


The Historical Review/La Revue Historique

Vol 17 (2020)



Selective Memory and the Legacy of Archaeological Figures in Contemporary Athens: The Case of Heinrich Schliemann and Panagiotis Stamatakis

Vyron Antoniadis, Anna Kouremenos

doi: [10.12681/hr.27071](https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.27071)

Copyright © 2021, Vyron Antoniadis, Anna Kouremenos



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

To cite this article:

Antoniadis, V., & Kouremenos, A. (2021). Selective Memory and the Legacy of Archaeological Figures in Contemporary Athens: The Case of Heinrich Schliemann and Panagiotis Stamatakis. *The Historical Review/La Revue Historique*, 17, 181–204. <https://doi.org/10.12681/hr.27071>

SELECTIVE MEMORY AND THE LEGACY OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL
FIGURES IN CONTEMPORARY ATHENS: THE CASE OF HEINRICH
SCHLIEMANN AND PANAGIOTIS STAMATAKIS

Vyron Antoniadis and Anna Kouremenos

ABSTRACT: The legacy of antiquity has loomed large over the Greek capital since the foundation of the modern Greek state. Archaeologists have served as the main catalysts in the country's endeavour to connect antiquity and modernity. Thus, the legacy of deceased archaeologists is tangible in many parts of Athens and a reminder of the significance of archaeology as a discipline in modern Greece. This article examines how the memory of Heinrich Schliemann and Panagiotis Stamatakis has been appropriated (or misappropriated) in the Greek capital. They worked together to bring to light treasures from Mycenae (1876) but shared a contemptuous relationship for the remainder of their lives. We aim to understand how society and the state treated not only the mortal remains of these two individuals but also their legacies. Hence, the abundance or absence of material evidence in Athens related to the maintenance of their memory will reveal how the archaeologists themselves worked to preserve or erase their posthumous legacy and how this has been appropriated.

In the past three decades, the study of memory has emerged as a subdiscipline in the fields of archaeology and classics. Scholars have generally concentrated on the utilisation of memory in antiquity, but the topic of how modern nation-states use and abuse the memory of their countries' pasts¹ has also gained

* We would like to thank Dimosthenis Donos and Nektarios Karadimas for their comments and suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper. This article was written within the framework of the project entitled "Anavathmis: Historical Research and Digital Applications" (MIS 5002357), which is implemented under the "Action for the Strategic Development on the Research and Technological Sector", funded by the Operational Programme "Competitiveness, Entrepreneurship and Innovation" (NSRF 2014–2020) and co-financed by Greece and the European Union (European Regional Development Fund).

¹ Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*," *Representations* 26 (1989): 13; Yiannis Hamilakis and Eleana Yalouri, "Antiquities as Symbolic Capital in Modern Greek Society," *Antiquity* 70, no. 267 (1996): 117–29; Yiannis Hamilakis, *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Dimitris Tziovas, "Reconfiguring the Past: Antiquity and Greekness," in *A Singular Antiquity: Archaeology and Hellenic Identity in Twenty-First Century Greece*, ed. Dimitris Damaskos and Dimitris Plantzos (Athens: Benaki Museum, 2008), 287–98; Dimitris Plantzos, "Dead Archaeologists, Buried Gods: Archaeology as an Agent of Modernity in

considerable ground in contemporary scholarship. According to Pierre Nora, “modern memory is, above all, archival. It relies entirely on the materiality of the trace, the immediacy of the recording, the visibility of the image.”² In this article, we focus on a slightly different subtopic within memory studies which, to our knowledge, has not been the subject of academic inquiry thus far, namely how a modern country deals with its archaeological heritage through the appropriation or misappropriation of the legacy of individuals that have left their mark on the discipline. The archaeology of death, or mortuary archaeology as it has been aptly termed,³ has developed into a distinct archaeological subdiscipline. It has attracted scholars working in a varied range of fields such as bioarchaeology,⁴ facial reconstructions of ancient people,⁵ and contextual and sociological approaches of individuals and entire cemeteries.⁶ Within this sector, archaeologists have also employed methods from other social sciences. In the last two decades, several studies on embodied identities in the context of burial ritual⁷ and on the memory

Greece,” in *Re-imagining the Past. Antiquity and Modern Greek Culture*, ed. Dimitris Tziovas (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2016), 147–64; Anna Kouremenos, “Πωμαϊκρατία ≠ Roman occupation: (Mis)perceptions of the Roman Period in Greece,” *Greece & Rome* 66, no. 1 (2019): 37–60.

²Nora, “Between Memory and History,” 13.

³Peter Metcalf and Richard Huntington, *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Mike Parker Pearson, *The Archaeology of Death and Burial* (Stroud: Sutton, 1999); Henri Duday, *The Archaeology of the Dead: Lectures in Archaeothanatology*, trans. Anna Maria Cipriani and John Pearce (Oxford: Oxbow, 2009); Sarah Tarlow and Liv Nissen Stutz, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Death and Burial* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁴ Clark Spencer Larsen, *Bioarchaeology: Interpreting Behavior from the Human Skeleton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

⁵ Jonathan Musgrave, John A.N.W. Prag, Richard Neave, Robin Lane Fox and Hugh White, “The Occupants of Tomb II at Vergina: Why Arrhidaeos and Eurydice must be Excluded,” *International Journal of Medical Sciences* 7, no. 6 (2001): 1–15, accessed 11 May 2019, <https://doi.org/10.7150/ijms.7.s1>.

⁶ Ian Morris, *Burial and Ancient Society: The Rise of the Greek City-state* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); James Whitley, *Style and Society in Dark Age Greece: The Changing Face of a Pre-literate Society, 1100–700 BC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

⁷ Parker Pearson, *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*, 49–52, 56–56; Fredrik Fahlander and Terje Oestigaard, eds., *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2008), 3–6; Silvia Bello and Peter Andrews, “The Intrinsic Pattern of Preservation of Human Skeletons and its Influence on the Interpretation of Funerary Behaviours,” in *The Social Archaeology of Funerary Remains*, ed. Rebecca Gowland and Christopher Knüsel (Oxford: Oxbow, 2006), 1–13.

of the dead⁸ have been published. But all of these enquiries have dealt with the consecration of the memory of the dead in antiquity, whether these were prominent individuals or commoners. Taking these studies as a starting point, we transport this theme into the present era by investigating how deceased archaeologists are commemorated in contemporary Athens and how their legacies are appropriated by the public and by scholars of antiquity.

Since archaeology is a relatively neoteric discipline, having been ordained as such only in the nineteenth century,⁹ not enough time has passed to allow for a comparison of the treatment of the memory of deceased archaeologists prior to the twentieth century, and this is perhaps a major reason why scholars have refrained from dealing with this topic. Multitudes of books and articles have been published on how the country has preserved the memory of major luminaries since the foundation of the independent Greek state in 1830, from the warriors who fought in the War of Independence in 1821 to writers, actors, singers, politicians, scientists, artists and other public figures since then. It seems to us that archaeologists are perhaps the only group of individuals whose memory has not been preserved in the public consciousness to the same degree as luminaries in other fields, although one may argue that archaeology as a discipline is well-respected by a large percentage of the country's population.

It is perhaps ironic that individuals who have spent their entire lives searching for various symbolisms on ancient funerary stelae and in tomb structures may themselves become part of a similar study posthumously.¹⁰ This resulted from the fact that certain archaeologists chose to express, with their own tombs and other memorials, symbolic aspects that might preserve their memory in the

⁸ Susan Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Ruth M. Van Dyke and Susan Alcock, eds., *Archaeologies of Memory* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), 5–6; John Chapman, “Notes on Memory-work and Materiality,” in *Materializing Memory: Archaeological Material Culture and the Semantics of the Past*, ed. Irene Barbiera, Alice Mathea Choyke and Judith Rasson (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2009), 2–11; Dusan Borić, ed., *Archaeology and Memory* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2010), 24–26, 48–67; Howard Williams, *Death and Memory in Early Medieval Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 1–35.

⁹ Grigorios Palouritis, *Φιλολογική ιστορία περιέχουσα τους Νόμους, την Πολιτείαν, τα Έθιμα της Θρησκείας, των Εορτών, των Γάμων, και Επικηδείων, τα δημόσια, και τα κατά μέρος παιγνίδια των παλαιών Ελλήνων, εξαιρέσως δε των Αθηναίων* (Venice: Spyridon Vlandis, 1815); Stuart Piggott, *To Illustrate the Monuments: Essays on Archaeology Presented to Stuart Piggott on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Vincent J.S. Megaw (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976).

¹⁰ For a recent study on dead archaeologists, see Plantzos, “Dead Archaeologists, Buried Gods,” 147–64.

future. Apart from the graves of archaeologists in cemeteries, the memory of an archaeologist may be preserved in other places within a city. Most European capitals with their imperial monumental city centres have been locations par excellence for the preservation of the memory of many illustrious individuals. Although not an imperial city, Athens is a capital that lacks the typical modern city centre of former imperial capitals like London, Paris or Madrid. However, the Hellenic capital is rather unique in that it still preserves the memory of many Greek and foreign archaeologists in its main cemetery, in libraries (for example, Blegen), street names (such as Lenormant and Evans) and, most importantly, in the monuments excavated by them. Athens is also a city where there is a deliberate selection of artifacts that emphasise classical antiquity at the expense of other epochs.¹¹

In this article, we focus on the uses and abuses of the preservation of the memory of two individuals who lived in Athens during the naissance of archaeology as a discipline and shortly thereafter: Heinrich Schliemann and Panagiotis Stamatakis. These two men were driven by different motives regarding archaeology and there were also personal ambitions and antagonisms specific to each one that are not always easy to interpret.¹² They knew each other very well since they had shared a pernicious relationship during the excavation of Mycenae (1876) and, after their respective deaths, they were both buried in the First Cemetery of Athens. We attempt to distinguish the motives that led to the reverence of the former and the near obliteration of the memory of the latter in contemporary Greece. We shed light on how society and the official state treated not only the mortal remains of these two men but also how their reputations have been employed by both the government and the public in the form of including or excluding their names and archaeological contributions in textbooks, museums and in the urban centre of Athens. Hence, the abundance or absence of material evidence in the Greek capital related to the memory of these two archaeologists will be significant in understanding their legacies, both as archaeologists and as public figures.

Schliemann and Stamatakis in the Realm of the Living: Excavating Mycenae
Schliemann (1822–1890) was one of the pioneers, if not the first celebrity, of the early period of Aegean archaeology. His discoveries, especially at Troy and

¹¹ Richard A. McNeal, “Archaeology and the Destruction of the Later Athenian Acropolis,” *Antiquity* 65, no. 246 (1991): 49–63; Hamilakis, *Nation and its Ruins*, 85–98.

¹² Oliver T.P.K. Dickinson, Lena Papazoglou-Manioudaki, Argiro Nafplioti and John A.N.W. Prag, “Mycenae Revisited Part 4: Assessing the New Data,” *Annual of the British School at Athens* 107 (2012): 168.

Mycenae, instigated great fervour among both academics and the public for further investigations. Indeed, one might argue that without Schliemann's genuine archaeological contributions, it would have been impossible for later scholars to access and evaluate many aspects of Greek prehistory.

After a successful career as a businessman,¹³ Schliemann developed a passion for the Homeric epics and for the recently established field of archaeology. As early as 1858, his primary goal was to discover the site of Troy. There are many studies regarding not only Schliemann's archaeological career and approaches to material culture and history but also his character and behaviour, ranging from hagiographies¹⁴ to accusations of illicit excavation activities and even forgery.¹⁵ His excavation methods have long been criticised as crude and unprofessional, and his choice of which sites to excavate as purely opportunistic.¹⁶ However, his instinct for recognising sites of great "historical" importance was probably his most useful and admirable character trait¹⁷ and one that contributed to his celebrity during his lifetime.

Stamatakis (ca. 1830¹⁸–1885), on the other hand, possessed a talent quite the opposite of Schliemann's intuition for "historical" sites. He was far more interested in excavating sites using the stratigraphic methods that had emerged in the nascent field and ascribed equal importance to antiquities of different periods. First as an itinerant ephor of antiquities and then as an employee of the Archaeological

¹³ Schliemann made a fortune (1850–1852) in the gold rush in Sacramento, California, where he also acquired American citizenship. He also opened a banking institution in Sacramento. See John F. Wilhelm, "Heinrich Schliemann's Sacramento Connection," *California History* 63, no. 3 (1984): 224–29. Schliemann gained substantial sums of money as a military contractor during the Crimean War (1853–1856).

¹⁴ Georgios Korres, *Βιβλιογραφία Ερρίκου Σλήμαν* (Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens, 1974).

¹⁵ William M. Calder III and David A. Traill, *Myth, Scandal, and History: The Heinrich Schliemann Controversy and a First Edition of the Mycenaean Diary* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1986) con. Oliver T.P.K. Dickinson, "The 'Face of Agamemnon'." *Hesperia* 74 (2005): 299–308.

¹⁶ David A. Traill, "Schliemann's Discovery of Priam's Treasure," *Antiquity* 57, no. 221 (1983), 181–86; Traill, "Schliemann's Mendacity: A Question of Methodology," *Anatolian Studies* 36 (1986): 91–98; Traill, *Schliemann of Troy: Treasure and Deceit* (London: Penguin, 1996).

¹⁷ Georgios Korres, *Αναδρομή εις τον νεοκλασσικισμόν* (Athens: Etaireia ton Filon tou Laou, 1977); Donald F. Easton, "Heinrich Schliemann: Hero or Fraud?," *Classical World* 91 (1998): 335–43.

¹⁸ This date of birth is suggested by Vasileios Petrakos, *Πρόχειρον αρχαιολογικόν: 1828–2012* (Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens, 2013), 200.

Society at Athens in many areas (Peloponnese, Delos, Delphi, Viotia and Attica) of the newly formed Greek state, he travelled around the country in order to excavate and, above all, to safeguard various types of ancient monuments from looting.¹⁹ His work was both painstaking and risky since, according to the archaeological decree of 10/22 May 1834, the excavation and trafficking of antiquities were practically permitted to all individuals.²⁰ An example of Stamatakis' efforts to protect archaeological finds from looting by both locals and foreigners is his establishment of the Archaeological Museum of Sparta²¹ in 1874, which featured some of the antiquities that he had saved from looters. His excavations in various Greek sites, in Viotia in particular, ensured that foreign archaeologists were critically trained. As expected for the time period, such training was needed for those who possessed little grounding in fieldwork techniques, as Stamatakis testified in his correspondence with the president of the Archaeological Society.²² For this reason, Stamatakis was in Delos from 1872 to 1873 in order to supervise the excavation of the sanctuary of Heracles carried out under the direction of J. Albert Lebègue²³ during a period (late nineteenth century) when most of the major foreign schools of archaeology had begun to be officially established in Greece,²⁴ with the first being the French School at Athens (1846).²⁵

Before his arrival at Mycenae, Schliemann had excavated at Troy (1870–1873), where his remarkable discoveries made him an overnight sensation in many parts of the world.²⁶ Obsessed with discovering Homeric sites that would corroborate the locations and some of the events in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* – which in

¹⁹ Vasileios Petrakos, “Ο Παναγιώτης Σταματάκης και η ανασκαφή των Μυκηνών,” in *Τροία, Μυκήνες, Τίρυνς, Ορχομενός: εκατό χρόνια από το θάνατο του Ερρίκου Σλήμαν*, ed. Kaiti Dimakopoulou (Athens: Ministry of Culture, 1990), 106–12.

²⁰ Vasileios Petrakos, “Η λεηλασία της Τανάγρας και ο Παναγιώτης Σταματάκης,” *Μέντωρ* 76 (2005): 41–150.

²¹ Vasileios Petrakos, “Ο Παναγιώτης Σταματάκης ιδρυτής του Μουσείου Σπάρτης,” *Λακωνικά Σπουδάι* 11 (1992): 642–50.

²² Dora Vasilikou, *Ανασκαφές της Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας στις Κυκλαδες, 1872–1910* (Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens 2006), 18.

²³ *Ibid.*, 17

²⁴ Elena Korka, *Ξένες αρχαιολογικές Σχολές στην Ελλάδα από τον 19ο στον 21ο αιώνα* (Athens: Ministry of Culture, 2007), 14–23.

²⁵ Besides the French School at Athens, three additional foreign institutes were established in Athens in the nineteenth century: The German Archaeological Institute (DAI, 1872); British School at Athens (BSA, 1886); and American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA, 1892). See Korka, *Ξένες αρχαιολογικές Σχολές στην Ελλάδα* for further information on this topic.

²⁶ For a summary of the evidence from the excavations at Troy and the complex stratigraphy of the site, see Easton “Heinrich Schliemann: Hero or Fraud?,” 335–43.

the nineteenth century were considered to be mere fiction by the majority of Western academics – he set out to excavate Mycenae without obtaining an official licence. He hired local workmen and started the excavation. His team opened 34 sections before the police halted the dig after less than a week.²⁷ Meanwhile, during that time, Schliemann was put on trial in Athens: the Ottoman government, represented by Philipp Anton Dethier, director of the Imperial Museum at Istanbul from 1872 to 1881, accused him of illegally exporting from Turkey to Greece the so-called treasure of Priam, a collection of objects from his excavations at Troy.²⁸ Despite all these setbacks, he managed to obtain an official licence to excavate at Mycenae and it has been suggested that his financing of the demolition of the Frankish tower on the Acropolis of Athens – a structure that the government wanted to obliterate because it distorted the Western view of the Acropolis as a purely classical monument – aided him in achieving his goal.²⁹

Schliemann conducted the excavation at Mycenae, which commenced officially on 28 July 1876, under the supervision of the Archaeological Society. This was an attempt on the part of the government to safeguard the excavation and its finds, especially after the incident with the treasure of Priam.³⁰ The board of the Archaeological Society chose Stamatakis, one of its senior members, to supervise Schliemann's work, which led to some remarkable repercussions.

The Greek archaeologist was very strict about his archaeological approach from the launching of the excavation at Mycenae: he kept very detailed notes and considered stratigraphy a key factor in his investigations. For him important finds were not limited to prehistory but included later Greek and Roman architectural and artefactual remains³¹ while Schliemann was only interested in the former period. For this reason, Stamatakis carefully catalogued all structures before their demolition. For example, while digging the so-called tomb of Clytemnestra, he insisted on excavating rather than demolishing a staircase dating to the Roman period,³² much to Schliemann's displeasure. For Stamatakis, this was standard archaeological procedure, but for Schliemann and his wife, Sophia – one of the first women to actively participate as a supervisor

²⁷ Dora Vasilikou, *To χρονικό της ανασκαφής των Μυκηνών* (Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens, Athens), 39.

²⁸ Oliver T.K.P. Dickinson, "Schliemann and the Shaft Graves," *Greece & Rome* 23, no. 2 (1976): 159–68; Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 129–30.

²⁹ Vasilikou, *To χρονικό της ανασκαφής των Μυκηνών*, 62–65.

³⁰ Dickinson, "Schliemann and the Shaft Graves," 161.

³¹ Vasileios Petrakos, *Η εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία: η ιστορία των 150 χρόνων της, 1837–1987* (Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens, 1987), 279.

³² Vasilikou, *To χρονικό της ανασκαφής των Μυκηνών*, 87.

in an excavation³³ – this meant delay. Another example that highlights their different approaches to archaeology is the excavation of Grave V of Grave Circle A. The German archaeologist surmised that he had discovered the tomb of Agamemnon and repeatedly communicated this to Athens (including to King George I) and the rest of the world by courting the attention of the media at that time. Stamatakis, on the other hand, noted in his correspondence with the president of the Archaeological Society that every time Schliemann excavated a tomb in Grave Circle A, he claimed that he had discovered Agamemnon.³⁴ Thus, the dissimilar personalities and working styles of the two men, coupled with disagreements on the value they placed on different historical periods, made the relationship between them extremely strained and, after working together for some time, they stopped talking directly to each other.³⁵ Schliemann, frustrated by the control of Stamatakis and perhaps assuming that he had finished the excavation, left Mycenae in November 1876 to concentrate on the study and publication of the finds from it. Stamatakis stayed on to clean up the unfinished work that Schliemann and his team had left behind and, in the following year, he excavated another grave (Grave VI) in Grave Circle A,³⁶ which Schliemann neglected to include in a subsequent publication.³⁷

Schliemann and Stamatakis in the Underworld

Stamatakis died on 19 March 1885 of malaria.³⁸ He had lived and worked under very trying circumstances, including by the sacred lake at Delos and at Chaeronea, Viotia; both locations had swamps with mosquitos that caused many deaths at that time. Furthermore, he was one of the very few Greek archaeologists who mostly worked outside Athens. By the time of his death, Stamatakis had been appointed general ephor of antiquities and his funeral was held in the First Cemetery, with the grave stele being designed by the German architect Wilhelm Dörpfeld, who, interestingly, had been a close associate of Schliemann at Mycenae.³⁹

³³ David A. Traill, “The Archaeological Career of Sophia Schliemann,” *Antichthon* 23 (1989): 99.

³⁴ Vasilikou, *To χρονικό της ανασκαφής των Μυκηνών*, 127–28.

³⁵ Ibid., 107.

³⁶ Ibid., 169–78.

³⁷ Heinrich Schliemann, *Mycenae: A Narrative of Researches and Discoveries at Mycenae and Tiryns* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1880); Dickinson et al., “Mycenae Revisited,” 169–70.

³⁸ Stefanos Koumanoudis, “Εκθεσις,” *Πρακτικά της Εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* 40 (1885): 9–10.

³⁹ Vasilikou, *Ανασκαφές της Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας στις Κυκλαδες*, 103.

Moreover, Schliemann seems to have somehow recognised that Stamatakis was not merely an anonymous civil servant but an important archaeologist only after the latter's death. In the introduction to his book *Tiryns*,⁴⁰ he refers to Stamatakis as a "distinguished archaeologist". Dickinson, however, sees Schliemann's behaviour as proprietarily unethical and a contributing factor to the Greek archaeologist's obscurity.⁴¹ Korres⁴² claims that Stamatakis was forgotten due to his limited number of publications;⁴³ his work received fuller acknowledgement only within the last few years and this was partly aided by articles published by Dickinson,⁴⁴ Petrakos⁴⁵ and Traill,⁴⁶ which suggested that his role in the excavation might have been much more influential than most academics assumed. Vasilikou notes that there seems to be a problem with the accessibility of Stamatakis' notes;⁴⁷ his diaries, reports and excavation notes are stored in three different archives which are not always accessible to the public. His notes and letters, housed in the archive of the Archaeological Society and which have only recently been extensively studied and published by Vasilikou⁴⁸ and Dickinson,⁴⁹ hold detailed accounts on the excavation at Mycenae and his relationship with Schliemann. Vasilikou and Dickinson have shed new light on what Stamatakis thought not only of Schliemann's behaviour but also of the excavation process as a whole. According to Dickinson,⁵⁰ Stamatakis' understanding of archaeology falls much closer to the modern standards than Schliemann's approach, which focused primarily on recovering artefacts of value

⁴⁰ Heinrich Schliemann, *Tiryns: The Prehistoric Palace of the Kings of Tiryns; The Results of the Latest Excavations* (London: J. Murray, 1886), lx.

⁴¹ Dickinson, "Schliemann and the Shaft Graves," 161; Dickinson et al., "Mycenae Revisited," 169.

⁴² Georgios Korres "Παν. Σταματάκης απόστολος εις Σπάρτην (1875)," *Επιστημονική Επετηρίς της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Πανεπιστημίου Αθηνών*, 2nd. ser., 30 (1992–1995): 508.

⁴³ Panagiotis Stamatakis, "Εκθεσις περί των εν Βοιωτίᾳ έργων εν έτει 1882," *Πρακτικά της Εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* 37–38 (1882–1883): 63–74; Stamatakis, "Επιγραφαὶ Τανάγρας καὶ Δελφῶν," *Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς* (1883): 157–66; Stamatakis, "Ανασκαφαὶ εν Τανάγρᾳ καὶ Επιδαύρῳ," *Αθήναιον* 9 (1880): 458–66; Stamatakis, "Επιγραφαὶ Βοιωτίᾳς ανέκδοτοι," *Αθήναιον* 9 (1880): 319–20, 355–64.

⁴⁴ Dickinson, "Schliemann and the Shaft Graves."

⁴⁵ Vasileios Petrakos, "Παναγιώτης Σταματάκης και Ερρίκος Σλήμαν," *Μέντωρ* 23 (1992): 181–83.

⁴⁶ Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*.

⁴⁷ Vasilikou, *To χρονικό της ανασκαφής των Μυκηνών*, 187.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Dickinson et al., "Mycenae Revisited."

⁵⁰ Ibid., 164.

and disregarding stratigraphic methods. Stamatakis was a perfectionist regarding his notes and aware of the potential value of detailed documentation.⁵¹

Schliemann spent the last months of 1890 in Naples, where he collapsed on Christmas Day during one of his daily walks and was taken to his hotel, where he expired on 26 December. He outlived Stamatakis by five years, ultimately succumbing to an ear infection. Until the last moments of his life and despite the tremendous pain his illness caused him, he was planning to visit Pompeii in the very same week that he died.⁵² The reactions to his passing within the academic community, as well as in political circles in Athens, were grandiose: Dörpfeld, at that time director of the German Archaeological Institute (DAI), Panagiotis Kavvadias from the state Archaeological Service, and Charles Waldstein from the American School of Classical Studies at Athens gave eulogies at his funeral,⁵³ which was attended by major representatives of the local community and colleagues from Europe and the United States. Even though during his lifetime the Athenian press had not treated Schliemann favourably, particularly during his trial for the treasure of Priam,⁵⁴ with his demise, both the press and his academic circle preserved his memory for generations to come. Thus, Schliemann emerged as a focal figure not only in the history of archaeology, which he helped shape, but also for the Greek nation, which recognised him for his discoveries and for being a philhellene. The important position that Schliemann holds in modern Greek history can be witnessed in the ways his memory is present and maintained in contemporary Athens, as well as in the country's history books in all levels of education. One may argue that he forms the first member of a triad of archaeologists that most Greek students examine during their school years, the other two being Arthur J. Evans and Manolis Andronikos. But, where the latter two are noted for their spectacular finds and associated with Knossos and Vergina, respectively, Schliemann is unique for his presence as a larger-than-life figure, noted more for his charisma and passion for the Homeric epics than strictly for his archaeological discoveries.

Schliemann and Stamatakis in Contemporary Athens

For the traveller or tourist who wanders around the city centre of Athens, it is nearly impossible to escape from Schliemann and his legacy. In the National Archaeological Museum on Patission Street (fig. 1), his bust, along with that

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Traill, *Schliemann of Troy*, 296–97.

⁵³ Panagis Kavvadias “Διάφοροι Ειδήσεις” *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον* 6 (1890): 166–17; Kyriakos D. Mylonas, “Εκθεσις,” *Πρακτικά της Εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* 45 (1890): 5–7.

⁵⁴ Dickinson, “Schliemann and the Shaft Graves,” 161.

of his wife, Sophia (fig. 2), and of Greek archaeologist Christos Tsountas, is exhibited in the corridor by the main entrance.



Fig. 1. Locations mentioned in the text.
(Map by authors in QGIS using Stamen basemap.)



Fig. 2. Busts of Heinrich and Sophia Schliemann at the entrance to the National Archaeological Museum, Athens. (Photograph Vyron Antoniadis.)

Furthermore, his discoveries from Mycenae are installed in Room 4 after the main entrance in the central wing, which is the most prominent part of the entire museum. In one of the walls in the centre of the room, opposite the display case containing the “mask of Agamemnon”, a poster reproducing a telegram from Schliemann to George I is displayed on the wall (fig. 3), which confirms that he donated all the findings to the people of Greece, a testament to Schliemann’s philhellenism.



Fig. 3. Schliemann's telegram to George I,
National Archaeological Museum. (Photograph Vyron Antoniadis.)

Leaving the Archaeological Museum and heading towards Syntagma Square via Panepistimiou Street, the visitor will encounter the DAI on Fidiou Street (fig. 1), which, after its establishment in 1874, was housed in this neoclassical building that was commissioned by Schliemann and purchased by the German state in 1898.⁵⁵ It is perhaps fitting that a bust depicting him can also be found here, marking his association with the institute and, by extension, his position as a founding father of archaeology in Greece. On Panepistimiou Street, the visitor passes through the neoclassical trilogy of Athens (the National Library, the University of Athens and the Academy of Athens), followed by the city's first ophthalmological hospital; in the opposite corner one finds the building of the Archaeological Society at Athens (fig. 1), where Schliemann is commemorated by a stele in the main lobby among other great donors. A photo of the archaeologist in Mycenae was displayed in a recent exhibition dedicated to the excavations conducted by the society.⁵⁶ A few meters beyond the Archaeological Society one can see Schliemann's mansion (fig. 1), known as the Iliou Melathron (fig. 4), which today houses the Numismatic Museum. Portraits of Schliemann and Sophia hang on the walls, and an entire room is dedicated to their personages (fig. 5).



Fig. 4. Iliou Melathron (Numismatic Museum), Athens.
(Photograph Vyon Antoniadis.)

⁵⁵ Wolf-Dietrich Niemeier, “Γερμανικό Ινστιτούτο Αθηνών,” in Korka, *Ξένες αρχαιολογικές Σχολές στην Ελλάδα*, 88–101.

⁵⁶ The photo is published in the catalogue of the exhibition in Petrakos, *H εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία*, 47, ph. 13.



Fig. 5. Images of Heinrich and Sophia Schliemann in the Iliou Melathron (Numismatic Museum). (Photograph Vyon Antoniadis.)

Unlike Schliemann's tangible presence in Athens, a comparative search for monuments dedicated to Stamatakis is revealing, but perhaps not surprising. Although he was general ephor of antiquities, a senior member of the Archaeological Society and an excavator of Mycenae and many other sites, his grave no longer exists in the First Cemetery (fig. 1), where illustrious figures are buried. Since the municipality of Athens considered the grave to be rather unimportant, Stamatakis' bones were thrown, in the best-case scenario, into a collective pit.⁵⁷ Stamatakis' memory is only preserved in the building of the Archaeological Society. His name, excavations, and some of his notes were on display in a special exhibition until 2017 but have now been moved to the archive room of the society. It is ironic that in the catalogue of the exhibition, a mural painting from a Roman tomb unearthed by Stamatakis, is published next to a photograph of Schliemann.⁵⁸ One

⁵⁷ The legislation concerning the treatment of human remains in Greece is regulated by the following decree: three to five years after inhumation, the bones are exhumed and placed in an ossuary as long as the family pays a rent of about 50 euros per year. In cases where the family, if there is one, cannot pay the rent, the bones are placed into a collective pit known as *choneftirio* that is usually located inside the cemetery. In the case of the First Cemetery, there are many exceptions to this rule since not all the people buried there as early as the 1840s have living heirs. For further information, see <http://www.cityofathens.gr/node/29676>.

⁵⁸ Petrakos, *H εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, οι αρχαιολόγοι*, 47, ph. 12.

wonders why Stamatakis did not leave behind any photos of himself in a period when archaeologists from all over Europe and the United States could become recognisable through the publications of their portraits in newspapers, magazines and books. In the case of Schliemann, for example, multiple photographs, sketches and paintings of his likeness survive in both Greece and abroad. Apart from Stamatakis' notes in the archive of the Archaeological Society and a few articles in archaeological magazines, there is almost nothing else that could signify his archaeological contributions. Interestingly, the only city that preserves Stamatakis' legacy is Sparta, since he founded the city's museum in 1874. One may only speculate about his relative absence from the history of archaeology in Greece. Perhaps he was difficult to work with and colleagues deliberately obliterated his memory. Maybe he lacked the funds to hire a photographer to take his portrait, although one would expect that, given his elevated standing, the Archaeological Society would have hired a photographer to do so. Or, as we would suggest, it was a combination of all these factors, in addition to his own preference to refrain from engaging with the press of his day due to an inherent introversion and perhaps even a dislike of being visible. One may go as far as to claim that perhaps he suffered from what is known today as imposter syndrome, the persistent inability to believe that one's success is deserved or has been legitimately achieved as a result of one's own efforts or skills. Whatever the case may be, it is clear that where Schliemann took great pains to preserve his legacy, Stamatakis contributed to the annihilation of his own by choosing to remain as private as possible.

The Selective Memory of a Nation

As noted above, Schliemann's legacy is preserved in five different locations of the Greek capital. From these, only two are directly related to the German archaeologist: the first is his house and the second his tomb. The construction of both structures had Schliemann's endorsement since even the design of his tomb was approved by him with a private agreement and in his last will;⁵⁹ he also chose the exact location of the tomb within the cemetery.⁶⁰ Schliemann's house was built during a period when many wealthy Greek merchants, such as Georgios Averoff (1818–1899) and his heirs, donated most of their wealth to the Greek state. Indeed, buildings such as those of the neoclassical trilogy on Panepistimiou Street, in addition to the excavation and refurbishment with Pentelic marble of the Panathenaic Stadium, were funded by them and, in return, the city honoured

⁵⁹ Georgios Korres, "Das Mausoleum Heinrich Schliemanns auf dem Zentralfriedhof von Athen," *Boreas* 4 (1981): 135

⁶⁰ Ibid.

the benefactors by erecting statues and naming streets after them. Although Schliemann himself was not Greek, he was married to a Greek woman and, possessing a great amount of wealth, he also contributed to the neoclassical building programme of the city with his house and the building of the DAI.

The construction of his residence in 1881 should be seen as a statement of a learned and wealthy individual that happened to be an antiquarian in a time when the new capital of Greece had just begun to grow. Perhaps it was also a testament to his place in the society of his time; after all, with his discoveries at Troy and Mycenae Schliemann had become an international celebrity. He had actively participated in the design and decoration of the house and in 1878 had conversed about these subjects with the German architect Ernst Ziller, who was responsible for designing many neoclassical buildings in Athens apart from Schliemann's house.⁶¹ It is important to note that, by the time of its construction, it was one of the most impressive private residences in Athens; photographs and initial plans created by Ziller reveal that the mansion was to be constructed on a spacious plot, where it would be the most impressive building of its day, second only to the royal palace on Syntagma Square (now the parliament of the Hellenic Republic), which he designed in 1847.⁶²



Fig. 6. Schliemann's tomb in the First Cemetery, Athens.
(Photograph: Vyron Antoniadis.)

⁶¹ Anastasios Portelanos, “Η οικία του Ερνίκου Σλήμαν, ένα έργο του Ερνέστου Τσίλλερ,” in *Archaeology and Heinrich Schliemann. A Century After his Death. Assessments and Prospects. Myth – History – Science*, ed. Georgios S. Korres, Nektarios Karadimas and Georgia Flouda (Athens: s.n., 2012), 449–64, <https://www.aegeussociety.org/en/publication/archaeology-and-heinrich-schliemann-a-century-after-his-death-assessments-and-prospects-myth-history-science>; Korres, “Das Mausoleum Heinrich Schliemanns,” 82. Ziller designed the mansions of many wealthy Greeks of his time, such as those of Pesmazoglou, Stathatos and Melas.

⁶² Korres, *Anαδρομαί εις τον νεοκλασσικισμόν*, 96, fig. 3.

Perhaps the best indication of how Schliemann intended future generations to regard him is his monumental tomb in the First Cemetery (fig. 6). This has been the resting place of famous Greeks and foreigners who have been affiliated with the country from its naissance in the nineteenth century to contemporary times. Established sometime between 1837 and 1839,⁶³ certain aspects of it bear a striking resemblance to the ancient Athenian cemetery of Kerameikos. It must be noted that the Archaeological Society commenced excavations at Kerameikos in 1870, and many of the early funerary monuments and stelae of the First Cemetery were inspired by the finds from there.⁶⁴ It is also interesting to note that various religions and sects are represented. One finds the section of a Jewish cemetery, now converted into an open-air museum, which is separated by a high wall from the rest of the cemetery and can be accessed only by an adjacent road and a small gate. In another section, the Protestant and German Catholic cemetery is rather symbolically separated from the Greek Orthodox part with a very low wall with many openings. The Protestant section within the First Cemetery was officially inaugurated in 1914,⁶⁵ even though many Protestant tombs precede this date. Therefore, it is unclear whether there was an unofficial Protestant part in the First Cemetery before 1914, or whether the graves and the monuments were transported there from the Zappeion area (old Protestant cemetery) after 1913. Schliemann was the son of a Lutheran minister and one would expect to find his tomb in this section but, interestingly, it is not to be found in the Protestant section where most foreigners, including archaeologists Adolf Furtwängler and Carl Blegen, were buried.

Like his house in the centre of Athens, Schliemann's funerary monument is located in the most accessible spot of the entire cemetery: on entering the cemetery from its main gate, to the left there is a small slope of a hill, below which lies the graves of various patriarchs, a few prime ministers, and wealthy nineteenth-century merchants/national benefactors. On the ridge of the slope above these tombs there are four temple-like monuments that resemble one another; the oldest of these is Schliemann's mausoleum,⁶⁶ which was constructed around 1892 and was at that

⁶³ Maria Daniil, "Η εξέλιξη του Α' Κοιμητηριού της Αθήνας μέχρι τα χρόνια του Μεσοπολέμου," *Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες* 100 (2006): 96–102.

⁶⁴ Nelly Kyriazi, "The Influence of Ancient Greek Sculpture on the Sepulchral Monuments of the First Cemetery of Athens," in *Vorbild Griechenland: Zum Einfluss antiker griechischer Skulptur auf Grabdenkmäler der Neuzeit*, ed. Jutta Stroszeck and Heide Frielinghaus (Möhnesee: Bibliopolis, 2012), 41–52.

⁶⁵ Daniil, "Η εξέλιξη του Α' Κοιμητηριού της Αθήνας," 99–100.

⁶⁶ Dimosthenis Donos, "Zitiert oder abgewandelt? Verwendung und Funktion antiker Skulpturmotive und Denkmaltypen in griechischen Friedhöfen des 19. Jahrhunderts," in

time the only impressive tomb on the hill.⁶⁷ The state of preservation of the tomb is excellent if it is compared, for example, to the burial monument of Governor Ioannis Capodistrias (1776–1831), who is regarded as one of Greece's greatest statesmen.

Schliemann signed a private contract with Ziller on 12 December 1888 concerning the construction of his mausoleum,⁶⁸ which suggests that the then 66-year-old archaeologist had already envisioned the design of his tomb. The inscription depicted on the epistyle, which is in Attic Greek, reads “Σχλιεμάννω Ήρωι” and demonstrates Schliemann's megalomania; he considered himself and wanted to be remembered for posterity as a hero, much like the heroes in the *Iliad* that had obsessed him for the duration of his life and that he was convinced he had uncovered at both Troy and Mycenae. The rectangular shrine has been analysed in great depth by Korres⁶⁹ and there is a short description in English by Traill,⁷⁰ but there are a few observations concerning its iconography that can be added to this subject. The German archaeologist is represented twice in the monument; first, in front of the temple, where his bust faces the Parthenon,⁷¹ and then in the middle of the north frieze, where he stands holding a copy of the *Iliad* and, together with his wife (fig. 7), is in the process of discovering various archaeological treasures.⁷²




Fig. 7. Frieze on Schliemann's tomb depicting Sophia and him, First Cemetery, Athens. (Photograph Vyon Antoniadis.)

Stroszeck and Frielinghaus, *Vorbild Griechenland: Zum Einfluss antiker griechischer Skulptur auf Grabdenkmäler der Neuzeit*, 64.

⁶⁷ Korres, “Das Mausoleum Heinrich Schliemanns,” 139, fig. 1.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 344.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Traill, *Myth, Scandal, and History*, 299–300.

⁷¹ Korres “Das Mausoleum Heinrich Schliemanns,” plate 19, fig. 1.

⁷² Ibid., plate 18, fig. 2.

There are many workers assisting the couple but they do not have definable human features; rather, they appear to resemble classical statues dressed in nineteenth-century peasant clothes, thus betraying their origins and cementing their anonymity.⁷³ During that time, King Othon could be depicted in an ancient Greek himation as he is shown in the main university building at Panepistimiou Street, but it was rather uncommon for non-royals to be portrayed in ancient garb. Interestingly, there is an irony between the calm expressions of the anonymous workers participating in this strange archaeological procession and the troubles that both Schliemann and Sophia faced with Turkish and Greek officials at Troy and Mycenae, respectively. In fact, it brings to mind the writings of Stamatakis when he states that Sophia made the scathing remark that he was capable only of leading animals and not archaeological missions.⁷⁴

Apart from the house and the tomb, another location where Schliemann is commemorated is the National Archaeological Museum but, in this case, one may argue that his legacy is not so much linked directly to him as to the ideology perpetuated by the Greek state. As in all national museums, the one in Athens reflects a specific ideology which is bound to its very foundation in the nineteenth century; far from being the main treasure house of ancient Greek art, the museum is one of the strongest links between the ancient and modern Greeks⁷⁵ and this ideological approach can be appreciated best via a linear chronological narrative. Thus, the way that the permanent collection is placed makes evident that not only Greek archaeology but Greek civilisation itself commences with the Mycenaeans and the excavation of their most prominent citadel. This bridges Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos' national narrative of a unified classical, medieval and modern Greek civilisation,⁷⁶ with prehistory and its champion Schliemann playing an important role in it.⁷⁷ Thus, the setting of the permanent collection makes evident the fact that the Mycenaeans are the forerunners of the Greek nation and, as the earliest-known speakers of the Greek language, deserve to be

⁷³ Ibid., plate 18, fig. 1–3.

⁷⁴ Vasilikou, *To χρονικό της ανασκαφής των Μυκηνών*, 98.

⁷⁵ Hamilakis, *Nation and its Ruins*, 115–19.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 115–17.

⁷⁷ Paparrigopoulos attempted to bridge the classical past with Byzantium and modern Greece. Athens and Constantinople became the symbolic capitals of the Greeks and a Helleno-Christian ideology was perpetuated at the exclusion of other periods such as the Roman and Ottoman. See Sofia Voutsaki, “The Search for Greek Identity in the Work of Christos Tsountas,” in *Ancient Monuments and Modern Identities: A Critical History of Archaeology in 19th and 20th Century Greece*, ed. Sophia Voutsaki and Paul Cartledge (London: Routledge, 2017), 130–47. For the omission of other periods from the Greek national narrative, see Kouremenos, “Ρωμαιοκρατία ≠ Roman Occupation.”

displayed in the best part of the museum and that the man who brought them to light should be commemorated in one of the museum's preeminent locations.

A similar ideology is propagated through the educational system; Schliemann is one of the first images of an archaeologist that a child in Greece encounters in school. As early as the third grade of primary school, a student will find Schliemann's portrait (fig. 8)⁷⁸ in a textbook and it is explicitly stated that, although he was a foreigner, he was married to a Greek woman and his discoveries proved that Greek civilisation did not begin in the Dark Ages but much earlier in the time of Homer's Achaeans.⁷⁹




Fig. 8. A page from a third-grade primary school history textbook depicting Schliemann below the poster of the 2004 film *Troy*. (Stratis Maistrelis, Eleni Kalyvi and Marina Michail, *Iστορία Γ' Δημοτικού: Από τη Μυθολογία στην Ιστορία* (Athens: Computer Technology Institute and Press Diophantus, 2013), 132.)

⁷⁸ Stratis Maistrelis, Eleni Kalyvi and Marina Michail, *Iστορία Γ' Δημοτικού: Από τη Μυθολογία στην Ιστορία* (Athens: Computer Technology Institute and Press Diophantus, 2013), unit 10, 132, accessed 4 December 2020, http://ebooks.edu.gr/ebooks/v/pdf/8547/537/10-0056-02_Istoria_G-Dimotikou_Vivlio-Mathiti/. The Homeric Achaeans are the first Greeks in this unit of the history textbook. See *ibid.*, 131.

⁷⁹ In the present edition of this book, Schliemann's portrait is printed next to a poster of the film *Troy* (2004). See *ibid.*, 132.

Interestingly, the painstaking and groundbreaking work of other important archaeologists working on Bronze Age material is completely omitted from schoolbooks, including the history book taught in secondary school which goes into more detail about the ancient world and its monuments. For example, Michael Ventris (1922–1956) and his decipherment of Linear B,⁸⁰ the written form of the Greek language during the Mycenaean period, are nowhere to be found in this narrative; Christos Tsountas (1857–1934), who produced the first synthesis of the Mycenaean civilisation and is considered by most scholars today as the father of Mycenaean studies, is also overlooked.⁸¹

In the case of Stamatakis, it is not the preservation of his memory that is remarkable, but on the contrary, the obliteration of it. Although the Archaeological Society attempted to prevent the destruction of his tomb, the municipality of Athens decreed that Stamatakis' bones and stele would be removed from the cemetery since he lacked living heirs.⁸² This is striking given that the Archaeological Society had spent 680,500 drachmas for the erection of the marble stele and for the purchase of the tomb in 1887.⁸³ One might argue that his legacy is fittingly not present anywhere in Athens apart from the archive of the Archaeological Society (which is only open to specialists by permission) since his archaeological investigations were not related to the Greek capital. But the same argument can be applied to Schliemann – he never worked on Athens' material past, preferring to conduct most of his excavations outside the Greek capital. In fact, his only archaeological investigation in the whole region of Attica took place at the tumulus in Marathon, with rather unsatisfactory results.⁸⁴ In a very short necrology, Stefanos Koumanoudis, secretary of the Archaeological Society, stated that Stamatakis passed away in the prime of his age and career, when his colleagues expected him to publish his archaeological reports from the sites where he had worked.⁸⁵ Unfortunately, this did not pan out and the Greek archaeologist was destined to become a mere name in an archive while the eminence of his colleague and nemesis Schliemann remains strong to this day.

⁸⁰ John Chadwick, *The Decipherment of Linear B* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1967).

⁸¹ Dickinson, "Schliemann and the Shaft Graves," 165.

⁸² Petrakos, *H εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία*, 282.

⁸³ Stefanos Koumanoudis "Εκθεσις," *Πρακτικά της Εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* 42 (1887): 14.

⁸⁴ James Whitley, "The Monuments That Stood before Marathon: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Archaic Attica," *American Journal of Archaeology* 98 (1994): 213–30.

⁸⁵ Stefanos Koumanoudis, "Εκθεσις," *Πρακτικά της Εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* 40 (1885): 9–10.

Conclusion

Schliemann's legacy in Athens is composed of an amalgam of his own property, his wishes and the Greek state's ideology. His image can be seen in the most prominent locations of the Greek capital: the central collection of the National Archaeological Museum, the Numismatic Museum, and on his mausoleum in the First Cemetery. One may surmise that, given his presence in so many parts of Athens, Schliemann appears to be one of the most illustrious figures of modern Greek history and tradition. After all, the iconography and inscriptions on his mausoleum demonstrate that he wanted to be remembered as the heroic excavator and explorer of the ancient world. If fame was what Schliemann pursued during his lifetime, he succeeded exceedingly in this endeavour. But while the books of history taught in primary and secondary schools in Greece depict him as the archaeologist and philhellene par excellence, one wonders whether the monuments related to him around Athens do, in fact, enhance this legacy. In essence, one may argue that they do not. Schliemann, with the magnitude of the buildings he erected in Athens and the splendour of his mausoleum, does not really give one the impression of a heroic archaeologist who was a master of his craft; instead, he appears to be more of a benefactor who also actively participated in excavations. His activity was very unusual for his time since archaeologists did not follow this lavish display because most, if not all, did not possess the financial means for such splendour and may have not been dominated by a desire to have their legacies preserved for eternity. Blegen, for example, who also spent a considerable part of his life in Athens and Mycenae, is buried in a small grave together with his wife in the Protestant section of the First Cemetery (fig. 9). The only aspect that Blegen's and Schliemann's graves share is the spiral symbol from Orchomenos and the stele of Grave V in Grave Circle A of Mycenae.



Fig. 9. Blegen's grave in the First Cemetery. (Photograph Vyon Antoniadis.)



Fig. 10. The bronze door on Schliemann's tomb, First Cemetery, Athens.
(Photograph Vyron Antoniadis.)

On Blegen's grave, the symbol is carved on the tombstone but on Schliemann's tomb it is engraved in the bronze front door (fig. 10).⁸⁶ Even Furtwängler's grave, with the magnificent bronze sphinx, is restricted to a much smaller space (fig. 11). That these two archaeologists chose to have more modest burial monuments compared to Schliemann's is a testament not only to their lower economic status but also to their desire to emphasise their work instead of their personalities and self-proclaimed heroism. But be that as it may, in the end, it was Schliemann's megalomania and fervent desire for posthumous glory that prevailed since it is he who has left his mark in the world of Greek archaeology, he who is most remembered to this day by the public, and he who appears in school textbooks as the preeminent figure of his era, even if academics today do not recognise him as a great archaeologist.

⁸⁶ Korres, "Das Mausoleum Heinrich Schliemanns," plate 19, fig. 2.




Fig. 11. Furtwängler's grave. The low enclosure of the Protestant section of the cemetery can be seen behind the tomb. (Photograph Vyon Antoniadis.)

Stamatakis probably never cared much for fame. The fact that he avoided having his photograph taken and was constantly absent from Athens, in contrast to most of his fellow contemporary Greek archaeologists, reveals a character that was consumed by his work to the detriment of his self-promotion. Only his notes outlasted him and it is telling that so little information about him as a person has survived to this day. He tried to safeguard antiquities in an environment where looting was rampant and politics and external relations with the Great Powers (Britain, France, Russia, Germany, United States) of his day were a very delicate matter.

It seems that in the end the wishes of Schliemann and Stamatakis were fulfilled. The German archaeologist is still regarded as one of the most important archaeologists of all time, at least by the Greek state, its educational system and by many academics as well as the public. This is the international view of the romantic nineteenth-century archaeologist who, despite all odds, discovers treasures and gains glory, a blueprint for the creation of characters like Indiana Jones in the twentieth century. Stamatakis, on the other hand, symbolises another romantic view of an archaeologist that is rather representative among civil servants: that of an individual who, with scarce financial means and almost no support from his employer (that is, the Greek government), would make it his life's work to safeguard what he deemed as the heritage of his nation.