

KTp 71m

2
/

THE IMPERIAL
GERMAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE



BY
AD. MICHAELIS

REPRINTED FROM THE
JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES, VOL. X.
1889



71m
RTP

THE IMPERIAL GERMAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE.

FEW English scholars have an exact knowledge of the history, the constitution, and the labours of the German Archaeological Institute, although the existing science of classical archaeology may be roughly said to be a creation of that Institute. So when, some months ago, an authoritative paper by Professor Michaelis of Strassburg, a member of the Central Direction, appeared in the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, supplying exactly such information on these matters as should be current among us, the Editors of this Journal thought that the opportunity thus offered was one of which advantage should be taken. Accordingly permission was obtained from Professor Michaelis and the Editors of the *Jahrbücher* to publish in these pages a translation of the article. The translation was undertaken by Miss Alice Gardner; and Professor Michaelis has himself made some additions to the text to fit it more completely for an English audience. [ED.]

Scientific institutions, which take their functions seriously, live a silent life. This is a result of the very nature of scientific work, which in most points of its manifold occupations cannot appeal to a wide public. Only in case of especially important discoveries, or of conspicuous performances, and on festal occasions do such institutions step out of their quiet round of work into public light, and demand the sympathy of wider circles.

Such an occasion arose ten years ago, when the Archaeological Institute at Rome, on the 21st of April 1879, celebrated in the midst of wide sympathy, in its new stately mansion on the Capitol, the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation. Delegates from different quarters met on the Tarpeian rock and congratulatory letters were received: among others a sympathetic letter of the Trustees of the British Museum and a very elegant Latin address from Cambridge University. Especially we Germans called to mind with pleasure the share which German scholars had taken in the foundation and progress of the Institute. In all our journals the importance of the occasion was recognised with expressions of goodwill and sympathy. The circumstance that the 'Institute of Archaeological Correspondence' was founded in 1829 in Rome, and that this festival attached especially to this Roman Institute, made it easy to forget, or at least not sufficiently to remember, that meanwhile the Roman Institute had acquired a worthy parallel at Athens, and that both Institutes were in fact branches of a German Archaeological

RTP 21m



THE IMPERIAL GERMAN ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE. 191

Institute, the headquarters of which are in Berlin, and a great part of the sphere of its activity in Germany. In fact that very festival contributed not a little to the notion still widely spread, that the work of the Institute is confined to Rome. The German Institute seemed absorbed in the Roman, with which so many travellers, in their winter journeys in Italy, made a more or less hasty acquaintance, of which probably in many cases they first heard at Rome. Thus it is easy to understand how the interest of the public, so far as it concerns itself with such a scientific institution, is accustomed to turn exclusively to the Roman Institute and its occasional utterances.

I will endeavour in the following pages to show that this way of regarding the matter is too narrow, and does not correspond to the facts as regards the Institute. Scholars in general may be glad to acquire a more correct view of the Institute as a whole. In order to make clear in what ways the limits of its activity have been gradually widened, it seems necessary first to give a slight sketch of the history of the Institute.¹

I.

The 'Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica' was founded in the year 1829 as a private undertaking. The real founder and the soul of the whole was Eduard Gerhard, supported principally by Bunsen and Panofka. The most important archaeological scholars in Germany and Italy shared earnestly in the work. There were joined with them a few colleagues from England, Denmark, and Greece; outside Germany and Italy an important contingent was furnished only by Paris, where archaeological studies flourished, under the presidency of the noble Duc de Luynes, then often called 'le dernier gentilhomme de la France,' who had already given important aid in the preliminary discussions in regard to the foundation of such an international scientific union. This is not the place to detail the friction and disagreements which took place during many years between the French group, led by the Duc de Luynes, and the Germans and Italians, under Gerhard and Bunsen, both parties aiming at taking the leading part in the Institute. At last in 1836 a compromise was made, by which Rome was recognized as centre of the Institute, but greater independence was allowed to the French section, the place of publication alternating between Rome and Paris. So matters remained until the revolution of February. The political storms to which France was exposed in 1848 quenched there for the moment all scientific interests. The Duc de Luynes, a strong supporter of the white banner, alike from family tradition and from personal conviction, gave up all hope of the permanence of the Institute, and on the 12th of May 1848 the French section announced, through its secretary M. De Witte, that with the completion of the last year's volume

¹ Comp. the author's *Geschichte des deutschen archäologischen Instituts*, 1829—1879. Berlin, 1879. (Also in Italian: *Storia dell' Istituto*, etc., Rome, 1879.)

their share in the labours of the Institute ceased. Thus only the Italians and the Germans remained.

The correspondence, whence the Institute had taken its name, was in these first twenty years of its existence the chief source of activity of the Institute, owing to the difficulty of travelling and the want of scientific journals. Its centre was the Roman Secretariate, which from the first was almost regularly in the hands of German Scholars; Bunsen, Gerhard, Panofka, Kellermann (a Dane), Emil Braun, Lepsius, Wilhelm Abeken, and Henzen form a noble series of names. Besides occasional separate publications the Institute published yearly three volumes. The Monthly Gazette or *Bullettino* gave a current account of new discoveries. The *Monumenti Inediti*, appearing in large folio form, twelve plates a year, gave reproductions of important monuments for the most part unpublished. A volume of *Annali* contained longer or shorter scientific treatises among which discussions of the large plates occupied most space; smaller plates (*Tavole d' aggiunta*) served for supplement or for publication of smaller works of art. The language of these papers was either Italian or French, even the titles of the volumes being bi-lingual; Latin also was allowed. German was forbidden, although German contributors formed a majority, on the obvious ground that the use of that language would have kept away Italian correspondents, on whose zealous support it was necessary to rely for furnishing material. The same languages were used in the weekly sessions of the Institute in winter, the so-called 'adunanze.' The Italians were obliged, German being forbidden, to accept as currency that extraordinary dialect which acquired the name of 'il barbaro dell' Istituto.'

The weakest side of the Institute was the financial. At first the revenue was derived only from the produce of the publications, but the difficulty and irregularity of the bookselling business, caused by the remoteness of Rome and by imperfect postal institutions, made this resource a very unsatisfactory basis for a reasonable finance. It was often necessary to trust to advances made by the secretaries, and the inexhaustible liberality of the Duc de Luynes did much to keep the ship afloat. The Papal Government was not disposed to support the 'Prussian' Institute, and it was a matter for congratulation if no enmity was displayed. On the other hand the Prussian treasury at first felt a difficulty in subsidising a 'foreign' and private undertaking. Only on the accession of Frederick William IV., the protector of the Institute from its beginning, a modest salary was paid by the State to the first secretary, and later to the second also, a grant of about £200 first placing the finances in a tolerable condition. The responsibility of the Institute still continued for all other expenses, no small matter considering the unsatisfactory character of the trade in books at a time of so much political disquiet.

Amid such financial difficulties the Institute, passing after Braun's death (1856) into the judicious hands of Wilhelm Henzen and Heinrich Brunn (the latter being later replaced by Wolfgang Helbig), performed a work of great importance on behalf of archaeology and Latin epigraphy. In addition

to its strictly scientific work it became a sort of academy for training young scholars, particularly from Germany and other northern lands. Rising Italian students also took an eager part in the Institute, which in their opinion was half Italian. French archaeologists rarely stayed at Rome or assisted personally in the work of the Institute which, however, some of them supported by correspondence or contributions; generally they gravitated more and more to the French School of Athens established in 1846. The clearer that the influence of the Institute on German learning grew, especially in supplying the chairs of archaeology in the German Universities, by this time universal, the more incumbent it became on the State to give more liberal assistance. This did not, it is true, strike the smaller German states, but it was one of the beneficial actions of the Prince Regent of Prussia to carry out his brother's intention in increasing the grant to the Institute to £875. By that sum, besides the salaries of the secretaries, provision was made for scientific publications, a fixed revenue secured to the library, which had hitherto been almost dependent on charitable contributions, and two travelling scholarships founded for young archaeologists. In a truly liberal spirit it was provided that these students need not be born Prussians so long as they had taken a doctor's degree or passed examinations in Prussia; and in fact most of the secretaries had come from other German states. As a necessary consequence the relations of the Institute to the Direction which sat in Berlin under Gerhard's presidency underwent a change. That Direction ceased to be merely a board of reference for the secretaries, partly scientific and partly administrative, and became, in virtue of the larger grant and the award of scholarships, a Direction responsible to the State. The secretaries were not yet, it is true, functionaries of the State, but their relation to the Central Direction became closer and more definite.

This was but the first step in the passage of the 'Instituto prussiano' into a public institution of the Prussian State. A complete assumption of this relation was brought about by the Central Direction in conjunction with the Secretaries at Rome in 1867, with a view to certain great advantages, such as complete protection of the Institute established in a foreign country from all political aggressions, close relations with the Berlin Academy, and the establishment of the secretaries as state officers with a claim to pension. On July 18, 1870, King William accepted the arrangement, and on March 2, 1871, he signed as Emperor at Versailles the new statute. The change not unnaturally passed without public notice in so momentous a time. More attention was aroused when in 1874, on the motion of the German Reichstag, the Institute, which had always been pan-Germanic in character, ceased to be connected with the Prussian State, and became attached to the German Empire. The Central Direction in Berlin was strengthened by the addition of four archaeologists resident in other German universities; four travelling scholarships for classical archaeology and a fifth for students of Christian archaeology, each of £150 per annum, were constituted in the place of the two which existed, and thrown open to all German subjects; a considerable increase in the grant, now

amounting to nearly £5,000, allowed the Institute to plan and carry out on a larger scale its various undertakings.

It is thus evident how slowly and gradually the transformation of the Institute was accomplished. It was not till after it had, by its innate vitality, sustained successfully an anxious struggle of many years, and thereby given full proof of its deserts, that it was able to receive the reward of its faithful labours. But the increase in its funds was by no means to be confined to operations in Rome. At the suggestion of the Central Direction the transformation of the Institute into an Imperial Institution was at once associated with a widening of its sphere by the establishment of a Branch Academy at Athens. At the time of the foundation of the Roman Institute, in 1829, the political state of Greece was not such as to allow of such a project, and it seemed sufficient to use the publications of the Roman Institute as the medium also of making known discoveries in Greece. But when in Greece the state of the country became more settled, when excavations were undertaken which led to great results, when scientific travellers of all nations began, in perpetual succession, to explore the land from end to end,—it became more and more evident what rich treasures were here to be brought to light, and also how inadequate to the task of discovery and of exploitation were either the unaided efforts of the Greeks themselves or the occasional attempts of passing strangers. The right course was marked out by the above-mentioned French school, which had both rendered eminent services to the more exact knowledge of Greek lands and Greek art, and was also serving as an excellent training institute for the younger generation of French archaeologists. Nor could any more opportune moment be chosen for the establishment of a similar institution for Germans than the time at which the German Empire was starting its epoch-making excavations in Olympia. Nor could the tasks which called for the activity, in Greece, of any archaeology ready to wield the shovel as well as the pencil or pen, be regarded as of less importance than those which lay nearest to the Roman Institute, such as the complete exploration of Italy. On the contrary, in proportion to the greater dignity and originality of Greek art as compared with that of Italy, to the greater amount of virgin soil in the Archipelago and the neighbouring lands of ancient Greek population in comparison with the well investigated homes of ancient Italian civilization, was the certainty of the hope that the new work to be undertaken from Athens would yield rich results which might further the progress of science towards the solution of its most important problems. From the archaeologist's point of view, there could be no doubt that the younger academy must rank as at least equal in dignity with the older sister-academy in Rome, though possibly to the general public the latter, being old-established and personally known to many, continued to take precedence, or even to be still regarded as *the* Institute. The works of the Athenian Institute were to be found—with the exception of some separate publications—in the *Mittheilungen* of which there appeared annually a stout octavo volume accompanied by plates. In outward appearance it corresponded generally to the Roman *Annali* except that it

was not accompanied by a folio publication of *Monumenti inediti*, and thus there was no connection between the text and the illustrations of such monuments as were too large to be reproduced in the plates. Monthly reports were also dispensed with. Although in the case of contributions from members of other nations, foreign languages were not excluded, yet even with them the use of German greatly preponderated, since among Greek scholars, in consequence of their studies abroad, the knowledge of German has become so general, that the necessary association with the natives of the country has not been, as formerly in Italy, hindered by linguistic difficulties.

Although the establishment of the Athenian branch implied a remarkable extension of the original Institute—doubled in fact its functions and its sphere of activity—yet the ends and the means of the new Imperial Institute were not confined to these two foreign localities. A third centre for investigations had sprung up in Germany itself. As early as the year 1843, Gerhard had started in Berlin the *Archaeologische Zeitung* as a lesser German organ of his favourite foundation, the Roman Institute. When the Central Direction took this journal in hand, the bond was tightened which already bound the journal to the Institute. Beside the various publications in foreign tongues issued from Rome and the Athenian *Mittheilungen*, the *Zeitung* represented primarily German archaeological work. But for this last, tasks were preparing of an entirely different character.

The annual budget of the Central Direction placed at its disposal a certain sum 'for special scientific undertakings originating in the Institute.' Of all the functions which archaeological science is in our days called to fulfil none is more pressing than the collection and publication of all existing or traceable monuments. Latterly, active progress has been made in simple tabulation by means of accurate catalogues, although many very important collections are still without a good list of their contents. But this process is no more satisfactory than catalogues of manuscripts of ancient authors. Works of art cannot be studied without reproductions—descriptions cannot enable us to see things. But reproductions only exist to a very insufficient extent. Archaeologists have only too long contented themselves with publishing and explaining the particular monuments that they came across more or less by hap-hazard, and they have often seemed quite unconscious that work on such fragmentary material can lead to no sure results. Here and there indeed one of the older Italians has attempted to collect together the monuments of one kind—as Pietro Sante Bartoli has done for the terracotta lamps, Gori for the so-called diptychs with their ivory reliefs, Ficoroni for the leaden seals—but these were, both in the kind of the monuments and in the execution of the design, efforts of modest scope. One man clearly perceived what was wanted—George Zoega, the founder of sound method in archaeology,—and he personally undertook the collection of Roman marble-reliefs; but the publication of these was, unfortunately, soon interrupted by his death. His example was followed by Eduard Gerhard, who publicly declared: 'No class of ancient works of art has as yet been treated in a clear and comprehensive way, so as to take account of the whole supply that has

come to hand, and to the arbitrary character of a mere fancy choice are we to attribute the fact that our knowledge of the old art-monuments is entirely wanting in a firm foundation.' Gerhard, whose favourite proverb was, 'Monumentorum artis qui unum vidit nullum vidit, qui milia vidit unum vidit,' gave brilliant example in the collection he himself accomplished, with the help of the Berlin Academy, of Etruscan mirrors, *i.e.* of the drawings engraved on their backs. At the same time he brought together abundant material for a collection of reliefs on Etruscan sepulchral urns, and he made some provision for the far-reaching field of Greek vase-paintings, if only by his very comprehensive publications. The *Élite céramographique* edited by Ch. Lenormant and De Witte was undertaken from a similar point of view, but remained also far from exhausting the marvellous riches of vases stored up in the various public and private collections. As to sculpture, an invaluable foundation has been laid in Count Clarac's large *Musée de sculpture*, which, however, is greatly wanting in stylistic accuracy and in critical circumspection.

It was in this direction that a path of successful activity was marked out for the Institute. Already in 1835, Bunsen had called attention to the duty of the Institute to bring together in reproductions or at least in descriptions, all accessible monuments and to work them out on principles of classification. In close connection with the Institute, the Berlin Academy embarked on the mighty undertaking of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, under Mommsen's superintendence, and shortly afterwards on that of a revision of certain parts of Boeckh's collection of Greek inscriptions, especially the Attic, superintended by Kirchhoff. In the former work, Henzen, the secretary of the Roman Institute, took part; in that of the Attic inscriptions, Koehler, the secretary of the Athenian Institute. These great enterprises, moving along similar lines, might serve as models for archaeological undertakings of the same kind. In Rome, Brunn, one of the secretaries, revived Gerhard's project of a collection of the reliefs on Etruscan sepulchral urns, and even completed the first volume (1870), after which he handed over the remaining two volumes to his pupil Gustav Körte.¹ Körte also took up the continuation of Gerhard's work on mirrors, which had been begun by Klügmann in Rome in 1878, and interrupted by his early death (1880), and this has been appearing in parts since 1884.² In Vienna Conze urged the Austrian Academy, in 1873, to undertake the collection of Greek sepulchral reliefs, a task which, on account of the great wealth of material, it was found necessary to confine in the first instance to the sepulchral reliefs of Attica. This work, the publication of which will shortly be begun, was since entrusted, by the consent of the Academy of Vienna, to the care of the Archaeological Institute. The Institute had further undertaken, after the death of Otto Jahn (1869), the design which he had kept in view of collecting the Roman reliefs on

¹ H. Brunn, *I rilievi delle urne etrusche*.
I. *Ciclo troico*. Rome 1870.

Band bearb. von A. Klügmann und G. Körte.
Numbers 1-9. Berlin, 1884-1888.

² Ed. Gerhard, *Etruskische Spiegel*. *Fünfter*

sarcophagi, which task was committed to Jahn's pupil Friedrich Matz. The premature death of this young and excellent investigator (1874) for a time deprived the enterprise of its leader, until Carl Robert entered on the great undertaking. He carried it on so zealously, that at present the first part of the collection divided into five volumes is shortly to be published. And finally Richard Kekulé had in 1873 proposed to the Central Direction the collection of the so-called terra-cottas, *i.e.* of the statuettes and reliefs of baked clay, and had thus undertaken a difficult and far-reaching work which had hitherto been undeservedly neglected. Assisted by his pupil Hermann von Rohden, Kekulé accomplished his task as quickly as the material at his disposal would allow. The first volume, comprising the terra-cottas of Pompeii, compiled by Rohden, appeared in 1880; four years later followed Kekulé's compilation of Sicilian terra-cottas.¹ Two further volumes, comprising the Roman bas-reliefs best known from the Campana collection in the Louvre and the Tanagraean terra-cottas, are in course of preparation.

But however long the list of the publications of 'series' now in process, we see that after all but a modest beginning has been made when we consider the whole of the task yet to be accomplished. For to mention but a few of the most prominent classes of monuments, we are still wanting in the statues, the pictures, the vase-paintings, the bronzes, the gems,—to say nothing of the architectural works. Only for the first-named class, the statues,—among the most important of all,—are the preparatory operations already begun. There are two points of great importance in determining the choice of the series to be collected. In the first place it is necessary to find the right man for the particular task, which is not always an easy matter. The undertakings that have hitherto been started rest entirely on the personal initiative of the editors, who have for the most part had at their command the results of some preparatory work, their own or that of others. In such a case it was necessary to seize the opportunity, without considering whether this or that class of monuments was of the greatest importance. So that this point has been most essential in determining the selection of subjects. Besides this consideration, we have that of the funds to be applied to the work. The sum granted to the Institute for such purposes scarcely suffices to keep on foot the undertakings already started, indeed besides other causes, of which we shall speak directly, the paucity of means has had no small share in retarding the publications. So that it is no wonder if from time to time other series, of narrower compass, which might readily have found some one to take them up, have had to be postponed, and if the preparatory work for the series next contemplated, that of the statues, progresses but slowly.

It is thus evident that the Institute, working from its centre in Berlin, and sustained by the effective co-operation of the branches at Rome and Athens, has made considerable efforts towards supplying archaeological

¹ R. Kekulé, *Die Antiken Terracotten*. I. H. Stuttgart, 1880. II. R. Kekulé, *Die Terracotten von Rohden, Die Terracotten von Pompeji*. Berlin u. Stuttgart, 1884.

studies with the fundamental basis so long required. All this activity is scarcely known beyond the narrowest circle of specialists, still less has it received its due meed of praise. But this is only natural when we consider that the greater part of the preparatory work must of necessity be accomplished in complete silence. We lose all inclination to disparage the exertions made and to complain of the delay in the appearance of results as soon as we realize the nature of the preparatory work; thus even in the case of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, in spite of the wonderful powers of work of Mommsen and his fellow-labourers, whole decennia elapsed from the commencement of the whole work before the separate volumes could be arranged in something like connected sequence. We may be allowed to trace here the course followed in this kind of work in the case of one class of monuments which may serve as a specimen—that of the Roman sarcophagi.

The marble sarcophagi of Roman times fall into two great classes. One kind is especially found in Greek lands, and comparatively few specimens came from other regions. The other consists of those that are for the most part products of the city of Rome, and of a smaller number manufactured in other parts of Italy or in the provinces of the Roman empire. Of the sarcophagi belonging to the city of Rome, the greater number have remained in Rome, but very much scattered, as since the time of the Renaissance, the long reliefs of the sarcophagi have been freely used for the adornment of palaces, villas and houses, while the complete sarcophagi have served as fountains, troughs, and for similar purposes. A considerable number had gradually found their way into the Roman museums. But there was also a large number of these sarcophagi and sarcophagus reliefs that had strayed away from Rome into the other museums of Europe. Scarcely a single collection, as far as St. Petersburg, Copenhagen, Scotland (Rossie Priory), Portugal, is without any specimens. On account of this wide diffusion of material, the editor experiences in the first place considerable trouble in making a complete survey, then he has to make sure how much of this has already been published and also whether the publications are to be trusted. This is very seldom the case, since at the present day the claims of science are much higher than they were formerly, and involve not only reproductions accurate in detail and correct in style, but above all things we must have it carefully ascertained how much of the work in high relief—so easily damaged—is really antique, and how much is an addition due to the naïve delight in creation of past centuries, which, unconcerned with questions as to genuineness, busied itself in producing something pleasing that could be used in the decorations of courts, passages, and halls. We also have to cope with modern restorations, as they are still carried on in Rome, where, *e.g.*, people are not afraid to produce, by completely arbitrary additions, from the damaged remains of a sarcophagus representing Marsyas, a varied combination of representations of all kinds of events. These investigations are, of course, only to be made with the originals, and thus require long journeys on the part of the collator, often to distant lands, where the remains of ancient art are to be found at the very limits of modern culture. Personal inspection is

most particularly needed in the case of those sarcophagi which are only known from descriptions, often only from brief mentions. And again, it is only in this way that the distinction can safely be made between what merits or requires reproduction by engraving, and what only needs an exact description; since it would evidently be needless waste to have a drawing made of every single repetition of exactly the same composition.

These preparatory efforts on the part of the intending editor must be followed by those of the draughtsman. And it is no light task to discover an artist who has skill in work of this particular kind and is willing to devote himself to it entirely. As soon as he is found, he must next be made acquainted with the special character of the work in hand and must acquire practice in it. Mechanical reproductions, by means of photography, are generally impossible owing to the position of the monuments and the light in which they stand. We must have recourse then to drawing by hand, which by reason of the multitude of figures, and the dimensions of the compositions, often, too, the inconvenient position of the objects, occupies a great deal of time. And then the draughtsman ought also to be somewhat of a diplomatist. He must obtain access to the original, must overcome the innumerable, always novel difficulties which the fancies of the owners or the avarice of the keepers put in his way, must on occasions provide himself with a scaffold and see to what is necessary in other ways. In Rome, or generally in the larger museums, he is supported in his efforts by the officials of the Institute or the directors of the collections, but in the smaller, out-of-the-way places, he must rely on his own energy, tact, and powers of persuasion. But at last all these difficulties are overcome, and the bitter cold of winter in the museums and the glowing heat of summer in the streets and courts have been successfully withstood,—the drawings are ready. Now begins the revision, for even the most practised draughtsman, not being a specialist in archaeology, will not be able to comprehend and reproduce everything correctly. Again, he will hardly in every case have a quite sound judgment as to the distinction between the antique parts and the modern additions or alterations. The head of the undertaking must therefore set out on his travels again, and if possible in company with the draughtsman, must set about a comparison of the drawings with the originals, and order what alterations may be necessary. Not till then does the material lie to hand in a form fit for use.

This work, which has to do with several thousands of many-figured reliefs, has meantime occupied a period of many years and necessarily consumed large sums of money. As a matter of fact, the work preparatory to the *Corpus Sarcophagorum* has cost about £5,000. Now begins the publication. A publisher has to be found and terms arranged with him—no easy matter in a work involving so much engraving. Besides this, the editor of the collection must determine the arrangement of the whole work, the suitable distribution of the separate subjects on the plates, the mode of reproduction—by copper-plate, lithography, mechanical process, or one of the heliotype processes—and to superintend the carrying out of the whole. He must at the same time be always on the watch to see whether in the mean-

time new monuments of the kind come to light and require supplementary drawings. Finally he has to compose the letterpress, and to solve all the problems which may be raised in connection with it. Then he must send to press, and the printing being often of a laborious kind involves yet further expenditure of time; and now at last first the volume, finally the whole work, is complete, until fresh accretions of monuments necessitate the production of supplementary numbers.

Thus tedious is the process involved in every single series. With smaller works that frequently change hands and are easily lost sight of when in private ownership, such as terra-cottas, the difficulties are in many respects yet greater. Then again, the greater the artistic merit or the more peculiar the style of the monument, the greater are the difficulties of a really artistic drawing and reproduction. Yet another point is to be observed. It is not enough to reproduce in their present condition the originals that are still extant—we must go back to the older sources, some of which set before us these same works in their earlier state, often untouched by any restorations, while others preserve for us sculptures that have vanished or been lost. We have to do with two different kinds of sources. Particularly valuable are the older collections of drawings after the antique, from the fifteenth century downwards, to which only in recent years the attention of archaeologists has been directed. This material is again very scattered. Berlin and Coburg, possessing two copies of a large collection of such drawings made about the middle of the sixteenth century, were first considered. A particularly rich treasure is hidden in the Royal private library at Windsor, the collections of the famous *Commendatore dal Pozzo*, of the seventeenth century, of the Cardinal *Massimi*, &c., a great part of which the Institute has been able to make use of by the kind mediation of the Empress Frederick, and by the gracious permission of the Royal possessor. The British Museum, some English private collections, the Paris Library, the Library of the *Escorial*, &c., contain other drawings of the kind not yet sufficiently brought to light, and we can hardly doubt that many similar sources of information lie unknown in various places. These must be tracked out and brought into use as far as is possible. But not only are the treasures hidden in manuscripts to be discovered—all the literature of past times must be diligently searched through with the same object. Reports of excavations, descriptions of vanished works or of the earlier state of such as have since been defaced, early engravings, notices of the fortunes of the monuments in the hands of various owners, of dealers, and of restorers—all these form the material for long and tedious labours, which, however, not being specially difficult, can be apportioned to younger workers under experienced oversight. It is quite evident that this indispensable work, if it had to be undertaken afresh for each separate undertaking, especially if we take into account the scattered and not easily accessible state of the literature on the subject, would involve a quite unreasonable waste of time, money, and strength. But also for the collection of Latin inscriptions, of which the conditions are very similar to those of the collection of sarcophagi and other monuments, the troublesome

work of making extracts of the whole literature in manuscript or print, had been undertaken and accomplished as a whole. So that we must regard as a necessity to the completion of the entire undertaking of the publication of series, a repertory, comprehensive and as complete as possible, of archaeological literature—not, of course, to be printed as a work in itself, but as a preparatory help to archaeological work. This notwithstanding it is possible that the order of the monuments to be extracted may be determined with reference to such undertakings as might be nearest at hand. This task also has already been undertaken by the Institute with a special view to the future series of statues, and has only been temporarily interrupted through want of the necessary funds.

But we have not even yet come to an end of the efforts of the Institute for the progress of archaeology. We must add a considerable number of special publications and of grants towards the publication of works, which, though useful, were not likely to be a commercial success. Not, of course, that such assistance was given whenever asked for, even in the case of very desirable publications. Such a course would have gone beyond the means and the purposes of the Institute. Only such works could be taken up which had, so to speak, the character of inventories or of sources of information. Among these are, in the first place, catalogues of antiques, such as that by Duetschke, in five volumes, of the collections of Upper Italy, including those of Florence¹; that by Matz and von Duhn of the scattered monuments of Rome²; and that by Schreiber of the collection in the Villa Ludovisi.³ Next to these comes Schoene's index of the valuable Bocchi collection of vases in Adria, of which the Institute undertook the publication, with copious illustration by plates.⁴ The Jubilee of the year 1879 was the occasion of De Rossi's magnificent work on the older plans and views of the city of Rome, which opened up an almost unknown field of research.⁵ It was also from the funds of the Institute that means were provided for Mau's *History of Decorative Wall-painting in Pompeii*, with the accompanying valuable atlas of splendidly executed coloured plates, a work of the greatest importance for the knowledge of ancient decoration.⁶ Schliemann's Mycene finds led to the two great publications of Furtwängler and Löschcke on the so-called Mycene vases, which make a considerable contribution towards the knowledge of one of the oldest phases of art and civilization on Greek soil.⁷ An excavation specially undertaken by the Institute in the neighbourhood of Acharnae brought to light a bee-hive vault like those of Mycene, the complete contents

¹ H. Duetschke, *Antike Bildwerke in Oberitalien*. I.-V. Leipzig, 1874-1882.

² F. Matz and F. von Duhn, *Antike Bildwerke in Rom*. I.-III. Leipzig, 1881-1882.

³ Th. Schreiber, *Die antiken Bildwerke der Villa Ludovisi in Rom*. Leipzig, 1880.

⁴ R. Schoene, *Le antichità del Museo Bocchi di Adria*. Rome, 1878.

⁵ G. B. de Rossi, *Piante iconografiche e pro-*

spettiche di Roma anteriori al secolo XVI. Rome, 1879.

⁶ A. Mau, *Geschichte der decorativen Wandmalerei in Pompeji*. Berlin, 1882.

⁷ A. Furtwängler and G. Loeschcke, *Mykenische Thongefässe*. Berlin, 1879. *Mykenische Vasen, vorhellenische Thongefässe aus dem Gebiete des Mittelmeeres*. Berlin, 1886.

of which were published in a special treatise.¹ Another is ready for publication on an excavation undertaken by the Institute itself in Lesbos under the superintendence of Koldewey, for exploring a large and hitherto completely unknown Ionic temple. Finally, with the support of the Prussian Ministry of Education and of the German Military Staff the Institute undertook an entirely fresh survey of Attica, and is publishing the results under Ernst Curtius and Kaupert's supervision in more than twenty large sheets.² By these means, Attica now belongs to the most exactly known regions of the world. A detailed text by Milchhoefer accompanies the atlas. As a welcome sequel to this we may regard the maps of Mycene, undertaken by Captain Steffen, which have for the first time presented a clear and complete representation of this remarkable seat of the earliest Greek culture.³

II.

We hope that what we have said above will have made clear to the reader how narrow and inaccurate is that conception which would still make the *Archaeological* Institute identical with the *Roman* Institute, and confine all attention to this branch only. What we are dealing with is in fact nothing less than an attempt at the *organization of archaeological work*, so far as such an attempt is necessary and practicable; for it is hardly needful to say that, besides this, the free labour of individuals will and must often continue to be the principal factor in scientific progress. This thought was already present to Gerhard and to the other founders of the Roman Institute, and we must admire the talent with which the task was taken up, and the parts assigned, while the threads invisibly rested in the hands of that great organizer. But since Gerhard's death we have no central personality, acknowledged as such by all nations and by all fellow-workers. Moreover, the tasks set before archaeology—which may justly be considered among the most progressive sciences of our century—have so much increased that a single person and the former limited means no longer suffice for the comprehensive and lofty purposes in view. In consequence, the Central Direction, faithful to the traditions of the Institute while gradually transforming them, has undertaken this task and entered on the new paths marked out, without claiming in any way a privilege for doing so, but showing the way to other similar Institutions or Academies which might be willing to undertake or to promote other parts of the large work still remaining. For it is evident that neither the work of individual specialists nor the means of individual publishers would be sufficient for such a scope. Only large public funds, methodically laid out, might in time attain the goal. The same remarks apply to the large historical publications undertaken in different countries

¹ *Das Kuppelgrab bei Menidi*, herausgegeben vom deutschen archaologischen Institute in Athen. Athens, 1880.

Attika. Plates, I.-V. Berlin, 1881-1887. Letterpress, I. II. Berlin, 1881-1883.

² E. Curtius and J. A. Kaupert, *Karten von*

³ Steffen, *Karten von Mykenai*. Berlin, 1884.



and generally supported by public funds, or by learned bodies, except that it results necessarily from the nature of art, which must appeal to the eye, and to the conditions of the editing of works of art, that the publication of the great archaeological collections requires much larger sums than do the drawing up and the publication of mere written documents. And so in the choice of the means of reproduction no luxury is admitted; in fact economy is carried to such lengths that—hitherto, at least—those who are working on the series or on the special enterprises, receive no other reward for their most fatiguing labours than that which consists in the consciousness of having furthered the cause of science. There is need in truth of the self-denying, ideal tone of mind, which is not yet out of vogue among the representatives of science in Germany, to overcome faint-heartedness in work. But there is also need of a union of all forces, of a close organization, to prevent the strength of individuals from being spent unprofitably, and to make all efforts help towards the attainment of the great objects in view.

It has already been remarked that for these objects the most important means have been provided in the two institutions abroad, the Roman and the Athenian Institutes. For either of these Institutes, its sphere of action has been determined by its geographical position. Athens must be the centre of exploration for those lands of the East where Greek influences have preponderated, not merely for European Greece with its islands and the neighbouring regions, but also for Asia Minor, which has of late been the field of rival explorations from all nations, as far as Cyprus and the coasts of ancient Phoenicia. The Roman branch institution naturally has Italy for its primary field of research, without losing sight of the further western lands of the old Roman Empire. Besides keeping a watchful eye on all fresh discoveries, besides their own travels of research and even their own excavations on a small scale, the branch institutions find leisure for prosecuting vigorously those great tasks which belong to the Institute as a whole. The directors of the series as well as the artists employed, naturally have recourse to the secretaries in Rome or Athens, who smooth their paths and generally undertake their cause. But besides the secretaries, they have at their disposal the whole ranks of young scholars, who for about forty years have, in the phrase of the Capitol, gone by the name of *ragazzi*. Of these the main body consists of those who hold the bursaries of the Institute, four being appointed every year, and they are joined by other young scholars, Germans and foreigners—of late especially Austrians. These young men, under the direction of the secretaries, go through courses of study, with practical work, in archaeology, epigraphy, and topography, which, considering the riches of material heaped up and still accumulating from all sides in the museums, afford an incomparable practical completion to their previous academic studies. Moreover they make their entrance, under the guidance of the secretaries, into the organism we have already described of archaeological work as a whole, and it is gratifying to see how zealously and how skilfully the young men, in addition to their own studies, undertake now the

cataloguing of a collection, now the promotion of one of the great publications, now a small excavation, now the exploration of unknown places or of insufficiently known ruins. We soon recognize that a strong common motive power urges on all these labours, and how in active and friendly competition each exerts himself for the common good: 'To be the first in every field, and still surpass the rest.' And yet the reins are not held so tight as may be the case in other similar institutions. The German way is to leave to the individuals as much freedom as possible, and the good training and good will of the majority fully justifies this principle. All the more encouraging is the voluntary co-operation of the individuals in common effort for the progress of science.

When the attention has to be directed to such high and far-reaching purposes, the question naturally arises whether the arrangements handed down from the past are still quite adequate to those purposes, or whether in certain points reforms are required. Such considerations have come home to the members of the Central Direction for many years past. As might naturally be expected, any such suggestions applied less to the newer arrangements which were a product of the tendency to take a wider range than they did to the oldest part of the whole establishment, the Roman Institute. This had both in its organs and in its settlements entirely kept to the traditions of its time of foundation, more than a half-century before, when the Roman Institute was the only accredited scientific representative of archaeology in Italy. But in the place of a patronizing Papal government and a divided Italy, had been formed the united Italian kingdom, which was striving to gather its forces together in the scientific as well as in the political field, and wrote on its banner the proud utterance: '*Italia fa da sè.*' Already in the year 1872, the municipal Commission of Archaeology, which had for its task to preserve antiquarian interests amidst the extensive rebuilding going on in the new capital of Italy, began to publish its own archaeological journal, the editors of which were in a better position than the Institute to follow up and to place on record the discoveries which were daily being made. Thus the antiquities of the city of Rome were withdrawn from the monthly Reports of the Institute, and only the *Monumenti* with the *Annali* attached to them continued to be the natural vehicle for publications requiring much space and large plates. A quantity of periodicals in the provinces of wider or narrower scope followed the example of the capital. Of still greater moment was the decision taken in 1875 by the Roman *Accademia dei Lincei* to publish monthly accounts of all new excavations and discoveries derived from the reports furnished by the Inspectors of Excavations throughout Italy to the General Direction of Antiquities at Rome. The annual quarto volume composed of these official *Notizie degli scavi* served the same purpose which the *Bullettino* of the Institute had been endeavouring for half a century to carry out with less abundant and trustworthy materials. Was it then expedient to continue the production of the *Bullettino* in its early form? None could answer this question in the affirmative except those who regarded anything which was customary as necessarily worthy of preservation.

The difficulties connected with the folio plates of the *Monumenti Inediti* were of another kind. When that publication was begun, two methods of engraving only were in use for such works, lithograph and copperplate. The former process had been only occasionally used by the Institute, particularly for the plates published in Paris, and again, more recently, for the reproduction in colours of vase- and wall-paintings. Copperplate engraving, on the other hand, was used by skilled artists both in Paris and Rome, and so was principally employed for the plates of the Institute. During a long time, up to about 1870, they were confided mainly to Bartolommeo Bartoccini, whose engravings also in other artistic publications have won celebrity. But gradually this branch of art decayed at Rome, and now it is cultivated with far more success elsewhere. Thus in the case of difficult engravings foreign engravers had to be employed. Also in regard to all of the modern photographic processes of reproduction the level of technical excellence at Rome is rather low; and the silver-printing which is practised there with zeal and success is out of the question when a large edition is required. In the case of chromo-lithography too, only easy subjects are reproduced with tolerable success. The result of these unfortunate conditions, for which the Institute was in no way responsible, was that difficult plates had frequently to be executed out of Italy. And when this was the case the original drawings had to be sent to Berlin, or Leipzig, or Munich, and the stock of the valuable plates had to be sent back to Rome; whence once more at the end of the year they made their way back to Germany with the complete edition. It was surely simpler and more practical, seeing that this would probably be necessary oftener and oftener in coming years, simply to remove the whole publishing of the *Monumenti* from Rome.

For such removal there was another and a still stronger reason. The *Monumenti* were the only folio publication at the disposal of the Institute. In the hands of the secretaries at Rome they were naturally mainly used for the reproduction of Italian monuments, among which a prominent place was taken by the monuments of Etruria, and lately by those of early Italian civilization, besides vases, statues of the kind common in Roman museums, sarcophagi, and wall-paintings. True Greek art was thrust too much into the background, and commonly found a place only on suggestion from abroad. Such a selection of material fulfilled ill the general purposes of the Institute. It naturally seemed unfair that the Athenian Institute, situated at the very source of the purest art and in the midst of continual important discoveries should not have so large a share in that great publication as had Rome. A share in it was also claimed by the Berlin Direction; German museums and many foreign galleries, such as the British Museum with its many unpublished treasures, could be more easily reached from Berlin.

Finally there were inconveniences in connection with the *Annali*. One of the chief purposes of this publication was, as has been shown, to provide an accompanying text to the plates of the *Monumenti*: the two were closely connected. The consequence was that sometimes a very important monument difficult of comment was kept back for years because an able

commentator could not be found; sometimes a plate was accompanied by a hastily written paper quite unworthy to appear in a first-rate periodical. Such experiences suggested the question whether it would not be better to loosen the close union between the *Annali* and the large plates, and to let each periodical stand on an independent footing.

Yet another point called for consideration. At the time when the Institute was founded, circumstances had required the exclusive use of the Italian, French, or Latin language, and the exclusion of German. But times were changed. Knowledge of the German language had, within the last few decades, spread to a remarkable extent, especially in Italy,—the only country here in question. There are at the present day in the principal cities of Italy but few scholars who are not acquainted with German, at least sufficiently well to be able to read it without difficulty, especially as German archaeological literature cannot be safely neglected by any student of the subject. On the other hand there was not a single Italian whose ears were not sensitive to the foreign-sounding style of Italian that pervaded the writings of the Institute, and it required all the courtesy which belongs to Italians by birth and breeding to endure patiently, and without change of countenance, such mutilation of their beautiful mother-tongue. As early as ten years ago, on the occasion of the jubilee of the Institute, the impatient inquiry was heard from the younger Italians, whether the time had not come to allow admission to the German language, with the Italian, into the periodicals of the Institute, and to give credit to Italians for knowing at least so much German. And indeed, since the French had withdrawn from the Institute, and the Roman Institute belonged almost entirely to Germans and Italians, it seemed unreasonable to reserve, simply in memory of old times, to the French language the place it had formerly held, now that its use had long ceased to be very frequent, and to exclude German from the periodicals of an institution that belongs to the German Empire, from which it derives its entire support, is guided by German officials, and is by preference frequented by young German scholars. We may safely ask whether France, England, or Italy, under similar circumstances, would ever have for more than fifty years completely renounced the employment of their own languages in oral discussion and in publication. And apart from the question of national dignity, convenience and equity demanded that Germans should no longer be compelled to clothe, or to cause others to clothe, their articles in the generally inconvenient and ill-fitting garment of a foreign tongue. How much of the natural expression of the thought and the original colour of the description is usually lost in this process of transformation, and how easily an unintended comic element creeps in, might be illustrated from many examples.

III.

It was along these lines that changes were being mooted within the Central Direction, and a discussion of the subject had been placed among the agenda for the next general meeting, when matters were unexpectedly brought

to a more speedy decision. In the New Year's number of the *Kölnische Zeitung* for 1885, Herr Ihne, Professor of English Literature at the University of Heidelberg, and author of several works on Roman history, who had lived some winter months at Rome, complained of the exclusion of the German language from the writings and discussions of the Roman Institute. The Imperial Chancellor (the Institute as a foundation depending on the Empire, and on account of its branch academies in foreign parts, comes under the Foreign Office) demanded from the Central Direction a statement on the subject, and subsequently ordered them to give the German language its proper privileges in the Roman Institute. The *Monumenti* and the *Annali* were to be turned into a German periodical, the use of Latin being permitted; in the *Bullettino*, on the other hand, Italian was to be allowed, and in exceptional cases also French. In the oral discussions of the meetings German and also Italian were to be used—other languages only when the speakers were unfamiliar with either of these tongues. By this means, a definite line was laid down for the further resolutions of the Central Direction. In the most essential points, these new orders agreed with the intended changes already described, and although at first the regulation seemed to involve difficulties in some points of its execution, after a personal conference of the Central Direction with the Roman secretaries, a satisfactory understanding was reached as to the method of carrying out the future rules.

The affairs of the *Monumenti* lent themselves the most easily to re-arrangement. When this was to be made the chief periodical of the Institute as a whole, the removal from Rome to the residence of the Central Direction, Berlin,—also desirable on technical grounds—and the transformation of the *Monumenti antichi inediti* into *Antike Bildwerke* followed as a matter of course. The epithet *inediti* might be omitted, because an occasional more exact republication of monuments of which hitherto only inadequate engravings had appeared, was not to be entirely excluded. Each of the three centres of the Institute, Berlin, Rome, and Athens, obtained free disposal of a third of the twelve annual plates, although this rule is not to be enforced with pedantic precision. If one of the three seats of Direction happens to be particularly rich in materials, so that it can make public any specially important monuments, it is an understood thing that precedence should be given to its publications, and on the other hand the editorial staff has to take means for preventing undue preference from being given to any particular kind of monuments, and to provide for a fair proportion among the works of architecture, of sculpture, and of painting. The three numbers that have appeared since the change afford a justification of it which will be easily appreciated. They are distinguished from the former Roman *Monumenti* both by the variety of important monuments and by the great superiority in the processes of reproduction, and if, especially in the latter respect, something remains to be desired (for in this respect Berlin is less advanced than, *e.g.* Vienna), the progress made is nevertheless clear to every unprejudiced mind. We would observe in particular that the investigation of

architectural remains had not till now been allowed to occupy the space which its importance merited. The textual appendix to each number consists only of a rather short table of contents of the separate plates, which gives the facts about as fully as would a good catalogue. No more lengthy explanations are permitted in that place. Such elucidations as are necessary, in cases where opinions may safely be stated, find their place in one or other of the periodicals of the Institute; where the mere reproduction is sufficient, or where adequate explanation would require deeper and more protracted study, then at least the monument is made accessible to all archaeologists as soon as possible.

When in the case of the large plates, appended explanatory notices ceased to be necessary, the *Annali* seemed to lose their chief *raison d'être*, which had consisted in maintaining such connection between illustration and explanation. The remaining part of the contents of this periodical were more like those of the *Bullettino*. Seeing then that the number of really valuable, or even of somewhat important archaeological works which can take the shape of magazine articles, is not very numerous, and seeing also that it would not be desirable to further the publication of inferior work by means of a superfluity of periodicals of similar character, it seemed advisable to effect a concentration of forces, the more so as other nations—Italy, France, England, America—have recently begun with great success to unite their forces in special periodicals dedicated to archaeology. To this end, the part of the Roman *Annali* devoted to the more important investigations was united with the *Archaeologische Zeitung* of Berlin, and the twofold origin was expressed in the new title of *Archaeologisches Jahrbuch*. For the sensational interest of striking novelties, suitable for a journal or a monthly magazine, is out of place in a quarterly or an annual, which should be in the first place devoted to continuous scientific investigations of greater or less scope. These can sometimes dispense with pictorial illustrations, or they may be illustrated in the plates of the annual or by smaller sketches inserted in the letterpress, or finally they may be attached to the larger plates of the *Antike Bildwerke*. The form of the *Jahrbuch* is like that of the previous *Archaeologische Zeitung*, but made a little smaller, so that the inconvenient two-column page could be changed for a single column. The annual is supposed to be capable of extension by the issue of separate supplements. Often, unfortunately, the publication of extensive archaeological works which require a large number of plates meets with great difficulties in the conditions of the book trade, or sometimes it is effected in an out-of-the-way place, where it is withdrawn from convenient general use. The supplementary numbers of the annual, following as occasion arises, are designed to obviate, as far as possible, these disadvantages, without compelling the purchasers of the annual to take the supplements in addition. As a first instalment a paper by Strzygowski on the illustrated calendar of *Furius Dionysius Philocalus* (A. D. 354) has already appeared. A number of other interesting works—for instance, a report on important discoveries in the Aeolic town of *Aegae*, and a treatise, by *Dörpfeld* and *Reisch*, on the remains of earlier Greek

theatres and their arrangements—have been promised in the forthcoming supplements. Finally, from the present year onwards, the annual, appearing in quarterly numbers, contains a regular supplement corresponding to the *Archaeologische Anzeiger* formerly edited by Gerhard. For as it is desired, as far as possible, to keep the annual in the regions of purely scientific discussion, and seeing that the periodicals of the Roman and of the Athenian Institute—of which we shall speak directly—are occupied principally within their own geographical limits, it is advisable to have a paper of freer scope for communications on points of bibliography and on points touching museums, for notices of the proceedings of the Berlin Archaeological Society (a society akin, as it were, to the Institute) and of other scientific societies, for news of excavations, for short scientific notices, for obituary records, and so forth. This completion of the annual by the addition of a paper of this kind will certainly meet the wishes of many fellow-workers, especially of such as reside in the provinces, and owing to their distance from the centres of the Institute are without opportunity of hearing the news that ever flows thither from all parts. Thus, for example, since a knowledge of the proceedings of the above-mentioned Berlin Society, very important in many ways, has for years been unattainable by means of German archaeological periodicals, people had to gather their information from political, literary, and other newspapers and weekly papers. If possible, this will not be the case in future.

Besides these two German publications, which especially represent the Institute as a whole, the two foreign Institutes naturally require each its special organ. In Athens, the *Mittheilungen* appearing in quarterly numbers, illustrated by a number of smaller plates, has for the most part kept its original arrangement. Under Ulrich Koehler's editorship, this periodical has by the thoroughness of its discussions and its excellent scientific tone obtained a place of honour among its contemporaries. The only wish to be expressed—one justified by the title of *communications*—is that the periodical could be directed more along the lines taken by the publication—also Athenian—of the French School. However, in this respect a marked improvement has of late been visible, which is to be attributed partly to the conscious purpose of the editors, partly to the increased interest in travels and discoveries taken by members of the Institute, especially by the holders of studentships and their companions, and partly in the character and bent of studies of one of the secretaries. Wilhelm Dörpfeld, who had belonged to the Athenian Institute for some years, and became second secretary in 1886, and soon after first secretary, belongs to that band of architects who have received a thorough training in the exact investigation of ancient buildings, by means of the German excavations at Olympia and the Prussian at Pergamum, and at the same time are capable of making a complete co-ordination of their investigations with those of archaeologists who have undergone a different training. In securing Dörpfeld for the Athenian Institute, the study of architecture—hitherto almost entirely neglected—has won a permanent place as a branch of the work of the Institute. Both the *Antike Bildwerke* and the Athenian *Mittheilungen*, have already

gained much thereby, and not the least advantage of the newly aroused activity of the Institute has been the gradual fresh measurement, of extant ancient buildings, and the discussion of the results obtained from them. The lesser excavations set on foot in various places for the purpose of promoting those investigations afford at the same time an excellent training in such work for the young scholars who take part in them. It is to be hoped that Germany will not renounce the hope of plucking, on some future occasion, new Olympian or Pergamene laurels, and on such an occasion, this band of directors of excavations will be found, in virtue of their knowledge and their practical skill, to be of very great service.

The example of the Athenian periodical naturally suggested itself to those who had the task of revising the form of the Roman *Bullettino*. The zealous activity of the Italians above described, particularly in reporting archaeological discoveries, and to some extent also in working out results, necessitated some kind of change. We are far from regretting this circumstance—on the contrary, it seems to us quite in the order of things that Italy, strengthened on all sides, should regard it as a task peculiarly her own to collect and make known the archaeological facts and discoveries within her own limits; nay, we acknowledge, with unmixed satisfaction, that among the reporters not a few are accomplishing their task most meritoriously. Though the Roman Institute has lost thereby some of its previous functions, it still retains sufficient for its powers. Moreover, even in the field of reporting, not all its duties were taken away. With respect to such important excavations as, *e.g.*, those of Pompeii, no reports are, for minuteness and accuracy, to be compared with those of Mau in the Roman *Bullettino*. The Italian official inspectors of excavations are so numerous that it is impossible for all to stand at the same level of scientific knowledge, and many places merit and require a more accurate report. This applies especially to those parts of Italy which were once Greek, and which lie somewhat outside the circle of interests of the Italian investigator. Further, it is a natural result of regular and official drawing up of reports, that in the course of a long-continued excavation the connection of results is easily broken, and that they cannot afford to pass over anything, however slight and insignificant. We can thus easily imagine that in many cases a supplementary or a periodical *résumé* of the really important things discovered (which must depend not on the descriptions of others but on personal observation), and a sketch of the results ensuing therefrom, must be by no means out of place. And further, the Athenian *Mittheilungen* have shown that, besides the reports of excavations, room may be found for special scientific investigations. This function of the former *Annali*, with the plates thereto belonging, is now also reserved for the *Bullettino*. So that the Roman *Mittheilungen* (with the second title of *Bullettino*) not only represent the former *Bullettino*, but constitute, with the addition of a part of the *Annali*, an extended organ for researches belonging to the regions of the Roman Institute, *i.e.* to all the western lands of the Mediterranean basin. As not only the labour of Germans, but, according to the older custom, the co-operation of Italian members of the Institute is particularly expected in