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Homer and Troy during the Final years of the Empire
Construction of the new building of the Imperial Museum (1891) (Cezar, 1995).
Government efforts to protect antiquities increased rapidly in the years after the promulgation of the revised antiquities code in 1884, which forbade archaeologists to take original ancient objects out of the Empire.¹ The antiquities law became even more strict in 1907. Not only had it become difficult to obtain permissions to excavate on Ottoman soil, visiting archaeological sites was restrained as well; foreigners needed a formal permission from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to visit historic sites and monuments.

1. Controlling Heritage and the Development of the Ottoman Museum

Authorities were on the alert for illicit diggings, but guarding the ancient sites of their Empire was not easy. They had to deal with foreign excavators who were trying to evade the regulations in every possible way. Besides excavations without a permit, illegal removals of ancient objects and attempts at arranging secret bargains with high officials, even activities such as purchasing land near ancient sites in order to excavate secretly were among the pressing problems of the Ottoman Empire at the turn of the century.

Efforts to end such activities are evident in various official correspondences, warnings, investigations, orders and decrees. Moreover, local bureaucrats, education commissioners, high-school principals and teachers received requests from above to be watchful of illegal activities and to inform the government in such cases.² This was also the course of action when illegal excavations were spotted in Troy in 1886. According to a report of 28th October 1886, a group of Germans who wanted to carry out excavations and do research at Troy without

¹ The new antiquities law was to a large extent adopted from the Greek antiquities law of 1834. See Ernst Meyer (ed.), Briefwechsel II 1876-1890 (Berlin 1958), Schliemann to Humann, 7th February 1890 (326) 348-350; Humann to Schliemann, 9th February 1890 (327) 350-352. See also chapter 2 of this study.
permission were barred from the area.\(^3\)

Reports of illegal excavations frequently resulted in sending members of the Imperial Museum to these places to investigate and confiscate artefacts. These objects were subsequently sent to the museum in Istanbul. Also artefacts coincidentally found by locals went to the museum. In fact, the government encouraged the protection of sites and ancient objects by locals. Inhabitants of the Empire were encouraged by monetary rewards to hand in finds to the government.\(^4\)

Still, illegal excavations carried out by Ottoman subjects were a recurrent matter. In March 1887 Ottoman authorities discovered illegal excavations carried out by a group of locals at the mound of Çobantepe –or the tomb of Paris– near Pınarbaşı on the Ballıdağ at the Troad. This tumulus had not yet been excavated. The finds were impressive, among them a golden diadem, three thin golden fillets with decoration, fine strips of gold and fragments of a bronze mirror case and bronze bowls. The authorities secured the treasure immediately and included the finds in the Troy collection of the Imperial Museum.\(^5\)

Meanwhile the museum in Istanbul became fuller and fuller. The collection expanded even more through the activities of Ottoman excavation teams, for instance at Sidon. Quite impressive ancient works, such as the stunning so-called Sarcophagus of Alexander the Great (4\(^{th}\) century BC) and the Sarcophagus of the Mourning Women (4\(^{th}\) century BC) were shipped to the museum in 1887. As a matter of fact, the latter one – in the form of an Ionic temple with female figures standing between the columns – was seen as a paragon of Hellenic culture and subsequently chosen as a model for the new museum building, which was

---

\(^3\) Istanbul Ottoman Archives of Prime Ministry/Başbakanlık Arşivi (IBA): DH.MKT. 1415/45, 01/S/1304 (28/10/1886).


completed in 1891 (fig. 1).6

The neo-classicist style of the new museum building perfectly fitted the tradition of European museums (fig. 2 & 3). The choice for such a style had to be seen in relation to the function of the Imperial Museum, which had mainly become an institution that represented a modern Ottoman cultural identity connected with western civilization. In fact, the Ottomans had discovered the Hellenistic sarcophagi within the territories of the Empire, they subsequently brought them to the capital of the Empire and now they used it as a model for their Imperial Museum. By doing so, ‘a form thought of as western was shown to be local’. Moreover, the Imperial Museum was devoted to archaeology and emphasized territoriality. The organization and the presentation were based and ordered according to archaeological sites, not on historical or art-historical narratives typical for western museums.7

The finds at Ballıdağ also rekindled Schliemann’s interest in Troy. He came back to the region on 24th April 1887. He did not receive a festive welcome from the Ottomans. Actually, his visit was clearly not appreciated: local authorities gave him a hard time.8 They pressed him to show them a formal permission, which he did not have, and did not allow him to visit the site, because of his previous illegal activities. Ottoman officers closely watched the scholars that accompanied Schliemann and obstructed their actions, which caused them great annoyance. In the end, Schliemann and his companions had to leave the region without even having had a look at the site at Hisarlık.9

---

6 O. Hamdy Bey and Théodore Reinach, Une nécropole royale à Sidon. Fouilles de Hamdy Bey (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1892); See also the comments of the historian Edhem Eldem on the publication. This was part of research material for the exhibition of the Lebanese filmmaker, photographer and curator, Akram Zaatari, in Salt Beyoğlu, Istanbul (2015): https://vimeo.com/117724682 (10/06/2015).
8 IBA: HR.SYS. 16/50, 07/Ş/1304 (01/05/1887); Joachim Herrmann & Evelin Maß, Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow 1976-1890 (Berlin 1990) 467.
9 Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 218-220; Ottoman correspondence regarding Schliemann’s visit at the Troad on 24th April 1887 is also discussed in Rüstem Aslan, Ali Sönmez and Reyhan Körpe, ‘Heinrich Schliemanns Ausgrabungen in Troia nach Osmanischen Quellen’ in: Studia Troica, 18, (2009) 237-249; see in particular DH. MKT. 1417/90, 11/Ş/1304 (05/05/1887) and the memories of Carl Schuchhardt, Aus Leben und Arbeit (Berlin 1944) 143.
However, the finds at the Ballıdağ not only triggered Schliemann’s interest in Troy. They also encouraged scholars and archaeologists who preferred the Ballıdağ as the site of Homeric Troy. Although Schliemann believed he had delivered enough proof that he had uncovered ‘Ilios of the Homeric Poems’ during his excavations of 1882, his interpretation of the site of Homeric Troy had become a point of discussion once again.

2. Schliemann’s Reputation under Fire

Schliemann’s major assailant was Ernst Bötticher, a retired army captain and member of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte. He began, as has been mentioned before, attacking Schliemann’s interpretation of the site as early as 1883. According to Bötticher Schliemann’s Homeric Troy – second stratum (Troy II) – was not a city at all, but a huge crematorium. The ashes, cinerary urns and half-burnt bones at the mound of Hisarlık were proof for that. Bötticher accused Schliemann and his associates Dörpfeld and Virchow of purposely creating an illusion by misrepresenting the site at Hisarlık.

His two books and numerous articles, reviews, pamphlets and letters published in various papers and journals gave Schliemann a hard time for years. The publication of Bötticher’s article in the Correspondenzblatt of the Gesellschaft in July 1889, in which he presented more arguments for his ‘fire-necropolis’ theory, was a shocking experience for Schliemann. His associate Virchow and his circle dominated the Gesellschaft, and including an article of Bötticher in its publications was confronting. Expressing his bitter disappointment about this event, Schliemann says to Virchow: ‘ich sah daß Herr Ranke Hauptmann Boetticher, die Spalten seines wichtigen Correspondenzblatts zur Disposition gestellt hat. Unmöglich hätte Herr Ranke Ihnen einen größeren Schimpf anthun können, denn er weiß ja daß Sie dort an Ort und Stelle mit mir gearbeitet, daß

---

10 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Gladstone, 3rd May 1882, (116) 142-144.
11 Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 218-221.
Sie viele Reden darüber gehalten und wichtige Schriften publiziert haben (...). Außerdem weiß er daß Boetticher Sie, sowie auch den bekannten vorzüglichen Architekten des Alterthums Dr Dörpfeld, der in 1882 fünf Monate lang mein Mitarbeiter in Troia war, als Fälscher und Betrüger dargestellt hat. Haben Sie sich denn mit Herrn Ranke überworfen? Wie kann er anders mit gesundem Menschenverstand einen so wahnsinnigen Unsinn aufnehmen? Wo war denn die Stadt der Lebenden, wenn Hisarlik die Feuernekropole war?’. 12

Various learned societies were interested in Bötticher’s publications and his theories gained more and more scholarly acceptance. Well acquainted with this scholarly threat, Schliemann exclaimed in 1886 ‘und das Ärgerliche ist daß er gar viele Proselyten macht’. 13 He was right, Bötticher’s ideas received serious intellectual following, among them from the prominent archaeologist Salomon Reinach (1858-1932) of the Institut de France, who was close to the Ottoman government; Reinach had been charged by Osman Hamdi Bey to classify and catalogue the collection of the Imperial Museum.

In a paper and a talk at the 10th Congrès International d’Anthropologie et d’Archéologie Préhistoriques in Paris in August 1889, Reinach gave a synopsis of one of Bötticher’s recent critical articles. Schliemann realized that the credibility of his interpretation of the site at Hisarlik was losing ground and he was getting serious rivals. He clearly considered Reinach one of them: ‘Einen Feind habe ich aber doch hier [conference at Paris]; nämlich Salomon Reinach, den Direktor des Museums in Saint-Germain en Laye, der ach wiederum eine gegen Virchow, Dörpfeld and mich gerichtete Smachschrift des Hauptmanns a. D. E. Boetticher vertheidigte’. 14

Schliemann felt desperate because of the long-term attacks of Bötticher who had never seen Troy. Wilhelm Dörpfeld, who was considered to be an authority on ancient architecture, was also enraged about the fact that Bötticher called his plan ‘Phantasiegebilde’ and that he proclaimed that Dörpfeld, together with Schliemann, had invented the buildings, temples and walls and ‘aus den kleinen

---

12 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Virchow, 26th July 1889, (293) 316-318.
13 Meyer, Schliemann to Fabricius, (220) 235.
The reputation of Schliemann and his associates was badly damaged and their integrity was under attack. Schliemann’s efforts to silence Bötticher were ineffective. Dörpfeld and Virchow tried to force him to withdraw his assertions, but their attempts failed as well. Although Schliemann believed he had finished with excavating Troy forever after his excavations in 1882, he felt forced to go back to Troy to silence his opponent and to answer the accusations. In his letter to the German ambassador, Joseph Maria von Radowitz (1839-1912) about this situation, he states: ‘Die Unmöglichkeit einsehend diesen furchtbaren Schmähschreiber auf andere Weise los zu werden sind wir entschlossen die Ausgrabungen in Hissarlik schleunigstmöglich fortzusetzen, und, nachdem wir dort eingerichtet sind, Bötticher aufzufordern unser Mitarbeider zu werden’. With the objective to prove that Bötticher was wrong and that his theories were without any foundation, Schliemann made preparations to create the suitable setting for his last Trojan campaign in 1889/1890, including two conferences attended by prominent scholars and, of course, Bötticher.

3. The Final Encounter of Schliemann and the Ottomans in Troy

By September 1889, Schliemann communicated his request to resume excavations in Troy to Osman Hamdi Bey. Both Osman Hamdi Bey and Schliemann were at that time in Paris. Osman Hamdi Bey demanded a plan of the site that Schliemann wanted to explore and pressed Schliemann to respect the Ottoman antiquities regulation of 1884. Schliemann then promised ‘to submit to
Giving up all his finds to the Ottomans would be revolutionary for Schliemann, since his archaeological enterprises had always ended with the illegal exportation of the finds out of the Empire. But soon the truth came out that showed him in his true colours: he had no intention at all to leave the archaeological finds to the Ottomans, but meant to take the finds with him. And, above all, he was tremendously ambitious and strategic, and used diplomatic channels more than anybody else.

Thus, in his letter to Herbert von Bismarck (1849-1904), the son of the German chancellor, Schliemann asked him to help him in getting the permission to excavate and assured him that Berlin would be the beneficiary of everything he would find. To the German ambassador Joseph Maria von Radowitz (1839 – 1912), on the other hand, also asking him to support him in obtaining the permission, he maintained that Osman Hamdi Bey had already promised him the sale of the antiquities to the Museum in Berlin afterwards. Any communication concerning this subsequent sale, however, has not been found so far. Thus, to assure that the director of the Ottoman Imperial Museum would sell the artefacts afterwards could also be part of his strategy to gain diplomatic support in order to acquire the permission as soon as possible.

His communication, in February 1890, with Karl Humann (1839-1896), excavator of Pergamon and director of the Royal Museums in Berlin, makes it clear that Schliemann’s statements on obtaining all Trojan finds may indeed have been nothing more than a strategic argument. Schliemann asked Humann to assist him in getting half of the finds from the Ottomans. Humann, on the other hand, although appreciating his ‘youthful fire’, felt forced to underline that things were different now in the Empire and that it was not so easy to obtain antiquities: ‘Ich aber bin leider gezwungen, Wasser in ihren Wein zu gießen. Sie

19 Quoted in: Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 281.
20 Heinrich Schliemann, Briefe, Ernst Meyer (ed.) (Berlin 1937), Schliemann to H. von Bismarck, 11th October 1889, 293.
21 Meyer, Briefwechsel, Schliemann to Radowitz, 13th September 1889 (299) 322 and 14th November 1889 (311) 331-333.
kennen das türkische [sic] Antiken-Gesetz, das auf dem Griechischen abgeklopfte, jede Antike, auch die künftig noch gefunden wird, für Staatseigentum erklärt und eine Ausfuhr ganz verbietet’. Then again, Humann also emphasized the possibility of exceptions. According to him, although in principle only copies of the artefacts were allowed to leave the country, with the support of Osman Hamdi Bey sometimes an exception was possible. 22 Schliemann’s communication with Osman Hamdi on 13th September 1889, however, shows no signs of such a support. On the contrary, Schliemann even distances himself from the finds. 23

Schliemann received his firman late October and started excavations at the site early November 1889. Osman Hamdi Bey sent Galib Efendi as a delegate of the Imperial Museum. Galib Efendi, as Osman Hamdi Bey pointed out, was an excellent draughtsman who in that capacity could assist Schliemann during the excavations. 24 The delegate of the Museum was responsible for the protection of the finds, since only he was allowed to have the key of the storehouse in which the artefacts were stored. Eventually, the museum employee Halil Bey became the Ottoman delegate at Hisarlık with that responsibility. 25

Schliemann’s main purpose was to determine the nature of the ruins of what he believed to be Homer’s Troy, namely the second stratum, once and for all. To enforce his position, Schliemann requested the Academies in Germany, Austria and France to send delegates: independent scholars. The first conference Schliemann hosted at Hisarlık in December 1889 was attended by George Niemann (1841-1912), a prominent architect and professor at the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts, the cartographer Major Bernhard Steffen (1844-1891), who had produced maps of Mycenae as a delegate of the Academy of Berlin, Halil Bey, Frank Calvert, Dörpfeld and, last but not least, Captain Bötticher

22 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Humann, 7th February 1890 (326) 348-350; Humann to Schliemann, 9th February 1890 (327) 350-352.
23 Schliemann to Osman Hamdi Bey, 13th September 1889, BBB 41/387; Quoted in Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 281.
24 Osman Hamdi Bey to Schliemann, 13th November 1889, B 41/545.
25 See also: Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Radowitz, 13th September 1889 (299) 322 and 14th November 1889 (311) 331-333 and Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 220.
himself. No French delegate was present. Although Schliemann had hoped for the attendance of Reinach, the latter was not able to come. The French Academy selected another specialist, but he could not make it to the conference in December.

During the conference Schliemann tried to prove to Bötticher that all the data ‘conformed with the truth’ and he states: ‘that all the ruins of buildings, gates, towers, and walls described in my book are accurately depicted in the plans and nothing in them has been falsified’. Major Steffen and George Niemann signed the Conference’s protocol in defence of Schliemann. By doing so, they declared that they accepted as true that the remains in the second stratum were of a town with a temple and halls. However, they did not confirm Schliemann’s claim that Hisarlık was the Homeric Troy. Nor did they give dates for the stratum. In the end –it took great effort, indeed– Bötticher was convinced. He acknowledged the protocol and took back his accusations, but he did not sign it. He also refused to make a public apology and left Hisarlık on December 6th.

Schliemann discovered two Greek inscriptions during the campaign. On October 31st Frank Calvert, on the other hand, excavating at Schliemann’s request, discovered a necropolis from the fourth century at Hisarlık. However, since getting permission to excavate ancient cemeteries at the Troad was a complex venture, this discovery was a guarded secret.

Although Bötticher had retracted his accusations at Hisarlık, once he had left the site he continued to criticize Schliemann. He resumed his fire necropolis-theory

26 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Radowitz, 14th November 1889 (311) 331-333.
27 Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 220; Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 281-283.
29 Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 221.
31 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 282.
32 Schliemann to Virchow, 31st October 1889 (549) and 14th November 1889 (553), in Herrmann and Maass, Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow 1976-1890, 522, 524-525; Schliemann to Frank Calvert, 22nd January 1890, BBB 42/116; Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 220.
and gained more and more scholarly acceptance, whereupon Schliemann decided to host a second and larger international conference. Almost immediately, he invited various scholars and made preparations to resume excavations, which he started on 1st March 1890.33 Gradually the scholars he had invited arrived at the site. The participants of the second Hisarlık conference between March 23rd and April 7th were, among others, Osman Hamdi Bey, director of the Ottoman Imperial Museum, his brother, colleague and future successor Halil Edhem Bey (1861-1938), Karl Humann, Friedrich von Duhn (1851-1930), professor of Classical Archaeology from Heidelberg, Charles Waldstein (1856-1927), director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Wilhem Grepler (1826-1907) from Breslau, member of the German Society for Anthropology, Ethnography and Prehistory and the French specialist in Near Eastern Archaeology Charles L. H. Babin (1860-1932) and his wife. Also Frank Calvert, Virchow and Dörpfeld were present (fig. 4).34

Osman Hamdi’s presence, in fact, was quite striking. Schliemann finally after twenty years of insolence towards the Ottomans, was going to respect the Ottoman position in classical archaeology? Did he believe that this prominent Ottoman figure should attend the conference and take part in deciding the archaeological interpretations of Troy? Yet, Osman Hamdi Bey’s invitation has to be put into perspective, since Schliemann’s letter to Humann on 20th August 1890, clearly shows that Schliemann invited him merely on the advice of Humann who emphasized that Osman Hamdi’s attendance at the conference was necessary to foster goodwill.35 At any rate, it is obvious that Schliemann was forced for the first time to take the Ottomans seriously and to involve them in his archaeological activities. The Ottomans, on the other hand, accepted the invitation and sent their most prominent person in archaeology to Troy.

After discussing the excavation results and the interpretations of Schliemann, the participants of the conference signed the protocol on March 30th.36 By doing so

33 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Calvert, 6th March 1890 (331) 353.
34 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 284-286; Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 221; Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion. 15.
36 The protocol text was published in: Carl Schuchhardt, Schliemann’s Excavations: An Archaeological and Historical Study (London 1891) 325-326.
they rejected Bötticher’s theories and declared that the plans of Schliemann and Dörpfeld were correct and that no signs of burnt corpses had been found at the site. This was a relief for Schliemann, indeed; yet on the other hand, Bötticher - not invited this time- continued to attack Schliemann. Reinach was not convinced either.

Schliemann’s Achilles’ heel in his struggle with Bötticher was his failure to find a prehistoric cemetery at Hisarlık. His excavations from March onwards concentrated on the search for a cemetery and on exposing all of the house walls of Troy II. He desired, moreover, to determine the fortification walls of each settlement. In order to achieve his objects, he decided to excavate outside the central part of Hisarlık. But, instead of finding buildings of the second stratum outside the walls, Schliemann and Dörpfeld discovered impressive buildings and Mycenaean pottery in the sixth stratum (Troy VI). The imposing discoveries made havoc of the stratigraphy of Hisarlık: if the sixth stratum was contemporary with Mycenae, the second city had to be dated to much earlier times. In fact, already in 1873, Frank Calvert had pointed out that the second stratum could not be later than 2000 BC. Calvert’s view became justified.

The Mycenaean pottery of the sixth settlement undermined Schliemann’s interpretation of the second stratum as Homeric Troy. As Carl Schuchhardt, who was writing a book on Schliemann’s excavations and who had visited the excavations, pointed out, ‘I witnessed only the beginning of work on the sixth city, but it was already apparent that its impressive stone buildings contained good Mycenaean pottery. Since this sixth stratum was contemporary with Mycenae, Dörpfeld regarded it as the Troy destroyed by Agamemnon. Schliemann was annoyed. He did not want to abandon the ‘Palace of Priam’ and the ‘Treasure of Helen’ [sic] from the second city and looked with displeasure at

---

each stirrup jar that emerged from the earth’. 40

In view of Schliemann’s profound interest in pottery sherds, 41 Osman Hamdi and Halil Edhem Bey most probably allowed him to take the sherds found at the site. 42 As he wrote to Humann, ‘Hamdy zum Congréß einzuladen, den Mancar [Aufsichtsbeamten] größter Freundlichkeit und Liberalität zu behandeln usw. hat sich als ganz ausgezeichnet bewährt. So z. B. schenkte mir Hamdy in Ihrer Gegenwart Alles bis dahin gefundene und sagte dem Mancar, das Museum brauche solche Sachen nicht, ich könnte Alles nehmen. Diesen Auftrag hat der Mancar dann auch, was zerbrochene Topfware und Steininstrumente betrifft, ehrlich ausgeführt’. 43

Schliemann’s words indicate that Osman Hamdi Bey and the overseer were quite tolerant in handing over artefacts to him. Yet the text of another letter by Schliemann concerning the discovery of a council chamber, which he identified as an odeon or a small theatre, shows a totally opposite Ottoman attitude. In this letter to Virchow on May 30th, Schliemann states that he found ‘a beautifully preserved odeon with marble heads of Caligula, Claudius I, and the younger Faustina, all well-preserved and skilfully worked, as well as a marvellously sculpted lion. I will have to give the lion and the Claudius to the Turkish Museum, although the Turkish overseer has been ill in the Dardanelles for a long time now. The two others, however, I hope to rescue for science and for the benefit of the fatherland, but no word about this must get out; otherwise Hamdy will learn of it right away and not only cancel our firman at once but hang a suit on us too’. 44 Apparently, Osman Hamdi Bey was not so obliging as Schliemann had made him appear in his previous letter to Humann.

Schliemann’s communication with Alexander Conze (1831-1914), now secretary

\[\text{\footnotesize 41 Edmund F. Bloedow, \textquote{Schliemann's Attitude to Pottery}, in: J. Herrmann (ed.), \textit{Heinrich Schliemann: Grundlagen und Ergebnisse moderner Archäologie 100 Jahre nach Schliemanns Tod} (Berlin 1992) 211-221.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 42 Traill, \textit{Schliemann of Troy}, 288.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 43 Meyer, \textit{Briefwechsel II}, Schliemann to Humann, 20th August 1890 (351) 177-379.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 44 Herrmann und Maat, \textit{Die Korrespondenz zwischen Heinrich Schliemann und Rudolf Virchow 1976-1890}, 545-546; See also his letter to Bismarck on 22nd July 1890 in: Meyer, \textit{Briefwechsel II} (347) 371-374.}\]
of the German Archaeological Institute, on 9th December 1890 is also revealing on this point. Telling him about his secret discovery of a treasure, which he considered more valuable than his finds at Mycenae, he notes that he secured the treasure from ‘Türkei’ and asks Conze ‘verraten Sie niemand das Geheimnis’. Otherwise, he continues, ‘wäre es ausgeschlossen, einen »Firman« zu erhalten. To Humann, moreover, he expresses his worry about the possibility that Osman Hamdi Bey might think he had secretly discovered valuable finds. In that case, he utters ‘wird er mir daher nicht meinen Ferman erneuern wollen.

Schliemann promised to obey the Ottoman antiquities regulation. According to his permit he had to meet the requirements of the antiquities law. As he states to Frank Calvert on 6th March 1890, he was allowed to excavate wherever he pleased ‘in a circuit of two days journey in diameter. But, alas, as to the antiquities to be discovered I have to submit to the new réglements’. Nonetheless, he smuggled important finds to Athens. The most important strategy he pursued was to reward the workman who brought the object he found directly to him. This tactic worked well. In order to get a reward, the workmen passed over the Ottoman overseer and handed the finds in to Schliemann, who

45 In his diary on 8th July Schliemann notes that his workman Demos discovered a major treasure: four axes of nephrite, four sceptre knobs of crystal, 50 pieces of crystal in the shape of large semi-circles and two round plaques of crystal, one iron sceptre knob, a large number of small gold objects, two clumps of bronze fragments with small gold trinkets. His biographer Traill is sceptical of the treasure. He maintains that it is quite remarkable that Schliemann, once again, found an important treasure close to the end of the season. He, moreover, draws attention to the fact that Schliemann is inconsistent about the circumstances in which the treasure was found: Schliemann ignores Demos in his later reports and sometimes claims the presence of Dörpfeld, whereas Dörpfeld says nothing of the sort. Although Schliemann suggested that the treasure, known to scholars as Treasure L, was found at Troy II, the characteristics of the objects correspond more closely with Troy VI or VII: see Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 290-292; The objects are catalogued for the Schliemann collection in Hubert Schmidt, Heinrich Schliemann’s Sammlung trojanischer Altertümmer (Berlin 1902) and Alfred Götze, ‘Die Kleingeräte aus Metall, Steine, Knochen, und ähnlichen Stoffen’, in: Wilhelm Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in den vorhistorischen und historischen Schichten von Ilion 1870-1894, 1, 325-420. See also Donald F. Easton, ‘Schliemann’s Mendacity-A False Trail?’, Antiquity, 58, (1984) 197-204 and Schliemann’s letters to Schöne, 9th October 1890, (356) 382-384, to Alexander Conze, 9th December 1890, (363) 388-391 and to Gustave von Gößler (1938-1902), the German Minister of Culture, on 13th September 1890 (353) 379-382, in Meyer, Briefwechsel II.

46 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Alexander Conze, 9th December 1890, (363) 388-391, see also his letter to Gustave Gößler, on 13th September 1890 (353) 379-382.


48 Meyer, Briefwechsel II, Schliemann to Calvert, 6th March 1890 (331) 353.

49 Nationale Zeitung, 30th January 1891.
subsequently with the help of Agis the Caravel, the consul in the Dardanelles for Spain and Italy, smuggled the finds illegally out to Athens where his brother-in-law, Alexandros Castromenos, picked them up.\(^{50}\)

Through this strategy Schliemann managed to smuggle out to Athens the most beautiful and important artefacts he found, including Treasure L, during the excavations from March to the end of July.\(^{51}\) Next to the treasure, he illegally removed a decorated silver vase of 17 cm in height and nine marble chests, including the marble heads and the lion he had found in the odeon. Although Schliemann was considering to hand over the head of Claudius I and the lion to the Ottomans, he found a way to circumvent this delivery.\(^{52}\) This is remarkable, since the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul knew about the discovery. In fact, in a telegram sent to Istanbul on 8\(^{th}\) June, the overseer Galib Bey reports the discovery of ‘an odeon and two marble statues’.\(^{53}\) As Schliemann had noted in his letter to Virchow on 30\(^{th}\) May,\(^{54}\) perhaps Galib Bey’s illness gave him the opportunity to make the shipment of the chests possible. On the other hand, as Traill correctly states, it is remarkable that the Ottoman authorities were not more watchful regarding Schliemann’s acts, since they knew from experience that ‘Schliemann was a wily and unscrupulous manipulator’.\(^{55}\)

Indeed, illegally transporting artefacts was not something new for Schliemann. His previous transfer shows clearly that he always found the right way to circumvent laws or overseers and to find collaborators in order to manage illicit shipments of artefacts. Moreover, he always treated his helpers with great respect and made serious efforts to reward them for their assistance. So, helping Schliemann was profitable. This time he also highly commended A. de Caravel in his letters to various prominent figures, by calling him the saviour of Trojan

\(^{50}\) Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 288.
\(^{51}\) See Schliemann’s outgoing letters: BBB 42/315, 42/352, 42/400 and 42/431; See also Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 288-192.
\(^{52}\) The items of Treasure L, now presumably in Moscow, and the heads in Berlin have been claimed by the Turkish government, since they were illegally removed from Turkish soil, in: Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 289, 301.
\(^{53}\) IBA: Y.PRK.MF. 1/12, 20/L/1307 (08/06/1890).
\(^{55}\) Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 305.
antiquities, and he even tried to arrange a German medal for his services. The three heads are now in Berlin, but it is not clear what happened to the lion after its shipment to Athens.

As mentioned before, Schliemann discovered a large amount of Mycenaean pottery in the sixth stratum. These finds, in fact, forced him, as Traill aptly points out, ‘to think the unthinkable’, namely that it was not Troy II that was Homer’s Troy but in fact Troy VI. In his letter to King George of Greece on 27th July 1890, he actually dropped a hint in that direction; however, he did not explicitly claim the discovery of the real Homeric Troy. The credit of discovering the right area of Homeric Troy went to Wilhelm Dörpfeld.

Schliemann wound up the excavations at the end of July with the intention to resume his work in March 1891, but his health put a stop to his plans. He died on Christmas Day 1890, before he received an excavation permit and without finishing his life’s work.

4. Finding Troy Once More
Dörpfeld’s Excavations in 1893 and 1894

‘Rest in Peace. You have done enough’, were the arresting words of Dörpfeld at the funeral of Schliemann on 4th January 1891. Dörpfeld took over the job from Schliemann. An expert on the Mycenaean world, he wanted to settle the issue of the new Mycenaean discoveries of the sixth stratum. In his work Troia und Ilion

57 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 289, 288, 346.
60 Traill, Schliemann of Troy, 297.
(1902) he published these new discoveries, in particular the remains of two large buildings, and carefully propounded the possibility that this very stratum might be Homer’s Troy. At this point, he explains that Troy VI ‘enthielt an jener Stelle die Reste zweier grossen Gebäude, die sich durch ihre Abmessungen, durch die Güte ihrer Bauweise und durch die Stärke ihrer Mauern vor den Bauten aller anderen Schichten auszeichneten. Von dem einen dieser Gebäude konnte auf S. 59 des Berichtes ein Grundriss veröffentlicht werden, der die Gestalt eines griechischen Tempels oder eines alten Wohnhauses, eines Megaron, zeigte’.

Subsequently, he questions ‘Hatten wir hier etwa einen oder gar zwei Tempel gefunden, die nach der Zerstörung der homerischen Burg Troja noch in vorhistorischer Zeit über den Ruinen der II. Schicht errichtet waren? Oder konnten die beiden gefundenen stattlichen Gebäude die Innenbauten einer grösseren Burg sein, deren Ringmauer weiter nach Aussen lag, und bisher noch nicht gefunden war? Sollte etwa eine der früher entdeckten, bisher für griechisch gehaltenen Mauern die Burgmauer dieser VI. oder «mykenischen» Schicht bilden? Und wenn dies der Fall war, musste dann nicht die II. Schicht viel älter sein als der trojanische Krieg, und musste sie nicht die Ehre, das Troja Homers zu sein, an die VI. Schicht abtreten?’

Only further excavations could give an answer to these questions. Ottoman authorities also attached particular importance to clarify the Trojan issues and to settle the questions concerning the strata raised by Schliemann’s final excavations. After discussing these matters during an assembly of the Education Committee and reviewing the advantages the excavations could bring for the Imperial Museum, the Ministry of Public Instruction and the Grand Vizier decided that it was necessary to grant Dörpfeld the permit in order to resume the excavations at Hisarlık. The Palace Secretary gave his approval to Dörpfeld’s request on 23rd August 1892. The permit was granted for a year, yet under the express condition that Dörpfeld and his team would observe the Ottoman Antiquities Law. Moreover, excavations were only allowed in prescribed areas,
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and the excavators had to stay away from forts and safety zones. Sophie Schliemann funded the excavations, since she believed that it was her duty to make it possible that her husband’s work would be finalized.

Dörpfeld’s team included the archaeologist A. Brückner, the prehistorian R. Weigel and the architect W. Wilberg. The discovery of the impressive fortification walls and strong constructions in the sixth stratum was a great relief. According to Dörpfeld, these discoveries substantiated the proof that Troy VI was Homer’s Troy. They also showed that Troy II was prehistoric. In fact, the stratigraphy of the site was the main focus of the research activities and the excavations carried out by Dörpfeld and his working partners. In the end, Dörpfeld defined nine separate cities, situated on top of one another; the first five lower cities belonged to the prehistoric era, the sixth stratum was classified as the legendary Troy of the Mycenaean period and the uppermost three layers were identified as late Greek and Roman (fig. 5).

The impressive walls of Troy VI, which invited comparison with the famous walls of Troy as described by Homer in the Iliad, were an important reason for Dörpfeld to propose this stratum for Homeric Troy. The possibility that Homer’s Troy was going to be established very soon made Dörpfeld’s ambitions to resume excavations in the following year feasible. The Ottomans decided to extend Dörpfeld’s permit for another year. Kaiser Wilhelm II, moreover, stood behind Dörpfeld and funded the excavations of 1894, which started in the spring and lasted until mid-July.

The excavation team consisted of scholars from various scientific fields, among them the architect W. Wilberg, the prehistorian A. Götze and the archaeologists H. Winnefeld and H. Schmidt. The museum employee Ahmed Bey joined the team as supervisor and representative of the Ottoman State. The excavations

63 A great deal of research has been done on the stratigraphy of Troy and the layers have been rearranged through time, but this is not the subject of this thesis. See for an overview of the history of the archaeology of Troy and its stratigraphy: Manfred Korfmann (ed.), Troia. Archäologie eines Siedlungsübergangs und seiner Landschaft (Mainz am Rhein 2006) and the series Studia Troica. See also Jorrit Kelder, Gülay Uslu and Omer Faruk Şerifoğlu (eds.), Troy. City, Homer and Turkey (Zwolle 2012), in particular chapter 2.
concentrated on the sixth stratum in order to discover more evidence. Dörpfeld’s excitement regarding his discoveries is noticeable in his report of the excavations when he states ‘Angesichts dieser stattlichen Ruinen, namentlich der schönen Stützmauern und der mächtigen Burgmauer, war kein Zweifel mehr möglich: das waren die von Homer besungenen Mauern und Türme, hier war die Burg des Priamos’. 64

Finally, Dörpfeld clarified the size of Troy VI and convinced many scholars. He became the archaeologist who decided the question of Troy. 65 Even Frank Calvert, who in an earlier period had dated Schliemann’s second stratum to between 2200 and 1800 B.C., was convinced. He declared Dörpfeld had proved the sixth city to be Homer’s Troy, and not the older, burnt second city. 66

Unlike in earlier periods, this time the Ottoman authorities were dealing with an erudite partner with a serious reputation and scholarly experience. The Ottoman newspaper Servet-i Fünun emphasized Dörpfeld’s reputation as a scholar and reported his discoveries and the nine different settlements he identified. 67 Dörpfeld acted in accordance with the regulations and handed in the finds discovered at Troy. The most beautiful artefacts were included in the Troy collection of the Imperial Museum in Istanbul. Dörpfeld’s priorities were on a different level. He was not looking for recognition in a way Schliemann had done. His interest was scholarly: ‘Die Burg des Priamos ist uns thatsächlich wieder geschenkt, und dazu besitzen wir in ihr einzigartige, hochwichtige

64 Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion, 19-23, see also Wendy Rigter and Gert Jan van Wijngaarden, ‘Troy VI and VIIA in the Late Bronze Age’, in: Kelder, Uslu and Şerifoğlu (ed.), Troy: City, Homer and Turkey, 28-34, 32-34.
65 Nevertheless, in the course of time the discussion over which city should be associated with Homer’s Troy would come up again. According to Dörpfeld’s successor Carl Blegen, it was impossible that Troy VI was Homer’s Troy, since an earthquake had destroyed that city. Troy VIIa, on the other hand, had been destroyed by a war. This led him to believe that Troy VIIA presented Homer’s Troy. The discussion entailed in the identification of Homeric Troy with both layers VI and VIIA is still not over. Traces of fire in Troy VI are seen as possible evidence of war. For the question of whether the Iliad of Homer has a basis in history, see: Joachim Latacz, Troy and Homer; Towards a Solution of an old Mistery (Oxford 2004), Michael Wood, In search of the Trojan War (London 1985) and Wendy Rigter and Gert Jan van Wijngaarden, ‘Troy VI and VIIA in the Late Bronze Age’, Kelder, Uslu and Şerifoğlu, Troy: City, Homer and Turkey, 32-35.
67 Servet-i Fünun, 25/Mart/1320, 26, (07/04/1904).
Ruinenstätte zum Studium der ältesten Geschichte der Menschheit’.  

5. Overseeing Troy at the Turn of the Century

For all the good experiences with Dörpfeld and the members of his excavation team, the firmly embedded suspicion and caution of the Ottomans towards activities – in any way – at the Troad could not easily be removed. Dörpfeld’s plans to explore some of the tumuli in the surroundings, for instance, were stopped by the authorities. Although Dörpfeld emphasized the importance of these surveys, the Ottomans could not be persuaded at all. In fact, they were suspicious. Ottoman documents demonstrate that visitors of the archaeological site of Troy were recorded. This was in accordance with the new regulations regarding foreigners, who needed formal permission to visit historic sites and monuments. Yet, beside formal registrations, it is remarkable that local officers were also given instructions to observe closely ‘the attitude and actions’ of these visitors. Thus, not only getting a permit to visit Troy had become difficult at the turn of the century, once at the site, evidently, the visitors were also closely watched.

In September 1894, for example, when the eminent British Admiral Edward Hobart Seymour (1840-1929) visited the site together with the British ambassador, local authorities were secretly instructed by telegram to follow their activities closely. Although we can assume that this has to be related to the military function of the visitor and the strategic position of Troy and the Dardanelles, the Ottoman attitude was not different when Dörpfeld and some scholars visited the site in 1902, 1903 and 1906. In accordance with the regulations, the permission to visit the site was given by the Ministry of Foreign
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68 Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion, 25.
69 Idem, 23.
70 He served as a Royal Navy officer in the Crimean War and became Commander-in-Chief of the China Station in 1897.
71 IBA: Y.PRK-ASK 100/24: 12/Ra/1312 (13/09/1894).
Affairs, the Grand Vizier and the Sublime Porte respectively and finally confirmed by the Sultan. In the meantime the authorities of the Biga Province received the order to keep a close but inconspicuous eye on Dörpfeld and his companions during their visit. In case of ‘detecting any noticeable or suspicious act’, this had to be reported by telegram ‘using a secret code’.72

In fact, as already mentioned before, this was the general practice. There is a long list of people, from artists to politicians and travellers of various nationalities, whose visits and acts in Troy were recorded by and reported to different ministries and departments of the Ottoman state.73 Newspapers, too, paid attention to visitors of Troy, and informed Ottoman readers about their identities and nationalities.74 However, despite the efforts to regulate and inspect activities in Troy, the authorities did not succeed in controlling the archaeological activities carried out in the region. Frank Calvert, who had lived in the region for decades, knew the Troad better than anyone else. Although Ottoman authorities had granted no official permits to excavate in Troy after the excavations of Dörpfeld, Calvert managed to continue digging at mostly unknown and rich sites around the Troad clandestinely, such as Hanay Tepe and Tavolia nearby Karanlık Limanı. His private collection in his family residence, called Thymbra Farm, expanded tremendously around the turn of the century. Calvert kept his collection secret in order to avoid claims from the Imperial Museum. According to witnesses, it was kept in a secret chamber entered only by him, and it included a large number of artefacts from various historical periods found at the Troad. Thymbra Farm was to serve as military quarters for the Ottomans during the Battle of Gallipoli in 1915-1916 (fig. 6).

In 1900, Calvert donated 9 acres of land at Hisarlık to the Imperial Museum. Clearly pleased by this gift, the Ottomans rewarded Calvert with the highest

72 IBA: I.HR. 376/1319/IZ-9: 21/Z/1319 (31/03/1902); DH.MKT 702/57: 7/S/1321 (05/05/1903); I.HR. 383/1321/S-03: 1/S/1321 (29/04/1903), DH.MKT. 1074/21: 21/R/1324 (28/05/1906).
73 Here a selection: IBA: Y.PRK.ASK. 205/28:10/Ca/1321 (04/08/1903); DH.MKT 763/25: 20/Ca/1321 (14/08/1903); Y.PRK.DH 12/55: 20/Ca/1321 (14/08/1903); Y.PRK.ASK. 229/24: 13/R/1323 (17/06/1905); DH.MKT. 1060/80: 26/M/1324 (22/03/1906); DH.MKT. 1152/89: 28/M/1325 (13/03/1907).
74 Ikdam, 03 Kanun-i evvel 1313 (15/12/1897).
imperial honorary distinction. In 1905, he secretly sold part of his collection to the Worcester Art Museum in Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1905. Other artefacts were destroyed by the earthquake of August 9th, 1912, but Frank Calvert had died in 1908 and did not witness that disaster.75

In the meantime, the Ottomans were working on the regional infrastructure in order to make travelling to Troy easier. In 1901 a pier was constructed in the harbour of Karanlık Limanı ‘for the visitors of the ruins of Troy’.76 Troy, indeed, attracted Ottoman subjects. İhtifalcı Mehmed Ziya (1866-1930), an expert on antiquities and a member of the Ottoman Committee for the Protection of Ancient Objects, for example, visited the historical sites at the Troad in 1909. His account of this visit shows a tremendous interest in the legendary stories of Troy and the Dardanelles, in mythology and Homer, but also in Herodotus and Strabo.77

Homer and Troy within Ottoman Society in the wake of the First World War

The neo-Hellenist movement, launched by the acknowledged intellectuals Yahya Kemal (1884-1958) and Yakub Kadri (1889-1974) in 1912, stimulated attention for Homer and Troy all the more (fig. 7). The impressive work Esâtîr-i Yunâniyan (Greek Mythology) by Mehmed Tevfik Pasha (1855-1915), published in 1913, can be regarded as the manifesto of the Ottoman neo-Hellenism. Homer was treated very extensively in this book of 762 pages, which belongs to the Zeitgeist of the progressive late Ottoman period (fig. 8).78

The members of the neo-Hellenist movement published articles on their great admiration for classical antiquity in a range of newspapers and magazines and regarded the classics as providing an example for Turkish literature and culture. However, there was also criticism of neo-Hellenist ideas, spurred on in particular
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75 During the 1930s Frank Calvert’s family gave what remained of the Calvert Collection to the Çanakkale Archaeological Museum. In: Heuck Allen, Finding the Walls of Troy, 231-245.
76 IBA: DH.MKT. 2512/102: 5/Ra/1319 (22/06/1901).
77 Mehmed Ziya, ‘Kale-i Sultaniye Sevahili, in: Muzaffer Albayrak and Ayhan Özyurt (eds.) Yeni Mecmua, özel sayısı 18/03/1918 (İstanbul 2006) and Halil Ersin Avcı (ed.) Çanakkale’yi yaşamak (İstanbul 2006) 245-262.
by the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. In this context, a cartoon of Yahya Kemal (1884-1958) in ancient costume, drawn by Sedat Nuri, appeared in the literary supplement Peyam-i Edebi of the newspaper Peyam on 26 January 1914. According to the sceptical text accompanying the cartoon, Yakup Kadri is ‘a neo-Hellenist poet, his work is unpublished, just like Homer he declaims...’ (fig. 9).

Visiting Troy was triggered by travel reports published in Ottoman periodicals. A detailed travel report including illustrations was published in the periodical Şehbal in 1913 (fig. 10). According to this lively account the best way to reach the ruins of Troy was ‘asking the drivers in Çanakkale to bring you to the place of Hisarlık. Upon leaving Çanakkale the coastal road will be followed. After one and a half hours, this road will take a curve to the left and go uphill. At that moment you will enter a quite beautiful pinewood. The panoramic view from the peak of the slope is very lovely. On one side the view of the city of Çanakkale and on the other side the panorama through the pine trees of the Dardanelles stretching like a blue ground, is astonishing. And one remembers all the civilizations that came here and have been destroyed’. Not only the route to the ruins of Troy was painted in glowing terms, the account also paid extensive attention to the Trojans and the Trojan War. According to the writer, Cemal, the famous Trojan War was a battle between Greek city-states, led by Agamemnon, and ‘the very important people who inhabited Troy, with other Asian people who were united to defend the country, led by the celebrated Hector’. Again, the Asian origins of the Trojans were emphasized, which made Turkish identification with the Trojans easier. After discussing the fall of Troy, the report highlights the development of the various settlements at the mound of Hisarlık and the discoveries of the Ottoman army during the digging of trenches in the region in preparation of the Ottoman-
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80 Cemal, Şehbal, 3/68, 394, 1 Kanun-i sani 1328 (14/01/1913).
Italian War (1911-1912). According to the author, these discoveries showed that Troy was much larger than the mound of Hisarlık. He goes on to devote some attention to the excavations of Heinrich Schliemann ‘who took a lot of objects with him, among them fairly precious weapons and vases’.

The author concludes his report with the striking characterization of Troy as ‘one of the historical treasures of our nation’. This statement demonstrates not only the appropriation of the history of the Empire’s territories and its remains, it also illustrates the notable position of Troy within Ottoman society in the wake of the First World War, a fatal event that would mark the end of the Ottoman Empire.

81 The war between the Ottoman Empire and the Kingdom of Italy is called the Tripolitanian War in Turkey and the Libyan War in Italy. It started in September 1911 and ended in October 1912. The Empire lost the war and Italy occupied the last Ottoman provinces in Africa; Tripolitana, Fezzan and Cyrenaica (together Libya). Also the Italians captured the Islands of the Dodecanese in the Aegean Sea. The Ottoman-Italian War marked the political and military weakness of the Empire, but all the more it encouraged the former Balkan provinces to unite in order to remove the Ottomans from Europe. This led to the Balkan Wars in 1912 en 1913. See: Erik J. Zürcher, *Turkey: A Modern History* (London 2004) 106-109.

82 Şehbal, 1 Kanun-i sani 1328 (14/01/1913).
Figure 1

Figure 2
Original drawing of the façade of the main building of the Imperial Museum (Cezar, 1995).
Figure 3
Ozalid copy of the buildings of the Imperial Museum, from the original plan (Cezar, 1995)

Figure 4
Figure 5
Stratigraphy of Wilhelm Dörpfeld showing the nine settlements of Troy (Dörpfeld, 1902).

Figure 6
Thymbra Farm served as military quarters for the Ottomans during the Battle of Gallipoli in 1915/1916 (Collection Çanakkale Deniz Museum, photo Geert Snoeijer, 2012).
Figure 7

Esâtîr-i Yunaniyan (Greek Mythology) by Mehmed Tevfik Pasha (1855-1915), published in 1913. Greek mythology is treated very extensively in this book. Publication of this book of 762 pages belongs to the zeitgeist of the progressive late Ottoman period in which Homer and Greek mythology gained an increasing place in the Ottoman-Turkish intellectual world (Photo Günay Uslu, 2012).
Figure 8
_Esâtir-i Yunaniyan_ includes maps showing ancient Greek civilisations in the Aegean region (Greece and Modern Turkey), such as Ionians, Aeolians, Dorians and Achaeans (Photo Günay Uslu, 2012).
Figure 9
This cartoon of Yahya Kemal (1884-1958) in ancient costume, drawn by Sedat Nuri, appeared in the literary supplement Peyam-i Edebi of the newspaper Peyam on 26 January 1914. Two acknowledged intellectuals, Yahya Kemal and Yakup Kadri (1889-1974), launched the Turkish neo-Hellenist movement in 1912. The movement's members published articles on their great admiration for Classical Antiquity in a range of newspapers and magazines and regarded the classics as providing an example for Turkish literature and culture. There was also criticism of neo-Hellenist ideas, spurred on in particular by the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. According to the critical text accompanying the cartoon, Yakup Kadri is 'a neo-Hellenist poet, his work is unpublished, just like Homer he declaims...' (photo Günay Uslu, 2010).
This detailed travel report including illustrations was published in the periodical Şehbal in 1913. According to the writer, Cemal, the famous Trojan War was a battle between Greek city-states, led by Agamemnon, and ‘the very important people who inhabited Troy, with other Asian people who were united to defend the country, led by the celebrated Hector’. Emphasizing the Asian origins of the Trojans made Ottoman-Turkish identification with the Trojans easier (Photo Günay Uslu, 2010).