] which have already been discovered and make them accessible to science" (IIAE 1906: 54).*

The events of 1909 had a direct impact on this state of things. The passing of new archaeological legislation in 1910 brought about significant changes in the division of responsibilities between the Archaeological Society and the Government. Apart from a withdrawal of administrative tasks, the Society was imposed a severe cut of funds (Petrakos 1987a: 116). This split of respon-



sibilities between the Society and the Government slowed down museum work, which largely depended on the former. From that date on the Society mainly concentrated on the excavation and publication of archaeological material and the development of museums followed a quite different pace in the subsequent years.

After having delineated the ideological attitudes to the Greek antiquity and the way Greek archaeology was organised, it is now time to examine the view of museums and museum displays in Greece during the period under study. These questions are discussed in chapter four.

## Notes to Chapter Three

1. The definitive treatise on the subject is Demaras (1989); see also Demaras (1969).
2. Yet this was not a new process: from as early as the eleventh century the Byzantine Greeks, bordered as they were by foreign nations, began to realise their distinctively Hellenic roots and to acknowledge the classical Greek spirit and culture as their ethnic heritage. More precisely, Vakalopoulos (1974) in his "History of Modern Hellenism" holds that modern Greeks regained their national consciousness in the years after 1204 (siege and fall of Constantinople to the Franks). It is not coincidental, for example, that the name "Hellene", which had for centuries come to mean "pagan" or "non-christian", began to assume its double cultural and ethnological content: that of a Hellenic civilisation and a Hellenic origin (Svoronos 1975: 20).

For an account of how "The idea of the Greek Nation" developed the British reader may refer to Campbell and Sherrard (1968: 19-49).

3. For a brief introduction to the "language question", which has remained in the fore of the Greek cultural and political scene since the end of the eighteenth century, see Browning (1983).
4. Kakrides' (1989) book "The Ancient Greeks in Modern Greek folk tradition" is the most comprehensive treatise on the subject.
5. Protopsaltes (1967: 19-21, nos. 8-10; 27-28, no. 18; 45-47, nos. 37-38); Kalogeropoulou and Proune-Philip (1973); Kokkou (1977: 41).
6. A good sketch of "the ideological substructure of the new Greek state" is provided by Demaras (1982: 326-404) in his book on Greek Romanticism.

7. Fallmerayer, J. 1830. *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters*. Stuttgart und Tübingen. More specifically, Fallmerayer argued that all links between ancient and modern Greeks had vanished because of the intrusions of Albanian and Slavic ethnological elements into the Greek lands in the sixth and tenth centuries A.D.

On the impact of his theories on the evolution of Greek historiography see Veloudes (1982).

8. It should here be reminded that the new Greek state left a large part of Hellenism outside its borders; as a consequence, the question of the "unredeemed" Greeks was the axe around which developed most of the ideological and political orientations of the country until 1923 (when the Treaty of Lauzanne, which was signed on the aftermath of the "Asia Minor Disaster", confined the state to its Helladic territory and put an end to the aspirations of the "Great Idea").
9. Nevertheless, following a request by the French Scientific Expedition in Peloponnese for taking some ancient pieces from Olympia, Capodistrias asked the Assembly to modify this article. The Government was thus given permission to "forgive only the export of fragments... when requested as contributing to archaeological research" by some scientific institution of any government (Protopsaltes 1967: 73-75, 91-94, 159-162, nos. 48, 64, 66-68). Capodistrias saw this as a recompense for the exchange of books, maps and scientific instruments, which were greatly needed by Greek educational institutions.

For the same reason he later, during the stay of the Bavarian scholar and archaeophile Ludwig Thiersch in Greece, volunteered to offer some ancient pieces to the King of Bavaria to be deposited to the Munich museum (Protopsaltes 1967: 102-103, no. 75; 163-65, nos. 136, 138). This is probably the earliest instance of the use of Greek antiquities for diplomatic reasons, something that would be repeated in the future.

10. Protopsaltes (1967: 43-44, nos. 33-35; 40-43, no. 31; 48-51, no. 40; 52-66, no. 42; 84-85, no. 55; 45-47, nos. 37-38 respectively).



11. Kyriakos Pittakes (1798-1863) was born in Athens and educated in Foreign Languages, Latin and Medicine at Corfu. An indefatigable pioneer of Greek archaeology, he devoted his whole life to the cause of preserving the country's archaeological heritage. He best exemplifies the type of archaeophile patriot, whose lack of sound philological knowledge was compensated by his ardent love for the Greek past and his tireless efforts to safeguard it. (It was under his persuasion that the Greeks sent lead bullets to the Turks so as to prevent them from extracting the lead from within the monuments during the Acropolis siege in 1822; see p. 43). In 1832 he was appointed "Curator of Athenian Antiquities" (Protopsaltes 1967: 180-83, nos. 153-56). He played a leading role in the foundation of the Archaeological Society in 1836 and later in the publication of the Archaeological Journal, for the regular edition of which he made titanic efforts over the years. In 1848 he became General Ephor of Antiquities. The excavation of the Athenian Acropolis from 1833 to 1861 was also due to him. For his life and work see Kokkou (1977: 70-71, 85-99).
12. Ioannes Kokkones (1796-1864) was a prominent figure in the early educational scene of the country and an active member of the Archaeological Society.
13. Ludwig Ross (1806-1859) came to Greece in 1831 and travelled extensively around the country. Director of the Archaeological Service from 1834 to 1836, he later became a professor of Archaeology at the University of Athens. His books, especially the travelling notes, are a valuable source of information on the monuments and the history of the land.
14. The Theseion, Hadrian's Library, the private house of Pittakes, Pittakes' office in the Ministry of Culture, the plateau of the Acropolis, the "Pinakothèque" in the Propylaia, a cabin behind the Propylaia, two cisterns on the Acropolis, a small mosque erected in the Parthenon and a small building close to the Erechtheion. (For the evolution of the state archaeological collections in Athens see Kokkou 1977: 147-89).

15. See *ΠΑΕ* (1866: 4; 1868-69: 4-5) for the slackness and the breaking of the archaeological law everywhere in the country.
16. See Circulars no. 11355 of 14-10-1863, and no. 4630 of 20-6-1874 in *Sylloghe* (1905: 46-48, 60-61).
17. For the history of the Society see Kastorches (1879); Kavvadias (1900a); Petrakos (1987a; 1987b).

## **4 THE GREEK MUSEUM: A DISCUSSION ON PURPOSES AND INTENTIONS**

The aim of this chapter is to provide a clear insight of the term “museum” as applied during the first decades of museum development in Greece. The discussion which follows draws mainly on early texts on museums, museum legislation, official documents and other relevant publications.

### **The Concept of the Early Museum**

#### **The Museum as Depository**

Greek archaeological museums derived from the pressing need to secure the antiquities in safe places. Their depository character was evident from the outset, as shown in all references to a museum before and immediately after the Revolution. In his 1807 draft for a “GREEK MUSEUM” Adamantios Koraes, the most influential figure of the Greek Enlightenment and a diaspora Greek who resided in France for most of his life, suggested:

*“That a place... be named “GREEK MUSEUM”, where all these copies [i.e. the antiquities] will be deposited after their registration in a catalogue... The Greek Museum should have two curators... The registration in the catalogue should be detailed... It should be a stone-built building defined by a large piece of land... It should be provided... with a significant amount of money... The way of enrich-*



*ment [of the collections] is multiple..." (quoted in Kokkou 1977: 28-31).*

Koraes also stressed the need for "explanation" of the antiquities. The significance of this text lies not only in its early date, but also, and strikingly, in the clarity of Koraes' proposals. Such detailed guidelines would take long to appear again. Nevertheless, the basic function of museums as depositories of collected antiquities remained the same for a long time. Such was the idea of a museum expressed by the Filomousos Etaireia in 1813:

*"Collected antiquities are stored in a purpose-appointed place named 'MOUSEION' to be viewed by their lovers" (Kokkou 1977: 32),*

and later, in 1824, when they decided:

*"to form a Museum in which to deposit all remaining... vestiges of antiquity" (Protopsaltes 1967: 16-17, nos. 4-5)*

Similarly, various proposals addressed to the governor Capodistrias urged the establishment of a museum, where antiquities could be:

*"deposited... to common usefulness and glory" (letter dating in 1829; Protopsaltes 1967: 80, no. 51).*

Summing up this concept, a local governor, addressing the inhabitants of his area in 1829, explained:

*"Museum is called the place where antiquities are deposited and cared for. Antiquities are the old things, i.e. those made by our ancestors" (Protopsaltes 1967: 107, no. 82).*

All the above ideas materialised in the foundation of the first National Museum on Aegina in 1829, primarily conceived as a shelter for antiquities

(see p. 77), whereas the depository character of museums was legally sanctioned in the archaeological law of 1834:

*"The construction of museums ... shall have as primary purpose the preservation in situ of all objects having local value" (Article 8; see p. 52)*

### **The Museum as Educator**

The educational mission of museums was realised as early as 1825, when the first edict of the Provisional Greek Government on the duties of the Ephor of Education ordered the collection of ancient remains in each province and their deposition in schools:

*"so as each school will gradually have its museum; a most necessary thing... for knowing the abilities of our ancestors" (Kokkou 1977: 41).*

There was indeed a close connection between schools as depositories of antiquities and museums and school teachers often served as "museum curators" (see pp. 54-55). Later, implicit behind the foundation of the museum at Aegina was the notion that exposition to the ancient Greek antiquities gathered in the museum, would have an educational effect on the population (see pp. 77-78). Yet no detailed statement of purpose was issued at that time and the educational role of museums was not officially established until much later (see below).

### **The Public Museum**

From the outset Greek museums were conceived as places to be publicly enjoyed (see above) and this is one of the most important characteristics of

early museum development in Greece. One aspect of this concern for the public was the provision of regular opening for museums. For example, the early state collection housed in Hadrian's Library in Athens was open to the public once a week (see p. 85). Later, regular hours of opening would be established for most Athenian museums.

Particular concern for the public was mainly expressed by the Archaeological Society which, apart from the progressive extension of opening hours in its museums (see pp. 106, 108 & 127), on every occasion stressed that the museums were open to all and that the public was provided "every permission and facility in studying and copying and drawing the antiquities and even publishing them freely through the press..." (*ΠΑΕ* 1860: 14-15; cf. *ΠΑΕ* 1871-72: 12). On the other hand, the Society made every effort to display collections or excavation finds quickly and render them accessible to the public. Thus, it was often thought that antiquities "should no longer remain... totally enclosed and invisible to a wider public" (e.g. *ΠΑΕ* 1880-81: 26). The fact that displays were "open to public view" (*ΠΑΕ* 1882-83: 31) or "for the public's sake..." (*ΠΑΕ* 1883: 9) was stated every time a new display opened (see also *ΠΑΕ* 1883: 13; 1889: 30). In fact, displaying antiquities was legitimate only if they would be accessible to a wide public (*ΠΑΕ* 1887: 12), whereas discomfort was expressed when a collection could not be immediately displayed:

*"The antiquities transported were initially placed in two rooms in the basement and thus they necessarily became inaccessible to the public... However, it is hoped that in a few months' time... the collection will... open again to the public (ΠΑΕ 1881-82: 19).*

In 1890 the issue of publishing the Archaeological Society's hand-written catalogue was raised. It was then rejected on the grounds that because the



museum visitors had the real exhibits in front of them, they did not need a descriptive catalogue, but "another kind of explanatory catalogue" instead (*IIAE* 1890: 58). What is interesting here is the recognition of the public need for such information.

## The Museum in Legislation

Despite the fact that a clear conception of museums was already evident before the foundation of modern Greece, museum legislation did not precede museum foundation. On the contrary, the first Greek museums were established before any such legislation was sanctioned. It seems that the need for specific museum legislation was only really felt during the organisation of the major Athenian museums. This resulted in a series of legislative acts which are discussed below. It should be noted that similar provisions were not taken for the organisation of provincial museums (for a complete list of museum legislation from 1833 to date see Petrakos 1982: 181-212).

The first legal provisions are found in the archaeological law of 1834, which established "the preservation *in situ* of all objects having local value" as the primary purpose of museum construction (see above). This, in fact, was the principle which guided early museum foundation all over Greece. A few years later, in a recommendation *On an archaeological museum* in Athens, some of the prerequisites for museum foundation are already understood: safety for the antiquities, appointment of a curator and a committee and collection (in Athens) of all antiquities which had no local value or were in danger *in situ*.<sup>2</sup> In conclusion, collection, safeguard and deposition of antiquities were the main functions which early Greek museums were called to fulfil according to the needs of the country at the time.

Only when the initial urge to secure the antiquities was satisfied and the conditions of their preservation improved, could priorities change. Thus, in 1858, when the construction of the National Museum was being largely discussed, the *Draft for an archaeological museum* suggested that:

*"the museum should have general period divisions and subdivisions per category of antiquities... Room should be provided for replicas of contemporary [Greek] antiquities in foreign museums... Space should also be allowed for an archaeological library, offices and store rooms..." (Kokkou 1977: 208).<sup>3</sup>*

The discussion so far has concentrated on the official attitude. Let us also examine how the Greek museum was conceived in other quarters at that time. Two texts, published on the occasion of the construction of the National Museum, are particularly relevant here as they constitute the only theoretical documents on the Greek museum. The first, titled *Instructions on the museum's construction*, was published in 1858 by Alexandros Rizos-Rangaves, a prominent Greek scholar and archaeologist, who stressed that the museum building should have a form worthy of the ancient treasures it would contain, but its beauty should be based on skilful design harmony rather than sumptuous construction. He suggested an arrangement by chronology and type and drafted a comprehensive proposal for the layout of antiquities in the museum: statues, busts and architectural members in the centre of the rooms; reliefs and inscriptions walled in around the rooms; vases, coins and small objects in side rooms. Optimal conditions of lighting, he thought, would be provided by skylights in the central rooms and by windows in the side rooms. What is unique, Rangaves appended a list with rough percentages of antiquities discovered in Greece to that date in order to help the architects in space design and allocation (Kokkou 1977: 208).

The second document was a report by the Royal Academy of Arts in Munich, the judging committee in the competition for the museum's design (see p. 156). The Academy's report (1860) constitutes one of the most clear and sound accounts of museological principles expressed in relation to nineteenth century Greece. First, the report read, the exterior of the building should be relevant to and revealing of its content; in the case of the Greek museum the most appropriate means of providing harmony between the "architectural shell" (sic) and its interior was the adoption of the "Greek rhythm". This required smooth horizontal lines and flat surfaces and favoured constructing on length rather than height. The combination of closed rooms and open space, colonnades and open yards, in particular, was seen as most appropriate to the Greek landscape. In principle, the Academy's scheme for the displays resembled that of Rangaves but, in keeping with contemporary European practices, it provided for a second floor for small objects.<sup>4</sup> Oblique lighting, instead of vertical roof lighting, was considered to be the most flattering for the antiquities. In brief, simplicity of form and function were the principles advocated throughout the document (Kokkou 1977: 211-14). One cannot fail to observe that the text which best expressed the needs of the Greek museum was written by foreigners, Germans. In this they expressed a spirit quite opposite to that prevailing in the design of many German museums, that is, of sumptuous construction and impressive interior decoration (e.g. the Glyptothek, the Altes museum, etc.; see chapter ten, p. 324).

The first major piece of legislation on museum function, an analytical degree *On the organisation of the Athenian museums*, appeared in 1885, that is after most museums in the city were already open. Now, for the first time after 1834 (see p. 64), the purpose of museums was defined as follows:



*"The purpose of museum foundation is the teaching and study of archaeology, the general diffusion of archaeological knowledge and the generation of love for the fine arts"*<sup>5</sup>

The same decree established that the National Museum and the Acropolis Museum would be open daily with a fee of one drachma each, apart from weekends when entrance was free of charge; that antiquities should be displayed "decently" and in chronological order and that museum catalogues should be printed for public use. It also ordered that guards should be in uniform.

The educational purpose of museums, first expressed above and repeated in 1886 (see n. 6) and then in 1893 (see p. 159), did not imply the application of educational programmes in the modern sense but, rather, the general educational and cultural benefit one might obtain through the systematic display of antiquities. Nevertheless, a circular *On teaching in the museums and the Acropolis*, dating from 1886, was in the spirit of our contemporary practices in that it provided specifically for school visits to the Acropolis and its museum and to the National Museum. Thus, teachers were asked to notify the General Ephory of Antiquities, orally or in writing, in advance of a planned visit so as to obtain a special permit. They were advised to prefer hours during which the museums were not open to the public. Moreover, it was stressed that, if optimum conditions of teaching were to be guaranteed, no more than twenty pupils at a time should be taken into the museum.<sup>6</sup>

The imposition of an entrance fee to the Acropolis Museum and to the National Museum lasted only for a year and so from 1886 onwards both museums were accessible without charge.<sup>7</sup> Both museums were open daily for four hours in the morning (usually from eight to noon) and then for two hours in the afternoon (later until sunset). Slightly different timetables were adopted for winter and summer. However, as a plethora of edicts and circulars issued

between 1885 and 1899 reveals, the exact opening times were often slightly altered.<sup>8</sup> In 1892 it was established that, apart from weekends, the museums would also be open for two hours on bank holidays and that they would be shut only on five occasions a year (Christmas, New Year's Day, etc.; see n. 8).

There were also "notifications" to visitors: a fee should be paid to the porter for the deposition of hats, umbrellas, etc.;<sup>9</sup> dogs should be left by the porter for one drachma; smoking was forbidden and so was touching the exhibits. What is more, wandering around the museums without study purposes, "out of boredom or for fun", was not allowed (see n. 8). Other legislative acts regulated issues arising on specific occasions; for example, the deposition of the Demetriou collection in the National Museum<sup>10</sup> or the deposition of the coins from the same collection in the Numismatic Museum.<sup>11</sup> Specific legislation, expressing a clearer view of museum organisation, was sanctioned only for the organisation of two major museums, namely the National and the Numismatic museums; note, for instance, the provision for an acquisition policy for both museums in 1893 (see p. 159 & p. 177), or the adoption of an arrangement of antiquities per collection.

## **The Display Concept**

Was there an explicit theoretical scheme on the purpose of archaeological displays in Greece and what, if any, were the objectives to be met in them? Was there a comprehensive policy for the displays of archaeology and what were the principles guiding their installation?

In our attempt to examine the role and the aim of archaeological displays in Greece, museum legislation proves, again, a valuable source. Let us first note that, compared to other aspects of museum function which were legislatively arranged (e.g. administration, opening hours, etc.), displays

occupy a tiny fraction in museum legislation. Thus, legislation (in 1858 and then in 1885) provided for only a general scheme for the organisation of displays, namely that by chronology and by type of objects (pp. 67 & 69). However, apart from the principle that antiquities should be "decently displayed" (see below) and although some ideas had been suggested (see the proposals of Rangaves in 1858 and those by the Academy of Munich in 1860, pp. 67-68), specific guidelines for the layout of objects within displays were not legislatively sanctioned.

Nowhere was there a clear statement on the objectives of displays. Yet a closer reading of the 1885 decree cited above (pp. 68-69) is revealing: "to this end", that is, "the teaching and study of archaeology, the general diffusion of archaeological knowledge and the generation of love for the fine arts" which was "the purpose of museum foundation", "museum antiquities should be decently displayed and classified in the rooms... according to the various periods of art history". Is this not an evidence that the official view of museum displays, implicit as it may be, was didactic and aesthetic? This would indeed be in accordance not only with the idea that "teaching is the primary purpose of museums" (p. 69), but also with the general taste for aesthetically pleasing displays, evident in the display terminology of the time.

In fact, a study of the language used in archaeological journals and general, literary, periodicals reveals a widespread view according to which antiquities should be "decently" displayed. As seen from above (p. 69), this was legally established for state museums in 1885, but it mainly constituted the spirit which prevailed in the displays of the Archaeological Society throughout. Expressions like "tasteful" or "decent" display (*IIAE* 1862: 13; 1878-79: 21), "appropriate" or "presentable" show cases (*IIAE* 1866: 7; 1869: 9), "decent deposition" (*IIAE* 1878-79: 21), "suitable and presentable placement" (*IIAE* 1907: 67) and the like, abound in the reports of the Archaeo-



logical Society. The language used in the *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον* (Archaeological Bulletin), the official journal of the Archaeological Service, is much more descriptive, factual and without these aesthetic implications. However, expressions, such as "decent show cases" (*Αθήναιον* 9, 1880: 393), "elegant order" (*Αθήναιον* 10, 1881: 322) and the like, are also found in the literary periodicals of the time.

At the level of "denotation", as Barthes would have put it, this terminology reflects aesthetic ideals, without specific implications in practice. However, an analysis at the level of "connotation", which comprises the ideological content of language (see p. 20), would reveal that this linguistic neutrality is misleading. In fact, the language used in reference to displays suggested the idea that the antiquities were conceived as art treasures, splendid relics of the Greek past which were to be admired in aesthetic isolation in the museum setting. This was in keeping with the official view of the antiquities as outlined in the previous chapter (pp. 50-51). Implied here was a view of archaeological displays where no "explanation", as Koraes had wanted (p. 63), was required, but where the antiquities were sanctified and their much proclaimed affinity with contemporary Greece was thus eventually curtailed. The examination of the actual displays in chapters five to eight and their subsequent analysis in chapter nine will allow us to elaborate on this point.

## Conclusions

The concepts of the Greek museum gradually shifted from the notion of a depository of antiquities to the idea of a place from which archaeological knowledge could be diffused, while throughout museums were thought of as places accessible to all members of society. Nevertheless, we cannot talk

about an overall state policy for museums. Museum legislation applied only to the Athenian museums in a way which sanctioned the precedence of the capital in all archaeological matters. Provincial museums functioned without a legal frame. Their role (deposition of antiquities of local value; see p. 64) was defined once and for all in the archaeological law of 1834; the only other legal provision made after that date was that all finds should be deposited in public museums around the country (archaeological law of 1899; see p. 54). But even the legislation which applied to the Athenian museums did not provide for more than the chronological and typological arrangement of exhibits, their "decent" display and practical issues of daily function, such as opening hours (a more complete museum policy was adopted only for the National and the Numismatic museums; see pp. 159 & 177). As for the purpose of displays, this was vaguely seen as didactic and aesthetic; yet a comprehensive theoretical conception of archaeological displays was missing.

However, a clear picture of the nature of Greek archaeological displays can only be formed through the detailed examination of the overall museum development, which is presented in the following four chapters.

## Notes to Chapter Four

1. This museum was never established (Kokkou 1977: 38).
2. Αρ. 1064, 13-5-1840, *Περί Αρχαιολογικού Μουσείου* (Sylloghe 1886: 33-34).
3. Note that what this document established was already practiced in museums in Europe. Chronological layout and displays of replicas, for example, was rather common (see chapter nine), whereas casts collections were popular during the nineteenth century (Connor 1989).
4. Note, however, that most European museums were mixed, that is, they contained antiquities in the ground floor and mainly paintings in the upper floor. E.g. the Lateran (Vatican 1983: 21), the Altes museum (Pevsner 1976: 127), the Kaiser-Friedrich museum (Klessmann 1971: 58).
5. RD of 25-11-1885, ΦΕΚ Α', 113, 7-12-1885.
6. Αρ. Πρωτ. 9630, 19-7-1886, Εγκύκλιος *Περί Διδασκαλίας εν τοις Μουσείοις και τη Ακροπόλει* (Sylloghe 1892: 100-101).
7. *Γνωστοποίησις εις τους επισκεπτομένους την Ακρόπολιν και τα Μουσεία*, 19-7-1886, (Sylloghe 1892: 102-105).
8. Αρ. Πρωτ. 3989, 26-5-1886, Εγκύκλιος *Περί των ωρών καθ' ας θέλουσιν είσθαι ανοικτά τα εν Αθήναις Μουσεία και η Ακρόπολις* (Sylloghe 1892: 97); R.D. of 4-7-1886, ΦΕΚ Α', 189, 17-7-1886, *Περί ελευθέρας εισόδου εις την Ακρόπολιν και τα Μουσεία*, Αρ.5965, 6-5-1887, *Περί των ωρών καθ' ας θέλουσιν είσθαι ανοικτά τα ενταύθα Μουσεία και η Ακρόπολις* (Sylloghe 1892: 113); R.D. of 9-4-1892, ΦΕΚ Α', 119, 11-4-1892, *Περί ελευθέρας εισόδου εις τα Μουσεία και την Ακρόπολιν και κατά τας μεγάλας εορτάς*, Αρ. 9635, 16-



4-1892, *Περί καθορισμού των ωρών κλπ., καθ' ας μένωσιν ανοικτά τα Μουσεία και η Ακρόπολις* (Sylloghe 1892: 244-45); Απόφασις 11761, 30-5-1895, *Περί ωρολογίου των εν Αθήναις Μουσείων και της Ακροπόλεως* (Sylloghe 1905: 283); R.D. of 10-3-1899, ΦΕΚ Α', 48, 15-3-1899, *Περί του καθορισμού των ημερών καθ' ας θέλουσι μένει κλειστά ή ανοικτά η Ακρόπολις και τα Αρχαιολογικά Μουσεία.*

9. This was later abolished; see Εγκ. 7492, 4-8-1889, *Περί καταργήσεως της υπό των επισκεπτών των Μουσείων γενομένης πληρωμής δια την φύλαξιν των ράβδων αυτών κλπ.* (Sylloghe 1905: 129).
10. R.D. of 4-8-1890, ΦΕΚ Α', 251, 28-9-1890, *Περί τοποθετήσεως εν τω Εθνικώ Μουσείω των υπό του Ιωάννου Δημητρίου δωρηθεισών Αιγυπτιακών αρχαιοτήτων.*
11. R.D. of 7-11-1891, ΦΕΚ 316, 11-11-1891, *Περί καταθέσεως των Αιγυπτιακών νομισμάτων της συλλογής Ιωάννου Δημητρίου εν τω Νομισματικώ Μουσείω.*

# **5 DISPLAYING ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREEK MUSEUMS: THE PIONEER PERIOD (1829-1874)**

## **Introduction**

As it has been shown, the main concern during the first years after the liberation was how to collect all scattered around the country antiquities gradually and secure them in the best possible way. This initially meant housing the antiquities in ancient monuments or public buildings as the construction of a purpose-built museum would take many years to realise. The first Greek museum was established in 1829 at Aegina, then capital of the new state. Soon, the transfer of the capital to Athens rendered the latter the centre of all museum activities for almost fifty years. After discussing the museum at Aegina, this chapter traces the development of the first Athenian museums from 1834 to 1874, when opened the first wing of the National Museum.

As stated in the Introduction, the data in the following four chapters is organised chronologically so that any changes or patterns in museum development may be better illustrated. Data presentation draws on an amended version of Pearce's model for artefact study, as outlined in the first chapter (pp. 8-9), and comprises, as each individual case permits, a note on displays' history, layout, spatial organisation, hardware, supporting material, environment, and overall assessment. It should here be reminded that this is the first detailed study on Greek archaeological displays, so that some displays, particularly the early ones, are by necessity discussed in great, and

perhaps tedious, length; the data presented here will hopefully provide useful ground for further research to build upon.

## The First National Archaeological Museum at Aegina

### Historical Note

The foundation of the First National Museum at Aegina has to be examined within the context of the political and cultural revival of the country. Aegina, capital of Greece from 12-1-1828 to 3-10-1829 (Dantes 1967: 95), was at the time no more than a small town facing severe housing problems, with a population outweighed by refugees from other parts of Greece, living in poverty in huts (Koulikourde and Alexiou 1950: 38-40). Nevertheless, Aegina was "the centre of the intellectual cultivation of the nation" (Rangaves 1894, cited in Konstantinopoulos 1968: 42). The establishment of primary and higher schools, the foundation of the National Library and other similar institutions, as well as the establishment of the National Museum reflected concern for the education of the youth:

*"The Government... educating the new... generation towards virtue and wisdom did not forget that the strongest motives for the acquisition of these two... goods are the glorious memories of the good taste and intelligence and political grandeur of our ancestors. Thus contemplating [the Government] ordered the establishment of a national museum, for collecting into it whichever relics were threatened with destruction or were in danger of becoming a pray to foreigners, postponing to happier times to request from the earth what she... covers in her bosoms" (Moustoxydes 1831: 64).*



The museum's foundation by Capodistrias, who wished it to become the central and main museum in Greece (Keramopoulos 1913: 86), reflected both his concern for the protection of antiquities as well as an early realisation of the educational role and potential of museums.<sup>1</sup>

*"Considering the need and the usefulness of gradually collecting all antiquities, still covered by the soil of Greece, which, having the potential to contribute to the progress of Philology and the Arts, are scattered in various places of the State... Wishing to secure the antiquities now held in the Orphanage building and whichever ones will later add to this collection..."*

Thus read the Edict of 21 October 1829, officially establishing the museum (Protopsaltes 1967: 110, no. 84). However, the museum's formation goes back to an earlier date. The first nucleus of the collection, comprising antiquities donated or casually found, was placed in the Orphanage building in May 1829 (Kokkou 1977: 62, n. 4).<sup>2</sup> The Orphanage<sup>3</sup> was a big rectangular building with a paved courtyard in the middle, where a small church dedicated to "Greece's Saviour God" was also erected (Kokkou 1977: 48). According to a first, unofficial piece of news about the museum, published on 14-9-1829 in the General Newspaper, "two statues, two heads, nine inscriptions, sixty seven reliefs, one decree, one large stone vase and two gold earrings" formed the "beginnings of the newly established museum", which was "daily visited by travellers and by the French committees of Fine Arts [i.e. members of the Expédition Scientifique de Morée], the painters of which copy the most important" (quoted in Pharmakides 1960: 24).

Administration during the first months was entrusted to the Administrative Committee of the Orphanage formed by Count Viaro Capodistrias,<sup>4</sup> the Governor's brother, the archdeacon Gregorios Konstantas

and the arhimandrite Leontios Kampanes. Soon, however, Capodistrias recalled from Venice Andreas Moustoxydes,<sup>5</sup> a scholar who was to become his main collaborator in the educational and cultural sphere, to entrust the direction of the museum to him. Moustoxydes arrived on the island in October 1829 and actively devoted himself to the collection and safeguarding of antiquities by all means: purchase, small scale excavations, donations by individuals,<sup>6</sup> touring of the Cyclades in 1830 (Pharmakides 1960: 48), etc. His monthly reports to the Government on the museum's acquisitions, compiled from at least April 1830 until August 1831, are a priceless source of information on that first period (Manes 1960: 67).<sup>7</sup>

At the same time a recommendation, sent by Capodistrias to the temporary local authorities, instructed them how to collect and preserve antiquities, how to take detailed notes of them, how to conduct excavations, where necessary and how to provide for the transport of all antiquities to the National Museum (Protopsaltes 1967: 142-45, no. 117). The Government was often requested to increase measures for collecting antiquities and provide for their safe transport to Aegina.<sup>8</sup> As a result, the museum was soon enriched with finds sent from all over Greece and especially from the islands, often accompanied with a draft catalogue of them, some of which are published by Protopsaltes (1967: e.g. 97-100, no. 72; 140-41, no. 114). The term "catalogue", it is reminded, is here used in its broader sense and it does not mean detailed catalogues as we know them today.

The first official catalogue of the museum, compiled by Andreas Moustoxydes, appeared in December 1830 in a report to the Government (Protopsaltes 1967: 152-55, no. 127). From Moustoxydes' report we gain an idea about the amount of objects accumulated in the museum by 1830 as numbers are given per category of objects (e.g. 109 vases, 359 coins, seventy one inscriptions, twenty four statues, etc.)<sup>9</sup>. A total of 967 objects are

recorded. At least another six catalogues of the acquisitions of that period were sent to the Government as shown in *Protopsaltes*.<sup>10</sup> Cataloguing the exhibits remained one of the basic concerns until 1832 when Andreas Moustoxydes left his post (*Protopsaltes* 1967: 169-73, no. 144). A catalogue compiled by Leontios Kampanes, then Curator of the museum, for the period 1829-1832, cites 354 pieces of sculpture and another 1,204 ancient objects, many of which were of a later date (e.g. icons and religious vestments). This catalogue was later published by Panaghiotes Kavvadias (1890-92: 11-37) and although simple, it would prove useful for identifying the exhibits (Kokkou 1977: 63-64). The painter Athanassios Iatrides<sup>11</sup> undertook the curation of the museum from 1832 onwards. Iatrides stopped recording the collections; most likely because of his fear of giving a bad impression due to his illiteracy (Kalogeropoulou and Proune-Philip 1973). He did compile instead detailed, much admired, drawings of the exhibits.<sup>12</sup>

The history of this first museum ended in 1834 with the move of the Orphanage to Nauplion and of the Military School from Nauplion to Aegina.<sup>13</sup> The collections were temporarily kept by the Commander of the Military School, until their final transport to Athens in September 1837 (Kokkou 1977: 67-68). "Nine baskets full of vases, some other antiquities and ninety five statues and reliefs" were transported to Athens, whereas "the less important antiquities" like "some useless vases"<sup>14</sup> remained at Aegina "for the foundation of a local collection" (Kavvadias 1890-92: 19-21; see also Reinach 1896: 76; Keramopoulos 1913: 86). It was not until 1898, however, that a local museum was established on the island (see p. 222).



## Displays

### ▪ First Display Area

The area under the two narthexes of the Saviour's Church, on either side of the church's entrance (Plan 1),<sup>15</sup> referred to as "statues stand" (Iatrides 1832; quoted in Protopsaltes 1967: 184-87, no. 158) or, by euphemism, "museum of ancient sculpture" (Giraudeau 1835: 255), was used for the deposition of sculptures, architectural fragments, inscriptions and reliefs. The church was attached to the south-east side of the building (Pharmakides 1960: 46). From Moustoxydes' 1831 catalogue of the museum we may deduce that a total of 162 sculptured pieces were on display (Moustoxydes 1831: 64; cf. Protopsaltes 1967: 155, no. 127). Most visitors of the time refer to a large number of marble pieces which did not, in general, attract their attention (Cochrane 1837: 284-85; Klenze 1838: 165). The identification of these pieces is impossible since no mention is made to particular ones and judgements such as "among...[them] are a great number of fine and remarkable productions of art" (Cochrane 1837: 284) should be taken to reflect subjective taste. However, there seemed to be an agreement on the quality of some of the inscriptions (Giraudeau 1835: 255; Klenze 1838: 165; Ross 1863: 145).

All sculptures were simply mixed up on the stone pavement without special arrangement, nor conservation and care for display and lighting (Klenze 1838: 166). Moreover, the area was exposed to the sun from nine o'clock in the morning until six o'clock in the afternoon and, apart from the unbearable heat, strong sun rays made close observation of the antiquities almost impossible (Klenze 1838: 165; Ross 1863: 144).

Iatrides' 1832 report to the Secretariat of Religious Affairs and Public Education is a very eloquent account of the museum's appearance. The church, he wrote, was accessible through the "statues stand", the door lock of

which was in such a bad condition so as to render the use of keys unnecessary. "Very often", he recalls, "I find the door open and the affixed on the antiquities inscriptions (sic) tore off". In addition, both the floor and the sculptures were continuously soiled from birds and dust and needed cleaning with a wet sponge twice a week (Iatrides 1832; quoted in Protopsaltes 1967: 185-87, no. 158). By 1843, when Müller and Schöll (1843: 16) visited the museum, most of the antiquities had already been transported to Athens.

#### ▪ Second Display Area

The second part of the museum, containing all smaller objects, from Aegina and other parts of Greece, was housed in the Library.<sup>16</sup> Due to the lack of space antiquities were deposited in one room "besieged... by books".<sup>17</sup> A rather "temporary and sad" position as Iatrides calls it.<sup>18</sup> His point is well elucidated:

*"A museum's intelligent rhythm (sic) and archaeological order are most necessary; however, it is not enough that each thing is put to its place, but that the place is also appropriate and constructed for its purpose so as to orderly 'receive' the objects put there" (Iatrides 1832; quoted in Protopsaltes 1967: 185, no. 158).<sup>19</sup>*

Moustoxydes' 1831 catalogue, where he cites 1,090 vases and figurines, 538 lamps, clay vases, bronzes and various other small objects, as well as 359 coins, provides an idea about the overall number of antiquities, which must have been displayed in one way or another in that room (Moustoxydes 1831: 64). Giraudeau (1835: 254-55) reported that antiquities were placed on the highest shelves of the Library, while Klenze (1838: 167-70) wrote that vases were "placed next to each other" in hundreds. He mentioned a collection of 450 vases from Aegina, Thera, Attica, which were small, fragmented, dirty and with no interesting decoration. Among them he noticed twenty five ones

exceeding normal standards of size and decoration, to add, nevertheless, that none of them compared to the ones in the collections of Naples, Bavaria or Vulci.<sup>20</sup> He found nothing worth mentioning among coins, bronzes and clay figurines.

By far the clearer image of the room's arrangement is provided by Ross' 1863 description. Grave finds such as clay lamps, clay and bronze figurines, etc., from Aegina, Athens and Delphoi, were displayed in a pair of small glass cases. Two large shelves were used for vases of various sizes and shapes, many of which, according to Ross, were well preserved and of excellent beauty. A small coins and gems collection was kept in a small chest of four or five drawers (Ross 1863: 145).

## Discussion

To our contemporary standards, the museum at Aegina would not qualify as anything more than a basic, improvised storage area. Nevertheless, it does deserve our attention not only for historical reasons, as being the primal attempt of museum development in Greece, but more significantly, as illuminating the struggle of a whole era for securing the country's archaeological heritage. Beyond noble intentions, difficulties abounded in every step, from the gathering of antiquities and their transport to the island to their security and conservation. "There is nothing as convenient and simultaneously as hard as to establish a museum in Greece today", wrote in 1834 Andreas Moustoxydes, the man who devoted himself to the museum's case, making specific reference to the financial hardship of the newly-established State.<sup>21</sup> In the light of this, it becomes clear that proper display could be no more than the last, although not least, concern. We may note, however, that a rough classification of antiquities per category was adopted in their display.



It is difficult to say with certainty if the museum was officially open to the public. As already shown, the area under the narthexes of the church, where sculptures were deposited, was not securely locked and one could easily have access to it on the way to the church itself. Thus, the establishment of fixed visiting hours might have been unnecessary for this part of the museum. If the sculptures under the porticos were rather easily accessible, the same was not true for the inner Library room where all the remaining antiquities were displayed. During the first years the keys of that room were in the hands of the Orphanage Committee, the members of which disliked the presence of the museum Curator, Iatrides, thus rendering access to the room difficult even for him (see Protopsaltes 1967: 185-86, no. 158). But even later, when the keys were finally ceded to Iatrides (Protopsaltes 1967: 191-92, no. 163), one had apparently to access the room through him. When Klenze (1838: 166), visited Aegina in 1838, for example, he had to ask for the door to be broken into in order for him to visit the room, as the Curator was away with the key.

Moreover, the use of the building as an Orphanage, probably rendered it inaccessible to the general public apart from specific hours or occasions. If this was the case, then the museum was not really accessible to the lay visitor; in fact, it seems that the majority of its visitors were foreign travellers or archaeologists.

## **The First Archaeological Museums in Athens**

### **Introduction**

Any discussion on the evolution of the first Athenian museums should take into account the historical circumstances of the first years after the Liberation

and the fact that emphasis was primarily laid on collecting and securing the archaeological relics (see pp. 51-53). In 1832 Kyriakos Pittakes was appointed Keeper of Athenian antiquities by the then Provisional Government, with the task of "keeping vigil" for the safeguard of antiquities and monuments in the city of Athens (Protopsaltes 1967: 182-83, no. 156; Kokkou 1977: 88, 154). The formation of the first public archaeological collections dates back to that time. These collections included antiquities transported to the capital from the provinces and were initially housed in ancient monuments and public premises (see p. 60, n. 14). Yet many antiquities remained in the open air due to the lack of space for their deposition. These first collections were no more than temporary depositories of archaeological finds. Nevertheless, it is interesting to read that the collection housed in Hadrian's Library (1837-1874) [1] was open to the public once a week, every Thursday, as shown in a newspaper article dating back to 1844 (reported by Kokkou 1977: 176).

At the same time considerable aid to the Government was provided by the Archaeological Society, one of the main aims of which was to assist in the discovery and restoration of Greek antiquities (see p. 55). The Society's attitude is well elucidated in the following passage:

*"Antiquities discovered or purchased or acquired by any other means by the Society are property of the National Museum of Greece; until a public building is erected for this purpose, they will be kept by the Society in some appropriate place and registered... in catalogues. They will be always accessible to all lovers of antiquities...; the Society reserving no priority right for herself"*  
(Petrakos 1987a: 233)

Thus, from 1846 and up until 1893, when all its collections were transferred to the National Museum, the Society actively organised its temporary museums in Athens.

The evolution of the first public archaeological collections will not concern us here, not only because they do not fall within the spectrum of the present research, but also because their history is well illustrated in a series of articles and books (Kavvadias 1890-92: 12-29; Reinach 1896: 73-84; Kokkou 1977: 153-88). An exemption is made for the Theseion, which was the only one among the above-mentioned depositories to be legislatively established as a museum and for the Casts Museum which was the first "museum" of the Archaeological Society.

## **The Theseion: Phase One (1834-1874)**

### **Historical Note**

The temple of Hephaestus, known as "Theseion" [2], was legislatively established as "Central Archaeological Museum" in 1834 (RD of 13-11-1834; Kalogeropoulou and Proune-Philip 1973: πη). Despite the variety of uses throughout its long history, the temple, a Doric one dating back to the fourth century B.C.,<sup>22</sup> survived almost intact and served as a Christian church at the time of the museum's foundation. The building was arranged as a museum in the first half of 1835 (Müller and Schöll 1843: 18): all ecclesiastic attributes were removed, a new two-sided roof covered with Maltese stone tiles replaced the vaulted one of the Christian church and a new horizontal wall replaced the apse on the east side (AE 1837: 10; Sauer 1899: 7) (Plan 2). The museum housed antiquities from Athens and Piraeus along with finds from small-scale excavations and a variety of antiquities purchased by Ludwig Ross on the



islands (Müller and Schöll 1843: 18). Later, in 1837, the majority of the antiquities in the National Museum at Aegina were also transported there (Reinach 1896: 76; Kokkou 1977: 172; see p. 80). Müller and Schöll (1843: 21) refer to the Theseion as the largest display area at the time. In 1836 it was already filled (Kavvadias 1890-92: 17; Reinach 1896: 76) and other places were also sought for the deposition of antiquities (Kokkou 1977: 179). According to an unofficial source, in 1844 the museum already contained some 615 ancient pieces (*Αιών Ζ'*, no. 571, 25-10-1844). All contemporary references agreed that antiquities were piled up in the temple in such a disorderly way that it was rather difficult to find one's way around them (Saulcy 1845: 262; About 1858: 255; *Παρνασσός* III, 1879: 78; Sauer 1899: 7). Bréton (1868: 203), described the situation which prevailed in the museum as "a beautiful disorder".

Three descriptions of the Theseion's interior from 1845 to 1869, varying in details and accuracy, provide us with an insight into the museum's layout during this period. The first description of the museum, published by Saulcy in 1845, is a relatively brief and rather subjective one, accounting only for the most remarkable antiquities on display (Saulcy 1845: 261-68). Eustratiades' descriptive catalogue, titled "Those [antiquities] recorded in the Theseion at the beginning of 1864",<sup>23</sup> constitutes one of the most reliable sources of information on the museum at the time. A total of 615 ancient objects are cited with their catalogue number, but, as it will be shown, there were more, unnumbered, objects on display. Kekulé's 1869 treatise on the sculptures contained into the Theseion also proves, because of his concern to cite objects according to their exact position, a very helpful source of information. It should be noted that, although Eustratiades' and Kekulé's descriptions coincide in many aspects, the total number of antiquities accounted for as well as their layout differ. Kekulé's account was a selective one<sup>24</sup> accounting for some 375 ancient pieces, as compared to the 615 catalogued ones cited in

Eustratiades, so the latter probably constitutes a more reliable source as far as total numbers of displayed antiquities are concerned. A plausible explanation to the question of the layout difference may hardly be given. It could be seen to reflect either a different arrangement of the exhibits in a time lapse of only five years (something hard to imagine within that period) or a less than careful description on the part of one of the two writers. This seems unlikely given their very meticulous discussion. It may then be safer to assume that the layout difference observed simply reflects a more subjective approach followed in the description of the museum by one of them.

In the discussion which follows all three descriptions (which take the route to the right of the entrance door eastwards) are combined in order to portray the museum's layout during that phase.

### **Display Layout (Plan 2)**

The interior of the Theseion was "far from being sufficient" (Saulcy 1845: 261) for the wealth it contained and antiquities were also placed under the temple's peristyle as well as in the surrounding area (e.g. the statue of Victory found at Megara,<sup>25</sup> a sarcophagus, some marble seats and two big altars [2]).<sup>26</sup> Saulcy vividly describes the impression given when entering the museum: "in the interior of the temple objects are so crowded that it is almost impossible to judge at first sight even approximately the number and merit of the pieces which form this enormous collection". He further elucidates the way of display: "A pile of monuments was set against the four walls in most cases disposed on many ranks in height, or, truly speaking, piled on each other. Along the axis of the temple itself is a longitudinal assemblage of juxtaposed or superimposed sculptures, in front of the entrance door, which is placed in the long side turned to the south..." (Saulcy 1845: 262).

### ▪ South Side (Eastwards)

Saulcy (1845: 262-63) mentions only eight sculptures on the south-east side, but a much larger number of antiquities was apparently aligned here. Eustratiades<sup>27</sup> cites a total of one hundred and fifty six pieces placed as follows: nos. 1-83 (reliefs, architectural fragments, inscriptions, statues) stood to the right of the entrance door (along the east side of the south wall) until what he calls the "grid" (see p. 93). He then refers to five "grids" (A-E), where were placed nos. 84-126, that is a total of forty two pieces, (an average of eight pieces per grid). A total of eleven lead and clay objects (nos. 127-38) were reported to be placed "on the grids", whereas another seventeen objects (nos. 139-56; inscriptions, gravestones, funerary hydriai and capitals) were placed "underneath the grid".<sup>28</sup> Kekulé (1869: 1-27) gives the following sequence: six sculptured pieces; frame A; four pieces; frame B; one piece; frame C; one piece; frame D; two pieces; frame E and nine pieces. He also mentions that some twenty seven small or fragmentary pieces, mainly Roman portraits, were put in a kind of closed cupboard (*verschlossenen Schränken*) on this side, without giving its exact position.

### ▪ East Side

Saulcy (1845: 263) mentions ten funerary marble urns standing along the east side featuring a small four-faced herm in their middle. Eustratiades<sup>29</sup> writes that nos. 157-99 (gravestones, capitals, statues' heads), that is forty two pieces, were placed "besides the east door [which was not used] into frames or out of them". At the north-eastern corner a "scaffold" (sic) with four ranks (cited as "highest", "middle top", "middle low" and "ground position" respectively) accommodated nos. 200-56 (architectural fragments, fragmentary sculptures, funerary hydriai, etc.), that is a total of fifty six pieces.

According to Kekulé (1869: 45-58) the alternation of free standing pieces and frames continued along the east side as follows: a large one-handled vase



was followed by a cupboard with five sculptured pieces, another large vase preceded frame F, which was followed by three sculptures; then frame G and finally another fifteen pieces (mainly gravestones and two large vases<sup>30</sup>).

#### ▪ North Side

In Saulcy's description it is sometimes difficult to locate exactly the objects in question.<sup>31</sup> However, if our assumption is right (see n. 31), some eight pieces of sculpture attracted his attention here (Saulcy 1845: 263-4). Eustratiades cites a total of seventy three pieces of sculpture (nos. 257-330) placed from the south-eastern corner to the "Harpy". From the Harpy from Delos,<sup>32</sup> which probably stood at the middle of this side, to the north-west corner stood another sixty three funerary reliefs, gravestones, statues, etc. (nos. 331-400).

Kekulé's (1869: 77-132) scheme is the following: twenty six pieces (gravestones, funerary reliefs, vases) were followed by frame H; then another two pieces; frame J; one piece; frame K; another piece; frame L; some eight pieces (among which the Harpy); frame M; four pieces including Hermes from Atalante<sup>33</sup> [3]; frames N, O, P and Q; and, at the end of the side the unfinished "Apollo" of Naxos<sup>34</sup>, cited also by Saulcy.

#### ▪ West Side

Saulcy writes that "four other rows of monuments are disposed in parallel to the occidental wall and in front of the one [row] placed against the wall itself" (Saulcy 1845: 262). What he really means by that is not very clear as he does not further refer to this side. According to Eustratiades<sup>35</sup> some sixty nine pieces were placed along the west side (nos. 401-70), some of which were put into two "frames". Two "glass cases", protecting sculpture fragments, were also referred to on this side. According to Kekulé (1869: 132-46) frames R, S and T were aligned to the west wall followed by some twenty three sculptured pieces (statuettes, gravestones).

### ▪ South Side (Westwards)

Saulcy (1845: 264-66) cites some funerary vases and a total of seven sculptures (among which was the gravestone of Aristion,<sup>36</sup> put into a glass case for protection and that of Lyceas<sup>37</sup> beside it), displayed along the west side of the south wall. According to Eustratiades<sup>38</sup> more than a hundred pieces of sculpture (nos. 458-550; statuettes, gravestones, clay pithoi) stood along the south wall westwards of the door: from the south-west corner to the entrance door some unnumbered objects followed no. 470; then nos. 471-95 (gravestones, female torsi, capitals, etc.), which are referred to as "the basin series" (the "basin" itself being unnumbered), followed by "the pithoi series" (nos. 495-540; nos. 495-518 were inscription fragments put into a frame and nos. 522-40 were clay pithoi). Some other antiquities were placed among the series of pithoi as well (no numbering is given for them). The description of the west side of the south wall concludes with the "Aristion series", comprising statues and reliefs (nos. 541-50), among which was the relief of Aristion itself. The twenty sculptures cited by Kekulé (1869: 147-61) on this side include the Thera kouros,<sup>39</sup> Aristion and Lyceas gravestones, as well as Hermes from Andros<sup>40</sup> [4].

### ▪ Middle

As already shown, an assemblage of juxtaposed antiquities was placed in the middle of the museum; it was headed by two sarcophagi on either side. Three pieces of sculpture attracted Saulcy's attention on the south side of the assemblage, whereas he observed "twenty more or less mutilated torsi...placed upon ten funerary gravestones" (Saulcy 1845: 267) along the assemblage's north side. Eustratiades<sup>41</sup> describes the assemblage of antiquities as follows: four statues (nos. 551-55) were grouped around the "West larnax"<sup>42</sup> [3] and some unnumbered antiquities around the "East" one. Between them antiquities were placed in two lines, the south-facing one comprising twenty one busts,

gravestones and capitals (nos. 556-77) and the north-facing one thirty seven pieces (nos. 578-615).

Kekulé's description is based on a distinction of "corridors" (*Gänge*), by which he probably meant the area between each wall and the pile of antiquities in the middle. The south corridor (Kekulé 1869: 27-44) comprised some twenty three sculptures including the Omphalos Apollo<sup>43</sup> and a copy of Pheidias' Amazon.<sup>44</sup> Four pieces, including the sarcophagus already cited in Eustratiades, stood at the east corridor; antiquities along the "north corridor" (*Nördlicher Gang*) comprised some sixteen pieces (mainly gravestones) and another twenty two ones (statuettes, fragmentary grave reliefs) for which Kekulé writes that they were placed "on the higher row" (*in der oberen Reihe*), probably denoting that they were placed on top of each other. Another sarcophagus stood at the western front of the assemblage [3].

## Display Organisation

The majority of the antiquities on display were discovered in Athens between 1831 and 1837; another large part was discovered at Aegina from 1830 afterwards; and the rest came from Attica, Piraeus, Salamis, Thera and some of the Aegean islands. This shows that antiquities were displayed soon after discovery, a fact which enhances our hypothesis that the museum's layout must have been more or less crystallised by 1845, when Saulcy first described its interior. When one looks at the spatial organisation of exhibits, it becomes evident that no intelligible scheme of any kind may be traced behind it. We may well assume that the variety of sculptures, inscriptions, gravestones, funerary vases and other fragmentary antiquities contained in the Theseion, were simply arranged according to convenience of size and shape. In fact, we have Pittakes' assertion that the arrangement of antiquities followed the "most suitable" way (see next page).



## Display Hardware

As already shown, display hardware comprised large wooden frames along the museum's four walls, wooden shelves at the north-eastern corner, cupboards at the south-eastern side and two glass cases placed at the western side. The frames were a technique devised by Pittakes, who set up the display, in order to secure a multitude of fragmentary pieces of sculpture housed in the museum, the proper display of which was impossible due to the extreme lack of space. "As the matter was fixing the fragments in a way rendering their abstraction impossible", Saulcy writes, "their conservator conceived the idea of having enormous wooden frames, or flat cases, constructed into which a pure and simple mortar bath received disorderly inscriptions, heads, corpses, antefixes, hydriai's pieces, etc." (Saulcy 1845: 267). Saulcy (*ibid.*) refers to twenty-eight of these frames, whereas the number resulting from Kekulé's account is nineteen and Eustratiades is rather vague about their total number. According to Rangaves, the frames, which contained hundreds of more or less important fragments, measured eight to nine feet high by four wide (Rangabé 1855: III). Evidence shows that they were simply juxtaposed on the ground, aligned to the walls [3]. This picture, however, is somehow challenged by Eustratiades' description. Firstly, one observes that he uses both the term "grid" and "frame"; secondly, in his reference to the south-east side, he distinguishes among antiquities placed "into", "on" and "underneath" the five "grids" (p. 89). There seems to be no obvious reason for not accepting that both "grid" and "frame" were used interchangeably to describe Pittakes' wooden panels. If a grid was some kind of display table the "on" characterisation would suffice. "Into the grids", however, shows that antiquities were placed into a display surface, above and underneath which there was enough space for the display of other objects. This suggests that the frames were either suspended on the wall or placed on a kind of support so as

room would be left for the placement of other antiquities underneath them. If our hypothesis is correct, the resulting scheme could have been as follows: five wooden panels were either hung (given the fact that each one of them contained an average of eight ancient pieces -a total of forty two are cited-their weight might have rendered suspension to the wall quite possible), or placed on some sort of support along the east side of the south wall. Eleven lead and clay objects were put on top of the grids; these objects probably being neither heavy nor bulky, they could have easily been placed on the narrow surface of the wooden beams. Thus, space would have remained available for seventeen funerary gravestones, urns and capitals reported to have been placed underneath. The above scheme is hardly sustainable from Kekulé's description, as he provides no indication whatsoever that objects were placed on or under these frames, and this leaves the question without a satisfactory answer for the time being.

It is interesting to note that, although this means of displaying antiquities was accepted only as a temporary solution by contemporary scholars (Saulcy 1845: 267; Rangabé 1855: III), the columnist of a contemporary newspaper saw it as a way in which "those valuable fragments and relics are best secured, they are easily seen and studied, portrayed like ancient... paintings... and they do not require big and large buildings" (*Αιών Ζ'*, no. 569, 18-10-1844).

"As for the statues and all other [antiquities] for which art and study require that they be well visible", Pittakes himself writes, in an article dating back to 1856, "I arranged [them] in the Theseion, wherever most suitable, after having attached them to bases with iron joints..." (quoted in Kokkou 1977: 172-73). All antiquities, it was reported, were numbered in red fast ink<sup>45</sup> with "arabic numerals... attached to the objects themselves" (Newton 1852: 16) in accordance to the collection's catalogue.<sup>46</sup> The only source of natural light was probably the south door (and possibly the east one, which was not used as

a door) and, as there is no indication that some kind of artificial lighting was used in the Theseion, one can imagine that the museum's interior must have looked rather dark. However, this may not have been a serious inconvenience as the museum could probably be visited only during the morning or early afternoon, when daylight would have been still bright.

## Discussion

Although the Theseion was the "central museum" of Athens at the time, information on the museum's everyday function, including security provisions and visiting, is not clear. Kyriakos Pittakes was the Ephor of the museum and responsible for the display of antiquities in it, but the degree of his responsibility over the museum's security and opening is not known. According to the Guide Joanne (1888: 90), the museum key was held by the guardian who lived nearby. It is difficult to say if the museum was regularly open to the public, but the above piece of information seems to suggest that the guardian would open the museum, during the morning or afternoon, whenever there were visitors. What kind of visitors would these be? Judging from other early Athenian museums we may well assume that the Theseion was only visited by a very specific category of people, mainly foreign travellers or scholars and knowledgeable Greeks interested in archaeological matters. In any case, the remoteness of the temple at the time did not probably favour public visiting [5].



## The Theseion: Phase Two (1874-1909)

### Historical Note

The interior of the Theseion must have remained more or less unaltered until 1874, from which time the majority of antiquities were transported to the National Archaeological Museum (*IIAE* 1876: 26; *Αθήναιον* 8, 1879: 154). Although the museum's interior must have looked more spacious, there is no indication that the remaining antiquities' layout was altered. In January 1878 a wooden "scaffold" received the plaster casts from the temple of Apollo Epicurus at Bassae in Figaleia sent from London (see p. 100) and to that date kept in the Acropolis' guard-house.<sup>47</sup> Sybel's (1881: 244-50) and Milchhöfer's (1881: 40-43) accounts of the museum give us an idea of how it looked at the time. Unlike previous descriptions, theirs follow the route to the left of the entrance door, but while Sybel does not give further indications about the exact position of objects, Milchhöfer, although very brief (Milchhöfer 1881: 40), is more accurate.

### Display Layout (Plan 2)

The gravestones of Aristion and Lyceas were placed to the left of the door (Milchhöfer 1881: 41-42; Sybel 1881: 244-46), followed by five sculptures among which stood the grave monument of Prokledes, Archippe and Prokles.<sup>48</sup> A series of gravestones stood behind these pieces, followed by a wooden structure (*Fachwerk*) where plaster casts from reliefs in the Acropolis' collection (he does not mention which ones) were probably displayed on the first two shelves, whereas some other casts were put on the last, lower shelf (e.g. a cast from one of the Spartan "heroizing" type reliefs and another from

an Arcadian relief depicting Asklepios and Hygeia then in Paris; Milchhöfer 1881: 43). At the end of that side stood the torso of a male statue belonging to a grave monument.

Along the west wall, some Geometric vases stood behind other antiquities (Milchhöfer 1881: 43) together with a cast from the Parthenon's east pediment figure of Selene<sup>49</sup> (Sybel 1881: 244) and another from a large funerary vase in the National Museum (see Milchhöfer 1881: 17, \*2). Some votive objects' supports, along with a series of architectural fragments, stood on the floor along the north side, whereas a cast of the large marble lekythos of Myrrhine<sup>50</sup> and two other sculptures were placed behind these (Milchhöfer 1881: 43; Sybel 1881: 244).

The casts from the south and north interior frieze of the temple of Apollo Epicurus at Bassae in Figaleia were displayed in the middle of the temple (Milchhöfer 1881: 43; Sybel 1881: 244). As no antiquities were reported to have stood along the east wall by either writer and, given the fact that a lot of antiquities had already been removed from Theseion, it could be assumed that this side was left empty at the time. The relative spaciousness of the museum towards the end of the nineteenth century (as compared to the previous piling of objects) is probably somehow echoed in the fact that, although this number is apparently a mere indication of what he saw on display, Sybel only described a total of sixty-four antiquities (as opposed to the 615 ones reported by Eustratiades in 1864; note that some thirty-one of these were also described by Kekulé in 1869).

At the end of the century the Theseion started also accommodating Byzantine and other finds (AA 1927-28: 44) and it continued to be used as a museum, until finally abolished in 1935 (Kokkou 1977: 174). However, it seems that the interior of the temple was used as a depository rather than a museum. According to the 1904 edition of the Baedeker Guide (p. 67), the

interior of the temple, which contained nothing significant at the time, was not accessible to the public without a special permit.

### **Display Organisation and Hardware**

No change was observed in the organisational pattern of the display during that second phase and antiquities were once again arranged according to spatial convenience. Although neither Sybel nor Milchhöfer are very specific about the display hardware, it apparently remained the same during this period. It is clear, however, that frames were still in use when they visited the museum. They both refer to "*Rahmen*" (Sybel cites three of them) without specifying their location. It can be noted that some of the fragments referred to by Sybel to be contained into these frames, were seen by Kekulé into the frames aligned along the north wall in 1869. Helpful this it may be, but we should bear in mind that some of the frames may have been dissolved by 1881 and pieces arranged differently. Sybel (1881: 245) also refers to the glass case protecting the gravestone of Aristion and Milchhöfer (1881: 43) talks about a wooden structure, used for the accommodation of casts.

### **Discussion**

Information on this second phase of the Theseion's history as a museum is even more scarce than the information on its first phase is. However, we may presume that the museum must have lost its uniqueness in the city after the establishment of the museums of the Archaeological Society from 1846 onwards. This may have had an impact on the Theseion's visiting, but nothing is known on this matter. It should be noted that responsibility for the museum had at that time passed to Panaghiotes Eustratiades,<sup>51</sup> who succeeded Pittakes as Ephor of Antiquities in 1863.



## The Casts Museum

### Historical Note

Pursuing what Petrakos (1988: 96) characterises as a kind of "archaeological Great Idea", in 1843-44 the Archaeological Society officially requested the British Museum to hand over the four parts of the frieze of the temple of Athena-Nike (*IIAE* 1844: 182; Kokkou 1977: 179-80; Petrakos 1987a: 29). Although the wording of the first reference<sup>52</sup> on this request does not make it clear whether it concerned the originals or just copies of them, the latter seems more likely. Thus in 1844, following the efforts of the Society's corresponding members in London, the British Museum agreed to undertake the expense of making and sending replicas<sup>53</sup> from the four parts of the frieze of the temple of Athena-Nike, the one Caryatid from the Erechtheion and one column slab and a capital from the Erechtheion (*IIAE* 1845: 202; Kastorches 1879: 29; Kavvadias 1900a: 27; Petrakos 1987a: 31). This first dispatch of 1844 was followed by a second one in 1846, which consisted of casts from the Parthenon Marbles; namely, the pedimental sculpture, the fifty metopes removed by Elgin and the part of the frieze carried away to England. Rangaves, who characterised the replicas "dark shadows of their splendid originals" (quoted in Petrakos 1987a: 31), gives a vivid account of the enthusiastic reception of the ship's precious cargo (thirty eight colossal chests) by the Athenians at Piraeus' port in November 1846 (*IIAE* 1847: 296). Finally, in 1847-48 the British Museum sent replicas from the sculpture of the temple of Apollo Epicurus at Vassae in Figaleia (*IIAE* 1848: 10-12; Kastorches 1879: 33; see also Jenkins 1990: 107).

An appropriate place for the accommodation of the casts being sought for, the Government ceded a "spacious, circular vaulted room" in a Turkish bath at the north-eastern corner of the Roman Agora to the Society, which converted it to a temporary "but... appropriate museum" (*PIAE* 1845: 204; 1847: 297) [6]. The Society's desire to occupy the whole building was not satisfied (*PIAE* 1847: 297). According to an information by Kokkou (1977: 184), statues and inscriptions from the Society's own collection were also temporarily placed in the Bath from 1851 onwards. The majority of the museum's contents were transported to the newly-built Acropolis Museum in 1874, whereas the casts from the temple of Apollo Epicurus were first transferred to the guardhouse of the Apomachoi on the Acropolis and finally to the Theseion in 1878 (Kokkou 1977: 180; p. 96). The Bath itself, being built above ancient structures, was demolished in 1890 during excavations by the Society (*PIAE* 1890: 12-13).

Traulos (1960: 184, 211, fig. 140) identifies the Bath in which the museum was housed as that of Oula Bei (Plan 3). Information shows that only one of the Bath's rooms was used, but we do not know which one this was. A contemporary reference in the press which reads "passing by [i.e. the Bath]... and having looked through the railed door" (quoted in Kokkou 1977: 180), suggests that the room in question was the first one, the only room of the building which, according to the floor plan, had a door (Plan 3). The Society's comment on the spaciousness of the room is challenged by About (1858: 255), who, visiting Athens in 1852, wrote that the casts were kept in "a small mosque, as big as a hand". In any case, we may imagine that space was limited.

## Display Layout

Information on the interior of this museum is scarce. However, we know that a four-sided pedestal placed in the middle accommodated the casts from the Parthenon's pedimental sculptures, whereas the statue of Iris, from the west pediment,<sup>54</sup> stood at the centre of the room (*IIAE* 1847: 300; it is not clear whether that meant the centre of the pedestal as well). A piece of information in a contemporary newspaper (*Αθηναί* IE, no. 1374, 19-12-1846; quoted in Kokkou 1977: 180) according to which a multitude of reliefs similar to the surviving metopes on the Acropolis were seen along the walls, probably suggests that replicas of the metopes were placed around the museum walls in ranks of height. According to a more explicit source, copies of the fifty metopes were displayed on the "highest rank" (*IIAE* 1847: 304) on either side of the door. This, in turn, allow us to suppose that, given the fact that no indication is given about the placement of the frieze, it may have been displayed in the lower ranks, that is underneath the metopes.

## Display Organisation and Hardware

The casts were arranged around the room according to their original positions on the temple itself, that is pedimental sculpture, metopes, frieze. The museum's display hardware was apparently extremely simple. We already saw that a four-sided pedestal was placed in the middle to accommodate the figures of the Parthenon's pediments. No construction-material is reported for this pedestal, but we may presume that it was wooden. (This sort of wooden structure was common in those years; see p. 113. A wooden structure used in the museum of Eleusis, although one-sided, may provide an idea of the structure in question here [98]).



## Discussion

It is interesting to point out the resulting effect of the display. The arrangement of the pedimental sculptures on a four-sided structure, no doubt destroyed their coherence as a group designed to be placed on the triangular surface of a pediment. If an attempt was made to present the sculptures in as similar a way as possible to their original one on the pediments, then a kind of a two-sided, possibly triangular-like, structure should have been used instead of the four-sided one. This said, we should not forget, however, that convenience of space, rather than that of internal coherence, was the decisive principle behind displays at that time. As for the information that the metopes were placed on ranks of height it may suggest two things: that they were either attached to the walls themselves or placed on some sort of shelves running along the walls. There is no indication that any written information accompanied the replicas displayed in the museum. We may presume that this was not the case. As far as lighting is concerned, the entrance door and the roof's skylight (*IIAE* 1858-59: 23) were probably the only sources of natural lighting in the room, which, being a bath, would presumably have no windows.

Finally, although emphasis was laid upon the fact that the casts collection was to be enjoyed by the public (Kastorches 1879: 32), it has not been possible to trace any evidence on the museum's visiting. Its existence was published in the press, but whether it was visited by more than a very restricted circle of people, as, for example, the members of the Archaeological Society, foreign archaeologists or travellers and perhaps other knowledgeable people, is not known. In fact, it is very premature to talk about museum visiting or apply other museum terminology, as we understand it today, to that pioneer period of museum development in Greece. It has to be reiterated time and again, that during those years all "museums" were characterised by a

mainly "temporary store-room" nature, which did not allow for further concerns.

## The Museum at the University of Athens

### Historical Note

A large lecture theatre on the ground floor of the University of Athens [7] was ceded in 1858 by the University to the Archaeological Society for the temporary accommodation of its collections.<sup>55</sup> These collections included all kinds of Greek antiquities such as statues, busts, reliefs, gravestones, vases, bronze vessels, moulds, coins, etc., for the most part donated by private collectors (*IIAE* 1858-59: 26). Other antiquities belonging to the Society were gradually transferred to the University from various depositories in Athens (Kokkou 1977: 184). A small collection of Egyptian antiquities was, also, added to the museum in 1860 (*IIAE* 1860: 14). It is interesting to note that the Society felt somehow obliged to provide an explanation for the poor artistic quality and the bad state of preservation of some of the exhibits by noting that "many of them are most curious [sic] relics of art, explanatory of ancient life in general and some of them unique" (*IIAE* 1860: 15; see n. 20 above). Another reason for displaying such impaired remains was to enhance realisation that these were almost the only remains left to the Greeks themselves and thus, stimulate a desire for obtaining more of better quality and condition.

It is equally worth noting that, despite its primitive and temporary nature, the museum was open to the public three times a week. Opening hours are not known but, judging from the information on the opening hours of the Society's later museums, the museum at the University must have also been accessible only in the afternoons. Moreover, the Society provided every

facility to the “lovers of antiquities” in “studying and copying and drawing” the antiquities (*IIAE* 1860: 14).

In 1861 Stephanos Koumanoudes,<sup>56</sup> who was responsible for organising the museum, started compiling the official catalogue of the collections (*IIAE* 1861: 24; Kokkou 1977: 157). Since that year antiquities started being displayed even at the corridor in front of the lecture theatre (*IIAE* 1861: 22) and a year later under the colonnade of the interior atrium of the building (*IIAE* 1862: 12). Moreover, 1862 is recorded as the first time when some consolidation work was done on the antiquities (*IIAE* 1862: 12).

## Display Layout

The University’s “anatomy” lecture theatre situated at the north-eastern corner of the basement<sup>57</sup> along with an adjacent long room served as the main *display area* (Plan 4). This room, however, is referred to as both “adjacent” (Phrearites 1864a: 9-10, n. a) and “back” room (Phrearites 1865b: 78). A reference to the placement of iron frames to the windows of the east side, mainly for securing the contents of “the archaeological store” (Phrearites 1865a: 188) allows us to assume that the room in question was the long one to the right of the lecture theatre (Plan 4). Although the reference to the “back” room cannot be confirmed, the assumption that it was also used for the deposition of antiquities is plausible. We may thus assume that all the north-eastern corner of the basement was used for the accommodation of antiquities.

In the lecture theatre all sorts of antiquities (mainly smaller and more fragile ones like clay, stone and glass vases, clay lamps, moulds, lead and bronze objects, coins, etc.) were placed on the desks (Phrearites 1865b: 78), whereas the long room was full of a variety of objects, probably accumulated without order. We may assume that the small collection of Egyptian antiquities for the “elegant display” of which its donor provided the Society



with "cases" (*ΠΑΕ* 1862: 13) was also displayed here. By 1862 that area had already been filled to capacity (*ΠΑΕ* 1862: 13).

The *second area* accommodating antiquities were the porticos of the interior courtyard of this side (*ΠΑΕ* 1861: 22; 1862: 12; 1864: 5; Phrearites 1865b: 25). The Hermaic stelai of the Kosmetes, found in 1861 were placed "in an orderly way" on the walls, along with other fragmentary sculptures also "accumulated" there (*ΠΑΕ* 1862: 12; Phrearites 1865b: 25-26). According to a reference in Phrearites (1864a: 11, n. a) the porticos were still uncovered in 1864, so antiquities remained in the open air. The same author also mentions antiquities being placed in the interior corridors of the University, without further reference to the exact location (Phrearites 1865b: 25-26); this is a piece of information which cannot be confirmed, but could be an indication that some antiquities were also placed in other areas of the building's basement.

## Discussion

The main part of the east side of the basement of the University building served as a temporary museum or rather, as some of our sources called it, "a deplorable archaeological store" (Phrearites 1864b: 32; 1865a: 188). All references suggest that the prevailing image would have been that of a disorderly accumulation of antiquities. The objects were probably juxtaposed according to the availability of space, with smaller ones housed inside (lecture theatre and adjacent rooms) and sculptures placed in the open air (porticos). There is no indication that catalogue numbers or some sort of label were affixed to the antiquities on display.

The two rooms adjacent to the lecture theatre were apparently naturally lit through their windows. This lighting, however, could not probably suffice for the lecture theatre itself. In fact, the lack of evidence that some kind of artificial lighting was used there, in combination with a reference to the

museum being "a relatively dark prison" (Phrearites 1864b: 32), seems to confirm the assumption that the lecture theatre was very dimly lit. Finally, we know nothing on the museum's security at that time.

No specific information exists on who worked in setting the museum up but, as there was no museum personnel at the time, we may only presume that the person mainly responsible for all museum works would have been the Society's Secretary General, Stephanos Koumanoudes (see n. 56). One might have thought that Koumanoudes' knowledge, skills and methodical mind should, in some way, be reflected in the museum's overall appearance. However, it has to be emphasised that it was a period of internal reorganisation and target-defining for the Society (see Petrakos 1987a: 39-42), a period when only basic steps could be taken as far as museum development was concerned. Viewed in this light the rather sad and "deplorable" image that the museum presented should be explained as a result of lack of appropriate space, financial resources and personnel (see, for example, Phrearites 1865b: 49-56), rather than reflecting the Society's or Koumanoudes' lack of interest for the museum.

As already mentioned, the museum was open to the public three times a week. Nevertheless, we cannot fail to observe that, given its position at a relatively remote end within the building, which would probably render its access rather difficult; the fact that the building itself was not yet fully completed (see Phrearites 1864a; 1865b: 25-26; 1868) and also the building's very character as a university, which meant that it was accessible only to a specific minority of people, we are inclined to assume that the museum's public would have probably been very specific and restricted.

## The Museum in the Varvakeion Lycaeus

### Historical Note

The sparseness of space in the University led the Society to seek for other premises for the accommodation of its collections. In 1861 the Government ceded to the Society some rooms at the basement of the Varvakeion Lycaeus<sup>58</sup> [8]. Many of the inscriptions, which were to this date kept in the University's lecture theatre, were transported there in 1862 (*IIAE* 1862: 13; see also *IIAE* 1865: 5-6; 1866: 7). Despite the fact that a wing of the Varvakeion's ground floor was also ceded in 1864,<sup>59</sup> the Society showed a certain reluctance in moving its antiquities. The ongoing, serious dispute between the University's rectorate and the Society over the space occupied by the latter's collections<sup>60</sup> resulted in the Minister of Religious Affairs and Education ordering the Society to evacuate the University, transport all its antiquities into Varvakeion and construct the necessary for their display cases.<sup>61</sup> We may thus consider 1865 as the real foundation date for this museum (*IIAE* 1865: 5).

At the expense of the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Education and the University, "convenient positions and cases" for the antiquities were constructed and "the whole was arranged in such a way that soon afterwards Varvakeion could provide the lovers of antiquities with an idea of the first, so to speak, orderly Athenian museum" (*IIAE* 1866: 7). Considerable time, money and effort were invested into the transfer, conservation and arrangement of the exhibits, a work which must have been to the greater extent carried out during 1866. Expenses totaled the amount of 2165,13 drachmas, which was reported as the highest sum spent for museum works since Independence, "and this means progress" (*IIAE* 1866: 7).



The museum was open twice a week on Monday and Wednesday afternoons from three to five during the winter (*cf. ΠΑΕ* 1865: 6, n. 1, where it is reported that it was open from three to six) and from four to six during the summer; but, as often reported in the following years, it was poorly attended by Greeks, the majority of its visitors being foreigners (*ΠΑΕ* 1866: 7; 1872: 12; 1881: 23). The basement, which was closed to the general public, could only be visited after special permission by the president of the Society (*ΠΑΕ* 1865: 6, n. 1; Sybel 1881: 233).

A collection of Prehistoric relics from Switzerland, Syria and Greece donated by George Finlay along with their catalogue and two cases, enriched the museum in 1869 (*ΠΑΕ* 1869: 9; see p. 113). In 1876 the Society was obliged to evacuate two of the rooms in the Varvakeion and either compress the antiquities into the remaining rooms and the basement or transport them to the one completed wing of the National Museum (*ΠΑΕ* 1876: 27). By 1877 the Varvakeion had by far exceeded its space capacity (*ΠΑΕ* 1877: 37). From 1878 onwards both this and the museum at the Polytechnic were simultaneously open (*ΠΑΕ* 1878: 27). When in 1882 political events led to the confiscation of the Varvakeion by the Government, the Society had to evacuate the building and transfer all the antiquities within five days to the east side of the Polytechnic building, which was ceded to the Society the previous year (*ΠΑΕ* 1881: 27; 1882: 18; for the historical events see Dakin (1972: 137). The antiquities deposited in the building's basements remained there until 1886 (*ΠΑΕ* 1884-85: 25; 1885: 35; 1887: 13).

## Display Layout

The Varvakeion's use as a temporary museum spanned over a period of twenty years, from 1862 up until 1882. Considering the years from 1862 to 1866 as preparatory ones (only the basement, which was not accessible to the

public, was used at the time) there then remains the period from 1866 to 1882 during which two major phases should be distinguished on the basis of space allocation.

▪ **Phase One: 1866-1876**

As already shown, it was not until 1866 that final display arrangements crystallised and the museum's complete display profile would undoubtedly be best portrayed within the period 1866-1876, when all six, east wing rooms, allocated to the Society were in use. Unfortunately, no hard evidence on how the museum looked at that time survives. Eustratiades'<sup>62</sup> report provides only a very rough account of the museum's content in 1865, that is immediately after the collections' removal from the University. This report, however, seems to reflect a still incomplete stage as it refers to only two out of the six rooms. The information in ΠΑΕ providing no clear idea on the museum's layout during that period either, no lucid interpretative scheme may be drawn. It can only be deduced by later sources that antiquities were typologically arranged within the rooms.

▪ **Phase Two: 1876-1882**

In 1876 space available for display narrowed down with the evacuation of two rooms and the compression of the main part of their contents into the remaining four. A safe, but obviously not completely exact, reconstruction of the museum's display profile for this period may be attempted on the basis of two texts both dating from 1881. One is Milchhöfer's description in his book on the Athenian museums (Milchhöfer 1881: 63-86) and the other is von Sybel's account of the sculptures contained into the Varvakeion, part of his sculpture catalogue of the Athenian museums (Sybel 1881: 196-235). Milchhöfer's description is by no means exhaustive, whereas Sybel's catalogue is probably more reliable as far as total numbers of objects on

display are concerned, but refers only to sculptures. The provision of a diagram of the display area by Milchhöfer (1881: 63) makes it easier to follow the museum's description and to visualise its interior to a considerable extent.

Four rooms situated at the east side of the building's ground floor formed the display area at the time (Plan 5). The rooms were narrow, with no direct access to each other, communicating only by means of a long, narrow corridor in front of them. Such an architectural layout was not a happy one for a museum's purposes for the additional reason of rendering their surveillance difficult (*IIAE* 1877: 37). There were two vase rooms, one for sculpture, one for terracottas and bronzes, while various other sculptures were displayed along the corridor.

- *First Vase Room (Plan 6, no. I)*

A series of small Greek and Roman marble heads from excavations in Athens were displayed to the right of the entrance door and along the room's east long side (Milchhöfer 1881: 63-65; Sybel 1881: 203-208). On the basis of Sybel's (1881: 203) reference to glass cases (*Glastische*) in this room, we may assume that Milchhöfer's (1881: 63-64) vague reference to *obere Reihe* and *zweiten Fachwerk* may well account for this kind of display surface; it is also possible that some heads may have been displayed on rows of open shelves (*cf.* [86], [90]). A series of red figured Attic vases were also on display along this wall. In the middle of that side a lectern-type cabinet (*pultschrank*) accommodated the contents of two Roman sarcophagi found in Athens in 1865 (Milchhöfer 1881: 64).

Milchhöfer (1881: 65) refers to only three, but apparently a whole series of marble heads were placed (on shelves we should think again) under the window along the narrow north side of the room. If our reading of Milchhöfer (1881: 65, 67) is correct at this point, we should then imagine an alternating series of glass-covered, lectern-type cabinets (*Glaspulten*) and simple, glass-



covered cabinets (*Glasschränke*) placed against the long west wall of the room and accommodating a large number of small objects (vases, bronzes, jewellery) of various provenances and dates (even later ones like, for example, Byzantine). These cabinets apparently resembled the ones placed along the sides of the large Mycenaean hall of the National Museum [26]. What is worth noting here is that provision was taken for the distinctive display of special finds within a single cabinet (e.g. the jewels of two women, *Philotera* and *Amymone*, discovered in 1874 into a marble sarkophagus at Dipylon in Athens, were placed into a separate box in their cabinet; Milchhöfer 1881: 65-66).

- *Second Vase Room (Plan 6, no. II)*

Some large Geometric vases stood on the floor to the left of the entrance, that is along the west side of the room, followed by three rows of vases (Corinthian, Attic black and red figured, etc.). Another five rows of vases of various provenances and shapes were reported along the north side. The meaning of what Milchhöfer calls a "row" (*Reihe*) is not very clear, but we may assume that vases were displayed either on open shelves or in some sort of cabinet; the latter is more likely.

Along the east side of the room, a collection of glass vases was displayed (in some sort of case) to the left of the window and a few vases stood on the window parapet. A round table (*runden Tisch*), which must have stood somewhere in front or by the window, bore a large red-figured lekythos. Milchhöfer (1881: 73-75) then refers to four grided cabinets (*Gitterschränke*; containing mainly Corinthian and Attic pottery, lekythoi, drinking cups, large amphorae, etc.) which, starting from the window's right, apparently run along the south wall since he immediately afterwards mentions a replica of the Tenea Kouros<sup>63</sup> placed at the end of that side to the right of the entrance door.

In the middle of the room a glass cabinet placed in front of the window

accommodated a collection of small vases. Its description (two compartments with four to five shelves each) suggests that it looked like the freestanding glass cases used later in the National Archaeological Museum [63]. In the middle of the room stood also a lectern-type case (*Pulttisch*) with a collection of coins and vases placed in its upper part and some funerary urns with bone remains underneath it. This was probably the familiar kind of large wooden display case with sloping top, variants of which were extensively used throughout the nineteenth century (e.g. [26], [67] & [168-170]).

It is strange to note that, although according to Milchhöfer (1881: 69-77) this was exclusively a vase room, Sybel (1881: 196-203) accounts for a large number of sculptures here. What is more interesting is that, as shown in his catalogue, a certain classification order, either typological (e.g. series of Aphrodite statuettes grouped together; Sybel 1881: 198-200) or geographical (e.g. Athenian finds placed together; Sybel 1881: *passim*), was followed in the display of sculptures.

- *Sculpture Room (Plan 6, no. III)*

A series of ancient moulds, funerary urns and various sculptures was displayed along the long west side of this room to the left of the entrance door (Milchhöfer 1881: 78; Sybel 1881: 208-10), probably in some sort of cabinet.

Wooden shelves, in ten parts according to Sybel (1881: 210-17; see also Milchhöfer 1881: 78), run along the north side in front of the windows and accommodated, classified according to provenance, fragments of votive offerings from the sanctuary of Kybele at Tanagra, votive reliefs from the Athenian Kerameikos and a variety of other sculptures. The term "wooden shelf" as used by both writers (*Holzrepositorien* and *Wandbretter* respectively) implies a row of open, uncovered shelves here (also known from elsewhere; see, for example, [98]).

On the east side of the room two glass-covered, lectern-type cabinets

accommodated, according to their provenance, the collection of Prehistoric finds from Switzerland, Scandinavia, Greece and America, which was donated to the Society by G. Finlay (see p. 108; Milchhöfer 1881: 79; Sybel 1881: 217). Standing to their right was a cabinet with some Egyptian objects, followed by four, at least, grided cabinets containing a variety of stone and terracotta objects (stone vases, clay moulds, loom weights, amphorae handles,<sup>64</sup> etc.) typologically arranged (Milchhöfer 1881: 79-80; Sybel 1881: 217).

In the middle of the room a freestanding wooden structure, (*freistehende Repositorium*) probably a kind of multi-levelled scaffold (*cf.* [98], left hand side corner), bore a great number of typologically displayed reliefs, statuettes, fragmentary gravestones, etc. (Milchhöfer 1881: 80-81; Sybel 1881: 218-28).

- *Terracotta and Bronze Room (Plan 6, no. IV)*

Milchhöfer's (1881: 82-86) use of the display hardware terminology in the description of this room being somehow more difficult to decipher, the reconstructive attempt which follows will, to a certain extent, be more arbitrary than the preceding ones. Placed along the longitudinal axis in the middle of the room was a series of freestanding glass cabinets and glass cases with terracottas mainly from Tanagra. Various figurines were placed on the north-eastern window's parapet, while a glass lectern-type cabinet with bronze and lead objects stood possibly to the right of that window. A series of wall cabinets (*Wandschränke*) and shelves (*Repositorien*) along the east side of the room accommodated mainly Tanagran terracotta figurines and bronze objects.

Moving westwards, more terracottas were displayed in a cabinet to the right of the north-western window and a large clay bath was placed underneath the window. Some clay Comedy figures were reported to be on display in a glass cabinet, whose exact position is difficult to locate, whereas some Boeotian reliefs and children toys were displayed to the left of the window.



Finally, more Tanagran figurines were on display along the west wall, probably in a series of glass lectern-type cabinets or shelves (deducible from Milchhöfer's (1881: 86) reference to *den unteren Theilen des Repositoriums* and *Mittelpulten*).

#### - Corridor

Displayed along the corridor as well as on the window parapet at the end of it was a variety of Greek and Roman sculptured pieces (reliefs, gravestones, marble funerary vases, etc.) for the main part discovered in Athenian excavations.

#### - Basement

As already seen the basement was accessible to the general public only by permission. At the time of Sybel's (1881: 233-35) description it contained various sculptures from Athens, among which was the long series of the Kosmetes Herms from the excavation of Aghios Demetrios Katephores (see p. 164, [49]).

### Display Organisation

The spatial organisation of exhibits was based on typological order, which broadly meant that each room exhibited a single different category of antiquities (vases, sculptures, bronzes and terracottas). Typological arrangement was also adopted within the rooms so as groups, like white Athenian lekythoi, Corinthian pottery, etc., were displayed together (see, for example, the arrangement of the vases per shelf into the glass cabinets of the second room; Milchhöfer 1881: 71-75). This was combined, where possible, with a geographical classification, e.g. votive reliefs from the sanctuary of Kybele at Tanagra, finds from the Athenian Dipylon and Kerameikos, etc. (Sybel 1881: 210-11, 214-15 respectively). This general organisation notwithstanding, it becomes clear that availability of space was often the

decisive factor behind the arrangement of antiquities in a certain position. In other words the organisational consistency of display was not always followed with the same rigidity. The same holds also true for chronological order, which was the most, so to speak, neglected factor as a single case could at times accommodate objects from various periods (*cf.* Milchhöfer 1881: 66, Byzantine objects along with Archaic and Classical finds).

### Display Hardware

The same consistency may also be observed in the layout of the display hardware in the rooms. Glass covered, lectern or simple-type cabinets, gridded cabinets and shelves run around the walls. In the middle usually stood other cabinets (simple with flat surfaces, *Glasskasten*, or lectern-type ones), tables (see second vase room) or other shelf structure (see sculpture room). Some antiquities, usually large vases, were simply placed on the floor. As for the layout of objects within the cabinets it has already been noted that this followed criteria of typology and provenance and that special care was, when necessary, taken for the distinctive display of special finds within a single cabinet (see p. 111). However, despite the seemingly methodical organisation, Collignon still felt that the collection of vases in particular (whose catalogue he compiled) was "badly arranged into some narrow rooms..., compressed in dusty cabinets, ...disposed with little order" (Collignon and Couve 1902-1904: preface).

### Discussion

It must have emerged from the discussion so far that the Varvakeion gave indeed "an idea of the first, so to speak, orderly Athenian museum" (see p. 107). It was probably the first time that a consistent display approach was reached in a Greek museum. In fact, we cannot fail to observe that there was a

general display pattern and that this was followed throughout the museum rooms. This was undoubtedly due to the much larger space allocated to the Society for the display of its collections, but also to the motivation and skills of those who worked on the displays. As already noted the display at the Varvakeion was mainly set up in 1866 and, although no information on the people involved survives, two people, namely Stephanos Koumanoudes, Secretary General of the Society and Panaghiotes Eustratiades, then General Ephor of Antiquities, were likely to have inspected the works themselves. A reference in ΠΑΕ (1865: 6) attests that Eustratiades did inspect some of the display works carried out in the Varvakeion. The degree of their contribution is not known, but it is tempting to assume that the Varvakeion's orderly display pattern owed a lot to the men's methodical minds and accuracy (also attested, for Eustratiades, by his work in the National Museum; see pp. 172-73).

Something should also be said about the provenance of the antiquities on display as well as their approximate number. The main part of the material came from Athenian excavations like those at the area of Aghios Demetrios Katephores and Panaghia Pyrghiotissa (from 1859 onwards), the necropolis of Kerameikos and Dipylon (mainly in 1869-70) and the south slope of the rock of the Acropolis (Serpentizes, Dionysos theatre, Asklepeion; mainly in 1876-79; Petrakos 1987a: 42-43, 44, 46-47 respectively). This alone was a fact obviously contributing to the display's consistent effect, although there is no evidence whatsoever that the exhibits' provenance was explicitly stated to the visitors. We should also stress the short time lapse between excavation and display of finds in this case, noting that, following the probable addition of many finds from Kerameikos and the Acropolis' south slope, the museum must have looked more crowded after ca.1870. That the museum image was a crowded one it is evident from our sources, but total numbers of antiquities on display



are difficult to assess. Sybel (1881) cites some 615 ancient pieces of sculpture a number, however, accounting for only a fraction of what was on display as his is merely a sculptures catalogue. An idea on the multitude of the vases on display may be extracted by Collignon's (1877) catalogue of the vases collection as it was in 1876, where a selection of ca.755 vases (in some cases only the most striking per category ones; Collignon 1877: 24) are classified and described.

In conclusion, some remarks on the level of information provided in the displays and the museum's accessibility. As far as we know the only informative supporting material, were the catalogue numbers affixed to the exhibits (*IIAE* 1866: 7). There is no other evidence that some explanatory labels, for example, accompanied the exhibits as well. As far as accessibility is concerned we may observe that, as was the case with the museum at the University, although the Varvakeion was in a central place of the city its very nature as a private school would undoubtedly have inhibited access by the general public.

## **The Museum at the Polytechnic School of Athens**

### **Historical Note**

The year 1876 was marked by the discovery of the royal tombs at Mycenae by Heinrich Schliemann. The discovery was hailed with enthusiasm and the tombs' remarkable golden grave goods revived the Homeric legend of ancient, "all golden" Mycenae. A temporary display of the first finds was soon afterwards set up in the National Bank of Greece (*IIAE* 1877: 12-14; Kokkou 1977: 187) [9]. At the same time the Society took responsibility over the collection and arranged for its accommodation in the newly-built Polytechnic

School of Athens<sup>65</sup> [10]. By 1878 the Mycenaean collection was already displayed in one large room at the north wing on the first floor of the building (Plan 7, no. 1; *ΠΑΕ* 1878: 27; *Παρνασσός* II, 1878: 733), soon afterwards including new finds from Tiryns and from a new tomb dug by Stamatakes at Mycenae in 1877 (*ΠΑΕ* 1878: 24).

The remarkable new discoveries from all over Attica and the Peloponnese annually added to the Society's collection. Finds from Prehistoric tombs at Spata in Attica, Argos and Nauplion were already on display in 1879 (*ΠΑΕ* 1879: 21), while finds from the large vaulted tomb at Menidi (ancient *Acharnai*) were deposited in the museum in 1880 (*ΠΑΕ* 1880: 28). Intensive works for sorting, cataloguing and displaying the multitude of those finds were under way in the subsequent years, lasting at least until 1882.<sup>66</sup> The construction of new cases "for their [i.e. the finds'] decent display to the public" (*ΠΑΕ* 1880: 28) was one of the primary concerns of the Society, which proudly reported that "for the first time in Greece antiquities were decently displayed in appropriate cases" (*ΠΑΕ* 1878: 27). Care was also taken for the compilation of a separate catalogue for all the above-mentioned collections (*ΠΑΕ* 1879: 23).

At around the same time the museum was enriched by a very important collection of Egyptian antiquities donated by Ioannes Demetriou,<sup>67</sup> which was by 1881 displayed in a room adjacent to the Mycenaean one (*ΠΑΕ* 1882: 19) (Plan 7, no. 2). What is interesting is that Demetriou probably also commissioned the drawing of suitable cases and pedestals for the display of his collection. A series of these drawings survive today in the Archives of the Archaeological Society in Athens [11], [12], [13], but there seems to be no indication that they were executed.

For security reasons two gendarmes were appointed to guard the museum. Entrance was free to the public three times a week, but a fee was charged for those visiting the museum twice a week<sup>68</sup> (*ΠΑΕ* 1879: 21-22).

As already shown, up until 1881 the Society's collections were housed both at the Varvakeion Lycaum and at the Polytechnic (see p. 108). At that time the Society's request for the concession of more space in the Polytechnic was accepted and two rooms were given at the east wing of the first floor (*ΠΑΕ* 1881: 27; Plan 7, nos. 3 and 4). Works for the display of the remaining collections (apart from the sculptures, which were being transported to the west wing of the National Museum; see *Αθήναιον* 10, 1881: 322), until that date housed in the Varvakeion, lasted from 1881 to 1883.<sup>69</sup> Extensive works had to be carried out before the final display was accomplished, including some structural amendments in the rooms and the construction of new display hardware similar to that used in the Mycenaean and the Egyptian room (*ΠΑΕ* 1882: 18-19).

During that time and until the new wing's displays opened in 1883 (*ΠΑΕ* 1883: 13), opening hours were restricted to Saturday afternoons from two o'clock to four o'clock. (*Παρνασσός* V, 1881: 183). Two more guards were appointed for the museum's security (*ΠΑΕ* 1883: 13). From 1883 the museum was open every day apart from Sundays and bank holidays (*ΠΑΕ* 1883: 15). At the same time works were under way for the accommodation of glass and bone objects in yet another two small rooms (*ΠΑΕ* 1883: 14; 1884: 25; 1885: 35), one of which, containing Egyptian antiquities from the last Demetriou dispatch, was apparently ready in 1887 (*ΠΑΕ* 1887: 12).

Apart from Stephanos Koumanoudes, Secretary General of the Society at the time, the main responsible for all these works was his son Athanassios Koumanoudes, who in 1877 (when the museum at Varvakeion was still open) was appointed Curator of the Society's museums (Petrakos 1987a: 55). It was



the first time that the title was attributed and that such a permanent post was created specifically for the museum needs, a fact which must undoubtedly have had a positive effect on the museum's organisation. Later, in 1888 Athanassios Koumanoudes was assigned an assistant (*IIAE* 1888: 30).

Finally, following the completion of the National Museum in 1891, the Society's collections started being transferred to the new building. The Egyptian collection was handed over in 1891;<sup>70</sup> the coins and gems of the same collection had been added to the Numismatic Museum, then housed at the Academy), the Mycenaean in 1893<sup>71</sup> and all the remaining antiquities were by 1895 moved to the National Museum (*JHS* 1894-95: 209). It is worth stressing that the Society presented the new museum with all the display hardware, to that date used in its temporary museums, noting that the "...cabinets, tables and pedestals" were "sumptuous...totalled 148 metres in length and had costed more than fifty five thousand drachmas" (*IIAE* 1893: 24-25).

Surviving sources allow us safely and accurately to draw the museum's display profile between 1881 and 1888. First, there is Milchhöfer's (1881: 86-106) description of the Mycenaean room, which, written prior to the museum's final arrangement, accounts only for the first stage of the museum's display history. Then follows Schliemann's 1882 catalogue of the Mycenaean collection and, finally, a very useful and elucidating description of the whole museum in the 1888 edition of Guide Joanne (1888: 102-34), which provides a comprehensive display plan for each room with the exhibits' exact position.

## North Wing

### ▪ Mycenaean Room (Plans 8 and 9)

#### - *Display Layout*

Housed in the north wing's large, middle room (Plan 7, 1) the Mycenaean display first opened in 1878. By 1881, the time of Milchhöfer's description, the display presented the following image: the finds from the five royal tombs excavated by Schliemann at Mycenae (golden diadems and jewellery, cups, swords, funerary masks, etc.), laid out according to each individual burial (I-V), along with finds from Schliemann's excavation at Tiryns, were displayed in a series of fifteen cases (Plan 8, 1-15), placed next to each other in rectangular order in the middle of the room. It should be noted, however, that the numbering of the burials in the museum did not strictly correspond with Schliemann's original one. The last case (Plan 8, 16) of the row contained the finds from Spata. In the centre of the room a freestanding case (Plan 8, VI) accommodated the finds of the sixth Mycenaean royal tomb (the one excavated by Stamatakes). The lower compartments of all these cases accommodated large bronze vessels. Finally, the Prehistoric finds from Menidi were accommodated in cabinets (Plan 8, M) placed against the west wall of the room.

By the time Schliemann described this room, that is just one year later in his 1882 catalogue, the image had already been altered. The layout of the central row of cases remained the same, the only difference being that the sixteenth one now also accommodated finds from Tiryns (Plan 9, 16), instead from the Spatan ones, which were moved to three cabinets at the west wall (Plan 9, 18-20). A cabinet accommodating the finds from Nauplion (Plan 9, 24) was added at the west end of the north wall, after the ones containing the Spatan and Menidian (Plan 9, 21-23) finds. A series of relief tombstones from

Mycenae were also put on display occupying the space from the eastern corner of the south wall, along the east wall, to the north-eastern end of the north wall. Finally, a multitude of fragmentary pieces of sculpture (some of which came from the *dromos* of "Atreus' Thesaurus" at Mycenae) were displayed in and above three cabinets along the north side of the room. No change in the room's layout is suggested by the 1888 Guide Joanne's (pp. 110-11) description, the only additional information being that large Mycenaean vases were by that time placed on the north wall's window parapets.

#### - *Display Organisation*

The organisational pattern of material in this room was initially based on provenance (e.g. Mycenae, Tiryns, etc.). Within the display hardware, material was arranged according to size, with smaller and lighter objects (e.g. figurines, jewellery) placed in the upper parts of the cases and cabinets and bulkier ones (e.g. large vases) in the lower compartments. Some vases were also placed on top of the cabinets (Schliemann 1882: 45-47, 50; Guide Joanne 1888: 120). Extant photographs from the National Museum further clarify the way of display into the cases. See, for example, the way of displaying gems and jewellery into small, shallow separate partitions within the cases [29], [30]. Special mention should be made of the case which stood in the middle of the room (Plans 8 and 9). Here, probably for the first time in the display history of the Greek archaeological museums, an entire burial was displayed exactly as unearthed by excavation, in what was described as "an interesting kind of restoration" (Guide Joanne 1888: 119): the two skeletons were arranged on the very pebble layer found underneath them in the tomb itself, with all the funerary gifts placed accordingly around them (see also Schliemann 1882: 48-49). According to a 1892 reference, "the Mycenae collection, as exhibited in the Polytechnic, has probably taken the most



prominent place in his [i.e. the visitor's] memory", a quote which reveals something of the effect of the room to contemporary visitors.

#### *- Display Hardware*

The fact that all the display hardware used in the Polytechnic was inherited by the National Archaeological Museum and that the Mycenaean collection was soon afterwards displayed in an equivalent large Mycenaean hall in that museum, a very good and revealing photograph of which survives today [26], allows for a safe visual reconstruction of the Mycenaean room at the Polytechnic. The cases standing in the middle of that room were of the double-sided, glass-covered, lectern type seen in [26] (see also Guide Joanne 1888: 107); whereas the cabinets arranged along the west and north walls were probably identical, if not the very ones (of the simple, upright type) placed along the walls of the Mycenaean hall of the National Museum (two of which are seen in [26]). There is no evidence on the display hardware bearing the relief tombstones in the Polytechnic, but we may assume that they were placed either on the floor or on simple pedestals. The evidence from the way these, or at least some of these, tombstones were displayed in the National Museum makes the latter more plausible ([26]; see, for example, three on the left hand side and two on the right one).

#### ▪ Egyptian Room (Plan 10)

##### *- Display Layout*

The Egyptian collection, which opened in 1881, was housed in the room situated on the left of the stairs and its entrance was exercised through the east side (Plan 7, 2). The display was "decently" set up by A. Postolakas<sup>72</sup> and A. Koumanoudes (*Αθήναιον* 10, 1881: 321). The former also compiled a catalogue-guide of the collection,<sup>73</sup> on which is based the layout which follows (see also Guide Joanne 1888: 103-104). A series of wall cabinets

accommodated a variety of bronzes (figurines of gods and goddesses, cult objects and sacred animals; cabinets I-V) and wooden sculptures (cabinet VI), whereas the large cases in the middle of the room contained objects of porcelain (case 1: 1-4) and glass paste (case 2: 5-8), a selection of coins (case 3: 10; see Engel 1885: 5), jewellery (case 3: 11-12), some Greek and Roman works (case 4: 13-14) and Roman vases and lamps (case 4: 15-16). In the centre of the room stood a bronze female statuette. Some other objects were displayed between the wall cabinets, like the relief stele placed on a table between cabinets I and II along the east wall and two stone sculptures in the niche between cabinets IV and V at the south wall. Finally, a variety of marble, basalt and other stone fragments from funerary monuments were placed underneath the windows of the north side opposite to the entrance.

#### *- Display Organisation and Hardware*

The organisation of exhibits in the Egyptian room was based on construction material (e.g. bronzes, wooden objects) and typology (e.g. god figurines, animal figures; see Plan 10, caption). The display hardware used in this room was probably identical to that in the adjacent Mycenaean room, i.e. large, double-sided, glass-covered lectern-type cases in the middle and simple, upright cabinets along the walls. For the table between cabinets I and II we should imagine a simple wooden, square or round one.

### **South Wing**

#### **▪ Vases, Lamps and Jewellery Room (Plan 11)**

As already shown, display works on this side lasted from 1881 to 1883. On 15 February 1883 opened the first room, containing the Society's collection of vases, lamps, coins and jewellery (*ΠΑΕ* 1883: 13; Plan 7, 3). Judging only by the rich collection of vases (ca.3,000 according to an unofficial information in

the Guide Joanne 1888: 127; cf. the ca.1,028 ones selectively cited in Martha 1880), this must have been a very crowded room.

#### *- Display Layout*

Our reconstruction of this room's layout is based on Guide Joanne (1888: 127-34): the vases were arranged into twenty four cabinets, fifteen (I-XV) running along the walls and another nine (XVI-XXIV) standing free along the room's longitudinal axis as well as near its north-west (XXII-XXIII) and south-west (XXIV) sides. Large Geometric funerary vases were placed among the wall cases as well as underneath the windows along the south side. Among these vases probably also stood the large Melian amphorae, which were reported in 1887-88 to be "mounted... in conspicuous positions" (*JHS* 1887-88: 276). Finally, five large cases, accommodating the lamps (case 1), moulds (case 2), Byzantine coins (case 4) and various Christian antiquities (case 5), were placed between the wall cases and the freestanding cabinets (note that nothing is reported for the third case).

#### *- Display Organisation and Hardware*

The vases were chronologically displayed (Plan 11, caption) and an idea of how the cabinets were internally arranged is provided in [64] and [65]. Moreover, the solid, wooden pedestals shown in [63] indicate the way in which the large Geometric vases were presented among the wall cabinets in the Polytechnic. As in the case of the Mycenaean room, a photograph of the first vase room in the National Museum allows us to visualise the vase room in the Polytechnic. Although it is not clearly documented, it is more than likely that all, or at least most, of the display hardware used in the National Museum's vase room came from its equivalent room in the Polytechnic. Thus we may imagine that the wall cabinets depicted in [63], or at least cabinets of the same type, stood along the walls of the vase room in the Polytechnic. The same holds true for the cabinets in the middle of the room [63]. We have no



evidence for the cases accommodating the lamps, moulds, coins, etc. (Plan 11, 1-5), but these were probably either double-sided, glass-covered, lectern type ones or flat top, glass-covered ones.

#### ▪ Bronze and Terracotta Room (Plan 12)

This room opened on 7 November 1883 to accommodate the Society's bronzes and terracottas collection (Plan 7, 4). The bronzes came mainly from excavations in the Peloponnese, purchases and donations. It also temporarily housed some sculptures from the excavations at Epidauros (*AE* 1883: 196; *Παρνασσός* VII, 1883: 870).

##### - *Display Layout*

The exhibits were arranged as follows (Guide Joanne 1888: 119-22): one wall cabinet (Plan 12, 1) and two large cases in the middle of the room (case 2-3 and 4-5) accommodated the collection of bronzes (helmets, mirrors, figurines, etc.). All the remaining cabinets and cases housed the large figurines collection (cabinets I-XI).

##### - *Display Organisation and Hardware*

A typological classification was adopted for bronze objects (e.g. cabinet 1: helmets in the upper part, statuettes in the lower part), whereas terracotta figurines were arranged chronologically as well as geographically (e.g. Archaic or Classical from Tanagra, etc.). Note the interesting effect of the simultaneous display in cabinet I of Archaic Tanagran figurines in its upper part and Cycladic marble figures in the lower part (Plan 12, I).

As already seen the display hardware used in this side was similar to that used on the other side. This leads us to imagine the familiar double, lectern-type cases in the middle of the room and the simple, upright-type cabinets running along the walls.

## Discussion

Among the temporary museums of the Society the museum at the Polytechnic was the one which better qualified as "museum". Following the efforts for an orderly display initiated in the Varvakeion, it was probably the first really systematically organised Greek museum, a fact which is well reflected in the museum's descriptions. Appraisals of the museum's displays may be found in various contemporary publications, where, for example, one reads that objects were classified "very decently" in a way which "honoured" the people involved in setting the displays up (*Παρνασσός* VII, 1883: 284, 870). It was also felt that "the arrangement of the whole, under the able direction of M. Koumanoudes, *remains a model*, to which one may hope that in time the other museums of Athens may attain, as soon as they have digested their ever accumulating acquisitions" (*JHS* 1887-88: 276; emphasis added). As already seen it was the first time that specific museum posts were created and the museum's order undoubtedly owed to this fact.

From 1883 onwards the museum was regularly open every day; from nine to noon and from two to four during the winter (1 September-31 March), from nine to noon and from three to six during the summer (1 April-31 August), apart from Monday mornings, Sundays and bank holidays.<sup>74</sup> Its position in the very centre of Athens was, no doubt, beneficial to museum visiting. However, the nature of the building as a Polytechnic School may perhaps, as in the case of the University (p. 106), have caused an uncomfortable feeling impeding the lay Athenian of entering, but the fact that this time the museum halls were far more accessible, situated as they were close to the entrance, possibly counterbalanced this discomfort. Yet we may reasonably assume that the museum's public still remained restricted and specialised.

## Conclusions

This first period of museum development in Greece falls within the so-called “heroic era” of Greek archaeology (Koumanoudes 1984: 15), a period predominated by the single aspiration of recovering the ancient past and restituting its Hellenic roots to the nation. The efforts towards securing archaeological remains laid upon the state and the Archaeological Society, with individuals like of K. Pittakes, P. Eustratiades and St. Koumanoudes, playing a major role.

Six museums were established during this period, although four of them, that is the museums of the Archaeological Society, essentially count as one. They were all housed in already existing buildings. Displays were initially set up in the “most suitable” way (Aegina, Theseion, University) according to the availability of space. Soon, however, followed attempts to arrange the exhibits in mainly typological order. This process is well manifested in the displays of the Archaeological Society (from the University through the Varvakeion to the Polytechnic).

Finally, it is important to note that from the very beginning museums were conceived as places to be enjoyed by the public (see p. 85).



## Notes to Chapter Five

1. For a general discussion on Capodistrias' educational efforts see Koukkou (1972); Loukatos (1978); Kordoule (1981-82).
2. Kavvadias (1890-92: 9) was probably influenced by Kekulé's (1869: forward) unjustified reference to the museum's foundation in March 1829, when writing on Moustoxydes's supervision of it, because we know that the latter did not arrive at Aegina before October 1829 (see p. 79).
3. Built by Capodistrias in 1828 (Konstantinopoulos 1968: 21; see also *EAAE* 16, June 1991: 91) to house hundreds of orphans, it also housed the Central School, the National Library and the National Press, thus becoming "the first intellectual centre of liberated Greece" (Koukkou 1977: 48). It operated until 1844. Edmond About saw it deserted in 1854 (Koulikourde and Alexiou 1950: 57).
4. According to an information by Vretos-Papadopoulos (1837: vol. II, 122-23), the first piece of the museum was placed by Viaro Capodistrias, who had gradually formed a large collection of antiquities.
5. References on his life and work in Koukkou (1977: 65, n. 1).
6. Protopsaltes (1967: 120-21, no. 97; 117-18, nos. 92-93; 120, no. 96; 95-97, nos. 69-72; 116-17, no. 91; 126-27, no. 105 respectively).
7. It should be noted that Moustoxydes was the first to compile a draft on archaeological legislation, which formed the base for the first archaeological law in Greece issued in 1834 (Manes 1960: 64). And, he was probably the first who proposed the Government to take

measures for securing all religious treasures, like manuscripts, which were kept in monasteries (cf. Protopsaltes 1967: 121-22, no. 98; 124-25, no. 102).

8. E.g. Protopsaltes (1967: 151, no. 125). For the difficulties of collecting antiquities at that time see Kokkou (1977: 63) and Manes (1960: 64-67).
9. The numbers are identical to those referred to by the French consul G. d'Arc, who visited Aegina in 1830 (quoted in Reinach 1896: 74-75).
10. Protopsaltes (1967: 130-32, no. 110; 135-39, no. 112; 152-55, no. 127; 156, no. 129; 157-58, no. 131; 164, no. 137).
11. A good account of his life and activities in Pharmakides (1960).
12. Protopsaltes (1967: 184-87, no. 158; 193-94, no. 164). The intention of the Secretariat of Education to publish Iatrides' drawings, in order to form a kind of pictorial guide to the museum, was never implemented (Pharmakides 1960: 125-27).
13. The exact content of the museum at that time is unknown as a double catalogue written by Iatrides on the occasion is lost (Kokkou 1977: 67, n. 4).
14. The notion according to which "useless" antiquities could remain *in situ*, and "important" ones had to be transported to the capital typified this early period of museum development in Greece.
15. For a very interesting and thorough, yet unpublished, study on the reconstruction of the first phase of the building, where one can find many floor plans, see Ministry of Culture. 1988. *Μελέτη Αποτύπωσης και Αποκατάστασης Αρχικής Φάσης του Κτηρίου του Καποδιστριακού Ορφανοτροφείου (Παλαιών Φυλακών) Αίγινας*. Athens: Directorate of Restoration of Ancient Monuments. Dept. of Topography and Photogrammetry.

16. The position of the Library in the building is not known, and although Muller and Scholl wrote that the museum room was underneath the Orphanage, this does not help us in locating it within the building.
17. Letter of the Secretariat of Education to the Orphanage Committee, quoted in Pharmakides (1960: 108).
18. For the decision to disconnect the museum from the Library, which was never implemented, see Kokkou (1977: 66).
19. Note the early understanding of basic display principles expressed in this comment by a man who was neither a "specialist" nor a scientist.
20. Note the aesthetic grounds on which this comparison was based. Judgements of this kind were typical of that period among European scholars, and their influence on the way in which Greeks themselves felt about their newly-discovered antiquities may, for example, be reflected in the Archaeological Society's need to "justify" the display of aesthetically "impaired remains" in its temporary museum at the University of Athens (see p. 103).
21. Quoted in Kokkou (1977: 63). For the state's wretched financial position at the time see Pharmakides (1960: 86-95).
22. Built in 445 B.C., the temple was dedicated to Hephaestus and Athena. Used as a Christian church from the end of the sixth century A.D. onwards, it also served as a cemetery, a stable, etc. After Athens' liberation in 1834 it was established as church of Saint George the Akamates (Kokkou 1977: 170-72, where some bibliography). For the history of the temple see also Sauer (1899: 1-15). Koch (1955) provides interesting drawings and photographs of the temple in various phases.



Let us also mention that the area around the temple was still at that time used as a gathering place for the Athenians. On Easter Tuesday, for example, they danced the so-called "Labyrinth" (a dance recalling the one executed by Theseus and his companions on his return from Crete) at the terrain South East of the temple (see Koch 1955: 26-28; Bréton 1868: 204). See also Omilos Filon Athenon (1925: 16) to form an idea on the prominent position of Theseion among the humble huts and ruins of the new capital at the time. Cf. Ross (1863: 267) "You could hardly believe you were in Athens if... Theseion and the citadel's remains [i.e. the Acropolis] were not in place".

23. Eustratiades, *Archive. Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας. Φακ. 5. Αι εν τη πόλει συλλογαί. α) Θησείου συλλογής κατάλογος και πίναξ.*
24. However, inscriptions were all described (Kekulé 1869: IX).
25. Saulcy (1845: 262); Newton (1852: 23); Eustratiades (*Archive. Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας*, file 5, sheet 7); Kokkou (1977: 173); Petrakos (1987a: 28).
26. Kekulé (1869: 162-75); Eustratiades, *Archive. Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας*, file 5, sheet 7-9.
27. Eustratiades, *Archive. Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας*, file 5, sheet 1-2, pts. 1-4.
28. The difference between the plural and singular form should probably be attributed to inattentiveness.
29. Eustratiades, *Archive. Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας*, file 5, sheet 2, pts. 5-6.
30. Cf. Newton (1852: 24), who referred to some very large and fine early vases into Theseion.

31. Saulcy cites the objects according to their catalogue numbers. Thus, although he is not always clear about the location of objects, a key in understanding the position of antiquities he refers to may be provided by comparing his description to Eustratiades' one, which gives the catalogue numbers of all exhibits. Although the former's description is some nineteen years later, we are probably right to assume that the museum's layout would have remained more or less the same; contemporary sources show that the museum was already filled before Saulcy compiled his description (see p. 87).
32. NAM 1661; Karouzou (1968: 182-83).
33. NAM 240; Maderna (1988: Taf. 27, 1).
34. NAM 14; Karouzou (1968: 11).
35. Eustratiades, *Archive: Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας*, file 5, sheet 4, pt. 9.
36. NAM 29; Richter (1961: 47, 170, figs. 155-58).
37. NAM 30; Richter (1961: 48, 170, figs. 159-60).
38. Eustratiades, *Archive: Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας*, file 5, sheet 4, pts. 9-10.
39. NAM 8; Richter (1960: 69-70, figs. 178-83).
40. NAM 218. Note that in 1845 Saulcy (1845: 263) saw this statue to the right of the entrance; at that time the torso was only roughly supported with logs on to its base and so the plaster addition to the legs must date from after 1845. Photograph [4] dates after 1869; precisely, sometime between 1874, when the antiquities started been transported to the National Archaeological Museum and some of the frames must have been dismantled (a fact that would explain the gap behind Hermes from Atalante in [4]), and 1881, when both the

Hermes from Andros and the Hermes from Atalante were already on show in the National Museum (see Milchhöfer 1881: 13).

41. Eustratiades, *Archive: Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας*, file 5, sheet 5-6, pts. 13-15.
42. NAM 1183.
43. NAM 45; Boardman (1985: 53, fig. 66).
44. NAM 705; Bothmer (1957: 219, no. 66, pl. LXXXIX 4).
45. Rangaves on the contrary writes that the colour was not indelible (Rangabé 1855: III).
46. *Αιών Ζ'*, no. 569, 18-10-1844. Pittakes apparently compiled catalogues for all Athenian collections of the time, which contained detailed descriptions of each object, their provenance, circumstances of discovery, state of preservation, etc. Later, when objects started being transferred within the collections, and especially when miscellaneous antiquities were framed together in Theseion, these catalogues became useless. Theseion's catalogue was initially kept in the Archive of the General Ephory of Antiquities and was later transferred to the National Museum (Kokkou 1977: 156). Rangaves, however, wrote that, to his knowledge, no catalogue of the various fragments existed at the time (Rangabé 1855: III).
47. Eustratiades, *Archive: Ημερολόγιον Υπηρεσίας*, File 1, p. 284 (1877); 289 (1878). See also Kokkou (1977: 179-82).
48. NAM 737. In 1869 Kekulé (1869: 175) saw it outside the temple.
49. Figure N; Brommer (1979: 142). Milchhöfer (1881: 43) refers to it as Nike.
50. NAM 4485. Petrakos (1981: 76-7, figs. 58-9).



51. Panaghiotes Eustratiades (1815-1888) was one of the most important figures of the nineteenth century Greek archaeological scene. Trained in Classics in Germany with a Greek Government grant, he was appointed Ephor of Antiquities in 1863, and General Ephor in 1864 (Petrakos 1987a: 260, 262; *passim*). His detailed and minutely kept diary of all the Archaeological Service's activities from 1863 to 1872 (kept in the Archive of the Archaeological Society in Athens) is an invaluable source of information for us today. We should also note that two of the most important museums, the National and the Acropolis Museum, were founded during his days, preparing the way for Panaghiotes Kavvadias' activities later (Petrakos 1988: 99).
52. The wish that the British Museum should send casts from the Parthenon and the Figaleian Marbles was already expressed by Pittakes in 1837 (Kokkou 1977: 180, n. 1).
53. There seems to be a confusion about the material from which the casts were made; they were referred to as both "clay" and "plaster" replicas (*IIAE* 1845: 202; 1858-59: 23 respectively). Recently, however, Jenkins (1990: 106, n. 151) provided information which shows that the replicas were in cement.
54. Figure N; Brommer (1979: 122, 123 (1, 2)).
55. *IIAE* 1858-59: 26-27; 1860: 14; 1861: 22; 1864: 5; Phrearites (1864a: 9-10, n. a; 1864b: 30); Kastorches (1879: 91).
56. Stephanos Koumanoudes (1818-1899) was born in Adrianoupolis from where his family moved to Belgrade. His talent in languages developed from his early youth. He obtained a firm philological knowledge studying in Munich and Leipzig under the supervision of renowned scholars of the time and at the Sorbonne in Paris. He settled down in Athens in 1845, when he became a professor of Latin at the University in 1846. An active member of the Archaeological Society, he served as its General Secretary from 1859 to 1894. He left a

very considerable amount of literary, critical, lexicographical and archaeological work. Particularly important are his epigraphic publications (Petrakos 1987a: 262-76).

57. Archive of the Archaeological Society, no. 17, 31-6-1864.
58. Archive of the Archaeological Society, no. 761, 8-9-1861. The Varvakeion was a neoclassical building erected in 1857-59 by the architect Panaghiotes Kalkos (see Acropolis museum, p. 140) at the expense of the wealthy Greek expatriate Ioannes Varvakes. It served as a model high school for boys and does not exist today. See Bires (1966: 146-47); Kokkou (1977: 185).
59. Archive of the Archaeological Society, no. 37, 31-3-1864.
60. Phrearites (1864a: 10, 11, n. a; 1864b: 30-33; 1865b: 25-29, 49-56). See also Archive of the Archaeological Society, no. 108, 6-1-1864; nos. 47, 48, 13-4-1864; no. 17, 31-6-1864; no.98, 22-10-1864.
61. Archive of the Archaeological Society, no. 14, 31-5-1865.
62. Eustratiades, *Archive. Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου. Φακ. 5. Αι εν τη Πόλει Συλλογαί. (Η εν τω Βαρβακείω συλλογή τω 1865 ότε μετεκομίσθη εκ του πανεπιστημίου).*
63. The original at the Glyptothek in Munich; Richter (1960: p. 84-5, no. 73, figs. 245-50).
64. A catalogue of the inscribed amphorae handles was published by Dumont in 1871 (*ΙΑΕ* 1879: 26).
65. Work of the architect Lysandros Kaphtantzoglou, who, according to Kokkou (1977: 187), also designed the new display cases for the museum there. For the history of the Polytechnic and for the classicist spirit in Greek architecture during that period, see Bires (1957).

66. *ΠΑΕ* (1879: 21; 1880: 19, 28; 1881: 27; 1882: 19); *Παρνασσός V*, 1881: 90; *Αθήναιον* 10, 1881: 322.
67. *Παρνασσός IV*, 1880: 660; *V*, 1881: 91, 372; *ΠΑΕ* 1881: 26-27; see also Numismatic Museum, p. 195, n. 98.
68. Later, increasing expenses for the accommodation of all the Society's collections lead to the imposition of an entrance fee. It is not clear when this happened, but it must have been before 1886, when it was proposed that entrance to the museum be left free (*ΠΑΕ* 1886, Annex: 28). In 1887 entrance was left free on Saturdays (*ΠΑΕ* 1887: 31) and finally in 1890 on all days (*ΠΑΕ* 1890: 43). For an interesting argumentation on entrance charges see *ΠΑΕ* (1889: 46).
69. *Αθήναιον* 10, 1881: 322; *Παρνασσός V*, 1881: 87, 91, 183, 372, 769.
70. *ΠΑΕ* (1890: 42; 1891: 37); *JHS* (1890-91: 396; 1892: 150, 151); *ΑΔ* (1891: 91).
71. *AJA* (1891: 517); *The Athenaeum* (1891, no. 3337: 492); *JHS* (1892: 150); *ΠΑΕ* (1893: 24).
72. See p. 194, n. 94.
73. Postolakas, A. 1881. *Sammlung Agyptischer Alterthümer der Hellenischen geschenkt von Giovanni di Demetrio*, included in Milchhöfer (1881).
74. This information comes from an "Announcement" circulated by the Office of the Archaeological Society and kept today in the Archives of the Society. (I would here like to thank Mrs. A. Bikake for showing the document to me). It is undated, but it must date from 1883 or immediately after, as in that year opening hours were from two to five every day apart from Sundays (*ΠΑΕ* 1883: 283). The "Announcement" also regulated some other issues: visitors were not allowed to bring their dogs, walking-sticks and umbrellas in the



museum. Smoking was forbidden, and so was touching the exhibits. Finally, the guards were not allowed to accept tips.

## **6 DISPLAYING ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREEK MUSEUMS: THE FORMATIVE PERIOD (1874-1900) / THE ATHENIAN MUSEUMS**

### **Introduction**

The second period of museum development in Greece first saw the establishment of four major state Athenian museums: the Acropolis Museum, the National Archaeological Museum, the Numismatic Museum and the Epigraphic Museum. The last two museums are examined in this period, because although their formation antedates 1874 they were both organised after that date.

### **The Acropolis Museum**

#### **Historical Note**

##### **▪ 1863-1886**

Soon after the establishment of the modern Greek state the Acropolis started to serve as a depository for a variety of finds discovered in the early years after the Liberation. "I left in its ancient position every relic which cannot be destroyed and which contributes to the ancient topography; whatever may be stolen or mutilated I preserve *wherever there is hope for rescue*", wrote Pittakes in 1853, illustrating the struggle for preserving the antiquities during

those early years (*AE* 1853: 952, n. 1; emphasis added). Some antiquities stood in the open air and others were sheltered in ancient monuments or more recent buildings (for a discussion on the Acropolis' depositories see Kokkou 1977: 161-70).

Pittakes was the first to ask the Government's permission for building a proper museum on the east side of the rock in 1844, but his idea was not implemented (Kokkou 1977: 195).<sup>1</sup> It was not until 1863 that two edicts decreed the construction of "a special archaeological museum" at the east side of the Acropolis, which was to be named "Vernardakeion<sup>2</sup> museum of the Acropolis antiquities" and built on Panaghiotes Kalkos' plans.<sup>3</sup> The foundations were laid in 1864, but the discovery of significant antiquities underneath them made clear that the location was inappropriate for the museum (a fact which would also be demonstrated during the large scale excavations of 1885-90). However, despite some thoughts to build the museum elsewhere, it was finally decided to proceed with the initial plan and construct the building on the south-east side of the rock (Kokkou 1977: 197). Panaghiotes Kalkos<sup>4</sup> designed a simple, low stone building, measuring forty metres long by twenty wide, with no exterior decoration, in respect for the adjacent ancient monuments. The building was completed in 1874. Soon afterwards it received the casts collection of the Parthenon sculptures, to that date kept in the Turkish Bath (see p. 100), along with some of the antiquities scattered on the Acropolis (*RA* 1876: 31, 299; Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906: 15).<sup>5</sup>

#### ▪ 1886-1909

The large scale excavations carried out on the Acropolis by P. Kavvadias and G. Kawerau from 1885 to 1890 led to a dramatic enrichment of the museum, mainly with the series of Archaic korai and to extensive works of classification and re-organisation of the museum by Panaghiotes Kavvadias<sup>6</sup>



which lasted from 1886 to 1889 (Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906: 43). The museum was characterised as "a mine of archaeological wealth" (*JHS* 1888-89: 274) and the works carried out in it received wide coverage by general and specialised journals, in Greece and in Europe. This, in fact, reflects the sensation caused by the new discoveries as well as the museum's importance.<sup>7</sup>

Works comprised the construction of stone pedestals, which replaced the old provisional ones, the construction of wooden showcases along the walls, the rearrangement of the Parthenon and the temple of Athena-Nike rooms, as well as paving the museum with mosaic floors, painting the walls and enlarging the windows for better lighting (*AA* 4, 1888: 21, 37, 48, 68, 92, 117, 163, 176). At the same time intensive works were carried out for the classification of sculpture (*AA* 4, 1888: 176, 194, 226; 1889: 23, 102, 118, 158, 176, 223, 252). By December 1889 all works had come to an end and the museum's displays were crystallised. Although nothing is reported on this matter, we must presume that the museum was closed to the public from 1886 to 1889.<sup>8</sup>

It is instructing to note that all these works gave "employment to a good deal of energy on the part of the Foreign Schools" (*JHS* 1892: 151). Dr. Kawerau undertook the arrangement of the early architectural fragments, whereas "the almost endless labour of sorting and cataloguing the vase fragments discovered in the excavations" was carried out by Dr. Wolters, Dr. Graf and Dr. Hartwig, members of the German Archaeological Institute of Athens (*JHS* 1888-89: 275; 1890-91: 396; 1894-95: 209). The cleaning of bronzes, which due to the Acropolis' humidity were temporarily transported and exhibited in the National Museum, was entrusted to A. Bather, member of the French Archaeological School in Athens.<sup>9</sup>

Meanwhile, a second smaller museum, intended to contain vases, terracottas and minor antiquities, was erected in 1888 to the east of the old one (*AA* 1888: 21; *JHS* 1887-88: 118; *The Builder*, Jan. 28, 1888: 61; Plan 14) "...so

that only the more important finds might be exhibited in the large museum" (Dickins 1912: 4).<sup>10</sup> This small museum was intended for specialised study and was not initially open to the public. "At present", reads a 1889 report, "it is the receptacle for unarranged, or roughly arranged fragments of all sorts" (*JHS* 1888-89: 274). It has to be noted that all inscriptions, bronzes and vases had by that time been transported to the National Archaeological Museum (Kavvadias 1890-92: 39, n. 1).

## Display Layout

### ▪ 1874-1886

Display works started in 1874, but no evidence of how the museum looked during the early years survives. The earliest extant accounts of the museum's interior are Sybel's (1881: 339-97) and Milchhöfer's (1881: 52-62) 1881 descriptions. Together these constitute the only source upon which we may draw for the museum's display profile for the period 1874-1886. The museum comprised eleven rooms (Plan 13). Entrance was through the west side into a small *vestibule*, where both writers refer only to the large statue of Prokne and Itys<sup>11</sup> and a torso of Athena.<sup>12</sup>

#### - Room I

This was placed to the right of the vestibule and contained Archaic works. A series of wooden shelves, running along the four walls of the room and comprising three to four ranks, accommodated a variety of sculptures, reliefs and architectural fragments (among which terracotta architectural fragments from the old Parthenon along the south and west walls). Both Sybel and Milchhöfer refer to some pieces being placed behind or in a gridded structure (*Gitter*, Sybel 1881: 345; *vergitterten Fachwerk*, Milchhöfer 1881: 54). This probably denotes that some sort of gridded shelf or rough cabinet was also in

use here. Other sculptures stood free on the ground. Among them were the seated Athena by Endoios<sup>13</sup> to the left of the entrance door, the Calf-bearer<sup>14</sup> on the west wall and a four sided base depicting Athena's birth<sup>15</sup> in the centre of the room (all of which were later moved into room V; see p. 146). Among the reliefs displayed in this room was the female charioteer relief<sup>16</sup> to the right of the second door (later in the vestibule; see p. 149).

#### - Room II

This, also, contained Archaic sculpture, mainly votive reliefs to Athena and architectural fragments, as well as small fragments from the Parthenon pediments and frieze. As in room I, these were displayed on ranks of wooden shelves or behind gridded wooden structures.

#### - Room III

This room was devoted to the display of originals and casts from the pediments and the frieze of the Parthenon. Surviving figures from the east pediment were displayed along the north wall, whereas figures from the west pediment were displayed underneath the windows at the opposite south side of the room. According to Milchhöfer (1881: 57) most figures were placed on the floor and a few others were attached to the walls. However, Sybel's (1881: 355) reference to the "first table" (*ersten Tisch*) implies that some of the figures were displayed on a supporting structure, probably wooden (this is, in fact, confirmed by a later description of the room; see p. 148). Original and cast slabs from the frieze, were placed in superimposed ranks on either side of the two doors.

#### - Room IV

Similarly, originals and casts from the Parthenon metopes were on display around the walls of room IV. Various sculpture fragments from the temple were also grouped under the window at the south side of the room.



### - Room V

In this room fragments from the Balustrade of the temple of Athena Nike were placed on either side of the entrance door in ranks. A wooden scaffold (*Holzgerüst*), with three to four shelves, ran along the south wall and accommodated various small fragments from the temple of Athena-Nike. Fragments from the Erechtheion frieze were displayed at its right side. Moving towards the east wall one could see a multitude of reliefs placed on wooden shelves or on the floor, whereas more fragmentary sculpture was displayed on shelves along the north wall of the room. The display hardware of room V also comprised some lectern-type cabinets, containing clay and bronze objects.

### - Rooms VI-X

Room VI contained various architectural fragments and reliefs displayed on superimposed wooden shelves. The remaining rooms (VII-X) accommodated a collection of inscriptions, partly arranged in chronological order.

### ■ 1889-1909

Several guides and catalogues, varying in detail and published between 1888 and 1904, allow us to reconstruct the museum's display profile for the period 1886-1904. A first, popular bilingual guide published in 1888 (*Sculptures 1888*; second edition in 1890) and a contemporary description of the museum in *Guide Joanne* (1888: 64-67) provide only rough accounts of the museum's content. The 1891 edition of the popular guide proves a more reliable source (*Sculptures 1891*), whereas two complete catalogues published in 1895 constitute the ultimate reference for the museum at the time (*Kastriotis 1895*; *Kavvadias 1895*). The last description of the museum, within the period under study, dates to 1904 (*Baedeker 1904*: 57-60). Since only slight alterations of the rooms' layout throughout that period is implied by these sources, all seven of

them will be combined in the description which follows and any layout changes reflected in them will be noted.

The works of 1886-1889 had lead to a complete rearrangement of the museum's layout. The content of the rooms changed and so did the visiting route, which was now to the left of the vestibule.

*- Room of the Bull (Plan 14, I)*

The main exhibits here were some old, limestone pedimental sculptures from the Acropolis. Straight in front of the entrance (i.e. on the north wall) was the group of Herakles and the Lernaean Hydra<sup>17</sup> and the group of a bull attacked by a lion,<sup>18</sup> underneath it [14]. The group of Herakles fighting Triton,<sup>19</sup> was placed somewhere along the east wall and the group of the introduction of Herakles to Olympus<sup>20</sup> was displayed along the west wall. A collection of Prehistoric and black and red figured vases was displayed in a series of glass cases and cabinets. More specifically, the cases situated underneath the group of the bull and the lion (Kavvadias 1895: 8; just visible in [14]) accommodated a multitude of votive to Athena objects (figurines, clay and stone spindle-whorls, loom weights), clay lamps and stone Prehistoric tools.

*- Room of the Triple-bodied Monster (Plan 14, II)*

Our sources imply significant changes in the contents of this room from 1891 onwards. Sculpture initially on display in this room included the head of Athena from the Gigantomachy pediment of the old Athena temple along the east wall of the room (Guide Joanne 1888: 65; Sculptures 1888: 16; later moved first to room V and then to room IV; Baedeker 1904: 58), the Hippalektryon (a mixture of a cock and a horse with a rider)<sup>21</sup> and the seated Athena by Endoios (see p. 143), all of which were later moved to room V (see below). Among the exhibits which remained in the room was the group of the Triple-bodied monster,<sup>22</sup> displayed below the window of the north side of the room, with its

painted reconstruction by M. Gillieron above it [15]. A case in the middle of the room accommodated fragmentary pottery and figurines.

*- Room of the Figurines (Plan 14, III)*

This room contained mainly a large series of clay votive figurines. In 1888 some inscriptions and fragmentary pottery, for which there is no later mention, were also on display (Guide Joanne 1888: 65). By 1895 the room contained some seventeen cabinets with various figurine types, which were later transported to the National Museum for consolidation (Kastriotis 1895: 16-19).

*- Room of the Marbles (Plan 14, IV)*

In 1888 a variety of marble and terracotta architectural fragments were displayed along the west wall, whereas some inscribed stelai were placed along the other walls of the room. Bronze and terracotta objects were displayed in cases (Guide Joanne 1888: 65). It seems, however, that by 1895 the display consisted mainly of sculptures, among which were the statue of Athena by Euenor,<sup>23</sup> the seated figures of scribes (previously in room V; see below),<sup>24</sup> the torso of Theseus<sup>25</sup> and a large votive relief to Athena.<sup>26</sup> At that time this room's collection of vases was also transported to the National Museum for consolidation works (Kastriotis 1895: 19, n. 1).

*- Room of the Calf-Bearer (Plan 14, V)*

A multitude of important Archaic sculpture was on display in this room: the Rampin rider,<sup>27</sup> the name piece figure of the Calf-Bearer (placed to the right of the entrance door), the seated Athena by Endoios, the Hippalektryon, a base depicting Athena's birth (see p. 143 above for the last four pieces), the figures of two Sphinxes,<sup>28</sup> the upper part of Athena from the Gigantomachy pediment (p. 145) [16], etc. According to Guide Joanne (1888: 65) the figures of the scribes, later in room IV (p. 146), were in 1888 displayed in a glass case placed



below one of the windows (it is not specified which one). The cases and cabinets of this room were full of fragmentary painted pottery.

A piece of information dating from 1888 (Sculptures 1888: 26-28) shows that the series of cabinets and cases laid out in rooms I-V were marked with letters of the alphabet according to their content. Those marked "A" contained the newest, yet uncatalogued, finds; those marked "B" contained clay figurines; and, the one marked "C" contained finds unearthed from the north wall of the Acropolis in 1886 (fragments of black figured pottery, clay tablets, coins). Rooms I-V also included a display of inscribed bases.

*- Large Archaic Room (Plan 14, VI)*

This room, which "renders the museum unique worldwide" (Kavvadias 1895: 108), contained the celebrated series of Archaic korai<sup>29</sup> [17]. They were all set up on new stone pedestals, which replaced the old, probably brick-built, ones that were used in this room before 1888 (AA 1888: 21). Since no information on the museum's layout between 1881 and 1888 survives and since most of the korai were discovered in 1885-86, we may assume that they were firstly displayed during the museum's reorganisation in 1886-88. The example of one of the most impressive figures, the Antenor kore,<sup>30</sup> which was in 1888 placed next to the window and later moved to the middle of one of the narrow sides (probably the south side), shows that their arrangement around the room must have changed throughout the years. Moreover, sometime at the turn of the century the korai, or some of them, were placed in glass cases (Toudouze 1904a: 23), [18].

As shown in [17], wall shelves running along the west side of the room accommodated a display of fragmentary sculpture. It seems, however, that sometime by 1904 the shelves were removed and the room was thoroughly reorganised [18], something which is not attested by written evidence. The exceptional atmosphere of this room is evoked by this same description: "An

exquisite room, a whole room; you come noiselessly to the centre to sit on a leather sofa, as though you feared to profane a sanctuary" (Toudouze 1904a: 22).

*- Room of the Ephebos (Plan 14, VII)*

This room must have initially looked very spacious as it was devoted only to the Parthenon metopes. A few original metopes, which remained in Athens, were displayed around the walls along with fragmentary pieces of them placed in cabinets. Casts from those metopes which were in the British Museum were placed above them (Sculptures 1888: 94; Guide Joanne 1888: 66). Later, however, new sixth and fifth century B.C. sculpture discoveries were added to the room: the "blond boy" head<sup>31</sup> in the middle of the room (visible in [20]? It was later reported to be displayed in a glass case; Baedeker 1904: 59); four statues of winged Nikai<sup>32</sup> (of which Acr. no. 690 stood in front of the south wall [20]); a kouros' torso (Acr. no. 692, also standing in front of the south wall [20]); a kore head,<sup>33</sup> the front part of a horse,<sup>34</sup> the "Kritian boy",<sup>35</sup> the fragmentary figure of a rider on his horse<sup>36</sup> (all of which are shown in [19]); the relief of the "thinking Athena",<sup>37</sup> a relief depicting Hermes and the Nymphs,<sup>38</sup> etc.

*- Parthenon Room (Plan 14, VIII)*

The layout of this room remained unaltered after the 1886-88 reorganisation. A low platform running around the room accommodated the pedimental groups. The frieze slabs were attached to the walls in superimposed ranks [20]. The platform bearing the pediments was initially a long wooden table (Guide Joanne 1888: 67), but it must have later been replaced by a more solid built structure. The display was now enriched by some visual representations of the Parthenon sculpture. In the centre of the room a four-sided structure bore drawings of the Panathenaic procession (Sculpture 1888: 48; Kavvadias 1895: 114). It is not clear whether a reconstruction of the pediments, which was later

reported to be placed in the same location (Baedeker 1904: 60), replaced those drawings or was shown in addition to them. Panels showing the pediments' contemporary state as compared to the one depicted in Carrey's 1674 drawings,<sup>39</sup> were hung on the west door's pilaster (Sculptures 1888: 46; Kavvadias 1895: 117).

*- Nike Room (Plan 14, IX)*

The fragmentary figures from the Ballustrade of the temple of Athena-Nike, placed into plaster panels, were displayed in the north side of the room [21], [22]; the south side accommodated the fragments from the Erechtheion frieze.

*- Room of Graeco-Roman Heads (Plan 14, X)*

This room contained mainly a series of fourth century B.C. and Roman heads [21], along with a variety of other sculpture, some of which, such as the base of the pyrrhic dancers<sup>40</sup> and two small headless statues of Athena,<sup>41</sup> were later moved to the vestibule (Kavvadias 1895: 61).

*- Vestibule (Plan 14, XI)*

The display here consisted mainly of reliefs and bases among which were the Lénormant relief,<sup>42</sup> the female charioteer relief (p. 143), the statue of Prokne and Itys (p. 142), the base depicting Athena's birth (p. 143), the torso of the so-called Jason,<sup>43</sup> a stele bearing the text of a treaty signed between Athens and Samos in 405 B.C.<sup>44</sup> and a large relief of Demeter and the Kore.<sup>45</sup>

## Display Organisation

The museum's displays were laid out according to chronological order so that each room, or a sequence of rooms, corresponded to a different period of Greek art. Based on this primary organisational frame, individual sets of displays within the rooms, were then structured according to material of construction (limestone or marble sculpture, clay objects, etc.) or typology



(architectural fragments, reliefs, figurines, Archaic korai, etc.). Bulky exhibits, like sculpture and architectural members, were displayed around the walls, whereas smaller objects such as vases, clay figurines, etc., were displayed in cases and cabinets usually placed in the centre of the rooms. This general pattern was consistently followed throughout the period under study.

## Display Hardware

The comparative analysis of display techniques and hardware used in each of the two display periods distinguished above, shows a consistent approach throughout. During the period 1874-1886 most of the display hardware in use was wooden and consisted largely of sets of superimposed wooden shelves, scaffolds (with at least four ranks) and other rough wooden display surfaces (*Holzrepositorien*, *Holzgerüsten*, *Holzfächern*; Milchhöfer 1881: 53-62; *Wandbrettern*, *Holzrahmen*; Sybel 1881: 341-81; cf. [15] and [17]). Reference to shelves during the period 1889-1909 is scarce. In fact, there is only one clear reference to the shelves housing fragments from the Erechtheion frieze in room IX (Guide Joanne 1888: 67). Photographic evidence, however, shows that shelves were still in use [17], although perhaps to a lesser extent. Moreover, a low platform running around the walls was built below the shelves in some of the rooms (see, for example, [15] & [21-22]). Although the platform in the Parthenon room is up until 1904 consistently referred to as wooden, photographic evidence shows that in other rooms it may have been replaced by a stone-built one [15]. Note the interesting example of space economy, just visible in [14], where the upper part of a cabinet for small finds was used as platform for the display of a sculpture group.

In other instances exhibits were simply attached to the walls (e.g. Parthenon room; Milchhöfer 1881: 57; [20]), placed on the ground or on pedestals which, as deduced by later references, were rough, probably brick-

built during the first phase and stone-built during the second (AA 1888: 21) [22]. As already noted, reference to several gridded compartments also indicates the use of some sort of light shelf-cases or rough cabinets during the first display period (see pp. 142-43), but there is no mention of such hardware for the second period.

While all the above-mentioned hardware held stone antiquities, lectern-type cabinets were used for the display of pottery and other small objects (*Pultschränke, Pult*; Milchhöfer 1881: 61). The use of cabinets and glass cases was generalised after the museum's reorganisation in 1886-89. Finally, mention should be made of the four-sided, wooden scaffold on which visual reconstructions of the Parthenon were displayed in the relevant room.

### Supporting Material

As far as supporting material was concerned, we may only be certain about catalogue numbers, which were affixed on the exhibits [21-22]. It is possible that basic labels might also have been used in some cases (see, for example, what looks like a label affixed to a metope in [20]), but this cannot be proved. We should, furthermore, note the first use of basic interpretative material in a Greek archaeological museum; namely, the painted representations in the Triple-bodied monster room and the Parthenon room (pp. 145-46 & 148-49). Evidence from a slightly later photograph of room VII [19], indicates that the name of each room was written high on one of its walls and we could thus assume that this practice was also followed in the other rooms. Finally, labels reading "Please do not touch", in both Greek and French, were affixed below some exhibits [21].

On a more technical level, it is interesting to note the way in which missing parts of sculpture were replaced by either plaster stands [19] or iron rods [16]. According to a modern source, the walls were painted in the deep

red colour, which was favoured by the neo-classical tradition of the time, thus providing a rather sharp contrast to the sculpture's whiteness (Brouskare 1974: 15). Little is known about the museum's lighting conditions, apart from the fact that they were improved after the windows' enlargement in 1888 (p. 141).

## Discussion

Information on display works and the people involved in them during the first period (1874-1886), is scarce. The speculative vision of rooms packed with a mass of exhibits, as reflected in the two 1881 descriptions referred to above (p. 142), seems to be justified by contemporary references reporting on the museum's "deplorable situation" (RA 1883: 364); or, Reinach's (1883: 148) comment: "As for the so-called Acropolis museum... it is a dark entresol where the most precious pieces are like drowned underneath fragments which distract and tire attention". The man mostly responsible for the museum at the time must have been the then General Ephor of Antiquities, Panaghiotes Eustratiades, who was at the time also busy with the classification of sculpture in the National Museum.

More may be said about the display profile of the second phase (1886-1909), initiated with the museum's reorganisation and redisplay. This was mainly the work of one man, Panaghiotes Kavvadias, who was appointed General Ephor of Antiquities and director of Athenian museums in 1885. It is further known that Kastriotes was appointed Ephor of the museum in 1894 and V. Philios in 1904 (Baedeker 1904: 57), but it is difficult to assess their possible contribution to the museum's display profile. The discussion which follows will inevitably concentrate on the period 1886-1909.

The Acropolis Museum's profile is that of a well organised museum with clear spatial lay-out and consistent displays. This was undoubtedly due to the fact that it was the first purpose-built Greek museum. Moreover, the effort put



into the museum's proper arrangement reflected its significance as one of the most important Athenian and Greek museums at the time. Alteration of the spatial lay out and improvement of the display hardware, did not affect the museum's main display trend, namely chronological and typological classification of exhibits, which was consistently followed throughout the years.

Despite this and the existence of the second museum, space was insufficient and the exhibits were displayed in such a way in which their autonomy was rather lost. Suffice it to recall the multitude of superimposed ranks of exhibits, to visualise the suffocating display environment. Some attempts to space the rooms out were made later (AA 1915, Annex: 19). Although the rooms were crowded and most objects juxtaposed in a linear sequence, effort was made to differentiate the display of important exhibits. Note, for example, the effect provided by the placement of the korai on pedestals of varying height, in an effort to stress their individuality [17].

A point which should be stressed here is the publication of popular guides for the first time in the history of Greek museums (Sculptures 1888; 1890; 1891).<sup>46</sup> The museum was open daily from eight in the morning till noon and from three in the afternoon till sunset during the summer (1 April-30 September); from nine in the morning till noon and from two in the afternoon till sunset during the winter (1 October-31 March). Slightly different hours were adopted for Sundays. From 1892 onwards the small museum was also open daily from nine in the morning till noon, apart from Sundays and bank holidays (AA 1892: 31). Visiting figures, however, are impossible to assess. The museum's significance was evident, but its location on a not easily accessible site might have been an impeding for the lay visitor factor.

A final comment should be made on the presence of a leather sofa in the centre of the large Archaic room [17]. Whether its placement there was

dictated by the archaeological and aesthetic excellence of the content of that room, or was simply made possible by the room's size, it, nonetheless, shows concern for the visitors, who could thus have a rest and admire the display (*cf.* the use of similar sofas in the National Museum [48], [50], [57]).

Overall, it seems that the visitor was left with a feeling of awe, such as is presented in Toudouze's words: "infused by strange emotion, you wander from room to room instinctively lowering your voice, as though in a sacred place; you tread softly; the silence is deep, imposing..." (Toudouze 1904a: 22-23).

## **The National Archaeological Museum**

### **Introduction**

The long, turbulent history of the construction of the National Archaeological Museum provides fertile ground for discussing nineteenth century ideological and museological issues with regard to Greece. On the ideological level, the museum's history reflects contemporary attitudes towards the Greek Antiquity both in Greece and in Western Europe. On the museological level, the National Museum represents the culmination of the arduous efforts towards the establishment of systematically organised museums in Greece, thus marking a new era of museum development in the country.

The critical place of antiquities in the Greek consciousness of the time, the long controversy over the museum's construction and the extensive foreign involvement in its planning and organisation, are some of the issues which can be raised in connection with the museum's building. The foreign influence, in particular, is a question which needs more discussion. It is interesting, for example, to note how the choice of the architects involved in

the building's planning reflected the nationality of the monarchs of Greece. For almost thirty years, during King Otto's reign, the museum's planning was entrusted to German architects. Later, the involvement of the Danish architect Theophil Hansen, coincides with the reign of King George I, who was of Danish origin. Note that the only Greek involved in the museum's building was P. Kalkos, the architect of the Acropolis Museum. A review of the museum's history is provided elsewhere (Kokkou 1977: 201-46) and so only its main phases will be summarised here.

### Historical Note

The first plans of the museum were drafted by the renowned German architect Leo von Klenze,<sup>47</sup> the designer of the *Glyptothek* and the *Alte Pinakothek* in Munich (see Plagemann 1967: 33-46, 67-81), who visited Athens in 1834. After choosing the hill of St. Athanassios at the Kerameikos area for the museum's construction, Klenze designed a complex that was in keeping with the ancient Greek principles of asymmetry. Two buildings, an octagon and a rectangular one, were connected by a small colonnade. The asymmetry of the construction was enhanced by the fact that the rectangular building, which was three storey high on one side and only one storey on the other, gave the impression of two separate buildings (Plan 15). The tripartite structure was intended to provide not only for the display of antiquities, but also for other collections which would be added to the museum later. Hence, Klenze ascribed the term "Multitechnic" (*Παντεχνεῖον*) to the museum. Klenze's plans were not implemented, but the issue continued to preoccupy the Greek Government, which from 1854 onwards assigned a special amount for the museum in the state annual budget. The first real step towards the museum's construction came in 1856, when Demetrios Vernardakes (n. 2) donated a large sum of money for the purpose.



The announcement of a public competition for the museum's design in 1858 generated, the anticipation for the results aside, some of the earliest, if not the earliest, writings on museum matters in Greece. The royal edict declaring the competition contained, for the first time in an official text, specific and explicit instructions on museum organisation (see p. 67); whereas the *Instructions on the museum's construction*, published at the same time, stressed that the museum building should be skillfully designed so as to do justice to the treasures it would contain and gave detailed guidelines for the exact placement of each category of antiquities in the museum rooms (see p. 67). It is strange that, despite the abundance of guidelines of a technical nature, the above texts did not lay down the location of the museum itself, an omission which fuelled the ongoing dispute in years to come.<sup>48</sup>

The competition, however, bore no fruit as none of the submitted plans was approved by the judging committee, the Royal Academy of Arts in Munich, because they were deemed inappropriate to the Greek landscape and spirit. The Academy's report -an interesting theoretical scheme for the Greek museum which was reproduced in the Athenian press of the time- has already been discussed in chapter four (p. 68).

After the competition's failure, the German architect Ludwig Lange,<sup>49</sup> member of the Munich Academy and old friend of Greece, took the initiative of designing the museum's plan. Lange also opted for the Kerameikos area and he designed a sculpture gallery rather than a general museum, little in keeping with the instructions. The building was rectangular, with a cross-like ground plan and a long, open Ionic colonnade on the front side. A monumental staircase emphasised the central entrance and the rooms were symmetrically arranged around the interior courtyards (Plan 16). The ground floor was intended for the display of sculpture and reliefs, whereas architectural members and other stone antiquities would be placed in the interior courtyards

and colonnades. A second floor would accommodate vases, coins and other small antiquities and a third one was intended for the museum library. In general, Lange's design was in keeping with the neoclassical tradition of museum building in the nineteenth century Germany and Europe.<sup>50</sup>

Lange's plan did not come close to implementation until 1865, when two royal decrees provided for the construction of the museum on the hill of St. Athanassios at the Kerameikos area. Nevertheless, as a result of severe objections to the plan and the location of the museum in particular, its foundation was called off once more (Kokkou 1977: 228). The final solution came in 1866 with the donation of a large piece of land at Patission street by Elene Tositsa (who had previously also donated a piece of land for the construction of the Polytechnic school nearby).

The museum's foundations, which was to be built according to Lange's plans, slightly altered by P. Kalkos, were solemnly laid on 3 October 1866 (*Παλιγγενεσία* Δ', no. 1012, 3-10-1866), but the museum building would undergo various phases and take many years to finish. After the completion of the first, west, wing in 1874 (Plan 17), works stopped until 1879. Nevertheless, soon after the completion of the west wing, a special committee was set up for the arrangement of the antiquities, to that date kept in various Athenian repositories, which started being transported to the museum (Kokkou 1977: 247). Those from the Theseion, for example, were moved to the National Museum in 1877,<sup>51</sup> followed gradually by the collections of the Archaeological Society.<sup>52</sup> A rough classification was then carried out (*ΠΑΕ* 1876: 6, 26; Kavvadias 1890-92: 35-38). A second, north, wing, was finished in 1880-81 and was immediately used for the accommodation of stone antiquities (*Αθήναιον* 9, 1880: 394; *Παρνασσός* V, 1881: 91). The south wing was built between 1883 and 1885.

In 1887, despite the fact that the building was reaching completion, the Greek Government asked the help of the Danish architect Theophil Hansen<sup>53</sup> for reasons which are not clear. Hansen rejected Lange's plans and presented a new design for a low, one-storey, museum to be erected on the Acropolis' south slope, that is between the theatre of Dionysos and the odeum of Herodes Atticus (Plan 18). His plan, however, could not be implemented, not only because the location was completely inappropriate and the costs involved prohibiting, but mainly because the museum's building at Patission street was almost finished.

The museum's completion was undertaken by Ernst Ziller,<sup>54</sup> Hansen's pupil and follower. After final completion in 1889, the museum's ground plan presented a significantly different picture from the original Lange's one (*cf.* plans 16 and 21). Apart from the addition of rooms on the front and along the interior courtyards, the part which was mostly altered was the museum's facade, featuring a propylon with four Ionic columns and an elongated colonnade on either side [23-24]. Ziller's plan and decoration were simple and plain, in the spirit of the neoclassical tradition of the time.

It is interesting to note the intention of erecting a museum for replicas behind the main building, which was largely discussed in 1888, that is, before the final completion of the building.<sup>55</sup> Construction of casts for sale or for exchange with foreign museums started in 1889 (*AA* 1889: 103) and a "Museum of Casts" was legislatively established as an annex to the National Museum in 1893. It was intended to receive casts of both ancient and more recent works of sculpture,<sup>56</sup> but it is not known whether this decision was implemented or not.

The systematic organisation of the museum by Panaghiotes Kavvadias, the General Ephor of Antiquities, started in 1885 (*AA* 1885: 4) and was intensified from 1889 onwards, that is after the latter had finished his work at



the Acropolis (Kavvadias 1890-92: 38-39; pp. 140-141). Owing to the regular account of most aspects of the museum's organisation in archaeological journals of the time, mainly *AΔ* (1888-92) and *JHS* (1887-1899), we are in a position to follow the various steps taken. We, thus, know that the first collections to be arranged were the bronzes and vases and that the archaeologist Valerios Staes<sup>57</sup> was moved from his post in Argolid and Corinthia to undertake the curation of the vase collection. A workman was assigned to help in technical matters and new showcases were constructed (*AΔ* 1888: 22).

At the same time, significant new finds from various parts of the country came to the museum, like the sculpture from the temple of Despoina at Lykosoura in Arcadia,<sup>58</sup> those from the excavations at Eretria (*AΔ* 1889: 83), Rhamnous<sup>59</sup> and the most important bronzes from Olympia (*JHS* 1889-90: 212). The rooms were decorated in 1891 (*AΔ* 1891: 17). At around the same time opened the central wing, that is the Mycenaean and Egyptian rooms,<sup>60</sup> which were impressively decorated by the German architect G. Kawerau (*AΔ* 1891: 91; Staes 1909: 1). Thus, by 1894 the entire museum was accessible to visitors.

In the meantime, the museum's name, *Central Museum*, had in 1888 changed to *National Archaeological Museum*.<sup>61</sup> A royal decree "On the Organisation of the National Archaeological Museum" issued in 1893 was the first official document providing for the museum:

*"The foundation of the National Museum aims at the study and teaching of the archaeological science, the diffusion of archaeological knowledge among us and the development of love for the arts. For this reason all antiquities which are significant for understanding the history of ancient art and knowing ancient life... are to be assembled in it. They are placed in the museum per collections in which they are scientifically classified".<sup>62</sup>*

Finally, the discovery of the ship wreck near Anti-Cythera and the refloating of the bronze statues from within it in 1900, dictated the extension of the museum.<sup>63</sup> Works were carried out between 1903 and 1906, adding a new elongated wing to the building's east side (*AthMitt* 1903: 477; Plan 23). Finally, by the end of the period under study, impressive gardens embellished the front of the museum [25].

## Display Layout

The display history of the National Museum can be portrayed with a considerable degree of accuracy thanks to a series of publications covering the period 1881 to 1909.

### ▪ 1881

The only side of the museum which was open to the public in 1881 was the west one and our information on its actual state is based on Eustratiades<sup>64</sup> and Milchhöfer (1881: 1-35). A variety of finds which were later reported to be placed elsewhere in the museum were deposited in the *vestibule*, which initially also served as a distribution place (Plan 19). Here, among other exhibits, for example, were six crates containing finds from Melos and another five with finds from elsewhere in Greece. Moving to the left, *room Ia/Ib* contained Archaic sculpture, including some of the *kouroi* and funerary reliefs. *Room II* contained mainly funerary urns, displayed along the semi-circle, gravestones and other sculpture, among which was the Hermes from Andros (p. 91, n. 40). *Room III* contained votive reliefs and other sculptures many of which were later to be found in the following rooms (for example, the so-called Perseus, the large Eleusinian relief,<sup>65</sup> the reliefs of dancing girls from the theatre of Dionysos in Athens,<sup>66</sup> a frieze from Thermopylae<sup>67</sup>). The statue of Athena Parthenos (found at the Varvakeion in 1881) was placed in the centre (see n. 72). Moving to the right (south) of the vestibule, *room*

*IVa/IVb* contained a display of Roman funerary reliefs (here were also the two statues from Aegion, later in the Poseidon room), *room V* a series of portraits, whereas sculpture and ceramics were displayed in *room VI*. Overall, Eustratiades recorded a total of 962 ancient pieces on display at that time.

▪ 1887-88

By 1887 the museum's north wing was also accessible to visitors. Our information for that period is taken from three catalogues, namely two editions of the museum's first sculpture catalogue (Marbres 1887; 1889) and *Guide Joanne* (1888: 135-50). It should be stressed that all the above sources constitute no more than selective descriptions.

The *room of Archaic Works* (Plan 20, 1<sup>1</sup>/1<sup>2</sup>) contained many important and well-known pieces of sculpture, like the statue of Nikandra,<sup>68</sup> a series of Boeotian kouroi,<sup>69</sup> the Nike by Archermos from Delos,<sup>70</sup> the gravestones of Aristion, Lyceas (p. 91, n. 36 & 37) and that by Alxenor from Naxos [38],<sup>71</sup> etc. The main exhibits in the *Athena room* (Plan 20, II), which, as reported in *Guide Joanne* (1888: 140), was not yet completely arranged, were the Varvakeion Athena,<sup>72</sup> the Lénormant Athena,<sup>73</sup> the large Eleusinian relief (previously in the third room; see above), sculpture from the temple of Alea-Athena at Tegea, the temple of Apollo at Delos and the temple of Asclepios at Epidauros. The *Hermes room* (Plan 20, III) contained the statue of Hermes from Andros (p. 91, n. 40), sculpture and architectural fragments from Epidauros [43], the frieze from Thermopylae [44; top] and the reliefs found at Mantinea.

In the following *Poseidon room* (Plan 20, IV) one could see three marble statues found on the island of Melos, including the large statue of Poseidon,<sup>74</sup> the dancing girls reliefs (p. 160), the statues of Hermes from Atalante (p. 90, n. 33) and from Aegion, the so-called Perseus, etc. The main exhibits in the *room of the "Delos warrior"* (Plan 20, V) were the eponymous piece and the sleeping



maenad or hermaphrodite (Guide Joane 1888: 144). Then followed the large *room of funerary reliefs* (Plan 20, VI) which accommodated a large collection of funerary reliefs and vases. "The visitor to this large room... is exalted, imagining himself in a fourth century B.C. necropolis and seized by a mysterious, religious sentiment", wrote the museum's popular guide, echoing the impression of this display on the visitors (Marbres 1887: 36; see also Kavvadias 1895: 64). Note that *rooms VII, VIII, IX and X*, could then only be visited with a special permission, which perhaps indicates that they were under reorganisation at the time.

#### ▪ 1891

The completion of the building in 1889 was followed by a period of reorganisation, the first phase of which is reflected in a new edition of the sculpture catalogue published in 1891 (Marbres 1891). However, only the north-west side of the museum was accessible at that time.

The spatial arrangement of rooms B-Δ remained almost unaltered, apart from several antiquities which were now differently placed. The statue of Themis<sup>75</sup> and that of Nemesis' priestess, Aristonoe,<sup>76</sup> from the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnus, which were in 1890 temporarily displayed in the museum's vestibule,<sup>77</sup> had by 1891 found their definitive place in the *Themis room*, a small room added to the north-west corner of the building (Plan 21, unnumbered). Mounted on one of the walls of this room, moreover, was a painted representation of the murals discovered in a tomb at Corinth (Marbres 1891: 32). The addition of new finds meant moving the contents of room Z into room E (Plan 21) and the subsequent renaming of room Z as the *Kosmetes room*, after some thirty three heads of the hermaic stelai of the "Kosmetes"<sup>78</sup> (annual supervisors of the Athenian ephebes) displayed there [49].

### ▪ 1895-96

The systematic organisation of the museum was marked by the publication of its first cumulative, although provisional, catalogue, written by P. Kavvadias in 1895. Along with a catalogue by P. Kastriotes, published in the following year (Kastriotes 1896), this reflects an almost definitive arrangement of antiquities in the completed building.

Straight through the entrance door, one could first visit the *Mycenaean Hall* (Plan 22, B) which contained the collection previously displayed in the Polytechnic School (p. 121). Other Mycenaean antiquities were on display in small adjacent rooms (Plan 22, β-β'), while the collection of Egyptian antiquities was arranged in the *Egyptian rooms* (Plan 22, Γ-γ). Back to the entrance, one could turn left and start wandering through the sculpture rooms (Plan 22, Δ-Σ). As compared with the situation revealed in previous descriptions (pp. 160-61), the core of sculpture contained in the *Archaic room* (Plan 22, Δ) remained the same, with the addition of some more pieces, for example, a large Archaistic head of Apollo [39]. The same was true for the *Athena room* (Plan 22, E). The main pieces added in the *Hermes room* (Plan 22, Z) were the relief of Diotima from Mantinea,<sup>79</sup> sculpture from the Heraion at Argos [45] and a base by Bryaxis from Athens.<sup>80</sup> In 1896, the plaster casts from the frieze of the temple of Apollo Epicurus at Figaleia, which were previously displayed in the Theseion (pp. 96-97), were for the first time reported to be placed on the upper part of the walls of this room (Kastriotes 1896: 16). This piece of information, however, is not repeated in later sources.

The *Themis room* (Plan 22, H) remained unaltered, but in 1896 it received three new discoveries from Delos; namely, a Roman copy of the "Diadoumenos" by Polykleitos,<sup>81</sup> the statue of a naked athlete<sup>82</sup> and a female draped statue,<sup>83</sup> all of which were later moved to the next room. Changes were observed in the *Poseidon room* (Plan 22, Θ), where some statues were

removed (Kavvadias 1895: nos. 250, 253, 284-295) and others added (Kavvadias 1895: nos. 264-312, 355-368). A Roman mosaic, depicting a Meduse head, was now placed in the centre of the *Kosmetes room* (Plan 22, I), whereas the display in the first *room of the funerary reliefs* (Plan 22, K) presented no major changes.

Now, however, the entire east wing of the building was devoted to the display of the vast collection of reliefs. More funerary reliefs were accommodated in *rooms*  $\Lambda$  [53], [54],  $M$  [55] and  $N$  [56], whereas *room*  $\Xi$  contained Greek and Roman funerary monuments, mainly sarcophagi. Further south on that side, *room*  $O$  housed more Roman funerary monuments [59], [60], *room*  $\Pi$  a series of votive reliefs from the temples of Asclepios in Athens and Epidauros [61] and *room*  $P$  various other reliefs and sculpture [62]. The two small rooms flanking the interior yard at this side (Plan 22,  $\Sigma$ - $\Sigma'$ ) housed a collection of Byzantine antiquities, including mosaics from the Daphni monastery (Kavvadias 1895: 73).

The museum's south wing was devoted to the vase collection, whose arrangement and display was praised in contemporary sources.<sup>84</sup> *Room*  $T$  contained Prehistoric, Archaic and Classical pottery from all over Greece, apart from the most prominent Mycenaean vases, which were displayed in the Mycenaean Hall (Kavvadias 1895: 76). Large Geometric vases were placed in the middle of the room [63]. The series of Attic red-figured vases along with other vases filled *rooms*  $Y$  and  $\Phi$  [65]. Then followed the collection of clay figurines, mainly from Beotia, Tanagra, Athens, Thebes and other areas of Greece (Plan 22,  $X$ - $\Omega$ ) and Asia Minor; the bronzes, mainly those from Olympia and the Acropolis, were displayed in *room*  $\Omega$ .

#### ▪ 1895-1904

No major alteration of the museum's layout towards the end of the nineteenth century is reported, but some minor changes would have probably resulted



from the addition of new, or previously stored, antiquities (*JHS* 1898-99: 1). At the beginning of the twentieth century, a general catalogue of the museum published by Svoronos in 1903, was followed by the museum's description in the Baedeker guide one year later.

A comparison of the museum's layout as in 1895 with that observed in 1904 (largely relying on the sequence in which the various exhibits are described) reveals that, although the basic display layout remained the same, some major changes, mainly due to the addition of new pieces and the different placement of others, occurred. Such a fact seems to be confirmed by Svoronos' (1896a: μα) critique of Kavvadias, who, according to the former, was constantly altering the exhibits' position in the rooms.

Only some of the most obvious changes observed are noted here. Sometime before 1903, for example, the reliefs of the dancing girls were moved from the Poseidon room to the *Themis room* (Svoronos 1903: 19-21) [46], where the Anti-Cythera finds were also displayed (Baedeker 1904: 83; Plan 23, VII). Moreover, sometime between 1895 and 1904 rooms XVI and XVII must have been merged into room XVII, because the latter was then cited as the *Karapanos room* (Plan 23, XVII), containing the Karapanos collection of finds from the excavations at Dodona in Epirus, along with clay objects from Corfu (Baedeker 1904: 85). This merging seems, in fact, to be confirmed by two photographs [61-62]. Note, also, that the *first figurine room* apparently opened during this period (Plan 23, XXII; cf. plan 22 where it is unnumbered).

#### ▪ 1904-1909

Information for this period comes from Staes' 1907 sculpture and bronze catalogue (second edition in 1910) and Kastriotēs' sculpture catalogue of 1908. A separate catalogue for the Mycenaean collection appeared in 1909 (Staes 1909).

The basic layout still remained unaltered, although some changes occurred. One of the most striking new features of the *Archaic room* (Plan 24, 8) was probably the colossal kouros discovered at Sounion in 1906.<sup>85</sup> The statue was placed in the middle of the room replacing the Melos kouros,<sup>86</sup> which was moved to the north wall [37]. In the *Hermes room* (Plan 24, 10) the statue of Hermes from Andros was moved from the side to the centre of the room (Staes 1907: 37). Some marble heads and figurines, mainly from Epidauros, were now displayed in cabinets in the *Kosmetes room* (Plan 24, 13; Staes 1907: 80), whereas the Anti-Cythera finds were definitively arranged in the new bronze rooms (Plan 24, 33-35; Staes 1907: 215) in 1907.<sup>87</sup> These rooms contained the entire bronze collection, apart from the Karapanos collection, which was held separately, and was relocated in 1907 (Plan 24, 22; Staes 1907: 302). Sculpture was occasionally moved twice within one year. Three statues from Delos (nos. 1826-28), for example, which were up to 1907 displayed in the *Poseidon room* and the relief of Echelos and Vassile,<sup>88</sup> to that date in the *Athena room*, were in 1908 temporarily moved to one of the reliefs room (Plan 24, 21), only to find their old position after 1909 (Baedeker 1909; Papaspyride 1927).

A reference to some 2,725 pieces of sculpture on display in 1908 (Kastriotis 1908: 4) gives us an indication of the total number of antiquities on display during that period (*cf.* with the 962 ones in 1881, p. 161).

## Display Organisation

A chronological and typological pattern, already in use during the first years and intensified later, was adopted in the displays organisation. From Eustratiades (see n. 51) and Milchhöfer (1881: 1-33), it follows that the museum displays, which initially comprised almost exclusively sculptures, were as early as 1881 broadly classified in chronological and, to a less extent,

typological order. We know nothing certain about their spatial arrangement, but they were probably displayed in a linear way.

Later and especially after ca.1892, when all the museum's collections were laid out, this pattern was generalised. Antiquities were first divided into three broad categories, that is sculpture, vases and bronzes, according to typology. Displays were then laid out in chronological order, with each room or sequence of rooms representing a period of Greek art. Objects of all kinds were usually juxtaposed in a linear way [44], [49-50], [56] and placed according to size [54], [62-65]. Often, the spatial arrangement of particular objects was dictated by principles of aesthetic appeal [50], [57]. The general rule was that bulky objects were placed on a lower, ground, level, with smaller ones placed higher on the walls [48], [50].

## Display Hardware

The museum's hardware in around 1881-1883 consisted of wooden pedestals, with at least three ranks, tables, simple or glass-covered and upright cabinets (Eustratiades, *Archive*; see n. 51). Antiquities were also placed on the floor. The bulkier pieces of sculpture were displayed on the pedestals' ranks. Fragmentary sculpture was placed in glass-covered tables, whereas upright cabinets housed the vases. Presumably, this hardware was of simple form and construction, but this is all we may say about it. Photographic evidence from other Greek museums, however, help us in visualising the type of the wooden pedestals [98] and a later photograph from the National Museum [56] gives us an indication for the way of display of marble funerary vases in room II.

The first specific piece of information on the construction of show-cases, as well as the first reference to them in a description of the museum, dates from 1888 (AA 1888: 22; see also Guide Joanne 1888: 142), but nothing more is known on the type of these cases. This is all our information on the museum's



display hardware until 1893, when all the display hardware used in the museums of the Archaeological Society was presented to the National Museum (p. 120). As already shown, this hardware mainly consisted of wooden upright cabinets, double-sided lectern-type showcases, tables and large bases. Both the display hardware and the layout of exhibits within it, was probably almost identically "transplanted" from the Polytechnic to the Mycenaean [26] and the Egyptian rooms. Additional display surfaces were apparently constructed in the vase and bronze rooms, whereas completely new hardware was constructed for the display of sculpture.

More specifically, the display layout was as follows. Bulky sculpture (statues, large reliefs, gravestones and large funerary vases) was displayed on individual, marble pedestals and bases, which varied in size and form according to the kind of exhibits they bore. They generally consisted of from one to three blocks [37], [48], [50], [59]. Occasionally, they took the form of a low, shelf-like, platform attached to the wall (see, for example, the display of small gravestones [59-62]). Note the different marble used for some of these bases [53], as well as the aesthetic effect provided by the smooth transition from square to circle in the bases of some funerary vases [54]. A slightly different type of base was used for the display of Mycenaean gravestones in the Mycenaean hall [26].

Smaller pieces of sculpture, like architectural fragments, heads, reliefs, marble vases, etc., were generally placed on plain shelves [44], [49], [56], [60]. Very often, however, they were displayed on individual, elegant, shelf-bases, which were attached to the walls [36], [46], [48].

Vases, figurines and bronzes were displayed in upright cabinets and cases placed along the walls and in the middle of the rooms [63-64]. Large Geometric vases were exalted by being displayed on bulky wooden pedestals

[63]. Prehistoric vases of medium size were also placed on top of the cabinets or simply on the floor [63].

Generally, a variety of means served for highlighting significant exhibits. The most widely used were individual bases, either freestanding [49] or placed in a cabinet [28], large cases [41] and columns [57], which occasionally also bore a glass oval-shaped case [57], [65]). Alternatively, a panel was placed behind a sculpture so as to provide a visual frame to it [57]. Occasionally also an exhibit was circumscribed by a chain [48], [57].

Finally, a word on technical matters. The first observation concerns the extensive use of plaster in the restoration of sculpture [36-37]; a practice which received negative criticism (*JHS* 1890-91: 396). Plaster was also used for the consolidation of sculpture to the bases [37], [45] as well as for the restoration of vases [63]. Iron rods were also used for consolidating sculptures to their bases [42], [37].

## Supporting Material

A consistent attempt, probably the first ever observed in a Greek museum, was made to supplement the exhibits with supporting material. Firstly, the content of all rooms or their name was clearly noted with large painted letters on the walls [26], [34], [37], [48], [50], [56]. Catalogue numbers were clearly marked on the very objects [56]; besides them, if displayed in a cabinet [27], [31]; on the shelves [44]; or on the bases underneath the exhibits [61]. Cases and cabinets were numbered [26], [32], [57] and bore case-headings [26], [63-65].

Labels were sometimes affixed either on the very exhibits [38] or on their bases [40], [43-44]. We should note that this is the first clear evidence on the use of labels in a Greek museum. They were either very laconic [43] or more detailed [40], but it seems that, on the whole, they were no more than

identification labels, containing the basic information on the objects (Baedeker 1904: 76; 1905: 89; see also Staes 1909: 5). Occasionally also the names of important artists were clearly painted on the wall behind the relevant exhibit [35-36]; and the names of donors were painted on the wall above the display of the donated collections [26]. On a different note, other wall inscriptions, in Greek and French prohibited the guards from accepting tips [35], [19], [55; on the doorway].

Displays were at times supplemented by plaster casts of objects in other Greek museums (see, for example, the display of casts of Minoan finds from Knossos, held in the Herakleion Museum, in the Mycenaean hall; Staes 1909: 92), as well as with painted reconstructions [50; right hand side, top]). Note also the display of imprints of gems beside the originals in the cases of the Mycenaean hall [31].

### Display Environment

The decoration of the rooms provides ground for some interesting observations. Objections to the grandiose Mycenaean-like decoration of the Mycenaean hall were expressed in a contemporary journal: "The design is good... but... the colouring is not satisfactory. Instead of the brilliant blue and scarlet that form so rich and pleasing a contrast in the originals, in this room a pale blue and dull brownish red are used, which seem much out of place in such designs and spoil the general effect" (*JHS* 1892: 150). The decoration of that room remained unaltered throughout the period under study.

Photographic evidence allows the distinction of at least two phases in the decoration of the rest of the museum. A two-zone wall decoration characterised both phases. During the first phase the transition from the lower, painted zone to the upper, plain one, was uninterrupted. During the second phase, however, a narrow decorative strap was inserted between the lower,



painted zone and the upper one, which was now covered with marble panels. A flower-like motif filled the decorative strap in the Archaic room [34-37], whereas a wave-like motif was adopted in other rooms [48], [52], [63].

The first phase probably dates from ca.1891, when the museum was initially painted (p. 159). Sometime between 1906 and 1910 the museum must have been redecorated. The earliest evidence for this change is provided by photographs showing the Sounion kouros in the centre of the Archaic room [34-37]. Most of these photographs date from 1910. However, the *terminus post quem* for dating this phase must be 1906, the year when the statue was discovered and must subsequently have been placed in the room. This coincides with the time of the extension of the building; a fact which may have justified refurbishment of the decoration. Note, for example, the seemingly bad condition of the walls of some rooms as seen in contemporary photographs [33].

The museum floor was differently paved. A mosaic with Geometric patterns and vivid colours, covered the floor of the Mycenaean hall [26], whereas an almost identical one paved the vase wing (only the motif of the edge zone is different) [63]. It seems that all sculpture rooms were paved with plain, monochrome blocks of stone [37], [48], [62]. The bronze rooms were similarly paved. There, however, the stone blocks, which were of two colours, formed a pattern on the floor [57] (note that the two-zone wall decoration was not followed here).

Natural lighting was provided by large windows in all rooms, whereas more light came through a skylight in the middle bronze room [57]. Moreover, this was the first museum for which there is clear evidence that heating was installed. A photograph dating to 1910 shows that a stove was used in the large room of funerary reliefs [50]. There is no reason why not to assume that some similar means of heating would have been used in the rest of the museum.

Finally, photographic evidence shows that comfortable leather couches, placed in some of the rooms, provided rest for the visitors [37], [48], [50], [52] (*cf.* the use of couches in the Acropolis Museum [17]).

## Discussion

The displays of the National Museum embodied only a fraction of the works carried out there and which probably made it, at least during the first years, resemble an enormous work-site. A closer look at the various activities and at the people involved in them will elucidate some aspects of the function of the principal museum of the country at its beginnings.

As already seen, works started after the completion of the first wing in 1874. At that time a committee for the museum's arrangement was formed by the ephor of antiquities (Kokkou 1977: 229, 247). The classification of objects was entrusted to three archaeologists (Eustratiades, Koumanoudes, Rangaves), an architect (Kaphtantzoglou) and a chemical engineer (Roussopoulos), while two sculptors (Vitsares, Marmarinos) undertook the arrangement and setting up of objects in the rooms. This was the first time that a special committee was charged with a museum's display.<sup>89</sup>

However, Eustratiades was the main individual responsible for the museum at the time and to him we owe the first methodical, although rough, registration of the museum's contents. The chaotic situation, which must have prevailed in the museum during those first years, with antiquities scattered all around the newly-built wings, have apparently rendered this work extremely hard; under this light, Eustratiades' contribution must be greatly appreciated. A careful reading of his description of the museum shows that a basic classification and display of antiquities, no matter how rudimentary, did exist at the time. This impression is also given by Milchhöfer's contemporary account of the museum and, in a way, opposes to the picture of complete

chaos, which Kavvadias (1890-92: 38) claimed to have found later.

Works were intensified from 1889 onwards. Unfortunately, while the period from 1889 to 1892 is sufficiently documented in the *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον* (Archaeological Bulletin), that is the main source of information on the works in the state museums, the suspension of its publication between 1892 and 1915 creates a significant gap of information, which is not compensated by other sources. Nonetheless, it remains a fact that Panaghiotes Kavvadias was the man who shaped the museum's profile. He actively organised all aspects of museum work, namely gathering of material, consolidation and restoration, classification, arrangement and display; and he was, no doubt, morally responsible for the gradual assemblage in the National Museum of antiquities from all over Greece (Kavvadias 1890-92: 39, n. 1). Among his contributions we should mention the publication of a popular catalogue as early as 1887 (Kavvadias 1886-87). However, while Kavvadias himself praised his efforts for properly organising the museum, his work was severely criticised by his contemporaries. Svoronos (1896a: μα), for example, accused him of unnecessary waste of public money in successive decorations of disputable aesthetics and of unjustified removal of antiquities within the rooms.

Among the archaeologists who worked for the museum's organisation, were Panaghiotes Kastriotes, Keeper of sculptures, Valerios Staes, Keeper of the vase and bronze collection, Chrestos Tsountas,<sup>90</sup> Curator of the Mycenaean collection and Konstantinos Kourouniotes, who was later entrusted the curation of the Egyptian collection (Baedeker 1909: 79). The degree of their involvement, if any, in the museum displays is not known, but they greatly advanced the museum's cataloguing (see bibliography).

Many foreigners also contributed in the museum's organisation. The German architect-archaeologist G. Kawerau, for example, decorated the



Mycenaean and the Egyptian rooms. His compatriot Edgar undertook the classification, display and publication of the finds from Phylakopi at Melos (Nicole 1911: 23). The French Collignon and Couve (1902-1904) and Nicole (1911) studied and published the vase collection. Note also the contribution of Dr. Pick, who was especially sent from Berlin to examine and arrange the museum's coins collection (*JHS* 1888-89: 276).

The museum was open from eight and later nine, o'clock in the morning till noon and from three in the afternoon till sunset during the summer (1 April-30 September) and from nine o' clock in the morning till noon and from two in the afternoon till sunset in the winter (Marbres 1887; Kastriotis 1896). Situated in a central part of the city, it was apparently one of the most easily accessible Athenian museums of the time, but nothing is clearly known on its visiting figures.

Overall, the profile of the National Museum, the principal museum of the country, was that of a systematically organised museum, with clear spatial layout and consistent display approach. The museum's main display trend, that is chronological and typological order, was followed throughout, despite changes in the layout of the rooms.

## **The Numismatic Museum - Phase One: The Formative Period (1829-1843)**

The first nucleus of the numismatic collection, comprising some 359 golden and silver coins and gems, was housed in the National Museum at Aegina (p. 82). The collection, stored rather than displayed, was kept in a small chest of drawers in the inner room of the museum from 1829 until sometime in 1834, when it was transferred to Athens. The collection's curation was first entrusted to the young Danish numismatist, Giede, then, after his sudden death in 1836,

to Ludwig Ross and later to Kyriakos Pittakes in 1837. It is not clear where the collection was housed between 1834 and 1837, when Pittakes undertook to keep the coins in his house. In 1843, following a royal decree for the collection's housing in the National Library of Athens, Pittakes handed the coins over to the Library's Ephor, G. Kozakes-Typaldos (Kokkou 1977: 259-61).

## **The Numismatic Museum - Phase Two: The Period of Scientific Classification (1843-1888)**

### **1843-1856**

"The Numismatic collection was housed in one of the rooms of the National...Library"<sup>91</sup> (Deleghiannes 1885-86 in Loghodosiai Prytaneon: 25), which, as reads a report on the first fifty years of the University of Athens, was housed in the upper rooms of the University from 1843 to 1887 (Kozakes-Typaldos 1857: 3; Pantazides 1889: 49). This is further specified by Marghares (1951: 322) who writes that the Library was installed in the north-west wing on the upper floor of the University (Plan 25). The extreme narrowness of available space, both in the Library (Kostes 1884-85 in Loghodosiai Prytaneon: 82; Pantazides 1889: 115, 207) and the building as a whole (Phrearites 1864a: 12-13; 1865a; 1865b), did not allow for any display facilities of the collection.<sup>92</sup> Although Kozakes-Typaldos (1857: 3-4) refers to a "coins-case", where some of the coins were put, most references clearly show that coins were disorderly kept in linen bags and paper parcels.<sup>93</sup> In an appeal letter, addressed by Kozakes-Typaldos in 1862 to all lovers of Greece in the country and abroad, who could help the museum build its collections, it is specified that the museum's target was not the quantitative increase of its collection but the formation of a collection representing, to as great an extent as possible, all

phases of ancient numismatics (quoted in Touratsoglou and Tsourte-Koule 1988: 106).

### 1856-1888

Systematic organisation of the collection began with the appointment of Achilleus Postolakas<sup>94</sup> as director in 1856. The number of coins had increased from 1,641 in 1843 to 8,522 in 1857 (Kozakes-Typaldos 1957: 4, 15), while some major donations also added considerably to the collection.<sup>95</sup> In 1866 a special committee was set up to help Postolakas with the classification<sup>96</sup> and a year later the beginning of the edition of the museum's first descriptive catalogue was saluted as marking the existence of a real numismatic museum (Phrearites 1868: 424).

In fact, despite later criticism against the museum's "miserable situation", the lack of space and the unsuitability of the available space at the time (Svoronos 1889: 12; 1896a: 8), Postolakas' contribution towards the museum's methodic organisation and the accuracy of its catalogue were highly praised by both Greeks (Svoronos 1898b: 134; 1906: 149; Oikonomos 1927: 3) and foreigners (Engel 1885: 2, 5). However, although what was described as "the so far almost insignificant numismatic collection" had at the end of the period been converted "into a veritable museum, perfectly classified" (Svoronos 1906: 149), it has to be borne in mind that the museum was intended for scientific use only<sup>97</sup> and was by no means accessible to the public. Special mention has to be made here of the donation by Ioannes Demetriou<sup>98</sup> of his Ptolemaic coins' collection in 1880, which constituted one of the museum's major acquisitions (Touratsoglou and Tsourte-Koule 1988: 108).

In 1888 a major theft at the museum upset Athenian society and the issue received wide coverage as both Postolakas and Ioannes Svoronos, his



collaborator and subsequent director, were unfairly accused of involvement (Reinach 1888b and 1889; Svoronos 1889). All coins left were then put into boxes and deposited into sealed cupboards in the National Museum (ΑΔ 1890: 156; Svoronos 1890-2: 39).

## **The Numismatic Museum - Phase Three: The Display Period (1890-1909)**

### **Historical Note**

In 1890 a special decree "On the statutes of the Numismatic museum and its services" (RD of 12-11-1890; ΦΕΚ Α', 295, 14-11-1890) set the frame for the museum's reestablishment in the Academy of Athens [66]. Ioannes Svoronos<sup>99</sup> was appointed director and the coins were transferred from the National Museum in August 1890. The detailed regulations of the museum provided by this edict, laying specific emphasis on the pedantic registration and cataloguing of coins by the director and his duty to report monthly to the General Directorate of Antiquities, have probably to be viewed as a consequence of the agitation following the 1888 theft. Furthermore, it was this edict which decreed free, daily public entrance to the museum (article 6; see p. 180 below). The museum was officially established in 1893 by two legal acts,<sup>100</sup> which arranged its statutes and the methods of acquisition. The Academy's east wing, a large hall divided into three parts by Ionic marble columns, was arranged to meet the museum's needs (Plan 26). Svoronos (1890-92: 50-59) clearly explains the new arrangement, which was completed in 1892 (ibid.: 240).

## Display Layout

The south room, separated by a heavy purple curtain (Svoronos 1890-92: 51) and later by a large glass partition (Svoronos 1897: 13), served as library and office. Apart from desks, a reading table and the library shelves, this room contained thirty oak coins cases (see below), the coins case of the Mourouzes collection<sup>101</sup> and another two large oak cases. The main display area was the large central room, where six large oak display tables, measuring 5m long by 1,28m wide, were placed [67]. The north room contained another four identical tables, two measuring 5m long and two 3,26m, placed in its middle, whereas six coins cases were placed between the window columns. The bookshelves along the walls of this room were converted to show-cases for the display of galvanoplastic casts of the most important Greek coins held in foreign museums.<sup>102</sup>

## Display Organisation

A choice of coins, best characterising each ancient period,<sup>103</sup> country, city or king, was selected for display, according to a system similar to the one used in the Cabinet des Médailles in Paris: the display tables were covered with white silk cloth divided by golden string into small squares. Each square contained one coin placed on top of an identification label, which cited provenance (country, city or king), date and registration number (Svoronos 1890-92: 53).

## Display Hardware

According to Svoronos three distinctive display surfaces were used at the museum. "Display tables" constituted the principle means of display. They were long (5m\*1,28m or 5m\*3,28m), rectangular, oak cases, the upper part of which consisted of two tilted levels covered by wooden-framed glass under which coins were displayed [67-68]. Each case had ten subdivisions and their

floor was covered with white silk cloth, divided into small squares by golden string. The cupboards at the lower part [68] probably served for storage needs. These display tables were constructed in Athens in 1888 by a furniture maker named Shengassen. The silk cover was especially ordered in the Indigent Women's shop (Svoronos 1889: 14). More display tables were constructed in 1907 with the money of the Dorideian bequest (Svoronos 1907: 167).

"Coins cases" were oak and movable, according to the classification system in use at the Numismatic Museum in London. Thirty such cases, designed by Svoronos himself and intended to accommodate 60,000 coins, were constructed in 1888 by the furniture maker N. Aperghes (Svoronos 1889: 14; 1890-92: 52). Standing on bases and having ancient Greek busts on top, they resembled ancient Greek herms (Svoronos 1890-92: 51). They were placed in the south room; the north one having another six. These coin cases were not intended for display but for the scientific classification of the collection. They were, in fact, referred to as "storage coins cases"; Svoronos 1892-93: 240): coins were arranged on paper panels, which had movable partitions, according to the British Museum's classification system Svoronos (1889: 14; 1890-92: 52). Four new coins cases in ancient Greek style, similar to the ones constructed for the Demetriou collection [69], were constructed in 1893, probably on Ziller's drawings (Svoronos 1890-92: 14) "in accordance with the Academy's interior decoration procuring the Museum with much modesty and decency" (Svoronos 1893-94: 6). Many new cases were made at the beginning of this century (Svoronos 1905: 256; 1907: 167) [70], but we have no indication for their placement in the museum.

Finally, the bookshelves alongside the walls of the north room were used as show cases for the display of galvanoplastic casts.



## Discussion

The Numismatic Museum was organised in such a way so as to constitute a rather unique case in the chronicle of museum development in Greece. It was perhaps the single Greek museum of the time (apart from the Acropolis and the National museums) fully deserving the name. Housed in permanent premises, its collections being minutely catalogued and available for scientific study, it was one of the very few Greek museums to have a collecting policy. The collection was safely secured and well displayed and provision was also made for an office and library. For all these reasons a closer look at some of the museum's functional aspects as well as the reasons behind them is welcome here.

### ▪ Scientific Study and Classification

The emphasis placed on the scientific study and classification of the collection could be interpreted as a mere result of the surprisingly fast pace of increase of coins<sup>104</sup>, which had to be catalogued, studied and cared for. However, one cannot fail to acknowledge that the museum's distinctive character and orientation was almost exclusively due to the personal contribution of its two first directors, Achilleus Postolakas and Ioannes Svoronos, both of whom had received a firm scientific education in France, Germany and Britain. As already shown, the system adopted in London was used for the classification of coins, whereas the one adopted in the Cabinet des Medailles in Paris was followed for their display.

Another point which deserves mention is that, although the museum was accessible to the public on a daily base since 1890 and the publication of a popular catalogue was planned, it did retain its purely scientific nature as it is clearly reflected in Svoronos' (1890-92: 63) criticism of the museum's new regulations decreed in 1890. Daily opening of the museum to the public, he

argued, could not be implemented as this would impede other work needs. His fear, instead of negating concern for public availability of the collection, is rather expressing a real fact: there was just not enough time for virtually one person, Svoronos himself, to deal with both research and other work.<sup>105</sup>

#### ▪ Cataloguing

The pace and the means of increase of the collection from 1866 to 1887 were annually reported by both the Ephor of the National Library and the Numismatic Museum's director, in reports attached to the University Rectors' speeches at the end of each year (Pantazides 1889: 116, 219); Postolakas compiled some individual publications as well.<sup>106</sup> An exact catalogue of Greek coins started being compiled by Postolakas on 5 August 1867 and the exact date was recorded as this event marked the museum's existence (p. 176). Three volumes appeared until 1878 (Engel 1885: 2). Since 1894-95 a descriptive catalogue of new acquisitions was annually edited in two copies one of which remained in the museum's archive and the other was sent to the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Public Education (Svoronos 1897: 1; 1905: 254).<sup>107</sup> Moreover, new acquisitions were minutely listed by Svoronos in his annual reports on the Numismatic Museum in *JIAN*.<sup>108</sup> These same reports constitute our most valuable source of information about the progress of the works carried out in the museum every year.

Svoronos (1890-92: 53) also continued the task of compiling the museum catalogue and in 1897 he asked the Government to assign a special credit for the publication of the museum's hand-written catalogues (Svoronos 1897: 3).<sup>109</sup> This concern for exact and assiduous cataloguing was explained by Svoronos himself (1898a: 7), who believed that they constituted the only possible way for property and administration control, thus making what was probably the earliest reference on museum accountability in Greece.

### ▪ Security

The Academy's windows were secured by steel-made frames identical to the Parisian ones and brought from Berlin, whereas a large iron door was placed by the already existing wooden one for further protection. The most valuable coins were put into a big iron-safe box (Svoronos 1889: 13; 1890-92: 50). Moreover, a permanent day-guard of three men [67] and a night-guard of two-armed men was appointed.<sup>110</sup> In 1891-92 electric bulbs were put in the interior of the museum for security reasons and in 1894-95 an electric bell connected the guards' posts to the guard-house (Svoronos 1897: 12-13). It should be stressed that similar measures are reported for no other Greek museum of that time. Finally, in 1898 Svoronos (1898a: 24) strongly opposed the establishment of the Museum of Christian Antiquities just underneath the Numismatic Museum for fear of increasing the risk of theft for the former (see also Svoronos 1897: 12-13).

## The Epigraphic Museum

### Historical Note

The first systematic collection of inscriptions dates back to Capodistrias' period. After the foundation of the National Museum at Aegina many inscriptions were transported there from all over the country (see p. 79). However, the history of the Epigraphic Museum is closely connected with Kyriakos Pittakes' activities and zeal for securing the inscriptions. He had over the years gathered and safeguarded inscriptions on the Acropolis and various other places in Athens and he also planned the publication of some thousand and six hundred unpublished inscriptions. This work was never completed, but he later sent his collection to August Boeck, who used it in the



publication of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* (Kokkou 1977: 266). However, Pittakes did publish many inscriptions in the *Archaeological Journal* from 1837 onwards.

The formation of the Epigraphic Museum dates back to 1885, when it was decided that all the Acropolis inscriptions, which were not topographically or architecturally associated with its monuments, had to be transferred to the National Museum, then still under construction.<sup>111</sup> The Archaeological Society handed its epigraphic collections in, while other inscriptions were also transferred from the provinces. Four rooms in the south basement of the National Museum, along with the interior court on that side (Plan 27), were used for the placement of inscriptions and their curation was trusted to the German archaeologist H.G. Lolling,<sup>112</sup> who entered the Greek archaeological service for this purpose.<sup>113</sup>

Officially, the Epigraphic Museum was founded by a royal decree in 1893 as part of the National Archaeological Museum.<sup>114</sup> In 1896, two years after Lolling's death, Vassileios Leonardos,<sup>115</sup> the prominent Greek epigraphist, was appointed Ephor of the Epigraphic Museum [71], but he did not undertake the direction and systematic organisation of the museum until 1913, i.e. at a period which falls outside the boundaries of the present study.<sup>116</sup> It should be noted that the ever-increasing number of inscriptions led, in 1904, to the decision to construct a building especially for the Epigraphic Museum (*ΠΑΕ* 1904: 13-14).<sup>117</sup> Yet the project was never implemented and the inscriptions remained housed in the same premises for several years.<sup>118</sup>

## Display Layout

The four rooms in which the collection was housed (Plan 27, 1-4) were half-underground, with low vaulted ceilings and small windows and, although "well lighted" according to a contemporary reference (*JHS* 1887-88: 119), they

were obviously very inappropriate for the display and study of inscriptions (Peppas-Delmouzou 1966: 2; Kokkou 1977: 268). Nothing is known about the organisation of the material in the rooms, but evidence from a later photograph [72] testifies for a disorderly placement of inscriptions on wooden shelves or on the ground. Inscriptions were also arranged around the walls of the south interior court, protected from the weather by a sloping roof (*JHS* 1890-91: 396; 1892: 151; in this latter reference the use of both interior courts is implied, but this is not confirmed by any other source).

## Discussion

In a 1887-88 reference one reads that the museum rooms were “always accessible to the professional” (*JHS* 1887-88: 119), but we do not know if they were also accessible to the public. However, from 1892 onwards the museum was officially open every day from nine to noon, except on Sundays and important holidays (*AA* 1892: 31; Baedeker 1905: 90). Yet we may assume that it was a study collection, of interest only to specialists and it is rather unlikely that it would have attracted the lay visitor. In fact, the scientific orientation of the museum is understandable, if one thinks of the pressing needs for conserving and cataloguing the vast collection. The catalogue started being compiled by Lolling in 1894 and was completed by Wolters in 1899 (Lolling 1899).

## Conclusions

Museum organisation was markedly improved during this phase of museum development. Displays were now systematised and better documented and museum collections were consistently studied. Let us note, however, that while displays were set up by Greek archaeologists, the scientific study of the

collections was to a large extent done by members of the foreign archaeological schools. Concern for the public was expressed by the publication of popular guides for the first time and the regularisation of opening hours.

Perhaps the most eloquent comment on the transformation of Athenian museums within a time span of ten years (ca.1883-1893) is that by F. de Saulcy who wrote in 1893: "Not only have Athenian museums considerably grew in the wake of excavations..., but their internal physiognomy has been transformed and their organisation has become so perfect that I do not know of better arranged museums in Europe". He went on to say that the Acropolis and the National museums, in particular, "should be today places of pilgrimage for all those perceptible to aesthetic emotions" (RA 1893: 237).



## Notes to Chapter Six

1. Note that Leo von Klenze had in 1834 also proposed this location for the National Museum (Kokkou 1977: 203-204).
2. Named after Demetrios Vernardakes (1800-1870), a wealthy expatriate from Russia and one of the great benefactors to the nation (Kokkou 1977: 207, n. 5). His donations later also helped in building the National Archaeological Museum (see p. 155).
3. Sylloghe (1886: 44-46), "On the construction of a special museum" and "On the museum's building".
4. Panaghiotes Kalkos (1818-1875), one of the first gifted Greek architects, studied in Germany and France with the aid of a grant by King Otto. He later worked in the Ministry of the Interior and collaborated with the Archaeological Society. His architectural language, evident in a series of public buildings that he designed in Athens (the Varvakeion Lycaum, the Town Hall, the Amaleion Orphanage, etc.), is characterised by classical analogies and simplicity of form (Kokkou 1977: 235, where bibliography).
5. However, as shown in a letter by P. Eustratiades to the Ministry mentioned in Kavvadias and Kawerau (1906: 15, n. 2), it was only in 1877 that the various buildings housing antiquities on the Acropolis were totally evacuated.
6. Panaghiotes Kavvadias (1850-1928) was one of the most prominent figures of early Greek archaeology. Born at Cephallonia, he studied Classics in Athens and Archaeology in Munich, with a grant by the Greek Government. He was appointed Ephor of Antiquities in 1879, and General Ephor after P. Stamatakes' death in 1885. An ambitious and restless nature, he managed to dominate the archaeological scene of the country by occupying various crucial

posts: Secretary of the Archaeological Society (1895-1909, 1912-1920), General Ephor of Antiquities (1885-1909), Professor of Archaeology at the University of Athens (1904-1922) and member of the Academy (1926).

He set up the first displays of the Acropolis Museum and the National Museum, started the publication of the *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον* in 1885 and worked on the systematic organisation of the Archaeological Service. Field work included the large excavations on the Acropolis and those at the sanctuary of Epidauros. Nevertheless, his authoritative and despotic manner lead to his becoming increasingly unpopular among his fellow archaeologists and caused his removal from the Society and the Service in 1909 (see Petrakos 1987a: 82-84, 108-111, 282-84).

7. See, for example, *The Classical Review* III, 1889: 140; *The Athenaeum* no. 3234, 1889: 528.
8. A fact enhancing our hypothesis is that, in the process of the excavations, the area underneath the museum's floor had to be dug in 1888 (*ΑΔ* 4, 1888: 104-105; 169-70).
9. *JHS* (1892-93: 124-30, 232-71; 1894-95: 64, 209). For their catalogue see Ridder de, A. 1896. *Catalogue des Bronzes Trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes*. Paris: Thorin & Fils.
10. In 1914 the scarceness of space in the museum led to the decision to build a second extension, which was built after the end of World War II (Kokkou 1977: 200).
11. Acr. 1358; Brouskare (1974: fig. 351).
12. Acr. 1358 and 1336; Brouskare (1974: figs. 8-9 respectively).
13. Acr. 625; Payne and Young (1936: pl. 116).
14. Acr. 624; Payne and Young (1936: pls. 2-4).

15. Acr. 610; Dickins (1912: 141-43).
16. Acr. 1342; Payne and Young (1936: pl. 127 (1)).
17. Acr. 1; Brouskare (1974: figs. 15-17).
18. Acr. 3; Brouskare (1974: figs. 80-81).
19. Acr. 2; Brouskare (1974: fig. 47).
20. Acr. 9; Brouskare (1974: figs. 27-29).
21. Acr. 597; Payne and Young (1936: pl. 136).
22. Acr. 35; Brouskare (1974: fig. 55).
23. Acr. 140; Brouskare (1974: fig. 248).
24. Acr. 144 and 146; Payne and Young (1936: pl. 118 (1-2)).
25. Acr. 145; Payne and Young (1936: pls. 105-106).
26. Acr. 581; Payne and Young (1936: pl. 126 (1)).
27. Acr. 590; Payne and Young (1936: figs. 11a-c, 133 (3-4)).
28. Acr. 630 and 632; Payne and Young (1936: pls. 7-8 (1); 5-6).
29. Acr. 670-688; see Richter (1968).
30. Acr. 681; Payne and Young (1936: pls. 51-53, 124 (5)).



31. Acr. 689; Payne and Young (1936: pls. 113-15).
32. Acr. 690-91, 693-94; Payne and Young (1936: pls. 119-20).
33. Acr. 696; Brouskare (1974: fig. 123).
34. Acr. 697; Payne and Young (1936: pls. 139-40).
35. Acr. 698; Brouskare (1974: fig. 238).
36. Acr. 700; Payne and Young (1936: pls. 137-38).
37. Acr. 695; Brouskare (1974: fig. 237).
38. Acr. 702; Payne and Young (1936: pl. 128 (3)).
39. Carrey's drawings provide valuable information on the pediments' state before 1687. At that time a bomb, which fell into the Parthenon during the siege of the Acropolis by the Venetian commander Francesco Morosini, caused significant damage to the building and its sculpture (Kokkou 1977: 10).
40. Acr. 1338; Brouskare (1974: fig. 5).
41. Acr. 1336, 1337; Casson (1921: 238-39; 239-40 respectively).
42. Acr. 1339; Brouskare (1974: fig. 379).
43. Acr. 1325; Ridgway (1964: pl. 39-40).
44. Acr. 1333; Brouskare (1974: fig. 377).
45. Acr. 1348; Brouskare (1974: fig. 363).

46. A guide titled *Πρόχειρος Οδηγός δια τον επισκέπτην της Ακροπόλεως*, published in Athens in 1891, has not been possible to find.
47. After having studied in Berlin and travelled in France and Italy, Leo von Klenze (1784-1864) started his carrier in the court of Prince Jerome in Kassel. His work, however, is closely connected to Munich, where he lived from 1816 until his death in the service of Kings Maximilian I and Ludwig. A friend of Greece since the Revolution, he arrived in Athens as a delegate of King Ludwig in 1834 and undertook a series of projects among which was the alteration of the Kleanthes-Schaubert town plan of the city and the design of the Palace, the National Museum and another building (Kokkou 1977: 202-206).
48. Note that Theophil Hansen in his 1859 plan of the "Athenian Trilogy" intended the place where he would later build the National Library, i.e. to the left of the University, for the Museum building. However, this was just an idea which lacked rigorous design (Kokkou 1977: 209).
49. Ludwig Lange (1808-1868) was trained as an architect, but showed an early interest in painting, which he would perfect under the guidance of the renowned German painter Karl Rottman. In 1834, following his master, who was commissioned to paint a series of Greek landscapes by King Ludwig of Bavaria, he came to Greece. He stayed in Greece for four years, teaching, painting and designing buildings. In 1847, long after his return to Munich, King Ludwig appointed him as a professor to the Academy, where he worked until his death in 1868 (Kokkou 1977: 222-24).
50. Note, for instance, the similarity of Lange's facade to that of Schinkel's Altes Museum in Berlin. For a general discussion of nineteenth century European museums see Plagemann (1967) and Pevsner (1976).

51. Eustratiades, *Archive: Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας. Φακ. 11. Κεντρικόν Μουσείον. Τα εν τω Κεντρικώ Μουσείω Αρχαία*, pp. ιζ, and ιθ.
52. *Αθήναιον* 8, 1879: 154-55; *ΠΑΕ* (1879: 21; 1890: 42; 1891: 37; 1893: 24).
53. Theophil Hansen (1813-1891) was born and educated in Architecture in Copenhagen. In 1838 he went to Greece to join his older brother Christian (also a well-known architect). He stayed there until 1846 involved in archaeological research and architectural design. From 1846 to 1891 he lived and worked in Vienna, where he designed three important Athenian buildings: the Academy, the Zappeion and the National Library (Kokkou 1977: 239-40).
54. Ernst Ziller (1837-1923) first went to Greece to supervise Hansen's building of the Academy in 1861. After a brief stay in Germany, he returned to settle down permanently in Athens in 1868. Ziller designed and built a variety of public and private buildings throughout the country, some of which still embellish Greek cities today (see Syros Museum). He also participated in archaeological research and drew ancient monuments (Kokkou 1977: 242).
55. *JHS* (1887-88: 119); *The Classical Review* II, 1888: 53; *Guide Joanne* (1888: 149).
56. Law ΒΡΜΘ' of 8-2-1893, ΦΕΚ 30, Α', 15-2-1893, "On the Foundation of a Workshop and a Museum of Casts".
57. Valerios Staes (1857-1923) was born at Kythera and studied Medicine in Athens and Bonn. He continued with Classical studies in Bonn, Gottingen, Berlin and Hall. On his return to Greece he was first appointed Ephor of the Archaeological Service in 1885 and then Ephor of Argolid and Corinthia in 1886. Recalled to Athens in 1887, he undertook the curation of the vase, figurine and small objects collections at the National Museum. He had also participated in many excavations (*AE* 1922: 113).
58. *JHS* (1889-90: 213); *ΑΔ* (1890: 15); *BCH* (1893: 201); *ΠΑΕ* (1895: 28).



59. *The Athenaeum* no. 3287, 1890: 554; no. 3293, 1890: 783.
60. *BCH* (15, 1891: 646); *The Athenaeum* no. 3337, 1891: 492. See *JHS* (1890-91: 396) and *AA* (1892: 99) for the placement of the I. Demetriou Egyptian collection.
61. RD of 19-4-1888, ΦΕΚ Α', 115, 29-4-1888.
62. RD of 31-7-1893, ΦΕΚ, Α', 152, 9-8-1893. A similar decree "On the Statutes of the National Museum" would be issued much later (RD of 26-10-1910, ΦΕΚ, Α', 332, 30-10-1910).
63. Such was the sensation caused by the discovery that in 1901 "the Anti-Cythera treasure" was temporarily "exposed to public view" at the Ministry of Culture (Svoronos 1903: 4-5).
64. Eustratiades, *Archive*. See n. 51, the file as a whole.
65. NAM 126; Boardman (1985: fig. 144).
66. NAM 259-260; Karouzou (1968: 191-92).
67. NAM 221-222; Karouzou (1968: 188).
68. NAM 1; Richter (1968: figs. 25-28).
69. E.g. NAM 8-10; Richter (1960; figs. 178-83; 138-40; 306-11 respectively).
70. NAM 21; Richter (1968: fig. XIVa).
71. NAM 39.
72. NAM 129; Boardman (1985: fig. 97).
73. NAM 128; Boardman (1985: fig. 98).

- 
74. NAM 235; Petrakos (1981: fig. 94).
  75. NAM 231; Petrakos (1981: fig. 90).
  76. NAM 232; Petrakos (1981: fig. 95).
  77. *The Athenaeum* 1890, no. 3287: 554; no. 3239: 783.
  78. NAM 384-418.
  79. NAM 226; Boardman (1985: fig. 172).
  80. NAM 228a; Richter (1950: fig. 723).
  81. NAM 1826; Petrakos (1981: 71).
  82. NAM 1828; Petrakos (1981: fig. 130).
  83. NAM 1827; Petrakos (1981: 69).
  84. *JHS* (1894-95: 64); see also Collignon and Couve (1902-1904: preface).
  85. NAM 2720; Richter (1960: fig. 33-39).
  86. NAM 1558; Richter (1960: fig. 273-79).
  87. The marble finds from the wreck were on temporary display "in the gallery to the right of the entrance" (Staes 1907: 215), which probably suggests the narrow gallery along the right side of the museum's facade (Plan 24).
  88. NAM 1783; Boardman (1985: fig. 168).

89. Note that the set up of sculpture by sculptors is a practice still favoured in Greek museums today.
90. Chrestos Tsountas (1857-1934), was educated in Athens and Germany. One of the long-standing collaborators of the Archaeological Society, he excavated systematically all over Greece (e.g. Peloponnese, the Cyclades, Thessaly) and became renowned for his pioneer study of Greek Prehistory (Petrakos 1987a: 284-87).
91. The incorporation of the Numismatic collection into the Library, from its origin at Aegina up to 1910, was perfectly justified by "the scientific link between coins and books and the former's explanation through the latter" (Phrearites 1868: 381). Moreover, "rightly so, numismatic collections are everywhere considered as a part of libraries as coins are real books for whom is able to read the past in them..." (ibid.: 417). Cf., for example, the incorporation of the Cabinet des Médailles into the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.
92. For the general disorder which prevailed in the University building during that period see also Finlay (1872: 283) and Pantazides (1889: 67-72, 168-74).
93. Newton (1852: 26); Phrearites (1868: 383, 401); Kallighas (1869-70 in Loghodosiai Prytaneon); Finlay (1872: 283).
94. Achilleus Postolakas (1821-1897), the "hero-builder" of the Numismatic Museum (Oikonomos 1927: 3), was born in Vienna. His family returned to Greece in 1834. He received a good education. Appointed Ephor of the Numismatic Museum in 1856 he remained at his post until 1887. For his life and work see: Svoronos (1898b); Oikonomos (1927: 3); Oikonomidou (1972: 39-41); Ghalane-Krikou (1988: 76-82).
95. For example, the Zossima brothers' donation of 12,457 coins in 1857 (Oikonomidou-Karamezine 1988: 26; Touratsoglou and Tsourte-Koule 1988: 106); the donation of the Zougra treasure (9,171 coins) by Queen Amalia in 1859 (Kokkou 1977: 261), etc.



96. Phrearites (1868: 379-424) gives a detailed account of this task showing that the system used was the Eckhelian one, also adopted in Paris, Vienna and the British Museum (Finlay 1872: 284), according to which coins were geographically arranged, and that all Greek coins were classified and put into nine coins-cases by 1868 (*cf.* Postolakas 1875: 2, where he refers to 13,724 coins put into 686 drawers).
97. *Cf.* Law ΣΜΗ of 24-11-1867; ΦΕΚ 73, 18-12-1867 "On the National Library", article 22.
98. Ioannes Demetriou, a wealthy Greek who lived in Alexandria, also provided the money for the construction of two cases designed by E. Ziller for the placement of his collection (Touratsoglou and Tsourte-Koule 1988: 108, n. 9). They were made in 1892 and may still be seen in the museum today [69]. A contract was signed on 25-2-1880 for 10,000 coins some of which were bequested after his death in 1892 (Svoronos 1897: 3; 1898a: 4; Oikonomidou-Karamesine 1988: 29; *cf.* RD of 7-11-1891, ΦΕΚ 316, 11-11-1891, "On the deposition of the Egyptian coins of the Ioannes Demetriou collection in the Numismatic Museum"). For the history of the whole collection see also the sections on the Polytechnic and the National Archaeological Museum (pp. 118 & 192, n. 60).
99. Ioannes Svoronos was born at Mykonos in 1863 and studied Law in Athens, where he first met Postolakas. He later went to Paris, London and Berlin to continue his studies in Numismatics with a grant by the Greek Government. On his return to Athens he was appointed director of the Numismatic Museum at the age of 26. He left a voluminous corpus of publications, which started when he was still a student and was characterised by high academic quality. He died in Athens in 1922 (Svoronos 1889: 5-12; Oikonomos 1927: 4-8).
100. Law ΒΠΠΕ of 2-3-1893; ΦΕΚ Α', 48, 5-3-1893. RD of 5-8-1893; ΦΕΚ Α', 154, 10-8-1893.
101. Probably the collection of P. Lampros, which was bought by the Prince Alexander Mourouzes in 1866 and donated to the museum (Pantazides 1889: 218; Touratsoglou and

Tsourte-Koule 1988: 108). For its publication see: Postolakas, A. 1868. *Κατάλογος των Αρχαίων Νομισμάτων των Νήσων Κερκύρας, Λευκάδος, Ιθάκης, Κεφαλληνίας, Ζακύνθου, και Κυθήρων*. Athens: National Press.

102. The collection, comprising 589 casts, was donated in 1857 by Edward Linden, teacher of Emperor's Alexander B' sons in Petroupolis (Kozakes-Typaldos 1857: 16).
103. Works for the display of a choice of Mediaeval and more recent coins had started as well (Svoronos 1890-92: 13).
104. Some indicative figures are worth noting here: 359 coins in 1831 (Moustoxydes 1831: 64); 8,522 in 1857 (Kozakes-Typaldos 1857: Table IA, 15); 60,000 in 1889 (Svoronos 1889: 14); Svoronos cites a total of 154,330 coins acquired between 1890 and 1912 (*JIAN* 15, 1913, 76; quoted in Oikonomidou-Karamesine 1988: 31).
105. Note that the publication of the first international numismatics journal, *Journal Internationale d'Archéologie Numismatique*, from 1898 onwards, was also due to Svoronos.
106. Postolakas, A. 1883. *Εθνικόν Νομισματικόν Μουσείον. Νομίσματα εισελθόντα κατά τα ακαδημαϊκά έτη 1879-80, 1880-1, 1881-2 and 1882-3*. Athens: S. Vlastos; Postolakas, A. 1884. *Νομίσματα εν τω Εθνικώ Νομισματικώ Μουσείω κατατεθέντα έτει ακαδημαϊκώ ΑΩΠΓ-ΑΩΠΔ*. Athens: S. Vlastos.
107. Cf. the Royal decree of 5-8-1893, mentioned above. New acquisitions were also reported by the foreign archaeological journals, e.g. *BCH* (15, 1891: 646).
108. Svoronos (1898a; 1904; 1905; 1906; 1907; 1908; 1909-10; 1911); Svoronos and Konstantopoulos (1910).
109. For a list of all the museum's catalogues until 1898 see Svoronos (1898a: 7-23).

110. Security had been a matter of great concern ever since 1844-45, when the Ephor of the Library asked for a small guard and a small guard-house to be erected at the north side of the University (Asopios 1844-5 in Loghodosiai Prytaneon: 5).
111. RD of 25-11-1885, ΦΕΚ Α', 113, 7-12-1885; ΑΔ 1, 1885: 7.
112. Habo Gerhard Lolling (1848-1894), who first came to Greece in 1872 as a teacher, is mainly known for his contribution in the study of Greek inscriptions. He collaborated with the German Archaeological Institut in Athens and the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin and conducted some excavations in Greece, before undertaking the curation of the Epigraphic Museum in 1886 (ΑΔ 1894: 129-132; *AthMitt* 1894: V-XXIII).
113. ΑΔ (1888: 93); *JHS* (1887-88: 119; 1888-89: 276; 1890-91: 396); Baedeker (1905: 90); Kokkou (1977: 268).
114. RD of 31-7-1893, ΦΕΚ Α', 152, 9-8-1893.
115. Vassileios Leonardos (1857-1930) studied Medicine in Athens and Classics in Vienna. He had a long, varied career both at the Greek Archaeological Service and the Archaeological Society, by which he was first appointed Ephor of antiquities in 1884. One of his most important excavations was that of the sanctuary of Amphiaraos at Oropos, Attica, whose inscriptions he studied for years. His work in the Epigraphic Museum, where he systematically classified the inscriptions in the order of their publication in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, was mainly carried out between 1913 and 1929 (Petrakos 1987a: 287-92).
116. For his exemplary work on the systematic cataloguing of the inscriptions, based on the publication of the Attic inscriptions in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, see Peppa-Delmouzou (1966: 2-3).



117. It had earlier been proposed that a peripheric wall be built around the National Museum and inscriptions be set up against it (*JHS* 1887-88: 119).
118. It was only after World War II that expansion works in the National Museum allowed for the accommodation and redisplay of the Epigraphic collection in new halls during the 1960s (Peppas-Delmouzou 1966: 4-7).

# **7 DISPLAYING ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREEK MUSEUMS: THE FORMATIVE PERIOD (1874-1900) / THE PROVINCIAL MUSEUMS**

## **Introduction**

After the organisation of the Athenian museums, the time was ripe for the establishment of museums in the rest of the country. Some eight provincial archaeological museums were set up between 1874 and the end of the century. Their foundation was jointly undertaken by the Government and the Archaeological Society.

In those cities where there already existed nuclear local collections, museum development mainly involved providing for these collections' proper accommodation and arrangement in permanent premises (Sparta, Syros, Schematari, Aegina). It also involved intensified collecting activities in an attempt to safeguard as many antiquities as possible in the new museums (Schematari). Elsewhere, site museums were built for housing the finds of specific excavations (Olympia, Amphiareion, Eleusis, Epidauros).

Six out of the eight museums were housed in purpose-built buildings (Sparta, Olympia, Amphiareion, Eleusis, Schematari, Epidauros). Four out of these were regularly accessible to visitors and generally qualified as museums (Sparta, Olympia, Eleusis, Epidauros), whereas the other two were basically a "storage area" and not so much of a proper museum (Amphiareion, Schematari). Only two out of the eight museums were accommodated in existing public buildings (Syros, Aegina).

As for their geographical distribution, three museums were in the Peloponnese (Sparta, Olympia, Epidauros), three in Sterea Hellas (Amphiareion, Eleusis, Schematari) and two on the islands (Syros, Aegina). Here follows an analytical presentation of all eight museums established between 1874 and the end of the century.

## The Sparta Museum

### Introduction

It is not a coincidence that the foundation of the modern city of Sparta concurred with the nomination of Athens as capital of Greece in 1834. Echoing the notion of the Bavarian King Ludwig, the father of King Otto of Greece, that "there cannot be Athens without Sparta", the city's establishment was in keeping with the ideals of a Greek cultural revival, which was favoured by the Bavarians.<sup>1</sup>

A first small collection of antiquities, formed by Ludwig Ross in 1833 and kept at Mystras, was destroyed by fire (Kokkou 1977: 149-50). Much later, Panaghiotes Stamatakes was in 1871 sent by the Archaeological Society as an Inspector of Antiquities in the provinces. From this post he worked on the systematic collection of antiquities from the surrounding area and the establishment of a local archaeological museum (*IIAE* 1872: 15). In 1873 the collection already comprised some 288 objects, many of which were donated by individuals (*Hώς* B', 30-11-1874; 7-12-1874).<sup>2</sup> All acquisitions were recorded<sup>3</sup> and a committee was set up for the museum's organisation (*IIAE* 1873: 30),<sup>4</sup> which was housed in two rooms at the courtyard of the Gymnasium (Hirshfeld 1873: 165; Dressel and Milchhöfer 1877: 294). It is worth noting an exhortation addressed by the president of the Archaeological Society to the



inhabitants of Sparta, in which he asked them not to allow for the collection to open only once or twice a year for the sake of some European visitors, but to frequent it themselves and serve as a good example to other Greeks (*IIAE* 1873: 30).

## Historical Note

### ▪ 1874-1906

The museum building was designed by the architect Gh. Katsaros<sup>5</sup> and was constructed between 1874 and 1876.<sup>6</sup> A simple, stone, one storey, neoclassical building, it featured a central propylon with four Ionic columns on the front and back and two small wings on either side [73]. Situated in a large piece of land on the east side of the city, it was remote at the time [74].

Eustratiades<sup>7</sup> reports that the collection was transferred there from the Gymnasium in 1876, but it seems that antiquities were still in the Gymnasium in 1877 (Dressel and Milchhöfer 1877: 294). According to a contemporary list, the museum's acquisitions between 1871 and 1875 amounted to some 644 objects (*IIAE* 1876: 42-43). The museum's organisation was not completed before July 1881. In a letter sent to the General Ephor of Antiquities, P. Eustratiades, Stamatakes accounts for the variety of difficulties with which the museum's arrangement presented itself. The three rooms were filled to capacity and the museum guardian was ordered to stay day and night in the building for security reasons.<sup>8</sup> Tod and Wace (1906: preface) reported that a reorganisation of the museum was carried out in 1900-1902 by P. Kastriotes and D. Philios, but this piece of information is not confirmed.

### ▪ 1906-1909

In 1906 the Archaeological Society built a new two-wing extension [75], which provided additional space not only for existing antiquities, but also for

the finds from the excavations of the British School at the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia.<sup>9</sup> At that time Tod and Wace, members of the British School of Athens, published a catalogue of the museum, which accounted for over 800 objects, mainly sculptures and inscriptions.

## Display Layout

### ▪ 1876-1906

Information on the museum's layout during the first years after its foundation is scarce. A catalogue compiled by Dressel and Milchhöfer in 1877 dates from the period when the collection was still partly in the Gymnasium and gives us an idea of the number of its objects (ca.300), but does not elucidate their spatial arrangement. From the above-mentioned letter by Stamatakes, we assume that displays were first crystallised in 1881. The only piece of information was that "antiquities were laid out in such a way so as one could easily... study them" (n. 8). Whether this suggests a really spacious arrangement of antiquities or it only reflects Stamatakes's own feeling about the display, it is difficult to say.

The first reliable source on the museum's layout is the description in Guide Joanne (1891: 255-56). The museum included mainly sculptures from the excavations of various Laconian sites, which were displayed in the vestibule and two rooms on its either side (Plan 28).

In *the vestibule* Roman statues and fragments of sarcophagi were placed along the walls and fragmentary sculpture was displayed in a case. *The room to the right* of the entrance contained mainly inscriptions and funerary stelai placed on the floor or on shelves. A glass-case in the centre of the room housed finds from the Menelaion (terracottas, ornaments, etc.).<sup>10</sup>

The display of sculpture continued in *the room to the left* of the entrance. A well-known, four-sided stele, depicting two mythological couples on either

large side and snakes on either narrow side, was placed on a Roman altar in the middle of the room.<sup>11</sup> Displayed along the wall to the right of the entrance was a series of Laconian, "heroized reliefs".<sup>12</sup> The room also included a series of reliefs of the Dioskouri, several statues of Kybele enthroned and other fragmentary sculpture.

The description of the museum in the 1904 edition of the Baedeker guide (1904: 364-65) shows that the museum's layout remained the same in subsequent years.

#### ▪ 1906-1909

As already shown, two new wings were added to the museum in 1906. Unfortunately, our only source for that period, Tod and Wace's catalogue, does not account for the spatial layout of the exhibits. A photograph, which must date from after 1906, testifies that some minor changes occurred; for example, the four-sided stele, which was previously displayed in the room to the left of the entrance, was then placed in the middle of the vestibule [76]. However, we have no serious reason for not assuming that the layout of the old part of the museum remained almost the same and that the new wings accommodated finds from the recent British excavations.

### Display Organisation

The consistent nature of the museum collections, which comprised mainly sculptures, probably made their spatial arrangement easier. Our sources do not allow for an exact evaluation of the pattern adopted, but it seems that antiquities were broadly arranged according to typology. Thus, the room to the left of the entrance contained mainly Laconian reliefs, like the series of the "heroized reliefs" and the room to the right of the entrance contained funerary inscriptions. It is difficult to judge if chronological order was strictly followed.



Bulky pieces of sculpture were either juxtaposed in a linear way or grouped in the corners of rooms and smaller pieces were placed higher on wall shelves [76]. Other small objects, like votive offerings, were displayed in cases in the centre of the rooms. Overall, photographic evidence shows a rather random display approach [76].

### **Display Hardware**

The museum's hardware was of the basic, simple type, which we already came across in the first Athenian museums. Small wall shelves accommodated sculpture and funerary inscriptions (Guide Joanne 1891: 255) [76]. Cabinets held pottery and fragmentary sculpture (Guide Joanne 1891: 255). And a series of glass-covered lectern-type cases housed other small objects (visible in the far end of [76]).

### **Display Environment**

The museum was naturally lit from a series of windows on the front and back sides [73], [75]. Lighting was better, it was reported, in the early evening (Baedeker 1904: 364). Monochrome paint covered the walls, but we have no indication on the colour used. The floor of the vestibule was paved with alternating black and white blocks of stone [76]. It seems, however, that, initially at least, only a coarse layer of pebbles paved the floor of the other rooms [77].

A wooden couch was placed in the corner of the vestibule sometime after 1906, but we do not know if similar couches existed in the rest of the museum [76].

### **Discussion**

The Sparta Museum was the first provincial museum in Greece. Established at a time when the Athenian museums were still under organisation, it was

funded by both the Government and the Archaeological Society. Note that the Sparta Museum was one of the ten museums where the Archaeological Society intended to appoint a permanent curator (*ΠΑΕ* 1907: 73), which tells us something of the museum's importance at the time. This post was filled by K. Rhomaios<sup>13</sup> just in 1909, that is at the end of the period under study (Petrakos 1987a: 105). When attempting an overall assessment of the museum one has to take into account the fact that it was the first archaeological museum which was built, organised and set up without the resources or facilities which the Athenian museums could benefit from. This is particularly important if one thinks of the lack of permanent personnel and its impact on the museum's regular function. Suffice it to remind that Stamatakes did not stay in Sparta, after setting the museum up and there is no evidence of some other staff appointed there after he left. It is worth noting, however, how the above deficiencies did not reflect on the museum's building, which was designed in the grandiose, but simple, neoclassical style that was favoured at that time.

Unfortunately, the limited and fragmentary nature of our information, does not allow for a secure portrayal of the museum's function during the period under study. For example, nothing is known on the museum's visiting figures, but its rather remote location within the city of Sparta [74] did not probably favour public visits. Moreover, although this cannot be certainly testified, it seems that the museum was not regularly open, since one had to notify either the director of the Gymnasium or the museum guardian, who held the key, in order to see it (Guide Joanne 1891: 255; Baedeker 1901: 401). Surviving evidence does not show whether this later changed or not. The only piece of information on the museum's audience is a reference to "several travellers" who arrived daily in the city and visited the museum and the antiquities in a 1884 issue of a local newspaper (*Ηώς Ζ'*, no. 230, 28-3-1884).

Let us also note that an entrance fee of one drachma was charged (Baedeker 1904: 364).

Finally, let us note that the museum was set up and organised by Greeks (Stamatakes in the 1880s, Kastriotes and Philios at the beginning of the twentieth century), but the scientific study and publication of its collections was mainly done by foreign archaeologists (Dressel and Milchhöfer, Tod and Wace). This scientific nature of the foreign contribution, already observed in the discussion on the Athenian museums, was, as will be shown later in this chapter, also common ground in the case of some other provincial museums.

## **The Olympia Museum**

### **Historical Note**

The archaeological museum at Olympia was the first site museum to be built outside Athens. Its construction was announced soon after the end of the German excavations,<sup>14</sup> which lasted from 1875 to 1881 (*Παρνασσός* VII, 1883).<sup>15</sup> The decision, however, was met with scepticism as some felt that the remoteness of Olympia was very inappropriate for the purpose and insisted that the "Olympic museum" be built in Athens.

In a very interesting series of articles M. Demitsas (1883a; b; c) argued emphatically against the museum's construction at Olympia. First, he wrote, the foundation of the museum at a place where virtually nobody could visit it opposed to the primary requirement of museum foundation, namely accessibility to as many people as possible; second, communication between Athens and Olympia was bad and time consuming; third, the unhealthy climate of the area and the complete lack of comfort rendered a long stay there almost impossible; and four, the expenses involved for the scholar who



would decide to travel to Olympia by far exceeded the tight budget of most archaeologists, that is the people who were most likely to visit the museum.

Similarly, when asked its opinion on the matter, the Archaeological Society proposed that those antiquities which were not intrinsically connected to the buildings of the sanctuary, the Hermes of Praxiteles in particular, should be transported to the National Museum in Athens where they would be easier accessible to more visitors and scholars (*IIAE* 1883: 22)<sup>16</sup>.

Despite the controversy, the Government proceeded with the museum plan. Built on a hill very close to the site [78], the museum was designed by F. Adler, professor at the Berlin Polytechnic and W. Dörpfeld, a well-known German architect and archaeologist. The German architect C. Siebold supervised its construction in 1886<sup>17</sup> and expenses were covered by Andreas Syngros, a wealthy Greek after whom the museum was given the name "Syngreion".<sup>18</sup> The official opening was on 18 May 1887 in the presence of the royal family (Fellmann 1972: 44-45).

A large, rectangular building, the museum comprised a prodomus, a high central hall flanked by two lower, narrow wings and a back hall serving as opisthodomus. Two Doric columns, modelled on the columns of the temple of Zeus, adorned the entrance propylon. Clay acroteria and capital roof tiles decorated the edges of the roof [78-79].

Technically, however, the building presented serious problems, one of which was water leaking through the roof and the windows in cases of heavy rain [82-83]. The museum was flooded several times after severe rainstorms, for example in 1899. Worse, the entire east side of the building leaned to the outside creating a crack. The old debate on the inappropriateness of Olympia revived and the Government was accused of indifference (*AJA* III, 1899: 258). Some went as far as to suggest the construction of a new museum (Kourouniotes 1909b: 59-61). However, despite a series of consolidation

works, which started as early as 1898 and culminated in a complete restoration of the building in 1909. a final solution to the building's problems was not found.<sup>19</sup>

The museum was systematically organised by Kourouniotes in 1903 and restoration of sculptures was carried out by the sculptor L. Sochos. Sculpture was consolidated and displayed either on pedestals or on plaster shelves constructed for this purpose; the walls were painted in red colour, apart from those of the central and the Hermes room; a shed was constructed in the museum court for the protection of inscriptions and a small house was built next to the museum for its staff (*IIAE* 1903: 58; *AthMitt* 1903: 477).

### Display Layout

The displays were arranged as follows (Plan 29): *the vestibule* contained various Roman sculptures, *the central hall* housed the pediments and the metopes from the temple of Zeus and the statue of Nike by Paeonios, *the back hall* housed the statue of Hermes by Praxiteles and the two side wings accommodated Roman sculpture, the bronzes and other finds.

The set up of the two main halls remained unaltered throughout the years. Antiquities in the rest of the museum, however, were up until 1901 only roughly arranged (Papageorghiou 1890; Leonardos 1895; 1901). Final arrangement was apparently carried out in 1903 by Kourouniotes and thus the first source of information on the new set up is the description in the 1905 edition of the Baedeker guide (1905: 295-301). The discussion which follows is based on this and Kourouniotes' (1909a) description.

The length of *the central hall* corresponded to the width of the temple of Zeus so as the extant figures of the two pediments could be arranged in their original position. The west pediment represented the fight of the Lapithae and the Centaurs at the marriage of Peirithoos, where the Centaurs attempted to

carry off the Lapithae wives. On the east pediment was depicted the preparation of Pelops for his chariot-race with Oinomaos.<sup>20</sup> Photographic evidence shows that this room was arranged in 1888 [80-81]. The figures were set up by the German sculptor R. Grüttner according to their interpretation by G. von Treu and L. Curtius.<sup>21</sup> Reconstructions of the groups, one-tenth the size of the originals, were exhibited on the walls behind [82]. Let us note that the statues were not restored; instead, missing pieces were replaced with iron rods, allowing the visitor to freely appreciate the statues' artistic quality. This unobtrusive method of restoration was highly esteemed by some scholars; in his article on "the impiety of restorations", Toudouze declared "what we want for our museums, is the artistic spirit which prevailed in the organisation of the Olympia museum" (Toudouze 1904b: 77).

The end walls of the central hall were occupied by the remains of the metopes, which represented the Labours of Herakles [82-83]. Plaster casts replaced those fragments which were in the Louvre.<sup>22</sup> Between the two doors on the north side of the hall stood the Nike of Paeonios, with a reconstruction, one-fifth the original, displayed to its right [82], [84].

*The back hall* housed exclusively the Hermes of Praxiteles, which stood at its west side. The few missing parts of the statue were supplemented by plaster after the restoration by the German Professor Schaper and an iron rod pierced through its back attached the statue to the wall behind.

#### ▪ West Wing

*Room I* housed large lion's head water-spouts from the temple of Zeus on the window side [85], along with architectural terracottas from the Treasuries of Gela and of the Megareans and from the Leonidaion. The display in *room II* included five inscribed pedestals of black limestone and the base of the statue of the Thessalian athlete Polydamas. The main exhibit in *room III* was the pediment from the Treasury of the Megareans on the rear wall. Two tables in



the centre of *room IV* accommodated small bronzes (statuettes, helmets, armour, spear-heads and other weapons, ornaments, vessel-handles, etc.) [86]. Here also were two large bronze cauldrons. By the south wall was the large Archaic head of Hera and to the right of the exit a cabinet with terracottas, marble heads and bronzes [87].

#### ▪ East Wing

*Room V* contained Roman statues [88] and the bull from the Exedra of Herodes Atticus placed in the centre. *Room VI* contained fragmentary sculpture, whereas more Roman statues were on display in *room VII* and *VIII*. In the centre of *room VII*, one could see a lion holding a sheep beneath its right paw [89]. The terracottas displayed in *room IX* included the large Archaic clay acroterion from the temple of Hera, whereas the store room beside *room IX* contained the remainder of the small bronzes. Statues of Roman emperors were displayed in the *vestibule*.

### Display Organisation

The fact that the exhibits came exclusively from one site gave the displays an homogeneous character and rendered their spatial arrangement more consistent. Outstanding exhibits were distinctively displayed either in a specifically designed hall (the pediments of the temple of Zeus and the statue of Nike) or in a separate room (the statue of Hermes). The remainder of the exhibits were laid out in typological and chronological order. Within this general framework, objects were grouped according to material of construction. Architectural fragments, for example, were divided in two groups, that is terracotta and stone and bronzes were displayed separately. Displays were thus very consistently organised.

## Display Hardware

Hardware comprised stone pedestals, platforms and plaster shelves for the display of sculpture and very few cases for the display of small objects.

Statues and large architectural members were placed on low stone platforms running along the bottom side of the walls [83], [88]. Occasionally this platform took the form of a higher display-wall [85]. The pedestal of the statue of Nike partially consisted of its original pieces [84]. That of Hermes had its original epicranon and its base was reconstructed according to the original one (Leonardos 1895: 19, 26-27 respectively).

Architectural fragments were juxtaposed on series of specifically constructed plaster shelves [89-90]. An upright cabinet [87] and two tables in room IV [86] were the only cases used in the museum for the display of bronzes and terracottas (Baedeker 1905: 300).

## Supporting Material

Catalogue numbers were affixed below the sculptures [86-90], but there is no indication whatsoever on the use of identification labels. We should, however, note the use of scaled reconstructions which were placed behind the pediments and beside the statue of Nike in the central hall [82].

## Display Environment

The central hall was probably the museum's most imposing room. Its walls were simply decorated, but the floor was covered with an impressive tile mosaic, which gave the room an exquisite atmosphere. This was enhanced by the room's height and its wooden ceiling. Sitting on either of the two couches placed in the centre of the room, the visitor had the opportunity to enjoy the display in a relaxed manner [83]. The same was also true for the Hermes room, where two wooden benches were placed on the rear wall [82].

Two display effects are noteworthy here. First, the visual distinction of the statue of Nike within a frame provided by the door pillars and the decorated zone above the statue [84]. Second, the deliberate restriction of the viewpoint from which the statue of Hermes could be seen by a screen, which was hung from the west door of the back hall and impeded the statue's immediate view from the central hall [82].<sup>23</sup>

In the rest of the museum walls were painted in red colour and the floor was paved with plain blocks of stone [85], [88]. Large windows provided a good source of direct natural light.

## Discussion

The Olympia Museum was one of the better staffed provincial museums and one of the ten museums where the Archaeological Society could appoint a permanent curator (*ΠΑΕ* 1907: 73). Before the appointment of Vassileios Leonardos (p. 197, n. 115) in 1887, the museum's curation was entrusted to the brothers A. and K. Demetriades. D. Stauroopoulos was appointed in 1895 and K. Kourouniotes in 1901. An assistant curator and other staff, lived permanently in the museum for its better surveillance (Leonardos 1901: 267).

Out of all the above archaeologists, Kourouniotes was probably the one to whom the museum display profile owed the most but, as already seen, a significant part of the set up was done by German archaeologists. How the various tasks were allocated to either side is not known, but it seems that, as might be expected since they excavated the site, the Germans had more say in scientific issues, like the interpretation of sculpture groups. The first catalogues of the museum were drafted by the Demetriades brothers and Leonardos (1901: 297) had by 1901 compiled five new hand-written catalogues for each category of finds.



It would be very interesting to have an indication on the museum's visiting figures and assess whether the fear, expressed before its construction, that nobody would visit it in the "remoteness" of Olympia, came true or not. It seems that some statistical figures on the museum's visitors for the period 1901-1904 were recorded by the assistant Curator P. Voulismas, but the relevant document has not been found (Lampros 1917).

## **The Amphiareion Museum**

### **Historical Note**

The first museum at Amphiareion was a typical case of a small site museum built for housing excavation finds and intended more as a "museum storeroom" (*IIAE* 1957: 154) than a proper museum. Excavations at the site started in 1884 by Sp. Fintikles and later by V. Leonardos.<sup>24</sup> Soon afterwards a small building was constructed at the site itself (Plan 30) and all finds, apart from the coins (which were transported to the museum of the Archaeological Society at the Polytechnic in Athens) were secured there (*IIAE* 1884: 13; Petrakos 1967: 1). In years to come many finds were also transported to the National Archaeological Museum (*IIAE* 1886: 56; 1888: 32).

### **Discussion**

The Amphiareion Museum was far from qualifying as a museum in the true sense of the term, but is included in this discussion as an early example of a site "store-museum" of the type that we will encounter later in this chapter.

An early draft plan (Plan 31) and two old, partial photographs [91-92] are all our visual documentation on the museum. It was apparently a very simple,

one storey, stone-built building with two and later perhaps three rooms.<sup>25</sup> It mainly housed inscriptions, unearthed during the excavations, most of which dated from the Roman period. It seems that ceramic finds were kept in wooden crates, which did not provide optimum means of security (Petrakos 1968: 65).

Only assumptions can be made on the museum's function as there is scarcely any direct information. Although there is a brief reference to the "museum" in both the *Guide Joanne* (1891: 2) and *Baedeker* (1904: 171) there is no indication that it was regularly accessible. It is more likely that a visit could be arranged after the guardian, who probably held the key to the museum, was given some notice.

## **The Eleusis Museum**

### **Historical Note**

#### **▪ 1883-1890**

Systematic excavations at the sanctuary of Demeter and the Kore at Eleusis were funded by the Archaeological Society and carried out by Demetrios Philios from 1882 to 1894 and by Andreas Skias from 1895 to 1907.<sup>26</sup> In the custom of the time, important finds were transported to Athens.<sup>27</sup> Those finds which remained at Eleusis were initially kept in a guard house on the south-west edge of the site (Philios 1889: 7-8; Plan 32) [93]. Until at least 1888 some antiquities were still kept in the small church of Saint Zacharias in the town of Eleusis, which had served as a depository from very early years (*Guide Joanne* 1888: 196; see Kokkou 1977: figs. 59-60).

### ▪ 1890-1909

Ever since the beginning of the excavations, the Archaeological Society had intended to construct a proper museum at the site and it seems that the German architect W. Dörpfeld was at some stage involved in the museum's design (Plan 33). The museum, however, was built in 1890-1891 by the Greek architect Ioannes Mousses. Installation works started immediately after the completion of the building: finds were transported to the museum, registered and arranged in the rooms after the construction of the necessary wooden hardware (*ΠΑΕ* 1889: 27; 1890: 27; 1891: 12). The cost involved amounted to some 20,000 drachmas (Philios 1906: 107).

By 1892 space was already insufficient and an extension was added to the building, which now comprised five rooms (*ΠΑΕ* 1892: 59; Plan 34). Large-scale display works were carried out by Andreas Skias. In 1894 inscriptions were set up "according to space economy" and many of the sculptures were put on new pedestals (*ΠΑΕ* 1894: 16). But the museum's display profile was essentially crystallised in 1898 with the complete rearrangement of old and new finds. *Room IV* (Plan 35), in particular, was thoroughly reorganised. A catalogue of all finds up to 1897 was also compiled (*ΠΑΕ* 1898: 13, 90). Despite these efforts, however, the museum was filled to capacity and the need for a further extension was already expressed in 1896 (*ΠΑΕ* 1896: 28; 1897: 93).<sup>28</sup>

### Display Layout (Plan 35)

The museum's layout for the period under study is well documented through Philios' (1896; 1906) descriptions, references in travellers' guides<sup>29</sup> and a series of photographs. The discussion which follows is based on Philios (1906: 106-24).



Entrance was through the south-east side into *room II*, which housed reliefs and sculpture closely connected to the Eleusinian cults [94]. One was initially faced by the large relief of Lakrateides that was displayed on the wall opposite to the entrance.<sup>30</sup> Reliefs related to the cult of Triptolemus were placed to the right of the entrance (e.g. Kanta 1979: fig. 25). Other sculptures, like the statuettes of Poseidon and Dionysus, a Roman copy of the head of the statue of Athena Parthenos and a statue of Antinoos,<sup>31</sup> were placed on the wall left and opposite to the entrance. A case in the centre of the room accommodated a variety of small finds from Eleusis and Megara.

*Room I* was filled with vases and clay and stone figurines, which were displayed in a series of cases [95]. The display of vases included a series of large Geometric amphorae [96-97].

In *room III* a variety of architectural members and vases was placed on shelves and cabinets [98-99]. The room also housed many votive to Plouto and the Kore reliefs.<sup>32</sup> Important large reliefs, like the Rheitoi relief and that depicting a battle scene between Athenians and Spartans,<sup>33</sup> were attached to the pilasters of the doors [97]. In the centre of the room was placed a capital from the Small Propylaia [98], [100].

*Room IV* contained the rest of the sculpture, including the Kistophoros caryatid [101], a Nike torso and a large headless statue of Demeter placed in the centre.<sup>34</sup>

*Room V* housed a large collection of inscriptions. More inscriptions were arranged in the museum's courtyard, whereas two large marble torches, previously kept in the church of Saint Zacharias, were placed by the entrance door [102].

## Display Organisation

Exhibits were generally organised in typological order (vases, sculpture, inscriptions), with vases laid out chronologically (Kourouniotes 1924: 46) and reliefs occasionally grouped in a thematic order, as in room II which contained exclusively reliefs related to the Eleusinian cults. Here, again, space economy dictated the placement of bulkier antiquities at a lower level and lighter ones at a higher level. Objects were linearly juxtaposed.

## Display Hardware

The museum's display hardware comprised stone pedestals, wooden shelves, cabinets and scaffoldings and a glass covered case, all of which were of a very simple type. Statues and bulky pieces of sculpture were placed on pedestals [98]. Fragmentary sculpture and reliefs were put on wooden scaffoldings [99] or on open shelves at the lower part of cabinets [100]. Reliefs were also placed on the floor [98].

The cabinets accommodating vases and figurines were quite primitive in that their front was protected by nothing more than a wire net [98], [100]. Shelves comprised simply a wooden plank supported by an iron rod [98], [100]. We have no indication for the case placed in the centre of room II, but photographic evidence shows that it was probably of the well-known, glass covered type [95].

## Display Environment

The museum walls were simply painted in monochrome of unknown colour and the floor was paved with asymmetric stone blocks [98]. Natural lighting was provided by a series of windows and by the two doors situated at its facade (the second, in room IV, was not used) [103] and it was probably sufficient given the limited width of the rooms.

## Discussion

At the beginning of the century the Eleusis Museum, a strictly site museum built to accommodate the finds from the excavation of the Eleusinian sanctuary, was considered to be one of the most important provincial museums in Greece (Philios 1906: 106-107).

Despite its significance, however, no information on its day-to-day function survives. Apart from D. Philios and A. Skias, who organised the museum and set up the displays, the only other information on the people who contributed to the museum is that Ioannes Papanikolaou worked on the cleaning and consolidation of finds (*IIAE* 1898: 90). Philios and mainly, Skias tried to provide as orderly a display as possible. The museum's display profile was simple and somehow random, but antiquities were arranged, if anything else, consistently. The use of supporting material was apparently confined to catalogue numbers, which were at times affixed on the very exhibits [99].

Only assumptions can be made about the museum's visiting. Eleusis was no more than a small town<sup>35</sup> and, despite its proximity to Athens, it was probably not frequently visited apart from people with specific archaeological interests. In the early years, when excavation finds were kept in the guard house, the guardian of antiquities usually waited for the visitors at the train station (Guide Joanne 1888: 196). Later, one could enjoy a guided tour of the museum and hospitality in the guardian's house at the price of a small tip (Baedeker 1901: 140). We know nothing of the locals' response to the museum and, although evidence from other areas of Greece would suggest that they did probably not visit the museum, it is wiser not to draw any conclusions on this point.



## **The Schematari (Tanagra) Museum**

### **Introduction**

The foundation of the "museum" at Schematari is typical of early museum development in Greece in that it was built in order to shelter those local finds which had not to that date been transported to Athens. In this respect it was intended more as storage space than as a proper museum. It is interesting to note the inconsistent use of the terms "collection" and "museum" in relation to the Schematari Museum, even in the case of one and the same publication. Not only does this confusion of terms reveal the museum's rough nature but, more significant, shows that the museum concept was rather unclear at the time (*IIAE* 1877: 40, 42). That such a "museum" should be included in the present study may at first look odd, but the examination of "primitive museums" will be helpful in the general assessment of museum development in the country in later chapters.

### **Historical Note**

Tanagra, once a thriving classical city, was "rediscovered" in the early nineteenth century and had a quite traumatic modern history. In the early 1870s the area, which became renowned for its clay figurines, witnessed disastrous grave-robbery by professional and amateur looters.

In his attempt to establish the sequence of events, Higgins (n. d.: 29-30) notes that the village of Schematari (which lies ca.5km to the north of ancient Tanagra) was built "over one of the principal grave-lined roads leading out of Tanagra so that when digging for the foundations of their houses the inhabitants could not have failed to come upon ancient burials with their

offerings of figurines". The rumour of discoveries apparently attracted the attention of grave-robbers from other areas, who established themselves at Schematari and set to work. For two years the area was ransacked and the unearthed figurines were sold in the market. The problem received wide coverage in the Athenian press but, although private excavations were banned in 1873, the Government did not react as drastically as was needed.

In 1873 the Archaeological Society sent Panaghiotes Stamatakes to dig whatever might be left and try to gather all antiquities scattered around the area with the aim of forming a local collection (Koumanoudes 1874: 164-65). He conducted a series of excavations from 1874 to 1879 and again in 1881-82. After him Chrestos Tsountas dug in 1887 and E. Koromantsos in 1888 (AA 1888: 34-35; 1889: 123). The principal finds from the excavations were first sent to the museums of the Archaeological Society in the Varvakeion and the Polytechnic in Athens and later transferred to the National Museum.<sup>36</sup>

Only bulky pieces whose transport to Athens was difficult remained in the area but, by 1876, the collection already amounted to some 1,135 antiquities (IAE 1876: 43). It was initially accommodated in a house rented by the Government and at the courtyard of the church of Panaghia at Schematari (IAE 1874: 29-31). The French archaeologist Hassoulier compiled a catalogue of the collection in 1878.<sup>37</sup>

In 1882 a piece of land measuring 946m<sup>2</sup> was donated to the Government by the monastery of Soter for the construction of a museum.<sup>38</sup> The museum was built by the Archaeological Society in 1890-91 and, although the building was not fully completed, it soon received the antiquities.<sup>39</sup> Installation works were carried out by Demetrios Konstas, Ephor of the Archaeological Society in 1890-91. Konstas also compiled a new catalogue of the collection, which now comprised some 5,644 pieces of sculpture, inscriptions, architectural members, reliefs, vases and other antiquities (AA 1891: 91).

## On the Display

The "museum", a very simple, stone-built, low building, comprised a long room covered with a tile roof and was naturally lit through a series of windows [104-105]. It contained mainly funerary stelai and inscriptions but information on its interior is almost non-existent. It seems that some basic display hardware, like shelves, was in use for the accommodation of the antiquities [106]. Most sculpture was probably placed on the floor. There is no indication of the existence of show cases for that early period. In fact, the first reference to the construction of cases which has been found dates to 1911.<sup>40</sup>

Overall, the material was probably arranged in some basic order, but whether this could qualify as a display or not, it is hard to judge.

## Discussion

As has already been said, the Schematari "museum", which was founded in the wake of illegal digging in the area of Tanagra, exemplifies the type of early, small, store-like museum aimed mainly at protecting local antiquities and not so much at public visiting (*cf.* the Amphiareion Museum above). This is further implied by the inconsistent application of the terms "collection" and "local museum" in relation to it (*ΠΑΕ* 1877: 40, 42).

The museum key was held by the guardian of the necropolis of Tanagra but, although reference to the "small local museum" is made in some travellers' guides (Baedeker 1901: 149), it was probably not accessible to the lay visitor. This seems further justified if we think of the museum's location in a rather remote rural area, which would render visiting awkward.

Finally, it should be remembered that a private body, that is the Archaeological Society and not the Government took the initiative for the museum's foundation.



## **The Local Archaeological Museum at Aegina**

### **Historical Note**

#### **▪ 1837-1898**

After the dissolution of the first National Museum at Aegina and the transfer of the majority of its contents to Athens in 1837, very few antiquities remained on the island. These were partly kept at the courtyard of the Orphanage and partly in the Town Hall (Kourouniotes 1913: 86; Koulikourde and Alexiou 1950: 118). Despite the fact that the Orphanage ceased working in 1844 and Edmond About saw it deserted in 1854 (Koulikourde and Alexiou 1950: 57), some thirty three pieces were apparently still there in 1865.<sup>41</sup> In 1896 Reinach (1896: 76) referred to a total of forty eight inscriptions and eighty seven reliefs, saying that on the island were left antiquities and fragments that were not worth the transport to the capital. Those years could be described as a transitory, "storage" phase.

#### **▪ 1898-1909**

Efforts towards establishing a local museum on the island must have been under way for some time before 1898, when the teacher A. Pelekanos "an enthusiastic lover of antiquities, ... was appointed Curator of Antiquities at Aegina and succeeded with great difficulty to assemble them into the ground floor of the Governor's House..." (Kourouniotes 1913: 86). This was a large private house [107] in the centre of the city used by Capodistrias as his residence and office and later for the accommodation of various public services (Lampros 1887: 265-68; Arintzopoulou 1984: 1, n. 6). The museum

was housed there until 1926 when it was transferred to the "Eynardeion", where it still is today (Araintzopoulou 1984).

### **Display Layout**

From a later description in the *Guide Bleu* (1911: 170), we know that the museum was installed in two rooms at the ground floor of the building. The display core was apparently formed by the already existing small collection, but the museum was gradually enriched with finds from excavations on the island, such as those at the temple of Athena Aphaia in 1901-1903 and at Kolona from 1903 onwards. However, nothing is clearly known about the spatial layout of objects. One of the most remarkable exhibits was the Archaic Sphinx, which was found during the excavations of Furtwängler at Kolona in 1903 [108-109]. Displays also included fragmentary sculpture and terracottas (*Guide Bleu* 1911: 170).

### **Display Organisation and Hardware**

Antiquities were placed in the museum without any order. Some sculptures were just placed on the floor, whereas small objects were placed in glass cabinets (*Guide Bleu* 1911: 170). This is confirmed by photographic evidence from one of the rooms showing upright wall cabinets and wooden shelves of a very basic type [108-109].

### **Discussion**

Founded in the wake of local initiatives, the Aegina Museum was housed in a public building that also served for other purposes and there is hardly any information on its function, personnel and visiting. The only references to the museum's interior are two laconic descriptions in the *Baedeker Guide* (1901: 88; 1904: 127), which reflect a very poor display profile. These, however, do

not constitute the most reliable of sources. There is no evidence that the museum was regularly open and only assumptions can be made on this matter. The museum key was perhaps held by some guardian who would let visitors in the rooms with or without previous appointment.

Overall, the establishment of the Aegina Museum serves as a good illustration of local attempts towards the foundation of small museums in areas from which the most important finds had been transported to Athens.

## **The Syros Museum**

### **Introduction**

The establishment of the museum of Syros is clearly connected to the island's financial and cultural prosperity during the nineteenth century. Hermoupolis, the capital, was inhabited by refugees from Asia Minor, Chios, Crete, Hydra and elsewhere, after the 1821 Revolution and it was one of the very few Greek cities founded during the nineteenth century.<sup>42</sup> Due to its favourable geographical position, the city soon became the largest commercial port of the country and a trade bridge between East and West.<sup>43</sup> Financial growth coupled with the intellectual vivacity of its inhabitants (due to a long-standing affinity of the island with Italy and the West on one hand<sup>44</sup> and to the origin of the new population on the other), led to a rapid cultural boom. Education, in particular, was developed from the very beginning with the establishment of schools (for both boys and girls), technical colleges and other cultural institutions. The Gymnasium of Hermoupolis, for example, founded in 1834, was renowned in its days (Phragides 1975: 441-45).<sup>45</sup> Thus, it comes as no surprise that Hermoupolis was in the nineteenth century "the educational centre of the



entire East" and "the first inevitable stopover for those wishing to learn" (quoted in Traulos and Kokkou 1980: 53).

## Historical Note

### ▪ 1833-1886

An interest in securing antiquities scattered around the island was manifested from an early stage. The initiative for the museum's foundation is usually associated with the foundation of the "Ellenikon Mouseion" (Greek museum) in 1833.<sup>46</sup> The "Mouseion" was a sort of a "cabinet litteraire", the first literary society of Greece, aimed at the "diffusion of useful knowledge" by means of lectures, discussions, reading and other cultural activities. The society formed what was perhaps the first public library in Greece, which, according to a contemporary piece of information, also comprised some statues (Makry-michalos 1962: 717; Drakakes 1962: 765).

The members of the "Mouseion" were also active in gathering antiquities<sup>47</sup> and the first small collection was formed by Ioannes Kokonnes, a teacher who served as Ephor of Antiquities in the Aegean islands in 1833-34.<sup>48</sup> According to Kokkones, the collection, which comprised some fifty five inscriptions and fourteen reliefs, was in 1835 housed in one room adjacent to the girls' school (Kontoleon 1950a), but it seems that it was soon afterwards moved to the newly-built Gymnasium (Gherasimide 1933: 48). The antiquities were badly stored in wooden crates in the Gymnasium's basement and courtyard for many years (Zographakes 1886: 27; Monoghios n.d.: 12-13).<sup>49</sup>

Much later, the issue of the museum revived in the wake of important archaeological discoveries on the island of Delos in the early 1880s. In recurrent discussions during the City Council's meetings, it was proposed that the museum of Syros should become the Central Museum of the Cyclades as this would benefit the island both intellectually and financially. Two buildings

were opted for the purpose: a public building at "Nessaki", which was previously the residence of the Health Inspector and one of the wings of the Town Hall. The former was finally chosen and the museum was established in 1886 (Zographakes 1886: 27-32).<sup>50</sup>

#### ▪ 1886-1899

Soon after the collection's transfer to the building at "Nessaki", its curation was entrusted to Antonios Vlastos, Chief School Director of Syros, who systematised its cataloguing. However, his long illness and subsequent death put this effort to an end (Monoghios n.d.: 13). Extant information on the period which followed is rather unclear, but contemporary references to the "county museum" in the press, imply that it remained in that building at least up until 1889.<sup>51</sup> In 1888 the collection was enriched by the finds of the French excavations at Amorgos.<sup>52</sup> It seems that this "museum" was open to visitors twice a week, on Wednesdays and Saturdays from ten in the morning to noon.<sup>53</sup>

Although the Government intended the Syros Museum to become the "Central Museum of the Cyclades" (ΑΔ 1888: 49; cf. JHS 1887-88: 119), the issue was not resolved and a rumoured plan of transporting insular antiquities to the National Museum in Athens, published in an Athenian newspaper, alerted the Cycladiots. "What purpose does the gathering of antiquities in Athens serve? These must be visited *in situ*..." was their reply (Πατρίς [Σάμου], no. 1146, 13-8-1888).

In the meantime, the City Council of Hermoupolis had ceded some space in the Town Hall, but nothing is certain on the exact date of the collection's transfer there. Kontoleon (1950a) proposed a date around 1888, whereas Monoghios (n.d.: 13) writes that the collection was transferred by the new Curator N. Polites in 1899. This is confirmed by Polites (1907: 161) himself, who wrote that he personally sought for the accommodation of antiquities in

three rooms at the north-west wing of the building. These rooms, it will be shown, were arranged in 1900-1901, but evidence from 1894-96 suggests that perhaps some other space, most probably in the building's basement, was initially used. Visitors to the museum in 1894, for example, reported that it was a small room without light and air (cited in Kontoleon 1950a) and Pollak (1896: 195), who visited it in 1896, got the same impression. The same Polites (1909: 183) commented on the museum's "deplorable situation" in 1895.

The discoveries of Tsountas at Chalandriane in 1898 brought the issue strongly to the fore (Tsountas 1899). The upheaval which followed is well reflected in the relevant long correspondence between the City and County Councils and the Government, which is held in the Historical Archive of Hermoupolis. The City Council decreed that the finds should remain on the island,<sup>54</sup> but this did not prevent their transport to the National Museum. The Government proposed that, should the Hermoupolis City Council provide appropriate premises for their housing, some "duplicates" along with replicas of the Chalandriane finds could then be send back from Athens.<sup>55</sup>

#### ▪ 1899-1909

Works on the establishment of a proper museum in three rooms of the north-west wing of the Town Hall<sup>56</sup> (Plan 36) [110], were intensified with the appointment of N. Polites as Curator of antiquities in 1899.<sup>57</sup> Installation and consolidation works were mainly carried out in 1900 and the museum was ready in 1901.<sup>58</sup> The original financial estimate for the museum's installation survives in the Historical Archive of Hermoupolis<sup>59</sup> and gives us an indication on the works involved [111], which included rearranging the available space, painting the walls, constructing three glass tables for the deposition of small finds and transporting the antiquities from the "old" to the "new" museum (see above). By 1901 the Syros Museum was finally housed in permanent premises.



## Display Layout and Organisation

The collection, which comprised finds from the French excavation at Amorgos and finds from Syros, Delos and Rheneia, was displayed in three rooms at the north-west corner of the building. As no ground plan of these rooms after the 1900-1901 amendments survives, their closest approximation is provided by Plan 36. It is also very difficult to assess the spatial layout of the objects as hardly any information survives on this matter. The only indication available is a brief, not very specific reference to the museum in the Baedeker guide (1904: 233). According to this, the first room contained Hellenistic reliefs from Rheneia and the second some funerary inscriptions and Roman sculpture. No mention of the third room is made, but this was perhaps not used for display purposes at all. In fact, it is very likely that it served as the curator's office.

## Display Hardware

The only evidence on the museum's display hardware is the reference to three glass tables in the proposed budget for the museum's establishment (n. 59). According to this document one of these tables was to be placed "in the middle" and would measure 2.10x1.30x0.60m and two others, measuring 3.70x0.90x0.60m and 12.80x0.90x0.60m respectively, were to be placed in the "corners". No mention of the room for which the tables were intended is made. It is very tempting to recognise these very tables in three old glass cases which are today in the museum's store room, despite the fact that there is no indication on the date of the latter's construction and that their dimensions are quite different. Even if they are not the original ones, however, these cases must be of the same type.

## Discussion

The Syros Museum occupies a special place in the history of museum development in Greece, because its foundation provides a very good example of the importance of local initiatives in museum foundation in the country. The museum's significance lies not so much in its displays and organisation as in the painstaking efforts which were made for its proper establishment.

Nothing is known on the museum's personnel, but it seems that the only member of staff was the Curator, that is N. Polites after 1899. It is interesting to note that neither Polites nor his predecessor, A. Vlastos, were archaeologists, but educationalists. This is indicative of the close connection between education and museums during that period, but it may also reflect the fact that it was probably more convenient for the Government to entrust the museum's curation to someone who was already employed in the civil service than to create a new archaeological post.

According to the 1896 census, Hermoupolis had a population of 18,160 inhabitants (Phoustanos 1902-1903: 41), with a cultural education exceeding average standards of other Greek cities at the time. Was museum visiting among their interests? It is difficult to say. What may be noted is that during the period of its temporary accommodation in the building at "Nessaki", the museum was open twice a week (p. 226). Regular opening to the public for the period after 1901, however, is not documented. On the contrary, a reference in Polites (1907: 162) makes it more likely that the museum was not open at that time. We may thus have to assume that visits were perhaps specifically arranged.

## The Epidauros Museum

### Historical Note

#### ▪ 1881-1888

Excavations at the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros started by P. Kavvadias in 1881 and continued until his death in 1928 (Kavvadias 1891; 1900b). The most important finds were, as usual, transported to Athens. In 1883, for example, sculpture from the sanctuary was already displayed in the museum of the Archaeological Society at the Polytechnic,<sup>60</sup> whereas other sculpture was transported to the National Archaeological Museum (*IIAE* 1886: 80) [43].

In 1884, however, a small house (the long, low building visible on the left hand side of [112]) was constructed for those sculptures and architectural fragments which remained at Epidauros (*IIAE* 1884: 9; Kavvadias 1900a: 75).

#### ▪ 1888-1890

Excavations stopped between 1888 and 1890 and during that time the Government constructed the first carriage-road from Nauplion to the sanctuary (Kavvadias 1900b: 29). At around 1890 the Archaeological Society added to the already existing rough "museum" a two-storey building, whose upper floor was intended for the accommodation of the excavation team and the visitors, whereas the ground floor served as a temporary museum.<sup>61</sup> Thus, by 1890 the entire ground floor of the building which is visible on the left hand side of [112] served as a museum (Plan 37) [113].



### ▪ 1899-1909

The existing museum, which initially measured 60m in length, was built in 1899 and extended with two wings in 1901 (*IIAE* 1899: 15; 1901: 13, 16) [112]. Some additional building works followed in 1905 and a second floor was raised in 1907 (*IIAE* 1907: 64) [114].

Display works lasted from 1905 to 1909 and mainly involved a large-scale reconstruction of the most important buildings of the sanctuary. Extant architectural members were consolidated and supplemented with plaster where was necessary. More specifically, partly reconstructed were the entablature of the temple of Asklepios [115], the temple of Artemis [116], the colonnade of the Thymele along with its unusually decorated ceiling [117-119] and the Propylaia [120]. Original sculpture from the sanctuary, which had for the main part been taken to the National Museum in Athens (e.g. [43]), was substituted by plaster replicas [119]. Works also included the setting up of inscriptions on pedestals and the construction of a shed outside the museum for housing the remaining antiquities<sup>62</sup> [114].

In 1909 installation works were almost completed, the museum was painted, its floor was paved and four columns were set up by the entrance door (*IIAE* 1908: 65-66; 1909: 63) [114]. There is no clear evidence of the museum's official opening but we may reasonably presume that this happened sometime between 1909 and 1910 (when photographs [115-120] date from). A piece of information in the 1909 edition of the Baedeker guide (1909: 330), according to which the old museum building was still in use in that year, makes 1910 a more plausible date for the museum's inauguration.

### Display Layout

The Epidauros Museum is quite unique in that it comprises exclusively sculpture and architectural members from the various buildings of the

sanctuary and thus presents one of the most coherent displays of all Greek museums. It is also apparently the only Greek museum whose displays can be almost fully portrayed through photographic evidence.<sup>63</sup>

The building, a very long and narrow one, comprised three rooms. It is not clear if the *first room*, the vestibule, contained any exhibits but, if it did, then it probably housed inscriptions and some fragmentary sculpture as today.

Upon entering the *second room* the visitor was surrounded by a series of statues, heads and inscriptions linearly displayed along the walls [115]. Some of them, such as the acroteria from the temple of Asklepios and the two reliefs of Asklepios on the left wall, were cast replicas of the originals in the National Museum. Further down one could see the reconstruction of the temple of Artemis on the right hand side of the room.

In the first part of the *third room* one could see the reconstruction of the temple of Asklepios on the right hand side and a series of sculptures related to the god on the left hand side [116]. Further down the left side followed the impressive reconstruction of the Thymele [117-119] and the display ended with a reconstruction of the temple's Propylon on the back wall [120].

### Display Organisation

The spatial layout of exhibits followed their provenance in the sanctuary, e.g. remains of the temples of Asklepios and of Artemis, the Thymele, the Propylon, free-standing votive sculpture and inscriptions.<sup>64</sup> Due to the narrowness of available space, displays were arranged in strict linear juxtaposition. What should be noted is the attempt to reconstruct architectural members in their approximate imaginary position on the buildings.

## Display Hardware

The museum's hardware was confined to platforms, shelves and small bases for the display of sculpture. More specifically, a platform projecting from the lower part of the walls in the second room bore statues on its top and inscriptions attached to its front side [115]. Two long shelves above it accommodated a series of heads, statuettes and fragmentary sculptures, each of which was first individually placed on a small base (*cf.* the similar bases in the National Museum in Athens, which was also set up by P. Kavvadias).

In the same way, fragmentary sculpture was displayed on two long and two small shelves along the left wall of the third room [116]. Small individual shelf-bases, which projected from the wall above this platform, accommodated plaster casts of some acroteria figures from the temple of Asklepios. On a still higher level, another figure, probably also an acroterion, was supported by iron rods [116]. Finally, two shelves placed in the last section of the room accommodated fragments from the Thymele's top acroterion [119].

## Supporting Material

The museum was also unique in that it extensively and exclusively depended on painted reconstructions to supplement its displays. Small-scale painted reconstructions of the various buildings by the French Defrasse (see Caton 1900; Kavvadias 1909), protected by glass frames, were hung beside the relevant displays [116-119]. Painting was further used as a substitute for architectural members; see, for example, the two Doric columns, which were painted in replacement of the missing originals in the reconstruction of the Propylon [120]. It seems that no other information, not even the customary catalogue numbers or identification labels, supported the displays.



## Display Environment

The interior of the museum was impressive in its simplicity. Walls were painted in monochrome and the ceiling was covered with wooden long planks [115]. The floor was paved with blocks of stone, which formed a strict geometric pattern in the second and the first part of the third one [115-116] and were simple, monochrome ones in the last part of the third room [117-119]. A series of side windows provided plenty of natural light. There certainly was an elongated spatial quality in the museum, which was further enhanced by the linear juxtaposition of the displays, the uniform character of the pavement blocks and the parallel joints which run across the wooden ceiling.

We should also note the existence of simple wooden chairs and benches, which were juxtaposed along the walls [121] and were similar to the ones we already came across in the Sparta Museum [76].

## Discussion

Containing vestiges from one of the most important ancient Greek sanctuaries, the Epidauros Museum was and still is today particularly significant. Yet due to a considerable lack of data, it is difficult to portray its everyday function. Neither early catalogues nor descriptions of the museum were ever published during the period under study here and so our information is restricted to the brief annual reports in ΠΑΕ and the photographic evidence which mainly allow for a commentary on the displays.

The museum was organised and set up by Panaghiotes Kavvadias, the excavator of the site. He was also responsible for the interpretation of the various buildings of the sanctuary which were reconstructed in the museum with the assistance of the artist Panaghiotakes (Meliades n.d.: 338). Some of Kavvadias' restorations, the reconstruction of the Thymele in particular, later

proved mistaken, as they were not substantiated by the evidence of the surviving remains (Tomlinson 1983: 65). It was exactly these reconstructions, however, which gave the museum its unique and special character and probably had an imposing effect on the visitor. Many other archaeologists, mainly German and French, have also had a share in the work carried out at Epidauros (e.g. in restoring and studying the plethora of inscriptions), but the degree of their involvement in the museum, if any, is not clear, with the exemption of Defrasse who painted the reconstructions (Defrasse 1895). The Epidauros Museum was one of the ten provincial museums where the Archaeological Society was given the right to appoint a permanent curator (*IIAE* 1907: 73), but we do not know whether this was implemented or not.

As was the case with all site museums of the period, the museum was not easily accessible. The nearest city was Nauplion with which the sanctuary was connected by a carriage-road, constructed, as we already saw, at around 1890. But, the journey required a good deal of time and Athens, from where most visitors with special archaeological interests would come, was still further away. The complete lack of information on the museum's visiting makes it impossible to draw any conclusions on this matter.

## Conclusions

At the end of what we have called the formative period of museum development in Greece, significant work was done towards establishing and organising museums in the provinces. On the whole, museum foundation was not based on any coherent or consistent programme, nor was it legislatively provided. Instead, individual solutions were adopted for individual cases and this resulted in considerably varied museum profiles. The task was basically fraught with a variety of problems, which were resolved with the collabora-

tion of various parts, that is the Government, the Archaeological Society and individuals.

The principle concern was, as it had always been, securing the antiquities, existing ones or new excavation finds, in permanent premises. In urban centres private initiatives made this somehow easier and often the establishment of local museums largely depended on the zeal of individuals as, for example, the School Inspector A. Vlastos at Syros and the teacher A. Pelekanos at Aegina. Financial expenses were covered by central (Sparta), or local Government (Syros, Aegina ), the Archaeological Society (Amphiareion, Eleusis, Schematari, Epidauros), or private donations (Olympia).

Staffing was a crucial issue but, there is no indication that permanent staff, apart from a guardian, was employed in most of the museums. The archaeologists who were responsible for a museum's organisation were not usually based in the area. According to the existing evidence, only one out of the eight museums, the Olympia Museum, was permanently staffed. Museums were at times set up with the collaboration of foreign archaeologists (Olympia). Foreign involvement, however, was mainly confined in the publication of scientific catalogues (Sparta) and not so much in the shaping of museum displays.

The accessibility and visiting profile of these museums is difficult to draw, as even in the case of urban museums public visiting is not documented (mainly in the case of the Syros and Aegina museums). The more so in rural areas where site museums were built with the aim of providing a shelter for the finds rather than a proper museum (mainly at Amphiareion and Schematari).

Any attempt to classify these museums' displays remains necessarily arbitrary due to the fragmentary nature of the existing information. Yet efforts towards improving display organisation were clear throughout that period.



Overall, displays varied from the very simple, random ones (Syros, Aegina) through the more systematically organised (Sparta, Eleusis) to the more elaborate ones (Olympia, Epidauros). In other cases the arrangement of antiquities was so unordered, that it could not qualify as a display (Amphiareion, Schematari). The common type of layout was typological and chronological, with objects placed in linear juxtaposition, at times grouped together and rarely displayed in thematic order. There was a very limited, if any, use of supporting material and only in two cases did reconstructions and painted representations accompany the exhibits (Olympia, Epidauros).

Concluding, only four out of the eight museums would qualify as proper museums (Sparta, Olympia, Eleusis, Epidauros), the rest being either somehow rough and provisional (Syros, Aegina) or store-like ones (Amphiareion, Schematari). The establishment of many more museums at the beginning of the twentieth century, would inaugurate a new era of museum development in the country. This is the subject of the following chapter.

•

## Notes to Chapter Seven

1. See Kapsales (n.d.: 200). The organisation of the modern city would take many years, due to the Spartans reluctance to abandon their old settlement at Mystras and the marshy nature of the plateau where the city was to be built.
2. The notion which prompted such donations was that "archaeological museums are not the property of each city but of the whole nation or so to speak, of humanity at large and those who donate to them, donate to society" (*Ευρώτας Α'*, no. 27, 6-12-1874).
3. The existence of a hand-written register is also confirmed by Dressel and Milchhöfer (1877: 295).
4. Note that this was the only instance when the 1840 recommendation for the establishment of specific museum committees was implemented (see p. 66).
5. Theodoropoulos (1901: 41; 1905: 19), Chrestou (1960: 72) and Steinhauer (n.d.: 3) refer to Hansen as the museum's architect, but no proof of his involvement in the museum's planning has been found.
6. *Ευρώτας Α'*, no. 23, 9-11-1874; *Εφημερίς των Φιλομαθών ΚΓ*, no. 834, 28-1-1874, p. 2835; *ΠΑΕ* 1876: 33. For the various phases of the construction see Eustratiades, *Archive: Ημερολόγιον Υπηρεσίας*. Φακ. 1, 189-90; 220; 223; 236; 255-56). Some interesting details on the politics of the museum's building in the local newspaper *Ευρώτας Α*, no. 26, 21-11-1874.
7. Eustratiades, *Archive: Ημερολόγιο Υπηρεσίας*. Φακ. 1, 255.
8. Eustratiades, *Archive: Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας*. Φάκελλος 4 (β), Λακωνία.

9. *IIAE* (1906: 58-59; 1907: 70); *JHS* (1907: 287). For the excavations see Dawckins (1929).
10. The sanctuary where Menelaos and Helene were worshiped as divine. Excavations there unearthed a rectangular structure with three terraces of blocks of limestone and a marble cornice. No temple was found but the debris contained numerous votive offerings. See Catling (1983) and (1986; where also information on the activities of the British School of Athens in Laconia).
11. See Chrestou (1960: 80-82).
12. They generally depicted a god and a goddess enthroned, the former holding a kantharos, the latter grasping her veil. They were probably sepulchral offerings, the sitting persons being the deities of the underworld or, possibly, the apotheosized deceased; see n. 11.
13. Konstantinos Rhomaïos was one of the first Greek archaeologists who were sent abroad for further studies with a grant by the Archaeological Society at the beginning of the twentieth century (Petrakos 1987a: 105).
14. The first actual excavation was carried out in 1829, immediately after the War of Independence, by the French *Expédition Scientifique de Morée*. Barely six weeks were available for work, but they sufficed for a partial examination of the temple of Zeus. All sculpture discovered was removed to the Louvre (Gardiner 1925: 6-7).
15. In 1875 an agreement which was signed between the Greek and the German governments permitted the latter to excavate at Olympia. The responsibilities of either side were arranged by a special law "On the confirmation of the agreement between Greece and Germany concerning the archaeological excavations at Olympia"; for the text see Leonardos (1901: 140-44).



16. The same scepticism about Hermes was later expressed by Adolf Michaelis (1908: 133-34), who believed that a cast would suffice to Olympia and that the statue should be transferred to Athens.
17. For a drawing of the museum by Siebold dated 12/24-4-1883 see Balanos, *Remains*.
18. Papageorghiou (1890: 83); Leonardos (1895: 3-4; 1901: 267); Kourouniotes (1909a: 3).
19. *ΠΑΕ* (1898: 21; 1899: 18; 1901: 16; 1909: 65). For later reports and technical suggestions on the museum's consolidation and the security of the statue of Hermes in particular, see Balanos, *Remains*. The building was abandoned much later, when a new museum was built opposite the site in the 1970s.
20. The placement of the figures on the pediments has been a matter of long lasting controversy. A review of the various reconstructions in Becatti, G. 1943. *Il Maestro di Olympia*. Firenze. For the interpretation of the figures in the new Olympia museum see Ashmole, B. and Yalouris, N. 1967. *Olympia. The Sculptures of the Temple of Zeus*. London: Phaidon Press.
21. Papagheorghiou (1890: 267, n. 1); Leonardos (1895: 4, n. 3). Fellmann (1972: 45) writes that G. von Treu and A. Furtwängler also helped in this work.
22. Fragments of the metopes were taken to France by the Expédition Scientifique de Morée in 1829 and were exhibited in the Greek hall at the Louvre. For details on the Expédition and the way of acquisition see Michon (1895).
23. The use of a screen does not clearly result from the photographs, but it is assumed from a later suggestion by Balanos made during the discussion for a new Hermes room (Balanos, *Remains*, letter dated 12-4-1926).
24. For the history of the excavations see Petrakos (1968: 62-65).

25. According to a reference in Androutsopoulos (1972: 59), which may be justified by the existence of a smaller side building in [92].
26. A first small-scale excavation was carried out by the French F. Lénormant in 1860. Finds were kept in the house of the commander Laskas at Eleusis, where "archaeologists could study them at any time" (Lénormant 1860-61: 1, n. 1). For the Eleusinian cult see Kerenyi (1967). A general review of the history of the sanctuary and assessment of excavation results in Mylonas (1961).
27. *IAE* (1888: 27, 32); Guide Joanne (1888: 203); Baedeker (1901: 140).
28. A new room was added much later in 1936-39 (Kanta 1979: 27).
29. Baedeker (1901: 140; 1904: 106); Meyers (1901: 187).
30. Kourouniotes (1936: fig. 30). The reconstruction of the relief and the placement of its extant fragments in the wall facing the entrance was the work of two German archaeologists, Reichel and Heberdey (Philios 1905: 183, n. 1).
31. Kanta (1979: figs. 33, 26, 30, and 36 respectively).
32. E.g. Kanta (1979: fig. 21 and 16).
33. Kanta (1979: figs. 10 and 3 respectively).
34. Kanta (1979: figs. 47, 20 and 18 respectively).
35. For a history of Eleusis see Sfyroeras (1985).
36. Higgings (n. d.: 30); *IAE* (1887: 64); *AA* (1888: 204); *BCH* (14, 1890: 204).

37. ΠΑΕ (1878: 26); Παρνασσός (III, 1879: 77).
38. ΠΑΕ (1882: 15); see also Παρνασσός (V, 1881: 183).
39. ΠΑΕ (1890: 33-35, 44; 1891: 35); *The Athenaeum* no. 3285, 11-10-1890, 490.
40. *Thebes Archive*, no. 359, 22-12-1911; no. 374, 3-2-1912. See also no. 769, 16-5-1914.
41. Eustratiades, *Archive: Παράρτημα Ημερολογίου Υπηρεσίας. Φάκελλος 14. Αιγίνα α) Τα εν τη Αιγίνη έτι και νυν (Ιουν. 1865) υπάρχοντα κατά τας εκθέσεις Σταματάκη και Λογιωτατίδου και τα σημειώματα Αγγ. Βλάχου.*
42. The old city of Syros was built in the thirteenth century high on a sharp peak for fear of the pirates (for an old history of the island see Ampelas (1874). The new city, Hermoupolis, expanded on the plane which lays underneath it until the sea. The two municipalities are distinct even today. A history of the inhabitation of the city in Drakakes (1983); see also Phragides (1975: 384-89). For the development of Hermoupolis see Kolodny (1969-70) and Traulos and Kokkou (1980).
43. For a detailed and interesting study of Syros's development and the reasons for its decline see Kardases (1987).
44. This affinity was initiated in 1207 when Syros, along with most of the Cyclades, was passed to the Venetian Erico Dandolo. Later, in 1633 Capucin and Jesuite monks settled on the island and established the communication of Syros with Europe. At the same time the port of Syros started serving foreign ships (Traulos and Kokkou 1980: 22-23).
45. A catalogue of the holdings of the rich library of the Gymnasium in Matthaïou and Patsiou (1989).



46. Klon (1875: 1-2), Choumes (1902-1903: 236) and Monoghios (n. d.: 12) cite 1835 as the date of foundation. However, the information provided in Vlachoghiannes (1911: vol. 5, *passim* but mainly pp. 44-45, 107-108, 110-12) according to which the "Mouseion" was established in 1833, is more accurate.
47. Undated document sent by the Ephory of the Mouseion to the City Council of Hermoupolis, today in the Historical Archive of Hermoupolis. *Ιστορικό Αρχείο Ερμουπόλεως, Ι/Αρχαιότητες 1(1), αρ. κατ. 233/11*. From the same document we know that some antiquities were kept in the basement of the church of Metamorphosis.
48. Zographakes (1886: 26); Kokkou (1977: 150). Kontoleon (1950a) attributes the provision for the foundation of an archaeological museum at Syros in the first Greek archaeological law of 1834 to these activities.
49. An interesting and rich documentation on the collection of antiquities at Syros during the first half of the nineteenth century and the discussion on the museum survives in the Historical Archive of Hermoupolis. The documents themselves are not published, but they are thematically listed by Loukos and Poleme (1987). Particularly interesting for this study is file I, which is titled Antiquities (*Αρχαιότητες*).
50. Monoghios (n.d.: 13) cites 1888 but his account of the museum's history does not on the whole seem as accurate.
51. *Πατρίς [Σάμου]*, no. 1174, 4-3-1889.
52. *Πατρίς [Σάμου]*, no. 1128, 9-4-1888; no. 1132, 14-5-1888; Kontoleon (1950a).
53. *Πατρίς [Σάμου]*, no. 1130, 30-4-1888; no. 1132, 14-5-1888.

54. *Ιστορικό Αρχείο Ερμουπόλεως Ι/Αρχαιότητες/1 (3)*, αρ. καταγρ. 509/9, αριθ. 3726/2898.
55. E.g. *Ιστορικό Αρχείο Ερμουπόλεως Ι/Αρχαιότητες/1 (3)* αρ. καταγρ. 509/9: αριθ. πρωτ. 14816, 16-2-1899; 10942, 19-2-1899; 19, 3-1-1900; 19, 20-1-1900, and, 10671, 22-2-1900.
56. The impressive neoclassical building was constructed by Ernst Ziller in 1876 (see Ziller 1978) and still remains the main feature of the city's central square.
57. The original document in the Historical Archive of Hermoupolis. *Ιστορικό Αρχείο Ερμουπόλεως Ι/Αρχαιότητες/1 (3)* αρ. καταγρ. 509/9, αρ. πρωτ. 898, 27-1-1899.
58. The relevant long documentation in the Historical Archive of Hermoupolis. *Ιστορικό Αρχείο Ερμουπόλεως Ι/Αρχαιότητες/1 (3)*, αρ. καταγρ. 509/9. E.g. nos. 2799/2207, 20-9-1900; 20699/17697, 31-10-1900; 12622, 13-11-1900; 3302/2599, 15-11-1900; 36/29, 17-11-1900; 12804, 26-11-1900; 13368, 7-12-1900; 1657, 21-2-1901; 993/715, 22-2-1901.
59. *Ιστορικό Αρχείο Ερμουπόλεως Ι/Αρχαιότητες/1 (3)* αρ. καταγρ. 509/9. *Δημοτικά Έργα. Προϋπολογισμός της απαιτούμενης δαπάνης δια τον καταρτισμόν Αρχαιολογικού Μουσείου επί της Β.Δ. γωνίας του ισογείου του Αρχείου*. The document is unnumbered, but dates from 17-11-1900 and is signed by the architect D. Eleutheriades (cf. Stephanou 1929: 12).
60. ΠΑΕ (1883: 9); Παρνασσός (VII, 1883: 870).
61. ΠΑΕ (1890: 44); Kavnadias (1900b: 29-30).
62. ΠΑΕ (1905: 23-24, 43-44; 1906: 53-54).

63. The use of the present, instead of the past, tense is not arbitrary since the museum displays have remained almost unaltered until today.
64. The majority of these were building inscriptions recording legal, financial and architectural arrangements which shed light on the construction history of the sanctuary. They are particularly important as they constitute one of the most complete series of such building documents to have survived from ancient Greece (for the texts see Burford 1966). Another large group comprised inscriptions recording the cure given by Asklepios to the various patients who sought healing in his sanctuary.