The "Face of Agamemnon"
Author(s): Oliver Dickinson
Source: *Hesperia*, Vol. 74, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 2005), pp. 299-308
Published by: American School of Classical Studies at Athens
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/25067959
Accessed: 06/07/2010 03:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://dv1litvip.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ascsa.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American School of Classical Studies at Athens is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Hesperia*.

http://dv1litvip.jstor.org

HESPERIA 74 (2005)
Pages 299–308

THE "FACE OF AGAMEMNON"

ABSTRACT

In this article, the author responds to the claim put forward by William M. Calder III in 1999 that the most famous burial mask from the Shaft Graves at Mycenae—that generally believed to be the one that Schliemann took for the "face of Agamemnon"—is a forgery, planted by Schliemann himself. From an analysis of the surviving documentation, it is argued that this theory is untenable, particularly since Schliemann did not originally associate this mask with Agamemnon.

The burial mask NM 624 (Fig. 1) from shaft grave V at Mycenae is one of the most widely recognized icons of the Aegean Bronze Age, and it is almost universally believed that Heinrich Schliemann identified it as the "face of Agamemnon."[1] Any argument that it is a forgery planted clandestinely in the grave by Schliemann to be "discovered" during excavation is, therefore, surely of more than specialist importance. This view was put forward in a relatively recent article by William Calder III,[2] a well-known expert on Schliemann who has shown in various publications that much of what Schliemann claimed about his early life is romanticizing fiction. The queries that he raised were supported in comments on the article by David Traill,[3] another well-known analyst of Schliemann's career, especially with regard to his work at Troy. Traill has been able to demonstrate at least one major falsehood in Schliemann's account of his excavations,

1. My thanks to Tracey Cullen for encouraging me to write this article and showing considerable patience during the lengthy period of its writing and rewriting; to the reviewers of the original draft for their comments; to Stephanie A. H. Skennell, Institute for Aegean Prehistory Schliemann Project Fellow at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, for very helpful comments on the documentation and on Emil Ludwig; to Penny Wilson, Librarian of the British School at Athens, for research in Athens on my behalf; to Katie Demakopoulou for a copy of her *Deltion* report (Demakopoulou 2002); to Tobias Mühlenbruch for copies of his article and for drawing my attention to, and providing copies of, the cited articles of W. Arentzen and R. Witte; to the American School of Classical Studies at Athens for permission to reproduce Figs. 1 and 2; to Sinclair Hood and the Trustees of the Knossos Trust for permission to reproduce Fig. 3; and to Jeff Veitch of the Department of Archaeology, University of Durham, for making the print for Fig. 3.

2. W. M. Calder III, in Harrington et al. 1999, pp. 53–55.

3. D. A. Traill, in Harrington et al. 1999, pp. 55–56.

© The American School of Classical Studies at Athens

Figure 1. Burial mask NM 624, from the southern burial in shaft grave V, Mycenae. Alison Frantz Photographic Collection, American School of Classical Studies at Athens

the circumstances in which the hoard nicknamed "Priam's Treasure" was found,[4] and he has previously expressed doubts about mask NM 624.[5]

Calder's arguments were opposed by Katie Demakopoulou, who was Director of the Prehistoric Collection in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens at the time of writing, and further commented on by other specialists, including myself.[6] In this article, I set out my criticisms of this theory in detail. The arguments of Calder and Traill can be questioned not only on grounds of their general plausibility and presentation of the archaeological setting (to say nothing of the implications concerning Schliemann's honesty and collusion by Greeks in the fraud), but also because they are based on a premise that I wish to dispute, that NM 624 is the mask that Schliemann identified as that of Agamemnon. I would argue, in opposition, that the Agamemnon mask was NM 623 (Fig. 2), from the same tomb. It follows that if the fine mask NM 624 was not Schliemann's "face of Agamemnon," he would have had little motive to forge it.

I first came to the conclusion that NM 623 was Schliemann's "face of Agamemnon" when, in the course of researching Schliemann for other

4. Traill 1984; but his suggestions that Schliemann incorporated finds made earlier on the site, purchases, and even possibly fakes into "Priam's Treasure"—as he has also suggested of the Shaft Graves—have not been accepted, to my knowledge.

5. Calder and Traill 1986, p. 134. Later, however, Traill (1995, p. 172) expressed a different view: "there are excellent reasons for assuming the mask's authenticity." In Harrington et al. 1999, pp. 55–56, he goes over the same ground, introducing the idea that it could be "an authentic find from a later tomb," apparently unaware that no such masks have ever been found in Mycenaean contexts except in the Shaft Graves and that no *major* tombs, of the kind that might produce such a mask, have been found on the acropolis of Mycenae; in the end, he is noncommittal.

6. K. Demakopoulou, in Harrington et al. 1999, pp. 57–58; for comments by others, see "Epilogue," p. 59.

Figure 2. Burial mask NM 623, from the northern burial in shaft grave V, Mycenae. Alison Frantz Photographic Collection, American School of Classical Studies at Athens

purposes, I read in Emil Ludwig's biography the text of a telegram reported to be "to the Minister." This reads, in the English translation: "In the last tomb three bodies, one without ornaments. Have telegraphed to Nauplia for a painter, to preserve the dead man *with the round face* [my italics]. This one is very like the picture which my imagination formed of Agamemnon long ago."[7] Surely, the "round-faced man" could refer only to NM 623. I briefly referred to this conclusion in an article published in 1976, and have since mentioned it privately to many colleagues, but was prompted to return to the point only by the publication of Calder's article.[8] I recently discovered that Reinhard Witte independently reached the same conclusion, and made some trenchant criticisms of Calder's arguments when Calder first presented them in a lecture, although, as Arentzen has pointed out, Calder and Traill appear to have ignored these criticisms completely.[9] Here, while not answering Calder point for point as Witte does, it is my intention to reopen the question with close attention to the documentation and history of the excavation.

It has proved impossible to verify the wording and even the existence of the telegram cited by Ludwig; the relevant copybook of Schliemann's correspondence was among those taken to Germany by Ernst Meyer "for safekeeping" during World War II, and apparently lost or destroyed there.[10] The text cited by Ludwig is remarkably similar, however, to that of a telegram sent by Schliemann to various Greek newspapers, and printed on December 3–4, 1876. This reads, in the translation made for Calder and

7. Ludwig 1931, p. 208.

8. Dickinson 1976, p. 164. It is remarkable, in view of their more recent writings, that Calder and Traill (1986, p. 238, n. 26) originally accepted this point: "It is clear, if rather surprising, that Schliemann regarded the mummy and its unprepossessing mask, rather than the 'Agamemnon' mask, as resembling Agamemnon." See also Traill 1995, p. 323, n. 1.

9. Witte 2000; Arentzen 2001, p. 189.

10. I am very grateful to Stephanie Skennell for information on this point. See further http://www.ascsa.edu.gr/archives/Gennadius/Schliemann/SchHistory.htm.

Traill: "In the last tomb there were three bodies, of which one was found without ornaments. I telegraphed to Nauplion for an artist to come here to draw the corpse which I referred to in my last telegram. This corpse very much resembles the image which my imagination formed long ago of wide-ruling Agamemnon."[11]

While Schliemann could well have used very similar language in different telegrams, one might conjecture that Ludwig "improved" the text of the newspaper telegram, perhaps drawing for dramatic effect on Schliemann's account of the body, in which the phrase "round face" appears.[12] Alternatively, perhaps more plausibly, he may have been given an elaborated version of the story handed down in the Schliemann family tradition, which could also have been the source of the story that Schliemann wrote in a telegram to the king of Greece "I have gazed upon the face of Agamemnon." These words constitute a factoid, a statement repeated in print so often that it is taken to be fact. It is by no means impossible that in later years Schliemann, an inveterate romancer, claimed this, as he certainly seems to have been claiming by 1889 that mask NM 624 was his "face of Agamemnon" (see below). In his contemporary account of the excavations, however, he records a much more restrained telegram in French, sent on November 28, 1876, and replied to by the king's secretary. In that telegram he stated that he had discovered the tombs that tradition, as reported by Pausanias, claimed as belonging to Agamemnon, Cassandra, Eurymedon, and their companions, and that these contained immense treasures, all of which he was giving to Greece.[13] In any event, the references to summoning an artist that are found in the telegrams sent to newspapers and "to the Minister" are very significant; there can be no doubt that Schliemann is referring there to the making of a painting of the supposedly mummified burial found in the north of grave V (Fig. 3), a figure whose face was covered by NM 623.

Here it is appropriate to insert a brief account of the excavation of grave V. In Schliemann's terminology, grave V was the First Grave, for upon removing three of the grave stelae that he had found together in late August within the circular wall of slabs that he had originally taken for tombstones, and subsequently believed to enclose an "agora," he discovered the mouth of a shaft cut into the rock. This discovery took place on October 25,[14] but for a long time more effort was put into other excavations, and it was only on November 9 that he began to concentrate effort within the Grave Circle, to discover the mouths of other graves and find the first burial, in the grave he called the Second Grave (now grave I), on November 13. This grave and others were cleared first, partly because their burial layers seem to have lain nearer to the surface, and so the grave discovered first actually came to be excavated last.

Schliemann discovered that there were three burials in grave V, each laid out with feet to west and head to east, and he apparently excavated them from the west eastward. The central one proved to be without goods, and he plausibly hypothesized that it had been robbed, thus explaining the scatter of small items found throughout the fill of the shaft above. The southern burial, with mask NM 624, was cleared next, and then that with

11. Calder and Traill 1986, p. 234.

12. Schliemann 1880, p. 296: "but of the third body, the round face, with all its flesh, had been wonderfully preserved." Emil Ludwig (1881–1948) was a professional biographer, whose work has been described as vivid and dramatic but sometimes unreliable (see *The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia,* 6th ed., 2005; http://www.infoplease.com, "Encyclopedia," s.v. Emil Ludwig); see also Traill 1995, pp. 7–8. S. Skennell (pers. comm.) writes: "Ludwig's approach to biography was consciously literary-artistic and he avoided scholarly references, but he did have access to considerably more first-hand documentation than survives today, as well as contact with Schliemann's widow and (I think) daughter." Skennell believes that it is possible that Schliemann "encountered an alternate, more elaborate account that is now lost, either because it was contained in one of the copying books removed by Meyer or because someone in Schliemann's family told it to him as a piece of (not necessarily reliable) oral tradition."

13. Schliemann 1880, pp. 380–381, cited in English in Traill 1995, p. 162; see also Harrington et al. 1999, p. 52.

14. Calder and Traill 1986, p. 179.

Figure 3. Painting of the northern burial in shaft grave V. Courtesy S. Hood and the Knossos Trust; after Demakopoulou 1990, p. 117

NM 623. The northern burial, with mask NM 623, attracted considerable interest, because it was so well preserved.[15] Not only did Schliemann have a painting made of it, he first preserved the body by chemical means and then removed it by cutting into the rock beneath it and excising the whole slab.[16] A lump of earth, 1.3 × 0.7 m in dimensions, that seemed to be part of this burial was rediscovered in the Athens National Museum some years ago, but investigation revealed only small fragments of bone, scraps of gold and bronze, and a few amber beads.[17]

It is important to note that Schliemann ended the excavation at Mycenae with this burial and not that covered by mask NM 624, for this point undermines Calder's argument that Schliemann wished to close the excavations with a spectacular find, i.e., NM 624. Although in his reports he does speak highly of the qualities of this mask, he gives much more space to the discovery of the burial with mask NM 623, which was, indeed, more lavishly supplied with precious goods than the other, although it had a less impressive mask and breastplate. The burial with NM 623 had many weapons associated with it, including swords with decorated gold

15. See above, n. 12.
16. See Schliemann 1880, p. 298, for the fullest account of this operation.
17. Demakopoulou 2002.

hilt-plates, as well as gold scabbard attachments and other ornaments, three gold cups, four silver cups and a silver jug (almost certainly from a Knossian workshop), and a Minoan stone chalice. A plain gold breastplate rested on the chest, on which, it seems, there once sat a hexagonal box to which golden plates decorated with animal art had been attached; a long golden band, with part of a sword attached, lay across the loins of the deceased.[18]

In contrast, the southern burial, on whose body was found mask NM 624 and the only decorated gold breastplate, was notably poor in precious vessels, having none in gold and only two in silver, together with an alabaster jug with a gilded bronze rim attachment.[19] Many weapons lay near the deceased, however, including a sword with fine gold hilt-plates; on the body were, as well as mask NM 624 and the breastplate, a gold armband and a gold necklace, while many amber beads and other smaller finds were also associated.[20]

Neither of these lists includes all of the goods placed with the dead on the occasion of their burial. A great deal more was found in grave V, although Calder is incorrect to say that it was the richest of the graves—that distinction belongs to grave IV, as correctly noted elsewhere by Traill.[21] Grave IV also contained far more of the well-known treasures from the Shaft Graves (e.g., the Siege Rhyton, the "Cup of Nestor," the Lion Hunt Dagger) than grave V.[22] Although Calder claims that no other Mycenaean grave contains a tenth of what was found in grave V (thus ignoring graves III and IV), comparable quantities of treasure can be found in those rare cases where Early Mycenaean graves have survived unplundered.[23] There is nothing suspicious about the quantities of treasure found in graves IV and V, which might suggest that Schliemann "improved" them with additions of his own, whether items excavated elsewhere on the site or duplicates and forgeries.

Calder and Traill do not seem to appreciate how rare it is to find intact princely burials in Mycenaean Greece, nor how unlikely it is that finds like those in the Shaft Graves would be discovered in the excavation of settlement strata. Indeed, at Mycenae itself, the Early Mycenaean levels, which would have to be the source of any items supposedly used by Schliemann to enhance the Shaft Grave finds,[24] have largely been effaced or covered

18. See Schliemann 1880, pp. 296–306, 308–314, 316–317, and Calder and Traill 1986, pp. 254–256 (*Times* letters XII and XIII), for references to goods with the northern burial, summarized in Karo 1930–1933, p. 37, and Dickinson 1977, p. 49.

19. This jug (NM 829) was a Minoan product, adapted in style from an Egyptian vessel (Warren 1969, p. 104).

20. See Schliemann 1880, pp. 295–296, 300–302, 307–308, and Calder and Traill 1986, pp. 256–257 (*Times* letter XIII), for references to goods with the southern burial, summarized in Karo 1930–1933, p. 37, and Dickinson 1977, p. 49.

21. Calder, in Harrington et al. 1999, p. 54; Traill 1995, p. 171. In point of fact, both graves III and IV contained more gold (by weight) than V; see also Karo 1930–1933, pp. 166–168.

22. In Dickinson 1977, pp. 48–49, I summarize the most important finds.

23. Calder, in Harrington et al. 1999, p. 54. For example, the most significant contents of the intact cist in the Vapheio tholos, reported to have been arranged as if around a body, were 13 precious vessels, 14 weapons and implements, and 23 sealstones (Dickinson 1977, p. 90; the original report is Tsountas 1889, pp. 136–172), while the main pit in the Dendra tholos (which held two burials, but most of the items were associated with the "king") produced 10 precious vessels, nine very ornate weapons, four metal sealrings, seven sealstones, and glass ornaments that seem to have decorated some form of headgear (Persson 1931, pp. 31–39).

24. There can be no doubting the early date of all but one or two items found by Schliemann in the Shaft Graves. The only clear exceptions are two Late Mycenaean Psi figurines supposedly found in grave I.

over by later Mycenaean building activity, particularly in the area of the acropolis where Schliemann was excavating. Further, the excavations at Mycenae by Schliemann's successors, although far more extensive than his, have failed to turn up anything like the Shaft Grave treasures, either in graves or settlement strata, apart from Grave Circle B.[25]

It is difficult to see how Schliemann could have inserted a whole collection of forgeries into his finds without large-scale collusion on the part of his workforce and also of the Greek archaeologists under whose supervision he was working, or to imagine how he could have had work of such quality made so quickly. This theory has been criticized by several scholars, who have drawn attention to the difficulty of providing models for the forgeries, ordering them without leaving any written trace, and bringing them to Mycenae and placing them clandestinely in the burial layer.[26] In this connection it may be noted that the "Cup of Nestor," which Traill singles out as a potential forgery added to the Shaft Grave material,[27] would not in fact be a good representation of Nestor's cup as described in the *Iliad* (11.632–635); that cup has *four* handles, not two, and two birds per handle. Traill's alternative suggestion, that if the cup is genuine it is of Late Helladic IIIC date, is extremely implausible, since there is no clear evidence that vessels of gold were being produced at all in the Mycenaean world by then. Its links with material of the Middle and early Late Bronze Age are much clearer.[28]

Traill suggests that Schliemann had ample time to plant the mask. He writes:

> If we examine Schliemann's diary, it is clear that grave V had been excavated to within a meter or so of the burials by November 20. Given nine full days and nights, Schliemann was certainly capable of finding a way of adding the Agamemnon mask to the mud of grave V.[29]

Yet Schliemann had no reason to believe that there were gold burial masks on any of the dead until the resumption of excavation on November 28, when the three masks in grave IV were discovered, as his diary entry shows.[30] Two of these show notable points of comparison with NM 624, as has often been observed.[31] Thus, the time-scale within which Schliemann would have had to work is far shorter than Traill allows. It is difficult to see how the insertion of the mask could have been achieved when Schliemann was working under the constant supervision of Panagiotis Stamatakis, the Director of Antiquities, who was assisted from November 28 by other archaeologists sent from Athens, and by a guard of Greek soldiers on the site. Another pressing question is how Schliemann could have found

25. The original source of the "Acropolis Treasure," discovered at Mycenae in 1877 and reported in Schliemann 1880, chap. XI, is not known, but was certainly not the probable grave in which it was found; see Thomas 1939.

26. See, in particular, Masson 1995, p. 595; also K. D. S. Lapatin, in Harrington et al. 1999, p. 59.

27. Traill 1995, p. 174.

28. Traill 1995, p. 174. The vessel is illustrated and discussed in Schliemann 1880, pp. 235–239. See Davis 1977, pp. 183–186, with figs. 148–150, for a good modern discussion.

29. Traill, in Harrington et al. 1999, p. 56.

30. Calder and Traill 1986, p. 202.

31. See, e.g., comments by K. Demamakopoulou and J. G. Younger in Harrington et al. 1999, pp. 57 and 59, respectively.

the exact spot to place the mask (which, as he describes it, was found over the skull).[32]

Circumstantial evidence that Schliemann at this time regarded the northern burial in grave V as that of Agamemnon is provided by his choice of mask NM 623 for the frontispiece to chapter X of *Mycenae,* where he sets out his argument that the burials in the Shaft Graves are those of Agamemnon and his murdered following.[33] He uses an image of mask NM 624 to head the general account of the excavation of grave V in chapter IX.[34] It also seems noteworthy that William Gladstone, in his introduction to *Mycenae,* clearly understood Schliemann to be arguing that the northern burial in grave V was Agamemnon.[35] Schliemann, however, never proclaimed in any of his letters to the *Times* that he had found Agamemnon, and he made no attempt in the publication of his excavations to identify Agamemnon with any particular burial.

Why did Schliemann not do this? One can only speculate that he felt himself presented with a quandary. In many respects the northern burial would seem more appropriate for Agamemnon, because of its well-preserved state and the generally richer and more spectacular goods associated with it; but the southern burial had a much finer mask and breastplate. So perhaps, perceiving a potential contradiction, Schliemann deliberately left obscure the question of which burial he believed to be Agamemnon. He might also have seen it as a problem that grave IV was richer, and contained many more elaborate finds, than grave V. To judge from a statement of Karl Schuchhardt's, by 1889 Schliemann evidently believed that the burial with mask NM 624 was that of Agamemnon;[36] but by that time he could quite possibly have confused the details of what was found with which burial in his own mind. Certainly, Georg Karo had no doubt which burial Schliemann took to be Agamemnon when he wrote his magisterial catalogue of the Shaft Grave finds,[37] while, as Tobias Mühlenbruch has pointed out, Schuchhardt himself erroneously stated in 1941 that mask NM 624 came from the northern burial.[38]

For all the spectacular finds that he had made, Schliemann left Mycenae in a state of considerable frustration and never returned.[39] The Department of Antiquities and Stamatakis had tried to control his activities closely,

32. Schliemann 1880, p. 296.

33. Schliemann 1880, p. 333, no. 473.

34. Schliemann 1880, p. 289, no. 474.

35. W. E. Gladstone, in Schliemann 1880, pp. xxxi, xxxvii–xxxviii.

36. Quoted in Traill 1995, p. 297, from Schuchhardt's autobiography, when recalling a meeting with Schliemann in July 1889: "He was also angry that I had refused to consider the remains with the bearded mask to be Agamemnon, and on many other points."

37. Karo 1930–1933; see p. 37: "An der Leiche im Süden des Grabes, *seinem Agamemnon* . . ." [my italics].

38. Mühlenbruch 2003, p. 48. Unfortunately, earlier on the same page Mühlenbruch himself places the two burials at the wrong ends of grave V, i.e., the burial with NM 623 in the south and that with NM 624 in the north, though he correctly notes that Schliemann seems to have taken NM 623 to be the "face of Agamemnon," citing Witte 2000, p. 24.

39. See his comments in a letter to Max Müller written on December 31, 1876: "Believe me, I have had hard times at Mycenae. I had an overseer not a bit better than that furious Turk whom I had at Troy. . . . They all beg me to continue the work; but I won't do it" (quoted in Meyer 1962, p. 95). According to his diary entry dated Sunday, November 13 (actually November 12), Schliemann seems to have wanted to complete the excavations much earlier: "Wishing to terminate the excavations today in order to leave tomorrow morning" (quoted in Calder and Traill 1986, p. 191). Calder and Traill (p. 220, n. 188) suggest that this was "mere dramatization after the fact," but it is hard to see a rationale for this, since this

which is hardly surprising in view of the fact that he had smuggled "Priam's Treasure" out of Turkey and had been sued in Athens for its return by the Turkish Government. They were surely justified in taking such precautions, but Schliemann chafed fiercely against any restraint; he wanted a completely free hand. This, together with the increasingly bad weather, which often made it difficult to find workmen, is to my mind the most likely explanation for his rather abrupt departure from Mycenae, on which Calder and Traill characteristically place a more sinister interpretation. It is, perhaps, more surprising that the only publication that he produced of the finds at Mycenae was an edited version of his letters to the *Times*. This might be seen as another sign of his frustration, compounded by the fact that, as he rather characteristically commented, in a letter to Émile Burnouf, Director of the French School of Archaeology, "unfortunately, nothing is mine except the glory."[40]

The curious statement made by a local reporter of the *Argolis* newspaper on December 2, 1876, that mask NM 624 had no mustache[41] may support the possibility that the mask was "improved" during restoration,[42] but it is very hard to believe that a whole mustache could have been added. This alteration would have to have been made at a very early stage, since the mustache is clearly visible in the photograph used by Schliemann in *Mycenae,* which also appeared in the German and British versions of the book in 1878, and is discussed in some detail by Schliemann in his description of the piece.[43] Schliemann himself could not have had this done, for, as Arentzen points out, Stamatakis certainly would have noticed any attempt to change the mask's appearance so markedly.[44] Indeed, Arentzen makes the point that the "Hohenzollern facial hair" and "Winckelmann's Greek nose" that Calder had detected and thought suspicious in the mask[45] apparently did not impress contemporaries of Schliemann such as Charles Newton of the British Museum and the Irish scholar J. P. Mahaffy, who saw and actually handled the finds at a very early stage and deplored the overenthusiastic cleaning of the finds by the National Museum's conservators.[46] Mahaffy too would surely have noticed any changes made to the appearance of mask NM 624 between seeing and handling the finds in the National Bank of Greece and seeing them on display in the National Museum.

No doubt it is disappointing to have mask NM 624 dissociated from the "Agamemnon" story, but it seems to me that the conclusion is inescapable. This conclusion has the merit of exonerating not only Schliemann, but a good many people associated with him in one way or another, from the charge of foisting a fraud on the public. Further data may yet come from Stamatakis's still unpublished diary, or from unpublished correspondence of Schliemann's. But there seems no reason to doubt, on all the indications presently available, that mask NM 624 was found in precisely the circumstances that Schliemann described. Whatever questions may be raised about Schliemann's general behavior and veracity, and his claims about the circumstances in which finds (especially "Priam's Treasure") were made at Troy, there seems no good reason to suppose that he falsified his discoveries at Mycenae by incorporating forgeries, particularly not mask NM 624.

statement was never published in a *Times* letter, let alone in his book. He fumed at the delay that forced the closure of the excavations on November 26–27; see the letter to Müller quoted by Calder and Traill (1986, p. 227, n. 265), also in Meyer 1962, p. 93. My impression is that he left as soon as he reasonably could, if in a bad mood.

40. Quoted in Ludwig 1931, p. 209.

41. Cited by both Traill and Lapatin, in Harrington et al. 1999, pp. 56 and 58, respectively.

42. Considered as a possibility by Lapatin, in Harrington et al. 1999, pp. 58–59.

43. Schliemann 1880, p. 289, fig. 474; the mask is discussed on p. 312.

44. Arentzen 2001, p. 190.

45. Calder, in Harrington et al. 1999, p. 55.

46. Arentzen 2001, pp. 191–192. Arentzen also argues that the attractive reddish "bloom" on the gold objects, whose loss through cleaning Mahaffy deplored, must have been present on NM 624, like the other goldwork, and could hardly have been counterfeited by a modern goldsmith. This is an interesting additional argument for the mask's authenticity, but it is inferential, for Mahaffy only refers specifically to the "bloom" on the cups.

REFERENCES

Arentzen, W. 2001. "An Early Examination of the 'Mask of Agamemnon,'" *AntCl* 70, pp. 189–192.

Calder, W. M., III, and D. A. Traill, eds. 1986. *Myth, Scandal, and History: The Heinrich Schliemann Controversy and a First Edition of the Mycenaean Diary,* Detroit.

Davis, E. N. 1977. *The Vapheio Cups and Aegean Gold and Silver Ware,* New York.

Demakopoulou, K., ed. 1990. *Troy–Mycenae–Tiryns–Orchomenos. Heinrich Schliemann: The 100th Anniversary of His Death,* Athens.

———. 2002. "Εθνικό Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο," *ArchDelt* 52, B′1 (1997), pp. 1–3.

Dickinson, O. T. P. K. 1976. "Schliemann and the Shaft Graves," *GaR* 33, pp. 159–168.

———. 1977. *The Origins of Mycenaean Civilisation,* Göteborg.

Harrington, S. P. M., W. M. Calder III, D. A. Traill, K. Demakopoulou, and K. D. S. Lapatin. 1999. "Behind the Mask of Agamemnon," *Archaeology* (July/August 1999), pp. 51–59.

Karo, G. 1930–1933. *Die Schachtgräber von Mykenai,* Munich.

Ludwig, E. 1931. *Schliemann of Troy: The Story of a Gold-Seeker,* trans. D. F. Tait, London.

Masson, O. 1995. "Recherches récentes sur H. Schliemann," *RÉG* 108, pp. 593–600.

Meyer, E. 1962. "Schliemann's Letters to Max Müller in Oxford," *JHS* 82, pp. 75–105.

Mühlenbruch, T. 2003. "Noch einmal zur 'Maske der Agamemnon,'" *Heinrich-Schliemann-Gesellschaft Ankershagen Informationsblatt* 15, pp. 48–50.

Persson, A. W. 1931. *The Royal Tombs at Dendra near Midea,* Lund.

Schliemann, H. 1880. *Mycenae: A Narrative of Researches and Discoveries at Mycenae and Tiryns,* New York.

Thomas, H. 1939. "The Acropolis Treasure at Mycenae," *BSA* 39, pp. 65–87.

Traill, D. A. 1984. "Schliemann's Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure': A Re-examination of the Evidence," *JHS* 104, pp. 96–115.

———. 1995. *Schliemann of Troy: Treasure and Deceit,* London.

Tsountas, C. 1889. "Ἔρευναι ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ καὶ ὁ τάφος τοῦ Βαφειοῦ," *ArchEph* 1889, pp. 129–172.

Warren, P. M. 1969. *Minoan Stone Vases,* Cambridge.

Witte, R. 2000. "Die 'Maske des Agamemnon' oder Erkenntnisgewinn durch Diskussion," *Heinrich-Schliemann-Gesellschaft Ankershagen Informationsblatt* 12, pp. 22–24.

Oliver Dickinson

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS AND ANCIENT HISTORY
38 NORTH BAILEY
DURHAM DH1 3EU
UNITED KINGDOM

oliver@odickinson.freeserve.co.uk