A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology

Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past

MARGARITA DÍAZ-ANDREU

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP
Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto
With offices in
Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan South Korea Poland Portugal
Singapore Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

Reprinted 2010

ISBN 978-0-19-921717-5

Printed in the United Kingdom by
Lightning Source UK Ltd., Milton Keynes

5

Informal Imperialism in Europe and the Ottoman Empire: The Consolidation of the Mythical Roots of the West

'Informal colonialism' and 'informal imperialism' are relatively common terms in the specialized literature. The term 'informal colonialism' was coined—or at least sanctioned—by C. R. Fay (1940: (vol. 2) 399) meaning a situation in which a powerful nation manages to establish dominant control in a territory over which it does not have sovereignty. The term was popularized by the economic historians John Gallagher and Ronald Robinson (1953), who applied it to study informal British imperial expansion over portions of Africa. The difference between informal and formal colonialism is easy to establish: in the first instance, complete effective control is unfeasible, mainly due to the impossibility of applying direct military and political force in countries that, in fact, are politically independent. They have their own laws, make decisions on when and where to open museums and how to educate their own citizens. Yet, in order to survive in the international world they need to build alliances with the main powers, and that comes at a price. Many countries in the world were in this situation in the middle and last decades of the nineteenth century: Mediterranean Europe, the Ottoman Empire, Persia, and independent states in the Far East and in Central and South America. A simple classification of countries into imperial powers, informal empires and formal colonies is, however, only a helpful analytical tool that shows its flaws at closer look. Some of those that are being included as informal colonies in Part II of this book were empires in themselves, like the Ottoman Empire and, from the last years of the century, Italy (La Rosa 1986), and therefore had their own informal and formal colonies. The reason why they have been placed together here is that in all of them there was an acknowledgement of a need for modernization following Western-dominated models. They all had the (northern) European presence in their lands—at first primarily British and French, followed by Germans and individuals of other European states, mainly from other empires either alive such as that of Austria-Hungary or in decline like Sweden and Denmark. Some of these Europeans were trusted to provide advice on political and cultural matters, or even were appointed to Westernize their countries. The distinction between formal and informal imperialism, however, becomes blurred when some of them became quasi-protectorates of one of the main imperial powers, Egypt being a case in point (Egypt became under 'temporary' British military occupation in 1882 and a proper protectorate between 1914 and 1922). Informal empires could also have internal colonialism in their own territories. Some of these problems will be further analysed in Parts II and III of this book. Part II deals with informal imperialism, and Part III turns to the archaeology in the formal colonies.

In 1906 one of the first comprehensive histories of archaeology was published. Its author, the German professor Adolf Michaelis (1835–1910), assessed, in eleven extensive chapters, what he considered to be the most outstanding events of the history of the discipline. Italy and Greece received the most attention with nine chapters. Chapter 10 was devoted to 'single discoveries in outlying countries', in which Egypt, Babylon, Northern Africa and Spain were included. The work finished with some comments on the application of science to archaeology. Very little of the archaeology in the colonial world, that is, beyond classical Italy and Greece and Europe's imagined origins of civilization in Egypt and the Near East, formed part of Michaelis' account. Antiquities in Asia (with the exception of its westernmost fringe), Australia, sub-Saharan Africa and America were ignored. Interestingly, the archaeology of the European continent beyond the classical lands was also overlooked. However, this chapter and part of the one that follows will focus on the archaeology examined by Michaelis. In both, the discussion will revolve around informal imperialism. Perhaps controversially, the discussion of informal imperialism will start with two less-politically powerful areas of Europe, Italy, and Greece, where the ancient remains represented a powerful symbolic capital for the European imperial powers during the period discussed in this chapter, from the 1830s onwards.

INFORMAL IMPERIALISM IN EUROPE

Informal imperialism in Europe until the 1870s

After the Napoleonic venture ended in defeat a tacit agreement created an area which was protected from imperial conquest. This comprised all European countries, including those in the Mediterranean: Spain, Portugal, Italy, and, from 1830, Greece. For the remaining years of the nineteenth century the great powers had to look elsewhere for territories to exploit economically. But while overt control over Mediterranean Europe was considered unacceptable, political assistance and economic gain together with cultural predominance were more tolerable options. It is within the latter aspect that archaeology played an important role in Italy and Greece, where the Roman and Greek civilizations had developed in antiquity. The absence of similarly appealing remains in Spain and Portugal explains why in these countries, despite receiving some foreign archaeologists willing to study their ruins and some institutional attention (for example the *Bulletin de la Société Académique Franco-Hispano-Portugaise* which began in the 1870s), the scale of the intervention was noticeably more moderate. In these countries imperial archaeology only became modestly important when the dangers of undertaking research during the political instability in the east of the Mediterranean pushed some archaeologists who otherwise would have preferred to be in Greece towards the west (Blech 2001; Delaunay 1994; Rouillard 1995). The reason behind the difference in treatment between, on the one hand, Italy and Greece and, on the other, Spain and Portugal lay in the power that the classical model had in the national and imperial discourses. Rome and Greece—not Spain or Portugal—were now not only invested with a crucial role in the gestation of civilization, as was the case earlier in the century (Chapter 3), but also of the European empires themselves: each of the powers endeavoured to present their nation as the paramount inheritor of classical Rome and the ancient Greek poleis, and of their capacity for the expansion of their cultural and/or political influence.

If in the early years of nationalism state-sponsored expeditionaries, patriotic antiquaries, and their societies and academies, and the first antiquarians working in museums had been key players in the archaeology of the classical Great Civilizations, in the age of imperialism the indisputable novelty in the archaeology of Italy and Greece was the foreign school. The institutions created in the imperial metropolises—the museums, the university chairs (including Caspar J. Reuvens (1793–1835), appointed in 1818, teaching both the classical archaeological world, and others)—served as a back-up to the archaeology undertaken in Italy and Greece. In Italy and Greece the foreign schools represented a clear break with the era of the pre-national cosmopolitan academies. In contrast, at the end of the nineteenth century the debate was to a degree restricted to groups of scholars of the same nationality who discussed learned topics in their own national languages. The effect at the international level of having so many groups of scholars in the same city is still in need of analysis. Rivalries and competition, but also scholarly communication, must have all played a part. The middle decades of the century represented a period of transition for the institution in place, the Istituto di Corrispondenza Archaeologica (Corresponding Society for Archaeology) founded in Rome in 1829, still had an international character. Its inspirer had been the then young Edward Gerhard (1795–1867), who aimed to promote international cooperation in the study of Italian antiquity and archaeology, and to, as the statutes proclaimed,

> gather and make known all archaeologically significant facts and finds—that is, from architecture, sculpture and painting, topography, and epigraphy—that are brought to light in the realm of classical antiquity, in order that these may be saved from being lost, and by means of concentration in one place may be made accessible for scientific study
>
> (in Marchand 1996a: 55).

Membership of the institute was composed mainly of Italian, French, and German scholars (Marchand 1996a: 56). It subsidized fieldwork and gave grants, published its own journal, the *Anali dell'Istituto*, and printed other specialized studies (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 52–5). Yet, despite its international status, scholars from different nationalities received unequal treatment. The reason for this was that the funding mainly came from a single source—the Prussian state, a benevolence consciously linked to the institute's diplomatic function for the German country (Marchand 1996a: 41, 58–9). It should not, therefore, come as a surprise that after the unification of Germany, the Istituto di Corrispondenza Archaeologica became an official Prussian state institution in 1871, and was transformed into the German Archaeological Institute soon after, the Rome house being converted into one of its branches. In 1874 it was promoted to a Reichinstitut (an imperial institute) (Deichmann 1986; Marchand 1996a: 59, 92). Despite this, the official language of the institute would remain Italian until the 1880s (Marchand 1996a: 101).

The Istituto di Corrispondenza Archaeologica also organized foreign archaeology in Greece. However, those individuals subsidized to study Greek antiquities were, perhaps not surprisingly, of German origin (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 182). Despite this, scholars from Britain and France also travelled to independent Greece, undertaking projects such as the architectural studies of the Acropolis in the 1840s. After this, the protagonism went to the French, especially after the opening in 1846 of the French School in Athens (Étienne & Étienne 1992: 92–3; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 121, 146, 179). The School undertook further works on the Acropolis and, mainly during the 1850s, supported expeditions to several archaeological sites including Olympia and Thasos by archaeologists such as Léon Huzey (1831–1922) and Georges Perrot (1832–1914). Meanwhile, German researchers focused on analysing sculpture and producing a corpus of Greek inscriptions (Étienne & Étienne 1992: 98; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 147–8). Significantly, the ideal of an international school was not pursued here. The French School in Athens would

become the first of many schools opened during the imperial period. At a colloquium organized to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the institution, Jean-Marc Delaunay (2000: 127) indicated that, in addition to the opposition against the Germans, the creation of the French School in Athens was also related to competition against the British, and, to a certain extent, the Russians who complained about its foundation. So powerful was its diplomatic role that even when the French monarchy was deposed in 1848, the French School was left unharmed. As Delaunay argues, in Greece the British had their merchants and sailors, the Russians the Orthodox clerics, and the Germans the Greek monarchy of Bavarian origin. The French only had their school. When the Germans thought of opening a rival branch in Athens, the traditional French antipathy for the British turned towards the Germans (*ibid.* 128).

Turning to Russia, there was a Commission of Archaeological Finds in Rome operating at least from the 1840s, which employed Stephan Gedeonov, a future director of the Hermitage Museum. In the early 1860s he managed to acquire 760 pieces of antique art, mainly coming from Etruscan tombs. These had been collected by the Marquis di Cavelli, Giampietro (Giovanni Pietro) Campana (1808–80), known as the patron of nineteenth-century tomb-robbers (Norman 1997: 91). Other parts of the collection—not including antiquities—were bought by the South Kensington Museum, and another by the Museum Napoleon III—a polemic and ephemeral museum opened and closed in 1862 in Paris—and later dispersed in museums throughout France (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 168–78).

In contrast to the situation in the Ottoman Empire, in Italy and Greece experts had to content themselves with studying the archaeology in situ owing to the ban on any antiquities leaving the country. In several of the Italian states this had been the case for a long time. Although the success of the regulations had been unequal, the Napoleonic experience had reinvigorated the determination to stop ancient works of art leaving the country: new legislation such as the Roman edict of 1820 had been issued in this context (Barbanera 2000: 43). In Greece the export of antiquities was also outlawed in 1827 (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 47), although the continued trade in antiquities made them partly ineffective. Given the impossibility of obtaining riches for their museums by official means, together with opposition from local archaeologists to foreigners excavating in their own countries, most excavations in Italy and Greece were undertaken by native archaeologists. Examples of these were, in Italy, Carlo Fea (1753–1836), Antonio Nibby (1792–1836), Pietro de la Rosa and Luigi Canina (1795–1856) at Rome (Moatti 1993: ch. 5), and Giuseppe Fiorelli at Pompeii. In Greece the main archaeologists were Kyriakos Pittakis, Stephanos Koumanoudis and

Panayiotis Stamatakis (Étienne & Étienne 1992: 90–1; Petrakos 1990). These are only a few names of an increasingly numerous group of local archaeologists working in the archaeological services and in an ever-growing number of museums. Although most of their efforts focused on the classical era, other types of archaeology were being developed such as prehistoric, church and medieval archaeology (Avgouli 1994; Guidi 1988; Loney 2002; Moatti 1993: 110–14). Of special interest is the development of the so-called sacred archaeology, inspired by the interest of the Italian lawyer Giovanni Battista de Rossi (1822–94). On the basis of a study of the description of the Rome catacombs provided in documents, he was able to locate many of them starting with those of Saint Calixt in 1844. His efforts received backing from Pope Pius IX, who in 1852 created the Pontifical Commission for Sacred Archaeology.[1] Under this institution the discoveries of other monuments related to the Christian Church in the past continued. Yet, the more general histories of archaeology are mute in describing the accomplishments of Italian archaeologists.

Because of the ban on the export of antiquities, countries were unwilling to finance excavations, although there were some exceptions that will be discussed later on. This meant that most foreign archaeologists focused their studies on already excavated sites and on finds. It is interesting to note that the work of experts came together with that of other consumers of antiquities; in addition to painters and other artists in the 1860s another type of Westerner would be interested in antiquity: the photographer. Photographs increased the circulation of images of antiquity and facilitated the visual experience of the classical model (Hamilakis 2001): one in which the ancient monuments were isolated from their modern context, and emphasized in size and grandiosity, symbolizing knowledge, wisdom and, more than anything else, the origin of Western civilization.

Positivism, the philosophy that raged throughout the academic world in the second half of the nineteenth century, resulted in this period in the production of catalogues. Positivists brought to extremes the eighteenth-century empiricist understanding of knowledge. This should be empirical and verifiable, and not contain any sort of speculation. Knowledge was, therefore, based exclusively on observable or experiential phenomena. This is why observation, description, organization, and taxonomy or typology took the form of large catalogues which reported the old and new finds although they went much beyond their eighteenth-century precedents. Examples of this were, in Italy, the inquiries into Roman copies of Greek sculpture, and research into the Etruscan world, where Greek influences in particular were investigated (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 50; Michaelis 1908: ch. 4; Stiebing 1993: 158). In 1862 Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903) initiated and organized the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum* (Moradiellos 1992: 81–90), an exhaustive catalogue of Latin epigraphical inscriptions. Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century German academics took the lead in science as opposed to the French. Detailed study and criticism allowed archaeologists and historians of art to break the previously believed geographical unity of ancient Greek art (Whitley 2000). Empiricism and positivism did not mean that politics were left aside. Mommsen was very explicit about the political aim of his work. He argued that historians had the political and pedagogical duty to support those they had chosen to write about, and that they had to define their political stance. Historians should be voluntary combatants fighting for rights and for Truth and for the freedom of human spirit (Moradiellos 1992: 87).

[1] In brackets it should be said that sacred archaeology would have an influence not only in other Catholic countries such as Spain, where members of the Church included the Catalan priest Josep Gudiol Cunill (1872–1931), who organized museums and obtained the chair of sacred archaeology in the influential Seminary of Vic in 1898. In Britain a movement to study religious buildings had started in the 1840s (Piggott 1976) and continued for most of the century. Events in Britain had parallels in all Europe (De Maeyer and Verpoest 2000), and included other churches such as the Orthodox Church (Chapter 9). Members of the Church of England started studies on religious architecture in the 1840s (Piggott 1976) and throughout the nineteenth century the Church itself managed to avoid legislation imposing state control on the buildings it owned (Miele 2000: 211).

Informal imperialism in Europe in the last four decades of the century

From the 1860s important political developments took place in Italy. As in the case of Greece, these would not have been possible—at least in the way events evolved—outside the framework of nationalism. The unification of Italy, although practically concluded by 1860, was only considered to be complete after the annexation of Rome in 1870. Italian field archaeology, organized from 1870 by a state archaeological service—the Sopraintendenza de Archeologia—became even more the province of Italians. There were exceptions, but the Italian state was not eager to accept them. This would be made clear to those who attempted to contravene the tacit rules. This was the experience, for example, of a member of the French School who had obtained permission to excavate an archaic cemetery in the 1890s. Soon after the first discoveries had taken place, this work was suspended, only to be resumed under the supervision of the Italian Ministry (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 320). In some cases disputes between Italian and other experts—such as those with German archaeologists following the discovery of an archaic piece at the Roman

Forum—had some echoes in the press where the news acquired some nationalist overtones (Moatti 1989: 127). International occasions such as the meeting of the International Congress of Prehistoric Anthropology and Archaeology (CIAPP) in Bologna in 1871 were also used to foster nationalist sentiment by the Italian organizers, although these academic rivalries led to criticism by some of the Italian archaeologists (Coye & Provenzano 1996).

Nationalism was also important to the way Greeks perceived their past. The expansion of the territory of Greece throughout the nineteenth century, acquiring areas such as the Ionian Islands in 1864, Thessaly and part of the Epeirus in 1891, led to a desire to erase the Ottoman past. One of the requests for change explained that it was necessary because, among other reasons, 'barbaric and dissonant names . . . give ground to our enemies and to every European who hates Hellas to fire myriad of insults against us, the modern Hellenes, regarding our lineage' (in Alexandri 2002: 193). Emblems would also adopt ancient imagery. The local would only be one level in the collective formation of the national identity; there were others at regional, national and international levels. This building had its tensions that in themselves helped to reinforce the image of the nation (Alexandri 2002). At an academic level, the first integral national history of Greece, the *History of the Hellenic Nation* written in Greek between 1865 and 1876 by Konstantinos Paparigopoulos (Gourgouris 1996: 252), accepted the classical past as the foundational period of the Greek nation. In this account ancient Greece was linked to a second and more definite major Golden Age, the Byzantine medieval era (Gourgouris 1996: 255–6). As in other European countries (Chs. 11 to 13), the medieval period was beginning to acquire a mightier presence through these accounts of the national Golden Ages (Gourgouris 1996: 259). Yet, the appeal of ancient archaeology would remain strong to the Greeks—as is still the case. At that time it was instrumental, for example, in Greece's political claims to annexe other areas beyond the borders established in 1829. The first independent state of Greece was only formed by a few Greek territories and had left aside many other territories inhabited by a predominantly Greek population. The Megale Idea, the 'Great Idea', as this project was called, came closer to reality through the following decades with the incorporation beginning in 1864 of the seven Ionian islands which were under British protection, of Thessaly in 1881, Crete in 1912, and Greek Macedonia in 1913 (Étienne & Étienne 1992: 104–5). In Greece the importance conferred on archaeology was such that it was even financially backed by a generous source, the lottery, whose money was fully dedicated to antiquities from 1887 until 1904. After that date archaeology had to share the lottery funding with payments to the wartime fleet (Étienne & Étienne 1992: 108–9).

Classical Rome and Greece were attractive models, therefore, both for Italian and Greek nationalisms, and for European imperialism, and this was to remain so during the outburst of imperial folly the world experienced from 1870. Comparisons were regularly drawn between ancient Rome and the modern empires, these being, to begin with, Britain and France (Betts 1971; Freeman 1996; Hingley 2000; Jenkyns 1980 but see Brunt 1965). But if the model of Rome served as a rhetorical model of inspiration for politicians, the other side of the coin was also true. Several studies have highlighted the influence that contemporary events had on historians' and archaeologists' interpretations of the past (Angelis 1998; Bernal 1994; Hingley 2000; Leoussi 1998).

The creation of the foreign schools led to further competition between empires. The new foundations by Germany and France in Greece were not viewed impassively by the British. In 1878 *The Times* published a letter by Richard Claverhouse Jebb (1841–1905),[2] then a professor of Greek at the University of Glasgow, in which he wondered why Britain was behind France and Germany in opening archaeology institutes in Athens and Rome (Wiseman 1992: 83). National prestige was at stake. Eventually, the British Academy in Athens would be set up in 1884 (Wiseman 1992: 85). It had been preceded by the creation of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* in 1880. The British Academy would only have its own publication, the *Annual*... from the end of the century, but as an institution it remained generally under-funded well after the Second World War (Whitley 2000: 36).

The American School of Classical Studies at Athens was opened in 1881, preceding, therefore, the British foundation (Dyson 1998: 53–60; Scott 1992: 31). Other foreign schools in Athens would be the Austrian in 1898 and the Italian in 1909 (Beschi 1986; Étienne & Étienne 1992: 107). A similar situation to that occurring in Athens was taking place in Rome. There, the German initiative of converting the internationally based Istituto di Corrispondenza Archaeologica into the German Archaeological Institute in 1871 was soon followed by the opening of the French School in 1873. Others would follow: the Austro-Hungarian Historical Institute (1891), the Dutch Institute (1904), the American (1894) and the British (1899) Academies (Vian 1992: passim). Schools

Large-scale excavations began with Olympia by the Germans, and later also included that of the French at Delphi and the Americans at the Athenian

[2] Richard C. Jebb also pointed to the low profile of the only chair of classical archaeology in Britain. The Disney Chair in Cambridge, then occupied by an obscure clergyman with some interests in antiquity, was later occupied by Percy Gardner, a Hellenist formerly from the British Museum and a scholar with direct knowledge of the excavations of Olympia and Mycenae. Later, in 1887, Oxford University instituted the Lincoln and Merton Chair of Classical Archaeology, occupied by Gardner for almost forty years (Wiseman 1992: 83–4).

Agora (Étienne & Étienne 1992: 107). It is important to note, however, that the number of excavations in Italy and Greece were less frequent, partly because potential sponsors—mainly the state and official institutions—were not easy to convince of the value of excavating merely for the sake of widening the knowledge about the period. Professor Ernst Curtius (1814–96), for example, had to argue for twenty years before he succeeded in obtaining state funding from Prussia for his project to excavate the Greek site of Olympia. He had originally proposed to excavate the site in 1853. In his memorandum to the Prussian Foreign Ministry and the Education Ministry he explained that the Greeks had 'neither the interest nor the means' to do major excavations and that the task was too big for the French, who had already started to dig elsewhere. Germany had 'herself inwardly appropriated Greek culture' and 'we [Germans] recognise as a vital objective of our own Bildung that we grasp Greek art in its entire, organic continuity' (Curtius in Marchand 1996a: 81). The outbreak of a war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire, the Crimean War (1853–6), however, delayed his project. In 1872 Curtius tried again. He argued that in order to avoid decadence, Germany should 'accept the disinterested pursuit of the arts and sciences as an essential aspect of national identity and a permanent category in the state's budgets' (in Marchand 1996a: 84). He failed again in his plea: to the instability in Greece, he had to add the opposition by the Prussian chancellor Bismarck, who saw the endeavour as fruitless given the ban on bringing back antiquities for German museums (Marchand 1996a: 82, see also 86).

Finally, Curtius could countermand Bismarck's opposition with the support received from the Prussian Crown Prince Friedrich. The prince appreciated the symbolic importance of excavating a major Greek site. As he explained in 1873, 'when through such an international co-operative venture a treasure trove of pure Greek art works . . . is gradually acquired, both states [Greece and Prussia] will receive the profits, but Prussia alone will receive the glory' (in Marchand 1996a: 82). The prince's negotiations resulted in the excavation treaty signed by the Greek King George in 1874 (Marchand 1996a: 84). Curtius' archaeological campaign started the following year and continued until 1881. Unfortunately, no great discoveries were made, in contrast to the large quantity of finds resulting from the German excavations in the Greek city of Pergamon in Turkey in the same years (see below). Curtius' efforts, accordingly, received little public recognition (*ibid.* 87–91). Unlike the discoveries yielded by the excavations at Pergamon, those from Olympia were not sufficiently useful for the imperial aspirations of Germany. Curtius would later bitterly remark that the bureaucrats 'revel in this accidental mass of originals [coming from Pergamon] and feel they have equalled London' (in Marchand 1996a: 96n).

The difficulty in obtaining state sponsorship was not unique to Germany, but shared by all and it was related to the problems of acquiring collections. The limits to the export of antiquities meant that, to expand their collections with objects originating from Italy and Greece, the great museums of the European powers had either to buy established collections (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 167; Michaelis 1908: 76) or to acquire plaster copies of the major works of ancient art from Italy and Greece (Haskell & Penny 1981; Marchand 1996a: 166). As will be explained later in this chapter, works of art would be obtained in great quantities through excavation and/or plunder in other countries—mainly those under the rule of the Ottoman Empire—with less restrictive legislation regarding antiquities.

In any case, the charm exerted by the Graeco-Roman civilization as an example to modern imperialism was also expressed by the increase in institutionalization of classical archaeology in the imperial metropolises in this period. In France the German-inspired reform of the universities during the early years of the Third Republic (1871–1940) encouraged the creation of new chairs of archaeology at the Sorbonne and several provincial universities, these usually being taken by former members of the French School at Athens and Rome (Gran-Aymerich 1998: 206–27; Schnapp 1996: 58). In the United States, classical archaeology was initially the major focus of the Archaeological Institute of America created in 1879. Its foundation has been considered to represent the beginnings of the institutionalization of the discipline in the United States (Dyson 1998: chs. 2–4, esp. 37–53; Patterson 1991: 248). During the last decades of the nineteenth century and until the First World War, the peak period of imperialism, foreign archaeology in Greece and Italy became marked by the rivalry of the imperial nations in their research. This was demonstrated by the appearance of foreign schools in Athens and Rome. Germany and France were the first to initiate the new trend. Germany not only transformed the Istituto di Corrispondenza Archaeologica into a Prussian institution in 1871 (and then into the German Archaeological Institute) but also opened a branch in Athens and began to publish *Athenischen Mitteilungen*. This move was observed with concern by the French, who in 1873 opened a French School in Rome and in 1876 the Institute of Hellenic Correspondence, and started to publish the *Bulletin des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* (Delaunay 2000: 129; Gran-Aymerich 1998: 211). Members of the former were also responsible for organizing expeditions in Argelia (Chapter 9), building an imperial network that will be analysed below. The examination of the flow of ideas between colonies—even between informal and formal colonies—will highlight interesting linkages between hypotheses that have hitherto been addressed separately.

The analysis of the connections between the political context of research and the archaeology of the Greek and Roman civilizations in this period needs also to consider the reasons behind the emphasis placed on language and race. As had happened in the archaeological studies of the northern and central European nations (Chapter 12 and others), the archaeology of Italy and Greece also became increasingly inspired by these topics. Together with liberal ideologies held by scholars such as Theodor Mommsen, the same authors often proposed the importance of the study of race and language in antiquity. For the latter, for example, philology provided the data needed to reconstruct its ancient history, which would in fact be read as a direct equivalent to the race history of Greeks and Romans. Racial discussions on Greek archaeology revolved around Aryanism. The belief of the existence of an Aryan race came from language studies, and in particular, the discovery made at the turn of the century of the linkage of most languages in Europe with Sanskrit in India, a linkage which could only be explained by the existence of a proto-language (Chapter 8). The spread of Indo-European languages from a primeval homeland could only be explained as the result of an ancient migration of a people—the Aryans. These were argued to have been the invaders of Greek lands who had created the prehistoric civilizations uncovered in Mycenae by Heinrich Schliemann and, from 1900, Knossos by Arthur Evans (McDonald & Thomas 1990; Quinn 1996; Whitley 2000: 37). The Aryan race was judged superior to any other. The perfection of the Greek body displayed in classical sculpture was interpreted as the ideal representation of the Aryan physique (Leoussi 1998: 16–19). Classical Greeks personified, therefore, the epitome of Aryanness, that was also found in their modern heirs, the Germanic nations, including Britain (Leoussi 1998; Poliakov 1996 (1971); Turner 1981). Initially, there were no such claims of purity regarding the ancient Romans. Yet, the Villanova cemetery, discovered in 1853, was interpreted as that of a population who had arrived from the north—the Indo-Europeans—responsible in the long term for creating the Latin civilization. Later, however, racial purity became an issue.

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE SUBLIME PORTE

The Tanzimat years (1839–76)

The nineteenth century was a period of extreme change for Turkey. As the centre of the Ottoman Empire, it endured a profound crisis in which Constantinople (today's Istanbul), the capital of lands in Europe, Asia and Africa, saw its territorial power diminish dramatically until the final collapse of the empire in 1918. Contrary to common European perception, the Sublime Porte (i.e. the Ottoman Empire) did not remain motionless throughout this process. The empire had reacted promptly to the political rise of Western Europe. A process of Westernization had started as early as 1789, overcoming the resistance by the traditional forces in Ottoman society. However, its military weakness in the face of its European neighbours, evidenced by disasters such as the loss of Greece and other possessions elsewhere, led the Sultan Abdülmecid and his minister Mustafa Reshid Pasha (Reşid Paşa) to start a 'reorganization' in what have been called the Tanzimat years (1839–76). New measures taken at this period were the promulgation of legislation in 1839 declaring the equality of all the subjects before the law—one of the principles of early nationalism (Chapter 3)—the creation of a parliamentary system, the modernization of the administration partly through centralization based in Constantinople, and the spread of education (Deringil 1998).

Regarding antiquities, the most obvious result of the wave of Europeanization was the organization of the relics collected by the Ottoman rulers from 1846. The collection was first housed in the church of St Irini. It was composed of military paraphernalia and antiquities (Arik 1953: 7; Özdogan 1998: 114; Shaw 2002: 46–53). The opening of the museum could be read as a counterbalance to the Western hegemonic discourse, making Graeco-Roman antiquities 'native' by integrating them into the history of the modern Ottoman imperial state. Thus, the empire claimed symbolically to civilize nature reinforcing the Ottoman right to the territories claimed by European philhellenes and the biblical lands (Shaw 2000: 57; 2002: 59). The small collection at St Irini eventually germinated into the Ottoman Imperial Museum, officially created in 1868 and opened six years later. In 1869 an order had been issued for 'antique works to be collected and brought to Constantinople' (Önder 1983: 96). Some sites such as the Roman Temples of Baalbek in Lebanon were studied by Ottoman officials displaced there as a result of the violence which had erupted between Druses and Maronites in 1860 (Makdisi 2002: para. 23). Baalbek was not used as a metaphor of the imperial decline, as Europeans had done until then referring to the Ottomans, but as a representation of the Empire's own rich and dynamic heritage (*ibid.* para. 28). In 1868 the Education Minister, Ahmet Vekif Pasha, decided to give the post of director of the Imperial Museum to Edward Goold, a teacher in the Imperial Lyceum of Galatasaray. He would publish, in French, a first catalogue of the exhibition (www nd-e). In 1872 the position went to the headmaster of the Austrian High School, Philipp Anton Dethier (1803–81). Under his direction the antiquities were moved to Çinili Köşk (the Tiled Pavilion), in the gardens of what had been until 1839 the Sultan's Palace—Topkapi Palace. Dethier also planned the enlargement of the museum, created a school of archaeology and was behind the promulgation of the firmer legislation regarding antiquities in 1875 (Arik 1953: 7).

The authorities' reaction was not strong enough to counter-alleviate the Europeans' greed for classical objects. From 1827 Greece's ban on the export of antiquities had left the Anatolian Western coast as the only source of classical Greek antiquities to furnish European museums. This would obviously affect the provinces of Ayoin and Biga, as well as the Aegean islands then under Ottoman rule. The European endeavour centred on ancient sites such as Halicarnassus (Bodrum), Ephesus (Efes), and Pergamon (Bergama) on the mainland and on islands such as Rhodes, Kalymnos, and Samothrace. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries British, Germans, and others would divest this area of its best ancient classical works of art, an appropriation to which later in the nineteenth century its Islamic heritage would be added. Western intervention, however, was increasingly viewed with mistrust by the Ottoman government, and a growing number of restrictions were set to control it, backed by ever-tighter legislation.

France had an early but short-lived interest in Anatolian archaeology that resulted in Charles Texier's (1802–71) expedition funded by the French government in 1833–7 (Michaelis 1908: 92). During the central decades of the nineteenth century Britain became the main contender in Anatolian archaeology (Cook 1998). The sound political and economic relations between the Ottoman Empire and Britain constituted an ideal background for the intention of the British Museum Trustees to enrich the collection of Greek antiquities, enabling the organization of several expeditions (Jenkins 1992: 169). The first, led by Charles Fellows (1799–1860), a banker's son who indulged in travelling, took place in the early 1840s (Stoneman 1987: 209–16). A permit was obtained to collect the antiquities at Xantos on the island of Rhodes for they were 'lying down here and there, and ... of no use'. It was granted 'in consequence of the sincere friendship existing between the two Governments [Ottoman and British]' (letter from the Grand Vizir to the Governor of Rhodes in Cook 1998: 141). It would only be after the next major excavation, that of Halicarnassus, that resistance would begin from the Ottoman government towards this European appropriation.

Restrictions started with the dig excavations at Halicarnassus, and continued with that of Ephesus. In 1856 a permit was obtained to remove the sculptures suspected of belonging to the ancient mausoleum at Halicarnassus in the Castle at Bodrum. In this case the British Museum commissioned Charles Newton (1816–94) to undertake the first work in the field, in the 1860s supported by others (Cook 1998: 143; Jenkins 1992: ch. 8; Stoneman 1987: 216–24). One of the first clashes between the Ottoman government and the excavators sent by the European imperial powers happened here. In this

case the coup de force was clearly won by the foreigners. In 1857, Newton managed to ignore the attempts made by the Ottoman War Minister who requested some of the findings—some sculptures of lions—for the museum at Constantinople (Jenkins 1992: 183). They were finally shipped to the British Museum. The uneasiness of the Ottoman authorities towards Western intervention became increasingly apparent in the 1860s and restrictions continued to grow. In 1863 the permit to remove sculptures from Ephesus (Efes) obtained by Sir John Turtle Wood (1821–90), a British architect living in Smyrna and working for the British Railroad Company, was granted only on the condition that if similar items were found, one should be sent to the Ottoman government (Cook 1998: 146). The excavation exhumed a large quantity of material for the British Museum, which arrived there during the late 1860s and 1870s (Cook 1998: 146–50; Stoneman 1987: 230–6).

In 1871 the permission obtained by the German entrepreneur, Heinrich Schliemann (1822–90), for the excavation of Troy was even more restrictive: half of the finds had to be given to the Ottoman government. The subsequent events would later be interpreted in the Ottoman Empire as a proof of the extreme arrogance of the West. Schliemann did not comply with the agreement and decided instead to smuggle the best findings of his campaign at Troy—the Priam's treasure—out of Turkey in 1873. He claimed that the reason was 'instead of yielding the finds to the government ... by keeping all to myself, I saved them for the science. All the civilized world will appreciate what I have done' (in Özdogan 1998: 115). The 'Schliemann affair' would have consequences not only for the Ottoman Empire but for Germany as well. The embarrassment of this diplomatic situation made the authorities in Berlin determine that, in the future, private individuals would be dissuaded from excavating abroad (Marchand 1996a: 120) (although Schliemann would be able to excavate again in Troy in 1878). Imperial archaeology was more than ever becoming a conscious state enterprise. In Turkey itself the 'Schliemann scandal' would have as a consequence the promulgation of the laws of 1874–5, whereby the excavator had the right only to retain one third of what was unearthed. The implementation of the law, however, had its problems, no less because it was overlooked by many including the state, for example in a secret treaty in 1880 between the German and the Ottoman governments related to Pergamon mentioned below.

The Hamidian period (1876–1909)

The Ottoman Empire did not remain unaffected by changes in the character of nationalism in the 1870s. As with many other nations, it was mainly in this period that Ottoman intellectuals started a search for the cultural roots of their national past, for the Golden Ages of their ethnic history. In this self-inspection not only were classical antiquities given more importance but the Islamic past became definitively integrated into the national historical account of Turkey. These changes occurred in the Hamidian period during the reign of Abdülhamid II (r. 1876–1909), and a key figure in them was Osman Hamdi Bey (1842–1910), a reformist educated as a lawyer and as an artist in France (among others by the archaeologist Salomon Reinach). Hamdi took over Déthier's post at his death in 1881. As the director of the Imperial museums (Arik 1953: 8) Hamdi Bey would encourage many changes: the promulgation of more protective legislation regarding antiquities, the introduction of European exhibition methods, he initiated excavations, and introduced the publication of museum journals and the opening of several local museums in places such as Tessaloniki, Pergamon, and Cos. Regarding the first change mentioned, Hamdi Bey was behind the antiquities law passed in 1884 whereby all archaeological excavations were put under the control of the Ministry of Education. More importantly, antiquities—or at least those considered so at this time, for there was some ambiguity about whether Islamic antiquities were included—were deemed as the property of the state and their export was regulated. However, as Eldem (2004: 136–46) indicates, there still were many instances in which Europeans managed to smuggle antiquities out of the country.

Under Hamdi's guidance several excavations mainly of Hellenistic and Phoenician sites were undertaken throughout the empire. One of the first excavations undertaken by him was one that he hurriedly excavated in 1883, knowing that the Germans were too interested in it. He also dug the tumulus of Antiochus I of Commagene on Nemrud Dagi. One of the key discoveries by Hamdi Bey was the Royal Necropolis of Sidon (nowadays in Lebanon) in 1887, where he located the alleged sarcophagus of Alexander the Great which he then had moved to the Constantinople museum (Makdisi 2002: para. 29). This resulted in an important enlargement of the existing collections in Constantinople which provided the excuse to claim for the need for a new accommodation for the museum. A new building with a neo-classical façade was constructed in the grounds of the Topkapi Imperial Palace, designed by Alexander Vallaury, a French architect and professor at the Constantinople Imperial School of Fine Arts. The new discoveries, together with other Greek and Roman collections, were moved there in 1891. This museum mimicked its European counterparts: the classical past still served as a metaphor of civilization. Significantly, this past was physically separated from the more recent, Oriental antiquities, which were not moved to the new premises. The new museum was well received by Europeans; as

Michaelis (1908: 276) stated, the museum was ranked 'among the finest in Europe'.

Despite restrictions and new legislation, foreign archaeology's intervention on Turkish soil grew in the Hamidian period. Britain now shared her involvement with other rising imperial nations such as Germany (Pergamon, from 1878), Austria (Gölbasi, from 1882, Ephesus, from 1895), the United States (Assos from 1881, Sardis from 1910) and Italy (from 1913).[3] Of these, Germany would be the nation to invest most efforts in—and obtain more riches from—Anatolian archaeology. This can be contextualized in the favoured treatment that Abdülhamid II gave to the Germans, when he established a strong informal alliance between the Ottoman Empire and Germany in the decades leading up to the First World War. In archaeology, in the first instance, Germany's role owed much to Alexander Conze's (1831–1914) shrewdness regarding the settlement made for the excavation of Pergamon. From his post as director of the Berlin Royal Museums' sculpture collection, Conze convinced the excavator, Carl Humann (1839–96), to downplay the potential of the site to be in a better negotiating position with the Ottoman government. Findings made from 1878 were not publicized until 1880, by which time the Ottoman government had not only sold the local property to Humann in a secret treaty, but also renounced its one-third share of the finds in favour of a relatively small sum of money—a deal partly explained by the bankruptcy of the Ottoman state (Marchand 1996a: 94; Stoneman 1987: 290). In 1880 Germany saw the arrival of the first impressive shipment from Pergamon. Humann 'was received like a general who has returned from the battlefield, crowned with victory' (Kern in Marchand 1996a: 96). As indicated earlier in this chapter, the success in Pergamon resulted in the lack of interest in excavations in Greece—Olympia— which, it was felt, only provided information for science and not objects of value to be displayed in museums (Marchand 2003: 96). For the idea of archaeology as history of art, however, the excavations of Pergamon came to form part of a trilogy that was to be the basis of the understanding of Greek archaeology. As the excavation of Olympia in Greece had provided a higher understanding of the sequence from the archaic to the Roman periods, and that of Ephesus provided information from the seventh century BCE[4] to the Byzantine era, the work on Pergamon reinforced knowledge of the urbanism, culture and art of the post-Alexandrine and Roman periods (Bianchi Bandinelli 1982 (1976): 113–15).

[3] References for the imperial archaeology in the Hamidian period are for Britain (Gill 2004); Germany (Marchand 1996a); Austria (Stoneman 1987: 292; Wiplinger and Wlach 1995); the United States (Patterson 1995b: 64), and Italy (D'Andria 1986).

[4] In this book BCE [before common era] will be used instead of BC and CE instead of AD.

The numerous findings unearthed in the various campaigns of Pergamon—the first one finished in 1886 but then continued in 1901–15 and from 1933 (Marchand 1996a: 95)—would also create in Germany the need for a large museum similar to the British Museum and the Louvre. The Pergamon Museum, planned in 1907, would eventually open in 1930 (Bernbeck 2000: 100). The excavation of Pergamon was also important on another level. In 1881 Alexander Conze became the head of the German Archaeological Institute. The campaign at Pergamon had taught him several lessons, not least that the institute had to be formed by salaried experts, following the directives of the main office of the German Archaeological Institute in Berlin (Marchand 1996a: 100). Under his direction, the German Archaeological Institute became the first fully professionalized foreign institute.

Finally, the German excavations were very influential in several European countries.[5] The successor to Conze's Austrian chair from 1877 was Otto Benndorf (1838–1907).[6] After teaching in Zurich (Switzerland), Munich (Germany), and Prague (Czechia, then part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire), he was appointed in Vienna, founding the archaeology and epigraphy department. In 1881–2 he excavated the Heroon of Gölbasi-Trysa, in Lycia (a region located on the southern coast of Turkey), sending reliefs, the entrance tower, a sarcophagus, and more than one hundred boxes to the Kunsthistorisches Museum (Museum of Art History) in Vienna in 1882. He helped Carl Humann with his excavation in Pergamon and later in the century, in 1898, he founded the Österreichische Archäologische Institut (Austrian Archaeological Institute) and was its first director until his death.

The study of the past in the Hamidian period did not only differ from the previous years in the greater control exerted by the Ottoman government regarding classical antiquities. It also contrasted with the Tanzimat era in the firm integration of Islamic history as part of Turkey's past. This coincided with a renewed impulse given to national history (Shaw 2002: chs. 7–9). Although the best-known national history of Turkey, Necib Asim's *History of the Turks*, was only published in 1900, publications similar to those produced by the European nations existed from the 1860s, such as that published by a converted Polish exile, Celaleddin Pasha, in 1869, *Ancient and Modern Turks* (Smith 1999: 76–7). These histories assisted in the formation of a new, modern identity for the Ottoman Empire. In them, the Islamic past was described. During the Hamidian period Islam was being used as one of the main reasons to hold the state together, although in practice different religions and ethnic groups were tolerated as an integral part of the empire (Makdisi 2002: paras. 10–13). The Islamic past became worth researching, preserving and displaying. In the new landscape of the empire, religious and imperial sites—places that were somehow related to the history of the Ottoman ruling family—became national symbols (Shaw 2000: 66). In some of them monuments were erected as historical mnemonics, as objects to assist memory. Thus, in 1886 a mausoleum was built for the resting place of Ertugrul Gazi, the father of the first sultan of the House of Osman and one of Turkey's original heroes (Deringil 1998: 31).

[5] For American archaeologists in Turkey see Gates (1996).

[6] There are many more German and Austrian scholars working on the Greek world whose scholarship was extremely influential in the development of the philological and art-historical approach in the last decades of the nineteenth century. To name a few, one can mention Franz Wickhoff (Art History), Robert Ritter von Schneider (Greek Archaeology), Wolfgang Reichel (Homeric Archaeology), and Eugen Bormann (Ancient History and Epigraphy) (see also others in Marchand 1996a).

Yet, although the Islamic past was definitively becoming part of the nationalist agenda, the appeal of the archaeology of the Islamic period only increased gradually. There were signs pointing in this direction, such as the creation of a first Department of Islamic Arts in the Ottoman Imperial Museum in 1889, that is, about twenty-five years after its opening. However, when the classical works of art were moved to the new museum premises in 1891, Islamic works of art were left behind, being taken from one venue to another until 1908, when they were eventually assembled in Topkapi's Tiled Pavilion. Despite their apparent lesser importance, the very act of displaying objects hitherto vested with religious significance marked in itself an important landmark and its significance should not be underestimated. This was not the result of storing objects as a response to a threat of destruction of religious objects, as had happened in Paris a century before when the Museum of French Monuments was created (Chapter 11), but part of a conscious process of nation building. Religious objects were being converted into national icons. The importance of antiquities from the Islamic period also became apparent in 1906, when new legislation tried to put a halt to their rapid disappearance to the European market which was growing increasingly eager for exotic Oriental objects. The lateness in building a sound scholarly base for the historical and artistic understanding of the Islamic past may explain why archaeology was practically left aside in the construction of pan-Islamic nationalism, a movement that also had followers in the Ottoman Empire such as Egypt (Gershoni & Jankowski 1986: 5–8).

Islamic antiquities would finally be given priority as secularized metaphors of the Golden Age of the Turkish nation after the constitutionalist Young Turk Revolution of 1908–10 (Shaw 2000: 63; 2002: ch. 9). Several commissions were organized, the first one in 1910, to discuss the preservation of Islamic antiquities in the country. In the following years others would be organized, one in 1915 to take on researching and publishing works 'of Turkish civilization, Islam, and knowledge of the nation' (in Shaw 2002: 212). Finally, in the same year the Commission for the Protection of Antiquities was set up to deal with the enforcement of the legislation protecting antiquities. A report on the deplorable state of the palace of Topkapi was issued acknowledging that 'Every nation makes the necessary provisions for the preservation of its fine arts and monuments and thus preserves the endless virtues of its ancestors as a lesson in civilization for its descendants' (in Shaw 2002: 212). As these words make clear, the nationalist vocabulary had definitively been accepted in Turkey's policy towards archaeological heritage.

In addition to the re-evaluation of the Islamic past, at the start of the twentieth century a fresh interest in the prehistoric past emerged. Interestingly, it was promoted by a pan-Turkish ideology which proposed the union of all Turkish peoples in Asia in one nation-state (Magnarella & Türkdogan 1976: 265). The proponents of this ideology organized the Turkish Society (Türk Dernegi) in 1908, an association with its own journal, *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Homeland). The society's objectives were to study 'the ancient remains, history, languages, literatures, ethnography and ethnology, social conditions and present civilizations of the Turks, and the ancient and modern geography of the Turkish lands' (in Magnarella & Türkdogan 1976: 265). As in Europe, the search for a national prehistoric past became a quest for the racial origins of the nation identified in the Sumerians and Hittites. This would feature in the discourse on the past adopted by Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938) after his rise to power after the First World War.

POST-NAPOLEONIC EGYPT: PLUNDER AND NARRATIVES OF EMPIRE AND RESISTANCE

The plunder of Egyptian antiquities

There had been a long tradition of interest in Egyptian antiquities even before the studies undertaken in situ in the Napoleonic period (Chapters 2 and 3). After the power struggle which followed the French and British invasions, Muhammad Ali, an army officer of Macedonian origin, was confirmed as Egypt's ruler in 1805. Under him, Egypt acted with increasing independence from her Ottoman master. His period in office (r. 1805–48) was characterized by a state-led modernization towards the Western model. In this context, some native scholars travelled to Europe. One of these was Rifaa Rafii al-Tahtawi (1801–73), who spent some time in Paris in the late 1820s, where he became aware of the European interest in Egyptian (and classical) antiquities. One of his collaborators was Joseph Hekekyan (*c.* 1807–74), a British-educated Armenian engineer born in Constantinople who worked on the industrialization of Egypt (Jeffreys 2003: 9; Reid 2002: 59–63; Solé 1997: 69–73). The situation al-Tahtawi found back in Egypt was deplorable compared to the standards he had learned in Paris. Antiquities were not only being destroyed by the local people, who saw the old temples as easy quarries for stone or lime, they were also being plundered by collectors of antiquities. These were led by the French, British and Swedish consuls—Bernardino Drovetti (1776–1852), Henry Salt (1780–1827) and Giovanni Anastasi (1780–1860)—and their agents—Jean Jacques Rifaud (1786–1852) and Giovanni Battista Belzoni (1778–1823) as well as by professional looters.[7] Later scientific expeditions had also taken part in the seizure of antiquities. The French expedition of 1828–9 headed by Champollion was by far the most modest. In addition to many antiquities, the expedition obtained a major piece of one of the obelisks at Luxor, which was erected at the Place de la Concorde in Paris in 1836. This was one of the many examples in which obelisks became part of the urban landscape of imperial Europe. The obelisk at the Place de la Concorde in Paris was the first one to be removed in the modern era. Then, in 1878, another one—the so-called 'Cleopatra's Needle'—was erected on the Thames Embankment in London and in 1880 New York acquired its own obelisk at Central Park. As a result only four obelisks were left standing in Egypt (three in the Karnak Temple in Luxor and one in Heliopolis, Cairo), whereas Rome had thirteen, Constantinople had one, and Britain, France, and the US had one each.

Other expeditions were not as modest as Champollion's. Richard Lepsius, sent by the Prussian state between 1842 and 1845, in addition to recording many site plans and rough stratigraphic sections (later published in his multi-volume *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*), managed to increase considerably the Berlin Museum's collections (Marchand 1996a: 62–5). Lepsius advocated for Prussian involvement in Egypt as a way for Prussia to become a major player in the study of that civilization. As he put it:

> It seems that for Germany, for which above all other nations scholarship has become a calling, and which has not yet done anything to further scholarship since the key to the ancient land of wonders was found [Champollion's decipherment of the hieroglyphs], the time has come to take up this task from her perspective and to lead on toward a solution.
>
> (Marchand 1996a: 62–3).

[7] On the personalities dealing with archaeology in this period see Fagan (1975: 97–256); Jasanoff (2005: chs. 7–9); Manley and Rée (2001); Mayes (2003); Vercoutter (1992: 60–82). On the French expedition of 1828–9 Fagan (1975: 97–256); Gran-Aymerich (1998: 79); Jasanoff (2005: 287–99); Vercoutter (1992: 60–82). About the obelisks see Fagan (1975: 260); Habachi (1977: ch. 7); Iversen (1968–72); Jasanoff (2005: 293).

One of Lepsius' colleagues, Ernst Curtius, reported that Lepsius had always been proud 'that he was allowed to be the one who unfurled the Prussian banner in a distant part of the world and was permitted to inaugurate a new era of science and art in the Fatherland' (in Marchand 1996a: 63).

Tahtawi's protests against the lack of interest towards the ancient Egyptian civilization, together with Champollion's pleas to the pasha, eventually resulted in the promulgation of an edict in 1835 forbidding the export of antiquities and making it illegal to destroy monuments (Fagan 1975: 262, 365; Reid 2002: 55–6). The ordinance also regulated the creation of an Egyptian Antiquities Service housed in the Ezbeqieh gardens of Cairo, where a museum was formed. The museum was to house antiquities belonging to the government and obtained through official excavations. However, most of these measures came to nothing, for the pasha was not interested in creating mechanisms to enforce the law. Instead, he subsequently used the museum collections as a source of gifts for foreign visitors; the last objects dispatched in this way were sent to the Archduke Maximilian of Austria in 1855.

European demand and Muhammad Ali's lack of care for the past encouraged the development of a strong antiquities market. Antiquities were being shipped out of Egypt in great quantities, the most popular destinations being the great museums. As Ernest Renan (1823–92), perhaps chauvinistically, described the situation in the 1860s:

> Purveyors to museums have gone through the country like vandals; to secure a fragment of a head, a piece of inscription, precious antiquities were reduced to fragments. Nearly always provided with a consular instrument, these avid destroyers treated Egypt as their own property. The worst enemy, however, of Egyptian antiquities is still the English or American traveller. The names of these idiots will go down to posterity, since they were careful to inscribe themselves on famous monuments across the most delicate drawings.
>
> (Fagan 1975: 252–3).

The antiquities market was also promoted by the appearance of a new type of European in Egypt. They were tourists helped, from 1830, by the publication of tourist guides starting with one in French and followed by others published in English and German (Reid 2002: ch. 2).

Auguste Mariette

Change would only come with the advent of the French archaeologist Auguste Mariette (1821–81). Mariette's first visit to Egypt took place in his role of an agent with the remit of obtaining antiquities for the Louvre. In 1850–1 he excavated the Serapeum at Sakkara, providing the Louvre with a large collection of objects. He returned to Egypt in 1857 to assemble a collection of antiquities to be presented as a gift to 'Prince Napoleon'—Napoleon III' cousin—during his planned (but never undertaken) visit to Egypt. Before Mariette returned to France in 1858 a good friend of the pasha, the French engineer Ferdinand de Lesseps (the builder of the Suez Canal between 1859 and 1869), convinced him to appoint Mariette as 'Maamour', director of Egyptian Antiquities, and put him in charge of a resurrected Antiquities Service. He was given funds to allow him 'to clear and restore the temple ruins, to collect stelae, statues, amulets and any easily transportable objects wherever these were to be found, in order to secure them against the greed of the local peasants or the covetousness of Europeans' (in Vercoutter 1992: 106). Mariette saw the beginning of a period of about ninety-four years of predominance of French archaeology over Egyptology, lasting even during much of the 'temporary' British military occupation of Egypt from 1882 (Fagan 1975; Reid 2002: chs. 3–5; Vercoutter 1992).

Mariette managed to set up a museum in 1863 and to slow down the pace at which Egyptian monuments were being destroyed, partly by forbidding all archaeological fieldwork other than his own. To a certain extent he was also able to hold back the export of antiquities. In 1859 the news of a discovery of the intact sarcophagus of Queen A-hetep and the seizure of all findings by the local governor required Mariette's strong intervention to stop this illegal appropriation of archaeological objects. The resulting treasure was presented to the pasha and included a gift of a scarab and a necklace for one of his wives. The pasha's delight at both the findings—as well as, and as Fagan points out (1975: 281), at the discomfiture of his governor,—led him to order the building of a new museum, which would eventually be opened at the suburb of Bulaq in Cairo. The Queen A-hetep finding was also important in a different way. When the Empress Eugénie, Napoleon III's wife, asked the pasha to receive this discovery as a gift to her, he sent the Empress to ask Mariette, who refused to handle it. This decision was not received happily by either of the sovereigns, but it was a landmark in the conservation of Egyptian archaeology (Reid 1985: 235). Mariette also ignored Napoleon III's comment that the antiquities of the Bulaq would be better off in the Louvre (*ibid.* 2002: 101).

Mariette—as well as his successor to the post, Gaston Maspero—was merely able to reduce the destruction and illegal export of antiquities rather than stop it completely. There were even accusations of the Antiquities Service's involvement in the illegal handling of works of art (Fagan 1975: passim). He had to be especially vigilant towards the agents of the great European museums. The craving for more antiquities had not halted, despite the law that new museum acquisitions could now only be acquired through the legal export of antiquities. The continuation of illegal trade of antiquities indicates that the European governments were in practice disregarding Egyptian law. This disrespect was explained by Wallis Budge, assistant keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities in the British Museum, described by Fagan (1975: 295–304) as one of the major illegal looters of antiquities, in the following manner:

> Whatever blame may be attached to individual archaeologists for removing mummies from Egypt, every unprejudiced person who knows anything of the subject must admit that when once a mummy has passed into the care of the Trustees, and is lodged in the British Museum, it has a far better chance of being preserved there than it could possibly have in any tomb, royal or otherwise, in Egypt.
>
> (Fagan 1975: 304).

The fear of losing the French control of Egyptian archaeology when Mariette's health deteriorated fostered the creation of the first foreign school in Cairo, the Mission Archéologique, the French Archaeological Mission of 1880, later transformed into the French Institute of Oriental Archaeology (Reid 1985: 236; Vernoit 1997: 2). Therefore, as already in Italy and Greece, in Egypt the French state funded an institution to deal with antiquities. In contrast, the similar British institution, the Egypt Exploration Fund (later called Egypt Exploration Society) founded in 1882, was a private initiative. The impetus for its creation came mainly from the English lady novelist and travel writer, Amelia Edwards (1831–92). Edwards had travelled to Egypt with her companion Kate Griffiths in 1873–4 and then set out to popularize the Egyptian world through her publications and numerous talks as well as to denounce the extent of the looting of antiquities (Champion 1998: 179–82; Fagan 1975: 322; Moon 2006). In Britain she received the support of Reginald Stuart Poole (1832–95), the keeper of the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum. The objectives of the Egypt Exploration Fund were 'to organise expeditions in Egypt, with a view to the elucidation of the History and Arts of Ancient Egypt, and the illustration of the Old Testament narrative, so far as it has to do with Egypt and the Egyptians' (in Fagan 1975: 323). This emphasis introduces an important factor that will be further discussed in Chapter 6: the influence of the Bible in the archaeology of Egypt, as well as Mesopotamia, Palestine, and to a certain extent Lebanon and Turkey. Accordingly, the Fund promoted legal intervention in Egyptian archaeology by scientifically excavating promising sites and respecting the legislation regarding the destination of the finds. Amelia Edwards would also become important in Egyptian archaeology for her role in academic Egyptology. In her Will she endowed a chair of Egyptian archaeology at the University of London to be occupied by her protégé Flinders Petrie (1853–1942). In addition to the French Institute of Oriental Archaeology and the Egypt Exploration Society, the Germans established a 'general consulate' for archaeology in 1899 which in 1907 became the German Institute for Egyptian Antiquity (Deutsches Institut für ägyptische Altertumskunde) (Marchand 1996a: 195).

The imperial resistance against a native alternative

Protagonism in nineteenth-century Egyptian archaeology had resided in foreign activities on Egyptian soil. This was not only caused by the interest of the imperial powers in appropriating the Pharaonic past, but also by their opposition to accepting native expertise in the study of antiquities. Mariette's role—as well as those of his successors—in stopping antiquities leaving Egypt was not matched by an opening of the foundation of a national Egyptian archaeological institution. A generalized patronizing attitude prevailed towards Egyptians. Hekekyan's geomorphological studies in the Cairo area, one of the earliest of this kind, was received in Britain with the criticism that the survey was not reliable because it had not been supervised by an authoritative scholar such as his sponsor, the President of the London Geological Society, Leonard Horner (Jeffreys 2003: 9). Another case of Europeans' patronizing attitude or prejudice towards Egyptians is that of the French archaeologist Mariette, who gave orders that no native would be allowed to copy inscriptions in the museum. Also Maspero's description of the opening of the Archaeology Museum in 1863 years later is revealing. He said that the Pasha, Khedive (viceroy) Ismail (r. 1863–79), 'being the true Oriental that he was . . . the loathing and fear which he had of death kept him from entering a building containing mummies' (in Reid 2002: 107). Native would-be Egyptologists seeking careers in the Antiquities Service were denied entry during Mariette's time, despite some being trained at the School of the Ancient Egyptian Language or School of Egyptology, created by his colleague (and friend) the German scholar Heinrich Brugsch in 1869 (*ibid.* 116–18). Despite Mariette's efforts against this, after his death some of Brugsch's disciples were able to achieve positions of importance within official Egyptian archaeology. One of them, Ahmad Pasha Kamal (1849–1923), would become the first Egyptian curator at the Cairo Museum. He was appointed to the museum after Mariette's death, and in the first few years organized a course on Egyptian hieroglyphs for a small number of students. Yet, following Maspero's departure to France in 1886, a period of chaos resulted in which the museum was led by incompetent directors (Fagan 1975: 353) who disregarded native expertise. Kamal had to close his Egyptian hieroglyphs school. Few of his students found jobs in the Antiquities Service, and Kamal himself was marginalized at the museum in favour of more junior French archaeologists. During this period, however, another Egyptian trained in Brugsch's school, Ahmad Najib, became one of the two inspectors-in-chief (*ibid.* 186–90). Upon Maspero's return from France in 1899 Najib was supplanted from his post. Although no Egyptian was given the directorship of any of the five provincial inspectorates, Ahmad Kamal was promoted to become one of the three curators of the museum (the others being of French and German origin). Kamal's appointment acted as a precedent, and made possible the opening of other museums elsewhere in Egypt run by local staff (Haikal 2003; Reid 2002: 204).

Kamal continued his efforts to teach Egyptology, first at the Higher School Club, then at a newly founded private Egyptian University in 1908–9,[8] and finally from 1912 at the Higher Teachers College. His pupils, although they still experienced a chilly reception by the Europeans in charge and were denied entry to the Antiquities Department, would form the important second generation of native Egyptologists (Haikal 2003). Kamal retired in 1914, his post being filled by a non-Egyptian. When he again insisted on the need to train Egyptians shortly before his death the then director of the museum replied that only a few Egyptians had shown any interest on the subject. 'Ah M. Lacau', the answer came, 'in the sixty-five years you French have directed the Service, what opportunities have you given us?' (in Reid 1985: 237).

Egyptians had also been denied the chance to study and preserve Islamic art—then called Arab art and archaeology (Reid 2002: 215). As might have been expected, given the situation described above, the initiative of caring for the Islamic period had come from Europeans—mainly from French and British citizens. This had come with the creation of the Committee for the Conservation of Monuments of Arab Art in 1881. Three years later the Museum of Arab Art was opened by this institution at the ruined mosque of al-Hakim with only one staff member—the doorkeeper (*ibid.* ch. 6, esp. 222). Although in most cases Egyptians outnumbered Europeans in the committee their influence was less powerful. They were officials who had other commitments and were not paid to serve in a committee whose discussions were, moreover, undertaken in a foreign language—French. In addition, the decisions made by the committee were taken on the basis of a technical section exclusively formed by Europeans who worked daily on the matters

[8] The Egyptian University was created in 1908 under the inspiration of Khedive Abbas (Abbas Hilmi II), overcoming the opposition of the British Consul General in Egypt Lord Cromer who had previously vetoed the institution as a breeding ground for nationalists (Reid 2002: 248).

under discussion. Not surprisingly, Egyptian attendance at meetings seems to have been poor, this being due to the resistance against European dominance or perhaps to reluctance in the face of foreign expertise. However, it was an Egyptian, Ali Bahgat (1858–1924), who directed the excavations at the Islamic ruins of Fusat begun by the Museum of Arab Art in 1912 (Vernoit 1997: 5). Despite this, in this period, Islamic archaeology did not reach the importance that had been granted to Pharaonic Egypt. At the turn of the century new premises for the Museum of Arab Art were built, but their cost was only a quarter of that of the new buildings opened in 1902–3 for the Egyptian Museum displaying collections of Pharaonic Egypt. It may be worth noting that this imbalance in the importance given to each museum is paralleled in the number of pages the widely used Baedeker tourist guide assigned to them in its edition of 1908. Two and a half pages were devoted to Islamic art as opposed to twenty-eight on Pharaonic Egypt (Reid 2002: 215, 239).

The obvious power that the classical model had in the Western world was epitomized by the publications of the British Consul General in Egypt from 1883 to 1907, Lord Cromer, who, for example, in *Modern Egypt* (1908), often included untranslated Greek and Latin quotations. He served as the president of the London Classical Association after his retirement and also had an effect on Egyptian native scholarship. However, not only Europeans paid attention to the Graeco-Roman past. A few decades before Cromer, as Reid indicates, Al-Tahtawi's *Anwar* (1868), which has been admired for its novel treatment of Pharaonic Egypt, in fact had twice the number of pages dedicated to the Greek, Roman, and Byzantine periods (Reid 2002: 146). Also in the mid 1860s excavations were undertaken in Alexandria, the town to the north of Egypt of Hellenistic origin, by another Egyptian savant, Mahmud al-Falaki (1815–85). He was a naval engineer who had become interested in astronomy in Paris, and in combining it with geography and ancient topography. His excavations aimed at drawing a map of the city in ancient times, a work that scholars have used ever since (*ibid.* 152–3). Despite his expertise, Mahmud al-Falaki seems to have perceived Europe as the centre for 'pure science'. He believed that scientists living elsewhere should assist European research by compiling data and resolving applied problems (*ibid.* 153).

The examples of Al-Tahtawi and al-Falaki, however, seem to have been the exception. In spite of al-Falaki's initiative most of those involved in the Institut égyptien (1859–80), the place in Alexandria where papers on Graeco-Roman topics were read and articles published, were Europeans. Similarly few Egyptians participated in the discussions (*ibid.* 159). No Egyptian Muslims or Copts played a part either in the foundation of a Greco-Roman Museum in 1892 or a Société d'archéologie d'Alexandrie in 1893. In 1902 from the total membership of 102 members of the society, only four were

Egyptians. The bulletin of the society was published in the major European languages but not in either Arabic or Greek (*ibid.* 160–3). Yet, in addition to Europeans there was another group who showed an interest in the study of the Graeco-Roman past. These were Syrian Christian immigrants who had arrived in Egypt from the mid 1870s, undertook many translations and wrote about the classical period in many publications written in Arabic (*ibid.* 163–6).

Unique to Egypt, of course, was its Pharaonic past. From the three possible types of nationalism existing in Egypt at the time, ethnic or linguistic nationalism, religious nationalism, and territorial patriotism, it was, to a certain extent, the second and, particularly, the third type that had a major influence at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century (Gershoni & Jankowski 1986: 3). This form of nationalism allowed the integration into the national discourse of the country's most ancient past. The Pharaonic past became the original Golden Age of the nation in the early national histories of Egypt. Of special importance was the work of Tahtawi, now considered the most important thinker of Egypt, most notably the first volume of his national history which was published in 1868–9 (Reid 1985: 236; Wood 1998: 180). The Pharaonic past became part of the secondary school curriculum in Egypt from at least 1874 (Reid 2002: 146–8; Wilson 1964: 181). In the midst of the nationalist ferment of the 1870s and early 1880s, local interest in ancient Egypt made possible the publication of books on the subject written in Arabic mainly by ex-students of Brugsch's school. At least two appeared in the 1870s, three in the 1880s, and six in the 1890s (Reid 1985: 236). The emergent nationalism movement against British control over Egypt would eventually be led by a young lawyer, Mustafa Kamil (1874–1908), the founder of the Nationalist Party (*al-hizb al-watani*) and by Ahmad Lutfi al-Sayyid, who created the Party of the Nation (*hizb al-umma*) (Gershoni & Jankowski 1986: 6). Although some alluded to the Islamic Golden Age of the Mamluks, for others the Pharaonic period was more appropriately native. In 1907 Kamal stated that:

> We do not work for ourselves, but for our homeland, which remains after we depart. What is the significance of years and days in the life of Egypt, the country which witnessed the birth of all nations, and invented civilization for all humankind?
>
> (in Hassan 1998: 204).

Nationalist sentiment for the Pharaonic past would prove a serious blow to the foreign hold on Egyptian archaeology. This mainly happened around the time Britain had conceded a greater degree of independence to Egypt in 1922, the very year of the discovery of Tutankhamun's tomb.

CONCLUSION

The nineteenth-century European powers inherited the practices established in the early modern period, such as the value given to the ancient Great Civilizations as the origin of the civilized world (Chapters 2 to 4). In the context of a firm belief in progress, historians set about to show how civilized their own nation was, by describing the inevitable steps that had propelled it to the summit of the civilized world in comparison with its neighbours. As seen in Chapter 3, early nineteenth-century imperial intervention, as a logical continuation of the Enlightenment and early modern imperialism, had resulted in the appropriation of archaeological icons from Italy, Greece (partly through the Roman copies of Greek works of art) and Egypt which were then exhibited in the greatest national museums of the imperial powers—the Louvre and the British Museum. An emerging group of quasi-professional pioneers had started the process of modelling the past of Italy, Greece, and Egypt into both Golden and Dark Ages. The end of the Napoleonic era would not halt their activities. On the contrary, archaeology, as a form of hegemonic knowledge, proved useful not only for producing and maintaining ideas commonly held in the imperial powers, but also in defining the colonized areas and legitimizing their assumed inferiority. This was the context in which the events narrated in this chapter took place. Simplifying the situation to the extreme, one could propose that there were two types of archaeology: that undertaken by the archaeologists of the imperial powers and that carried out by local archaeologists.

Regarding imperial archaeologists, imperialism fostered the remodelling of discourses about the past of areas beyond their boundaries. People beyond the core of imperial Europe were perceived as static, needing guidance from the dynamic entrepreneurial European classes to stimulate their development or to regain—in the case of the countries where ancient civilizations had occurred—their lost impetus. An exception was made originally with the modern inhabitants of those areas in which the classical civilizations had emerged. At first they were imagined to be carriers of the torch of progress, a perception particularly strong in Greece, but also present in Italy. Direct contact with the realities of these countries soon resulted in a transformation of Western perceptions, equating them to a great extent with societies elsewhere. Locals were generally viewed either as having degenerated from their earlier ancestors, or as the descendants of the barbaric peoples who had provoked the end of the area's glorious period. The role of the Western archaeologists coming from the most prosperous nations—mainly Britain and France to start with, others subsequently—was supposedly to reveal either the past Golden Ages of these degenerated territories or to uncover the barbaric past which explained the present. As the nineteenth century wore on, the difference between core Europeans and the Others—including the countries of Mediterranean Europe—became rationalized in racial terms, the first being seen as containing a superior, all-white, dolichocephalic, Aryan race (Chapter 12).

In the imperial powers, the importance of the continuing re-elaboration of the mythical past for a nation resulted in increasing institutionalization. The initial individual ventures and isolated state projects were gradually substituted by larger archaeological expeditions directed by the major centres of archaeological power, some already in place—the great museums, the universities—and other new ones—the foreign schools. A growing number of scholars dedicated to the decipherment and organization of archaeological remains were recruited to the proliferating university and museum departments specializing in the study of classical antiquity. The exploration of the past was legitimized as a search that would support the advancement of science. But this aspiration was only understood in national terms. This is clear from the competition between archaeological expeditions from different countries for the acquisition of works of art for their own national museum. There was, however, a major difference between Britain (and later also the US) and the other great powers' archaeology—in particular that of France and Prussia/Germany—mainly before the 1880s: there was a lack of a conscious government policy regarding foreign excavations. In Chapter 1 a distinction was made between the Continental or State-interventionist model and the Utilitarian model of Britain and the US. In the former, expeditions were organized by the mother country and received government backing from the start. In Britain and the US, however, private initiatives continued to predominate until the last decades of the nineteenth century. In many cases, however, entrepreneurs were supported by their government in securing permissions to excavate and transport archaeological objects and monuments back home. Some even eventually obtained financial backing from the Trustees of the British Museum or, especially in the case of America, private foundations. The differences between both models became more diluted during the period of greater impact of imperialism, especially from the 1880s, when Britain, and to a certain extent the US, inaugurated a state policy of actively encouraging foreign excavations and opened their first foreign schools.

It is important to note that the interest of the imperial powers in the antiquities of the countries analysed in this chapter was selective: it focused on the classical period and disregarded, to begin with, both prehistory and the Islamic past. A similar pattern will be analysed in the colonial world in

Chapter 9. In fact, this lack of concern towards Islamic antiquities (with the exception, perhaps, of numismatics, epigraphy and paleography (Ettinghausen 1951: 21–3), and to a very limited extent also towards all other non-classical antiquities) became diluted in the late nineteenth century, when non-classical antiquities became a focus of Western curiosity (Ettinghausen 1951; Rogers 1974: 60; Vernoit 1997). From that period, Islamic antiquities became the target of both local nationalists and the prosperous classes in the Western imperial powers. Yet, whereas for local nationalists the Islamic past was a Golden Age explaining the origin of the nation, for Westerners it became equivalent to exoticism, and the representation of the Other (Said 1978). Thus, in the West, especially from the 1890s, Islamic art was taken as a whole. Funding for Islamic archaeology centred on monuments and coins and their aesthetic and commercial value. The fresh attention directed towards the Islamic past would eventually draw Western archaeologists to explore other areas under the power of Constantinople from Albania and Kosovo to the territories in Saudi Arabia and Yemen. These areas are not discussed in this chapter for this would take us beyond the chronological limits established for this work, although sporadic initiatives may have occurred in this period (see, for example, Potts 1998: 191).

European hegemonic views of the past were contested in different ways in each of the countries analysed in this chapter. In the southern European countries antiquities became, from early on, metaphors for the national past and icons of national prestige and, therefore, measures were taken to protect them from the imperial craving for them. Laws were passed to criminalize the export of antiquities. Societies were organized and archaeology was taught at university level. In this way, imperial archaeologists had to content themselves with studying antiquities in competition or collaboration with local archaeologists. (Yet, in the long term, the accounts from the imperial archaeologists were more successful. In widely read histories of archaeology produced in the post-imperial powers (still Britain, France, and North America) their names are spelled out, while similar treatment is not given to their Italian and Greek counterparts.) In the nineteenth century, the growing use of imperial languages—English, French, German and perhaps Russian—also nourished the creation of national academies with traditions separate from each other. The transformation of the ethos of foreign schools in Italy is a case in point. Italian was abandoned as a medium of communication shortly after the internationally inclusive Istituto di Corrispondenza Archaeologica was substituted by the nationally-led foreign schools from the 1870s. In this atmosphere the endeavours of local archaeologists were often met with contempt by archaeologists coming from more prosperous countries. However, it would be too simplistic to claim that in the archaeology of nineteenth-century Italy and Greece there were two opposing accounts, that of the hegemonic imperial powers and the alternative local view. When examined more closely each of them encompasses a diversity of voices.

Resistance against European informal colonialism and its lust for classical antiquities was more difficult beyond Europe, and this chapter has discussed the cases of Turkey and Egypt. In the 1830s many of the provinces still under the political control of the Ottoman Empire contained ruins of a glorious past which had already been or were eventually to become incorporated as an integral part of the origin myth of the Western nations. The Greek remains found in Turkey, the impressive monuments located in Egypt, and, from the mid nineteenth century, those in Mesopotamia (Chapter 6), became a target of the Western lust for appropriation. The seizure of ancient works of art was enormous. During the second half of the nineteenth century the largest contingent of antiquities, and the most celebrated, were especially those coming from the first two areas. They were received by the large imperial museums in Europe—the Louvre, the British Museum, the Munich Glyptothek, the Prussian Altes Museum, and the Russian Hermitage. The Ottoman Empire, however, did not remain impassive to the appropriation of its past by Westerners. The nineteenth century saw the formation, still timid, of a local scholarship with competing narratives about their national past. At the beginning of the century the obvious political decadence of the Ottoman Empire had encouraged politicians and scholars to approach Western thinking. Nevertheless, the formal and structural differences between Ottoman and Western knowledge were too large for a swift transition. The diversity of countries within the empire and their wide autonomy also explains how the transition occurred at a different pace in the various parts of the Ottoman Empire. In Turkey a form of civic nationalism was imposed from above at the start of the nineteenth century and with it the first museum was organized. Yet, it would only be later in the century that this ideology spread in earnest among intellectuals. From the 1870s more protective legislation regarding antiquities was passed: the museum in Constantinople was modernized and others were opened, scientific journals began to be published, and excavations started. Less Westernized than Turkey, Egypt also saw the early organization of museums, only to be dispersed as Egyptian rulers used them as a source for prestige gifts. Egypt being under European control, and European archaeologists in charge of archaeology, the chaos of plunder by treasure hunters was only partially halted from the 1860s. Under their direction, however, local archaeologists stood little chance of finding employment in this field, although a few did. A more extreme example would be archaeology in Mesopotamia. As will be seen in Chapter 6, this remained almost completely in the hands of imperial archaeologists and would only be developed by local archaeologists in the twentieth century.