Journal of American Studies of Turkey
4 (1996) : 47-68.

American Archaeologists in Turkey: Intellectual and Social Dimensions

Charles Gates

A standard Turkish concept about archaeology, one attested by my students, (Note 1) is that Turkey is exceptionally rich in archaeological remains and, as a result, foreigners naturally want to work here. But the world is full of archaeological remains, even North America. The reasons why American and other foreign archaeologists might choose to undertake research in Turkey instead of in other countries are more complex than the Turkish public generally realizes. In this article I examine the motives of American archaeologists who have worked in Turkey. What they have found will be less important than why they came here in the first place. Aspects of the problem include the academic/intellectual framework into which the archaeology of Turkey fits in the United States, socio-political factors, and changes through time. American archaeology in Turkey is seen to be a component of US social and intellectual history, but it is a part of the social and intellectual history of Turkey as well. (Note 2)

Archaeology in Turkey can be divided into three major periods: Pre-Classical, Classical (Greek and Roman), and Medieval-Modern (Byzantine, Seljuk, and Ottoman). This article is concerned with the American activities in the first two, the third having rarely been the primary focus of archaeological work except when the architectural history of specific buildings is under investigation. One further restriction: I shall concentrate on work done within the borders of the Turkish Republic of today, making only passing reference to research in adjacent areas once held by the Ottoman Empire.

The Intellectual Background

Scientific archaeology began in Turkey in the second half of the 19th century under the influence of European scholarship. Earlier, from the Renaissance on, Europeans (and by extension Americans) had developed a keen interest in the material remains of Classical cultures, especially of the Romans (who had occupied all of southern and much of central Europe), with a focus on Italy (always a goal of artistically-minded travellers). Classical culture had been known throughout the Middle Ages, of course, especially with Latin in use as the liturgical language and *lingua franca* of Western Christianity. After the Middle Ages, Roman and indeed all

Classical culture continued to be valued for its moral and political authority (West; and Richard). As a result, Latin especially, but also Greek were widely studied, even in Protestant areas, well into the 20th century (Clarke). In addition to this interest in ancient literature, chance finds of Roman sculpture during the Italian Renaissance contributed to the growing fascination with the material remains of antiquity. One thinks especially of the Laocoon, the dramatic Hellenistic-Roman statue group discovered in 1506 during a probing into the palace buildings of the emperors Nero and Titus in the center of Rome; the impact of this sculpture in the Renaissance was enormous (Bober and Rubinstein 152-155; Haskell and Penny 243-247). In addition, collections of Classical objects were formed (Weiss 180-202); and at Pompeii, organized explorations began in 1748 and have continued to the present day (Kraus 13-25).

The Ottoman Empire controlled lands once key provinces of ancient Greek and Roman civilization. Travellers from Western Europe were few before the later 18th century; restrictions and rigors of travel discouraging most (Stoneman 22-164; Eisner 37-88; and Dinsmoor xvii-xxiii, for travellers interested specifically in Greek architecture). When European travellers did make the trip and report on their findings, the impact was tremendous (Constantine). James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, architects who published detailed drawings of ancient Greek architectural pieces seen during a trip to Greece in 1751-1753, are well-known representatives of those voyagers whose work stimulated an interest in the specifically Greek component of the Classical world. Johannes Winckelmann, a German scholar and librarian resident in Rome, never travelled east of the Adriatic, but nonetheless championed Greek art at the expense of later and derivative Roman in his highly influential *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (*History of Ancient Art*) of 1764. Publications such as these led to the rise of the Neo-Classical style in European art and architecture in the second half of the 18th century.

In the 19th century, European travellers continued to describe ancient sites in Anatolia, and make drawings of the monuments (Stoneman 207-236 and 265-296). In addition, they often took objects away, actual examples of Classical art, whether or not official permits were granted. Ottoman authorities had paid scant attention to such activities. This is not surprising, for the Latin and Greek languages and Classical cultures naturally enough did not feature in the Islamic-oriented education of Ottoman officials or resonate in their daily lives (Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856-1876* 32-35; and Findley 51-56). Only with the quickening of interest in European culture from the 1850s on did the Ottoman intelligentsia develop along with Europeans a curiosity toward the antiquities of their lands (for education and intellectual developments in the 19th century Ottoman empire, see also Davison, Westernized Education in Ottoman Turkey and Davison, *Reform in the Ottoman Empire, passim*; Findley 131-173; Shaw and Shaw 47-48, 105-113, 249-251, 447-448, and *passim*; and Ülken 35-93).

In the second half of the 19th century, important changes took place in archaeology as practiced in the Ottoman Empire (Arsebük 68-71). Archaeological sites began to be examined in a controlled way. Records were kept of the finds, and accounts of discoveries were published for the benefit of scholars and the general public. These developments were not exclusive to work in the Ottoman Empire, but were part of broader changes in scientific methods in 19th-century Europe (Daniel 48-147; and Trigger 73-206). At Classical sites in what is today Turkey, there was a gradual shift toward this approach. Sustained campaigns were undertaken, as at Pergamon (Note 3), not just raids on a single monument. At Troy in northwestern Turkey, Heinrich Schliemann brought to light the impressive remains of a prehistoric citadel, but the search grew out of his deep interest in the literature of ancient Greece (Schliemann, *Troy and its Remains* 3-8 and Schliemann, *Ilios: The City and Country of the Trojans* 1-20). Schliemann and especially his assistant and successor Wilhelm Dörpfeld published their finds with admirable promptness, providing an important early contribution to Bronze Age Aegean studies (Blegen 21-37 and 175-176; for a critical view of Schliemanns honesty, see Traill, *Excavating Schliemann: Collected Papers on Schliemann* and Traill, *Schliemann of Troy. Treasure and Deceit*).

The Ottoman government itself developed an interest in things Classical (Atasoy 1458-1465). Sultan Abdulmejid and his son-in-law Fethi Ahmet Pasha began a collection of antiquities in 1845, the basis for the Archaeological Museum of stanbul. Stored first in the Hagia Eirene, a disaffected Byzantine church on the grounds of the Topkapý Palace, then later transferred to the Çinili Köþk, a pavilion built by Mehmet II, the collection obtained the home it deserved with the opening of the present museum in 1891. Led by Europeans, Edward Goold then Anton Dethier, the museum moved into a new era of expansion and activity with the appointment in 1881 of Osman Hamdi Bey as director. He would remain in this position until his death in 1910. Laws regulating archaeological activities were issued first in 1874, then revised in 1884. This last set, which included a prohibition on the export of antiquities, continued in effect with minor revisions until 1973 (Atasoy 1463-1465; see also Blake 274-281, with occasionally differing information).

American Archaeology in Turkey before World War I

It was into this world that American archaeologists first stepped in 1881. Architects Joseph Clarke and Francis Bacon conducted excavations at Assos, in northwestern Turkey, on behalf of the Archaeological Institute of America from 1881 to 1883 (Clarke, *Report on the Investigations at Assos, 1881* and Clarke, *Report on the Investigations at Assos, 1882, 1883*; Clarke, Bacon, and Koldewey; and *PECS*104-105). For a first foray into Classical archaeology, Assos seems a surprising choice: a remote town that figured little in ancient history. But Clarke and Bacons interest was architecture, and Assos contains an early and unusual Temple of Athena, ca. 550 BC, an example of the Doric order combined with unexpected architectural

sculpture in a region dominated by the Ionic order. The two architects, aiming to recover actual examples of ancient Greek architecture (Van Zanten 178), stood firmly in the 19th-century tradition of historians of Classical art and architecture.

The next American project was at Sardis, where Howard Crosby Butler, another architectural historian who had already worked on Late Roman sites in Syria, directed excavations from 1910 to 1914. (Note 4) Like the excavations at Assos, the Sardis project had Classical tie-ins; indeed, before World War I, no American expedition was mounted in search of prehistoric remains within the borders of today's Turkey. Butlers aim was to get information about the Near Eastern contribution to Classical art and architecture. But as it so happened, work focused on the huge Hellenistic-Roman Temple of Artemis. The project was stopped by the outbreak of World War I. Appointed in 1919 to head the newly-founded School of Architecture at Princeton University, Butler returned only briefly to Sardis in 1921 before his death at age 50 in 1922 (Note 5) (Van Zanten 176 and 178-182).

Let us characterize American archaeology in the Mediterranean, Near East, and Egypt on the eve of World War I. Classical art reigned supreme. It was taught as an adjunct to language and literature in Classics departments, and formed the major component of programs in art history departments founded especially in the Ivy League colleges and in womens colleges (Smyth and Lukehart). Major research centers for Classical studies had been founded in Athens and Rome: the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (founded in 1881) and the American Academy in Rome (1894, the School of Classical Studies). Note that Ýstanbul, although a major historical center in the larger southeastern European (eastern Mediterranean) region, was not yet an important center for research into Classical or any other branch of antiquity. (Note 6)

Other Old World civilizations were also much studied (Trigger 35-45; and Wright). Texts were always the key, just as Greek and Latin texts had fueled interest in Classical cultures. The Bible stimulated archaeological exploratio in Palestine, with emphasis on the first millennium BC (Silberman 1982; Bar-Yose and Mazar; and Blakely). In Iraq and Syria, the decipherment, in the mid- to late 19th-century, of Akkadian and Sumerian allowed a deeper understanding of Mesopotamian cultures (Lloyd). And in Egypt, whose ancient writing system was deciphered in the early 19th century, the study of texts and well-preserved architecture and art was well advanced by World War I (Hobson). Each of these areas would become a specialized field of study. At this time archaeology itself consisted first and foremost of the description of objects (antiquarianism); from these descriptions, deductions were drawn. For most, archaeology in the Eastern Mediterranean was considered either the record of the Great Monuments of ancient art, or else a handmaiden to the information gleaned from texts (for additional bibliography on the history of archaeology in this region, see Silberman, *Between Past and Present. Archaeology, Ideology, and Nationalism in the Modern Middle East* 249-273).

The study of pre-Classical Turkey grew out of such studies of neighboring areas. Schliemanns search was inspired by Classical literature. Although the rediscovery of the Hittites grew out of an interest in the Biblical world and the Ancient Near East, the German explorations at Boðazköy/Hattusha, the Hittite capital, were given new impetus by the decipherment of the Hittite language in the early 20th century (Gurney 1-11).

Between the two World Wars

New excavations on Greco-Roman sites were begun by American teams: Colophon, in the Aegean coastal territory briefly occupied by Greece after World War I (*PECS* 233); Pisidian Antioch, near Yalvaç (*PECS* 60-61); and Antioch (Antakya), then in the French-occupied Sanjak of Alexandretta (*PECS* 61-63). But the inter-war period was particularly notable for the American entry into the prehistoric and pre-Classical field. At Troy, Carl Blegen (Note 7) of the University of Cincinnati excavated from 1932 to 1938, supplementing the findings of Schliemann and Dörpfeld (Blegen). The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago was founded in 1919 by the Egyptologist James Breasted with financing from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to promote research into the cultures of the Ancient Near East and Egypt (Jacobsen and Wilson; and Wilson). The Institute sponsored teams that conducted important surveys in central Anatolia and excavations at Aliþar Höyük (near Yozgat) under the direction of a German adventurer, Hans Henning von der Osten, (Note 8) and in the Amuq Plain, northeast of Antakya, by Robert Braidwood (see his *Mounds in the Plain of Antioch. An Archaeological Survey* and*Explorations in the Plain of Antioch*. For Braidwoods reflections on archaeology and his career, see Braidwood, Archaeological Retrospect 2 and Braidwood, Some Selected Archaeological Reflections).

In 1935 Hetty Goldman of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, began excavations at Gözlü Kule, the prehistoric settlement at Tarsus (Goldman *et al.*). Goldmans work, first at Colophon then at Gözlü Kule, marks the start of the participation of women archaeologists, American or American-based, in the archaeology of Turkey. Much credit must go to Bryn Mawr, Goldmans alma mater, the small yet distinguished womens college whose perennially strong programs in Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology have encouraged many students to enter the field. (Note 9)

Another strand in the study of ancient Turkey that would eventually affect America was the appointment to academic posts in Turkey of German scholars expelled by the Nazi regime in 1933. Ýstanbul University was newly reorganized and Ankara University would shortly be founded, (Note 10) both following the model of German universities. Both benefitted from these emigr professors who taught in all fields (Widmann; and Neumark). Like Hittitologist Hans Güterbock, many began by lecturing in German with translation into Turkish, but eventually were able to give the lectures themselves in Turkish. A nationalist reaction in 1948 led to the

dismissal of these foreign professors. Several eventually found positions in the United States. Güterbock, for example, after a short stint in Sweden, was hired by the Oriental Institute, from where he has continued to advance the study of ancient Turkey.

By 1939, German archaeological research was dominant in Turkey. The large projects at Pergamon, Miletus, and Boðazköy/Hattusha, and the Austrian excavations at Ephesus had already uncovered much and published well. In 1929 the German Archaeological Institute established a center in Ýstanbul to further its research projects; this institute contains the finest archaeological library in the country (Eyice). With the organization of Ýstanbul and Ankara Universities on German models, some students were sent to Germany to study archaeology. Today still, if a Turkish archaeology student can study abroad, Germany remains a popular choice. The French government also established a research center in Ýstanbul in 1930, now called the French Institute for Anatolian Studies (Tibet).

From American eyes, the study of ancient Turkey clearly fell between the cracks. Classics and Classical archaeology were centered in Athens and Rome, with their big research centers. Biblical, Mesopotamian, and Egyptian archaeology dominated oriental studies programs. The Americans had yet to establish a center in Turkey. Indeed, was there such a thing as the Archaeology of Turkey? Was it a unified, coherent subject, or was it split between Classics (with well-preserved sites clustered on the Aegean and Mediterranean coasts) and the Ancient Near East (with the Bronze and Iron Age sites of the plateau)? In Turkey itself, this fragmentation was institutionalized, with separate university departments for Prehistory (Paleolithic and Neolithic), Ancient Near Eastern (especially Bronze and Iron Ages), and Classical archaeology. But archaeology itself was privileged, with Atatürk promoting the study of the Hittites and even the Sumerians as possible ancestors of the Turks, a way of giving the Turkish people a stake in the antiquity of their country and region (Önder). Despite the failure to prove these connections, and despite the multiplicity of cultures who have lived in this land, for Turks, at least, the Archaeology of Turkey was and still is *sui generis*, a coherent subject.

Since World War II

When archaeological activity resumed after the hiatus of the war years, we see that the traditional kind of project continued: there were large-scale excavations with a focus on the Greeks and Romans. A new interest developed concerning the Anatolian Iron Age peoples contemporary with early Greeks, notably the Phrygians and the Lydians. The University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania began excavations in 1950 at Gordion, west of Ankara, under the direction of Rodney Young, with a search for the Phrygian component as a major aim (for a summary of findings at Gordion through the mid 1970s, see *PECS* 360; for a thorough and more recent bibliography and orientation to research at Gordion, see Sams xvii-xxxii and

1-17; for an appreciation of Rodney Young and his work, see DeVries, Rodney Stuart Young, 1907-1974; Thompson; and Edwards). At Sardis, George M. A. Hanfmann and his Harvard-Cornell-ASOR (Note 11) team resumed American work in 1958; here, the Lydians were targeted (for a summary of discoveries at Sardis through the mid-1970s, see *PECS* 808-810; see also Hanfmann, *Letters from Sardis*; and *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times*; for an appreciation of Hanfmann and his work see Mitten). Kenan Erim, a professor at New York University, began full-scale excavations at Aphrodisias in 1961. (Note 12) In contrast to Young and Hanfmann, his interests were purely Classical, focused on the great monuments of art and architecture, aims of the sort that Clarke, Bacon, and Butler would have appreciated. Although the site would also yield prehistoric remains (Joukowsky), Erim himself was enthralled by the high quality Roman sculpture that emerged in great quantities. All three men (Young, Hanfmann, and Erim) were trained in the Classics, in philology first of all, in Classical art and archaeology secondarily. Young and Erim, at least, were conservative in their aims. They featured a historical-descriptive approach, and in the field used large crews to clear whatever individual architectural monuments might fortuitously pop into view. (Note 13) Such procedures typified the discipline of Classical Archaeology as practiced in the Mediterranean region until very recently.

Traditional approaches were applied in prehistoric archaeology, too. Machteld Mellink, a Dutch scholar trained in the Classics, joined Hetty Goldmans post-World War II team at Tarsus. Immediately fascinated by Anatolian prehistory, Mellink went on to become a leading expert in this field. A professor at Bryn Mawr College, her influence among archaeologists working in Turkey cannot be overestimated. From 1955 to 1993, her annual newsletter Archaeology in Asia Minor (later Archaeology in Anatolia) published in the *American Journal of Archaeology* was the internationally consulted summary of yearly archaeological activity in Turkey. (Note 14) From 1963 to 1975, Mellink conducted her own research project, the excavation of an Early Bronze Age settlement at Karatas-Semayük near Elmalý (northwest of Antalya), which allowed American students to take part in research in Anatolian prehistory (Eslick; and Warner).

The above projects continued methods and scientific goals that had their roots in pre-World War II archaeology. Beginning especially in the 1960s, several new factors have complemented such traditional approaches. Some have affected archaeologists of all nationalities, whereas others have concerned American archaeologists in particular.

1)*The revelation of Neolithic cultures in Turkey*. These, already attested from Mesopotamia, were revealed in Turkey, thanks especially to the British excavations at Hacýlar and Çatal Hüyük. (Note 15)During the Neolithic period people made the important transition from hunter-gatherer societies to settled communities, with control of food sources (domestication of plants and animals), development of fixed villages and towns, and new technologies such as pottery (with metallurgy to

follow). Americans would eventually take part in illuminating this important era: with Robert and Linda Braidwood in a joint Turkish-American-German project at Çayönü, near Diyarbakýr (Braidwood and Çambel; and M. and A. Özdoðan); Jacques Bordaz at Suberde and Erbaba (west-central Turkey); and in recent years Michael Rosenberg at Hallan Çemi, near Batman (Rosenberg).

2)*The development of underwater, or nautical, archaeology*. This was due to an American initiative. When the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania was contacted about the likelihood of investigating a shipwreck discovered off Cape Gelidonya, southwest of Antalya, Rodney Young, chair of the Classical Archaeology department, assigned graduate student George Bass to the project. Bass learned how to scuba dive, and in 1960 directed an excavation of this wreck of *ca.* 1200 BC, then the earliest ship known anywhere in the world, and published the results for his Ph.D. dissertation (Bass). Bass went on to found the Institute for Nautical Archaeology. Based at Texas A & M University, the Institute has undertaken excavations throughout the world. In Turkey, with its important regional center in Bodrum, the Institute and its members have cooperated with the Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology and Turkish colleagues in the excavation and conservation of several more shipwrecks in Turkish Aegean and Mediterranean waters.

3)*Dendrochronology (dating by tree rings)*. Another dissertation prepared for the Department of Classical Archaeology at the University of Pennsylvania has also led to the creation of a distinctive research niche. Peter Kuniholm began by examining the wood from Phrygian tumuli at Gordion. From the growth rings of these logs, he was able to construct a relative chronology, on the model developed for the archaeology of the soutwestern United States. During the past 20 years Kuniholm (of Cornell University) has taken countless samples of wood, especially from Turkey and Greece, from periods ancient, medieval, and modern, and extended his chronology back 6000 years. In the process he has created an awareness of the value of dendrochronology that otherwise quite simply would not have existed. (Note 16)

4)*The founding of the American Research Institute in Turkey (ARIT)*. In 1964, a consortium of American and Canadian universities founded ARIT in order to assist North American scholars doing research on Turkey in the humanities and social sciences in all periods. Funds provided by the subscribing universities were used to maintain the headquarters, including a library open to the public, and to provide fellowships for scholars from the supporting universities. In addition, short-term scholarships have been awarded to Turkish scholars to pursue research inside Turkey; these grants, even if modest, have been much appreciated because such resources are otherwise scarce. Several US government agencies, notably the United States Information Service, have granted money for various purposes, including fellowships specifically for American citizens. The original Ýstanbul center was soon supplemented with a branch in Ankara, to serve the needs of

archaeologists and specialists in the Turkish Republic. Since then, the Ýstanbul center has catered particularly to students of Ottoman and Byzantine civilizations. The ARIT branches do not match the centers in Athens or Rome in the size of their libraries or facilities, but the Institute has played a highly appreciated support role for hundreds of scholars, North American, Turkish, and other. (Note 17)

5)*The fall of the Shah in 1979 and the end of archaeological exploration in Iran (reinforced by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the same year)*. Iran in particular had become a training ground for American archaeologists educated in anthropology. Virtually all American archaeologists presented so far were trained in Classics, or perhaps art history or oriental studies, the dominant mother fields for the study of ancient Mediterranean art and cultures. Archaeology as practiced in anthropology departments has been heavily influenced by developments in cultural or social anthropology. Moreover, it has concentrated on other regions of the world, such as the New World and pre-Classical Europe. Anthropological archaeologists tend to develop theoretical aims for their research, questions they would like to answer through excavation, whereas the traditional Classical archaeologists pick a site because of its interesting historical background or art and architectural remains, and then study whatever happens to come up, formulating generalizations accordingly. The quality of work of both schools can be high; it is the approach that is different, and of course the whole background of study can differ.

After World War II, the archaeological component of the field of anthropology took up an interest in the ancient Near East. Robert Dyson of the University Museum began his highly influential excavations at Hasanlu in Northwestern Iran in 1957, and over the next two decades trained many students who now hold prominent positions in Old World archaeology. After the fall of the Shah the new regime shut down all foreign archaeological work. Americans who had built their careers in Iran were suddenly dispossessed. These intellectual refugees sought new areas. Afghanistan was closed because of the Soviet invasion. Iraq and Syria welcomed some, although political tensions with the United States created underlying uncertainties for such projects, and the 1991 Gulf War closed Iraq to American and European excavations. Turkey proved to be the most sympathetic home. Just as Turkey welcomed German refugees in the 1930s, so too it has welcomed the scientific refugees from the political turbulence in the east. All have pursued projects in Anatolian prehistory, many in the southeastern quadrant of Turkey, the area closest to those regions heretofore familiar.

A unique confrontation of the two schools of American archaeology in the Eastern Mediterranean and Near East is to be found at Gordion, where Dyson student and former excavator in Iran Mary Voigt (of the College of William and Mary) directs the current excavation campaigns, begun in 1988, while project director G. Kenneth Sams (of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), a student of Rodney Young and veteran Gordionite, represents the school of archaeologists trained in Classics and art history. From all reports this has been a stimulating encounter.

6)*Large-scale salvage projects.* The building of dams on the Euphrates River in eastern Turkey gave rise to two major archaeological salvage campaigns, both supervised by Middle East Technical University: the Keban project (Elazýð province), and the Atatürk and Karababa dams project in Adýyaman and Urfa (now Þanlýurfa) provinces. (Note 18) Government permits, not always easily obtained, were freely granted for these areas soon to be flooded. The resulting project proved important training gounds for archaeologists of all nationalities. American salvage excavations in the early 1980s at Gritille (Ellis) and Kurban Hüyük (Marfoe) offered excavation experience to many, including anthropological archaeologists who in previous decades would have trained in Iran. Three such former students are now directing projects in the Þanlýurfa province: Guillermo Algaze at Titriþ Höyük (Algaze *et al*.), Gil Stein at Hacýnebi Tepe (Stein *et al*.), and Patricia Wattenmaker at Kazane Höyük (Gates 217).

7)*The Annual Archaeological Symposium.* In 1979 the General Directorate of Monuments and Museums of the Turkish Ministry of Culture initiated an annual symposium at which results of the previous years excavations, surveys, and archaeometrical research would be presented by Turkish and foreign scholars. This meeting has become an essential institution of Turkish archaeology, the best way to get an overview of what has happened, to see what methods are being used, and to meet with fellow archaeologists. Especially for pre-Classical periods, in which methods and aims evolve quickly, the Symposium has been an influential forum for the dissemination of information. It now seems incredible that archaeology in Turkey existed so long without it.

Current developments: the 1990s.

Gordion is not the only site that has witnessed changing methods and approaches. At Aphrodisias, following Erims death in 1990, the project is now run by a new generation, R. R. R. Smith and Christopher Ratté, who have announced research goals that parallel procedures in anthropological archaeology: e.g. search for the overall city plan, instead of concentrating on isolated buildings (Smith and Ratté). In sites of all periods, interest is increasing in the contribution that science can make to archaeology. Aslýhan Yener of the Oriental Institute, with her surveys and excavations in the metal-rich Taurus Mountains in the Niðde province and research on Early Bronze Age metallurgy, has brought attention to projects in which scientific analysis and collaboration with scientific specialists and archaeometrists is essential (Yener and Vandiver).

The 1990s have seen other trends as well, such as a new emphasis on regional and site surveys, in fact mandated for all excavation projects by the General Directorate of Monuments and Museums. American participation has been particularly active in the southeast, with Mitchell Rothman surveying in the region of Muþ and Elizabeth Carter in the province of Kahramanmaraþ (Rothman; and Carter). (Note

19)Restoration projects continue to be favored by the government, partly as tourist draws. All major Classical sites have or are undertaking such projects; the two major American Classical excavations, Sardis and Aphrodisias, have certainly done their share. Another influential factor in contemporary Turkey is the pressure from development, vacation centers in coastal areas, and roads and miscellaneous industrial and construction projects throughout the country. Solutions need to be found that can accomodate the wishes of both developers and preservers of the country's cultural heritage. In contrast to America, Turkey lacks well-organized protest groups, so the pressure against the financial interests of the developers often amounts to little.

Lastly, we might note the opening in 1988 of a Department of Archaeology and History of Art at Bilkent University in Ankara. The language of instruction at Bilkent is English, and this is the first Archaeology department opened at an English-language university in Turkey. This development reflects a need for a multilingual archaeology program; since archaeology is an international discipline, the specialist in ancient Turkey needs to be able to read English, German, and French as well as Turkish. Turkish-language programs have suffered from a lack of materials available in Turkish, and whether or not students can read English, German, or French has always been an *ad hoc* matter. Indeed, apart from certain select bilingual schools, the teaching of foreign languages in Turkish primary and secondary schools has generally been insufficient. At Bilkents department, it is guaranteed that an entire group of undergraduates can function in English, using English materials as well as, of course, those of any other language a student might happen to know, thereby increasing the international exposure of Turkish archaeology students. The Bilkent department also offers a place where American and other foreign scholars and students can join Turks in the study of the archaeology of Turkey and the entire eastern Mediterranean, creating an international outlook for archaeology in Turkish academia unprecedented since the days of the German refugees in the 1930s and 1940s.

The Future

The big Classical sites will continue, but as at Aphrodisias, aims will be made explicit and limited simply because it is impossible for American teams to find the sort of open-ended financial support that once allowed such projects to go on indefinitely. From 1995 on the situation has become particularly difficult, with the Republican majority in the US Congress eager to cut government programs. One victim is the National Endowment for the Humanities, in recent years a major source of funding for American archaeologists in Turkey.

The influence of anthropological archaeology will continue to penetrate Classical studies, at least as practiced by Americans. (Note 20) Such influence should eventually influence Classical archaeology as practiced by Turks. In contrast to the

American situation, anthropology in Turkey means social or cultural anthropology without the disciplinary link to archaeology. Anthropology may thus seem more distant to Turks than it does to archaeologists from the United States. The important change for America, I think, will stem from the big question posed earlier: is there an Archaeology of Turkey? As discussed above, the answer has traditionally been No, since the American academic structure favors on the one hand Classical archaeology, centered on Rome and Athens, and on the other hand Near Eastern archaeology, centered in Syria and Iraq, with its complementary fields of Biblical archaeology (Palestine) and Egyptology. This surely will change, because of the changing role of the Classics in American education (Damrosch). The study of Greek and Latin languages, which occupied a preeminent position in European and American education well into the 20th century, is declining. Students capable of doing advanced work in Classical literature are rare. As a result, Classics departments, a venerable part of every American university, have had to offer new courses in literature in translation, and in Classical culture and society, in order to secure high enrollments to balance the small classes of advanced Greek and Latin. More will have to be done, because within a few decades ancient Greek and Latin will be studied as rarely as ancient Egyptian, Akkadian, or Sumerian. A solution I support is the restructuring of Classics departments as departments of ancient Mediterranean cultures, in which Greek and Roman civilizations are studied together with the Ancient Near Eastern and Egyptian worlds. Students would be exposed to all cultures of the region. A healthier understanding of each culture and its interactions with others will be the result. In such a new curriculum, the archaeology of Turkey will be able to take its rightful place, no longer neither fish nor fowl, but an essential component of the larger region, with its own particular witness of the passage of civilizations. The Turkish government should enlist American and indeed teams of all nationalities in the creative protecting and promoting of archaeological and historical sites, not only with surveys and preservation projects, as done already, but also with the dissemination of information about archaeology and historical sites to the Turkish public at large. Archaeology should not be considered an elitist pursuit, but an essential component of the cultural heritage of every citizen of this country. How to make the past relevant to society at large is a challenge faced not only by Turkey, but indeed by most countries. For vigorous minds throughout the world, there is much scope for bold, imaginative solutions.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on a lecture given to the American Studies Association of Turkey on May 2, 1995, in Ankara. I would like to thank Gülriz Büken and Gönül Pultar for the invitation to speak on that occasion. In addition, I am grateful to Toni Cross and Marie-Henriette Gates for their comments on preliminary versions of this paper, to Antony Greenwood and Akþin Somel for discussion and bibliography

about 19th and 20th century Ottoman and Turkish intellectual history, to Danielle Newland, Mary Voigt, Aslýhan Yener, and Geoffrey Summers for bibliographic help, and to Peter Kuniholm for details of his childhood in Ankara and for information about George C. Miles.

Notes

1

Such concepts have been explored in a fourth-year undergraduate course offered by the Department of Archaeology and History of Art at Bilkent University, Museum Practices and Preservation of Cultural Heritage.
[Back to Text]

2

Plunderers and spies have also taken part in archaeology in Turkey. But with strict governmental controls in the granting of permits and the monitoring of field research (a government representative accompanies each excavation team, whether foreign or Turkish), authorized archaeologists are very unlikely to take part in such illegal activities. I shall not deal with these topics here; for a comprehensive treatment of illegal excavations and the smuggling of antiquities, see Meyer; and Rose and Acar.
[Back to Text]

3

Excavations at Pergamon began in 1878, under the direction of Carl Humann and Alexander Conze. For a summary of the history of excavations at Pergamon, see Radt 333-359.
[Back to Text]

4

For a bibliography of the Butler expedition as well as the later American excavations directed by George Hanfmann from 1958 to 1975, see Hanfmann, *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times* xvii-xxvi. For a summary of the findings at Sardis through the mid-1970s, see *PECS* 808-810.
[Back to Text]

5

Butlers visit in 1921 is attested by Hanfmann (*Letters from Sardis* 7). A 1922 season was conducted by T. Leslie Shear; in the aftermath of the Greco-Turkish war, no further work was done. See note 4 for bibliography.
[Back to Text]

6

The first two foreign research institutes in stanbul were short-lived: the Russian Archaeological Institute, 1895-1914, and the Hungarian Institute, 1917-1918 (Arsebük 71; Çoruhlu Macar Enstitüsü and Çoruhlu Rus Arkeoloji Enstitüsü).
[Back to Text]

7

For a brief biography of Blegen, see Coulson 2. A part of Mr. and Mrs. Blegens personal library duplicates of books already held by the American School of Classical Studies at Athensforms the core of the library of the Ankara branch of the American Research Institute in Turkey.
[Back to Text]

8

For bibliography about Aliþar Höyük, see Gorny, The 1993 Season at Aliþar Höyük in Central Turkey. Ronald Gorny, a graduate of the Oriental Institute, has resumed work at Aliþar and surroundings after a fallow period of some 60 years (see also Gorny *et al*.).
[Back to Text]

9

For an appreciation of Goldmans work, including a lecture delivered by Goldman at Bryn Mawr College in 1955, see *A Symposium in Memory of Hetty Goldman*.
[Back to Text]

10

An Institute of Archaeology was opened at Ýstanbul University in 1933; at Ankara University, archaeology was part of the academic program of the Dil ve Tarih-Coðrafya Fakültesi (the Faculty of Languages and History-Geography) opened in

1936. It is now the Department of Archaelogy.
[Back to Text]

11

The American School of Oriental Research, founded in 1900 to facilitate the study and training of American scholars in the Near East (Wright 18), with focus on antiquity. Centers were established first in Jerusalem and later, in 1919, in Baghdad. The main emphasis of ASOR-sponsored research has lain to the south of Turkey, in Palestine/Israel, Iraq, Jordan, and Cyprus (King). In Turkey, in addition to Sardis, ASOR sponsored the excavations at Nemrud Dað, the late Hellenistic sanctuary of Antiochus I of Commagene, conducted during 1953-1956 by Theresa Goell. A Radcliffe graduate with some advanced training in architecture, Goell worked at Tarsus after World War II. She later joined F. Dörner at Arsameia, then pursued her own studies at Nemrud Dað and the Commagenian capital at Samsat. With no advanced degrees, Goell had no formal academic position and remained a loner in Anatolian archaeology. She was a colorful character, however, and her life would make a wonderfully entertaining biography. Her papers are kept at Harvard University's Semitic Museum (see D. Sanders xiiixliv).
[Back to Text]

12

For a summary of work at Aphrodisias, *PECS* 68-70; and Erim. Concerning the life and achievements of Erim, see Bowersock.

Although Turkish by background, Kenan Erim lived most of his life in Switzerland and the United States. The son of a Turkish diplomat, he received his primary and secondary education in Geneva; his B.A. from New York University; and his Ph.D. from Princeton University. I assume he spent less time in Turkey than Peter Kuniholm. In any case, he was not a native-born American and belongs in the category of foreign-born archaelogists such as Hanfmann and Mellink. I worked with him for a month in Aphrodisias in 1973.
[Back to Text]

13

The 1950s and 1960s were prosperous years for America. Archaeological projects could be well funded by both governmental and private sources and thus could operate on the comfortable scale directors wished. After the oil embargo of late 1973, the American economy faced pressure, and financial support had to be fought

for. But funding could usually be found.
[Back to Text]

14

The newsletter has continued, now written by Marie-Henriette Gates, an American scholar teaching in the Department of Archaeology and History of Art at Bilkent University. Gates was an undergraduate student of Mellink at Bryn Mawr; in Turkey she took part in excavations at Karatas-Semayük, Aphrodisias, and Gritille, and now directs excavations at Kinet Höyük.
[Back to Text]

15

British research was facilitated by the opening in Ankara in 1949 of the British Institute of Archaeology, the first foreign research institute established in the capital. For a recent overview of research into the Neolithic period in Turkey, see Özdoðan.
[Back to Text]

16

Peter Kuniholm is also of interest for his background. Although several of the scholars mentioned here were born and raised outside the United States (such as Güterbock, Hanfmann, Erim, and Mellink), Kuniholm is the only American archaeologist working in Turkey who actually spent part of his childhood in this country. His father was a diplomat, the first secretary of the American Embassy in Ankara during 1949-1952. Among other activities, Kuniholm belonged to a Turkish American Youth Club that helped plant and water 5,000 pine seedlings around Anýtkabir, Atatürks mausoleum. Later, during 1962-1968, as a college graduate but before beginning graduate studies in archaeology, he taught English at Robert Academy (as the present Robert Lisesi used to be called then) in Ýstanbul. In doing so it happened that he was following in the footsteps of his wife's father, Gordon Merriam, and uncles, Ellis Briggs and Islamic numismatist George C. Miles, who had taught at the same school during 1921-1922 and 1929-1933. Moreover, his brother Bruce Kuniholm, now a specialist on Turkish and Middle Eastern politics, joined him on the teaching staff during 1964-1967 (Personal communications from Peter Kuniholm).

Concerning another group of Americans who lived in Turkey, it is of interest to note that none of the Peace Corps volunteers active in the country during the 1960s

became archaeologists, in contrast with the several whose experiences inspired them to study Ottoman history, Turkish language and literature, etc.
[Back to Text]

17

Personal communication from Toni Cross, director of ARIT-Ankara; and publicity brochures of ARIT.
[Back to Text]

18

It needs to be stressed that sites do not remain intact underwater, but instead are dispersed by the movements of the water: hence the need to investigate them before they are flooded.
[Back to Text]

19

Four earlier projects of the Oriental Institute have been resumed with regional survey as a key component, three by Americans or American teams--Gavurkalesi (Lumsden), Aliþar Höyük (Gorny, The 1993 Season at Aliþar Höyük in Central Turkey; Gorny *et al.*, The Aliþar Regional Project 1994), and the Amuq Plain, from 1995, under the direction of Aslýhan Yener and one by a British team, Kerkenes Dað (Summers *et al.*).
[Back to Text]

20

For a rich and bracing history and evaluation of Classical archaeology within the realm of Classical studies, with a focus on Greek archaeology, see Morris.
[Back to Text]

Works Cited

A Symposium in Memory of Hetty Goldman, 1881-1972, held at The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey, May 4 th, 1973. Princeton: The Institute for Advanced Study, 1974.

Algaze, Guillermo, ed. *Town and Country in Southeastern Anatolia. Vol. II. The Stratigraphic Sequence at Kurban Höyük.* Oriental Institute Publication 110.

Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990.

Algaze, Guillermo, et al. Titriþ Höyük, a Small EBA Urban Center in SE Anatolia. The 1994 Season. *Anatolica* 21 (1995) : 13-64.

Arsebük, Güven. Dünden Bugüne Arkeoloji [Archaeology Yesterday and Today]. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi.* Ýstanbul: Ýletiþim Ýayýnlarý, 1983. 1 : 66-75.

AST = XII. Araþtýrma Sonuçlarý Toplantýsý, Ankara, 30 Mayýs - 3 Haziran 1994 [12 th Meeting for Research Results, Ankara, 30 May - 3 June 1994]. Ankara: T. C. Kültür Bakanlýðý, Anýtlar ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüðü, 1995.

Atasoy, Sümer. Türkiyede Müzecilik [Museums and Museology in Turkey]. *Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi.* Ýstanbul: Ýletiþim Yayýnlarý, 1983. 6 : 1458-1471.

Bar-Yosef, Ofer and Amihai Mazar. Israeli Archaeology. *World Archaeology* 13 (1982) : 310-325.

Bass, George F. *Cape Gelidonya: A Bronze Age Shipwreck.* Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1967.

Blake, Janet. The Protection of Turkey's Underwater Archaeological HeritageLegislative Measures and Other Approaches. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 3 (1994) : 273-293.

Blakely, Jeffrey A. Frederick Jones Bliss: Father of Palestinian Archaeology. *Biblical Archaeologist* 56 (1993) : 110-115.

Blegen, Carl. *Troy and the Trojans.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1963.

Bober, Phyllis Pray and Ruth Rubinstein. *Renaissance Artists and Antique Sculpture: A Handbook of Sources.* London and Oxford: Harvey Miller and Oxford University Press, 1986.

Bowersock, G. Kenan Tevfik Erim, 1929-1990. *American Journal of Archaeology* 95 (1991) : 281-283.

Braidwood, Linda S. and Robert J. Braidwood, eds. *Prehistoric Village Archaeology in South-Eastern Turkey.* BAR International Series 138. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1982.

Braidwood, Robert J. *Mounds in the Plain of Antioch: An Archaeological Survey.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

-----. Explorations in the Plain of Antioch. *Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.*

-----. Archaeological Retrospect 2. *Antiquity* 55 (1981) : 19-26.

-----. Some Selected Archaeological Reflections. *Between the Rivers and Over the Mountains: Archaeologica Anatolica et Mesopotamica Alba Palmieri Dedicata.* Eds. M. Frangipane, H. Hauptmann, M. Liverani, P. Matthiae and M. Mellink. Rome: Dipartimento di Scienze Storiche Archeologiche e Antropologiche dellAntichita, Universita di Roma La Sapienza, 1993. 15-20.

Braidwood, Robert J. and Halet Çambel. The Çayönü Excavations: Overview Through 1981. *Prehistoric Village Archaeology in South-Eastern Turkey.* Eds. Linda S. Braidwood and Robert J. Braidwood. BAR International Series 138. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1982. 1-15.

Carter, Elizabeth. Report on the Kahramanmaraþ Archaeological Survey Project from 24.9.1993 to 11.11.1993. *AST.* 331-341.

Clarke, Joseph T. *Report on the Investigations at Assos, 1881.* Boston: A. Williams, 1882.

-----. Report on the Investigations at Assos, 1882, 1883. New York: Macmillan, 1898.

-----, Bacon, Francis H. and Robert Koldewey. *Investigations at Assos.* Cambridge MA: Archaeological Institute of America, 1902.

Clarke, M. L. *Classical Education in Britain 1500-1900.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Constantine, David. *Early Greek Travellers and the Hellenic Ideal.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Coulson, William D. E. Introduction by the Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. *Wace and Blegen. Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age, 1939-1989. Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens, December 2-3, 1989.* Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1993. 1-2.

Çoruhlu, Yaþar. Macar Enstitüsü [The Hungarian Institute]. *DBYA.* 5: 234.

-----. Rus Arkeoloji Enstitüsü [The Russian Archaeological Institute]. *DBYA.* 6: 368.

Damrosch, David. Can Classics Die? *Lingua Franca* September/October 1995: 61-66.

Daniel, Glyn. *A Short History of Archaeology.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1981.

Davison, Roderic H. Westernized Education in Ottoman Turkey. *Middle East Journal* 15 (1961): 289-301. Reprinted with bibliographical addendum in Davison, Roderic H. *Essays in Ottoman and Turkish History, 1774-1923: The Impact of the West.* Austin TX: University of Texas Press, 1990. 166-179.

-----. *Reform in the Ottoman Empire 1856-1876.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

DBYA = Dünden Bugüne Ýstanbul Ansiklopedisi. Ýstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfý, 1994.

DeVries, Keith, ed. *From Athens to Gordion. The Papers of a Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young. Held at the University Museum the third of May, 1975.* Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1980.

-----. Rodney Stuart Young, 1907-1974. *From Athens to Gordion: The Papers of a Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young. Held at the University Museum the third of May, 1975.* Ed. Keith DeVries. Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1980. xv-xvii.

Dinsmoor, William Bell. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, 3rd ed. London: B.T. Batsford, 1975 (reprint of the 1950 edition).

Edwards, G. Roger. Postscript. *From Athens to Gordion: The Papers of a Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young. Held at the University Museum the third of May, 1975.* Ed. Keith DeVries. Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1980. 159-161.

Eisner, Robert. *Travelers to an Antique Land: The History and Literature of Travel to Greece.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.

Ellis, Richard. Gritille 1984. *VII. Kazý Sonuçlarý Toplantýsý, Ankara 20-24 Mayýs 1985* [7th Meeting for Excavation Results, Ankara 20-24 May 1985]. Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlýðý, Eski Eserler ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüðü, 1986. 261-270.

Ergin, Osman Nuri. *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi* [History of Education in Turkey]. 2 vols. Ystanbul, 1977.

Erim, Kenan T. *Aphrodisias: City of Venus Aphrodite.* London: Muller, Blond and White, 1986.

Eslick, Christine. *Elmalý-Karataş I. The Neolithic and Chalcolithic Periods: Baðbaþýand Other Sites.* Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College Archaeological Monographs, 1992.

Eyice, Semavi. Alman Arkeoloji Enstitüsü [The German Archaeological Institute]. *DBYA.* 1: 207-208.

Findley, Carter V. *Ottoman Civil Officialdom: A Social History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Frangipane, M., H. Hauptmann, M. Liverani, P. Matthiae, and M. Mellink, eds. *Between the Rivers and Over the Mountains: Archaeologica Anatolica et Mesopotamica Alba Palmieri Dedicata.*Rome: Dipartimento di Scienze Storiche Archeologiche e Antropologiche dellAntichita, Universita di Roma La Sapienza, 1993.

Gates, Marie-Henriette. Archaeology in Turkey. *American Journal of Archaeology* 99 (1995) : 207-255.

Goldman, Hetty, *et al. Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus.* 3 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950-1963.

Gorny, Ronald L. The 1993 Season at Aliþar Höyük in Central Turkey. *Anatolica* 20 (1994) : 191-202.

----- *et al*. The Aliþar Regional Project 1994. *Anatolica* 21 (1995) : 65-100.

Gurney, Oliver. *The Hittites.* 2nd edition reprinted with revisions. London: Penguin Books, 1990.

Hanfmann, George M. A. *Letters from Sardis.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

-----. *Sardis from Prehistoric to Roman Times.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Haskell, Francis and Nicholas Penny. *Taste and the Antique: The Lure of Classical Sculpture 1500-1900.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Hobson, Christine. *The World of the Pharaohs.* New York: Thames and Hudson, 1991.

Jacobsen, Thorkild, and John A. Wilson. The Oriental Institute: Thirty Years and the Present. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 8 (1949) : 236-247.

Joukowsky, Martha Sharp. *Prehistoric Aphrodisias.* 2 vols. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1986.

King, Philip. *American Archaeology in the Mideast: A History of the American Schools of Oriental Research.* Philadelphia: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1983.

Kraus, Theodor. *Pompeii and Herculaneum.* Trans. Robert Erich Wolf. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1975.

Lloyd, Seton. *Foundations in the Dust: The Story of Mesopotamian Exploration.* Revised and enlarged edition. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.

Lumsden, Stephen. Gavurkalesi, 1993. *AST.* 267-280.

Marfoe, Leo. Introduction. *Town and Country in Southeastern Anatolia.* Vol. II. *The Stratigraphic Sequence at Kurban Höyük.* Ed. Guillermo Algaze. Oriental Institute Publication 110. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990. 1-20.

Meyer, Karl. *The Plundered Past: The Traffic in Art Treasures.* London: Hamish Hamilton, 1974.

Mitten, David G. George Maxim Anossov Hanfmann, 1911-1986. *American Journal of Archaeology* 91 (1987): 259-263.

Morris, Ian. Archaeologies of Greece. *Classical Greece: Ancient Histories and Modern Archaeologies.* Ed. Ian Morris. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. 8-47.

Neumark, Fritz. *Boðaziçine Sýðýnanlar: Türkiye'ye Ýltica Eden Alman Ýlim, Siyaset ve Sanat Adamlarý 1933-1953* [Seeking asylum on the Bosphorus: German scientific, political, and artist refugees in Turkey 1933-1953]. Trans. þefik Alp Bahadýr. Ýstanbul Üniversitesi Yayýnlarý no. 3062. Ýstanbul: Ýstanbul Üniversitesi, 1982.

Önder, Mehmet. Atatürk ve Müzeler (followed by summary in English: Atatürk and Museums). *Müze/Museum* 2-3 (1989-90) : 11-22.

Özdoðan, Mehmet. Neolithic in Turkey--The Status of Research. *Readings in Prehistory: Studies presented to Halet Çambel.* Ýstanbul: Graphis Yayýnlarý, 1995: 41-59.

Özdoðan, Mehmet, and Aslý Özdoðan. Çayönü. A Conspectus of Recent Work. *Paléorient* 15.1 (1989) : 65-74.

PECS= Stillwell, Richard, ed. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Radt, Wolfgang. *Pergamon: Geschichte und Bauten, Funde und Erforschung einer antiken Metropole.* Cologne: Du Mont, 1988.

Richard, Carl. J. *The Founders and the Classics: Greece, Rome, and the American Enlightenment* . Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Rose, Mark and Özgen Acar. Turkeys War on the Illicit Antiquities Trade. *Archaeology* March/April 1995 : 44-56.

Rosenberg, Michael, et al. Hallan Çemi Tepesi: Some Preliminary Observations concerning Early Neolithic Subsistence Behaviors in Eastern Anatolia. *Anatolica* 21 (1995) : 1-12.

Rothman, Mitchell S. The Pottery of the Muþ Plain and the Evolving Place of a High Border Land. *AST*. 281-294.

Sams, G. Kenneth. *The Early Phrygian Pottery. The Gordion Excavations, 1950-1973: Final Reports.* Volume IV. University Museum Monograph 79. Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1994.

Sanders, Donald H., ed. Nemrud Daðý. *The Hierothesion of Antiochus I of Commagene.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Sanders, James A., ed. *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck.* Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1970.

Schliemann, Heinrich. *Troy and its Remains.* Salem NH: Ayer, 1989 (reprint of the 1875 edition).

-----. *Ilios: The City and Country of the Trojans.* Salem NH: Ayer, 1989 (reprint of the 1881 edition).

Shaw, Stanford J. and Ezel Kural Shaw. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey.* Vol. II. *Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Silberman, Neil Asher. *Digging for God and Country.* New York: 1982.

-----. *Between Past and Present: Archaeology, Ideology, and Nationalism in the Modern Middle East.* New York: Henry Holt, 1989.

Smith, R. R. R. and Christopher Ratté. Archaeological Research at Aphrodisias in Caria, 1994. *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (1996) : 5-33.

Smyth, Craig Hugh and Peter M. Lukehart, eds. *The Early Years of Art History in the United States.* Princeton: The Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, 1993.

Stein, Gil J., *et al*. Uruk Colonies and Anatolian Communities: An Interim Report on the 1992-1993 Excavations at Hacýnebi, Turkey. forthcoming, *American Journal of Archaeology* 100 (April 1996).

Stoneman, Richard. *Land of Lost Gods: The Search for Classical Greece.* Norman OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.

Stuart, James and Nicholas Revett. *The Antiquities of Athens*. 3 vols. London: John Haberkorn, 1762-94; reprinted New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968.

Summers, G. D., M. E. F. Summers, and K. Ahmet. The Regional Survey at Kerkenes Dað: an Interim Report on the Seasons of 1993 and 1994. *Anatolian Studies* 45 (1995) : 43-68.

Thompson, Margaret. Introduction to the Symposium. *From Athens to Gordion. The Papers of a Memorial Symposium for Rodney S. Young. Held at the University Museum the third of May, 1975.*Ed. Keith DeVries. Philadelphia: The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, 1980. 1-2.

Tibet, Aksel. Fransýz Anadolu Araþtýrmalarý Enstitüsü [The French Institute of Anatolian Studies]. *DBYA* 3 : 332-334.

Traill, David A. *Excavating Schliemann: Collected Papers on Schliemann.* Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1993.

-----. *Schliemann of Troy: Treasure and Deceit.* London: John Murray, 1995.

Trigger, Bruce. *A History of Archaeological Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. *Türkiye'de Çaðdaþ Düþünce Tarihi* [The History of Modern Thought in Turkey]. Ýstanbul: Ülken Yayýnlarý, 1992.

Van Zanten, David. Formulating Art History at Princeton and the Humanistic Laboratory. *The Early Years of Art History in the United States.* Eds. Craig Hugh

Smyth and Peter M.Lukehart. Princeton: The Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, 1993. 175-182.

Warner, Jayne L. *Elmalý-KarataşII. The Early Bronze Age Village of Karataş*. Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr College Archaeological Monographs, 1994.

Weiss, Roberto. *The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969.

West, Andrew F., *et al*., eds. *Value of the Classics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1917.

Widmann, Horst. *Exil und Bildungshilfe: Die deutschsprachige akademische Emigration in die Türkei nach 1933.* Bern: Herbert Lang, 1973.

Wilson, John A. James Henry BreastedThe Idea of an Oriental Institute. *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck.* Ed. James A. Sanders. Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1970. 41-56.

Winckelmann, Johannes. *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums.* Dresden: Walther, 1764. Translated into English by G. Henry Lodge as History of Ancient Art, 2 vols. New York: Friedrich Ungar, 1968.

Wright, G. Ernest. The Phenomenon of American Archaeology in the Near East. *Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century: Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck.* Ed. James A. Sanders. Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1970. 3-40.

Yener, K. Aslýhan and Pamela B. Vandiver. Tin Processing at Göltepe, an Early Bronze Age Site in Anatolia. *American Journal of Archaeology* 97 (1993) : 207-238.

Zerner, Carol, ed. *Wace and Blegen. Pottery as Evidence for Trade in the Aegean Bronze Age, 1939-1989. Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Athens, December 2-3, 1989.* Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1993.