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Introduction

The first decade of the twentieth century was characterised by a rapid proliferation of museums and by the predominant role of the Archaeological Society in museum matters. Some sixteen museums were established within a time span of only nine years at an average rate of three museums per year (see Appendix 4). This remarkable growth was mainly due to the improved financial position of the Archaeological Society, as a result of which the Society was obliged to take on certain responsibilities normally belonging to the State (Petrakos 1987a: 107). Thus all but three museums were founded by the Archaeological Society and this probably led to a somehow more systematic approach to museum development.

The Ancient Corinth Museum

Ancient Corinth was first excavated by the American School of Classical Studies in Athens between 1896 and 1900 (Stillwell and Fowler 1932: 3-13). Then in 1900 the Archaeological Society proceeded to the construction of a site museum for the deposition of excavation finds. By 1901 the building was ready and antiquities started been placed in it (IIAE 1900: 20; 1901: 15-16)
[122]. However, available space was already limited as the museum initially comprised one wing, the west (Stillwell and Fowler 1932: 9). An extension was added in 1907 and arrangement works continued (IIAE 1907: 67), but there is no information on display works until 1918; in fact, it seems that displays did not crystallise before 1918, when the museum was finally organised (AΔ 1918, Annex: I).

Built on the north end of the site [123], the museum was a very simple, one-storey structure with cement floor and wooden ceiling. The windows had wooden shutters from inside and iron frames from outside. As later sources suggest, the building resembled more to a store room than to a properly established museum (Baedeker 1904: 312; cf. AΔ 1918, Annex: 1, where it is described as a totally inadequate space).

There is hardly any other information on this first museum at ancient Corinth. Surviving photographs from the interior of the museum are much later and they must date from after its thorough re-arrangement in 1926 (Carpenter 1928). One of them, however, is presented here only as an indication of what the interior of the building looked like [124]. Finally, it is rather very unlikely that the museum was open to visitors, during the period under study.

The Thera Museum

Historical Note

Excavations on the island of Thera were first carried out between 1896 and 1900 by the German archaeophile Hiller von Gaertringen (Gaertringen 1899-1902) who, according to an unverified piece of information, also intended to build a local museum (Baedeker 1901: 558). Excavation finds were initially
deposited in two side rooms in the cathedral \(\textit{AthMitt}\ 1900: 425; \textit{Gaertringen}\ 1899-1902: 33\) \[125\] until 1900, when the Archaeological Society undertook the construction of a proper museum \(\textit{IAE}\ 1900: 20\).\footnote{3} The plans for a simple, single-storeyed building were designed by the architect E. Phiorakes \(\textit{Gaertringen}\ \text{and Wilski}\ 1904: \text{fig.}\ 13\). Construction works lasted one year and costed 12,000 drachmas \(\textit{IAE}\ 1901: 15;\ 1902: 34;\ 1903: 25\). The museum, situated in a central place of the city next to the cathedral \[126-127\], was inaugurated on 22 June 1902 \(\textit{Gaertringen}\ 1902: 466\).\footnote{4}

**Display Layout**

The museum had an intelligible spatial layout and comprised four rooms (Plan 38). Its displays are fully portrayed through descriptions of the museum's interior and a series of photographs. In the \textit{vestibule} one could see the altar of the emperor Augustus \[128\], a statue of Tyche, the treasure of the Egyptian gods and architectural members.

To the right, \textit{the sculpture room} contained a series of Roman statues, mainly heads and busts, arranged around the walls, whereas a lion that was found in 1899 at the Agora was placed in the centre \[129-130\]. In one of the corners stood a wall cabinet which accommodated small statuettes of Venus and hermaic stelai and bore a statuette of Venus unfastening her sandal on its top \[131\].

To the left of the vestibule, a large collection of inscriptions, decrees and gravestones was displayed around the walls of \textit{the inscriptions room} \[132-133\]. In the centre stood the monumental decree of Ptolemy for Thera\footnote{5}. The large \textit{back room} accommodated the vase collection \[134-136\], apart from those vases which had already been transported to the National Museum \[137\].
Display Organisation and Hardware

Displays were clearly and orderly organised according to typology. Within the rooms, objects were linearly juxtaposed according to size. Sculpture and inscriptions were displayed on a series of two or three rows of open shelves, which run along the walls in the sculpture and inscriptions rooms [129-130], [132-133]. Below the shelves, some sculpture was placed on the floor. Solid, stone bases were constructed for the display of large sculptures, whereas the majority of the heads were fixed on small individual bases [129-130].

The back room was to the largest extent occupied by a series of wall cabinets and small chests for the accommodation of the vase collection [134-136]. Simple tables were used for the display of fragmentary pottery and large Geometric pithoi [136]. Vases were also placed on top of the cabinets and on the floor.

Supporting Material and Museum Environment

Apart from catalogue numbers, which are visible on some of the exhibits [131-132], [134], it seems that the displays lacked even the basic documentation. The museum's interior looked surprisingly simple and spacious due to the lack of display surfaces in the centre of the rooms. This impression was enhanced by the fact that walls and pavement were monochrome. Natural light came through the windows, which had transparent curtains [134].

Discussion

The Thera Museum gives us a first taste of the improvement in the development of the Greek museums which characterised the first decade of the twentieth century. Although small and provincial, the museum was systematically set up and well kept due to the efforts of E. Vassileiou, the Theran "Curator", and the German E. Pfuhl (Gaertringen and Wilski 1904: 34).
Did the museum's orderly displays have any impact on the public? Unfortunately, there is no information on the museum's everyday function or on its visitors. But, it would be legitimate to assume that the overall impression one could get was that of a well arranged and comprehensible museum.

The Chalkis Museum

At its meeting of 15 November 1899 the City Council of Chalkis decided to cede a municipal piece of land for the construction of an archaeological museum in the city. The museum's construction, it was thought, would not only meet the pressing need for safeguarding local antiquities; it would also "remind the Greeks of their ancient history". It is interesting to note that, in contrast with the common practice, the museum's foundation preceded the collection of local antiquities.

A series of articles in the local newspaper *Ευριπός* (Euripos) document the initial phases of the museum's building. The piece of land ceded was situated near the Chalkis school and a sum of 16,000 drachmas was allotted to the museum in the 1900 municipal budget. The auction for the work took place sometime in June 1900 and it seems that the speed with which the whole case proceeded owed to the activities of local representatives in Athens. The museum plans were drawn in Athens by the architect of the Archaeological Society A. Lykakes; it is not known if some alterations, proposed by the Chalkis engineer Krokidas were taken into account. In November 1900 it was announced that the building was almost complete, but works apparently went on in subsequent years (*ΠΑΕ* 1902: 34; 1903: 25). Expenses were covered by the Archaeological Society and amounted to some 17,482 drachmas (*ΠΑΕ* 1901: 15).
The museum was a simple, stone-built building in the neoclassical
tradition (cf. Volos Museum) [138]. It comprised a vestibule, one room on
either side of it and a back yard (Plan 39). Its content for the period under
study is not clearly known, but we may assume that it included sculpture from
the temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria\textsuperscript{13} and finds from other
excavations on Euboia. The only information we have on the exhibits’ spatial
layout is that the best pieces were placed in the vestibule, whereas bulkier and
less important ones were arranged in the back yard.\textsuperscript{14}

Overall, the Chalkis Museum is extremely poorly documented and
nothing is known on its daily activities, visitors, staff, etc. The museum was
one of the ten provincial museums where the Archaeological Society intended
to appoint a permanent curator (\textit{PAE} 1907: 73), but there is no indication that
this happened during the period examined here.

\section*{The Mykonos Museum}

\subsection*{Historical Note}

\textbf{1873-1900}

The history of the Mykonos Archaeological Museum is closely connected to
the excavations on the neighbouring island of Delos, which started in 1872 by
the French. In 1873 Panaghiotes Stamatakes was sent by the Archaeological
Society to supervise the works. On this occasion Stamatakes gathered
inscriptions and other transportable antiquities, which layed on Delos and
carried them off to Mykonos. This was the beginning of the Mykonos
collection,\textsuperscript{15} which was later roughly classified by P. Kavvadias (\textit{Παρνασσός}
V, 1881: 92). Yet in the years to come some antiquities were transported to
Athens, despite the Mykoniates’ protests (reported in Euanghelides 1914: 292, n. 1). The first collection was later enriched with the plethora of finds -mainly pottery- from the excavations on the deserted island of Rheneia, conducted in 1898-1900 by the Ephor of the Cyclades D. Stauropoulos. The “Rheneia find” was so rich that, according to a later source, the foundation of the Mykonos Museum was necessary for it alone (AE 1915: 103).

The Greek Government was determined to establish a special museum for the Delian finds at Mykonos, but the collection was for a number of years kept in hired premises. Thus, sculpture was placed in the ground floor of the house of the Mayor of Mykonos, L. Kampanes. This was characterised as the “central, so to speak, museum”, which, according to contemporary guides, was worth a visit (Guide Joanne 1891: 442-43; Baedeker 1901: 563). Three other private houses -one for inscriptions, another for the vase collection and the third for gravestones and other finds from Rheneia- served as rough “museums” (Baedeker 1904: 235-36). The key to these museums was held by the guardian of antiquities (Beadeker 1901: 563).

1900-1909
The construction of a proper museum started in 1900 by the Archaeological Society (ΠΑΕ 1900: 20; 1901: 15; 1902: 34) and the building was ready by 1905, but some repair works were still needed before final completion. A single-storeyed building, the museum was situated at the north end of the city of Mykonos overlooking its bay [139]. It comprised four rooms, two on either side of the entrance and had a large backyard (Plan 40).

Discussion
The complete lack of information on the museum’s interior makes the visual reconstruction of the displays impossible. Moreover, the only extant photographs, which could possibly help us, date from much later (ca.1923) and
so they cannot be used as reliable evidence for the period discussed here. However, one of these photographs is deliberately used here, so as to give a feeling of the place [140]. Note, for instance, that the stone-blocks which paved the museum floor came from the Tenos quarries.\textsuperscript{21} A document in the \textit{Delos Archive} (see n. 19) reads that the museum contained some stone bases, which were initially constructed for the Delian sculpture and by 1905 needed repair; these bases are probably the ones visible in [140]. The same source reads that the construction of wooden cases for the pottery from Rheneia was also contemplated, but we do not know whether this was implemented or not.

Similarly difficult proves the attempt to portray the museum's day-to-day function. The curation was entrusted to the Ephor of the Cyclades Demetres Stauropoulos, but this is all we know about and the question remains whether the museum was regularly open to visitors or not. A 1909 reference uses the verb "are kept" when talking about the museum's collections (Philadelpheus 1909: 40). Could this be an indication of the lack of proper displays? The case may be that, although completed, the museum was not properly set up and accessible until later. This, however, is a mere speculation. For the time being no definite conclusions can be drawn on the matter.

\section*{The Nauplion Museum}

Finds from Argolid and Nauplion had for many years been transported to Athens and deposited in the museum of the Archaeological Society at the Polytechnic (see p. 118). Strangely enough, no indication whatsoever has been found on the establishment of an early local collection of antiquities in Nauplion (a practice which was common in all Greek cities at the time). In fact, our first piece of news on the matter dates from much later when, in
1902, the Archaeological Society proceeded to the restoration of the "Vouleutiko" (Parliament) in order to use it as an archaeological museum.

Originally a Turkish mosque, this building served as the first parliament of the Greeks after the Liberation (Nauplion 1953: 13-14; Karouzou 1979: 59). Situated by the central square of the city, it was a large building symmetrically built with carved stones [141]. Its prayer hall, a large square room roofed with a hemispherical dome, was to be used as museum. Restoration works were completed by 1903 (ITAE 1903: 25; AthMitt 1903: 477), but it seems that the "museum" existed only by name until much later. In fact, organisation and cataloguing of the collections started as late as 1916 (AD 1916, Annex: 13) and there is no indication that the museum did operate before that date.

The Delphoi Museum

Historical Note

The prospect of unearthing the famous Delphic sanctuary had, from very early in the nineteenth century, irresistibly appealed to archaeologists from several countries. Small scale investigations were mainly undertaken in the 1860s by the French,\textsuperscript{22} who later asked official permission from the Greek Government to conduct large scale excavations. Negotiations between the two Governments lasted a decade and final agreement was signed in 1891.\textsuperscript{23} There was, however, a serious problem to be overcome before excavation could start as the small village of Kastri, which was built over the ruins of the sanctuary, had to be removed and built elsewhere. A grant of the French Assembly made it possible to buy the houses and the neighbouring land and excavations started in 1892.\textsuperscript{24}
At that time, the journey from Athens to Delphi was a time-consuming and difficult venture. The provincial carriage road, which connected Delphi to Itea on the south-west and to Thebes on the north-east, was not constructed until 1888. Till then, the trip from Piraeus through the Corinth canal normally took nine to ten hours (Kastriotes 1894: preface).

A first collection of antiquities, formed at around 1882 by P. Stamatakes (IIAE 1882: 64), was initially housed in two private houses and the school (Dassios 1992: 134-35). The main part of a museum was built later by the Greek Government, most probably in 1894: a first reference to the museum dates from 1894 (Jacquemin 1992: 168) and the same year Kastriotes (1894: 19) mentions the "separate museum" which housed the first finds at Delphi.

In 1901-1903 a donation by A. Syngros made possible the extension of the museum by the French School [142]. Two large pavilions were added on either end of the building, in a way reminiscent of small provincial French stations (Bommelaer et al. 1992: 209). It seems, however, that, in contrast to what was thought so far, the extension was not based on Tournaire's plans of 1900 (Plans 41 and 42), but on an amended design by Replat, the 1904 version of which is shown here (Plan 43). The museum was inaugurated on 2 May [or 20 April, according to the Old Diary] 1903. An official and solemn atmosphere prevailed on the day. Celebrations included a run and the adornment of the bay of Itea with five ships - three Greek and two French. The entire road down to Itea, it was reported, was full of people who came to celebrate the event.25

Already in 1904 the museum presented structural and other deficiencies (Bommelaer et al. 1992: 210) and it seems that it was partially repaired in 1910 (IIAE 1910: 30); apart from that nothing more is known about the fortunes of this building, which was restored in 1935-38 and thoroughly reorganised in the early 1960s.26
Display Layout

Three descriptions of the museum's interior, dating from 1903 to 1908 and supported by good photographic evidence, offer a complete visual reconstruction of the displays (Brunswick 1903: 894-96; Baedeker 1904: 149-54; Keramopoulos 1908: 7-25). The old, main part of the museum was divided by law walls into four small compartments; then followed two large, high-ceiling, side rooms (Plan 44) [143]; (see Plan 45 for Replat's suggestions on the display).

After ascending the staircase, the visitor entered room I ("Salle d'Aurige"). In front of the entrance door stood a bust of A. Syngros, flanked by two panels with information on the history of the excavations and the museum (d). The imposing figure of the bronze charioteer occupied the centre of the room (a); the remains of the bronze group were placed behind him [144]. A case placed against the wall (b) accommodated Archaic bronzes, whereas other small objects were put on a shelf (c).

The metopes from the Treasury of the Athenians, representing the exploits of Herakles (b-c) and of Theseus (d-f), were displayed around the walls of room II ("Salle du Trésor des Athéniens"). The figures of two Amazons, probably the Treasury's acroteria (g-h) and the two hymns to Apollo with musical notes inscribed on them (a) were placed in the centre of the room [145]. Room III ("Salle de la Tholos") contained relics from the circular Tholos. Its partial reconstruction occupied the back wall (a) surrounded by other architectural fragments from the building [146]. On the opposite side of the room was placed a circular altar from Marmaria (b) [147]. A glass case accommodated fragmentary figures from the Tholos' metopes (Keramopoulos 1908: 20).

A "forest of statues and other votive offerings" (Keramopoulos 1908: 20) adorned room IV ("Salle Gréco-Romaine" or "Salle du Monument de Pydna")
Opposite the entrance stood the monument of Aemilius Paullus, re-erected on its high pillar (a); casts of the reliefs of the monument’s frieze could be seen on the entrance wall (a₁-a₂). In front of this monument were placed the three dancing girls (b). The figures were originally supported by a tall column adorned with acanthus-leaves, which was restored nearby (b₂). The remains of the column could be seen in the corner (b₃). To the left of the Aemilius Paullus monument was a remarkable for its preservation statue of Antinous (d) and on the corresponding right side the statue of Agias from the Daochos votive monument (e). Architraves from two treasuries were reconstructed in front of the back wall (s-r); in the centre of the right half of the room stood the high triangular base of the Messenians (c). The remaining of the room was filled with the other figures of the Daochos monument and some other sculpture. Finally, a frieze from the theatre depicting the labours of Herakles was placed in front of the left wall (q).

Pedimental sculpture from the temple of Apollo (d-e) was placed on either side of room V ("Salle du Temple d’Apollon"). In the centre were displayed the metopes from the Treasury of Sikyon and the Delphic omphalos (b-c). By the exit stood the two imposing Archaic statues of Kleobis and Viton (g-h).

In the final room VI ("Salle du Trésor de Cnide") one was first faced with the Sphinx of the Naxians (o), whose reconstruction on a high Ionic column stood nearby (p). However, the main feature of this room was the reconstructed facade of the Treasury of the Siphnians (a) [150]. It is an interesting detail that, instead of the front side, represented here was the back one which is better preserved (Keramopoulos 1908: 15). Displayed to the right was one of the original Caryatids from the Treasury (k) [151], whereas the head of a small Caryatid (once thought to have belonged to the Treasury of Cnidos and later considered as the second one from the Treasury of the
Siphnians) was placed on the corresponding left side of the reconstruction (l) [152]. Finally, the frieze from the Treasury of the Siphnians was displayed on either narrow side of the room (c-f; f₁, g₁h₁) [153-154].

Display Organisation and Hardware

The material was spatially organised according to provenance and chronology. Thus each room was devoted either to a specific building in the sanctuary or to a group of monuments dating from the same period. This and the fact that the museum contained almost exclusively sculpture, gave the displays a very coherent look.

The display hardware was simple and basic. Statues were displayed on solid rectangular stone bases [148] and smaller sculpture was accommodated on small wall shelves [146]. Some fragmentary architectural members were placed on platforms [146]. Others, e.g. architraves and cymae -like the ones from the Treasuries of Cnidos and of the Siphnians- were either nailed to the wall and further supported by iron pegs [151] or put onto visually non-obstructive shelves, which matched their length precisely [152]. Reference should be made to the way in which surviving slabs from the frieze of the Treasury of the Siphnians were displayed on a special stone-built platform, placed in front of the window in room VI, so that they could be easier studied and appreciated [152-153].

The remaining exhibits, e.g. bronzes, figurines, vases and other small objects, were displayed in glass cases (in rooms I and III) for which there is no photographic evidence.

Supporting Material

Despite the fact that the displays at Delphoi were, apparently, only supplied with catalogue numbers, the rooms were clearly marked with their names
painted high on the walls in both Greek and French \(146\) (Brunswick 1903: 896) so as the visitor could at least have a general idea on the exhibits on display. Moreover, the extensive use of large-scale reconstructions -a way of presentation that was only matched by the Epidauros Museum (see p. 233)- provided considerable visual support to the displays.

On a technical level, plaster was extensively used in reconstructions or for the supplement of missing parts of sculpture by plaster stands \(149\), whereas in the case of the frieze from the Treasury of the Siphnians it replaced entire missing slabs \(154\).

**Display Environment**

The museum floor was evenly paved with stone blocks \(149\) and the walls were painted in monochrome. Plenty of natural light came from the large, vaulted windows in rooms IV and VI and from smaller rectangular ones in the remaining rooms. Notice should be made of the impressively high wooden ceiling in the two side rooms, which matched the height of the reconstructed monuments; this part of the building was, no doubt, specifically designed for the exhibits it housed.

**Discussion**

Overall, the museum presented a comprehensive spatial layout and a consistent display approach as a result of the efforts and work of one individual, T. Homolle\(^3\) (Keramopoulos 1908: 6). The displays probably had a pleasant visual effect, but it was exactly this spirit, aimed at impressing rather than being archaeologically exact, which was later criticised (Bommelaer et al. 1992: 235).

No details on the museum’s every day activities, like opening hours, guards or security, are known. Despite the museum’s importance, its location
far from urban centres in a fairly remote by the standards of the time area, probably rendered its visit difficult for people coming from a distance (cf. the arguments on the remoteness of the Olympia Museum in the late nineteenth century, pp. 206-207). It would be interesting to know if local people, from Amphissa and Itea which were the closest towns, for example, came to the museum. The complete lack of information on this matter leaves the question of visiting figures open. On the other hand, the edition at the beginning of the century of a series of commercial post cards from within the Delphoi Museum [144], [147], [155-156], may somehow reflect the museum's general appeal, but this all we can say.

The Chaeroneia Museum

In 338 B.C. ancient Chaeroneia became the battlefield where the Athenians and their allies, the Thebans, were defeated by the Macedonians, headed by their King Philip. Victory in this battle gave Philip the supremacy over Southern Greece, an event which would eventually change the flow of history in this area of the world for a considerably long period of time. After the battle, the Thebans buried their dead, who belonged to the renown Sacred Band, in a common tomb, the Polyandrion. A large sculptured Lion, commonly known as the Chaeroneian Lion, stood as the tomb's eternal guard [157].

The first archaeological collection at Chaeroneia was formed by P. Stamatakes who, as already shown (see p. 220), was in the early 1870s sent by the Archaeological Society for safeguarding antiquities in the region. Some ninety five objects had been deposited in the collection by 1876 (IIAE 1876: 44). Later, however, all movable antiquities that were gathered at Chaeroneia, were moved to the nearby city of Livadeia to be deposited in the local
collection (AA 1891: 91). It was only in 1903 that a local museum was constructed at Chaeroneia by the Archaeological Society for sheltering archaeological finds from the area and its vicinity (IIAE 1903: 25, 62; AthMitt XXVIII, 1903: 477). By 1907 the museum was ready and display works, including the consolidation of finds and their placement in display cases, had started (IIAE 1905: 23; 1906: 59, 145; 1907: 63). No more information has survived on this museum, which still functions today in the same location [158].

In the meantime, fulfilling a project which had been contemplated from as early as 1839-40, the Archaeological Society reconstructed the fragments of the Lion on their original base [157]; the cast which previously replaced the Lion was sent to the museum of Thebes (IIAE 1904: 17; see p. 266).

Discussion

The Chaeroneia Museum, a solid, stone-built structure, had a very basic floor plan with two medium-size rooms on either side of the entrance (Plan 46). The museum's rear wall had no windows, but there were two on either narrow side and four on the front [158]. The floor was simply covered with alternating black and white stone blocks, identical to those which paved the Tegea Museum [174]. This pavement survives in excellent condition in both museums and says something about the initial quality of construction.

Despite the fact that the very building has been used to date, nothing has been systematically recorded on its function. The display layout is unidentifiable and so are all other aspects of the museum's operation. We only know that it mainly contained Prehistoric finds (pottery for the most part) from excavations at Chaeroneia, Elateia, Orchomenos and other settlements in the area. There were also some sculpture and architectural members. But, can we talk about proper displays? Or, was the museum more of a store place?
Was it regularly open to the public? And if so, who were its visitors? The attempt to make any assumptions on these questions would be very difficult and, in fact, misleading and so it is better that they will remain without an answer.

What is more important, however, is that the Chaeroneia Museum illustrates a type of small, provincial museum which was built by the Archaeological Society at the beginning of the century and is still in use today (e.g. Lykosoura, Tegea; see p. 295).

The Delos Museum

Historical Note

Excavations on the island first started in 1872 by the French School and were systematised from 1904 to 1914. At that time finds were transported either to Syros (Polites 1907: 161-62) or to Mykonos, whose local museum was essentially established for the deposition of Delian antiquities (see p. 252). The finest sculpture was, as usual, moved to the National Archaeological Museum (JHS 1887-88: 119; Philadelpheus 1909: 39).

The Delos Museum was built in 1904-1905 by the Archaeological Society (IIAE 1904: 175; 1905: 23). The construction was entrusted to the French engineer M. Convert, whereas the arrangement of all practical matters was left to the Ephor D. Stauropoulos. A series of documents which survive in the Delos Archive illuminate the various phases of the museum's building. From the correspondence between Stauropoulos and the Archaeological Society, for example, we know that some construction material, such as wood and asbestos, were not locally available and had to be shipped from elsewhere. Although Stauropoulos had asked for these in May 1904, they were not
delivered until October that year,\textsuperscript{46} causing the works considerable delay. Yet as soon as November 1904 the construction was suspended because the building was roofless and exposed to the weather.\textsuperscript{47} Works resumed in May 1905\textsuperscript{48} and by August that year there only remained its paving, the construction of cases, bases, etc.\textsuperscript{49} As reported by Stauropoulos, works were almost completed by December 1905\textsuperscript{50} [159].

In 1907, however, the museum was still only partially paved and without cases. On top of that the need for an extension was already pressing as many antiquities remained unsheltered.\textsuperscript{51} The foundations of two new rooms, on the north side of the museum, were layed in 1909 (\textit{ItAE} 1909: 65; 1910: 31); their construction is, again, well recorded in a series of documents in the \textit{Delos Archive}.\textsuperscript{52} Works continued in 1911 and 1913,\textsuperscript{53} but nothing is known about the set up of displays in the new wing of the building. In so far as a much later piece of information can be trusted, the north wing was not completed before 1935 (\textit{Mykoniátika Xroniká} 21-4-1935) and thus a series of photographs from the interior of the museum -which is all we have- must show the old rooms [160-161].

Summing up, a first south wing was erected between 1905 and 1907 and antiquities were provisionally arranged in it. Then in 1909 started the building of the north wing, which was not completed until much later. It is thus difficult to accurately assess the situation which prevailed in the museum during the period under study, but we may say that represented here is only a transitional phase of the museum until its final arrangement in years to come.

Display Layout

The transport of the Delian antiquities from Mykonos and their first set up in the museum started in 1905, but this was only a provisory arrangement.\textsuperscript{54} Stauropoulos himself, writing in 1907, admitted that the museum looked
“more like a store” (*Delos Archive*, B', no. 47, 30-11-1907). Two years later, Philadelpheus (1909: 38-39) was left with the same impression: "[in the museum] many antiquities are, unfortunately, piled up casually and without order". The only extant photographs from the museum’s interior date from the late 1920s and so a first reaction would be to exclude them from the present study. However, given that the north wing was, apparently, not orderly set up until 1935 (see above) and that no change in the display layout was reported until then, it is not altogether unlikely that these photographs depict the rooms in the south wing in their initial condition. We could thus, although with great reluctance, draw on these photographs in order to visualise the displays layout.

As we have seen, the finest sculpture from Delos had already been shipped to Athens and was on display in the National Museum (e.g. the statue of Nikandra, the Nike from Delos). Left at Delos was, among others, some interesting Hellenistic sculpture: the group of Venus, Pan and Eros (later also moved to the National Museum), the statue of Apollo Kitharodos, those of Leto and Artemis, statues of the Muses, a statue of Kleopatra. On display were also many clay *pyrauna* (pans of coals; Philadelpheus 1909: 39).

Pottery and small objects were probably displayed in show cases some of which are visible in [160-161]. As for the sculpture, the platform that can be seen in [160] could well be the very, rough stone one which was constructed in 1909 (see above).

**Display Hardware**

The only information about this first set up is that Archaic sculpture was initially roughly placed on wooden planks, which were in 1909 replaced by a provisory low wall, until the completion of the new wing. It seems that in
1909 the museum also comprised some ten display cases, seven horizontal and
three vertical ones,\textsuperscript{60} one of which is probably visible in [160].

**Discussion**

Very few aspects of the museum's operation are clearly known. What is
significant is the creation of a special curator post at the Delos Museum. In
fact, this was the first of a series of ten such posts to be created by the
Archaeological Society (\textit{IIAE} 1907: 73) for which we know about.
Demosthenes Lolos, at first, and Demetres Peppas, soon afterwards, were
appointed Curators of the Delos museum, after succeeding in the 1909 exams
set up by the Archaeological Society for this purpose (Petrakos 1987a: 105).
Before them responsible for the museum was, as already shown, the Ephor of
Cycladic Antiquities D. Stauropoulos. It is him who must probably be credited
with the compilation of a new general catalogue, which started in 1907 (\textit{Delos
Archive, B'}, no. 22, 18-6-1907).

As already discussed, the museum was only roughly arranged during the
period which concerns us here and there is not even the slightest evidence that
it was open to visitors at that time. But, we should not forget that Delos was
deserted and uninhabited and even if the museum was regularly accessible it
would probably not be visited except by archaeologists coming with a very
specific aim in mind. Yet the museum's foundation marked the beginning of
longstanding and painstaking efforts towards preserving the island's
archaeological wealth.

**The Thebes Museum**

Thebes has excited the imagination of scholars for many generations. A score
of myths were connected to the city which was first occupied in Neolithic
times. Modern development has for the most part destroyed the vestiges of the old city and today Thebes presents the most acute problems for archaeologists. ⁶¹

Historical Note

• 1872-1904

Thebes was the first stop of P. Stamatakis when, in the early 1870s, he set out to collect and secure antiquities in Boeotia and the neighbouring areas. The Theban collection, which by 1876 numbered some 165 objects, was initially kept at "an appropriate place" (ΠΑΕ 1872: 14; 1873-74: 31; 1876: 43-44), ⁶² which in 1881 was referred to as a hired private house (Παρνασσός V, 1881: 183). Later sources read that the collection was housed in a room underneath the Boys School. It was first curated by the "Ephor" E. Kalopais ⁶³ (Guide Joanne 1891: 13) and then by Ep. Koromantzos ⁶⁴ and a doctor named A. Tselios (Baedeker 1901: 159). According to the same sources a visit could be arranged after contacting the "curators". By 1885 the collection's rough catalogue listed some 280 sculptures and inscriptions. ⁶⁵ There are several references to this collection up until 1904 (ΠΑΕ 1898: 22; 1899: 54-55; 1901: 16), when the Archaeological Society announced the construction of a museum in the city (ΠΑΕ 1904: 17; 1905: 22).

• 1904-1909

A step-by-step picture of the works carried out for the museum's building is provided through a series of documents which survive today in the Thebes Museum Archive. Along with the museum's construction, a shed was erected in the courtyard to accommodate the inscriptions and the plaster replica of the Chaeroneian Lion, which had just been replaced by a reconstruction in situ (see p. 261). It seems that both the building and the shed were for the most
part completed by 1905; then in 1906 an iron fence was placed around the museum's courtyard (IIAE 1906: 58-59). Yet a lot remained to be done, like paving the ground floor, painting the walls, glazing some of the windows, etc. The surveillance of all works and the classification of the museum's collections was in 1905 assigned to the Ephor of antiquities A. Keramopoulos, who was sent to Thebes. All expenses were covered by the Archaeological Society (IIAE 1908: 66).

The museum was to a large extent set up in 1909 and we are fortunate enough to have a good account of the works involved by Keramopoulos himself (Keramopoulos 1909a; 1909b). These included the construction of stone bases and plaster shelves for the accommodation of bulky and light sculpture respectively in the ground floor, the classification of inscriptions in the courtyard and the construction of small shelves for the placement of small antiquities in the shed, the consolidation and restoration of the plethora of vases in the museum's collections and the construction of display cases in the upper floor. Despite all that, however, the museum gave an untidy and filthy impression because the ground floor remained unpaved and, as reported in 1910, all the dust from downstairs went up and dirtied the upper floor. It seems that this situation did not change at least up until 1911. In fact, the conclusive information on the museum's pavement dates from 1915 (AA1 1915, Annex: 42).

In brief, the museum was built between 1904 and 1905 and set up mainly in 1909, while some construction works were still in suspension.

Display Layout

The museum had five rooms in the ground floor and a large one in the upper floor. Space allocation, however, was completely inadequate as rooms were small and hardly communicated with each other (Plan 47). On display in the
ground floor were sculptures dating from the seventh century B.C. to the third and fourth centuries A.D.; the upper floor housed small finds and pottery.

In the vestibule one could see the very original, for their technique, gravestones of Mnason, Rynchon and Saugenes.\textsuperscript{73} Here was also a series of lime gravestones which imitated temple entablatures bearing pediments (a type which was common especially in Boeotia.\textsuperscript{74} Rooms A-\textup{E} accommodated the remaining Archaic and Classical sculpture; the layout of these rooms, however, is not specifically accounted for in contemporary sources. We only know that the Archaic kouroi from the sanctuary of Apollo at Ptoon\textsuperscript{75} were displayed in room B (Keramopoulos 1909a: 121). The final room E was intended for the display of Roman sculpture and reliefs, but works there were still incomplete in 1909.

The upper floor contained small finds and vases unearthed from various sites around Thebes. In 1909 the main exhibits were finds from the excavations of Keramopoulos at the House of Kadmos in the centre of the ancient city\textsuperscript{76} and a plethora of finds (mainly vases)\textsuperscript{77} from the British excavations at the cemetery of ancient Mykalysos.\textsuperscript{78} Burials were displayed individually with all their grave goods and skeletal remains (Keramopoulos 1909b: 283). Finally, inscriptions were arranged in the courtyard (Keramopoulos 1909a: 121).

Display Organisation and Hardware

"As far as the spatial division of the building allowed, antiquities were classified chronologically" (\textit{IIAE} 1909: 121). This general scheme apart, antiquities were then placed according to typology and size.

The usual display surfaces were used in the Thebes Museum; that is, stone bases for bulky sculpture and plaster wall shelves -individual or continuous- for lighter pieces of sculpture; glass cases and shelves for vases
and other small finds; and shelves for the placement of inscriptions outside the museum.

Discussion

Because of its contents and organisation, the Thebes Museum was one of the most important museums established in the decade 1900-1909. Yet as its displays had not crystallised by the end of this period, a complete picture of the museum's interior cannot be drawn. Moreover, the complete lack of photographic evidence makes this almost impossible. Keramopoulos' efforts in organising the museum have, no doubt, to be praised. Despite his work, however, the unsuitability of available space, the fact that the building itself was not totally completed and the bad lighting (Threpsiades 1963: 5) gave the museum a rather untidy look.

Similarly, it is difficult to judge if the museum was regularly open to visitors. In the early years, when the collection was privately housed, it could be seen after special arrangement with the Keeper (see above). Was this the case in later years or did the museum have its own guardian? All these will remain questions.

The Herakleion Museum

A full understanding of the circumstances under which the Herakleion Museum was established, may only be achieved through some basic knowledge of Cretan history. The geographical position of the island constantly lured conquerors: the Arabs (824-961), the Venetians (1204-1669), the Turks (1669-1899). The desire for unification with motherland Greece led to continuous revolts, especially during the period of the Turkish occupation
but, following a period of semi-autonomy from Turkey, final union with Greece was only established in 1914.

**Historical Note**

- **1883-1899**

  When the history of the Herakleion Museum began, Crete was under Turkish rule and Cretan antiquities had attracted very limited, if any, attention. This state of things would dramatically change in 1878 with the foundation of the "Association of the Friends of Education", whose main aim was the promotion of Greek education on the island. In 1883 Joseph Chatzidakes, then elected President of the Association, encouraged them to undertake an even grater task; namely, protecting all ancient vestiges and securing them in a Cretan museum at Herakleion. The idea was enthusiastically endorsed by the Greek population of Herakleion and the first museum was established in two rooms at the courtyard of Saint Menas' church. The Association then asked for and obtained official recognition by Chamdi Bey, then director of the Archaeological Service and the Archaeological Museum of Constantinople, as the only authorised body for the protection of Cretan antiquities.

  It should be noted that the church was opted for the deposition of the antiquities as a safer place against possible Turkish hostilities. The rooms, however, were small and many antiquities were kept in crates like "travelling merchandise" (Chatzidakes 1931: 61). At that time the collection comprised finds from the first archaeological research in Crete, e.g. the excavations of Minos Kalokairinos at Knossos, the excavations of Federico Halberr at the Idaian Cave, etc. (*AJA* III, 1887: 174; X, 1896: 256. Guide Joanne 1891: 472). All finds were registered by Chatzidakes (*AJA* IV, 1888: 362).
1899-1907

After the declaration of the autonomy of Crete and the arrival of Prince George of Greece as High Commissioner in 1899, an archaeological decree was immediately issued, providing for the establishment of two public museums and two curator posts at Chanea and at Herakleion respectively.84 Stephanos Xanthoudides85 (who later replaced Chatzidakes at Herakleion) was placed as Curator at Chanea, whereas Chatzidakes remained at Herakleion.

At Herakleion, the museum moved to the city's large casern86 [162]. As far as space was concerned, Chatzidakes (1931: 62) accounts, “this building was vast, but it was deplorable in all other aspects”; water came through the shabby roof and the wooden floors were rotting. The exact location of the museum in the casern is not known and a piece of information which reads that it was between the Gymnasium and the director's house (Φωνή του Λαοῦ, Α', no. 20, 1-6-1903), is not of much help. It seems, however, that the museum extended on two floors. The basement section comprised sculptures. In the upper floor there were two rooms. Finds from the Idaian and the Dictaean Caves, etc., were displayed in cases in the first room, whereas the display of finds from Knossos and Phaistos, in the second room, was not yet finally arranged (Beadeker 1904: 414-15). At that time the collection numbered, apart from sculpture and golden finds, some 1,331 clay and 340 bronze objects, a catalogue of which was being compiled by Savignoni in 1900 (The Athenaeum, no. 3757, 28-10-1899: 593). The museum was open twice a week on Thursdays and Saturdays from three to five in the afternoon (Φωνή του Λαοῦ, Α', no. 11, 30-3-1903).

The casern was only a temporary depot and Chatzidakes concentrated all his efforts to the cause of constructing a real museum. Articles on the museum's lamentable state and insecurity in the casern and pleas for action were also often published in the local press.87 The long-discussed project of
converting the Venetian Loggia\textsuperscript{88} [163] into a museum was soon rejected as the building did not prove structurally strong enough.\textsuperscript{89}

In the years which followed, Chatzidakes' anxiety for the museum's security increased and so did his appeals to the Cretan Government. His reports to the Government reflect deep understanding of a museum's needs and problems. The museum building, he believed, need not only be solid, spacious and decent but it should be designed in accordance with its contents. He emphasized over and over again that the museum's construction should not be haphazardly dealt with. Chatzidakes' opinion was that the issue should be discussed by a special committee formed by the directors of the foreign archaeological schools of Athens, the archaeologists who had excavated in Crete and some well-known engineer. The museum's construction could just not be trusted to a local engineer who had never built a museum, let alone a public building of some scale, he insisted (Chatzidakes 1931: 63-65). Nonetheless, it seems that, wishing perhaps to create some political sensation, the Government was determined to build one large room even without adequate design, instead of carefully planning the museum's construction and future needs.

\* 1907-1909

The museum's construction lasted from 1904 to 1907 and was financed with some 40,000 drachmas by the Cretan Government and a further 25,000 by the Philhellenst Arnaud Jeanti.\textsuperscript{90} The museum was situated by the central square, where St. Francesco monastery used to stand (Loghiadou-Platonos 1978: 26) [164]. It comprised only a large and high room [165] which was completely inadequate for a collection of mainly small antiquities.\textsuperscript{91} Furthermore, available space measured only some 360m\textsuperscript{2} as compared with the 838m\textsuperscript{2} used in the casern. In 1907 the Cretan Government credited an extra 16,500 drachmas for the completion of the central room (\textit{H Iðη}, A', no. 31, 26-7-1907);
another 20,000 drachmas were given by the Greek Archaeological Society for the addition, in 1908, of an opisthodomus, which was designed in Athens by P. Kavvadias and Dorpfeld.92

Evidence shows that the collection was transferred from the casern to the new museum between October and December 1907.93 The museum was open on Thursdays afternoon, initially from three to five and later from two to five.94

Displays

Despite the good textual documentation on the history of the museum’s construction, its layout and organisation is only attested by contemporary post cards from the museum’s interior. The roof and the floor were wooden and there was a series of windows on either long side. Spatial layout was simple: a central colonnade divided the large room into two wings, where antiquities were arranged according to their provenance in Crete; finds from Knossos occupied the north side [166] and finds from Phaistos the south side of the room [167].

A variety of cabinets and cases predominated in the room. Display cases -of at least three types- stood in the centre of the each wing [166-167], [169]; they mainly contained small finds, like figurines, jewellery and pottery fragments on the upper compartments and vases on the lower ones. Upright cabinets were placed along the walls [166], [169]. Large vases usually stood on the floor (on bases or without them; see, for instance, the pithoi placed among the columns in the centre of the room [168]) or were put on top of the cabinets [169]. Frescoes from the palaces of Knossos and Phaistos were encased in glass-covered wooden frames hung on the narrow walls of the room or on some of the pillars [168], [170]. Outstanding exhibits were
individually displayed on special bases and cases (e.g. on the left hand side of [166]). Display hardware also included some closed cupboards [166-167].

Small headings denoting the provenance of the exhibits (e.g. Knossos Palace) were clearly visible on the cases [166], but there seems to be no evidence that labels also marked individual exhibits in them. In a later photograph the name of the room is also visible on the wall [170], but we do not know if this was already done by 1909.

Discussion

The Herakleion Museum was clearly one of the richest, in terms of content and exemplary, in terms of display layout, Greek museums of the time. The museum's profile was essentially shaped through the personal zeal of Joseph Chatzidakes, whose efforts were praised by his Greek and foreign colleagues alike. In a letter sent in 1911, G. Caro, Co-Director of the German Archaeological Institute of Athens, congratulates Chatzidakes for a task "accomplished by no other European museum director" (Νέα Εφημερίς A', no. 8, 29-5-1911). This was well reflected in the displays which were orderly and systematically arranged. Space was congested but it was cleverly utilised so as the general impression was not chaotic. Caro, for example, appreciated the "successful" use of space and regarded the display as exemplary. Finally, a fact which probably tells us something on the museum's appeal to its contemporaries is the edition of a considerable number of post cards in the 1910s (these must have been printed in hundreds as they can still be traced in Herakleion today).
The Lykosoura Museum

Introduction

The Ancient city of Lykosoura, situated in an impressive landscape at the heart of mountainous Arcadia, was known for the sanctuary of Despoina and the Kore. The small temple of Despoina, built in the second century B.C.,95 was adorned with colossal cult statues by the Messenian Damophon. The cult group depicted Despoina and the Kore seated, with the Titan Anytos and Artemis standing on either side. The figures were placed on a high pedestal with a sculpture frieze running along its front (restoration in Dickins 1906-07: Pls. XII-XIII).

Historical Note

* 1889-1906

Excavations at Lykosoura started in 1889 by V. Leonardos, then Ephor at Olympia, to be soon afterwards continued by P. Kavvadias and later resumed by K. Kourouniotes (AA 1889: 122-23; Kavvadias 1893; Kourouniotes 1911: 5-6). By 1890 the temple of Despoina was uncovered and the most important fragments from the cult statues were transported and later displayed in the National Museum in Athens.96 However, some finds were moved to the nearby town of Megalopolis, where it was intended to build a museum (RA 16, 1890 II: 241; IAAE 1896: 126).

In 1895 there already existed a small “museum” at Lykosoura; that is, a small building erected inside the stoa which layed to the north of the temple (Plan 48). Deposited there were those fragments which had not been moved to
Athens. This building was demolished in 1906, when the Archaeological Society financed the construction of a museum at Lykosoura (*IJAЕ* 1906: 57, 59).

- **1906-1909**

The new museum (which, as reported, measured approximately 13mx6,50m) [171] was mainly intended to provide enough space for the statues of Damophon, which would be restored there. This involved removing the original pieces held in the National Museum so as to reconstruct the cult group at Lykosoura (*IJAЕ* 1906: 120). All fragments -apart from the heads, a piece from the drapery of Despoina’s dress and some figures from the throne’s frieze, which were replaced by plaster casts- were sent back to Lykosoura. The consolidation and putting together of the various pieces was, for the most part, carried out in 1907 by Kourouniotes, Kaloudes and Dickins.97

**On the Display**

The Lykosoura Museum comprised only a medium-size room and contained exclusively sculpture and a few other finds from the sanctuary of Despoina. Standing opposite the entrance door were the colossal statues of Damophon, reconstructed on a stone-built base which was identical in dimensions to the original one. The remaining exhibits included architectural fragments from the temple, inscriptions, some free-standing sculpture and clay figurines (Kourouniotes 1911: 9). The spatial layout of these objects is not attested in contemporary sources and neither is the display hardware used in the museum. The museum was mainly intended to provide the visitor with an as much complete a picture of the cult statues as possible, but it is very difficult to imagine that any supporting material accompanied the exhibits.

The only other thing we know about the museum’s interior is that its floor was roughly paved and the ceiling was made of wooden beams and
canes. There were four windows, two on each narrow wall and one on either side of the entrance. The back wall, in front of which were placed the cult statues, was blind.

Discussion

Even today, the journey to Lykosoura requires something more than simply a taste for antiquities as the site is off-the-track for the overwhelming majority of travellers. Consequently, one wonders what kind of visitors would Lykosoura have attracted at the beginning of the century. Not surprisingly, nothing is attested on this matter. Baedeker (1904: 391) refers to the museum as unbedeutendes ("insignificant") and we may only assume that it was very poorly attended.

What is interesting about this museum is the fact that the very building is still used today. What is more, its displays -or, at least, the display methods- have remained almost unaltered and thus we have a visual approximation of the type of a small provincial Greek museum at the beginning of the twentieth century.

The Corfu Museum

Introduction

The historic fate of Corfu and the other Ionian Islands was very distinct from those of mainland Greece. The “Seven Islands”, as they are commonly known, had since Mediaeval times changed many masters: Venetians, French, Russians, French again and British. From 1815 to 1864 the Ionian Islands were an independent state under the protection of the British crown. Union with Greece was fully recognised only in 1864.
The history of the Corfu Museum is particularly interesting, because it was first legislatively established as early as 1833 (that is, almost contemporarily with the foundation of the first National Museum at Aegina) and also because it generated some interesting theoretical discussion on museums.

**Historical Note**

- **Nineteenth Century**

The foundation of the first museum at Corfu owes a lot to the initiatives of Lord Nugent, the British High Commissioner on the island. Not only did Nugent commission excavations on the island but, what is more, he ardently prompted the Ionian Assembly to proceed to the creation of a museum, which could suitably be housed in the summer palace at Mon Repos. On 16-2-1833 a law was passed for the establishment of an “Ionian Museum” by the Ionian Assembly (Viazes 1928: 115-16). What is highly interesting about this document is the regulations on the ownership of antiquities: the museum was viewed as a place where objects were securely kept, but not held in eternity and donors could claim their objects back any time they wished (Articles 5 and 6). This unique in the chronicle of Greek museums clause of “permanent lending”, was perhaps established in an attempt to appeal to the patriotic sentiments of the inhabitants. It seems that many Corfiotes responded and made donations to the museum (as reported in Peritsioles 1835; quoted in Viazes 1928: 117).

As for the museum’s premises, there is no indication that Nugent’s proposal for the Mon Repos palace was ever implemented, but we know that the museum’s direction was entrusted to the knight Paulos Prosalentes, a known painter and sculptor, whose endeavours were praised. His death a few years later, however, put an end to this effort (Viazes 1928: 117). The Ionian
Government continued to care for the preservation of antiquities, but the museum cause was not advanced.

- **End of the Nineteenth Century - 1906**

By the beginning of this century the museum had already been housed in some narrow room in the Gymnasium of Corfu and contained a mosaic found at Palaiopolis in 1846, sculpture, ceramics and other finds from all over the island (Kyriakes 1902: 104; Dontas 1970: 7).

“This sort of museum... is a magazine, where everything is confusedly placed” wrote Ippaviz in his history of Corfu (Ippaviz 1901: 204). Ippaviz's text is highly interesting at this point because, after noting that the city of Corfu did not have a large archaeological museum at the time, he presents his own ideas on the ideal Corfu museum: “... this Museum, which should be directed by intelligent people with patriotic feelings, could unite in it everything that would be apt for entertaining and instructing the youth of Corfu...”. To his mind, the museum should also include paintings, crafts, costumes, etc. and establish “permanent lending” of material. Entrance to the museum should be free at least once a week (preferably on Sundays). Finally, all conservation and reparation works, he suggested, could be carried out during the two hot months of the year when the museum would be closed (Ippaviz 1901: 279-84, “Il Nuovo Museo Corcirese”).

- **1906-1909**

A proper museum was erected by the Archaeological Society in 1906-1907 next to the Menecrates Monument at the area of Gharitsa (IIAE 1906: 57, 59; 1907: 71; Dontas 1970: 7). The fortunes of this museum during the period under study are completely unknown, there is no photographic evidence of it, and the only reference to the museum in the 1909 English edition of the Baedeker guide is totally unhelpful (Baedeker 1909: 261). We only know
that it was one of the ten provincial museums for which a 1907 decree provided for the placement of a curator (p. 56); according to a piece of information by Kalpaxes (1993: 30, n. 54) the post was occupied between 1907 and 1910 by a certain Marmoras.

Nevertheless, the Corfu Museum is discussed here not only because its official foundation falls within the time limits of this study, but mainly because of the history of its first creation.

The Tegea Museum

Historical Note

- 1879-1906

In 1879 the Ministry of Public Education commissioned P. Kavvadias and the German Milchhofé, to find the temple of Athena-Alea at Tegea. On this occasion Kavvadias also started assembling some scattered around the area antiquities with the aim of forming a local museum. This first collection was kept in the "Greek School" at Piali (Tegea) and it was trusted to the Mayor of Tegea (ITA 1909: 318).

Meanwhile, the "Tegeatic Association" was active in the same direction. The Association was founded in 1883 with two main aims: the restoration of the old church of Palaia Episkope at Tegea and the establishment of a local museum. The church [172] was restored in 1884-88 by E. Ziller (Tegheatikos Syndesmos 1983: 7-8; Ghiannios 1984: 9-12); the Association had also used the church or a nearby shed for housing some antiquities (Mendel 1901: 261). So, there initially existed two small collections, one at the "Greek School" and another in the church of Palaia Episkope (AE 1906: 29, 63).
In the meantime, excavations at the temple of Athena-Alea had uncovered Skopas' pedimental sculpture and the most important pieces had already been transported to the National Museum in Athens (AE 1886: 17-20; RA II, 1886: 82-83).

1906-1909

The Tegea Museum was erected in 1906-1907 by the Archaeological Society on a piece of land donated by the Archbishop Neilos Smyrniotakes from Piali. Then in 1909 K. Rhomaios started assembling in the museum all the existing in the area collections of antiquities and organising the displays. Moved to the museum was, apart from the local collections at Palaia Episkope and Piali, a considerable number of antiquities from Mantineia, to that date kept in Tripolis. Works, which included painting the walls, paving the museum floor and constructing the display hardware, were completed in 1909, after the Archaeological Society had sent skilled workmen at Tegea. Among them, the sculptor Panaghiotakes was responsible for the consolidation and set up of the various pieces in the museum (πIAE 1909: 300).

Display Layout

The museum was a solid, stone-built building [173] with the same simple ground plan that we have already encountered at Chalkis and Chaeroneia: two rooms, one on either side of a vestibule and a backyard.

The room to the left of the entrance contained all sculpture from the temple of Athena-Alea. The most important architectural fragments from the temple were displayed on the south side of the room according to their original position in the temple (spira, epicranitis, cyma) [174]. Rhomaios (πIAE 1909: 320) notes that care was taken during the placement of the pieces so as not to obstruct the view of their back and upper surfaces. Following the same principle, the best surviving pedimental fragments were put along the
west side of the room; a place was also reserved here for the casts of two female heads which were on display in the National Museum. The best preserved pieces, the Atalante torso and a female head, were displayed on individual pedestals [175]. The remaining small finds, e.g. clay and bronze objects, were accommodated in three cases [175].

In the **room to the right** of the entrance important sculpture, like the series of the *theoxeneia* and the Arcadic herms, were placed on either side of the north window. Displayed along the other sides of the room were reliefs of the infernal gods, statues of Asclepius, Hygeia and Artemis, grave reliefs and many small herms. Pottery and other small finds from Arcadia were placed in six cases [176].

In the **vestibule**, a Pan statue, some Roman female torsi and two marble thrones were "scatteringly" placed. Finally, inscriptions and other bulky sculpture was, according to the usual tactics, arranged in the **courtyard** [177]. Finds from Mantineia and finds from Tegea were grouped on opposite sides of the yard and two pieces from the large altar of the Alea temple were placed in the middle [178].

**Display Organisation and Hardware**

The exhibits were first coherently grouped according to provenance (e.g. sculpture from the temple of Alea, other Arcadic antiquities). They were then laid out according to their original position in the temple or according to their size and type (e.g. series of Arcadic herms, reliefs, etc.).

Built along the lower part of the walls was a stone platform, which in the left room accommodated architectural fragments from the lower level of the temple and in the right room reliefs and other sculpture. Above this platform two rows of wall shelves bore the remaining architectural fragments and other lighter sculpture [174-176]. Individual pedestals were used only on two
occasions [175]. The cases for the display of pottery and small finds were of the familiar lectern type, that was extensively used in the Athenian museums. The same applies to the upright wall cabinets, which are visible in [175] and [176].

Supporting Material

There is no evidence whatsoever that supporting material was used in the Tegea Museum but catalogue numbers, at least, should have been affixed on the exhibits. Missing parts were supplemented with plaster in the common way that we have already encountered in other museums.

Display Environment

The walls were painted in monochrome, which was a dash darker than the colour used on the ceiling. The floor was paved with rectangular, alternating black and white blocks of stone, (identical to the ones paving the Chaeroneia museum) which survive in an excellent condition to date. Natural light came through the windows, six on the east side, one on either south and north side [173] and one or two on the west side [174], [177].

Discussion

Overall, the Tegea Museum gave an orderly and pleasant impression. Its displays were laid out in a systematic and comprehensive manner and ample space was left for walking through the exhibits. This order reflected the efforts of K. Rhomaios, who also left a good description of all works carried out at that time. Rhomaios’s work should perhaps be assessed within the general concern of the time -mainly expressed by the Archaeological Society- for setting up small, local museums (cf. Chaeroneia, Chalkis, Lykosoura). The Tegea Museum was, again, a small museum situated quite far from urban
centres (Tripolis was, and still is, the closest city). Unfortunately, as with all these small museums, nothing can be said about visiting figures and other aspects of its operation. There probably was a guardian, who would open the museum to visitors, but it is not known if this was done on a daily base.

The Thermon Museum

Ancient Thermon was the political and religious centre of the Aitolians. Its sanctuary was centred around the temple of Appolo Thermios, dedicated in the second half of the seventh century B.C. The temple is important for the study of early Greek architecture and is well-known for its decorated terracotta metopes (today in the National Museum).\textsuperscript{113} The sanctuary was first excavated by Gh. Soteriades\textsuperscript{114} in 1879 and then more systematically until 1908 (Petrakos 1987a: 92, 357 where bibliography). It seems that excavation finds, the most important at least, were initially transported to the National Museum in Athens. A simple site museum was constructed at Thermon in 1908 (\textit{ITAE} 1908: 64). It comprised one room which measured 14x6m (Plan 49).

The museum was only partially organised until 1909, that is at the end of the period under study. We only know that Soteriades had arranged the inscriptions on leveled bases, which occupied half the museum's space. It seems that some cases and scaffoldings were also installed in the museum. The room was, apparently, not painted until 1915 and it generally looked like "a cold and bare store" (\textit{AA} 1915, Annex: 46). In fact, the museum was better organised much later: classification of the collection and compilation of a catalogue started in 1911-12; in 1915 a shed was built outside the museum for the inscriptions [179]; and the finds which had previously been moved to Athens were sent back to Thermon (apart from the large metopes) in 1915 and 1920-21 (\textit{AA} 1915, Annex: 46; 1920-21: 168).
Overall, the Thermon Museum exemplifies the type of small, "store site museum" intended mainly as a shelter for excavation finds (cf. with the Ancient Corinth Museum).

The Volos Museum

Introduction

The modern city of Volos was established at around 1840 and it soon became a thriving commercial centre. After the liberation of Thessaly and its incorporation into the Greek state in 1881, the city developed rapidly and occupied a crucial role in the financial life of the country. Its port, for example, was one of the largest commercial and industrial ports in Greece; its population increased from 16,788 inhabitants in 1896 to 23,563 inhabitants in 1907 (Trigones 1934: 49).

Historical Note

* 1881-1905
Before the liberation "Thessalian antiquities were a pray to anybody" (Arvanitopoulos 1909a: 5). After 1881 local initiatives led to an initial collection of scattered antiquities and stone pieces were from 1881 until 1898 kept in the Town Hall. More antiquities came to light after the demolition of the ancient fortress in 1898 and the entire collection was moved to the Fire Brigade building. Then, in 1899 it was transferred to the Gymnasium of Volos (Arvanitopoulos 1909a: 5-7).
1905-1909

In 1905 the Gymnasium moved to another building,117 where the archaeological collection was placed in the basement. It should here be noted that the antiquities had been roughly catalogued since 1898. In 1905 K. Kourouniotes compiled a new catalogue. When Arvanitopoulos arrived at Volos in 1906, the collection comprised some 199 antiquities, but as the figures in his new catalogue show, this number increased to 778 pieces within only one year (Arvanitopoulos 1909a: 7). Meanwhile, the Archaeological Society had expressed the intention of building a museum at Volos and commissioned Apostolos Arvanitopoulos118 with the gathering and registration of Thessalian antiquities (ITAE 1906: 58). Arvanitopoulos' efforts were highly successful resulting, among other things, in the unearthing of the painted stelai of Pagasai.119 This discovery caused sensation and made the need for a museum even more pressing.

The issue attracted a lot of local attention and the City Council offered the Archaeological Society three different pieces of land for this purpose (Θεσσαλία Ζ', no. 294, 4-6-1906). Then in 1907 A. Athanasakes120 proposed to finance the museum's construction (ITAE 1907: 59). The offer was accepted; the engineer A. Anghelides was commissioned with drawing the plans, whereas the construction was entrusted to the architect I. Skoutares (Arvanitopoulos 1909a: 8-9). However, an unpublished plan dated 8-12-1907 in the Volos Museum, is signed I. Skoutares (Plan 50). It seems that the location chosen caused controversy. Not only was it out of the city plan, some thought, but it was situated next to the Hospital and this was considered an unfortunate vicinity.121 Nevertheless, the museum's foundations were formally laid on 18 April 1908.122 Works proceeded rapidly; within a year Arvanitopoulos was able to arrange and set up the antiquities in the museum123 and the inauguration took place on 24 May 1909 (Arvanitopoulos 1909b: 131).
The building was in the neoclassical tradition and presented a plain but imposing facade, featuring an Ionian prostylon and pedimental crownings on its either end. Clay head-tiles decorated the contour of the tiled roof [180]. The same simplicity characterised the museum’s ground plan: two Γ-shaped wings, with three rooms each, sprang from the central vestibule, which gave way to a backyard (Plan 51).

Displays

- 1899-1909
  In the Gymnasium the collection occupied some rooms in the basement, but we know nothing on the way in which it was initially placed there. Soon after the discovery of the first stelai in 1907, however, a large wooden, glass-covered container was fabricated for the safe deposition of the best ones. The container was covered with a dark cloth for protection of the sensitive colours against the light and windows were blocked for the same reason (Arvanitopoulos 1928: 55, 127). The basement rooms were soon filled and many stelai were placed in the courtyard (Arvanitopoulos 1928: 55-56).

- 1909 Onwards
  The museum was almost exclusively devoted to the display of the Pagasai stelai. In 1909 the display was arranged in three rooms to the right of the vestibule (Plan 51). Room one contained the best preserved and beautiful stelai (nos. 1-42). Room two contained stelai which were well, yet partially, preserved (nos. 42-97). In the third room were less well-preserved stelai (nos. 98-210) and some “temporary” display cases which contained Prehistoric and Archaic finds (Arvanitopoulos 1909b: 136). Perhaps these were the finds referred to by Ampelas (1910: 236), who talks about some clay pithoi, stone tools and remaining of food stuffs such as dried cereals. Yet it is not certain
that the third room was accessible at the time (see the case blocking the entrance to it in [181]).

Opposite the museum entrance, a door led to the backyard which housed Thessalian inscriptions and other antiquities; finally, some bulky sculpture and architectural members of later date were placed in the exterior yard. The vestibule was empty at the time, but it was intended for future display of large grave monuments from Pagasai (Arvanitopoulos 1909b: 135-36; for the reconstruction see IAAE 1912: 43-44); the second compartment of the museum to the left of the vestibule was not yet set up.

Display Organisation and Hardware

The most important stelai were displayed in individual glass cases, which were placed on a stone platform constructed at the lower part of the walls. Arvanitopoulos (1909b: 134) intended to prevent deterioration of the colours by covering the cases with a dark cloth, but it is not known if he did so. Less significant stelai were just placed on wall shelves, continuous or single. In room two there was also a lectern-type wooden case (which seems to have blocked the entrance to room three [181]).

Supporting Material and Display Environment

Photographic and other evidence does not substantiate the existence of supporting material, but the visitor was informed on the content of the rooms by inscriptions high on the walls and some of the stelai were visually supplemented by painted reconstructions [181]. It seems that before the museum’s inauguration, Kavvadies “rushed to paint the walls of the first two rooms in a horrid dark red colour, which he later attempted to replace and turn into azure” (Arvanitopoulos 1909b: 133). What colour resulted from these experiments, it is not known. We may only note that the lower zone, below the
stone platform, was painted in a darker tone than the rest of the wall [181]. Also, the paint used in 1909 was a water-soluble one (replaced in 1912 by an oil-soluble paint; Arvanitopoulos 1909b: 135). The floor was paved with the usual black and white blocks of stone. Plenty of natural light came through the windows as electricity was not yet installed in Volos. Yet in an attempt to control natural light, window glasses were painted in opaque white (Arvanitopoulos 1909b: 135; after 1912 light screens could also be pulled down in case of strong sun rays).

Discussion

The discussion so far should have revealed something of the unique place that the Volos Museum held among contemporary provincial Greek museums. Not only was it well designed and set up, with coherent displays and clear spatial layout; what is more, the display rationale and techniques as well as conservation issues were carefully and consistently documented. Three main factors could have had an impact on this. First, the foundation and arrangement of this museum was to a great extent the result of active local involvement, at private and administrative level. The interest of the City Council, for example, is well attested. Second, the museum's construction was privately funded and this probably contributed to the short time lapse between the museum's construction and its set up. Third, the museum's organisation owed to the personal contribution and continuous efforts of Arvanitopoulos.

By far the most demanding issue was how to best set up and preserve the stelai. And yet, it is rather strange that workmen had to come from Athens especially for this purpose (Arvanitopoulos 1928: 142). The relevant discussion is particularly interesting in that it shows the problems which arose through the involvement of Kavvadias, then General Ephor of Antiquities, in the museum's set up. It seems that Kavvadias's haste to see the museum
opening was rather careless or, at least, this is Arvanitopoulos' version. The stelai were transported in just three hours only a few days before the museum's opening and they were hurriedly set up. Arvanitopoulos himself was very discontented with the methods used by Kavvadias, who not only fixed the stelai with iron bolts to the walls so that they could not be removed for study, but he also fixed and then unfixed some of them before opting for their final position (Arvanitopoulos 1909b: 132-33; 1928: 56). That the initial set up was greatly rushed is further confirmed by Arvanitopoulos, who says that after the museum's inauguration he was "ordered" to act "as necessary". In 1912, only three years after the museum's inauguration, he proceeded to a thorough reorganisation of the displays which went on for some years (Arvanitopoulos 1912a; 1928: 142; ΑΔ 1915, Annex: 43-44).

Kavvadias favoured the juxtaposition of the stelai, whereas Arvanitopoulos had proposed a display on bases which would be placed in the centre of the rooms, thus allowing for easy inspection of the stelai. However, when challenged with the re-arrangement of the display, Arvanitopoulos himself used the same method, although he admitted that the sequential juxtaposition of the stelai was "monotonous and untasteful". But, he explained, this was the best way of securing them under the circumstances. Although he felt that an elegant and more sumptuous arrangement would have then been untimed and vain, Arvanitopoulos did provide for future display of some stelai in the centre of the rooms, according to his initial idea (Arvanitopoulos 1928: 142).

The conservation of the stelai was another matter of concern and caused quite a heated discussion. Suffice it to refer here to the plethora of articles and reports on the issue.  

Another interesting issue was finance. As already discussed, the museum was constructed with private funds, whereas money for the displays was
provided by the Archaeological Society. However, this was not enough and Arvanitopoulos often appealed to local sensitivity for raising extra funds in order to guarantee the continuation of museum works.\textsuperscript{126} It seems that his efforts bore fruit and they were praised by his contemporaries (R. 1910: 42).

Entrance to the museum was free daily from eight in the morning till noon and from two to five in the afternoon (\textit{Theta\c{s}a\l\i\ta} 10, no. 2839, 15-6-1909); let us note that this is the second museum outside Athens for which clear evidence on opening hours has been found (the other was the Herakleion Museum). Visiting figures cannot be assessed, but the museum must have attracted significant attention, if we judge by the regular coverage it received in Volos' press. Short news on the museum, for example, were often published in the local \textit{Këp\v{z} (Herald); it is also interesting to note the almost contemporary publication of two articles on the museum in Athenian magazines (Ampelas 1910; R. 1910).

The Volos Museum has remained exemplary among Greek archaeological museums to date and one would not exaggerate if s/he ascribes this long tradition to Arvanitopoulos.

The Argostoli Museum

Introduction

The city of Argostoli had for a long time enjoyed a financial and cultural prosperity similar to that of Corfu and unmatched by Greek cities on the mainland. The modern city (which was founded in the eighteenth century when the Venetian Commissioner to the Ionian Islands transferred his capital from Saint George to Argostoli and rebuilt after the earthquakes of 1847) was well planned with large streets and squares, parks, etc. Its port was one of the
largest and safest in the East Mediterranean and a significant export centre. Argostoli's general affluence resulted to the establishment of a great number of charity organisations with money donated by wealthy Argostolians (Lykoules 1928: 393). It was such a donation, made in 1910 by M. Korghialenios, that allowed for the set up of the first archaeological museum in the city.

**Historical Note**

In the nineteenth century there was in Argostoli what we would call a "cabinet of curiosities" comprising objects of ancient art and medical instruments. This collection was bought in Florence and included a unique set of wax casts and replicas from the various phases of pregnancy. It was arranged in the house of the owner, Demos Valsamakes (Tsitseles 1904: 43). Another collection, comprising antiquities, coins, medals, natural history specimens and icons, was formed by the doctor A. Meliareses and was bequested to the Archbishopal Library. Finally, a collection of Egyptian coins and other antiquities was also bequested to this Library by G. Mazarakes (Tsitseles 1904: 371, 449-50). The early formation in Argostoli of such private "cabinets of curiosities", unknown elsewhere in Greece, echoes the city's cultural links with Western Europe, where such practices had been common ground since the Renaissance.

The need for the establishment of an archaeological museum at Argostoli arose only at the beginning of the twentieth century after the first systematic excavations on the island were carried out with expenses by the Dutch Geokopp. On the occasion, the Union of Charity Organisations ceded the old Anglican church of Argostoli [182] to be converted to a museum (IIAE 1908: 66; Tsitseles 1960: 475-76). Conversion works were for the most part carried out in 1909 by the Archaeological Society (IIAE 1909: 29, 65). Then a year later, in his will of 1910, Marinos Korghialenios bequested, among other
donations, the sum of 6,000 British pounds for the establishment of a museum in the city and this money came just in time (the text in Demponos 1989: 317-45).

**Display Layout**

Apart from the finds of Geokopp's excavations, displayed in the museum were the coin collections of A. Meliareses and G. Mazarakes (see above; Lykoules 1928: 394). The spatial layout of the museum in the old church is not known, but photographic evidence shows that local finds were displayed in one room [183], whereas replicas of sculpture in the National Museum in Athens (e.g. from the bronze statue of Poseidon) were on show in another room [184]. These photographs probably date from after (but not much later than) 1909, but their use here was considered necessary for the provision of a visual representation of the museum's interior.

**Display Hardware and Supporting Material**

As shown in [183] and [184] display cases were of a type commonly used during that period (cf. Herakleion Museum), that is large, free-standing, glass cases with wooden frames. It seems that these cases were constructed and sent from Athens (IIAE 1910: 29, 33). Within the cases objects were placed according to size, with large vases in the lower compartments and smaller ones in the upper compartments [183]. In the other room replicas were put on bases [184]. As shown in [183] and [184], the cases bore headings; labels are also visible on some shelves, so there was some kind of basic documentation on the exhibits.
Display Environment

The floor was paved with the familiar alternating black and white blocks of stone, whereas the walls had a two-zone decoration and the ceiling -in one of the rooms at least- was covered with wood [184]. Light probably came through windows, which are not visible in the photographs.

Discussion

The Argostoli Museum was just established at the end of the period under study and so we may only briefly comment on its operation. It seems that it had a clear and spacious layout and that enough room was left for the visitor to wander among the exhibits. It would be very interesting to know if the museum was frequented by the inhabitants of Argostoli, but no information survives on this matter.

It could be finally noted that Kavvadias, then General Ephor of Antiquities, was from Cephalonia and so it is not altogether improbable that the museum's foundation resulted from his efforts.

Conclusions

The designation of this last period as the "expansion period" of museum development in Greece seems well justified. Within only nine years (1900-1909) a total of sixteen museums were established. Eleven out of these were city (Mykonos, Chalkis, Thera, Nauplion, Corfu, Thebes, Argostoli, Volos, Herakleion) or semi-urban (Tegea, Chaeroneia) museums. A further five were site museums (Corinth, Delphoi, Delos, Thermon, Lykosoura). Museums were now purpose-built and most of them presented a very similar ground plan, that is one or two rooms on either side of a vestibule. Only two museums were housed in converted old buildings (Nauplion, Argostoli). As for their
geographical distribution around the country, museums expanded in all regions even where there was no previous local collection. In fact, some museums were established exactly with this aim, that is, initiating the collection of antiquities (Chalkis and perhaps Nauplion). Four museums were in the Peloponnese (Corinth, Nauplion, Lykosoura, Tegea), four in Sterea Hellas (Chaeroneia, Thebes, Delphoi, Thermon), one in Euboia (Chalkis) and one in Thessaly (Volos). More museums were now established on the islands: four in the Aegean (Mykonos, Thera and Delos in the Cyclades and Crete) and two in the Ionian sea (Corfu, Argostoli).

All but three museums (Delphoi, Volos and Herakleion) were constructed at the expense of the Archaeological Society, which played the leading role in museum development. Some museums were entirely or partially constructed with private donations (Delphoi, Volos, Argostoli, Herakleion). Particularly interesting is the case of small provincial museums some of which were out of urban centres. These museums were mainly characterised by solid, stone-built construction and extremely simple spatial layout. The construction of such good and compact buildings in areas which were neither within easy reach from major urban centres nor near, say, a major site, reveals something of the serious intentions of the Archaeological Society for developing local museums in the country.

Unlike the previous period, where individual solutions were for the most part adopted for individual cases, it seems that museum development was now based on a more coherent programme. There were common trends and many similarities in museum organisation. This was probably due to the fact that museum development was mainly left to the Archaeological Society, but also and perhaps more, to the appointment of permanent staff in museums. K. Kourouniotes (Lykosoura) and Gh. Soteriades (Thermon, Chaeroneia?), for instance, had been employed since the 1890s; A. Arvanitopoulos (Volos) and
K. Rhomaios (Tegea) at the beginning of the twentieth century. After the addition of a clause in the Society's regulations in 1907, the Society was given the right to appoint ten museum curators who would be assessed by written exams (*IIAE* 1907: 73-76). The first Curators to be appointed in this way were D. Lolos and D. Peppas, who were placed at Delos in 1909 (see p. 265). What should be stressed is that a lot depended on individual efforts. In fact, despite a certain central administrative frame, it is doubtful if things would have worked out without the personal zeal and contribution of individual archaeologists.

The involvement of foreigners in museums, which was quite typical in earlier periods, generally decreased during this period. With the exception of the Delphoi Museum which was set up by the French and T. Homolle, all other museums were organised by Greek archaeologists.

Display works also systematised during this period and most museums presented orderly display profiles. By 1909 displays had crystallised in six museums (Thera, Delphoi, Lykosoura, Tegea, Volos, Herakleion); others were still in progress (Mykonos, Delos, Thebes). Our information, however, is very limited for most museums, but it seems that their displays were set up later (Corinth, Chalkis, Chaeroneia, Argostoli). Still other museums were apparently no more than a kind of store (Nauplion, Thermon). Overall, many of these museums were still under organisation at the end of this period. Generally speaking, however, there was a consistent attempt for comprehensive displays which were laid out in chronological and typological order. Orderly set up and regularly open to visitors were, as far as we can judge, only four museums: the Delphoi, Thera, Volos and Herakleion museums. But very few things are known on public accessibility and visiting figures for the majority of the museums founded in this period.
Concluding, we may say that, despite the discrepancies observed, there was a marked improvement in museum organisation and set up at the end of this period. After 1909, however, political events and a change in the status of the Archaeological Society would lead all these efforts to a standstill. There followed a period of "decline", characterised by very little museum activities, which would end after World War II.
Notes to Chapter Eight

1. The Society’s main revenue came from the “Antiquities Lottery”, which was established in 1874 and was the only legal lottery in the country after 1887. Its profits reached their peak at the beginning of the twentieth century and until 1905.

For the Antiquities Lottery see IIAE (1901: 11; 1904: 11-12; 1909: 66-67) and Petrakos (1987a: 56-57, 81, 105, 107).

2. A new museum was built by the American Scholl of Classical Studies on the opposite side of the site in 1931-32 (Ancient Corinth 1935). Today the old museum serves as a store.

3. For the financial and other problems which preceded the museum’s construction, see Gaertringen and Wilksi (1904: 19-22).

4. This building was demolished in 1962 (ΔΔ 24, 1969: 393).

5. IGlAs III 327; Gaertringen (1899-1902: Taf. 25).


7. Εὔρυπος ΑΔ', no. 1674, 22-4-1900.
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11. Εὔρυπος ΑΣΓ, no. 1698, 11-11-1900; ΠΑΕ (1900: 20; 1901: 15).
12. A piece of information according to which the museum was built in 1910 is probably mistaken (ΑΔ 33, 1978, Χρονικά Β1, 120).


15. ΙΙΑΕ (1873: 29; 1876: 43); Delos Monuments (1991: 17).

16. The find of Rheneia is particularly important for Greek archaeology, as it provides one of the few safe chronologies for the study of pottery: in 425/25 B.C. the Athenians, following a oracle, proceeded to the general purification of Delos from all old burials, that is they transported all bones and grave goods to the opposite tiny island of Rheneia; births and burials on Delos were prohibited thereafter (Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War I.viii; III.civ).

17. For these excavations see ΙΙΑΕ (1898: 16, 100-194; 1899: 16-17, 66-67; 1900: 67-71).


19. See the outline of a document by Staupulos to the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Public Instruction about the situation in the museum: Delos Archive, B', 1905. no. 1, 1-2-1905.

20. The museum is still housed in this building, which was extended in the 1960s (Zapheiropoulou 1988: 3).

21. Delos Archive, B', no. 18, 26-8-1905.
22. The French School of Athens was founded in 1846 (Radet 1901). For the first excavations at Delphoi see Hellmann (1992: 49).

23. This was ratified by the Greek Law ΑΠΟΑ, 13-4-1891. For the Greek text see Kastriotes (1894); the French in Revue des Etudes Grécques (4, 1891, 189-90). A full account of the history of the negotiations is given in Amandry (1992); for the Greek side see Dassios (1992).

24. Coste-Messeliere (1943: 45-54) provides a brief account of the first excavations; see also the chapter "La Grande Fouille" in Delphes (1992). For a literary account of the events which preceded the uncovering of the site see Hoyle (1976, Chap. 12, Rediscovery).

25. Παναθήναια (6, 62, 30-4-1903, 445-46); Graindor (1930: 29-30).


27. The work, one of the very few surviving bronzes of the 5th century B.C., was dedicated by the Sicilian tyran Polyzalos in commemoration of his chariot victory in the Pythian Games in 478 or 474 B.C. (Papachatzes 1981: Phocica: 392-94, fig. 425-27).

28. The Treasury of the Athenians, which was very prominently placed, was built just after 490 B.C. with a tithe of the spoils of Marathon (Papachatzes 1981: Phocica: 337, n. 1, fig. 376-81).

29. Situated in the centre of the precinct at Marmaria (a spot nearly a mile to the east of the sanctuary), the Tholos had a circular peristyle of 20 slender Doric columns on a platform of three steps. It dates from the early fourth century B.C., but its dedication and purpose are unknown (Papachatzes 1981: Phocica: 306, n. 2, fig. 335-36, 343-47).

30. The monument commemorated the victory of Aemilius Paullus and the Romans over King Perseus of Macedonia at Pydna in 168 B.C. The complete pillar is estimated to have been 9.58m tall; it supposedly bore the bronze equestrian statue of Paullus on the top. The frieze
depicted battle-scenes between the two armies. Near the bottom was a dedicatory inscription, which has survived (Pollitt 1986: 155-57, figs. 162-64).

31. Grouped around a support embellished with acanthus-leaves, these figures formed a pedestal for a tripod or other votive offering (fourth century B.C.; Papachatzes 1981: Phocica: fig. 422-23).

32. Set up by the Thessalian Daochos to celebrate the victory of his master Philip in 338 B.C. at Chaeroneia, this family monument of nine statues reproduced in marble a group in bronze at Pharsala, of which part at least was by Lysippos. The group, identified from the surviving inscription at the plinth, forms a genealogical succession of seven generations from the sixth century B.C. (Papachatzes 1981, Phocica: fig. 415-21).

33. Dedicated after their victory at Naupactos, it was probably intended for a Nike similar to the one by Paeonios at Olympia (see p. 209; Papachatzes 1981: Phocica: 395).

34. Anciently believed to mark the point where the eagles of Zeus met at the centre of the known world.

35. The two brothers were called to eternal sleep by the Gods, while asleep in the Heraion of Argos, as a reward for yoking themselves to their mother’s chariot (Papachatzes 1981: Phocica: fig. 387).

36. Built in 525-26 B.C. with a tithe from the profits from the gold-mines of Siphnos it was intended to surpass in opulence the existing treasuries at Delphi. It was an Ionic temple in antis, with two columns in the form of Caryatids between the antae (Papachatzes 1981: Phocica: 329-32, fig. 369-74). At the time when the display was set up this Treasury was thought to be that of Cnidos and not that of the Siphnians and so all references to it read "Treasury of Cnidos".
37. Built in Parian marble before the capture of Cnidos in 544 B.C. by the Persians.

38. Homolle, was Director of the French School of Athens since 1891 and the man whose name would always be associated with the uncovering of Delphi; see Radet (1901).

39. The only information which has been found is that in 1910 the museum building already needed some repair (see a letter by the Ephor G. Soteriades to the Ministry, where he asks for the necessary money; Thebes Archive, no. 016,248, 1-10-1910).

40. The reconstruction was done by the sculptor Lazaros Sochos and the engineer Nikos Balanos. An interesting review of the issue in IIAE (1902: 28-32); see also Petrakos (1987a: 25, 49, 92, 101).

41. Note that in 1881 a cast from the head of the Chaeroneian Lion was set up in the centre of a large room in the British Museum (Παρνασσιάς, 1881, 94).

42. A hand-written catalogue by N. Papadakes dated December 1915 lists some 256 stone antiquities and a plethora of unnumbered ceramics (Κατάλογος Αρχαίων του Μουσείου Χαιρονείας, held in the Chaeroneia Museum).

43. Peppas (1929: 95-96); Kontoleon (1950b: 27); Bruneau and Ducat (1965: 25).

44. See a letter by Tsivanopoulos, Vice-President of the Archaeological Society, to Stauropoulos (Delos Archive, B', no. 503, 18-5-1904) and a telegram by Kavvadas to Stauropoulos (Delos Archive, B', no. 17671, 11-5-1904).

There also survives a considerable number of the payment notes and receipts that Stauropoulos submitted every fortnight (e.g. no. 24, from 19-9-1905 to 1-10-1905); these along with some 1904 draft sketches of the museum in French (probably by M. Convert) give interesting information on practical aspects of the construction.
45. See the relevant correspondence between Stauropoulos and the Archaeological Society
(\textit{Delos Archive}, B', no. 17, 4-5-1904; no. 33, 26-5-1904; no. 19, 28-5-1904).


48. See the letter by the Archaeological Society notifying Stauropoulos on its decision to resume the museum's building: \textit{Delos Archive}, B', 18-6-1905.

49. \textit{Delos Archive}, B', no. 18, 26-8-1905.

50. \textit{Delos Archive}, B', no. 31, 11-12-1905.

51. As shown in the outline of a letter by Stauropoulos to the Ministry: \textit{Delos Archive}, B', no. 47, 30-11-1907.

52. \textit{Delos Archive}, B', separate file titled \textit{Ιδρυσις μέρους μουσείου τω 1909 (Διπλάναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας), Α'-Γ'}.

53. \textit{Delos Archive}, no. 20433, 28-9-1911; no. 14484, 30-7-1913.

54. \textit{Delos Archive}, B', no. 31, 11-12-1905; no. 24, 19-9-1905 to 1-10-1905; no. 22, 18-6-1907.

55. NAM 3335; Karouzou (1968: 189-90).

56. Delos Museum nos. A 4125, A 4126 and A 4127 respectively.
57. Delos Museum nos. A 351, A 4130, A 4131, A 4132; these along with the statue of Apollo (A 4125) copied a group of the second century B.C. by Philiskos.

58. From the House of Dioskourides and Kleopatra; today restored in situ.


60. Delos Archive, B', no. 143, n.d.

61. For the diachronic development of the city see Symeonoglou (1985, where extensive bibliography); see also Tsevas (1928).

62. Note that Eustratiades (Archive: Ημερολόγιον Υπηρεσιάς. Φακ. 1, 206) records the formation at Thebes in 1873 of an Archaeological Committee for the local antiquities.

63. Eustratios Kalopais was a lawyer in Thebes and a lover of antiquities. He conducted research in the area on behalf of the Archaeological Society (Petrakos 1987b: 197, n. 227).

64. Epameinondas Koromantzos was a teacher in Thebes, and collaborated with Stamatakes in the surveillance and gathering of Theban antiquities. He was later in charge of the Theban collection (Petrakos 1987b: 197, n. 228).

65. Thebes Archive: handwritten catalogue dated 7-11-1885 and signed by I. Papademetriou, V. Leonardos and E. Kalopais.

66. See the outline of a letter by Keramopoulos to the Mayor of Thebes, where he announces that works would also include the pavement of the courtyard; Thebes Archive, no. 82, 9-11-1905.

67. See the budget proposed in 1905 for additional works in the museum; Thebes Archive, 26-4-1905.

69. See also *Thebes Archive*, no. 11, 17-3-1909 (application for the approval of expenses for the construction of cases); no. 81, 6-5-1909 (letter of the Archaeological Society to Keramopoulos about the classification of the inscriptions and the pavement of the museum's ground floor); no. 7091, 13-5-1909 (notification to Keramopoulos that the Archaeological Society would pay for the above works).

70. Outline of a letter by Keramopoulos to the Minister of Religious Affairs; *Thebes Archive*, no. 86, 1-11-1910.

71. Letter by N. Papadakes to the Ministry on the pressing needs of the Thebes museum; *Thebes Archive*, no. 296, 2-11-1911. See also no. 25019, 22-11-1911.

72. This building was demolished after World War II and was replaced by a new museum, which was inaugurated in 1962 (Demakopoulou and Konsola 1981: 28).

73. These stelai are characteristic of the way in which the warriors' figures are engraved with tiny little spots juxtaposed on the black surface of the marble (Karouzos 1934: 28-30, figs. 24-26).

74. Karouzos (1934: 31-34, figs. 27-29).

75. For the Ptoion kouroi in general see Ducat (1971).

76. For the initial excavations see Keramopoulos (1909c); extensive references in Symeonoglou (1973: n. 8).
77. An indication of the number of vases on display is given by a later reference by Keramopoulou, who says that he had himself counted some 4,471 vases (AΔ 1917: 125, n. 1).

78. For the excavations at Mykalysos see Burrows and Ure (1908; 1909).

79. Born in Melos by Cretan parents in 1848, Chatzidakes studied Medicine in Athens and then continued with Classics in Germany and Paris. He returned and settled down to Crete in 1882. President of the Association of the Friends of Education from 1883 to 1899, Chatzidakes greatly advanced the cause of Cretan archaeology and helped in the foundation and organisation of the Herakleion Museum. He died in 1936. For his life and work see: Elliadi (1933: 88); Mnemosyna (1938-40); Vlachos (1989).

80. Built between 1862 and 1895, when it was officially inaugurated, St. Menas is today the cathedral of Herakleion (Spanakes n.d.: 156).

81. This later proved to be a wise decision when, during the 1896 uprising, Turks from around Herakleion took shelter in the city and occupied the church. In his attempt to dispel the danger facing the museum, Chatzidakes asked for the help of two great friends and explorers of Crete, Federico Halberr and sir John Evans. As a result of their mediation, a British guard was placed in the museum and the leader of the Italian fleet, which was petroling off the Cretan shore, was commanded to protect the museum and Chatzidakes' family (he was, in fact, one of the very few Greeks who remained in the city). At the end Chatzidakes packed the most important pieces and entrusted them to one of the Italian ships until the liberation of the island (Chatzidakes 1931: 61-62).

82. For Minos Kalokairinos and the first excavation at Knossos see Aposkitou (1979). Kalokairinos also issued a newspaper titled Κρητική Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίδα (Cretan Archaeological Newspaper) where he reported on his excavation activities (issues of it from 1906-1907 can be found today in the Vikelaia Library at Herakleion). Kalokairinos presented
some of the finest vases he found to the King of Greece, the National Museum in Athens, the Louvre, the British Museum and the Capitoline Museums in Rome (KEA A', 1906, 6, 46). He believed that these presents would stimulate archaeological interest for Knossos; in fact, soon afterwards the French School and sir Arthur Evans asked permission to excavate the site (KEA 1906, A', 7, 51).


84. Passed on 21-6-1899 and published in the Official Newspaper of the Cretan State (3-7-1899). Its main points are reproduced in The Athenaeum, no. 3747, 19-8-1899, 264; see also Chatzidakes (1931: 22, 69-70, for the Chanea museum). This first decree was expanded in the detailed archaeological law, which was enacted by the autonomous Cretan State in 1901 and provided for the ownership of movable and immovable property, excavations, museums, etc. (Cretan Legislation 1913: 1-10). Note that article 20 also provided for the establishment of a casts museum at Chanea with replicas of the most important works of ancient Greek art, but it is not known if this was further pursued.

85. Xanthoudides (1864-1928) was an exceptional figure in Greek scholarship as his activity expanded beyond Archaeology into Classics, History, Linguistics and Folk Studies. He was actively involved in the Association of the Friends of Education and served the Cretan Archaeological Service for many years. From 1923 until his death in 1928 he was the Director of the Herakleion Museum, where he continued the work of Chatzidakes. The definitive source on his life and work is Detorakes (1978) where extensive bibliography; see also Mnemosyna (1938-40).
86. Originally the Venetian casem of St. George, it was later used by the Turks for the same purpose. The Greeks then used it as a Gymnasium. Today the building houses the Court and other administrative services (Gerola 1917: 88; Herakleion 1971: 176, 342).

87. E.g., Φωνη του Άαοου, Α', no. 20, 1-6-1903; no. 22, 20-6-1903; no. 26, 13-7-1903.

88. Built in 1626-1628 by the General Commissioner Francesco Morozini, the Loggia was a meeting place and an entertainment centre for the Venetian aristocracy of Herakleion. For the conversion plans see: The Athenaeum, no. 3757, 28-10-1899, 593, and Xanthoudides (1927: 74).

89. The building was finally restored after World War II and is used for cultural events today (Spanakes n.d.: 147-48; Herakleion 1971: 352-53).

90. Note that work delays were criticised in the press as causing further potential danger to the antiquities in the casern; see Δεφυνη, Α', no. 16, 17-6-1907.

91. This confirmed Chatzidakes' anxiety about the inadequacy of the engineers. It was characteristic, he wrote, that during the planning process they neither visited the museum in the casern nor consulted the archaeologists so as to form an idea on the nature of the collection which the new building would accommodate (Chatzidakes 1931: 64). The names of the constructors, however, are not known.

92. Η Ιδη, Α', no. 73, 14-6-1907; Β', no. 84, 30-8-1908. PIAE 1908: 66. For the later history of this first museum, which was finally demolished in 1937, see Chatzidakes (1931: 67-69); Platon (1964: 12-13); Alexiou (1968: 5-6). The new Herakleion Museum, designed by Patroklos Karantinos, re-opened after World War II.

93. Η Ιδη, Α', no. 45, 1-11-1907; see also Detorakes (1979: 32, 33).
94. *Epteg, Γ*, no. 87, 28-3-1908. *Iōfη, B*, no. 63, 4-4-1908; no. 102, 10-1-1909.

95. The first temple dates to the fourth century B.C.; it was re-built in the second century (Papachatzes 1981, *Arcadia* 333, n. 326).

96. *JHS* (1889-90: 213); *The Builder*, 15-3-1890, 189; 12-4-1890, 261; *BCH* (1893: 201).

97. *ΠΑΕ* (1907: 71-72); *JHS* (1907: 287). Kourouniotes (1911: 7) writes that Dickins and him had agreed to study and publish the sculpture together; the group, however, was later published by Dickins alone (see Dickins 1905-06; 1906-07; 1910-11).

98. Deduced from a much later document on the restoration of the museum; Archive of the Ε’ Ephorate of Antiquities, Sparta, 25-5-1971 (Ἀναφορά Επιμελητου Αρχαιοστητων Ε’ Εφορείας Γ.A. Σταήνιαινπρος τον Προϊστάμενον της Ε’ Εφορείας περί τον Μουσείου Λυκοστόρας).

99. For a history of Corfu see Ippaviz (1901); Idromenos (1930); Stamatopoulos (1978).

100. Off-spring of a British aristocratic family, Nugent himself was very progressive and a lover of Greece (Kyriakes 1902: 116-18; Aspiote 1974).

101. Let us also note the enactment in 1848 of a detailed governmental Act (ratified on 3 June) which regulated all issues related to excavations and the protection of antiquities on the island (Viazes 1928: 118-20). (For a general outline of excavations on the island see Papademetriou 1952).

102. The monument dates back to the sixth century B.C. It was dedicated by the city of Corfu in memory of Menecrates, a *proxenos* and friend of the island, who drowned.
103. The discovery of the famous pediment of Gorgo from the temple of Artemis in 1911 (*I.A.E* 1911: 164-204) necessitated the extension of the building, but works stopped because of World War I (see also *A.D* 1915, Annex: 45). In the 1930s the collection was moved to the palace, then to a store room. After World War II the collection was, again, transferred to the palace; the present museum was not built until 1962-65 (Dontas 1970: 8).

104. Tegea, the birthplace of Atalante, the heroine of the Calydonian boar-hunt, was one of the oldest and most important cities in Arcadia. (A general discussion of the history of Arcadia and Tegea in Alexopoulos 1932). The temple of Athena-Alea was among the largest and most renown ancient Greek temples in the Peloponnese. A Doric peristyle temple, it had seven semi-columns with Ionic bases and Corinthian capitals attached to the inside long walls of the cella. The temple was built ca.370 B.C. by Skopas, who also worked on the pediments. The east pediment depicted the hunt of the Calydonian boar; the west one represented the resistance of Telephos, son of Hercules and Auge (the daughter of King Aleos), against the Greek invaders to his land at Mysia in Asia Minor (Papachatzes 1981: *Arcadica*: 388-89).

105. Kavvadías records an anecdote, which reveals what happens when the foundation of a museum is tinted by a false sense of localism: “However, when the inhabitants of Achouri learnt that the museum was to be established not in their village, but in the village of Pialí [Tegea]... and as they were party-spirited, they carried off and hid away the above-mentioned antiquities...[two reliefs that Kavvadías had already seen]” (Kavvadías 1879: 878). Such a mentality is at times present even today, when the establishment of a museum is guided by factors alien to its true nature.

106. A catalogue of the collection was compiled by Kavvadías (1879: 879, n. 1).

107. Byzantine church, built on the ruins of the ancient theatre, it became a diocese in the Middle Ages; hence the church and the surrounding area are named Palaia Episkope (Old Diocese)
or Episkope (Diocese) to date (Kokkine-Domazou 1973: 36-38; Papachatzes 1981: Arcadica: 398, fig. 438).

108. It is not clearly attested that the church itself was used. If we trust the Baedeker guide (1904: 357) then the collection was housed "by the church".

109. IIAE (1906: 59; 1907: 70); Moraites (1927: 42, n. 4).

110. The task was fraught with difficulties which are eloquently described by Rhomaios (IIAE 1909: 301).

111. The attribution of this head has caused long controversy. Previously believed to have belonged to Atalante, it is today attributed by most scholars to a statue of Hygeia by Skopas. This head, commonly known as "Hygeia", was stolen from the Tegea Museum in 1916 and was moved to the National Museum for more security, after its rediscovery in 1925. A replica replaced the original at Tegea (Moraites 1927: 56, n. 1).

112. Arcadians had a particular sympathy for hermaic stelai and tradition has it that herms marked the Arcadian-Laconic borders (Pausanias VIII, 48, 6).

113. For the temple see Dinsmoor (1975: 51-52).

114. Gheorghios Soteriades (1852-1942) was born at Siderokastro in Macedonia and studied in Athens and Germany. He joined the Archaeological Service in 1896. Then in 1912 he became Professor of History at the University of Athens. A tireless excavator, he dug at Thermon, Boeotia, Phokis, etc. (Petrakos 1987a: 293).

115. For the first years of the city see Tsopotos (1933).
116. For the history and the development of the city see: Trigones (1934: 9-60); Thessalika Chronika (1935: 133-52); Kordatos (1960: 941-1008 for the recent history).

117. A photograph of this building, which was demolished after the 1955 earthquakes, in Kliapha (1983: fig. 143).

118. Arvanitopoulos was the first Greek archaeologist who was granted by the Archaeological Society for studies in Europe in 1899 (Petrakos 1987a: 103).

119. Demetriada-Pagasai was one of the most important ancient Thessalian cities. It is renown for its painted gravestones most of which date from the second half of the third century B.C. and were later re-used as building material during the construction of towers (from within which they were unearthed by Arvanitopoulos). The stelai were marble and rectangular with a pedimental crowning. Below the pediment was the departed's name, followed by a painted representation and sometimes an epigram. Apart from being important monuments per se, many of these stelai are particularly significant for the study of ancient Greek painting, since very few original paintings survive. They usually represent everyday life scenes. The main colours used were wax-diluted metallic oxides (Arvanitopoulos 1909a: 11-29, 63-93; 1928; Papachatzes 1954: 39-40, 76).

120. A. Athanasakes was born in Portaria on Mount Pelion. He later went to Egypt where he became a landowner. He spent large parts of his money on charities in his native area (Thessalika Chronika 1965: 315).

121. See a letter by the counsellor P. Apostolides in Κήρυκας Α', no. 182, 15-2-1908, where he opposes to the location of the museum. From this letter it results that the City Council was not advised on this matter. On the eleventh hour a different location was proposed by a certain M.R. writing in Κήρυκας Α', no. 191, 24-2-1908.

122. Κήρυκας, Α', no. 224, 30-3-1908; no. 242, 18-4-1908.
123. Arvanitopoulos (1909a and b); Θεσσαλία 10, no. 2839, 15-6-1909.


125. Arvanitopoulos (1909b: 133-35; 1912a; 1928); AE (1912: 261-62).

126. In a report addressed to the City Council in 1912, for example, he asks the Council's financial help in order to eliminate the danger of having to send the antiquities to Athens (something which was already done for gold finds; see Κηρος, E', no. 1575, 11-4-1912; Arvanitopoulos 1912b).

127. On Argostoli see Demponos (1981); for the recent history of Cephalonia see Moschopoulos (1989).

128. Valsamakes bequested his "museum" to the City Council of Argostoli, but the collection was in 1883 sold to the University of Athens.

129. The church was built in the mid1800s by the British and it later became local property. It was destroyed during the earthquakes of 1953 which devastated the entire city of Argostoli. A new archaeological museum was built in 1963 (ΑΔ 18, 1963, Χρονικά: 159).
9 THE DISPLAYS OF ARCHAEOLOGY: AN ANATOMY

A profile of museum displays has already been given in the discussion on individual museums. This chapter attempts to form a complete picture of display practices and their philosophy by drawing together all the points observed so far and looking at the factors which influenced the display of archaeology in Greek museums. By way of preamble to this analysis, however, let us first review some aspects of museum development in Greece (1829-1909).

The Official View of Museums

At the time of foundation of the modern Greek state, the view that Greece owed its political renaissance to the ancient monuments was widely endorsed. The practical and urgent need to safeguard the monuments was thus enhanced by the moral obligation to "prove" the Greeks' efficiency in preserving their heritage in the eyes of Europe. Within this frame, the Greek museums assumed their paramount role as trustees of the national antiquities (Law of 1834, p. 52), a role which they successfully accomplished.

Apart from their depository character, museums and museum displays were further and gradually ascribed a didactic role, in that they were seen as having the potential to diffuse archaeological knowledge and thus educate the public towards appreciating what is "good in art" (ΠΑΕ 1874/75: 25). In fact, the public orientation of Greek museums was one of their main theoretical prerequisites. Suffice it to recall the liberal spirit which typified some early
declarations of the Archaeological Society pertaining museum accessibility (p. 65). In practice, the educational and the public mission of museums mainly translated into the provision of extended opening hours and the publication of catalogues for public use. The fact that this applied almost exclusively to the Athenian museums (opening hours outside Athens, for example, are with certainty known only for the museums at Herakleion and Volos) does not undermine the importance of these intentions. The concern for publicly oriented museums, especially as expressed by the Archaeological Society, should be taken to reveal not only the Society's notion of a museum, but also an effort to establish the museum idea in the Greek consciousness. That the museum idea was new-born in nineteenth century Greece, is a major key-point in understanding the public response to museums, a point we shall return to later in this chapter. Let us first summarise some facts.

The Facts

By 1909 a total of thirty four archaeological museums had been established around Greece. However, only twenty eight museums were permanent, since the first National Museum at Aegina, the Theseion and the four museums of the Archaeological Society ceased functioning after their collections were transferred to the National Archaeological Museum. Twenty three out of these museums were funded by the Archaeological Society and only eleven by the state (Appendix 4). Clearly, the Society was the main institution responsible for museum development in Greece during the period 1829-1909, and its view of museums may be summarised in the following two points: first, the safeguard and deposition of antiquities was seen as a fundamental priority, whereas their study and publication, the Society held, could be carried out at a later stage. Second, everything was displayed for the public's sake and
museums were open to everybody (see p. 65). Thus the Society's purposes were ultimately educational and democratic as opposed to academic and elitist.

Museums' geographical distribution shows that almost a third of them (ten museums) were in Attica. The second biggest concentration was found in the Peloponnese with seven museums. Sterea Hellas and the Cyclades followed with four museums, the Ionian Islands with two, Euboia, Thessaly and Crete with one (Appendix 5). Most museums had an urban character, but almost a third of them were site museums (Appendix 6).

We should not fail to note that the majority of museums (twenty-three overall) and especially those founded during the period 1900-1909 were housed in purpose-built premises whose construction was funded either by the state or by the Archaeological Society. Where no specific building provisions were made, museums were housed in public premises (Appendix 7). The construction of some major museums was funded or co-funded by individuals (Olympia, Delphoi, Herakleion, Volos).

Museum buildings were called to satisfy specific practical needs and their architecture was characteristic for its simplicity. There was a taste for neoclassical architecture (National Archaeological Museum [23-25]; Sparta [73], [75]; Olympia [79]; Chalkis [138]; Volos [180]), but nothing here recalls the impressive facades and elaborate interior decoration of many European museums built after the ideals of classical Greek architecture (e.g. the British Museum, the Altes Museum in Berlin, the Glyptothek in Munich). Even the more elaborate Greek museums were characterised by plain facades, simple interiors and intelligible floor plans (see Plans 24; 29; 44; 51). The same principle of simplicity applied also in interior decoration (e.g. [36], [48], [52], [115], [146], [166], [174], [181]).
The lack of museum personnel in the contemporary sense meant that museums were organised by the regional Ephors of Antiquities, who were employed either by the Archaeological Service or the Archaeological Society. (As shown in Appendices 8 & 9 many of them worked in both institutions). The first specific museum post was established in 1877 for the museums of the Archaeological Society and was held by A. Koumanoudes (see p. 119). Permanent museum staff was appointed only at the beginning of the twentieth century (see pp. 295-96).

Security provisions are not documented, except for the Museum at the Polytechnic (p. 119) and the Numismatic Museum (p. 182). It seems that, as a rule, museum keys were kept by the museum guardian, or by some reliable person in the community, who would open the museum upon demand (see pp. 95, 205, 218 & 221).

After this general review of museum development in Greece, we may now proceed to analyse the displays of archaeology.

Theoretical Prerequisites for the Display of Archaeology

The discussion in chapter four has shown that an explicit philosophy on the display of archaeology was never articulated in Greece during the years examined here. Yet museum legislation and the use of language did attest to the existence of a certain, if implicit, display philosophy. Museum legislation assigned a didactic and aesthetic character to displays. Aesthetic presentation was also favoured in the display terminology of the time, which abounded in expressions such as "tasteful", "decent", "appropriate", "elegant" and the like in reference to displays. If, then, we may talk about a display philosophy, this was limited to a preference for orderly and aesthetically pleasing displays. As for the didactic character of displays this was seen as instructive in an
extended sense; that is, displays were seen as having the potential to generate and promote appreciation and taste for the antiquities (p. 69).

Did the actual displays comply with the above-delineated attitude or not? What, if any, was the message promulgated through them? A consideration look at the display patterns will help us answer those questions. (For a schematic anatomy of museum displays see Appendix 10).

Display Practices and Patterns

Display Organisation

In terms of spatial layout, early displays were organised according to the availability and convenience of space. Although a rough typological classification was adopted since the very beginning, it seems that a preference for chronological layout of objects gradually took over. The general organisation pattern later crystallised as either chronological/typological (arrangement of exhibits by chronology and within that by typology) or typological/chronological (arrangement by type and within that by chronology). Alternatively, objects were organised by provenance (Appendix 10).

Once this main pattern was established, exhibits were displayed according to the material of construction, occasionally by thematic order, and generally by size. Usually, the spatial layout of objects was linear. The prevailing tendency was to display as many objects as possible (e.g. the majority of excavation finds) and from the numbers of objects on display, which are known for some museums, we assume that what might be perceived as overcrowding was very common.
Display Hardware

The same type of display hardware -simpler in small museums and more sumptuous in large ones- was generally used. This hardware initially comprised simple, "improvised", surfaces (e.g. wooden shelves and scaffoldings, like those used in the provisional "museum" at Thera [125]) or surfaces which were already available (e.g. the desks at the University, p. 104). The construction of proper display hardware was initiated by the Archaeological Society for its museum at the Varvakeion Lyceum. Usual display surfaces comprised stone platforms projecting from the lower part of the walls (e.g. [15], [22], [82], [88]), stone or marble pedestals and bases (e.g. [48], [50], [148]), and wooden or plaster wall-shelves (e.g. [132-133], [174-176]) for the display of sculpture, architectural members, inscriptions and vases; wall cabinets (grilled or glass-covered, e.g. [87], [98]), display cases (simple or lectern-type, e.g. [26], [67]) and tables (e.g. [136]) for the display of vases, figurines, bronzes, coins, jewellery, etc.; glass cases (free-standing or attached to the walls) for the display of sculpture or other objects (e.g. [168-169], [183-184]); and simple cupboards for the display of various objects.

Supporting Material

What varied considerably was the amount of information which supported the exhibits. Usually, the only information provided were catalogue numbers. Beyond this, the extent and the quality of informative material depended on the scale and the appeal of each museum (Appendix 10). The use of labels is attested only for the National Museum [38], [40], [43-44], the Numismatic Museum and the museum at Argostoli [184], but is uncertain for other museums. Not surprisingly, the most comprehensive displays were found in the National Museum, where documentation included catalogue numbers [56], [58], labels, case-headings [57], [64], the names of rooms along with names of
artists or donors painted on the walls [35], [37], [50], and plaster casts (p. 163). Similarly documented were the displays in the Delphoi Museum [146], [150]. Above average was also the level of information at Olympia [82-83], Epidaurus [116-120], Volos [181], Herakleion [166], [170] and Argostoli [184].

Although textual information was minimal, supplement to the displays was at times provided in the form of casts, which were often displayed instead of the originals (when the latter had been transported to the National Museum, as at Lykosoura, p. 276); plaster reconstructions of missing pieces of original sculpture (Epidaurus [117-120], Delphoi [150], [155], Lykosoura); scaled reconstructions of a sculptured group (Olympia [82-83]); and painted reconstructions, which were used as a visual supplement to the displays (Acropolis [15], Volos [181]).

Display Environment

On the whole, display environment was simple and unobtrusive. Walls were usually painted in a monochrome neutral colour. The use of red, for example, is attested for the museums of Acropolis (p. 152) and Olympia (p. 208), and for the Mycenean Room at the National Museum (p. 170). At times a second zone was distinguished, as in the Volos Museum [181]. (See also the discussion on the wall decoration of the National Museum, pp. 170-71).

Floors were either cemented (e.g. [17], [20], [124], [134]) or paved with plain blocks of stone (symmetrical or asymmetrical) according to each museum’s financial resources (e.g. [37], [48], [61], [85], but [98]). A very popular pavement comprised alternating black and white blocks of stone, like at Sparta [76], Tegea [174-176], Chaeroneia (p. 261), Volos [181] and Argostoli [183-184]. Finally, tile mosaics were used in exceptional cases, like in the first Bronze Room at the National Museum [57], in the central hall of the Olympia Museum [82-84] and at the Epidauros Museum [116], [121].
Let us remember that a more ornate wall and floor decoration was adopted only in some of the rooms of the National Museum, such as the Large Mycenaean Hall [26] and the first Vase Room; but there again the decoration did not impose on the displays.

Lighting was natural through side windows (e.g. [17], [47], [50], [85], [134], [150], [168]). The use of a skylight, which was so common in European museums, is attested only once, in the first Bronze Room of the National Museum [57].

Benches and chairs were at times provided for the visitor's comfort [76], [84], [121]; whereas in the Acropolis, the National and the Olympia museums visitors could rest on leather coaches [17], [48], [50], [57], [82-83].

**General Remarks**

It is clear, therefore, that although display profiles varied, the general pre-requisites for chronological and typological arrangement of the collections and their "orderly" and "elegant" display were more or less accomplished. What should be pointed out is that although display patterns gradually took a common form as one period succeeded another, this was not necessarily reflected in the overall display profile. For example, store-like displays are observed even during the so-called expansion period of museum development (1900-1909), whereas well arranged and comprehensive ones were set up from as early as the 1870s (see the column "Display Character" in Appendix 10).

In order to account for this inconsistency we have to consider the factors which regulated museum development and display installation. More than anything else, museum development depended on the very real and very practical need to shelter and secure the antiquities in safe places. This was a priority of paramount importance so that the suitability of space did not really matter, provided basic protection was ensured. Consequently, displays were
usually accommodated in any space available, a point that we should retain for the discussion in subsequent pages. On the other hand, museums' security and good maintenance necessitated the provision of adequate financial and human resources. However, it has been shown that the majority of the museums examined here were set up with minimal funds and personnel, and this is another point that we should keep in mind.

These practical needs notwithstanding, there was another factor which had a clear impact on museum organisation; namely, a museum's significance within the overall museum network of the country. Clearly, major museums were granted all the attention and the resources necessary for their decent organisation and maintenance. This is especially true for the Acropolis Museum and the National Museum. Outside the capital, comprehensive displays were usually set up in museums of major importance, like the site museums of Olympia, Epidaurus and Delphi and the museums at Herakleion and Volos, but were also created in smaller museums like the ones at Tegea and Thera (Appendix 10). It may further be observed that displays which were set up by the Archaeological Society were on the whole better arranged than displays in state museums. This would indeed be in accordance with the Society's general concern for developing museums in Greece.

In other words, the general profile of a museum and its displays depended not so much on theoretical or practical expertise as on other factors, namely: a museum's general importance and appeal, financial resources, space suitability and personnel in charge. The major role that these factors played in museum development and display set up, will become evident in the next section which discusses the contribution of the archaeologists who set up the displays.
Display Authors

Within the above-delineated frame, the ultimate responsibility for shaping museum displays rested in the hands of the individual archaeologists. What is striking is that many of the Greek archaeologists who set up museum displays had studied in Western Europe, and some of them were specifically sent to visit museums in Italy at the beginning of this century (see Appendix 11). One then wonders if their exposure to West-European influences left any imprint on their own displays in Greece and how any possible influence manifested itself in their work.

Some twenty archaeologists concern us here (Appendix 12). Only three of them studied exclusively in Greece (of whom two were self-trained); seven studied at first in Athens and then abroad (primarily in Germany; to a much lesser extent in Paris or London), while ten studied exclusively abroad, of whom eight were in Germany and two in Vienna. That is, half of the Greek archaeologists studied exclusively abroad, and most of the other half also furthered their studies abroad. Germany, mainly Munich and Berlin, was the steady preference. We have no specific information on the exact programmes of study and other activities of the Greek archaeologists abroad, but we may assume that museum visits would have been among their primary interests; a short review of contemporary museum practices in Western Europe, and particularly Germany, might thus help us understand the kind of influence exercised on the Greek archaeologists who concern us here.
Display Practices in West-European Museums (nineteenth-early twentieth centuries)

The formal classicist tradition, initiated by Winckelmann in the eighteenth century, was particularly strong in Germany. In museum terms, this translated into an art-historical or chronological approach to displays; exhibits were arranged in diachronic sequences so as stylistic changes were made evident, with the emphasis placed on the objects' artistic qualities rather than on information. This approach, initiated in two of the most influential museums of the nineteenth century, the Glyptothek in Munich (Glyptothek 1980) and the Altes Museum in Berlin (Klessmann 1971: 28-29) was to become a model revered by museums all over Europe. No less an institution than the British Museum, for example, was very concerned to see its sculpture collections arranged chronologically (Jenkins 1992: 56, 58), while at the other end of Europe, a chronological arrangement was reached in the Archaeological Museum of Naples (Sambon 1904: 10). A thematic and typological approach, as exemplified in earlier displays like those at the Villa Albani and at the Louvre (Jenkins 1992: 58), was adopted only occasionally in the nineteenth century; for example, at the Museo Chiaramonti in Rome (Vatican 1983: 200). Let it be noted that a deviation from the formal chronological approach would be attempted, perhaps for the first time, only in 1908 with an exhibition illustrating Greek and Roman everyday life in the British Museum (Smith 1908: preface; Jenkins 1986).

In terms of layout, the linear juxtaposition of exhibits was common practice in many European museums as, for example, in the Museo Chiaramonti [185] and the Museo Capitolino [186] in Rome, the Archaeological Museum of Naples [187] and the Altes Museum in Berlin [188].

Museum decoration was often sumptuous and colourful in a way which stressed the aestheticism of the time. The most conspicuous example of such a
decoration was, of course, the Munich Glyptothek where Leo von Klenze applied his plans for a grandiose architectural effect (Pevsner 1976: 123-26; Glyptothek 1980). In the Altes Museum in Berlin red tapestry covered the walls, while ceilings were painted yellow, red and white (Klessmann 1971: 27-29). In the British Museum after the middle of the nineteenth century the walls of the sculpture galleries were painted in red and green, while the ceilings were variously ornamented (Jenkins 1992: 45). Architectural structures, such as niches (Braccio Nuovo, Vatican) and vaulted decorative ceilings (Archaeological Museum, Naples; Glyptothek, Munich) enhanced the "decorativism" of many museums.

The Impact of West-European Approaches to Display in Greece

It is impossible to believe that the Greeks who lived and studied in Germany, Britain, France and Italy were not influenced by the idealised view of ancient Greek antiquity and the art-historical approach to the display of classical antiquities which prevailed in Europe. In theory, then, the Greek archaeologists were probably predisposed to the art-historical and aesthetic approach to the display of classical antiquities, and would be inclined to follow a similar approach in Greece. Yet their intentions could only be realised with the provision of adequate space and the necessary financial and human resources. In practice, however, the majority of Greek museums were organised with minimal financial resources and were severely understaffed. Displays varied from the very random, store-like ones to the more sophisticated ones, according to space availability and the museum's importance (see above). As a rule, the simplicity of the display environment and the general appearance of the Greek displays was in marked contrast with that of most European museums. That is, although the theoretical orientation of the display authors was probably influenced by Europe, Greek reality did not allow them
to proceed to similar applications. Nevertheless, despite the differences at the practical level, most Greek displays, especially the displays of major museums like the National Museum, the Acropolis Museum, the Olympia Museum, the Delphoi Museum, did follow the art-historical perspective and the aesthetic approach of their European counterparts.

A direct European influence on the practical level may plausibly be discerned only in the displays of the National Museum set up by Kavvadias after his return from Munich. For instance, there is some resemblance between the layout and the general appearance of the Archaic Room in the National Archaeological Museum and the Rotunda at the Glyptothek [189] or between the type of display surfaces used in Germany [188-189] and those in the National Museum in Athens [36-37]. Nevertheless, any such resemblance did not go beyond the presentation level.

We may thus conclude by saying that a European influence on the Greek displays was evident not so much in practical terms as in the general approach to display, and that this approach was followed as each individual case permitted.

After having analysed the factors which influenced the set up of displays we may now attempt an overall assessment of displays' character and function within nineteenth and early twentieth century Greece.

Displays' Character

First Reading: Displays as Form and as Aesthetic Value

At first glance, Greek archaeological displays of the period under study were object-oriented, linear, classificatory, non-informative, and generally aesthetic.
Displays were object-oriented in the sense that the objects were the meaning for the display (Velarde 1992: 662). This becomes clearer, if we consider the nature of the Greek museums. In contrast to most their European counterparts, Greek museums did not derive from collections -private or other; rather, in Greece museums were the very reason for collecting (see pp. 62-63). Therefore, it was all too natural that they would put on show everything they held, in most cases with no selection. This was, anyway, a typical characteristic of the nineteenth century “show-case” museum, where displays were nothing more than simple showings of objects.

Related to this is another formal trend of early Greek displays: their strong linear and classificatory character. As Peponis and Hedin have shown (p. 11), linear and classification schemes of presentation occur at an early phase of museum development, when what is presented to the visitor is everything the expert knows. The concept of interpretation, which allows for more complex systems of spatial layout, may only be introduced when knowledge acquisition is separated from its transmission; that is, when the knowledge of things is separated from the knowledge of how to display things (Peponis and Hedin 1982: 24). In this respect, the lack of interpretation in the Greek displays of the period 1829-1909 is historically explained, if one considers the evolution of Greek archaeology as a discipline. Let us first not forget that the paramount purpose of early Greek archaeology was to collect all scattered antiquities and then secure them in museums. Displays were but one aspect of this concern for protecting the antiquities; therefore, they showed nothing more than what the archaeologists had collected or discovered.

More may be said to elucidate the lack of interpretation. We have already discussed the historical conditions which have tied nineteenth-century Greek archaeology to the ideological and political intention of proving the
diachronic continuity of Hellenism (pp. 45-46). As Kotsakis (1991: 68) has rightly pointed out, this ethnocentric ideological construct was so powerful and self-sufficient that it legitimised the absence of any theoretical orientation in Greek archaeology. Such a theoretical orientation would have been geared towards a more abstract discussion on the nature of historical processes and would have attempted to link the Greek past with past human activities on a larger geographical scale. What happened in Greece, instead, is that continuity as a focus of research-in archaeology, history and folk-studies- became so evident that it required no justification. For archaeology, it was enough to unearth the very tokens of the Greek past, the antiquities, and then present them to the public. No interpretation was required since the symbolic nature of the antiquities as national emblems was, supposedly, given. Within this frame archaeology was displayed as art-history, with implications which are discussed below (p. 335).

As the discussion in previous pages has shown, this was not unusual. According to the prevailing nineteenth and early twentieth century display philosophy, archaeological material was exhibited as "art" rather than as "archaeology", with the emphasis on aesthetics rather than on information (Jenkins 1986; Walling 1987). Nowhere was the aesthetic aspect of displays so manifest as in some rooms of the National Archaeological Museum in Athens. Consider, for example, the Large Mycenaean Hall whose decoration imitated the interior of a Mycenaean palace and which looked more like a treasure-room which induces awe and admiration (cf. Pearce 1992: 202-203). A similar effect was produced in the First Vase Room [63] and, to a lesser extent, in the First Bronze Room [57].

Therefore, if a "message" was to be read in the Greek displays this was initially aesthetic, which means that, consciously or not, the actual displays were in accordance with the theoretical scheme for the display of archaeology,
as outlined in chapter four. Yet beyond aesthetics displays of archaeology had obviously some other connotations to which we shall now turn.

Second Reading: Displays as Function

In functionalist terms, let us recall (p. 14), the main aim of a society is to continue to exist. To this end, physical adaptation to the environment is of primary importance. Equally important, however, is the internal arrangement of the society's components, which include cultural institutions and material culture, so that they best complement each other. Within this view artefacts are interpreted in terms of their ability to adapt to their environment and they are judged according to their utility value.

In so far as exhibitions are artefacts, in the sense outlined in the Introduction (p. 7), a functionalist perspective may be applied to exhibition analysis. Exhibitions as pieces of material culture may, accordingly, be assessed in terms of their adaptive relation to their historical and social environment and in terms of their functional role within this environment. The environment in question here is nineteenth and early twentieth century Greece.

As we have seen, one of the paramount aims of the Greek society of the time was the protection of the monuments. This was closely related to the purpose of confirming Greece's kinship to her classical heritage as well as her efficiency in securing this heritage in the eyes of the world. The country's institutions were, naturally, adapted to this ideological and political purpose. The educational system, for example, favoured the learning of Classics: ancient Greek, Latin, ancient Greek history and philosophy predominated over the teaching of science and practical subjects, and even over recent history and the official language (on the ideological structure of the Greek educational system from 1830 to 1922, see Tsoukalas 1987: 550-67).
Archaeological Service and the Archaeological Society were adapted to the same purpose of asserting the national identity through excavation, collection or simple gathering of antiquities, museum foundation and displays set up.

Within this frame, displays did not only preserve the antiquities in physical terms, but offered a visual authentication of the ancient heritage. That such an authentication was ideologically and politically necessary, it has already been discussed in chapter three (pp. 44-49). To the same end, displays had, implicitly at least, an educational role to fulfill in that they were expected to promote national consciousness -through the exposure of the public to the remains of the country's cultural heritage- and to diffuse archaeological knowledge (see pp. 69 & 71). Archaeological displays were thus adapted to the ideological structure of the new Greek state, which was based on a reverence for the ancient glory of Greece and the attempt to appropriate this glory for modern purposes. How this was achieved, is examined below.

Third Reading: Displays as Ideological Statements

As the discussion in chapter one has shown (p. 4), museums are never apolitical in nature, since they belong to the principal apparatuses through which the state propagates the dominant ideology. The dominant ideology projected from the new Greek state was modelled on a direct kinship with the past, the classical past. Displays offered the visual confirmation of this kinship by presenting the very tokens of this past, the antiquities. The antiquities were there, should anyone want to question either the nation's links with the classical heritage or the Greeks' ability to preserve this heritage. Further, displays were expected to help promote the national sense of self by continually reminding the Greeks of their heritage. Display power rested exactly there.
At first sight, however, one cannot discern an overt ideological message in this. The displays were set up in such a way as to conform with principles of decency and order; the presentational mode was externally neutral. What, then, was the possible ideological message that the visitor could read behind the displays? We should here be reminded that displays are, by virtue of their ostensibly neutral character, an area particularly prone to ideological manipulation and thus most influential in the eyes of the public. As Karp (1991: 13) reminds us, museums and their exhibitions are morally neutral only in principle; in practice they always make moral statements. The alleged innate neutrality of exhibitions is the very quality that enables them to become instruments of power as well as instruments of education and experience.

Two further points should be reminded here. Let us first recall the discussion in chapter one (pp. 18-19) and point out that antiquities, as artefacts, acquire "meaning" because of their intrinsic historical content. They are "the real thing" and as such exercise an immediate and irresistible appeal to the viewer. Further, because of their genuinely authentic relationship with a past era and a past society, antiquities may be used to validate present ideological and political purposes. Let us also remind that the "meaning" of exhibits is conditioned by what has rightly been described as the "museum effect" (Alpers 1991); the effect that the exhibition surroundings have on our perception of the objects on display. The mode of installation, the exhibition design and arrangement, are all factors which act independently of the exhibits themselves and may either help or impede our appreciation and understanding of them (see also Saumarez Smith 1989: 12).

In the light of these observations, we may now attempt to provide an answer to our question. We have on several occasions noted that the new Greek state stressed the affinity of modern Greece with her classical ancestors.
This, at least, was the standard ideological position during the crucial decades of the 1830s, 1840s and 1850s. One would expect, however, that in the second half of the century, when the ideological vision of the state was enlarged to include Byzantium and recent Hellenism, this change of attitude would be reflected in museums. As we have seen (p. 49), this was not the case. On the contrary, museums preserved the stereotypical and, apparently, deeply rooted sense of affinity with just one aspect of the Greek civilisation: the classical.

The antiquities were the proof of this affinity and as such had obvious ideological and political value. It was their genuine historicity which gave them a symbolic significance. In keeping with the dominant concept which regarded them as "sacred relics" (pp. 50-51), the antiquities were displayed as cultural treasures, testimonies of a glorious past, witnesses to the ancient heritage of which modern Greece was the recipient. It was against this ideological background that the effort taken in creating "decent" display settings, "appropriate" to the historical and artistic value of the exhibits, is to be understood. Most displays were characterised by an unmistakable aesthetic neutrality which must have resulted in creating feelings of reverence rather than appreciation. The implications of this approach, is that the affinity with the past was thus curtailed rather than enhanced in the eyes of the public. It may further be argued that the neutrality of presentation, the "museum effect", resulted in creating distance rather than understanding. The implications of this in museum visiting are suggested below (see p. 335).

We may thus conclude by saying that the Greek displays of archaeology were not free from ideological connotations. By their ostensibly neutral presentational mode they did, in fact, reinforce and perpetuate the dominant art-historical and idealised view of the Greek antiquities; a view which served the ideological purpose of asserting the Greek national identity through emphasising the affinities of modern Greece to her classical past. In other
words, displays did not diverge from the official ideological stance of the Greek state to the Greek archaeological heritage, a stance which emphasised Greece's classical inheritance. In this respect, and as far as their ideological orientation was concerned, Greek museums remained conservative.

The Public Response to Museums and Displays

The public response to museums and displays can only indirectly be traced, through archaeological journals and other publications. The reports of the Archaeological Society in *IIAE* through the 1860s and the 1870s (e.g. *IIAE* 1860: 5; 1862: 4; 1874/75: 25; 1879/80: 22) clearly show that the Greeks did not visit museums, which were mainly frequented by foreigners:

"But seldom and very few of us [i.e. Greeks] come to visit the museum; it is mainly foreigners who honour it and take advantage of it (*IIAE* 1866: 7)

or,

"But very few of us... frequent the museum and these out of simple curiosity, not for study, whereas many more foreigners, Europeans, [frequent it]... (*IIAE* 1873/74: 25-26)

There is no sufficient evidence to show if this changed later, while conclusions are even more difficult to be drawn for provincial museums, which are less documented. Nevertheless, we are probably not far from the truth if we argue that museums remained an "official" territory which, despite the intentions and the statements on their educational role, did not appeal to the general public.
Several factors may account for this. First, it is important to remember that the museum was completely new both as a concept and as an institution in Greece. Time was therefore needed in order for the public to get to know the museum and develop an appreciation for it. Let us here note that the coexistence or close proximity to the antiquities had been an experience common to many Greeks for centuries. For a large part of the population the antiquities were "at home" in the open air, where one could feel them and admire them. (Some aspects of the "intimate" relationship with the antiquities, which developed before the foundation of modern Greece and survived thereafter, are discussed in chapter three, p. 42). For those people the placement of antiquities in museums would perhaps rupture this intimacy and estrange them from something they were used to consider "theirs".

In fact, recent studies on museum visiting seem to indicate that such an hypothesis may not be entirely impossible. As Merriman (1989; 1991) has shown, in his pioneer survey of attitudes to the heritage and the past in Britain, museum non-visiting does not reflect an indifference towards the past, but, rather, a different appreciation of it. Museum visiting is regulated by the cultural "habitus" (in Pierre Bourdieu's terms) of the individual. Each individual is conditioned -through the family and the education he/she receives- to prefer particular modes of cultural activities in contrast to others. Therefore, the main difference between a museum visitor and a non-visitor is that the former has probably developed the appropriate "cultural capital" to understand museums and museum displays, while the latter may be as equally interested in the past, but feels intimidated by the museum environment. In other words, people who are not socialised into appreciating museums and museum displays are very likely to consider them as distant. For the overwhelming majority of the nineteenth-century Greeks, strained as they were by vital
problems, there was no opportunity to develop such an appreciation of an institution like the museum, which probably seemed irrelevant to their lives.

Certainly, museums themselves played the major role in this. We may plausibly argue that the "art treasure approach", which was projected by most Greek displays, impeded rather than aided understanding of the exhibits. In other words, the "museum effect" (see p. 331) created within the display environment enhanced feelings of "distanciation". In this way, to the majority of the non-intellectuals the museum probably looked like an official territory of little relevance to their contemporary life, a place for the scholars and the foreign travellers.

Yet a contradiction seems to emerge here: one would expect that the popular respect for the antiquities which was manifest before and immediately after the 1821 Revolution (pp. 42-44), would have naturally led to an interest in museums. This does not seem to have been the case. On the contrary, not only were the Greeks apparently indifferent to museums, but for many decades after the formation of the Greek state illicit dealings in antiquities were a real problem (pp. 52-54). To explain this contradiction one has to consider the financial difficulties of a very large part of the population and also the fact that there was a "market" for Greek antiquities in Europe.

During many of the years covered in this study, and at least up to the 1860s, the majority of the Greek population struggled to make a living. For example, the peasants, who formed the 60% of the population, lived in poverty having very small pieces of land, if they owned land at all; craftsmen and tradesmen were hit by the old-fashioned and heavy system of taxation, which was a source of continuous dissatisfaction for the majority of the Greeks. An improvement of the economy was initiated only during the 1860s, stabilised in the 1870s and the 1880s, to be cancelled once again after the Greek defeat by the Turks in 1897 (Svoronos 1975: 79-80, 100-105). It is thus clear that the
Greek population had other vital needs to meet, before embarking on museum visiting. It is against this background that illicit dealing in antiquities must also be explained. European interest in the Greek antiquities was probably too strong a lure for some Greeks to resist, so as to ignore the prospect of commercial profit (cf. Fletcher 1972: 157; Petrakos 1987: 57). In fact, contemporary experience shows that this is a problem common to many poor countries even today (Gazi 1990: 126).

Inevitably, however, what has been argued so far on the public response to museums, is preliminary thoughts and hypotheses. The relationship of the non-intellectuals to the antiquity and their perception of museums is a multi-faceted issue, the significance and particularity of which need detailed study.
The present study set out to provide a critical look at the way in which the Greek archaeological heritage was presented through Greek museum displays of the period 1829-1909, as well as to outline the history of Greek archaeological museums during that period. To this end, and given that museums and displays are a mirror of their own time and society, priority was given to examining attitudes to the Greek archaeological heritage and concepts of the Greek antiquity in nineteenth and early twentieth century Greece, and the ways in which these were promulgated in the country. As a first step, work was undertaken to investigate whether or not there was an obvious ideological attitude towards the antiquities at both an official and a popular level. Research has shown that the official attitude towards the antiquities is well manifested, whereas there is a considerable gap of evidence as far as the mass of the Greek population is concerned. Therefore, this study focussed on the official expressions of ideology and made only a slight attempt to account for the public opinion.

A question of crucial importance was whether or not the Western idealisation of the Greek antiquity had any impact on the Greeks' perception of their past. It has been shown that the reverence of the classical tradition in the Western world has indeed affected the Greeks' apprehension of their own past, at least in as far as aesthetic appreciation of the antiquities and the approach to display was concerned.

However, Greek awareness of the affinity of modern Hellenism with classical Greece was also conditioned by the intellectual tradition of the neo-Hellenic Enlightenment and the recollections of antiquity in folk legends and
the oral tradition. Before the 1821 Revolution the notion that modern Greeks were the direct heirs of classical Greek culture, which it was their role to revive, had been advanced by the scholars of the neo-Hellenic Enlightenment, to whom the turn to the ancestors was linked with the achievement of independence. At a popular level, the affinity with the Greek past was brought to mind by the presence of the monuments and the oral tradition. Thus, in the Greek consciousness the monuments were an indispensable element of the landscape, both literal and cultural, which should remain \textit{in situ} as guardians and protectors of the land.

When the new Greek state was formed in 1830, for the first time after four centuries, the need to establish and pronounce its national identity as quite distinctive from that of other nations emerged as a fundamental political and ideological priority. We have seen how the structuring of a distinctive national identity and the subsequent standardisation of a national "tradition" as unique and crystallised is the only way for any new political formation to justify itself. In the Greek case, the legitimation of the existence of modern Greece was its link with classical Greece and the obvious proof of this link were the antiquities. We can thus understand why for the state the monuments were the only "ready" national symbols for use and why, in an effort to validate its \textit{raison d'\textsc{etre}}, the state promoted as authentic national tradition the tradition inherited from ancient Greece. Let us remind ourselves that even when the ideological perception of the Greek past was expanded to incorporate Byzantium and recent Hellenism, classical antiquity still remained a powerful model and the sense of a national identity continued to be sustained along the notion of affinities with ancient Greece. This is significant, because it explains why Greek archaeological museums were exclusively oriented towards classical antiquity, not only during the first decades after the formation of the Greek state, but even much later.
More specifically, it has been shown that the dominant attitude to the antiquities, mainly as expressed by the Archaeological Society, regarded them as splendid remnants of a glorious past, as reflections of the ancestors' incomparable art; in other words, the antiquities were seen and revered as sacred relics. The persistence of this view throughout the period under study is indeed striking and help us understand the art-historical orientation of Greek archaeological displays.

In brief, central to the Greek ideology was the view of the monuments as paramount symbols of national pride and identity. That the monuments were the very reason for the existence of modern Greece was a view widely held not only among Greeks, intellectuals and non-intellectuals, but also by Europeans who have often remarked that Greece was saved in consideration of her past. In this respect, the efforts to protect the monuments were not only a fundamental priority, but also a moral obligation: that is, the duty to prove the modern Greeks worthy of their heritage in the eyes of the world.

Within this frame, museums were initially and primarily conceived as depositories of antiquities. Later, however, developed the idea of the museum as a place from which archaeological knowledge could be diffused and where the public could develop appreciation of the fine arts. It is important to remember that throughout the period under study museums were conceived as places accessible to all members of society; they were established to the public benefit. What is more, according to the Archaeological Society, the display of antiquities was legitimate only if they would be accessible to a wide public. The theoretical orientation of the Greek museum was thus tripartite: deposition, education and public benefit. In practice, however, the educational and public mission of museums mainly translated into the provision of extended opening hours, and the publication of catalogues for public use. Yet, although museum legislation covered many of these issues, an
overall state policy for museums was never articulated. Museum legislation applied only to the Athenian museums, while provincial museums, apart from being ascribed a merely depository role (as defined once and for all in the archaeological law of 1834, and re-stated later in 1899), functioned without a legal frame.

Within this vaguely defined structure, the main initiative towards developing museums in the country was taken by the Archaeological Society of Athens. The "pioneer period" (1829-1874) of museum development was characterised by the effort to collect antiquities and safeguard them in "museums". No coherent programme of museum development existed; rather individual solutions were adopted as each particular case permitted. Things improved during the "formative period" (1874-1900), which saw the organisation of the large Athenian museums, especially the National Archaeological Museum and the Acropolis Museum, and the creation of museums in the provinces (let us recall that the first museum outside the capital was founded at Sparta in 1874). Yet it was only during what we have called the "expansion period" (1900-1909) that museum development seemed to be based on a more coherent programme and that a marked improvement in museum practices was observed. This was due not only to the almost exclusive involvement of the Archaeological Society in museum matters, but also to the appointment of permanent museum personnel for the first time.

As we have seen, a comprehensive theoretical conception of how the Greek archaeological heritage was to be displayed and presented in museums was never explicitly formulated. Nevertheless, implicit, in museum legislation and the wording used in archaeological journals and other documents, was an art-historical approach to displays, according to which exhibits should be arranged by chronology and type, and displayed in a "decent" and "elegant" way. The aesthetic view of displays was undoubtedly influenced by what was
being practiced in contemporary European museums; and yet, it has been noted, the simplicity of the display environment and the general appearance of the Greek displays was in marked contrast with that of most European museums. It cannot have been otherwise, since Greek displays sprang out of very different needs and had very different aims. In Greece displays were initially nothing more than a place where newly collected or newly discovered antiquities could be deposited and, as a consequence, exposed to public view. Their function was thus closely related to the general effort to protect the antiquities. However, we should not forget that protection was closely related to the purpose of confirming Greece’s links with her classical heritage and proving her efficiency in securing this heritage in the eyes of the world. Within this frame, display purpose extended beyond the need to preserve the antiquities in physical terms, to that of offering a visual authentication of the ancient heritage.

With this in mind, it becomes clear why, despite the fact that the majority of the Greek displays of the period 1829-1909 were set up with very limited human and financial resources and the discrepancies observed from one museum to the other, the idealised view of ancient Hellas left a clear imprint on the museum environment: on the whole, and wherever there was a choice, the antiquities were displayed as art-treasures, as tokens of a glorious ancestry; and because the symbolic nature of the antiquities as national emblems was, supposedly, given, only minimal effort was taken in providing some sort of interpretation. In this way, archaeological displays reflected the ideology of the new Greek state which exalted the ancient glory of Greece and attempted to appropriate this glory for validating its present existence. Further, displays served the political and ideological purpose of asserting and strengthening the Greek national identity by presenting the obvious links of modern Greece with ancient Greece, that is the antiquities.
The analysis has indicated that the neutral and generally aesthetic approach to the display of antiquities probably resulted in establishing a feeling of distance instead of achieving displays' declared purpose, to generate appreciation of archaeology and the fine arts. In this way, it has been argued, the sense of affinity with the classical past that displays were expected to promote, was probably curtailed rather than reinforced in the eyes of the public. However, the public view of museums and displays is a subject which needs detailed examination in a separate study. For the time being, our initial question, concerning the extent to which attitudes to the Greek antiquity are expressed through museum displays, has been answered. By way of their presentational mode, Greek displays of archaeology did project a particular view of the Greek antiquity, a view which was in accordance with the official state ideology, and which regarded the Greek antiquity as a sacred source of national pride.
APPENDICES
Appendix 1: MODEL FOR ARTEFACT STUDY
[BY S. PEARCE]

Artefact has material, history, environment, significance

1. material - construction and ornament
   - physical description, relevant records

2. material - design, of itself, of ornament
   - comparison with other artefacts to create typology sets

3. material - characterisation
   i. provenance
   ii. industrial techniques
   - comparison with other samples and artefacts

4. history
   i. its own history
   ii. its subsequent history
   iii. its practical function
   - dating, etc. techniques, relevant documentary research

5. environment - context
   i. micro
   ii. macro
   - on site recording, research

6. environment - location
   i. in the landscape
   ii. in relation to patternning
   - landscape and location studies

7. significance
   - chosen philosophical and psychological systems

8. interpretation - role of artefact in social organisation
   - sum of previous study, body of cultural knowledge and analytical techniques
Appendix 2: MODIFIED VERSION OF S. PEARCE'S MODEL FOR ARTEFACT STUDY [BY BERAHA]

- Exhibition has material, history, environment, significance
- Material - components
- Material - characterisation
- Material - provenance
- History - its own previous post opening
- Environment - micro macro
- Significance
- Description of artefacts, secondary material & display hardware, space & circulation patterns
- Reconstruction of brief, & style of presentation, typology sets
- Of collection, secondary material, and hardware
- Dating, previous activity on site, collection display history, post opening changes
- On site, location and audience on map, and patterning
- Chosen theoretical system
Appendix 3: SOURCES

A. Published Sources:

1) Museum Guides (see Bibliography)

2) Museum or collection catalogues (see Bibliography)

3) Greek and foreign archaeological periodicals (see List of Abbreviations)


5) Travellers' accounts and descriptions (see Bibliography)

6) Travellers' Guides (Baedeker; Guide Joanne; Guide Bleu)

7) Newspapers¹ (Αἰών, Δάφνη [Ηράκλειο], Ελπίς [Ηράκλειο], Εὔρητος [Χαλκίδα], Ευρώτας [Σπάρτη], Εφημερίς των Φιλομαθών, Θάρρος [Σύρος], Θεσσαλία [Βόλος], Ηώς [Σπάρτη], Η Ιδη [Ηράκλειο], Κήρυξ [Βόλος], Νέα Εφημερίς [Ηράκλειο], Παλιγγενεσία, Πατρίς [Σάμου], Πινακοθήκη, Φωνή του Λαού [Ηράκλειο], The Builder)

8) General bibliography

¹ Reference is not made here of those newspapers which have not yielded relevant to this study data.
9) Legislative acts (see chapter four, and *passim*)

10) Museum ground plans

B. Unpublished Sources:

1) Archive of the Archaeological Society of Athens. In particular, P. Eustratiades, *Archive*; also N. Balanos, *Remains* (see Bibliography)

2) Historical Archive of Hermoupolis, Syros

3) Archives of several Ephorates of Antiquities in Greece. In particular: *Delos Archive* (Archive of the KA' Ephorate of Antiquities in Mykonos); *Thebes Archive* (Archive of the Θ' Ephorate of Antiquities in Thebes)

C. Sources of Photographs:

1) Athenian museums' archives (National Archaeological Museum; Acropolis Museum; Benaki Museum; Epigraphic Museum)

2) Provincial museums' archives (Archaeological Museum, Volos; Archaeological Museum, Mykonos; Korghialenion Historical and Folk Museum, Argostoli; Historical Archive and Museum, Herakleion)

3) Other archives (Archaeological Society of Athens; Commercial Bank of Greece, Archive of Neoclassical Architecture; Historical Archive of Hermoupolis, Syros; Nikos Gheorghiades' personal archive, Sparta)
4) Photographic archives of foreign archaeological schools in Athens (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut; American School of Classical Studies, Corinth Annex; Ecole Francaise d' Athènes)

5) Foreign archives (Brandenburghisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, [ex-East] Berlin; Archäologisches Institut der Universität, Heidelberg; Foto Alinari, Rome)

6) Books

7) Periodicals and encyclopaedias

8) Old post cards

9) Photographs by the author
# Appendix 4: GENERAL DATA ON MUSEUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Accessible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First National Museum, Aegina</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theseion</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Ancient Monument</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casts</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1858 (?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varvakeion Lyceum</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1874 (?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Museum</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1881 (?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic School</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>State (+ private don.)</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphiareion</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1891 (?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematari</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1891 (?)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numismatic</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigraphic</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegina (local)</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1898 (?)</td>
<td>Yes (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>Accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syros</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1901 (?)</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1909-1910</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Corinth</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>No (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thera</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykonos</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauplion</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>No (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>State (+ private don.)</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaeroneia</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1905 (?)</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>State (+ private don.)</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykosoura</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfu</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Yes (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermon</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>No (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volos</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Arch. Society (+ private don.)</td>
<td>Purpose-built</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argostoli</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Arch. Society</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 5: GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attica (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. First National Museum, Aegina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Theseion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Casts Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Varvakeion Lyceum Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Polytechnic School Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Acropolis Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. National Archaeological Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Numismatic Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Epigraphic Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Eleusis Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Aegina (local) Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Euboia (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Chalkis Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Museums of the Archeological Society.
### Sterea Ellada (6)

14. *Amphiareion* Museum  
15. *Schematari* Museum  
16. *Delphi* Museum  
17. *Chaeroneia* Museum  
18. *Thebes* Museum  
19. *Thermon* Museum

### Peloponnese (7)

20. *Sparta* Museum  
21. *Olympia* Museum  
22. *Eidauros* Museum  
23. *Ancient Corinth* Museum  
24. *Nauplion* Museum  
25. *Lykosoura* Museum  
26. *Tegea* Museum

### Thessaly (1)

27. *Volos* Museum
Appendix 5: GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

Cyclades (4)

28. Syros Museum
29. Thera Museum
30. Mykonos Museum
31. Delos Museum

Ionian Islands (2)

32. Corfu Museum
33. Argostoli Museum

Crete (1)

34. Herakleion Museum
Appendix 6: MUSEUMS' CHARACTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Museums (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acropolis Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Olympia Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amphiareion Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Eleusis Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Epidauros Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ancient Corinth Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Delphoi Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chaeroneia Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Delos Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lykosoura Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tegea Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Thermon Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Urban (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Schematari Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Museums  (21)

14. First National Museum, Aegina
15. Theseion Museum
16. Casts Museum
17. University Museum
18. Varvakeion Lyceum Museum
19. Polytechnic School Museum
20. National Archaeological Museum, Athens
21. Numismatic Museum
22. Epigraphic Museum
23. Sparta Museum
24. Local Archaeological Museum, Aegina
25. Syros Museum
26. Thera Museum
27. Chalkis Museum
28. Mykonos Museum
29. Nauplion Museum
30. Thebes Museum
31. Herakleion Museum
32. Corfu Museum
33. Volos Museum
34. Argostoli Museum
# Appendix 7: MUSEUM BUILDING TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Building (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>First National Museum, Aegina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Casts</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>University</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Varvakeion Lyceum</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Polytechnic School</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>Numismatic</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Local Archaeological Museum, Aegina</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>Syros</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <em>Nauplion</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <em>Argostoli</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancient Monument (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. <em>Theseion</em> Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Purpose-Built (21)

12. *Acropolis* Museum  
13. *National Arhaeological Museum, Athens*  
15. *Sparta* Museum  
16. *Olympia* Museum  
17. *Amphiareion* Museum  
18. *Eleusis* Museum  
19. *Schematari* Museum  
20. *Epidauros* Museum  
21. *Ancient Corinth* Museum  
22. *Thera* Museum  
23. *Chalkis* Museum  
24. *Mykonos* Museum  
25. *Delphi* Museum  
26. *Chaeroneia* Museum  
27. *Delos* Museum  
28. *Thebes* Museum  
29. *Herakleion* Museum  
30. *Lykosoura* Museum  
31. *Corfu* Museum  
32. *Tegea* Museum  
33. *Thermon* Museum  
34. *Volos* Museum
Appendix 8: PERSONNEL OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICE (1829-1909)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Ephors of Antiquities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andreas Moustoxydes</strong> (1829-1832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolf Weissenburg</strong> (1833-1834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ludwig Ross</strong> (1834-1836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kyriakos Pittakes</strong> (1848-1863)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panaghiotes Eustratiades</strong> (1863-1884)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panaghiotes Stamatakes</strong> (1884-1885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panaghiotes Kavvadias</strong> (1885-1909)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sources: Sylloghe 1905; Leukoma 1937; Kokkou 1977; Petarakos 1987a.
2 Sources: Sylloghe 1905; Leukoma 1937; Kokkou 1977; Petarakos 1987a.
## Ephors of Antiquities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Positions and Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. Kampanes</td>
<td>Curator at Aegina in 1832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Iatrides</td>
<td>Aegina, 1832-1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Kokkones</td>
<td>Cyclades, 1833-1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Ross</td>
<td>Athens, 1833-1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Pittakes</td>
<td>Sterea Hellas, 1833-1836; Ephor of the Central Museum, 1836-1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achilleus Postolakas</td>
<td>Numismatic Museum 1856-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. Loghiotatides</td>
<td>Attica, Beotia 1862-1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Eustratiades</td>
<td>Athens, 1863-1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ath. Demetriades</td>
<td>Sterea Hellas and then Peloponnese, 1875-1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Stamatakes</td>
<td>Peloponnese and then Sterea Hellas, 1875-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Svoronos</td>
<td>Numismatic Museum 1877-1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Kavvadas</td>
<td>Cyclades, Euboia, 1879-1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Demetriades</td>
<td>Peloponnese, 1881-1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Philios</td>
<td>Thessaly, 1883-1888; Ephor of the Acropolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chr. Tsountas</td>
<td>Various parts of Greece 1883-1904; then Ephor in the National Archaeological Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Leonardo</td>
<td>Phthiotis, Phokis, Olympia 1885; Ephor of the Epigraphic Museum 1896-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Staes</td>
<td>Argolid, Corinthia, 1886; Ephor in the National Archaeological Museum from 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Kastriotes</td>
<td>Cyclades, 1887; then Ephor in the National Archaeological Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Kontoleon</td>
<td>Delphoi 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Kourouniotes</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Skias</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Stauropoulos</td>
<td>Cyclades 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh. Soteriades</td>
<td>West Greece, 1896-1912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: PERSONNEL OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Many Greek archaeologists worked initially in the Archaeological Society and then in the Archaeological Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Vlastos</td>
<td>Ephor in Cyclades in 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panaghiotes Stamatakes</td>
<td>Ephor in Sterea Hellas 1871-1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanassios Koumanoudes</td>
<td>Curator of the museum at the Polytechnic School from 1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassileios Philios</td>
<td>Ephor from 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrestos Tsountas</td>
<td>Ephor in 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassileios Leonardos</td>
<td>Ephor in 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrios Konstas</td>
<td>Ephor in 1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Skias</td>
<td>Ephor from 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantinos Kourouniotes</td>
<td>Ephor from 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostolos Arvanitopoulos</td>
<td>Volos 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantinos Rhomaios</td>
<td>Sparta 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lolos; D. Peppas</td>
<td>Delos 1909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10: Displays’ Profile

### 1. The Pioneer Period (1829 - 1874)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Display Layout</th>
<th>Display Hardware</th>
<th>Supporting Material</th>
<th>Display Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First National Museum, Aegina</td>
<td>Roughly typological</td>
<td>Shelves; chest of drawers</td>
<td>Identification labels (?)</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theseion</td>
<td>&quot;The most suitable according to size and shape&quot;</td>
<td>Wooden frames; wooden shelves; cupboards; glass cases</td>
<td>Catalogue numbers</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casts</td>
<td>According to provenance in the monuments</td>
<td>Pedestal</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>According to space suitability</td>
<td>University desks</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varvakeion Lyceum</td>
<td>Typological; geographical</td>
<td>Glass cabinets; grilled cabinets; tables</td>
<td>Catalogue numbers</td>
<td>Basic systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic School</td>
<td>Geographical; construction-material; chronological</td>
<td>Cases; wall cabinets</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Formative Period (1874-1900): The Athenian Museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Display Layout</th>
<th>Display Hardware</th>
<th>Supporting Material</th>
<th>Display Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>Chronological; construction-material; typological</td>
<td>Wooden shelves and scaffolds; cabinets, cases</td>
<td>Catalogue numbers; painted representations; names of rooms</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Archaeological</td>
<td>Chronicological; typological</td>
<td>Cases; cabinets; low, stone platforms; bases</td>
<td>Catalogue numbers; labels; case-headings; names of rooms</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>names of artists or donors; plaster casts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numismatic</td>
<td>Chose of representative coins</td>
<td>Display tables; coins cases; bookshelves</td>
<td>Identification labels</td>
<td>Scientific, systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigraphic</td>
<td>Unknown; probably mixed</td>
<td>Shelves (?)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Disorderly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3. The Formative Period (1874-1900): The Provincial Museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Display Layout</th>
<th>Display Hardware</th>
<th>Supporting Material</th>
<th>Display Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>Typological</td>
<td>Simple shelves; cabinets; cases</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Basic orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>Typological; chronological; construction-material</td>
<td>Stone pedestals; platforms; plaster shelves; very few cases</td>
<td>Catalogue numbers; scaled reconstructions</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphiareion</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>Typological; chronological; at times thematic</td>
<td>Stone pedestals; wooden shelves; cabinets; scaffolds</td>
<td>Catalogue numbers</td>
<td>Basic orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematari</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegina (local)</td>
<td>Unorderly</td>
<td>Glass cabinets; wooden shelves</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syros</td>
<td>Chronological; typological</td>
<td>Three glass tables</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Basic orderly (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidaurus</td>
<td>Provenance in the sanctuary</td>
<td>Platforms; shelves; small bases</td>
<td>Painted reconstructions</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The Expansion Period (1900 - 1909)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Display Layout</th>
<th>Display Hardware</th>
<th>Supporting Material</th>
<th>Display Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Corinth</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thera</td>
<td>Typological</td>
<td>Open shelves; stone bases; wall cabinets; small chests; tables</td>
<td>Catalogue numbers</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykonos</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Stone bases</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauplion</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphoi</td>
<td>Provenance-based; chronological</td>
<td>Stone bases; small wall shelves; platforms</td>
<td>Catalogue numbers; names of rooms; large scale reconstructions</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaeroneia</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Display cases</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Chronological; typological; size-based</td>
<td>Stone bases; plaster wall shelves; glass cases</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Basic systematic (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>Provenance-based</td>
<td>Cases; cabinets; bases</td>
<td>Case-headings</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykosoura</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Basic orderly (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfu</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Expansion Period (1900 - 1909) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Display Layout</th>
<th>Display Hardware</th>
<th>Supporting Material</th>
<th>Display Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>Provenance-based; typological</td>
<td>Stone platform; wall shelves; pedestals; cases; wall cabinets</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermon</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Store-like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volos</td>
<td>According to the state of preservation</td>
<td>Stone platforms; glass wall cases</td>
<td>Content of rooms on the walls; painted reconstructions</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argostoli</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Display cases</td>
<td>Case-headings; labels</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: STUDIES OF GREEK ARCHAEOLOGISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K. Pittakes</td>
<td>Greece (self-trained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Stamatakis</td>
<td>Greece (self-trained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Eustratiades</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Koumanoudes</td>
<td>Munich; Leipzig; Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Postolakas</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Svoronos</td>
<td>Athens; Paris; London; Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Leonardos</td>
<td>Vienna; sent to visit Italian museums by the Archaeological Society in 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Kavvadas</td>
<td>Munich; sent to visit Italian museums by the Archaeological Society in 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chr. Tsountas</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Kastriotes</td>
<td>Athens; Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Philios</td>
<td>Germany; sent to visit Italian museums by the Archaeological Society in 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Kourouniotes</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Stauropolos</td>
<td>Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gh. Soteriades</td>
<td>Athens; Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Keramopoulos</td>
<td>Athens; Berlin, Munich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Rhomaios</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Arvanitopoulos</td>
<td>Athens; Germany; Britain; Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Chatzidakas</td>
<td>Germany; Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Skias</td>
<td>Athens; Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Staes</td>
<td>Athens; Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 12: DISPLAY AUTHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MUSEUM</strong></th>
<th><strong>DISPLAY AUTHOR</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aegina</td>
<td>A. Moustoxedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theseion</td>
<td>K. Pittakes; P. Eustratiades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casts</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>St. Koumanoudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varvakeion Lyceum</td>
<td>St. Koumanoudes; P. Eustratiades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic School</td>
<td>St. Koumanoudes; Ath. Koumanoudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>P. Eustratiades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>P. Eustratiades; P. Kavvadius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numismatic</td>
<td>I. Svoronos; Ach. Postolakas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigraphic</td>
<td>V. Leonardos; G. Lolling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>P. Stamatakis; P. Kastriotes; D. Philios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>V. Leonardos; K. Kourouniotis; Germans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphiareion</td>
<td>V. Leonardos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>D. Philios; A. Skias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematari</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegina (local)</td>
<td>A. Pelekanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syros</td>
<td>N. Polites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td>P. Kavvadius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSEUM</td>
<td>DISPLAY AUTHOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Corinth</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thera</td>
<td>E. Vassileiou; E. Pfuhl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkis</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykonos</td>
<td>D. Stauropoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauplion</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>T. Homolle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaeroneia</td>
<td>Gh. Soteriades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>D. Stauropoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>A. Keramopoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion</td>
<td>Gh. Chatzidakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykosoura</td>
<td>K. Kourouniotes (G. Dickins; P. Kaloudes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfu</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>K. Rhomaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermon</td>
<td>Gh. Soteriades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volos</td>
<td>A. Arvanitopoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argostoli</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Plan 3: Athens' market during the Turkish occupation period; the Oula Bei bath is shadowed (Traulos 1960: fig. 140).
Plan 5: Varvakeion Lyceum (drawing by P. Kalkos). Ground plan of the first floor; probably similar to the ground floor which served as museum (Bires 1966: 147).
VI. Varvakinion.

Plan 7: Polytechnic School. Ground floor. The 1868 plan on which basis the central and foreground buildings were erected (Bires 1966: 157).
Plan 8: Polytechnic School. North wing: The Mycenaean room in 1881 (Milchhöfer 1881: 88; see caption of next plan).

Cases = 1: Contents of Schliemann's graves II and V (interior side); 2-4: Contents of Schliemann's grave III; 5-9: Schliemann's grave IV; 10-13: Schliemann's grave I; 14: Finds from outside the graves; 15-16: Finds from Tiryns; 17: Contents of Mycenae tomb IV.


North wall = vases on the windows parapets and in three cases.

East wall and around = Mycenaean relief gravestones.

Cases = I: Harpokrates' bronze figurines; II: Gods' bronze figurines; III: Gods' and goddesses' bronze figurines; IV: Bronze cult objects; V: Bronze sacred animals; VI: Wooden sculptures.


Table = relief stele.

Underneath the windows = fragmentary stone sculptures from funerary monuments.

Niche = stone sculptures.

In the middle = bronze female statuette.

Wall Cabinets = I-II: Early vases from Athens and the Cyclades; III: Small black figured lekythoi; IV-VII: Various black figured vases; VIII: Various black and red figured vases; IX-X: Red figured vases; XI-XII: Athenian white lekythoi; XIII-XV: Later vases.

Free-standing Cabinets = XVI: Corinthian pottery; XVII: Various vases; XVIII: Tanagraean vases; XIX-XX: Mainly red figured vases; XXI: Boeotian vases; XXII-XXIII: Mainly drinking vases; XXIV: Fragments of panathenaic amphorae and inscribed vases.

Cases = 1: Lamps; 2: Moulds; 3: Not described; 4: Byzantine coins; 5: Christian antiquities

Wall Cabinets = I: Archaic figurines from Tanagra and Tegea, marble figurines from Amorgos; II-IV: Beotian figurines; V-VII: Classical figurines from Tanagra and Aegina; VII-IX: Classical figurines of various provenances; I: Bronzes (helmets, mirrors, statuettes) from Peloponnese.

Cases = X: Figurine moulds from Kerameikos; XI: Clay tablets from Athens and Melos; 2-5: Bronzes from Attica, Boetia, Peloponnese; 6-7: Lead objects.
Plan 13: Ground floor of the Acropolis Museum in 1881 (Milchhöfer 1881: 51).
Plan 14: The Acropolis Museum after 1888 (Kokkou 1977: fig. 81).
Plan 16: Lange’s plan for the National Museum, 1860 (Kokkou 1977: fig. 87-88).
Plan 17: The west wing of the National Museum as completed by Kalkos in 1874 (Kokkou 1977: fig. 90).
I. Nationalmuseum.
(Centralmuseum, Patissianmuseum.)

Plan 19: The west wing of the National Museum in 1881 (Milchhöfer 1881: 1).
Plan 24: The National Museum after the extension of 1903-1906 (Staes 1907).
Plan 27: Contemporary ground plan of the Epigraphic Museum; the rooms used by 1909 are 1-4 (Peppa-Delmouzou 1966).
Plan 30: Amphiareion. The museum is marked Σ. (IIAE 1884: Pl. E).
Plan 32: Eleusis excavations in 1883. The museum is marked ΜΟΥΣΕΙΟΝ.
(IAE 1883-84: Pl. E).
Plan 33: Drawing of the Eleusis Museum by W. Dörpfeld in 1885 (Petrakos 1987a: fig. 35).
Plan 34: Eleusis. Plan of the site with the museum building on the left hand side: ΜΟΥΣΕΙΟΝ (Kourouniotes 1934).
ΕΛΕΥΣΙΣ
ΙΕΡΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΡΟΛΙΣ
ΑΠΡΙΛΙΟΣ - 1934

ΑΚΡΟΠΟΛΙΣ

ΛΗΜΝΗΡΙΟΝ ΤΕΙΧΙΣΜΑ
ΥΛΙΚΑ ΠΛΑΓΕΙΑ

ΕΞΑΣΠΥΡΙΟΝ
Plan 35: Contemporary ground plan of the Eleusis Museum. Rooms I-V are the original ones (Kanta 1979: 25).
Plan 36: Hermoupolis, Syros. Original ground floor plan of the Town Hall by E. Ziller (1873). Historical Archive of Hermoupolis, gen. cat. no. 50.
Plan 37: Epidauros. Partial view of the topographical plan of the site. The museum is the long, narrow building below the theatre (Kavvadias 1900b).
Plan 38: Thera Museum. Ground plan (Gaertringen and Wilski 1904: fig. 13).
Plan 40: Mykonos Museum. Ground plan. Rooms 1-4 are the original (Zapheiropoulou 1988: 6).
Plan 41: Delphi Museum. Undated plan of the facade and the roofs by A. Tournaire. EFA.
Plan 42: Delphi Museum. Drawing of the principal facade by A. Toumaire (31-10-1900), EPA.
Plan 45: Delphi Museum. Suggestion for the display by Replat (29-8-1904).
EFA, no. 445.
Plan 48: Lykosoura. Plan of the site in 1895 with the first store room marked ΜΟΥΣΕΙΟΝ. (ΠΑΕ 1896, Pl. 1).
Plan 49: Thermon. Partial plan of the site and the ΜΟΥΣΕΙΟΝ. Archive of the Sixth Ephorate of Antiquities, Patra.
Plan 51: Volos Museum. Ground plan. Rooms 1-3 are the original ones (Museum leaflet).