Anadolu Araştırmaları
Anatolian Research

İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY PRESS

AnAr, 30, 271–286
DOI: 10.26650/anar.2024.30.1451818 Research Article

"Armed" with Modern History. The Statue of the River God Meander at Miletus, 1909-2023.

Nisan Lordoğlu[1], Julia Lenaghan[2]

[1]University of Hamburg, Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des antiken Mittelmeerraumes, Hamburg, Deutschland
[2]University of Verona, Department of Cultures and Civilizations, Verona, Italy

ORCID ID: N.L. 0000-0002-1748-5716; J.L. 0000-0003-0590-9224

Corresponding author:
Nisan Lordoğlu,
Universität Hamburg, Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des antiken Mittelmeerraumes, Edmund-Siemers-Allee 1, Westflügel 20146 Hamburg, Deutschland
E-mail: nisan.lordoglu@uni-hamburg.de

Submitted: 12.03.2024
Revision Requested: 14.05.2024
Last Revision Received: 20.05.2024
Accepted: 13.06.2024

Citation: Lordoğlu, N., & Lenaghan, J. (2024). "Armed" with modern history. The statue of the river god meander at miletus, 1909-2023. *Anadolu Araştırmaları-Anatolian Research*, *30*, 269–286. https://doi.org/10.26650/anar.2024.30.1451818

ABSTRACT
In 2023 during preparatory work for moving old objects into new storage at Miletus, the authors noted a large arm in a blue marble with broad white veins in the stone storeroom, the "Steindepot" (Fig.1a-c). Almost immediately we recognized it as belonging to the statue of the River God, the Meander, which is currently on display in the Miletus Museum and is carved in the same distinctive marble. The stone conservators and museum staff tried the arm against statue and the observation became a fact. The find compelled the authors to investigate how and when the arm had become disassociated from the statue. That history, not the ancient history of statue, is the focus of this article because it importantly reflects on the positive evolution of cultural heritage protection and equally demonstrates the mutability of the connection between nationalism and cultural heritage. Safeguarding art objects through time has become a national duty but peoples and interests are constantly in flux.

Keywords: Miletus, River God, Modern History, Object History, Sculpture

Introduction

In December of 1909 a German excavation team discovered a statue of a River God in a late-antique context in the Baths of Faustina at Miletus. The over-life-size statue was made in the Roman period from a blue-grey marble that had been quarried in the region. In July of 2023 the authors found this statue's right arm in a storeroom. This was not a striking new piece but the recovery of a lost fragment of the original find. The statue's most eventful and most difficult period of life was the twentieth century. It moved multiple times, and its value ranged from a complete but worthless fountain head to a loathsome antiquity to be destroyed to the centrepiece of a modern Turkish museum. This paper explores the reasons for this, reflecting on the difficulties of cultural heritage management in changing political and academic worlds.

The early excavations of Miletus in context

At the end of the nineteenth century interest in Mediterranean sites had reached a peak, culminating in the establishment of a new academic discipline, classical archaeology, and new museums. World politics at the time, which we now describe with terms such as globalization, imperialism, and colonialism, intersected with significant archaeological finds; for example, the palace of Nineveh, the sculptures of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia and the reliefs of the Altar of Zeus at Pergamon. This dynamic led to well-funded and competitive exploration and a desire to preserve ancient objects and sites in Greece, the eastern Mediterranean, and the Near East. In Ottoman Istanbul the Imperial Museum was founded in 1869 and began to collect antiquities from all parts of its Empire (Shaw 2003; Çelik 2016). While Osman Hamdi Bey was the director of the Museum between 1881 and 1910, the museum grew in content and in form. By 1891 a new building had been built, mainly for the sarcophagi from Sidon, and two key laws, one in 1884 and a second in 1906, were passed. The laws established an administrative system, the beginnings of a ministry, to control archaeological excavations and heritage objects. Importantly the laws prohibited exportation of and deliberate damage to archaeological objects which they deemed state property (Shaw 2003, 110-130).

At Miletus, the French scholar and archaeologist Oliver Rayet was the first to explore the site and remove museum-worthy marble finds. In 1872 he took statues to the Louvre (Panteleon 2015, 109, https://collections.louvre.fr/en/recherche?limit=100&q=milet). The Berlin Museum, which had established agreements with the Ottoman empire in 1878 in conjunction with exploration at Pergamon, began its scientific excavations at Miletus in 1899. Reinheld Kekule and Theodor Wiegand negotiated a special agreement between the Emperor Wilhelm II and Sultan Abdul Hamid in October-November of 1899. The agreement gave the Berlin Museum the rights to half of the findings, assigning the other half to the Empire. This pact effectively circumvented the new heritage laws of 1884. (Panteleon 2015,

61; Shaw 2003, 120). Theodor Wiegand served as the Berlin Museum's field director on site and attaché in Constantinople. He oversaw significant publications and the two most high-profile museum entries concerning Miletus. In 1909 he sent the architectural fragments of the Miletus Market Gate to Berlin (where he was later responsible for their reconstruction) and in the same year the statues of Apollo and the Muses arrived at the museum in Constantinople. This paper is about an object that neither went to Berlin nor to Istanbul, the blue marble River God from the Frigidarium of the Baths of Faustina.

Figure 1a-c: River God with its arm, 2023 (Miletus Archive)

Finding the River God and moving objects, 1903-1909

On 10 December of 1909, the German archaeological team at Miletus, under the direction of Wiegand, excavated a statue in blue-grey marble of a reclining river god in the Frigidarium of the Baths of Faustina. The statue had fallen from its original location on the north edge of a basin. It lay face forward in the basin, directly on top of its base which was broken into two pieces (**Fig. 2**). In the excavation diary Wiegand immediately identified the statue,

> „[...] der Flußgott, - der sehr gut erhalten, aber leider eine geringwertige spätrömische Arbeit ist -, wird wieder auf seine Basis gehoben."
> "The River god - which is very well preserved, but unfortunately a late Roman work of little value - is set back onto its base." (Wiegand, Grabungstagebuch, 10.12.1911)

Wiegand published the find in 1911.

> "Der Raum empfing Wasser aus seiner Zisterne, die durch Umbau eines ehemaligen quadratischen Thermensaales im Norden gewonnen worden war; das Wasser entströmte einem Marmorsockel (2,50 m breit, 0.50 m hoch), der mit dem überlebengroßen Marmorbild eines ruhenden Flußgottes geschmückt war, natürlich des Maiandros, mit Füllhorn und

> Fruchtkranz; vgl. z. B. Münzen von Antiochia am Mäander Cat. Br. M. Caria, S. 16 ff., pl. III. Als zweiter Wasserspender kam später auf der Ostseite ein etwa lebensgroßer Marmorlöwe hellenistischer Zeit hinzu, der früher für diesen Zweck nicht bestimmt war."
> "The room received water from a cistern that had been obtained by converting a former square thermal hall in the north; the water flowed from a marble plinth decorated with a larger-than-life marble image of a resting river god, Maiandros of course, with cornucopia and fruit wreath: cf. e.g. coins of Antioch on the Meander Cat. Br. M. Caria, p. 16ff., pl. III. A second water dispenser was later added on the east side in the form of a life-size marble lion from the Hellenistic period, which was not previously intended for this purpose." (Wiegand 1911, 33-34, fig. 13) (Fig. 3).

Figure 2: River God found in the basin in 1909 (Arachne, DAI İstanbul)

The over-life-size statue stretches out in a semi-recumbent pose with his left side resting against an amphora through which water flowed into the basin in front. Although Wiegand does not note damage, the photograph of the statue in the first publication seems to show a crack at the base of the raised right arm pit and that several fragments combine to form the lower part of the cornucopia. One hundred years later, in 2011 Renate Bol republished the statue. Assessing the carving and deep drillwork and comparing it to a similar statue from the Baths of Vedius in Ephesus, she dated the statue to the mid-second century AD, a date which well coincided with the Baths themselves named after Faustina the Younger (Bol 2011, 109-110, no. VI.22). She commented, in keeping with Wiegand's late Roman assessment, that its position on the north edge of the basin was secondary. Neither of the two scholars were interested in the exciting use of coloured marble which now makes it of great interest to scholars of Roman sculpture and economy. The white-veined grey-blue marble might come from the Herakleia quarries to the east of Miletus (see Toma 2023, 1-19), but also closely

resembles the marble of the statue of the horse of Troilos at Aphrodisias which isotopic analysis indicates comes from the city quarries there (Smith & Hallett 2015, 132-133).

Figure 3: 1911, placed on its base (after Wiegand 1911, fig. 13)

In 1911 Wiegand also published the other sculpture from the Frigidarium, which he identified as a Hellenistic lion (Wiegand 1911, 33). Its hindquarters are in the basin in the 1909 photograph showing the find situation (Fig. 2), and Armin von Gerkan and Fritz Krischen write some part of it was found "ohne Sockel auf dem Pflaster« ("without a base on the pavement", von Gerkan & Krischen 1928, 65). In 1977 Volker Michael Strocka studied the lion carefully, noting that it dated to the second quarter of the sixth century BC but that it had been reworked in the Roman period (Strocka 1977, 481-512). In 2011, Felicia Meynersen introduced a third period of use to Strocka's interpretation (Bol 2011, 110-113). Thus, in the Archaic period, the lion had functioned as a guardian of a grave in a necropolis near the Baths of Faustina. Then, according to Meynersen in the Hellenistic period, the mane and some facial details of the lion were reworked. In its final and, for Meynersen, third installation, probably the Severan period, the lion became a waterspout in the Frigidarium.

More than a year before the German team found these two sculptures in the Frigidarium of the Baths, probably in May of 1908, Wiegand had shipped the architectural elements of the imposing three-storey facade of the city's market gate, excavated in 1903, as well as inscriptions and ceramics for study to Berlin by boat. This was a difficult logistical feat of packing into crates; finding a secure, large boat with a sufficiently strong lifting mechanism; and waiting for the appropriate weather (Wiegand 1970, 101-102). The impressive statuary

program of six Muses and an Apollo, found in the Hall of the Muses in the same Baths of Faustina, some years earlier, reached the Imperial Museum of Constantinople in 1909. What, if any, intention there had been to move the River God and the lion, we cannot know. World politics suspended the Berlin Museum's excavations after the 1911 season. These two statues thus remained on site, at the basin in the Frigidarium in their last place of use. Wiegand's negative initial assessment of the River God, clearly recorded in the excavation notebook and which may have derived from the statue's dark marble and supposed late date, correspond to the disinterest in it during the period between the wars.

Figure 4: 1938, in the basin, by A. Eckstein (Arachne, DAI İstanbul)

1914-1938. The River God between the wars

After World War I (1914-1917) and the Greco-Turkish War (1919-1922), in March of 1924, Wiegand expressed his hope that work at Miletus and Didyma could be concluded. He noted that a visit of the Swiss architect Paul Schazmann, undertaken in the interest of the German team, in the summer of 1923 showed essentially no damage despite battles between the Greeks and Turks in the Meander valley (Wiegand 1924, 3). He cites only the deplorable carelessness of the "foreign" troops who permitted a fire in the dig house at Didyma. In 1924 Wiegand himself visited and notes that the excavation house in Akköy was used as quarters for soldiers (Wiegand 1929, 18).

Yet in the fullness of time, the German team became better aware of the toll that the wars had taken on the archaeological interests in the area, both at Miletus and Didyma. *Armin* von Gerkan reveals that of the small finds "large parts have been destroyed, or at least simply thrown away" (von Gerkan 1925, 1ff). In his pithy one paragraph review of von Gerkan's

opus, David George Hogarth highlights this detail, commenting that the "terracottas, bronzes and pottery" from the old excavations "have largely disappeared or been destroyed, presumably during the anarchical period succeeding the Greek landing at Smyrna (Hogarth 1926, 267)." Losses were primarily due to bombing in 1916 by the British, the housing of troops in the excavation quarters, and then a naturally-occuring fire which raged uncontrolled because the inhabitants had been expelled during the exchange of peoples. In 1928 and 1929, Walther Kolbe, the epigrapher, and Wiegand respectively published accounts of the situation (Kolbe 1928, 97-99, Wiegand 1929, 18).

That the small finds stored in boxes in buildings used by soldiers during a war were disturbed is unfortunate but unsurprising. That destructive fires consumed some finds and paper records is also a sad inevitability. These two events are slightly different from the willful destruction of the River God on the site of Miletus. When in 1928 von Gerkan and *Fritz* Krischen published the Baths and Palaestra, they record that,

> *"*Die Statue war vor dem Weltkriege bis auf die Nase und den Vorderteil des rechten Fußes gut erhalten. Das Ende des *Füllhorns ist wieder angesetzt*. Während des Weltkrieges wurde das Gesicht mit Hammerschlägen fast gänzlich zerstört."
> "Before the World War, the statue was well preserved with its nose and the front part of the right foot. The end of the cornucopia was still inserted. During the World War, the face was almost completely destroyed by blows of a hammer."

The footnote then reads, "Neuerdings heruntergestürzt, liegt die Statue jetzt im Bassin; in zwei Stücke zerbrochen ist die Vorderseite der Basis" („Newly fallen again, the statue now lies in the basin. The front part of the base is broken into two pieces") (von Gerkan & Krischen 1928, 123-124, no. 18). All the scholars, even Kolbe who notes the English and Italian factors, recognize the repercussions of the political instability but avoid blame or even the mention of an ethnicity or nationality with the loss of data. Comparable instances of the deliberate defacement of antiquities in the region in the years around 1920 are not recorded.

This leaves us today, possibly as the foreign scholars at the time, with no factual knowledge about the River God's losses. Nonetheless, we can be sure that the damage done to the statue was an act of anger taken against cultural property rather than an actual foe. The perpetrator in some way had suffered and associated the statue with a system of beliefs that he did not share and did not want. The political situation had left no one to protect the cultural property; no one was officially in charge and no one was invested enough in it to claim it. In Milet 2,2 (published in 1929) Wiegand, whose personal letters attest constant interaction with the local community during his excavations and who had used Greek workmen, commented on the situation after the population exchange. He reported that in 1914, the village of Akköy had about 1,500 residents, exclusively Greek, and Jeronda (Didim) had a similar number with a small Turkish population. In contrast, the Turkish village of Balat, which was situated on the

Theatre Hill of the city until the earthquake of 1955, had around 800 to 1,000 inhabitants. Whereas the residents of Balat fled momentarily to Mylasa (Milas) during the Greek invasion and then returned, the Greek villages were abandoned and in disrepair in 1924. Moreover, those who were imported into the area, mainly from Thrace, were entirely miserable and destitute (Wiegand 1929, 17). In this context it is notable that the perpetrator did not touch the lion in the same Frigidarium. A stone representation of an animal did not evoke the same anger as the anthropomorphic statue of the River God.

There are no further comments or photographs of the Frigidarium and its two statues until 1938 when Carl Weickert led another German excavation team on site. Wiegand had died two years earlier but von Gerkan, among others, participated. Although no mention is made of the River God, Albert Eckstein, a German Jewish doctor who had taken a medical chair in Ankara and remained there from 1935-1939, took a photograph in that year. His 1938 photograph intended to display the glory of the Baths of Faustina, focuses on the River God (Fig. 4). The photograph shows the statue damaged but sitting upright inside the basin, not fallen as reported by von Gerkan in 1928. An organized force of three men was probably needed to do this. In addition to the mutilated face, the statue has no right foot, and the right arm and cornucopia have broken along previous cracks (arachne.dainst.org/entity/1988053). The right arm has broken where the 1911 photograph (Fig. 3) suggests a crack, and the cornucopia, which the 1911 photograph suggests was reconstituted from three fragments, lacks a portion of the central fragment and its uppermost part. The base of the statue, on which it rested in 1911, lies in three pieces scattered to either side, east, southeast, and west of the statue. In contrast, the front part of the lion, not its hindquarters which are preserved in a separate piece (cf. Fig. 10b), remains on the side of the basin.

1955 – 1992. New sensibilities. A museum setting and a plaster cast.

In July of 1955 the area suffered a significant earthquake which badly damaged the town of Balat located on the site. It may also have caused the final destruction of Wiegand's two depots for small finds, the history of which Johannis Panteleon has carefully traced (Panteleon 2005, 27-39; Panteleon, 2015). Later in the year the excavations began again under the directorship of Carl Weickert who had previously directed one season in 1938. A certain amount of collecting and labelling small finds from the destroyed depots is attested.

It is possible that the arm of the River God had been picked up in 1938 when the damaged statue was put upright in the basin and that it had been stored in one of the two Wiegand depots for small finds which were still used in that year. Then during the early years of the new project, we might imagine that the arm was rescued from the debris of the earthquake-destroyed depots. While this cannot be totally excluded, the arm does lack any label that later excavators made when indicating Wiegand objects. The well-cleaned break surface (Fig. 1)

at the wrist of the arm currently bears the museum inventory number 539. The museum gave such numbers to finds that came from the Theatre depot in 1963. Thus, the arm was more probably a stray find — not necessarily even found in the Baths and in fact more possibly from old Balat—brought into the storage areas at the Theatre in some year between 1955 and 1963.

Figure 5a-c: 1982, by W. Schiele (Arachne, DAI İstanbul)

On 6 October 1973, the Miletus Museum officially opened. Its main rooms housed Archaic statuary and various small finds from Miletus, Priene and Didyma. It did not contain the River God which still stood in the Frigidarium. The object database Arachne (iDAI. objects Arachne, https://arachne.dainst.org/) has photographs of the River God there in situ in 1982 (Fig. 5a-c). In these images the statue is no longer in the basin (as in 1938 Fig. 4) but back again on the north edge of the basin, not however on the base that is pictured in the 1911 photograph (Fig. 3).

These detailed images show a defacement that seems deliberate, as von Gerkan had noted in 1928. The eyes, which belong to a recessed area of the face, are missing but the protruding cheekbones and the bulge beneath the lower left eyelid are preserved. Also missing are parts of the fruited wreath that the god wore in his hair and the locks framing the brow. Thus, the head, which remained attached to the body, shows breaks at different angles in different places. Therefore, while some damage to the statue, that in the locks of hair over the brow or even the right arm, might be construed as circumstantial, -- that is, as a result of being pushed forward off its base, --the missing eyes and areas around them (the bridge of the nose and upper moustache) read as intentional damage. Deliberate disfigurement of the eyes is a long-standing mode of extinguishing the spirit of a statue. Christians put crosses on the eyes of ancient statues (for example, the head of goddess from Sparta, see Kristensen 2013, fig. 1.20)

and the elimination of eyes in painted icons in orthodox churches in Cyprus, which is a similar to that of the River God, has been traditionally considered a Muslim intervention (Khokhlova 2023 at https://sites.courtauld.ac.uk/digitalmedia/2023/07/10/defaced-byzantine-frescoes-in-cyprus/). At Miletus this act indicates that the perpetrator's anger focused on obliterating a connection to an alien concept and culture.

Figure 6: Moving the River God to the Museum, 1992 (Miletus Archive)

In the second half of the twentieth century, the developed world became concerned with pollution and acid rain, and those in archaeology and in museums saw that the objects left exposed to the elements were deteriorating or in danger of deteriorating. Thus, the directorship of the Miletus Museum, led by Ahmet Semih Tulay, and the German excavation team, under Volkmar von Graeve, decided that the statue of the River God should be brought to the main hall of the Museum (von Graeve 1994, 407); he arrived there in 1992. This constitutes the seventh move that we can document: the first being in Late Antiquity when it was brought to the basin, the second when it fell into the basin, the third when the excavators in 1909 pulled it out of the basin, the fourth when it was pushed back into the basin post-1914, the fifth when it was placed upright again in the basin in 1938, the sixth when it was put back on the edge of the basin. In the Museum, the statue's unique marble, large size, and fine carving found a receptive audience, like that of Late Antiquity. The museum setting and excavation team had restored its value.

Motivated also by a desire to preserve a sense of context and wishing not to separate ruins from sculpture, the Museum and archaeological team considered it important to make

a 1:1 cast of the statue to leave on the north edge of the pool in the Frigidarium (Figs. 6-7-8). Mustafa Kulkul, an archaeological conservator at the İzmir Museum, created a silicon mould of the River God (Fig. 7a-b) taken directly from the marble sculpture. He then cast a replica in artificial stone. This durable version was intended to survive the elements. It was placed in the Frigidarium in 1993 (von Graeve 1994, 407, fig. 7), and there joined the artificial stone lion which had been made the year before. The creation of a replica by casting was a protective measure foreseen and promoted already in the 1884 law on cultural heritage (Shaw 2003, 110-25). Then a replica was a suitable exportable commodity that ensured the original would remain in situ. Just over one hundred years later, in 1992-1993, the cultural heritage professionals could not even imagine the potential international dissemination of an exciting find; interest at that point was on contextualization rather than the individual object. So, they placed their new replica at the edge of the basin, allowing visitors to continue to appreciate the last context and functionality of the object (Shaw 2003, 136). The replica of the River God was not, however, placed on its original base pictured in the 1911 photograph (Fig. 3).

Figure 7a-b: Casting the River God, 1993 (Miletus Archive)

Figure 8: Cast, 1995, by S. Westphalen (Arachne, DAI İstanbul)

In the Museum, they created a low plinth in a black and white speckled marble, possibly intended to echo the marble of the statue. This plinth is an unusual choice because it makes no reference to the original base (Fig. 3) which, as an architectural element, remains in situ in the Baths but, as noted above, not connected to the statue. In the Museum they posted a large drawing of the reconstructed Fridigarium behind the River God on his new and shiny plinth. The other waterspout of the basin, the lion, is pictured in the reconstruction but, as the plinth, is not included in the Museum display (Fig. 9).

Figure 9: Photo of Museum Display of River God (Miletus Archive)

There are three important observations to be made about this process. These observations reflect a subconscious human reaction that inevitably shapes heritage decisions, a carefully-calculated choice about economic value, and the evolution of conservation. First, the Archaic statue of the lion in the same context again received differential treatment. The lion, which had been spared the wrath of the angry individual in the decade between 1914-1924 presumably because it was an animal, was still treated differently in the late twentieth century. It was cast a year prior to the River God, as if a test case, and its artificial-stone replica was positioned in its find site in the Baths. The original object, however, was left outside in the Museum courtyard. Officials seemed to fear, possibly considering the events of the 1911-1938, that were it left on site, it would be vulnerable to vandalism. For academics, the lion was a funerary marker that had been brought into the Baths in Late Antiquity. Thus, they understood it best in the context of other such funerary markers and were content to see it in a line of lions in the courtyard outside the Museum (Fig. 10b). For most visitors to Miletus,

the sculpture of the lion represents an animal and as such seems appropriate outdoors in the courtyard. However, this choice unconsciously represents a twentieth-century prioritization of the Roman or earlier contexts, moments which we have been taught to believe are of higher civilizations, over the late-antique use. In reality the lion, as the museum drawing shows, was part of the last functioning context (Fig. 10a) of the Baths and might justifiably be displayed with the River God.

Figure 10a-c: Drawing of Museum Display of River God. Photo of Museum Display of Lion (Christine Özgan, Miletus Archive)

Second, from the moulds of the Museum, more casts of various materials could be made and distributed, even sold for profit, to cast collections throughout the world, as the 1884 law indicated. Yet, the mould was destroyed and to date only one cast has been made. In this case, the decision reflects a new understanding of this object. Disparaged by its German excavator in 1909 and just over a decade later deliberately damaged by those then residing in the area, in the late twentieth century it was a special "one-of-a-kind" object owned exclusively by yet another party, the Turkish Ministry of Culture.

Third, the statue provokes considerations about the evolution of visual restorations. In the 1990s a cast of artificial stone enabled the original object to be brought into a museum setting and a second version of the object, a convincing substitute, to remain in context. Now, new technology potentially allows for a yet another version of the head, a 3D print from a

scan. The scan can be enhanced to create a version of what the statue looked like when it was found. That is, a 3D scan of the extant object can provide the form on to which the original photographs of the early twentieth century can be mapped. This would provide a 3D file that restores the object to its original find condition. This file could be printed and displayed next to the current object. It would be a 21st century update of the 20th century silicon mould-artificial stone replica.

2023

Reattaching the arm, which was destructively removed in a period of war, the current excavation team, Ministry of Culture, and conservators hope to restore the ancient glory of the statue. They also wish to use this as an opportunity to remind the viewer of its full modern history which reflects so importantly both the development of modern Turkey and the development of modern archaeology and cultural heritage practice. This modern history begins in the boom years of archaeology in the late 19th century and in the years of the Sultan Abdul Hamid II's (1896-1909) pacts with European excavators. Those agreements led to new excavations at Miletus which yielded visually-exciting finds that became focal points both in Berlin and in Istanbul. The ensuing world war and contest between Greece and Turkey for ownership of the Ionian coast led to the mutilation of this beautiful blue-marble statue of a river god. Current stability and tourism in turn have permitted for the study and the restoration of the object.

The story of the River God, which has evolved from archaeological find to museum object, significantly illustrates the developing science of cultural heritage protection and the growing international awareness about duties of tutelage. The statue once disregarded as a late Roman fountain head has become a centre piece in a museum. This evolution is a mainly positive process which here begins with reforms by Osman Hamdi Bey, and notably includes the construction of a museum, the attempt to recreate context for an object both on site and in the museum, and the desire to protect a vulnerable material from the elements and vandalism. It also shows how over the course of approximately a hundred and forty years, a territory has moved from permitting the export of archaeological objects to the rejection even of controlled replication of objects for exportation. Taking the responsibility for safe-guarding gives a new sense of ownership. Now this object belongs to the museum of Miletus and to the Turkish Ministry of Culture. But as its history, beginning with a reuse in a late Roman Bath complex, warns us, its future might evolve further, and that its current museum location is possibly an artificial pause in its long life.

Throughout out the modern story of the River God, a human aspect has dominated, perhaps because the statue represents a human figure. Wiegand had a prejudice against the statue, possibly because of its colour, assumed date, and practical use. Co-inhabitants

of the area struck the statue in anger, possiby because of its pertinence to other cultures and again its unsual colour. Museum experts and archaeologists decided to take care of it, mainly because of its age and its capacity to evoke a past era. In these three fundamental perspectives, the enduring but constantly fluctuating value of the ancient object emerges clearly. It evokes different responses in different contexts. Finding its arm in a storeroom in 2023 and reattaching it in 2024 has more than archaeological significance because it tells this long story, one not just about its original makers but also about its changing caretakers. Understanding this past, we recognize how difficult it is for us to ensure its future.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Christof Berns, the director of Miletus excavations, and the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism for providing us with the opportunity to work on this object. We also thank Lisa Steinmann for providing essential direction for our archival research; Hasibe Akat İslam, from the Miletus Museum, for sharing information regarding the casting of the River God in 1992 and 1993; Sandra Golling, Nadia Cahenzli, and Berna Güler for providing us with photographs respectively from the Bochum Archive and the DAI-Istanbul. Finally, we thank the anonymous reviewers and kind friends whose comments improved this article.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Author Contributions: Conception/Design of Study- J.L.; Data Acquisition- N.L.; Data Analysis/ Interpretation- J.L., N.L.; Drafting Manuscript- N.L.; Critical Revision of Manuscript- J.L.; Final Approval and Accountability- N.L., J.L.

Grant Support: The authors declared that this study has received no financial support

Conflict of Interest: The authors has no conflict of interest to declare

References

Bol, R. (2011). *Milet. Funde aus Milet / Marmorskulpturen der römischen Kaiserzeit aus Milet*. Berlin ; New York: W. de Gruyter.

Çelik, Z. (2016). *About Antiquities: Politics of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hogarth, D. G. (1926). [Review of *Milet. Bd. I. Pt. 8. Kalebaktepé, Athenatempel und Umgebung*, by T. Wiegand & A. von Gerkan]. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, *46*, p. 267.

Gerkan, A. v., & F. Krischen, (1928). *Thermen und Palaestren, Milet I, 9*. Berlin: H. Schoetz und Co..

Gerkan, A. v. (1925). *Kalabaktepe, Athenatempel und Umgebung, Milet I, 8*. Berlin: Verlag von Schoetz und Parrhysius.

Graeve, V. v. (1994). 1993 Milet Çalışmaları, *XVI. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı I, 30 Mayıs – 3 Haziran 1994,* Ankara, pp. 405-417.

Khoklova, A. (2023). The Mystery of Missing Faces – Defaced Frescoes in Cyprus https://sites.courtauld.ac.uk/digitalmedia/2023/07/10/defaced-byzantine-frescoes-in-cyprus/

Kolbe, W. (1928). Rezension zu: von Gerkan, Kalabaktepe, Athenatempel und Umgebung (Milet Bd. I Heft 8.), Berlin: H. Schoetz & Co. 1925, *GGA 190,* pp. 97-111.

Kristensen, T. M. (2013). *Making and breaking the gods: Christian responses to pagan sculpture in late antiquity.* Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Panteleon, I. A. (2005). Funde aus Milet, XVI. Zum Schicksal der am Ort verbliebenen Funde der Wiegandschen Grabung nach 1914, *AA* 2005/2, pp. 27-39.

Panteleon, I. A. (2015). *Eine Archäologie der Direktoren: Die Erforschung Milets im Namen der Berliner Museen in den Jahren 1899 - 1914*. Paderborn: Fink; Schöningh.

Shaw W. M. K. (2003). *Possessors and possessed: museums archaeology and the visualization of history in the late Ottoman Empire.* University of California Press.

Smith, R.R.R., & C. Hallett (2015). Troilos and Achilles: A Monumental Statue Group from Aphrodisias, *Journal of Roman Studies* 105, pp. 124 – 182.

Strocka, V. M. (1977). Neue archaische Löwen in Anatolien, *AA* 1977, pp. 481-512.

Toma, N. (2023). Milet, Türkei. Marmor in Milet der Kaiserzeit. Bericht über die archäometrische Studie. Die Arbeiten der Jahre 2018 bis 2022, e-Forschungsberichte des DAI, S. 1–19 (§). doi: 10.34780/5cb1-3x71.

Wiegand, T. (1911). *Siebenter vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Königlichen Museen in Milet und Didyma unternommenen Ausgrabungen*. Berlin: Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Wiegand, T. (1924). *Achter vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Staatlichen Museen in Milet und Didyma unternommenen Ausgrabungen*. Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Wiegand, T. (1929). *Milet: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899 (Band 2, 2): Die Milesische Landschaft.* Berlin: Verlag von Hans Schoetz und Co.

Wiegand, G. (ed.) (1970). *Halbmond im letzten Viertel: Briefe und Reiseberichte aus der alten Türkei von Theodor und Marie Wiegand, 1895 bis 1918*. München: Bruckmann