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The Discovery of Troy

Schliemann and the Ottomans in the 1870s
Sophia Schliemann wearing pieces of ‘Priam’s Treasure’, ca 1874 ((Heuck Allen, 1999).
In May 1873, Heinrich Schliemann discovered a large cache of spectacular gold and silver jewellery, bronze bowls and cups, copper axes and other valuables at the mound of Hisarlık, on the Asian shore of the Dardanelles in the Ottoman Empire. Schliemann claimed that he had found the remains of Homeric Troy and named the precious finds ‘Priam’s Treasure’ (fig. 1). Schliemann’s report on the discovery of Priam’s Treasure published in the Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg) on 5 August 1873, received acclaim all over the world and impressed scholars as well as the general public. The Homeric world had become tangible for a large interested group. His discoveries triggered the interest in Homer tremendously and made him world-famous as the excavator of Troy.

Schliemann smuggled the majority of the artefacts that he found out of the Ottoman Empire. The illegal export of Priam’s Treasure was the apex. Schliemann’s illegal actions created a feeling of loss on the Ottoman side and had a lasting influence on the Ottoman attitude towards classical heritage. As Lowenthal suggests, heritage is most valued when it seems at risk: ‘threats of loss spur owners to stewardship’.

1. The Question of ‘ubi Troia fuit’

For centuries European countries identified themselves with Troy and traced their founders to the Trojan heroes to provide themselves honourable and glorious ancestors. Also Sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror (1432-1481) identified himself with the Trojans and joined in the tradition of European
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countries tracing their founders to Homeric heroes (fig. 2). However, the true setting of Homer’s *Iliad* was uncertain and had been a major subject of discussion and speculation for ages. Was ancient Troy just a legend or was Homer’s *Iliad* based on history? And if it was a real site, what was the precise location of Troy? Was ancient Troy to be found under a Greek and Roman city at the mound of Hisarlık, like most ancient writers, including Herodotus and Xenophon, believed? Or was Troy situated somewhere between the Scamander and the Thymbrios, as claimed by the local expert Demetrius of Sccepsis (around 180 BC) and subsequently adopted by the Roman geographer Strabo (63 BC – AD 19)? Or was Troy to be found in Alexandria Troas and Sigeum, both situated on the west coast of the Troad, as many scholars thought in the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

Gripped by the landscape of the Troad, the Dardanelles attracted many Western scholars and travellers. From the seventeenth century onwards the first scholarly attempts were made to identify the exact location of the events of the *Iliad*. In the early seventeenth century the English traveller George Sandys identified the rivers Scamander and Simois. The well-educated English traveller Robert Wood, furthermore, did pioneering work in the field of topographical research of the Trojan issue during his visits to the Troad, in 1742 and 1750. In his book *Essay on the original Genius of Homer*, published in 1769, Wood described the possible changes in the topography over the centuries and set the tone for future research. Wood’s work suggested that the location of Troy and the historicity of Trojan War could be identified by field research and laid the foundations for the
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modern topographical research of the Trojan issue.\(^9\)

**The nineteenth century**

The uncertainty about the true location of Homeric Troy continued into the nineteenth century, which was characterized by neo-humanism and the nationalization of humanities. Classical Greece became the basis of national identity in various European countries. This blooming European appropriation of the classics increased the appreciation of Homer and the identification with his heroes. Homer became a significant part of European education in which the study of Greek scholars and literature was promoted. Homeric heroes and heroines such as Hector, Achilles, Priam, Helen, Paris, Agamemnon Odysseus offered a rich potential for identification, which made the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* perfect reading material in the classrooms of European empires and newly founded nation-states during the nineteenth century.

The impact of Homer’s work on nineteenth-century well-educated Europeans was considerable. For prominent liberals, like William Gladstone, reading Homer was a compelling moral lesson and offered a ‘full study of life in every one of its departments’.\(^10\)

Moreover, the developments in the field of archaeology, with a growing implementation of archaeological and geological methods during the nineteenth century, made the issue of the topography of the plain of Troy even more fascinating. The desire to confirm the historical reality of the Trojan War and to prove the existence of Homer’s places and heroes preoccupied the minds.\(^11\)

By the second half of the nineteenth century, two principle sites were associated with Homeric Troy, that is to say Pınarbaşı-Ballı Dağ and Hisarlık (fig. 3). Although a substantial group of scholars remained sceptical to a certain extent about the very existence of the site, the majority of European scholars and travellers were convinced that the Homeric legends were historical and believed

---


the first site. It was Jean-Baptiste Lechevalier (1752-1836), in the service of Marie Gabriel Florent Auguste (Comte) de Choiseul-Gouffier (1752-1817), in his turn French ambassador to the Sublime Port between 1784 and 1792, who situated Homeric Troy at Ballı Dağ near the village of Pınarbaşı in 1785. According to Lechevalier the warm and cold springs at the top of the Pınarbaşı Çay were those described by Homer. The springs were presented as evidence for this hypothesis. The Austrian consul on Syros, Johannes Georg von Hahn, excavated the site in 1864.

The support for the hill near the town of Çanak, known to the Ottoman-Turks as Hisarlık (Place of Fortresses), on the other hand, was marginal. The engineer Franz Kauffer, also employed by Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier in 1787, was the first to map Hisarlık. At the turn of the century, the traveller and antiquary Edward Daniel Clarke identified Hisarlık with the Graeco-Roman city of Ilium Novum, Roman New Ilium, but did not make any connection with Troy. The Scottish journalist Charles Maclaren then identified the mound of Hisarlık as Homeric Troy in 1822. The ultimate reason for the lack of enthusiasm for this location had to do with Strabo’s view that Homeric Troy and Ilium Novum were situated in two different locations. Finally, convinced that Hisarlık was the very place to find Homeric Troy, Frank Calvert (1828-1908), the archaeologist who resided at the Dardanelles and who was a local authority on Trojan topography, carried out exploratory excavations at the mound, which was partly family property, between 1863 and 1865.

Frank Calvert was a member of a leading English expatriate family in the Dardanelles, who actually owned quite a few pieces of property in the region. The family served as consuls for various countries, such as Britain and the United States, in the Eastern Mediterranean area, but particularly in the Dardanelles during the nineteenth century. Passionate about Homer and living in the setting of the Iliad, Frank Calvert soon developed a keen interest in and a
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13 Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 39-41
profound expertise on the topography of the Troad, which European visitors frequently made use of. Calvert excavated several sites such as Hanay Tepe, Ophryneion, Colonae and Pınarbaşı. During his investigations, Calvert combined ancient sources with modern scholarly methods and observations on site, along with his local knowledge. In doing so, Calvert became the pioneer of the archaeological research of the Troad.

In 1863 Calvert broke with the theory for Pınarbaşı and decided to dig trenches on the east side of the hill of Hisarlık. This presumably convinced him that he had actually found the site of Troy. Yet Calvert made no important claims and his view was only barely signalled. Moreover, he lacked the financial resources to excavate the complete mound of Hisarlık and his efforts to interest institutions, such as the British Museum in 1863, to fund the excavations were fruitless.\[14\]

This was the state of affairs by August 1868, when Schliemann first visited the Troad. Having made a fortune as a businessman, the German ex-merchant Heinrich Schliemann aspired to an intellectual status and a scholarly career provided by archaeological research. Settling the question of “ubi Troia fuit” was the perfect opportunity to achieve such fame.\[15\]

2. Heinrich Schliemann in the Troad

Johann Ludwig Heinrich Julius Schliemann was born in 1822 in Neubukow in the grand duchy of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (fig. 4). According to Schliemann’s own accounts of his life, his fascination with Homer and Greece started in his early childhood and the dream of his life was to excavate Troy one day. At the age of fourteen, he became an apprentice in a grocer shop for five years. This

\[14\] Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 56; Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 63, 72-85, 103, 105, 120; See also a recent biography of Frank Calvert: Marcelle Robinson, Schliemann’s Silent Partner, Frank Calvert (1828-1908). Pioneer, Scholar and Survivor (Philadelphia 2006).

was the beginning of his successful career in commerce. He devoted his life, until his mid-forties, to trade in order to have enough money to be able to realize his dream. Subsequently, he studied archaeology in Paris. Using the *Iliad* as his travel guide, he examined the topography of the Troad and started excavations at Hisarlık. And finally, he discovered the legendary city of Troy.\(^{16}\)

However, as his biographer David A. Traill argues, Schliemann’s ‘various accounts of his life diverge on a number of details, making it impossible to state the facts with certainty. More important perhaps than the details themselves is the clear evidence these discrepancies present of a cavalier attitude towards the truth’. According to Traill, misinformation about Schliemann has gained widespread acceptance and this is attributable to Schliemann’s own accounts.\(^{17}\)

Indeed, what we know about Schliemann is for a large part based on his own diary, his numerous letters and his autobiographical forewords to his various archaeological publications. Schliemann’s life story and his archaeological achievements were full of contradictions and subject to debate during his life, and they still are.\(^{18}\)

What we know for sure is that Schliemann did indeed make a fortune as a businessman, whereupon he decided to retire and to travel. Between 1864 and 1866, Schliemann travelled to Tunis, Egypt, Italy, India, Indonesia, China, Japan, America, Cuba and Mexico. After his trip around the world, he settled down in Paris to study, among other things, Greek philosophy and literature, Egyptian philology and archaeology. In the meantime, he attended meetings of learned societies and travelled to Italy and Greece. He watched professional archaeologists at work and carried out experimental excavations in Greece. After his stay in Athens, he set sail to Constantinople and from there to the


\(^{17}\) Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 19, 2.

Dardanelles to explore the landscape and the possible locations.19

Soon after his arrival in the Dardanelles region in August 1868, Schliemann began to examine the plain of the Troad and carried out excavations at Ballı Dağ-Pınarbaşı. His conclusion was that this spot was not significant enough to lay a claim to Homeric Troy.20 During his stay Schliemann met Frank Calvert as well. He saw Calvert’s excavations at Hisarlık and viewed his precious collection of antiquities.

This encounter, in which Calvert shared the results of his research at Hisarlık and his opinion that Homeric Troy was beneath Novum Ilium, is considered to have been crucial for Schliemann’s enthusiasm to start excavations on the hill of Hisarlık.21 Calvert, on the other hand, was pleased by the enthusiasm of this wealthy ex-merchant and saw this as a chance to settle the Homeric question.22 By December 1868, Schliemann was ‘quite decided to dig away the whole of the artificial mount of Hissarlık’23 and was secure of Calvert’s ‘hearty cooperation’. Calvert, indeed, supplied him with the necessary information concerning the topography of Hisarlık and provided him with extensive practical advice about planning an excavation at the site. Moreover, Calvert implied that Schliemann had his consent to examine his part of the hill. As for the rest of the mound, the north-western half, he ensured that he would use his ‘influence with the other proprietor to allow the excavation’. Finally, he wrote to Schliemann that he had ‘no reason to expect any serious difficulty in persuading him [the Turkish landowner]’.24

Schliemann asked Calvert, as an influential inhabitant of the Dardanelles, to arrange a permit for him to excavate at Hisarlık.25 Calvert’s attempts in this direction, however, were not successful. As a matter of fact, getting a permit to

19 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, see in particular chapter 3.
20 Heinrich Schliemann, Ithaque, le Péloponnèse et Troie, 162-168; Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 51-54.
22 Letter Calvert to Schliemann 1st November 1868, in: Meyer, Briefwechsel I (110) 140.
23 Letter Schliemann to Calvert, 26th December 1868: Meyer, Briefwechsel I (112) 141-143.
excavate in this centuries-old crucial Ottoman province would turn out to be a complex venture.26

The Troad: An Ottoman Realm

Ottoman dominion in this region started in the 1350s. With the capture of Gallipoli on the European side, the Ottoman Turks gained control over the Dardanelles strait and this is also regarded as the beginning of the Ottoman Turkish existence in Europe.27 Gallipoli became the main Ottoman naval base from the 1390s onwards and became a place of significant importance particularly during the reign of Mehmed II the Conqueror, who founded a town here (Kale-i Sultaniye) and built strong bastions around 1460 for the defence of the Dardanelles and recently conquered Constantinople. 28 It was in the Dardanelles where the illustrious Ottoman cartographer Piri Reis created his first world map in 1513, worked out his two versions of Kitab-i Bahriye (Book of Navigation) in 1521 and 1526 and finally created his second world map in 1528-29 (fig. 5).29 Gallipoli kept its importance as a naval base until the construction of the Galata maritime arsenal in Constantinople in the first half of the sixteenth century.30

By the second half of the seventeenth century the region caught the interest of Hatice Turhan Sultan, the mother of the young Ottoman Sultan Mehmed IV. This powerful Valide Sultan, or queen mother, had the bastions on both shores of the Dardanelles renovated and modernized. For an advanced defence of the strait she commissioned the construction of two new fortresses, Seddülbahir and Kumkale, at the entrance to the strait between 1658 and 1660.31

In 1680, Kale-i Sultaniye (in popular speech Çanak Kal’esi (Castel of Pottery)),

26 Huuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 118.
27 Fuad Köprüllü, Osmanlı Devleti’nin Kuruluşu (Ankara 1991) 104.
29 Metin Soylu, Piri Reis Haritası’nın Şifresi (İstanbul 2005) 14.
the capital city of the province of the Dardanelles,\textsuperscript{32} was a town of approximately 3000 inhabitants, mainly Turks and Jews.\textsuperscript{33} In the eighteenth century the city flourished and from the early nineteenth century onwards most European countries, but Iran and the United States as well, had representatives in the town. To pass through the Dardanelles strait vessels were obliged to stop at Kale-i Sultaniye to show their documents and to pay taxes. Because of this position, the population of the region had frequent contacts with people from all over the world. Hence, this place, which was very close to the western world, became a chief trading town and a main market for local products. The Greek, Armenian and Jewish residents of this multi-ethnic Ottoman city were active in small businesses, such as tanneries or the manufacturing of rope, soap and jam. The Ottoman-Turks on the other hand were mainly armourers and shipbuilders.\textsuperscript{34} Although the inhabitants of the town could speak Turkish, they lived in their own quarters and they often spoke their own languages among themselves.\textsuperscript{35} According to Babinger in \textit{Brill's First Encyclopaedia of Islam}, in 1887 the bastions on both the European and the Asian side were once more subjected to renovation and the town had some 11,000 inhabitants, eleven larger and several smaller mosques and four churches in 1890.\textsuperscript{36}

Thus, by the nineteenth century, the Ottomans ruled over the mythical landscape of the Troad and lived in the presumed setting of the \textit{Iliad}. The Dardanelles, moreover, was a strongly fortified region and a crucial gateway to Istanbul. Obtaining a permission to excavate in this region was far from easy and, indeed, the Ottomans kept Schliemann waiting a long time. But this would not stop

\textsuperscript{32} Known to the Ottoman-Turks as Cezair-i Bahri Sefid (the Archipelago) until 1876, and later of the Biga Province.
\textsuperscript{33} Franz Babinger, ‘Kale-i Sultaniye’, 691-693.
\textsuperscript{36} Franz Babinger, ‘Kale-i Sultaniye’, 691-693.
Schliemann’s plans.

3. Schliemann’s confrontation with Ottoman Authorities

From April 9th to April 19th 1870, Schliemann conducted excavations on the north-western corner of the hill without a formal permit and without approval from the two Turkish proprietors. Schliemann justified this by saying: ‘Knowing in advance that the two Turkish owners would refuse to give me permission I did not ask them’.  

Although he had already received Calvert’s authorization to carry out excavations on his part of the mound of Hisarlık, Schliemann preferred to control the whole hill. Therefore, he attempted to buy the field from the local proprietors, since owning the property would release him of having to yield possible finds to the landowners. This is why Schliemann asked Calvert, in several letters, to buy the land from the Turkish owners for him as soon and as cheaply as possible. However, the two owners ‘refused to sell the field at any price’ and, as Schliemann explains in *Troy and its Remains* (1875), he was not able to continue his excavations in April 1870 ‘because the proprietors of the field (...) who had their sheepfolds on the site, would only grant me permission to dig further on condition that I would at once pay them 12,000 piasters for damages, and in addition they wished to bind me, after the conclusion of my excavations, to put the field in order again’. These requirements were highly inconvenient for Schliemann.

Schliemann’s unauthorized excavations caused irritation on Ottoman side. According to Calvert’s letter to Schliemann on July 20th, 1870, there was ‘not much chance’ of obtaining a permit since the government was ‘very much
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38 Heuck Allen, *Finding the Walls of Troy*, 128.
opposed’ to it. Obviously, Schliemann had boasted of his ‘arbitrary proceedings and having acted without authorization’ and according to Calvert they ‘must suffer the consequences and get the Firman when the Government are in better humour’.\footnote{Meyer, Briefwechsel I (139) 173.}
Schliemann duly tendered his regrets to the Minister of Public Instruction, Safvet Pasha, on 31\textsuperscript{st} August 1870.\footnote{Meyer, (143) 175-177.}

Schliemann was faced with formidable obstacles concerning the necessary permit to excavate. He reported at this point that the sultan would no longer give permission for excavations, since ‘the Turkish Government are collecting ancient works of art for their recently established Museum in Constantinople’.\footnote{Heinrich Schliemann, \textit{Troy and Its Remains}, 59.}

Indeed, by the time Schliemann conducted his test excavations at Hisarlık in 1870, Ottoman interest in antiquities was already increasing and official archaeology notably expanding. In the nineteenth century, due to the reformations (\textit{Tanzimat} 1839-1876) known as the ‘Ottoman enlightenment’,\footnote{Ilber Ortaylı, \textit{Osmanlı'nın Yeniden Keşfetmek} (Istanbul 2006) 167.}
a new intellectual group had been established, consisting mainly of bureaucrats, with a significant interest in European culture and literature, and a vast appreciation of Graeco-Roman artefacts.\footnote{Ilber Ortaylı, \textit{Imparatorlüğün en Uzun Yüzyılı} (Istanbul 2006) 244-257; Erik J. Zürcher, \textit{Turkey. A Modern History} (London - New York 2004) 66; M. Şükrü Hanıoğlu, \textit{A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire} (Princeton 2008) 94-108.}

These bureaucrats were faced with emerging domestic nationalist movements to separate substantial regions from the Empire, supported by the Great Powers, resulting in enormous territorial losses.\footnote{Donald Quataert, \textit{The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922} (New York 2005) 54-57.}

The ‘Eastern Question’

In the course of the nineteenth century the weakness of the Ottoman Empire and its consequences became a major issue on the international political agenda.\footnote{The so-called ‘Eastern Question’: how to satisfy the various national movements in the Balkan and the imperialist ambitions of the Great Powers, without destroying the Ottoman Empire. And if the Empire did collapse, which was a common idea, how to split it up rightly to avoid disturbance of the European balance of power. See: Zürcher, \textit{Turkey. A Modern History}, 38.}
The European attitude regarding the Ottoman Empire was an ambivalent one. As historian Quataert explains, ‘through their wars and support of the separatist
goals of rebellious Ottoman subjects, European states abetted the very process of fragmentation that they feared and were seeking to avoid. The important role of international politics in the revolts against the Ottoman ruler was unveiled during the Greek war of independence (1821-1830). Due to the admiration for classical Greek culture, Europe sympathized with the Greek rebellion. However, the European sentiment in favour of the Greeks was also related to the long anti-Turkish tradition, the expansion of western European Great Powers and the beginning of the era of modern imperialism in Europe. The support for the Greek rebellion reached a climax with the intervention of the Great Powers, a combined British, French and Russian fleet, in the Battle of Navarino in 1827. The Treaty of London in 1830 acknowledged the sovereignty of Greece. The Greeks set a precedent for other Christian peoples of the Empire and provoked European sympathy for new anti-Ottoman uprisings.

Tanzimat

In order to deal with the complexities of an ‘increasingly unwieldy state with out-dated systems of governance’, the Ottomans took steps to modernize the Empire. The main goal of the Tanzimat was to create a modern, centralized, unitary and constitutional state, but also to control domestic rivals. The centralization of the state during the Tanzimat period caused new relations to emerge between the state and its subjects and created a dominating bureaucracy. Within this framework, western administrative and technological skills became essential and knowledge of the West and the European languages extremely important. Hence, members of the bureaucracy visited European schools to learn Western languages and technical skills and subsequently they passed their knowledge on to other Ottoman students. These dominant bureaucrats were eager to create a new Ottoman identity, with a modern or western look and

48 Quataert, The Ottoman Empire, 56.
49 For a recent study on the history of anti-Turkish sentiments in Europe, see: Božidar Jezernik (ed.), Imagining ‘the Turk’ (Newcastle upon Tyne- Cambridge 2010).
50 Hanioğlu, A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire, 67-70.
The Empire was also aware of the importance of international support for the defence of its interests and of the fact that this could not be managed militarily only. Defence became dependent on diplomacy. In this context, it was not the military but rather the civil elite, in particular the French-speaking diplomats of the civil-official elite, which became influential. Thus, the importance of the diplomatic role increased and with the creation and expansion of a provincial administration, civil officials became the leading elite of the nineteenth century. Three diplomats, in particular, all three to become Grand Vizier, symbolized this era of civil-bureaucratic hegemony, and thus shaping the Tanzimat-period: Mustafa Reşid Pasha (1800-1858), Keçecizade Fuad Pasha (1815-69), and Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha (1815-71). These Grand Viziers were decisive in elaborating the reforms of the Tanzimat. Behind the reforms was no longer the will of the sultan, but that of bureaucrats who prepared decrees for the sultan to sign.

As a result of these developments, the new institutions emerging during the Tanzimat, such as ministries of trade and commerce, health, education and public works, also included a museum.

The Imperial Museum

Hagia Irene, a former Eastern-Orthodox church located in the outer courtyard of Topkapı Palace, had served as a depot for the sultan’s collection of military equipment and as a place where valuables had been kept since 1723. The formal collection of antique objects, however, began approximately in 1846. This collection was initially entitled The Depository of Antiquities, but in 1869 the name was changed to Imperial Museum (Müze-i Hümayun).

The order with reference to the foundation of the Imperial Museum from 1869 highlights the Ottoman discomfort with regard to European acquisitions of antiquities from Ottoman soil: ‘the museums of Europe are decorated with rare

52 Quataert, The Ottoman Empire, 62-64; Zürcher, Turkey. A Modern History, 56-58, 66.
works taken from here’. Together with this transformation and the discomfort with regard to European export of artefacts, efforts to collect antiquities increased. Illustrative of the formal attempts to intensify the acquisition of ancient works of arts are the directives of the Minister of Public Instruction, Mehmed Esad Safvet Pasha (1814-1883), a prominent scholar and politician of the late Tanzimat period (fig. 6). In 1869 and 1870, Safvet Pasha instructed governors of different provinces to collect antiquities and to transfer them to the museum in Istanbul. The latter decree received particular acclaim: the imperial collection increased with artefacts sent by the governors of several provinces, such as Salonica, Crete and Aydınp. The Ottoman newspaper Terakki covered these shipments, which indicates a growing public interest in the efforts to collect antiquities. Finally, the first museum catalogue was published in 1871.

These developments took place during the reign of sultan Abdülaziz (1830-1876), who was the first Ottoman monarch to visit Europe in 1867. During his stay in Vienna he saw the rich collection of antiquities of the Abras Gallery. Sultan Abdülaziz was fond of literature, music and painting. It was during his reign that certain politicians and members of the elite concentrated on fine arts, antiquities and the foundation of the Imperial museum.

Securing the possible setting of the Iliad

Heinrich Schliemann’s experimental excavations at Hisarlık took place in this climate, when the appreciation of classical heritage by the Muslim cultural elite of the nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire had already become apparent. As we have seen, Schliemann’s efforts to buy the field at Hisarlık were not successful. His requests to obtain immediate permission to conduct excavations at Hisarlık were not productive either. At this point Schliemann reports that the director of the Imperial Museum, the French scholar Anton Philip Dethier (1803-1881), and Safvet Pasha caused difficulties: ‘For reasons only known to them and in spite of

54 Rezan Kocabaş, ‘Müzeçilik hareketi ve ilk müze okulunun açılışı’, Belgelerle Türk Tarihi Dergisi, 21, (June 1969) 74-78, 75; See also: Shaw, Possessors and Possessed, 86.
55 Mustafa Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi I, II (İstanbul 1995) 228-232, 233; Shaw, Possessors and Possessed, 79, 84-87.
56 Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi, 245; Shaw, Possessors and Possessed, 83-85.
all their previous foul dealing they want me now to take out a firman in a regular way, which will require at least two months’.

All the more interesting is the fact that during this period, in which Schliemann was trying to obtain an official permit, the Ottoman government acquired the land from the two Turkish owners on behalf of the Imperial Museum. Schliemann indicates that his role was decisive in this transaction and that it was he who requested Safvet Pasha to force the proprietors to sell the land to the government. However, it is more likely to assume that the government realized the transaction in order to control Schliemann’s excavations. Indeed, Schliemann was enraged at the Ottoman transaction, and told Safvet Pasha that he wouldn’t excavate ‘without the security of owning the land’. Schliemann’s letter to Calvert is illustrative on this point: ‘but the field must be my property and as long as this is not the case I will never think of commencing the excavations for if I dig on Government ground I would be exposed to everlasting vexations and trouble’. In his letter to the American ambassador Wayne MacVeagh on 12th March 1871, he declares ‘Joyfully will I give him [Safvet Pasha] any amount of previous metals I may discover and even twice the amount I may discover but never my life would I think of putting the spade to the ground as long as he retains the ownership of the field, which he purchased merely to wrong me and which he afterwards, on my representations, abandoned to me in the presence of several witnesses’. Safvet Pasha, indeed, had mentioned to Wayne MacVeagh that ‘he could not let’ Schliemann ‘have the land’. The official correspondence concerning Schliemann’s request for permission to excavate at Hisarlık is clarifying on this point. In his letter to the Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha, on 19th June 1871, Safvet Pasha states that preliminary research disclosed Schliemann’s attempts to buy the land at Hisarlık. Consequently, the governor of the Dardanelles was instructed to buy the field for

57 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 86.
58 Schliemann, Troy and Its Remains, 58-60.
59 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 84; Schliemann, Troy and Its Remains, 52.
60 Meyer, Briefwechsel I, 12th March 1871 (150) 183-185
61 Meyer, (151) 184-186.
the Imperial Museum (fig. 7).  

In short, the Ottoman government discovered the test excavations at Hisarlık and incorporated the land. The Ottomans wanted to avoid the possibility that Schliemann would own the possible setting of the *Iliad*, and this, in fact, demonstrates a great interest in the search for Troy. However, in the introduction to *Troy and its Remains*, published in 1875, Schliemann says that Safvet Pasha ‘knew nothing about Troy or Homer’ at the time they met in December 1870. In addition he reports: ‘I explained the matter to him briefly, and said that I hoped to find there antiquities of immense value to science. He, however, thought that I should find a great deal of gold, and therefore wished me to give him all the details I could, and then requested me to call again in eight days. When I returned to him, I heard to my horror that he had already compelled the two proprietors to sell him the field for 600 francs, and that I might make excavations there if I wished, but that everything I found must be given up to him. I told him in the plainest language what I thought of his odious and contemptible conduct, and declared that I would have nothing more to do with him, and that I should make no excavations’. On 29th June 1876, however, Schliemann regrets the hostile remarks and begs a ‘thousand pardons’. Irrespective of whether the apology was made to receive a new permit to carry out excavations at Hisarlık or not, he declares in this letter which was printed in *The Times*, ‘I regret it all the more as His Excellency Safvet Pasha has from the beginning till the end been the benefactor of my Trojan discoveries.’

Schliemann’s Ottoman counterparts

The Ottoman representatives whom Schliemann had to deal with, were aware of the importance of an archaeological venture in search of Homeric Troy. Safvet Pasha was a significant *Tanzimat* reformer with a respectable
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63 Ottoman Archives division of the Prime Minister’s Office at Istanbul (IBA): I.HR. 250/14863 (1): 01/Ra/1288 (20/06/1871).
64 Schliemann, *Troy and its Remains*, 52.
65 Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 142-144.
administrative career, during which he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs six times. His speech on 20th February 1870 at the opening ceremony of the Darülfünun-u Osmani (Ottoman House of Multiple Sciences), 66 which had then been reorganized to meet the needs of modern sciences and technologies, clearly shows him to be an enlightened politician. Safvet Pasha regrets that ‘support, respect and protection of people of science received during the first two hundred years of the Ottoman history did not continue another two hundred years’ and states that if a relationship had been built with civilized European nations and if the Ottoman progress had been on equal terms with the speed of progress of these nations, the situation in the Empire would have been quite different. He also highlights the key motive of the Ottoman failure: ‘the disconnection of the Empire with the civilized nations’. In his opinion ‘sciences based on intellect improve by interaction of ideas and through debates among scientists. The civilized nations of Europe reached their stage of progress in this way’. According to Safvet Pasha the Empire had to become a truly civilized European nation and this would only be possible by taking the reforms ‘seriously and sincerely’ and by a ‘total’ adoption of the European civilization, as he puts it in a personal letter in 1879. Only in this way, he believed, would the Empire be able to conquer European interference and superiority; otherwise it would lose its prestige, rights and even its independence. 67

Safvet Pasha, who had been trained in the salons of the leading Beşiktaş Science Society (Beşiktaş Cemiyet-i İlimyesi) in the first half of the nineteenth century, 68 was an important reformer of the educational system of the late Empire and the founder of the Lycée at Galatasaray in 1868, which had been modelled after the French Lycée model. The Galatasaray Lycée provided a modern and western curriculum of secondary education. The students were instructed in French and

66 Darülfünun (House of Multiple Sciences) was founded on 23rd July 1846. Yet the Medrese (School of Theological and Environmental sciences), founded in 1453, is regarded as the predecessor to the Darülfünun, which was renamed Darülfünun-u Osmani (Ottoman House of Multiple Sciences) on 20th February 1870. Darülfünun evolved into Istanbul University in 1912. Source: www.istanbul.edu.tr/tarihce.php (23rd May 2009)

67 Niyazi Berkes, Türkiye de Çağdaşlaşma (İstanbul 1973) 209-211.

various other western and eastern languages. It is rather unconvincing that this important partisan of the Tanzimat, with knowledge of French and a significant appreciation of European civilization was not aware of Homer or at least of the Trojan legends.

This is also true for the then Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha: ‘the last great reforming statesman of the Tanzimat’ (fig. 8). He started his career in the translation bureau of the Empire and built up a respectable career, serving as a diplomat at Vienna and London (1841-1844) and as Minister of Foreign Affairs and Grand Vizier in the period between 1857 until his death in 1871. Hence, it is not surprising that this fervent supporter of the Tanzimat reforms, scholar and linguist, with a reputable career and knowledge of Europe, called Troy ‘the celebrated city of Troy from ancient times’ and emphasized that the discovery of objects during the excavations would be of value to science. He also attached great importance to the preservation and public display of the Trojan city walls, in the case of their eventual discovery.

Permission to Excavate for Troy

The American citizen Heinrich Schliemann presented a written application to the ministry of this humble servant, in which he wishes and requests a permission to carry out excavations at his own expenses in an open field in the district named Hisarlık, a territory located in the surroundings of Kal’e-i Saltaniye, where in his opinion the fortress of the famous dominion called Troy is situated. Mister Brown [American Ambassador] expressed and confirmed that the situation of the aforementioned person is recognized by the Embassy. The aforementioned person’s permit will be on condition that the excavations are at his own expense, and, in case of the appearance of works of ancient arts during the excavations, half will be taken on behalf of the Imperial Museum and half will be left for him. In the case of the discovery of the city walls, their preservation as a whole and their public display are required.


I.B.A: I.HR. 250/14863 (1) and (2): 01, 10, 11 Ra 1288 (20, 29, 30 June 1871).

---

60 Hanioğlu, A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire, 109.
71 IBA: I.HR. 250/14863 (1) and (2): 01, 10, 11 Ra 1288 (20, 29, 30 June 1871).
providing permission to Heinrich Schliemann, a citizen of the American government, to carry out excavations in the empty field in the district named Hisarlık, a territory located in the surroundings of Kal e-i Sultantye. The aforementioned person is of the opinion that the fortress of the most eminent city of Troy from ancient times is situated in this field. With regard to the position of the mentioned city in the written ancient histories, if in the course of his expectations a number of artefacts will discovered, these will be of value to science. (Fig. 9).


Thanks to the mediation of John P. Brown, diplomatic agent for the United States in Istanbul, Schliemann received the permit that allowed him to realize his dream of uncovering Homeric Troy.\(^\text{72}\) According to the Imperial decree of 30\(^{th}\) June 1871 – stipulations partly translated from the Ottoman text and quoted above – Schliemann’s excavations were at his own expense, including the costs of an Ottoman overseer. Furthermore, the decree required an equitable division of the discovered antiquities, half for the Imperial Museum and the other half for Schliemann. Finally, the decree included arrangements concerning the preservation and public display of the city walls. This last clause, obviously, worried Schliemann, since he meant to break down all the many walls not belonging to the heroic age and this could cause new difficulties.\(^\text{73}\)

Having arrived at the Dardanelles on the 27\(^{th}\) September and despite his permit, Schliemann encountered problems caused by Ottoman officials. This time the local governor, Ahmed Pasha, refused permission to dig, as according to him the official permit did not indicate the excavation area accurately enough. The governor required more detailed instructions from the Grand Vizier. Once again thanks to diplomatic support and the change of ministry, Schliemann finally began his first season of excavations on 11\(^{th}\) October 1871. The campaign continued until 24\(^{th}\) November 1871.\(^\text{74}\) The second full season ran from 1\(^{st}\) April to 14\(^{th}\) August 1872 and his final season covered the period between 2\(^{nd}\)


February to 14th June 1873.

On 31 May 1873 Schliemann uncovered a treasure of gold and silver cups and vases and a spectacular collection of gold jewellery: one ornate headband, numerous rings, bracelets, earrings and diadems. Schliemann smuggled the treasure out of the Empire. He called the collection of precious jewelleries ‘the Jewels of Helen’ and had his wife Sophia photographed while posing with it. The treasure included a gold cup with two ears and Schliemann saw a striking resemblance between this cup and the *depas amphikypellon* mentioned in the *Iliad*. According to Schliemann, this was the proof that he had discovered the remains of Homeric Troy. The treasure has since become known as Priam’s Treasure.

4. Ottomans Claiming Trojan Artefacts

_The artefacts which have been seized due to research on the Hisarlık territory and have been smuggled to Athens by the American Schliemann, are still there for the purpose of sale. Since aforementioned person has rejected to hand over the share of the government as required in accordance with the regulation, the director of the [Imperial] museum, Dethier, should be sent out to Athens immediately in order to file a formal lawsuit through the Imperial embassy [in Athens]..._

Ministry of Public Instruction to the Grand Vizier: IBA: MF.MKT. 17/98: 23/M/1291 (12/03/1874), translated from Ottoman.

---

75 See for an overview of the excavations and finds of Schliemann during his excavations between 1871 and 1873 see: Donald F. Easton, _Schliemann’s Excavations at Troia 1870-1873_ (Mainz am Rhein 2002), see also: Gert Jan van Wijngaarden ‘Heinrich Schliemann, Scientist and Romantic?’; in: Kelder, Uslu, Şerifoğlu (eds.), _Troy. City, Homer and Turkey_, 129-133.

76 Priam’s Treasure has been subject to debate since its discovery. The date of the discovery, the way it had been transported out of the Empire, the context of the finds and the content of the treasure are disputed. For a recent treatise on the discovery and the smuggling of the treasure, including Ottoman sources: Rüstem Aslan and Ali Sönmez ‘The discovery and Smuggling of Priam’s Treasure’ in: Kelder, Uslu, Şerifoğlu (eds.), _Troy. City, Homer and Turkey_ (Zwolle 2012) 137-142; Günay Uslu, ‘Schliemann and the Ottoman Turks’ in: Kelder, Uslu, Şerifoğlu (eds.), _Troy. City, Homer and Turkey_ 133-137, 137-142; Günay Uslu, ‘Ottoman Appreciation of Trojan Heritage, 1870-1875’, in _Tijdschrift voor Mediterrane Archeologie_, 41 (2009) 4-10.
By smuggling Priam’s Treasure out of the country Schliemann abused the agreement with the Ottoman authorities. He justified the illegal transportation of artefacts by saying that the Ottoman government had broken the written contract (the permit of 1871) by an additional decree already in 1872. This ministerial decree prohibited Schliemann to export any part of his share of the discovered antique objects. The decree in question - demonstrating Ottoman aspirations to stop the export of antiquities found on their soil – had annoyed Schliemann a lot.\textsuperscript{77}

The Ottoman government held an internal inquiry into the smuggling of the treasure, questioning the method of the ‘robbery’, in particular ‘by whom, from which quay, with whose vessel, how often and on which date’\textsuperscript{78}. Following inquiries into Schliemann’s operations, his helpers and his henchmen resulted in a punitive expedition. Local administrators, who were accused of negligence and a careless attitude towards the illegal handing over, lost their positions. Schliemann, on the other hand, had become extremely unpopular with the Ottoman authorities. In their opinion Schliemann was a liar and a robber (fig. 10).\textsuperscript{79}

The government clearly had no intention of throwing in the towel. The Ottomans claimed their share of Priam’s Treasure and took legal steps to acquire it. The correspondence of the Ministry of Public Instruction addressed to the Bab-ı Ali, the Ottoman Sublime Porte, clearly highlights the key motives of the lawsuit. Since Schliemann was not willing to hand over the Ottoman share of the artefacts in Athens and the objects had been put up for sale, the director of the Imperial Museum had to be sent to Athens to start legal action. In fact, the Ottomans were correct in their perception of Schliemann’s intentions to sell his Trojan artefacts. Schliemann did try to sell the complete Trojan collection, including Priam’s Treasure, to both the British Museum and the Louvre in September and October 1873, respectively.

\textsuperscript{77} Schliemann, \textit{Troy and Its Remains}, 52-55.
\textsuperscript{78} IBA: MF.MKT.17/188: 11/S/1291 (30/03/1874).
\textsuperscript{79} IBA: MF.MKT.18/147: 09/C/1291 (24/07/1874); MF.MKT.18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).
The legal conflict between the Ottoman Empire and Schliemann in the courts of Athens started in April 1874. The Greek court ordered the confiscation of the Trojan collection. However, since Schliemann had transferred the objects to a secret location, the Trojan collection was untraceable.\(^80\) The Ottoman government, furious about this development and concerned about ‘a possible sale of the entire collection or in parts, by Schliemann’, decided to publish a protest letter in prominent newspapers and periodicals within the Empire, as well as in Vienna, Berlin, Paris and London (fig. 11).\(^81\) This course of action in the form of a published protest, in French, against a donation or sale of the Trojan treasuries, demonstrates a determined Ottoman claim on Trojan artefacts (fig. 12).\(^82\)

Conflict is common to heritage; ‘claims of ownership, uniqueness, and priority engender strife over every facet of collective legacies’.

The Ottomans were insulted by Schliemann’s illegal actions, which they considered as robbery by an untrustworthy person.\(^84\) Schliemann, on the other hand, believed that the antiquities sent to the Imperial Museum ‘would be for ever lost to science’ and considered the Ottoman government to be ignorant.\(^85\) Here we have to take the European bias against the Turks into consideration. Hence, Schliemann got strong diplomatic support in abusing his agreement with the Ottoman authorities. In this context, the letter George Henry Boker (1823-1890), US Minister in Istanbul between 1871-1875, addressed to Schliemann on 16\(^{th}\) September 1873 is more than illustrative: ‘It would be worse than throwing away articles which you have discovered to permit any part of them to go into the absurd collection of rubbish which the Turks call their “Museum”… Of course, if you once get your treasures to America, they will be safe from Turkish pursuit … You must understand that all which I have written above is unofficial and personal. If I wrote you as Minister of the U.S., I should be obliged to use very different language, and to advise you to conform yourself to Turkish law [etc]. But in my sympathy with you as a man of science, I cannot be guilty of the hypocrisy of

\(^{80}\) Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 124, 130.

\(^{81}\) IBA: MF.MKT. 18/97 (1): 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).

\(^{82}\) IBA: MF.MKT. 18/97 (2): 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874); 06/06/1874.

\(^{83}\) Lowenthal, *Possessed by the Past*, 234-236.

\(^{84}\) IBA: MF.MKT.18/147: 1291/1874; MF.MKT.18/97: 1291/1874.

giving you such advice, knowing that it would be better for the world of letters that you should re-bury the objects than to turn them over to the Turks’. 86

The possibility that the Turks might be interested in classical civilization as well clearly did not fit into the image of the Turks, or Ottomans as they called themselves. As John Pemble, in his work The Mediterranean Passion: Victorians and Edwardians in the South, states, the west ‘judged and denigrated the Turks from a vantage point of political and moral superiority’. 87 As the famous nineteenth-century Egyptologist Sir John Gardner Wilkinson once asserted, the Turks were considered uncivilized: ‘they are the only instance of a nation that has reached the zenith of its power and fallen again, without ever having become civilized’. 88

Against these conceptions, the Ottomans dueled over the Trojan treasuries for a year. Schliemann described the legal conflict as ‘a most bloody battle’. 89 Finally, the Empire had to give up its Trojan claims and settled for an agreement with Schliemann, containing a financial compensation of 50,000 Francs, which was used to fund the construction of a new building for the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul. 90 Since the Ottoman government had to deal with a financial collapse in 1875, the correspondence of the Ministry of Public Instruction addressed to the Grand Vizier makes clear that the motive for giving up the ‘lengthy and futile legal struggle’ was, in fact, the considerable expenses involved. 91

The Empire’s financial and political problems

As the historian Carter Vaughn Findley implies, the weak link of the Tanzimat was finance. The downward spiral in the economy of the Ottoman government began with the failure of the attempt to centralize revenue collection and disbursement, just when free-trade treaties were being signed with the major

86 Boker to Schliemann, 28th June 1873, quoted in: Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 167-169, 164.
89 Meyer, Briefwechsel I, Schliemann to Newton, 16th May 1874 (243) 265-267.
90 Cezar, Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi, 299.
91 IBA: MF.MKT. 26/153: 26/S/1292 (03/04/1875).
European countries.\textsuperscript{92}
The economic expansion of the principal European states and the free-trade treaties intensified the progress of the incorporation of the Ottoman economy into the capitalist system. As a consequence Ottoman foreign trade expanded. Nonetheless, as the expert on Turkish history Erik Jan Zürcher indicates, an important characteristic of the trade pattern during the period of the Tanzimat was a large Ottoman trade deficit. The reforming governments were faced with considerable financial problems. Hence, after the Crimean War (1853-1856), European economic involvement in the Empire concentrated on loans to the Ottoman government. Due to the excessive costs of the Crimean War, the Empire started borrowing on European markets. These loans, to speak with Zürcher, ‘soon became a millstone around the treasury’s neck’, since the Empire had to pay back double the amount it actually received, plus interest. The payment of the loans became a fundamental problem, ‘debt servicing took up one-third of treasury income by 1870 and this percentage was rising fast.’ Moreover, new loans were largely spent on interest and paying off earlier loans. During the critical economic crisis in the 1870s the Ottomans became painfully aware of the Empire’s economic weakness and its dependence on European loans.

In this period the Ottoman government was faced with serious political problems as well. Increased pressure of taxation, due to the economic crisis between 1873 and 1878, escalated in revolts of the Balkan provinces against the Empire. The Ottoman suppression of these revolts, known as ‘Bulgarian Massacres’, caused an anti-Ottoman attitude in Europe. The discussions on the ‘Eastern Question’ resulted in the ‘Andrassy Note’ of December 30\textsuperscript{th}, 1875, which consisted of proposals for extensive reforms in Bosnia-Herzegovina under foreign supervision. By February 1876 the Empire agreed.\textsuperscript{93} However, this appeared only the beginning of a political crisis that would result in the Treaty of Berlin in 1878.

It was in this climate of political and financial chaos that the Empire gave up its

\textsuperscript{92} Carter Vaughn Findley, \textit{The Turks in World History}, 162.
Trojan claims and settled for an agreement. As Kamil Su, in his work on Ottoman museum history, implies, the Empire was ready to fall and was hesitant to do anything that could displease foreign states.⁹⁴ However, using the financial compensation to fund the construction of the new building for the Archaeological Museum demonstrates a keen interest in a proper institution in which antiquities found on Ottoman soil could be preserved and presented.

**Ottoman Antiquities Legislation**

Schliemann’s request for a permit, his excavations at Hisarlık and the illegal transportation of Priam’s Treasure occurred in a period when the Ottoman discomfort not only with the illegal but also with the legal export of antiquities was growing. The Grand Vizierate ordered the Ministry of Public Instruction to prepare elaborate legislation concerning the examination and authorization of excavation permits on 29th January 1869.⁹⁵ In this context, Safvet Pasha informed the British ambassador Sir Henry George Elliot ‘that by a law recently promulgated the excavation for exportation of antiquities is for the future prohibited throughout Turkish dominions’.⁹⁶ The first antiquities bylaw was published on the 13th of February in 1869 and, indeed, it prohibited the export of antiquities, except coins.⁹⁷ As historian Edhem Eldem underlines, this was the beginning of a modern approach to the organization of ancient objects and archaeological sites in the empire.⁹⁸

By 1874, a second bylaw was published. The law was drawn to protect

---

⁹⁴ Kamil Su, *Osman Hamdi Bey’e kadar Türk Müzesi* (Istanbul 1965) 27; See also Cezar, *Sanatta Batıya Açılış ve Osman Hamdi*, 245.


⁹⁶ Heuck Allen, *Finding the Walls of Troy*, 118, 310.


antiquities from European ‘pilfering’: ‘for some time inside of the [empire] people of various countries have been collecting attractive and rare works the protection of which needs to be kept in mind’. Schliemann’s illegal export of the Trojan discoveries in 1873 was the most current and prominent instance of these acquisitions. The High Council of Education, worried about the continuous foreign acquisitions of antiquities from Ottoman soil, pointed at Schliemann’s illegal transport of the Trojan treasuries: ‘it has already been proved that Schliemann sent all the valuable and precious objects found at Hisarlık, by means of which it is possible to establish and set up several museums, to foreign nations without giving the Empire its share ... all attempts and the lawsuit to acquire the mentioned share have been futile and the claim of the State is lost’. Such robberies, in which the objects were frequently ‘dismantled and removed violently’, had to be avoided. The law was passed in the same year in which the legal conflict between the Ottoman government and Schliemann had arisen. However, the antiquities law of 1874 did not stop the flow of artefacts to Europe and America. The law was too ambiguous to enforce or to bind and too flexible concerning the export of artefacts. The law would be profoundly revised in 1884 and again in 1906 under the supervision of Osman Hamdi Bey, an Ottoman painter and architect and director of the Imperial Museum between 1881 and 1910.

5. Troy: A Protected Zone

After the loss of Priam’s Treasure, the Ottoman government declared the site of Troy to be a protected area, in which excavations were no longer permitted. When the Ottoman army began the construction of military buildings at the hill of Dardanos in 1874, they rapidly received a warning from the Ministry of Public Instruction: the military service had to stay away from Troy. Furthermore,

99 Rehnuma: Müze-i Hümayun (Istanbul 1319/1902), ii, quoting the writ of the Grand Vizier to the Sultan (arz tezkeresi) for the new law, from Topkapı Palace Archives (Maruzat Arşivi) in: Shaw, Possessors and Possessed, 89.
100 Kamil Su, Osman Hamdi Bey’e Kadar Türk Müzesi, 52-55.
the order stated that if any antique objects were found during the construction at Dardanos, a notification to the Ministry should be made, upon which the Ministry would send an official to investigate. To safeguard the protection of the area, the government strictly instructed the local authorities to be watchful regarding secret or public excavations.\textsuperscript{101} As a consequence, when the British antiquary William C. Borlase (1849-1899) went to the Troad to observe Schliemann’s discoveries in 1875, he was not allowed to visit the site without an ‘escort’.\textsuperscript{102}

As to Heinrich Schliemann, he was clearly no longer wanted. Frederick Calvert, the elder brother of Frank Calvert, urged Schliemann to avoid returning to the Empire ‘until the matter will have been arranged or forgotten’.\textsuperscript{103} The US Minister in Istanbul George Henry Boker, who was asked by the Ottoman authorities for an explanation of Schliemann’s actions,\textsuperscript{104} also advised Schliemann not ‘to return to Turkey until the whole affair has blown up’.\textsuperscript{105} Moreover, emphasizing the Ottoman rage over Schliemann’s illegal actions, he told him that the Ottomans were of the opinion that he ‘should be brought here in chains for punishment’.\textsuperscript{106}

Indeed, the Ottoman High Council of Education had decided that ‘from now on there is no need and no possibility for Schliemann to do excavations and research’ on Ottoman territory. He was ‘only allowed to obtain pictures of future findings at the Imperial Museum’. The only thing Schliemann was left with was the right of publication.\textsuperscript{107}

The remaining Trojan artefacts were added to the collection of the Imperial Museum. Plans were made for continuing excavations at Hisarlik in 1875, albeit

\textsuperscript{101} IBA: MF.MKT. 18/94: 19/R/1874 (05/06/1874); IBA:MF.MKT. 18/147: 09/C/1291 (24/07/1874).
\textsuperscript{102} William C. Borlase, A Visit to Dr. Schliemann’s Troy’, \textit{Fraser’s Magazine}, 17, (February 1878) 228-239, 229; Susan Heuck Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 327.
\textsuperscript{103} Frederick Calvert to Schliemann, 23\textsuperscript{rd} July1873, quoted in Heuck Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 169.
\textsuperscript{104} Schliemann to Boker, 16\textsuperscript{th} September 1873, quoted in Heuck Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 175.
\textsuperscript{105} Meyer, \textit{Briefwechsel I}, 29\textsuperscript{th} July 1873 (215) 237.
\textsuperscript{106} Boker to Schliemann, 8\textsuperscript{th} November 1873, quoted in Heuck Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 176.
\textsuperscript{107} IBA: MF.MKT.18/147: 09/Ca/1291 (24/07/1874); MF.MKT.18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).
on behalf of the Imperial Museum. However, these excavations by the Turks did not take place. In the same year – faced with drought and famine in Anatolia which led to widespread misery and agitation and which made and the collection of necessary taxes impossible – the Empire was forced to declare bankruptcy as a result of a major financial collapse. Furthermore, the Balkan Crisis of 1875-1876 required full attention. Therefore, Troy could not become a major point on their agenda, but this did not refrain the authorities from sending officials to Troy in order to see that nothing illegal was happening at the site and to buy antiquities from the local consul, presumably Calvert, in 1876.

**An Inoperable Permit**

All things considered, the chances that Schliemann would receive a permit to recommence excavations at Hisarlik after his illegal deeds and the following clash with the Ottoman government were very small. As Schliemann explains in 1874, on the brink of the legal conflict: ‘An die Fortsetzung der Ausgrabungen in Troia ist somit vorläufig gar nicht zu denken’. However, he was determined to resume the excavations at the Troad. As early as on 29th June 1873, Schliemann asked Boker to help him in coming to an arrangement with the Porte. He suggested that he would excavate at Troy for another three months at his own expense for the exclusive benefit of the Ottoman government, ‘but that on the other hand no claim can be made on me by the Porte for the antiquities I hitherto found’. In this way, he tried to secure his Priam’s Treasure. According to Schliemann, he made ‘such liberal proposals’ because of his ‘ardent wish to continue all my life the excavations on Turkish territory’. Therefore, he requested Boker to assist him ‘to make again friends with the Turks’. But in the meantime, he rejected the request of the Imperial Museum to send them some of the owl-faced vessels that he found.

After the settlement of the court case with the Ottomans, Schliemann tried to

---

108 MF.MKT. 18/147: 1291/1874.
110 Meyer, Briefwechsel I, Schliemann to Brockhaus, 12th April 1874 (242) 265.
111 Meyer, Briefwechsel I, 19th August 1873 (216) 237-239.
112 Meyer, Briefwechsel I, 29th July 1873 (215) 237.
obtain the support of the British government in his application for a new permit to excavate at Troy on behalf of the British Museum. However, no support was forthcoming. He also asked Gladstone to apply personally for a permit, but this request was also rejected.\textsuperscript{113}

Schliemann’s wish to resume excavations was strengthened by the disagreement over his claims to have found Homeric Troy. His Trojan antiquities were disputed and the opinions differed on their date and their implication.\textsuperscript{114} Scholars like François Lenormant (1837-1883), Charles Thomas Newton (1816-1894) and Frank Calvert believed that the artefacts did not belong to Homeric Troy, but rather to a period between 2000 and 1900 B.C. Schliemann was faced with a one-thousand-year gap. He was also faced with important differences between his finds and those from Homeric sites in Greece.\textsuperscript{115} He felt forced to resume excavations at Troy in order to shed light on these matters, but even more to prove himself right: that Homeric Troy was indeed located at Hisarlık.

Schliemann’s negotiations with the Turkish officials started at the beginning of 1876. In his letter of 2\textsuperscript{nd} March 1876 to the Dutch Queen Sophie he explains that he had been at Constantinople for two months ‘for the purpose of getting a new firman, but encountered the very greatest difficulties’. Then Schliemann called in foreign ambassadors at Constantinople to force the Ottomans to grant him permission to excavate at Hisarlık. According to Schliemann he would never have been able to overcome the difficulties ‘had it not been for the universal interest’ his ‘discovery of Troy excited and for the great enthusiasm the foreign ambassadors in Constantinople feel for Homer and his Ilium’. The ambassadors ‘joyfully seconded’ his efforts and ‘by their conjoint pressure on the Turkish government’ he had ‘at last received the firm promise to get a new firman’.\textsuperscript{116}

Actually, to get a permit to resume excavations Schliemann had to be reconciled with Safvet Pasha. The Ottoman minister was not willing to fall in with Schliemann’s request nor was he ready to cooperate with him in another way. In

\textsuperscript{113} Heuck Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 178.

\textsuperscript{114} Meyer, \textit{Briefwechsel I}, Max Muller to Schliemann, 11\textsuperscript{th} February 1874 (233) 252-254.

\textsuperscript{115} Heuck Allen, \textit{Finding the Walls of Troy}, 171-175.

addition to the negative experiences with his previous archaeological activities, Safvet Pasha was also ‘much irritated’ with Schliemann for the bad picture Schliemann had given of him in the preface of his recently published work *Troy and its Remains* (1875). In this text Schliemann accused him of being ignorant and only interested in gold.\(^{117}\) Perhaps this is why Schliemann excavated at Cyzicus, a Graeco-Roman site in the province of Balıkesir, north-west Turkey in April 1876. According to Schliemann he dug at the site in order to do Rafet Bey, Safvet Pasha’s son, a favour.\(^{118}\)

Although the permit was authorized on 24\(^{th}\) February 1876, Schliemann received his *firman* not before 5\(^{th}\) May, after ‘superhuman efforts’ and not before he had ‘suffered in Constantinople during the 4 months’. As he explains to Gladstone on 8\(^{th}\) May 1876: ‘I have been for four months at Constantinople to get a new *firman* for Troy and I have had to battle with almost insurmountable difficulties. Two months it has cost me to persuade Safvet Pasha, the minister of public instruction, to send to the Sublime Porte the project of a new convention with me for Hissarlik (...) At last he sent the project of our convention to the Sublime Porte, but it was rejected by the Council of State’. After this negative response, Schliemann changed his track and convinced the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Reşid Pasha, to persuade the Grand Vizier to reject the decision of the Council of State and to order Safvet Paşa to give Schliemann the *firman*. Considering his international function, Reşid Pasha was clearly more sensitive to the pressure of the foreign ambassadors in Istanbul than Safvet Pasha.\(^{119}\)

Wiser now from bitter experience, the Ottomans were rather distrustful and cautious towards foreign excavations. They had a profound mistrust of Schliemann in particular. As a result of this, the new permit was much more detailed and complicated than the first one.

\(^{118}\) Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 141.
The permit of 1876

Works of immovable property, such as buildings and temples, discovered during the research are not included in the division. Since these kinds of things already belong to the state, aforementioned person [Schliemann] will receive nothing and shall not touch any aspect or part of it. These objects will be left in original form (…) The state has the right to suspend Schliemann’s activities and to cancel his authorization in the case of inconveniency or on account of legal motives, such as the possibility that the aforementioned person [Schliemann] would act contrary to the law and the regulation during the period of excavations (…) And if the state requires to, it has the right to excavate and to research the site by itself or to order others to carry out excavations (…) Monsignor Schliemann has no right to fight this procedure. He is not in the position to take legal steps because of suffering of loss or comparable claims or on account of other reasons (…) An official sent by the state will control the storehouse sheltering ancient works (…) And whatever the discovered works will be, after having been registered and correctly named in the inventory books of both sides, and after having been signed by the two parties, these objects will be placed in the storehouse for protection (…) And the movable objects to be found, which are interpreted as dividable, will be split by an administrator who will be sent separately by [the Ministry of] Public Instruction every month (…) In case of any conflict or dispute between the Empire and the aforementioned person, it will be the courts of the Empire that will do the hearing.

Parts of the permit of 1878. IBA: MF.MKT. 34/30: 28/M/1293 (24/02/1876), translated from Ottoman.

The permit, partly quoted above, paid special attention to works of immovable property, such as temples and other buildings. Schliemann was certainly not allowed to claim these works, since they ‘already belonged to the state’. Works of immovable property to be discovered during the excavations were clearly not to be included in any division. Schliemann was forbidden to ‘touch any aspect or part of it’ and would ‘receive nothing of these works’. The permit demanded that ‘these objects would be left in their original form’. Obviously, the Ottomans were now quite apprehensive of a possible export of the ancient works to be found, but most of all, this condition shows a determined need for the protection
of these artefacts.

As to movable objects, ‘with respect to the fact that the aforementioned place [Hisarlık] is property of the Empire’, the permit required that two thirds of the artefacts would be taken on behalf of the state and one third would be left for Schliemann. As we already know, the first permit of 1871 required an equal division of the discovered antiquities. This time, however, the Ottomans were more demanding in acquiring Trojan artefacts. The state had the right to claim the artefacts which were considered to be necessary for the Imperial Museum. In this case ‘these objects have to be transported to Dersaadet [Istanbul] every six months’. Evidently, the Ottomans intended not to be passive in the selection of the artefacts, but to claim priority rights.

The safety of ancient works of art to be found was a major point. Schliemann was required to construct a storeroom ‘for the protection of ancient works’. This ‘storeroom sheltering ancient works’ had to be ‘controlled by an official sent by the state’. The permit required that ‘whatever the discovered works will be, after having been registered and correctly named in the inventory books of both sides, and after having been signed by the two parties, these objects will be placed in the storeroom for protection’. Besides an additional attention for the safety of the antiquities, there was a strong intensification of the control activities as well. In this context ‘the movable objects to be found, which are interpreted as dividable, will be split by an administrator who will be sent separately by [the Ministry of] Public Instruction every month’. Presumably, suspicious of an overseer who received his salary from Schliemann, the Ottoman authorities desired to secure a correct division and to leave nothing to chance.

Since the Antiquities Law of 1874 had already become effective, the permission was given for a period of two years, in accordance with the eleventh article of this law, after which a new permit was required. It was not possible to continue the excavations without getting a new permit in accordance with the procedure at the end of this period. Moreover, after these two years, Schliemann was required to leave behind the immovable properties, especially the city walls. In addition to this, the permit forbade Schliemann ‘to claim the buildings constructed by him
or the ground on which the buildings were constructed’.

Furthermore, as a sign of caution, the permit included the right of the state to suspend Schliemann’s activities and to recall its authorization in the case of inconvenience or on account of legal motives, such as the possibility that Schliemann would act ‘contrary to the law and the regulations during the period of excavations’. In order to safeguard their authority, the permit included the condition that ‘if the state requires to, it has the right to excavate and to research the site by itself or to order others to carry out excavations’.

Schliemann had ‘no right to fight this procedure’. He was ‘not in the position to take legal steps because of having suffered losses or because of comparable claims or for any other reasons’. Wiser now from their experiences in the courts of Athens, this time the Ottomans wanted to safeguard their position and demanded that ‘in the case of any conflict or dispute between the Empire and the aforementioned person, it will be the courts of the Empire that will do the hearing’.

Schliemann was permitted to map the excavation site at Hisarlık. Still, he was not permitted to cross the borders indicated on the map. The permit was ‘only valid for the territories pointed out on the map’. If planning to excavate uncharted areas, Schliemann was obliged to file a new request. The permit stated that Schliemann would be accompanied by at least 20 persons with a salary of 100 lira during the excavations. The arrangement and the payment would be Schliemann’s responsibility. The state had ‘no responsibilities on this subject’. Nevertheless, the resolution of the Ministry of Public Instruction dated 22nd June 1876, which was a supplement to the already granted permit, demanded that the Ottoman overseer of the excavations had to examine Schliemann’s employees ‘constantly’.120

Clash with the local authorities

Initially Kadri Bey, restoration director and member of the staff of the Archaeological Museum and Ministry of Public Instruction, had been appointed

120 IBA: MF.MKT. 38/61 (1): 30/Ca/1293 (23/06/1876).
to control Schliemann’s activities. However, according to the Ministry of Public Instruction, Kadri Bey’s function was too demanding to allow his departure to the Dardanelles. 121 Without the presence of an official delegate, Schliemann was directly subordinated to Ibrahim Pasha, the Governor of the Dardanelles. In fact, Schliemann met with strong opposition on the side of Ibrahim Pasha. Schliemann or his permit did clearly not impress him.

At first, when Schliemann arrived in the Dardanelles in early May 1876, Ibrahim Pasha ignored Schliemann’s permit and maintained that he had not received an order on this subject from the Grand Vizier. 122 The Ministry of Public Instruction had communicated Schliemann’s permission to carry out excavations at Hisarlık to the Province of Cezair-i Bahr-i Sefid on the 4th May. Yet, this written announcement was quite general and it stated that no overseer had been appointed so far. 123 On 10th May 1876, a second writ was sent to the province. This time the correspondence was more detailed and instructed local authorities to make sure the stipulations of the permit were strictly observed. 124 Despite the notices of the government addressed to the province by which Schliemann’s permit were made public, Ibrahim Pasha still forbade Schliemann to enter the site and hindered him in the construction of barracks and huts at Hisarlık.125 Moreover, he gave Schliemann an overseer, Izzet Efendi, who was even more uncooperative. Izzet Efendi had been ordered to inspect Schliemann’s ‘strict compliance with the stipulations of the permit’. According to the resolution of the Ministry of Public Instruction of 22nd June 1876, Izzet Efendi had ‘the qualities’ and was ‘also according to the local authorities capable to perform this job’.

Besides inspecting the excavations, Izzet Efendi was instructed to keep the key of the antiquities storeroom in his possession. Furthermore, he was expected to

121 IBA: MF.MKT. 36/137: 29/R/1293 (24/05/1876); IBA:MF.MKT. 38/61-1: 30/Ca/1293 (23/06/1876).
122 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Déthier, 21st May 1876, (15) 45.
123 IBA:MF.MKT. 36/23: 10/R/1293 (04/05/1876)
124 IBA:MF.MKT 36/42: 16/R/1293 (10/05/1876).
125 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 142.
examine Schliemann’s employees and in the case of any suspicion, he was authorized to dismiss workers. Particularly, Nicolaos Zaphyros Giannakes, who had served Schliemann in his first campaign of excavations and played a significant role in the smuggling of Priam’s Treasure, was not welcome. Because of ‘his former misdeeds’, Nicolaos was ‘regarded as suspicious to the state’. As a result of this his elimination was required. Izzet Efendi forbade Schliemann to make drawings of any of the objects to be discovered and, what is more, he ordered Schliemann ‘to dismiss his own faithful servants and inspectors’. He demanded to select Schliemann’s workers and he also demanded that they were Turks.

According to Schliemann, Ibrahim Pasha gave him Izzet Efendi as a delegate to drive him to despair. In Schliemann’s words, Izzet Efendi’s sole occupation was to throw ‘obstacles’ in his way and to ‘vex’ him. Although Schliemann paid Izzet Efendi’s salary, this was certainly no reason for him to make things easier for Schliemann. In fact, Izzet Efendi took his job quite seriously and made Schliemann’s venture a misery.

By 29th of June 1876, probably hoping to please Safvet Pasha and to arrange a more flexible arrangement, Schliemann offered his apologies for his hostile remarks and described Safvet Paşa as the benefactor of his Trojan discoveries in a letter printed in The Times.

Even so, the local authorities at the Troad were not much of a support to Schliemann. On the contrary, they clearly opposed him and gave him a hard time. Because of their thwarts the venture became completely impracticable in the end. In this context, Schliemann explains that he is: ‘bei Ibrahim Pasha, dem Gegenwärtigen Gouverneur der Dardanellen, auf unüberwindliche Schwierigkeiten gestoßen’. In his opinion, Ibrahim Pasha was very frustrated with the fact that Schliemann had received a permit from the government, as a result of which he was no longer able to grant permission to people who wanted to visit the site of Troy. ‘Da nun bei Wiederfortsetzung der Ausgrabungen diese

126 IBA: MF.MKT. 38/61 (1): 30/Ca/1293 (23/06/1876).
127 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, (18) 47, 30th June 1876.
128 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 142-144.
fermane von selbst wegfallen müssen, so legt mir der Mann die furchtbarsten Hindernisse in den Weg um die Sache zu hintertreiben. Zwei Monate habe ich vergeblich gegen ihn angekämpft und bin vorgestern hieher zurückgekehrt [Athens], mit dem festen Entschluß nicht wieder nach Troia zu gehen ehe er nicht seine Stelle verloren hat’. Schliemann, irritated by Ibrahim Pasha’s ‘obstacles’, left the Dardanelles early in July 1876. He had stayed for two months in the Dardanelles without having carried out any excavations.

Obviously, he had not a high opinion of Ibrahim Pasha. He was hoping and expecting that the latter’s departure would occur soon, since ‘er in Constantinopel als eine große nullite bekant (…) ist’. According to Schliemann, Ibrahim Pasha’s position as governor was only a ‘farce’. However, Ibrahim Pasha was clearly not that insignificant to Istanbul. After his arrival in Athens, Schliemann was strongly advised by Safvet Pasha to get on good terms with Ibrahim Pasha. Following this recommendation, Schliemann left for the Dardanelles ‘in great haste’. But once he had arrived there, Schliemann explains that he found ‘Ibrahim Pascha hocherregt und entschlossen, die Sache auf jede Weise zu zerschlagen. Er vergaß sich selbst und demütigte mich mit allen Mitteln so sehr, daß er in Anwesenheit sämtlicher Angehöriger des Gouvernements mich wie einen Hund behandelte’. Still, Schliemann was persistent. He asked Gladstone to help him to put pressure on the Ottomans. Schliemann’s letter of 28th December 1876 addressed to Gladstone extends his gratitude to him, since thanks to Gladstone’s ‘powerful recommandation to Sir Henry Elliot, which has had the desired effect, the Grand Vezier having [has] given to the Governor General at the Dardanelles the strictest orders, not only not to throw obstacles into my way, but to render me every assistance and to give me every possible facility’. But by the end of 1876, according to Schliemann, the region was too unsafe to carry out excavations at the Troad.

129 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, (21) 50, 9th July 1876.
130 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, (22) 51-53, 12th July 1876.
131 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, (33) 66, 20th December 1876.
In the end, Schliemann’s permit of 1876 was not operable. However hard he tried and despite his extensive lobbying, it seems that he did not succeed in overcoming the clash with the Ottoman-Turkish authorities and so he failed to resume his excavations at Hisarlık in 1876. In addition to this, the unsafety of the region and the mounting disorder in the Ottoman capital between May (the deposition of Sultan Abdülaziz) and August 1876 (the succession of Sultan Abdülhamid II) had to be taken into consideration as well.\footnote{Further reading: Hanioğlu, \textit{A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire}, 109-124; IBA:MF.MKT. 45/24: 01/Za/1293 (18/11/1876); IBA:MF.MKT. 43/81: 10/N/1293 (29/09/1876).}

Schliemann centred his attention on other promising sites, such as Mycenea. The Ottomans kept a keen eye on possible activities on Troy, however. The telegrams of the Ministry of Public Instruction to the Province of Cezair-i Bahr-i Sefid on 29\textsuperscript{th} September 1876 and 18\textsuperscript{th} November 1876 are illustrative on this point: the Ministry required information about possible archaeological activities at Hisarlık, as ‘there is a rumour that Schliemann started excavations’ (…) ‘if this is correct, since when and is there an official overseer present’.\footnote{IBA:MF.MKT. 57/150: 06/S/1295 (09/02/1878); IBA:MF.MKT. 57/158: 23/S/1295} Despite the fact that Schliemann was focussing on Mycenae and his extensive archaeological activities there, the authorities were obviously aware of Schliemann’s continuing intentions to carry out excavations at Troy.

Even during the Russo-Turkish War (April 1877 – March 1878) the Ottomans kept their eye on Troy. The fact that the Russians were at the ports of Istanbul did not stop the Ministry of Public Instruction from informing the Province of the Dardanelles, on 7\textsuperscript{th} February 1878, that Schliemann had not received a new permit to excavate at Hisarlık, but was planning to utilize his permit of 1876. Since Schliemann was preparing a visit to the Troad to observe the location and to analyse to what extent the region was unsafe because of the Russo-Turkish War, the telegram addressed to the Province also included a request to inform the Ministry about the safety conditions of the area.\footnote{IBA:MF.MKT. 57/149: 04/S/1295 (07/02/1878).}

However, the authorities decided almost immediately that Schliemann’s permit had expired and that the Dardanelles was an unsafe region.\footnote{IBA:MF.MKT. 57/150: 06/S/1295 (09/02/1878); IBA:MF.MKT. 57/158: 23/S/1295}
6. Excavating in the Shadow of War

The late 1870s were in many ways catastrophic for the Ottomans. Besides the financial crisis and the provincial uprising in the Balkans, Russia declared war on the Empire on 24th April 1877. The Russo-Turkish War was disastrous for the Ottomans. On 3 March 1878 the Ottomans signed a peace treaty at San Stefano (now Yeşilköy), a place only a few kilometres from Istanbul, already invaded by the Russians at the end of the War. The treaty resulted in the creation of a large autonomous Bulgarian state under Russian occupation, after nearly five centuries of Ottoman control (1396-1878). The treaty recognized territorial gains and independency for Montenegro and Serbia. Romania, too, became independent and Russia annexed the Asian provinces Kars, Ardahan, Batum and Doğubeyazit. Austria-Hungary, Britain and the German Empire, however, feared a Russian domination of the Balkans and Asia Minor. The common fear of a destabilization of the European balance of power as a result of Ottoman collapse led to the Congress of Berlin from 13th June until 13th July 1878, one of the last great conferences organized to settle a major international problem in the period before the Great War.

The Treaty of Berlin in 1878 was a revision the Treaty of San Stefano. The principalities of Romania, Serbia and Montenegro remained independent, but Serbia and Montenegro had to be content with reduced territorial gains. Bulgaria remained autonomous but gained a smaller territory than recognized by the Treaty of San Stefano. Russia’s Anatolian acquisitions remained virtually unaffected. Another result of the Treaty was the Austria-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Britain’s control over Cyprus, although the regions officially remained part of the Ottoman territory.136

Although the attempt was to resolve the Eastern Question and to avoid the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, since that could trigger a serious European conflict, the Berlin Congress ended up repeating the mistakes of the past: the

creation of autonomous regions. The Empire was faced with the vast decrease of its European territory and with the expanded power and intervention of Europe, parcelling out Ottoman territories.\(^{137}\) Meanwhile, in fact a couple of weeks after the Berlin Congress, Schliemann restarted negotiations in Istanbul for the extension of his permit. This time the British Ambassador at Istanbul, Sir Austen Layard (1817-1894) supported him.\(^{138}\) And indeed, the Ottoman government was incapable in resisting diplomatic pressure and as Schliemann explains, he obtained the firman in the summer of 1878 ‘by the good offices of my honoured friend Sir A. H. Layard’.\(^{139}\)

The new permit was a continuation of the earlier permit that had been supplied for two years. Schliemann, consequently, was not allowed to claim works of immovable property, such as temples and other buildings. He was required to leave these objects behind in their original state. As to the movable objects, he was compelled to hand over two thirds of the finds to the Imperial Museum in Istanbul. Moreover, the artefacts to be found, after registration in inventory books, had to be shelved in a special storeroom, of which the key was to be kept by the Ottoman overseer. Since the region was still unsafe, Schliemann hired ten gendarmes for his protection. And finally, Schliemann was responsible for all the expenses of the excavations.\(^{140}\)

**Excavations in 1878**

The excavations started on 30\(^{th}\) September 1878 and continued until 26\(^{th}\) November 1878.\(^{141}\) His overseer was Kadri Bey, the aforementioned official of the Ministry of Public Instruction.\(^{142}\) He was appointed to control Schliemann’s

\(^{137}\) Territorial losses continued, with the Great War as the culminating point. To illustrate this: before 1850 the majority of the Ottoman subjects lived in the Balkans, but at the beginning of the twentieth century only 20 percent of the Empire consisted of European provinces. Source: Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire*., 54-57, 59; See also: Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire*, 110-124, 205-207.

\(^{138}\) Heuck Allen, *Finding the Walls of Troy*, 188.


\(^{140}\) Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 183, see for the conditions of the permit: IBA:MF:MKT. 34/30: 28/M/1293 (24/02/1876) and IBA:MF:MKT. 38/61: 30/Ca/1293 (22/06/1876); see for the continuation of the permit: IBA:MF:MKT. 57/158: 23/S/1295 (26/02/1878).


\(^{142}\) No biographical information on Kadri Bey has been found so far. Even so, in Peter Ackroyd’s adventorous novel *The Fall of Troy*, Kadri Bey plays a crucial role as the exciting site manager.
activities and to maintain ‘the perfect protection of the artefacts to be found’. The province was instructed to support this representative in ‘a correct way and to give him the necessary assistance’. The first account of Kadri Bey concerning the archaeological activities at Hisarlık dates from 7th October 1878. Actually, it is a report of the excavation progress. According to this account Schliemann did, indeed, hand over the key of the storeroom to Kadri Bey, but he was too occupied to sign the inventory books. Since the permit demanded registration of the artefacts with the signatures of both sides, Kadri Bey made inquiries as to how to manage this problem.

The Ministry of Public Instruction answered him very clearly: in accordance with the 29th article of the Antiquities Law, the registration of the discovered artefacts, including the signatures of both parties, the finding date and a description of the objects, in two inventory books was strictly required. No exception to this rule was possible. The Ministry ordered Schliemann to assign someone else, with the approval of both the American Consulate and the local authorities, to represent him in signing the inventory books. Furthermore, the directive ordered Kadri Bey to exchange the lock of the storeroom with a new lock, which only could be opened with two keys. One of these keys had to be kept by Kadri Bey, the other key was for Schliemann or his approved representative.

Indeed, Ottoman authorities were extremely watchful regarding Schliemann’s activities. The Minister of Public Instruction whom Schliemann had to deal with during his excavations in 1878 was the prominent statesman and the leading figure of the nineteenth-century Turkish-Ottoman Enlightenment Movement Mehmet Tahir Münif Pasha (1828-1910) (fig. 13). Münif Pasha did not hesitate to reply sharply to Schliemann’s requests when necessary: ‘Vos

143 IBA:MF.MFK.58/44: 6/L/1295 (04/10/1878).
144 IBA:MF.MKT.: 58/52: 24/Za/1295 (22/10/1878).
reproches sont sans fondement et indignes’. His letters to Schliemann demonstrate all the more clearly an administrator who politely yet resolutely responds to Schliemann’s requests to circumvent certain rules or to expand excavation sites at the Dardanelles. When Schliemann asked for dispensation regarding the registration of the discovered artefacts, for instance, Münif Pasha refused very politely: ‘Quant à votre proposition de vous dispenser de dresser et de signer les registres de antiquités mises au jour, je regrette de ne pouvoir vous satisfaire, les prescriptions de la Loi étant formulées la dessus.’ He advises subsequently, most clearly, that in this respect Schliemann had the possibility to appoint, in joint agreement with the local authorities in the Dardanelles and the American Embassy, a formal representative who could sign the registers instead of him.

Not only Schliemann, also his overseer Kadri Bey was under strict supervision. When Kadri Bey neglected his duty of providing the government with information concerning the progress in Troy, he received a serious caution within a couple of weeks. The correspondence of the Ministry of Public Instruction of 31st October 1878 demonstrates a close watch on the fulfilment of the conditions of the permit and in particular, a scrupulous attention to the protection of the Trojan artefacts. In this context, Kadri Bey was called to account when he neglected his duties. In fact, the authorities were quite enraged, because they had ‘received nothing else than just one piece of a writ’ ever since he had left for Hisarlik. Moreover, the Ministry immediately insisted on a detailed report of ‘the undertaken activities, the amount of the discovered antique works and their conditions, whether they are under lock or not’.

The government, moreover, clearly attached value to a meticulous inventory of the Trojan antiquities. The same directive instructs Kadri Bey to state expressly in the inventory books the different strata in which the artefacts had been found, and the authorities were also of the opinion that it was ‘necessary to mark the objects with the very same number with chalk or paint’.

146 Münif Pasha to Schliemann, 17th November 1878 (B 78/62).
147 Münif Pasha to Schliemann 21st October 1878 (B 78/574).
148 IBA:MF.MKT.: 58/59; 04/Za/1295 (30/10/1878).
Apparently, Schliemann communicated to the director of the Imperial Museum that the division of the artefacts would occur approximately at the beginning of December 1878. This was another reason for the authorities to reprimand Kadri Bey on his delayed report and to alert him to his duties, in particular the inspection, making an inventory and the protection of the Trojan antiquities. According to the Ministry, Kadri Bey was obliged to interpret to what extent the discovered antiquities could be included in any division, since the permit stated that not all discoveries were dividable. This was in any case true for the discovered buildings, such as temples; Schliemann had no right to claims these artefacts. Kadri Bey was, once again, reminded of his obligations and in particular of his responsibility to inspect and to report the discoveries.149

Indeed, Kadri Bey’s activities were closely watched. The telegram addressed to him on 31st October is illustrative on this point: ‘you are ordered to report the nature of your services, how many artefacts have been found, and what happened to them’. Additionally, when the authorities in Istanbul learnt that Kadri Bey took his cousin with him to the Troad to assist him during the excavations, he soon received a warning that this was definitely not appreciated. It was pointed out to Kadri Bey that this very cousin had acquired a bad reputation during his former work at the Imperial Museum.150 Kadri Bey was ordered to avoid this kind of complication. The warning demonstrates that the authorities were extremely cautious and suspicious and, clearly, they felt hesitant about the presence of a person with a shady reputation at the site.151

Not only the authorities were distrustful towards Schliemann, public opinion was critical as well. Schliemann appeared in Otoman cartoons as a greedy opportunist (fig. 14).152 Schliemann’s request for a new permit was also an issue in Ottoman newspapers. On 6th August 1878 the newspaper Tercüman-ı Şark says: ‘Hopefully this time Baron Schliemann will not smuggle the antique

149 IBA:MF.MKT. 58/59.
150 So far no record that may provide additional information on this subject has been found.
151 IBA:MF.MKT. 58/58: 04/Za/1295 (30/10/1878).
152 Hayal, 31 Ağustos 1290 (12 september 1874).
objects to Athens, so that our museum can also take advantage of it’.153

Schliemann’s 1878 excavations at Hisarlık resulted in four valuable treasures, which consisted of golden earrings, bracelets, pins and many small beads, often identical to earlier discoveries. Most of the season’s finds were made in the last two weeks of excavation; three of the four treasures were found on 11th November. The find of seashells at prehistoric occupation levels was another substantial discovery.154

The division of the artefacts found in the season of 1878 did not proceed smoothly. In fact Schliemann, once again, clashed with the Ottoman authorities. The government demanded that the division would take place at Istanbul and under supervision of an official other a Kadri Bey. However, Schliemann insisted that Kadri Bey represent the government during the division, since he considered him very ‘civilized’ and ‘reasonable’. Schliemann also insisted that Hisarlık was the place at which the artefacts should be divided. In the end, it was Schliemann who got his way. The Ottomans yielded to the pressure of the British Ambassador, Sir Austen Layard, and Hisarlık became the location of the division.155

As to the supervision, the Ottomans kept to their policy. Although Kadri Bey continued to be the supervisor of the division, he was only allowed to carry out his work in strict cooperation with the Province of the Dardanelles.

As a reaction to Kadri Bey’s report in which he informed the authorities that Schlieman was planning to complete the excavation season of 1878, the Ministry sent out a telegram to Kadri Bey on 9th November 1878, in which he was ordered to supervise the division, but only in the presence of two officials in the service of the Province.156

The Province, on the other hand, was separately requested to control the division.157

Evidently, the idea of letting the division take place with only Kadri Bey -whose salary was paid by Schliemann- representing the government, did not really sit well with the authorities. Obviously, there was a

153 Tercüman-ı Şark, 111, 19/S/1878 (06/08/1878), published in Mustafa Cezar, Sanatta batıya açılış ve Osman Hamdi (Istanbul 1995) 299.
155 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 185; For Sir Austen Layard in the Ottoman Empire see: Kurat, Yuluğ Tekin; Henry Layard’in İstanbul Elçiliği, 1877-1880 (Ankara 1968).
lack of trust in a good result.

The telegram of 9th November also contained principal directives concerning the division of the Trojan artefacts, which Kadri had to comply with. He was obliged to make a list of the artefacts with a description of the ‘kind and shape of all objects’ and a specification of the artefacts to be left to Schliemann. The list had to be made out in triplicate and had to be signed and sealed by Kadri Bey, the two officials and eventually by Schliemann. Then the lists had to be confirmed by the local authorities. Subsequently, Kadri Bey had to send one copy of the list with the Ottoman share of the Trojan artefacts to Istanbul.

As to Schliemann’s share of the Trojan objects, these artefacts, accompanied with a copy of the list, had to be forwarded to the customs house of Kal’a-i Sultaniye. The directive firmly ordered that Schliemann’s share could only ‘pass the customs after regular customs handling’. It stated, moreover, ‘to write to all the persons to whom it may concern to be watchful that nothing else passes the customs than the objects declared on the list’.

Finally, the directive is quite clear concerning possible finds after the registration on the lists: ‘it is not allowed to exclude these objects, whatever they are, from the division’. The Ministry sent an additional warning to the customs house of Kal’a-i Sultaniye to keep a sharp eye on the objects that Schliemann desired to pass through the customs. The writ says to control the objects with the lists and ‘in the case of export of any object that is not on the list, the customs officers who allowed this would bear the responsibility’. Furthermore, the customs house was ordered to pay the same attention to the objects that would be sent to Istanbul.

And indeed, the Imperial Museum finally got its much-desired share of the antiquities by the end of November 1878. Twelve boxes in total, filled with Trojan artefacts, arrived safely in Istanbul and were included in the collection of the Museum. The collection in Istanbul already consisted of the remaining Trojan artefacts of Schliemann’s first excavation season and of golden artefacts

---


Schliemann had been collecting broken sherds ever since the excavations in Mycenae in 1876. In order to include broken Trojan pottery in this collection, Schliemann requested Münif Pasha to give him fragments of Trojan pottery soon after the abovementioned official division. However, Münif Pasha refused to give Schliemann the pottery, which was already included in the collection of the Imperial Museum. He treated Schliemann’s request to obtain the pottery with care and diplomacy. Although the Museum was closely linked to the Ministry of Public Instruction, he maintained his distance and refused by saying: ‘Quant à votre proposition de vous céder les fragments de la poterie troyenne (…), ne pouvant disposer des objets appartenant au Musée, je regrette de ne pouvoir vous les accorder’.\footnote{Münif Pasha to Schliemann, 21st January 1879 (B 79/52).}

Excavations in 1879
Schliemann was planning to resume his excavations on 1\textsuperscript{st} March 1879.\footnote{Herrmann & Maäß, Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow 1976-1890, (4) 85-87.} To give the excavations more credibility, Schliemann invited well-known scholars to participate in the excavations at Hisarlik. He had become more and more integrated in the intellectual world and his scholarly status increased. By September 1877, thanks to Rudolf Virchow (1821-1902), a pathologist from the University of Berlin and founder of the German Society of Anthropology, Ethnography and Prehistory, Schliemann was appointed an honorary member of the Society. Due to this, Schliemann entered the German intellectual world. Besides, Virchow became an important friend in the long term and would join the excavations in 1879.

Schliemann could use intellectual backing in order to give himself a place and status in the world of scientific archaeology. To involve scholars of international
standing would merely stimulate this process. He offered them a good salary, travelling expenses, food and lodging. Consequently, during the excavations in the spring of 1879, Schliemann was accompanied by experts such as Virchow and Emile Burnouf (1821-1907), the latter the leading orientalist of the nineteenth century. Burnouf did research on the arrangement of the ancient houses and prepared the maps and the plans of the site. He also worked at his astronomical and geodetic studies. Virchow studied the geology of the Troad ‘particularly [on] the development of the Trojan plain, [on] the river-courses, springs, people, animals and plants’. Besides his researches, Virchow, obviously, also worked as a medical doctor and treated sick inhabitants of the Troad. Although Schliemann had also invited the assyriologists François Lenormant (1837-1883) and Archibald Henry Sayce (1846-1933) to join him at Hisarlık, these experts did not accept the invitation.

Kadri Bey continued to be the supervisor of Schliemann’s archaeological activities at Hisarlık. The Ministry of Public Instruction informed the local authorities of the Dardanelles of Schliemann’s imminent arrival in order to resume excavations at Hisarlık, on 25th February 1879. In addition, the province was requested to assist and support Kadri Bey with his work on location.

By April 1879, Schliemann wanted to excavate tombs in the vicinity of Hisarlık, which was outside his permit space. Although he had to stand up against the pressure of diplomats, urged by Schliemann, Münif Pasha took a firm line and maintained that Schliemann had to comply with the conditions defined in the antiquities law. Given the fact that the tombs were situated on private lands, Schliemann was required to obtain permission from the proprietors. Münif Pasha strove to proceed correctly in this matter and determinedly refused to circumvent
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165 Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 186.
168 IBA:MF.MKT. 60/43: 4/Ra/1296 (26/02/1879).
169 Schliemann asked the British diplomat Edward Malet (1837-1908), who maintained close ties with Sultan Abdülhamid II, to help him to get permission to excavate tombs at Hisarlık. Correspondence between Malet and Schliemann reveals considerable efforts undertaken by Malet to persuade Münif Pasha. See letters from Malet to Schliemann: 3rd April 1879 (B 78/250; 78150) and 6th April 1879 (B 78/2592; 78150).
As Schliemann explains to Gladstone, his 1879 excavations ‘produced less gold-jewels (I found only two treasures)’, but on the other hand, they resulted in ‘discoveries of the greatest possible importance’. He emphasizes, furthermore, the role of the experts: ‘… [discoveries] which I could not have made without the assistance of the famous professor Rudolf Virchow of Berlin and Emile Burnouf of Paris…’ Just like he did with his findings of 1878, Schliemann attributed the treasures of 1879 to the Homeric stratum (Troy II). In doing this, Schliemann believed that he had confirmed the identification of Priam’s Troy with the second stratum.

Indeed, the main focus of the 1879 excavations was on this stratum; Schliemann uncovered a significant section, including a major part of the fortification wall. At the end of this season, Schliemann believed his mission was accomplished and that he would ‘stop for ever excavating Troy’.

On 21st May 1879 the Ottoman authorities ordered the supervisor to send the discovered artefacts to Istanbul. In particular ‘precious pottery’ from Hisarlık was desired by the Museum. Schliemann, however, wanted to include the broken Trojan pottery in his collection and asked the support of Layard. He was convinced that if the potsherds went to the Archaeological Museum, they would be ‘forever lost to science’. Schliemann still had no positive picture of the Archaeological Museum. In his opinion, he explains to Layard, ‘The Turkish Museum is anything but public and… the Trojan jewels are of no value to science as long as they remain in the hands of the Turks’.

The Ottomans, again, yielded to the pressure of the British Ambassador and the Ministry decided that that the remains of the pottery had to be left at the site.
This also applied to the millstones. If Schliemann was interested in these stones, he was allowed to include them in his collection.\textsuperscript{177}

**New excavations for Troy in store**

Although Schliemann had the idea that his work at Hisarlık was completed, new doubts arose. Virchow began to express uncertainties concerning the geological formation of the Troad. In this context, he gave a contradictory verdict on Schliemann’s view, by uttering that ‘this plain is an old fiord, which has been filled by river-deposit’. In his opinion, a branch of the sea had covered the plain in prehistoric times.\textsuperscript{178} Schliemann began to reflect on carrying out new excavations.

At the same time Calvert was digging at Hanay Tepe, a mound about a few miles south of Hisarlık. Schliemann funded the excavations, in exchange for half of the finds. The findings contained neither gold objects nor any artefacts of artistic value, but included a number of skeletons. Schliemann was planning to ship his share to the Berlin Museum and convinced Calvert to do the same. Schliemann had decided to donate his entire Trojan collection to Germany.\textsuperscript{179} On 17\textsuperscript{th} July 1879, the Ministry of Public Instruction ordered the customs house at the Dardanelles to clear the eight boxes filled with artefacts that Schliemann was ‘intending to send to the German museum’.\textsuperscript{180}

However, the shipment to Berlin took a lot of struggle. Presumably prompted by his fear of having to share the discoveries with the Ottomans, Schliemann interrupted Calvert’s careful packing of the skulls and ordered them to be shipped immediately in July 1879. But because of a conflict between Schliemann and the German consul, the shipment could not take place until the autumn. As a result, some skulls were broken.\textsuperscript{181} Calvert’s share of the Hanay Tepe artefacts was shipped to Germany late in 1879.\textsuperscript{182}

\textsuperscript{177} IBA: MF.MKT. 62/139: 29/30/Ca/1296 (22/05/1879).
\textsuperscript{180} IBA: IMF.MKT. 69/116: 27/B/1296 (17/07/1879).
\textsuperscript{181} Heuck Allen, *Finding the Walls of Troy*, 202, 341.
\textsuperscript{182} Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 337.
Meanwhile, Calvert was continuing his excavations at Hanay Tepe, still sponsored by Schliemann. Although he received a warning from the governor, because he had ‘new orders from Cple [Constantinople] to stop the works at Hanai Tepe’, Calvert continued his excavations until mid-March 1880. Schliemann, on the other hand, spent his time working on his new book *Ilios*, published on 10th November 1880 in German, British and American editions. In fact, after the publication, Schliemann became increasingly doubtful concerning the size of the settlement that he connected with Homer’s Troy. Consequently, Schliemann and Calvert planned an extensive archaeological survey at various sites throughout the Troad. Calvert would carry out the excavations, funded by Schliemann. The excavations had to be clandestine, since Schliemann’s permit had expired.

As Calvert explains to Schliemann on 10th November 1880, ‘pioneer work should be undertaken now with not more than six men in the necropolis of ancient towns -this I can do without attracting attention-this method will save you much time- by the results the most likely localities can be selected as no share will be given to the govt., I propose the proceeds should be shared by us equally. I give my time and knowledge, you the funds’. Actually, to obtain a permit for such a large-scale survey was certainly not easy. All the landowners had to be contacted and persuaded to make arrangements with the excavators. It is notable that already in February 1879 Ottoman authorities mentioned Schliemann’s large-scale excavations. To be exact, on 18th February 1879, the Ministry of Public Instruction ordered the Province to make an inquiry into Schliemann’s extended excavations. In the course of these the Ministry inquired whether the excavated lands were the property of the state or private estates. The Ministry also wondered, ‘if these lands are possessed by private persons, do the landowners agree to the excavations, and are there any
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184 Heuck Allen, *Finding the Walls of Troy*, 207-209; Letter Frank Calvert to Schliemann, 10th November 1880, quoted in Heuck Allen, 208.
185 Schliemann wrote to Calvert that he would have to make arrangements with all the landowners on 9th December 1879; in Heuck Allen, 345.
Nevertheless, the clandestine campaign of Schliemann and Calvert went on until the spring of 1882. On the Ottoman side, however, no documentation has been identified concerning any knowledge of these illegal archaeological activities. Meanwhile, Schliemann, now an honorary citizen of Berlin, was determined to get a firman that would give him the right to explore the plain of the Troad. This time he relied on German diplomatic support. In fact, he applied to the Chancellor of the German Empire, Prince Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898), to support him in getting a liberal permit that would allow him ‘to make, simultaneously with the exploration of Troy, excavations on any other site in the Troad’ he might desire. Bismarck’s intervention worked: by October 1881 he received a new firman for continuing excavations at Hisarlık, and on the site of the lower town of Ilium. Only a couple of months later Bismarck ‘obtained’ the liberal firman for him. He was now allowed to explore the Troad, but under the condition that excavations should be carried out at one site at one given time and were made in the presence of a Turkish delegate. Yet, the conditions would be more stressful than expected. Soon it would become clear that the Turks were less tolerant towards such an extensive foreign venture on their soil, in particular as it concerned the Troad.

**Footnotes:**

186 IBA: MF.MKT. 60/8: 25/S/1296 (18/02/1879).
187 He received his honorary citizenship on 7th July 1881.
188 Schliemann, Trojan, 5.
Figure 1
Priam’s Treasure (Schliemann, 1875/1976).
Michael Kritovoulos (c.1410- c.1470) dedicated his work *History of Mehmed the Conqueror* to the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II. The work describes the rise of the Ottoman Empire between 1465 and 1467 and includes a report on Mehmed II's visit to Troy in 1462 (Topkapı Palace Museum, G.I.3)

Figure 3
The Troad
(Senior, 1859)
Figure 4
Heinrich Schliemann painted by Sydney Hodges in 1877 (Kelder, Uslu and Şerifoğlu, 2012).
Figure 5
Map of Troy and the Dardanelles (ca 1500) by the Ottoman cartographer Piri Reis. In his text Piri Reis describes Beşik Bay (Liman-i Çökertme) in the Dardanelles as a valuable harbour (Theune-Großkopf et al (eds.) 2002).
On 20th June 1871 the Minister of Public Instruction, Safvet Pasha writes to Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha concerning Schliemann’s request to excavate at Hisarlık. Safvet Pasha emphasises the importance of the discovery of Troy’s walls, but is also wary of Schliemann. Before the official permit is granted, Safvet Pasha purchases the site on behalf of the Imperial Museum. Schliemann’s permit, part 1, in the Ottoman Archives division of the Prime Minister’s Office at Istanbul (IBA): I.HR. 250/14863-1: 01/R/1288 (20/06/1871).
Figure 8
Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha (1815-71), Ottoman linguist, diplomat and leading politician of the Tanzimat period, was one of the Ottoman counterparts of Schliemann. Here representing the Ottoman government at the Conference of Paris in 1856 that brought the Crimean War to an end (Kelder, Uslu and Şerifoğlu, 2012).

Figure 9
Letter from Grand Vizier Mehmed Emin Ali Pasha to the palace secretary of Sultan Abdülaziz (1830-1876) about Schliemann’s request to excavate at Hisarlık. In this letter the Grand Vizier emphasizes the significance of the quest for Troy. He sees major advantages for science and for the understanding of human development in the excavations and possible discovery of the city walls and artefacts. He subsequently lays down conditions for the excavation, which are later ratified by the palace secretary through royal decree (text below left on the photograph). Ottoman Archives division of the Prime Minister’s Office at Istanbul (IBA): I.HR. 250/14863-2: 10 & 11/R/1288 (29 & 30 June 1871).
Figure 10
The Prime Ministry launched inquiries into Schliemann’s operations in the Troad and the smuggle of Priam’s Treasure. This report of the Ottoman official Izzeddin Efendi of 24th July 1874 provides detailed information on the smuggle of the objects from Troy. Schliemann worked strategically and well organized. According to Izzeddin Efendi, Schliemann put the gold jewellery in a box and the small pieces in his own and his family’s pockets and smuggled the objects to Athens in cooperation with the Greek shipper Andrea. The report highlights Schliemann’s Ottoman helpers and henchmen, among them Ottoman custom officers who allowed Schliemann to pass without any search or inspection. Ottoman Archives division of the Prime Minister’s Office at Istanbul (IBA): MF.MKT.18/147: 09/C/1291 (24/07/1874).

Figure 11
According, to the Minister of Public Instruction, in his letter to the Grand Vizier, Schliemann was unreliable and had serious plans to sell the artefacts to others. Moreover, the American Embassy was not willing to put pressure on Schliemann to cooperate with the Ottoman government. The Minister emphasizes the need to put Schliemann’s illegal activities on the international agenda by using international press. Ottoman Archives division of the Prime Minister’s Office at Istanbul (IBA): MF.MKT.18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).
Draft of the Ottoman letter of protest against a donation or sale of the Trojan treasuries by Schliemann, written on 6\textsuperscript{th} of June 1874. Ottoman Archives division of the Prime Minister’s Office at Istanbul (IBA): MF.MKT.18/97: 23/R/1291 (09/06/1874).

Figure 13
Mehmet Tahir Müneş Pasha (1828-1910), prominent statesman and the leading figure of the nineteenth-century Turkish-Ottoman Enlightenment Movement (Ali Budak, 2012).
Figure 14
Cartoon published in the satirical magazine *Hayal*, 12 September 1874 (31 Ağustos 1290). Mrs Schliemann: ‘You promised these to the Ottomans, and these to the Greeks. Now you tell me that you’re promising these to the American ambassador. What will remain for us? Schliemann: ‘Everything!’