

## *Archaeology Worldwide*

### 1. Archaeology as a Way of Looking at Faraway Worlds

Like the landscape in which it stands, architecture is a seemingly unchanging point of reference for the people who come to know it there. Both, however, are at the mercy of constant change. What we perceive as simply light shifting across the landscape, or, at most, as the influence of weather on architecture, metaphorically conveys to us the state of both landscape and architecture over the long course of history. Archaeology documents the influence of human activities on these kinds of changes: the Parthenon on the Acropolis in Athens not only provided a special place for *Athena Parthenos*, the famous statute of the goddess Athena, in the fifth century BCE, but also gave the city of Athens an inimitable image. Its ruinous condition today shows us both hints of the long-gone classical era of Greece and the history that has passed over it since then. More clearly than some history derived from written archival sources, archaeological objects tell of art and the age of classical cultures, and among these objects in particular are the surviving pieces of architecture.

As a landscape photographer in Greece and Turkey, Erieta Attali recognized these contexts early on.<sup>1</sup> She likes to say that her archaeological work over many years in Athens, Thessaloniki, or Crete, and in the archaeological departments of the great museums in London and New York pointed the way.<sup>2</sup> Since she was primarily a photographer, she learned to pay special attention to the surfaces of objects she had to photograph, whether it was their material qualities or the changing light above them; her knowledge of the use of ultraviolet and infrared light became essential to the analysis of the colored surfaces of antiquities. She understood that all archaeological objects come from particular contexts—places where they had last been used and discarded, and from where they had been removed. And she saw how archaeologically interesting buildings revealed their meaning in the surrounding landscape, impacting them until they disintegrated themselves as ruins into that landscape.

After her experience with the glass architecture of Japanese architect Kengo Kuma, Attali began to turn more toward architectural photography in 2001.<sup>3</sup> To her, the interior and exterior of the architectural object were the main things that had to be captured on film, along with their relationship to each other—especially that of the building and the building complex standing free in a landscape. She has produced significant photographs “at the extreme edges of the world,” where her childhood dreams had led her. At home in Israel, Istanbul, and Athens, or the eastern Mediterranean region in general, these extreme edges were, for her, in places such as Japan, Australia, Peru, Chile, Norway, and Iceland, where she also preferred deserts, clear mountains, and glacial coastlines.<sup>4</sup> Exterior and interior: what she captured of the surfaces of archaeological objects and the glass walls of modern architecture corresponded here to the cultural boundaries “in the periphery of the world”—boundaries in the sense that something completely different goes on beyond each one of them.

On her travels to distant lands Attali has always represented her own *métier* and her special perspective of things as a photographer in lectures, conferences, workshops, and exhibitions. She has taught in cities such as Copenhagen, Tokyo, Beijing, Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Melbourne, Sydney, Santiago de Chile, and São Paulo. Even there, she did not avoid going to the previously mentioned limits, “trekking on foot for miles while carrying a chest of equipment”<sup>5</sup>—what she needed to take pictures of special architecture in extreme landscapes. And it was worth the effort: this book contains a selection of the many photographs from her long-term project, *Periphery of the World*.

Why does she address archaeology here? After all, we immediately think of it as a science that provides us knowledge of the layers of culture beneath our feet, which are better described elsewhere. Since the nineteenth century, the term “archaeology” has primarily identified the methods of exposing previous lives in certain places by excavating layer after layer of seemingly indistinguishable earth.<sup>6</sup> These lives are defined by objects, which, when assembled together, result in certain contexts whose history can be made legible. A place that initially sounds modern to us, like Olympia in Greece,<sup>7</sup> turns out to have had a late Antiquity phase, and then right below that, a Roman phase, late Greek, and Hellenistic phases, and finally, its monumental classical phase; yet even further beneath those are also the archaic contexts and early Greek levels—world upon world, which we can see behind or beneath each other, as if we were looking through a window open only to us. Attali has worked with even deeper layers of pre-Grecian ruins in Knossos on Crete. In these layers, though, as in the photographs of them, only the traces of the people who once lived busy lives there can be found, not the people themselves.

In the very rare cases when intact subterranean tombs have been found, as in northern Greece, where Attali also worked, one could see the surviving objects piled on top of, and alongside, each other.<sup>8</sup> Their relationships tell us about how they were once used and about the rituals in which they were placed in these tombs. This is what is known as archaeological *context*: the tomb, the burial chamber, the burial ground itself, the objects deposited there, which either belonged to the buried or memorialized it. Only recently have we become interested in the plants that were either deliberately placed there, or came there by accident. Since ancient times, however, the most important items were soon removed from these types of tombs—first of all, so that they could be used under different circumstances, and second, to keep the precious objects in circulation. If the objects were particularly artfully made out of expensive, exquisite materials, they found their way to treasure chambers. Every wealthy castle of the early modern era in Europe had a “cabinet of curiosities,” the predecessors of today’s national museums or modern private collections.<sup>9</sup> Many antiquities were kept in such places, and are exhibited because they are beautiful, costly, or unique. A detailed history of art can tell us something about their manufacture, while related objects convey something about their origins in certain ancient workshops, and in the best-case scenarios, even identify an approximate time period in which they were made and used. These beautiful objects became stand-ins for “Greek art,” “Roman art,” or even for a particular artistic landscape, such as the Etruscan in central Italy. But the archaeological context of these antiquities from early collections—now the sole representatives of cultures—is lost when they are removed from the ground. That is why, in the nineteenth century, when regular excavations began in countries that are rich in antiquities, it became customary to protect ancient sites and to declare it illegal to remove unregistered, undocumented antique objects from the ground. All around the world today, a hard battle is being fought against treasure hunters

who continue to plunder ancient necropolises or use metal detectors to locate individual ancient utensils, weapons, jewels, or coins and remove them from their cultural levels. The window through which we want to view these former worlds will be irretrievably broken.

Conversely, this window allows these archaeological objects to enter our world well documented. When this happens through a brutal robbery or illegal acquisition, the objects also become eyewitnesses to these deeds: one day, antiquities without any provenance will tell of a lack of understanding of history that is still widespread in the early twenty-first century. Because even those things that have been carefully excavated and are maintained along with solid documentation of the context in which they were found—for example, through good archival photographs of their recently uncovered levels—will be able, in a museum, to answer questions from our world: why was this excavated and how did it come to be in a museum? And these, after all, are just some of today's questions: why was the object excavated in the first place? Why wasn't it simply covered over? As excavators, what is our interest in its archaeological context? What is its larger relationship to history, how do we figure it out, and why? What do we expect from a detailed description of the various layers beneath our feet, regardless of where we happen to be? And furthermore, when it comes to our questions about excavation, which of the objects in front of us has perhaps come to light by accident?

Don Pietro Monti, a pastor on Ischia on the Gulf of Naples, rector of the Church of Santa Restituta in Lacco Ameno, and an amateur modern archaeologist, spent the years 1950 to 1975 excavating the historical layers of the church under his charge. His goal was to find traces of earlier—possibly even the earliest—worship of St. Restituta, whose body, according to legend, supposedly washed up there in late Antiquity.<sup>10</sup> He took all of the objects he had found and had to remove from the upper levels (in order to reach the lower levels) and exhibited them right there in display cases, some of them directly beside the excavation site. But below the late Antiquity layers he actually sought were others: a Roman cemetery, and beneath that, an area where Greek pottery was once made. The view through the archaeological window also allowed Don Pietro Monti to see increasingly distant worlds (and because he could see them, we can too, since he documented everything very well), all the way back to the eighth century BCE, when Greek settlers appeared on Ischia, the edges of the world known to them at the time, to live and trade there, and to spread their culture throughout Italy and into the rest of Europe.

Near what is now the center of Lacco Ameno and the Church of Santa Restituta, other archaeologists have discovered an ancient necropolis containing what are so far the oldest graves of all, from the eighth century BCE. Some of the ceramics found in these tombs may have been produced in the pottery district of St. Restituta, while the early settlers may have brought others from their Grecian homeland.

On the shards of an otherwise unremarkable Greek drinking bowl one can discern the early words of a divinely poetic text inscribed in Greek letters: "I am Nestor's well-filled cup / Whoever drinks from this cup, straightaway / desire will seize him of beautiful-crowned Aphrodite (goddess of love)." This cup, dating from the eighth century BCE, documents the first appearance of the Greeks in what was for them the 'Wild West': Italy. At the same time it documents their knowledge of letters, writing, and reading, adopted just a little before from the Orient.<sup>11</sup>

The Greek poet and singer Homer, who lived in eastern Greece, was the first to tell of Nestor, the legendary King of Pylos, on the Peloponnese, and his golden, richly ornamented goblet intended for the celebratory enjoyment of wine, which was the forerunner

of this simple ceramic bowl. Although Homer's seafaring hero, Odysseus, visited southern Italy, Ischia and all of the essentially infinite adjoining lands to the north were, at the time, still undiscovered and hence, still outside of Homer's known world.

The bowl from Ischia shows us that, regardless of how familiar they are to us as material objects, archaeological finds open up our limitations, first of all, in terms of time (with the before/after of their historical contexts) and in terms of space (with the internals/externals of the routes along which their users migrated). Without a doubt, Ischia in the eighth century BCE stood on the outermost edge of the Grecian world, to whose internal culture the inscription bears witness. What awaited the Greeks who landed on Ischia, when they steered their trading ships further northward, out of their own cultural territory? To return to one of Erieta Attali's themes, was Ischia regarded as one of the "edges of the world" in those days? What did the Greeks know about the lands outside of their world?

## 2. Faraway?

From her home in the central Mediterranean region, Erieta Attali arrived at what she called the "edges of the world," periphery, via airplane. When the world of the Mediterranean Greeks was much smaller, they went north and east on foot, or with wagons, on horseback and on donkeys, while ships took them south and west. In the fifth century BCE they called their travel *periodos* ("going around"), or *periplous* ("sailing around"); the world historian Herodotus famously referred to this.<sup>12</sup> The Greek philosophers of his day initially described the world as a flat disc, assuming it to be surrounded by a great *okeanos*, or ocean. They called this the circle of the world the *periphoreia* and its explanation by guides *periegesis*. More precise descriptions of what could be seen inside the circle of the world—and beyond, in the orbits of the stars—led to geography, right at the time when (or because) the measurement of the world revealed its round shape. "Periphery" meant the least to those who "made the rounds," even when they reported their experiences after their return, recalling what had happened to them out there during *periodos* or *periplous*. And so arose the legends of what lay outside of the Greek world, initially about the peoples whose gibbering was not understood, the barbarians, and then primarily about the even more distant lands where competing merchants were not wanted: tales of threatening, winged griffins and the one-eyed, multi-headed, goat-footed, three-bodied, equally dangerous imaginary creatures. Even though there were no fixed borders in the modern sense, the lands belonging to the horseback-riding women warriors (the Amazons) were, for example, only possible outside of the known world, while specific geography was only possible within it. How adventurous and exciting all journeys to the cultures east of the Mediterranean must have been before Marco Polo!

When we talk about "periphery" today, we mean something that is dependent upon the relationship of a distant region to a particular central point. In Erieta Attali's work, this is doubly true: first of all, the countries she has been to are especially far away from her starting point in the eastern Mediterranean. But the buildings she has photographed *in extremis* are also far distant from the centers of life that exist there. This was different during the classical Antiquity period. After all, even the Greeks on Ischia wanted to stay there. To them, the permeability of the "borders" they reached and the possibilities for life beyond them were essential to trade there. Seldom in use in Antiquity, the word "periphery" literally meant "carrying around" (*peri* = "around"; *phero* = "I carry"), but that was

the most important thing to the Greek traders, anyway. And that is also the way that Attali has perceived it: her “edges of the world” imply a transition to a new environment.<sup>13</sup>

Herodotus lived in a time of upheaval, a period of great historical significance that resonated across the entire northern hemisphere between the Atlantic and the Pacific. As far as Herodotus’s description of the world goes, the classical was the central event, emerging in the fifth century BCE in Athens. From then on it became the focus of “before and after,” a central point that gave rise to the classical and to which it would refer from then on. The previously mentioned Parthenon, on the Acropolis in Athens, became the symbol for it. Herodotus himself measured distances in Egypt using a Greek standard: distances along the Nile were “just as far” as it was from Athens to Olympia (II 7). In the long history of the Greeks traveling around the world, their culture now had the *one* center. Archaeologically speaking, the “periphery” can therefore be defined as a region in which there were not many classical Athenian products, or even a complete lack of them. Herodotus still started with natural phenomena: when the Scythians north of the Black Sea told him that further north “the earth and air alike are full of feathers and so one cannot see anything” (IV 7), he levelheadedly explained that it was frequent snowfall. He related the story that, around 600 BCE, a ship sailed from east to west around the whole of Africa over a period of three years, and though he doubted it somewhat, he felt that it was confirmed by the observation “that the sailors during their round tour (of South Africa) had the sun (at sunrise no longer at their left, but) suddenly on their right” (IV 2). Keeping the classical in mind, the idea of classical culture as a center of the world, the periphery could be reevaluated. One would no longer measure *in extremis* (snow, the position of the sun), but *in classicis*: what do you have from the center, what do you not have, or what is different, and why?

Accordingly, scientific archaeology, whose core is known as “classical archaeology,” has dealt with these issues for more than two centuries now. Even though the objects of classical archaeology come from distant eras, their connection to Greek classical style and Roman classicism gave them a timely currency in the minds of everyone who asked these questions. In twentieth-century West Germany a new direction of research evolved, in between classical archaeology and the local pre- and early history: “provincial Roman archaeology.” Initially, it focused on the assertion of Roman culture in territories occupied by the Romans within the soon-to-be-reconstructed *limes*. Even in the eyes of the researchers working at the *limes*, Rome remained the center.

This, however, is gradually changing now. Excavation archaeology makes the *layers beneath our feet* interesting, *regardless of where* we stand. In contextual archaeology it is considered important to order the objects found into the appropriate historical periods, even if they are *far away* from the classical. Archaeology in China has drawn attention with its spectacular finds. The fact that construction on the Great Wall of China began in the fifth century BCE, at the same time as the classical wars between Athens and Sparta, has resulted in general philosophical and historical questions for quite some time.<sup>14</sup> Archaeology in Mexico and in the Andes has also arrived at a point where international comparisons can be made. The foundations for these kinds of cultural comparisons are open from Chile to southern India or Norway. Egyptology—originally based entirely on history and philology—has, like Near Eastern cultural history, turned into archaeology, with the archaeologies of Asian and American countries joining it. There is pre-history everywhere that people have lived or live; archaeology has spread “worldwide.”<sup>15</sup> Archaeology has been carried out in landscapes that were previously thought to have contained

little culture, like Australia, and it has been used to reconstruct special living conditions, for instance, among northern indigenous peoples, previously called Eskimos. Objects found in excavations around the world are displayed in local museums, because, as important as they are to increasing cultural tourism, they are particularly significant for the people living nearby, who are looking for the “history beneath their feet.” In this respect, such museums are not only destinations for further travel, and possibly also outstanding pieces of architecture in a vast archaeological landscape, they also open up more dimensions in the depths of history on site (Paracas, Ica, Peru), certainly most impressively when they are located at the edge of a necropolis (Knut Hamsun Center, Hamarøy, Norway).

Archaeology is very closely associated with what used to be called “historic preservation,” especially during the time when “classical” monuments were still its focus. Preservation, of course, not only requires the grand monument, but also every little object that comes to light during an excavation and must be removed from its excavation level. First, it must be cleaned, then restored, and then observed for years in a museum or its depositories. Of course, preservation also requires an excavation site itself, above all when what we are supposed to keep for visitors is a small room in the cellar of a new building or a vast ground on the site of an ancient sanctuary, such as Olympia in Greece. Ultimately, all ancient ruins that are still standing upright, along with their surrounding landscapes, are at the mercy of wear and tear, weather, and the growth of extra vegetation—meaning, historical changes and decay. Archaeologists do not just sit at their desks trying to reconstruct past cultures, ancient buildings, and old objets d’art. In order to protect everything, additional walls have to be erected, and here and there copies must replace the originals. What is often difficult to recognize about these kinds of additions to old excavation sites must now be precisely documented around the world, not only at the point of excavation and restoration, but in any place where there is an opportunity to think about the layers beneath our feet. Sometimes a wall made with old technology and in an old size for the protection of a place can inspire similar ideas, even when it is not at all “antique” (Castlecrag House, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia).

### 3. The World of Objects

Modern archaeology is always strongly determined by the objects existing; yes, more than every text-oriented method of writing history archaeology relies upon the interpretation of these objects, which are encountered, for example, in an excavation in recordable forms made of certain materials and bearing appropriate traces of workmanship. Lying in an observable layer in the excavation, they are in relationship to other, different objects, and out of their association with each other one can read moments in history, or even longer periods. This may be worlds far away from ours and beyond our understanding. Much of what interests us about archaeology around the globe is very far from us, both historically and geographically. But the objects themselves are near to us, and we can even touch them in a museum, if the expert in charge does not forbid it. Remember: the excavation is a window through which we look into the world of the objects lying there, and it is the door through which these objects enter our world, before they wind up in one of our museums. The condition and appearance of these objects allow us to discern which ones have already existed for a long time, or have gone through destruction and repair. Observing the layer, we can see how an object ultimately ended up there, and what other objects were with it, as

well as why it came to be there in this layer, buried beneath the next highest layer. This way of writing history is difficult to read, but relatively objective, i.e., it relates to the object itself.

Even though, over the course of the long history of collecting, some things reached our museums before the emergence of contextual archaeology, they are hardly free of clues about their original contexts. Plunderers and art dealers who lied about the history of their acquisitions have erased many clues. Some early collectors only acquired objects from a region they particularly liked, or from places whose ancient history was familiar to them, such as Italy, for instance. Some collectors only passed their rarities on to others who also wanted to know this information. These types of collectors' stories are part of the modern biography of archaeological objects—after all, with the exception of a few rare pieces that survived in medieval treasure chambers, all of them were dug up at some time, somewhere. At an auction in New York in 1987 the Berlin Antikensammlung acquired a magnificent Roman sarcophagus bearing the unique representation of a Roman general next to a depiction of a Greek saga about the death of a hero.<sup>16</sup> It turned out that it had been in the United States, on Long Island, around 1900, because it was mentioned in a text written by one of its previous owners. But beyond that, drawings were soon found, which showed that the sarcophagus had been in the possession of the famous Tuscan family of the Rinuccini since the sixteenth century, first in Empoli, and then in Florence. Made in Rome around 200 CE for a speedy funeral—meaning that it probably was not seen very long in Antiquity—in modern times it has been a famous work of art for almost five hundred years now—a good example of an intriguing biography of an object, which can be joined by many others.

In this case, drawings proved the sarcophagus had come to someone's attention early on. Ever since the advancing nineteenth century, photographs have allowed to document more precisely the condition and recent locations of older works of art. Archaeology and photography have belonged together ever since.<sup>17</sup> All of the bigger archaeological museums and institutes, and all of the older university departments of archaeology have so-called photo or slide depositories that are now being replaced by their digital successors—without explaining exactly “how.” They contain treasures from the long history of archaeological photography, that is, from location photography, excavation photography, museum photography, factual and object photography, or by its size independent sculpture photography. It was not until the last quarter of the twentieth century that the older black-and-white photograph, with all of its special characteristics, was replaced by the very different color photograph.

Compared to the older method of drawing, photography seemed to be suited above all to document the actual appearance of an archaeological object. Older photos can be compared to newer ones, in order to discover proof of changes, and possibly also of depredations made upon freestanding monuments, such as ancient architecture. Photos of excavations can capture the context of the finds, including the condition of the find on the day it emerges, even though black-and-white photographs were not always good enough to detect the finer differences in the material of the findings. It is also possible to record when excavated objects are taken to a museum and enter the new context of an exhibition, including the condition an object is in after restoration, or when it is moved to another storage space. Normally, however, each individual object is photographed against a neutral background, while excavations and their architecture are captured without any people—both types of photographs promising eternal life, so to speak. Photographs can be easily dated by the clothing worn by the excavators if they were posing in front of the antiquities, or from the people frolicking in the landscape with the architecture in the background.

Beyond documentation, such photographs may offer some stories: how many workers were available for the first excavations at Olympia in the nineteenth century; how many people visited the unprotected ruins on the Via Appia near Rome around 1960; how do visitors to the big museums behave in the early twenty-first century? But there are also tales in purely “objective” photography: after all, when the print has been developed, the photograph represents a reproduction of the object, replacing it, so to speak. The kind of neutral background, the framing, and the angle of the object, and even the paper upon which the photo is printed—all depends upon the time period and should be taken into consideration. Elements of the style of the times can be recognized in good black-and-white photographs of the nineteen-twenties. How people regarded antiquities at the time is yet another story, possibly offered to us in a photograph printed on old cardboard lying in a photo library. A series of these kinds of old pictures, taken at intervals throughout 1884–5, shows the excavation of the theater of Pergamon and the masses of rubble and dirt that were carted off and dumped down the hillside.<sup>18</sup> Archaeologists were interested in excavating the theater, not in the rubble, but the photos tell about how it was moved elsewhere and formed the landscape around the ruins.

In this respect, a museum is not only an archive for the objects collected in it—for which it probably set up an excavation of its own—it also has among the photos of its own collection in its library many rows of photos of comparable objects from other collections. In twentieth-century archaeology and art history photographs seemed to be the ideal means for producing series of images, documenting the course of time and changes of style, or (when published as “corpora”) presenting certain genres of art as completely as possible. With the original, the emphasis is on its authenticity; with a photo its reproduceability is its advantage. With these kinds of photos one could assemble an “imaginary museum,” projecting easily recognizable “masterpieces” from all around the world through art books, museum posters, and postcards into our heads.

Just as archaeological objects are at the mercy of change (perceived most particularly in the ancient architecture worn by weather in its surrounding landscape, and even worse, in structures polluted by the traffic in modern cities—all of which can be seen and compared in older and newer photos), photographs themselves are also subjected to alterations brought about by time. The old negatives, slides, and prints on paper or cardboard in all of the photo depositories are continually decaying, even though they were at times thought to be more durable than the potentially endangered originals; digitalization merely delays the problem.

This allows us to take another look at what modern archaeology worldwide makes available to our understanding of history. Objects like the Parthenon, which has survived on the Acropolis in the center of Athens, or “Nestor’s well-filled cup,” brought to light by the spades and brushes of an excavation on the periphery of the ancient world on Ischia, are in sorely damaged condition. Like the finds excavated on Ischia, the sculptures at the Parthenon have also been taken out of their context, brought to a museum, re-mounted there and exhibited as unique originals (B. Tschumi, New Acropolis Museum, in Athens, Greece). But their meaning for us only emerges from the questions that we ask about them. To do this, photographers point their cameras at them, using experience and eye, equipment and the available light, to make each object two dimensional, perhaps even mirroring them, bringing them as a depiction back again to our world. They may even prepare their prints so that our view of the original is more aligned with their own. Their images are possibly characterized by art, and thus dependent upon a certain style that relies on a certain



time period. After all, even descriptions like the ones in this essay are simply one author's individual views of the objects discussed, of what we are confronted with, or of what was once "beneath our feet"; meaning that they are simply illustrations of particular objects of this world, and these are the "mere images of the truth," as Susan Sontag once wrote.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Erieta Attali, *Erieta Attali 1997–2007: Architectural Landscapes in Greece* (Athens, 2007); for more on the following, see esp. the interview conducted by Ariel Genadt, "Ambient Excavations," in *Erieta Attali on Kengo Kuma Glass/Wood* (Ostfildern, 2015), pp. 72–76.

<sup>2</sup> According to several conversations between the author and Erieta Attali on "Architecture and Landscape on the Periphery of the World," (unpubl.), Berlin, November–December 2016; see curriculum vitae, specialized training in archaeological photography and work experience in archaeological photography and scientific photography: [http://www.erietaattali.com/fileadmin/user\\_upload/biography/Erieta-Attali\\_CV\\_long-version.pdf](http://www.erietaattali.com/fileadmin/user_upload/biography/Erieta-Attali_CV_long-version.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Attali 2015 (see note 1), p. 72.

<sup>4</sup> Erieta Attali, *In Extremis: Landscape into Architecture* (New York, 2010).

<sup>5</sup> Martyn Hook, interview with Erieta Attali 2016 (unpubl.).

<sup>6</sup> A. H. Borbein et al., eds., *Klassische Archäologie, eine Einführung* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 2000); F. Lang, *Klassische Archäologie, eine Einführung in Methode, Theorie und Praxis* (Tübingen, 2002).

<sup>7</sup> See W. D. Heilmeyer et al., eds., *Mythos Olympia – Kult und Spiele*, exh. cat. Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin 2012–13 (Munich, 2012).

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, S. Descamps, Lequine K. Charatsopoulou, eds., *Au royaume d'Alexandre le Grand, la Macédoine antique*, exh. cat. Musée de Louvre (Paris, 2011).

<sup>9</sup> For more on this and the following, see W.-D. Heilmeyer, *Erst erfreuen, dann belehren – Museologie und Archäologie* (Berlin, 2013), pp. 15–17, 45–48.

<sup>10</sup> For more on Don Pietro Monti, see W.-D. Heilmeyer, "Die Heilige Restituta und ihr Museum," *Museumsjournal Berlin und Potsdam*, 15:1 (2001), pp. 91–93; part one of the publication of his finds: G. Olcese, *Le anfore greco-italiche di Ischia* (Rome, 2010); part two, containing extensive information on the excavations and the Don Pietro Monti Museum: G. Olcese, *Pithecusan Workshops – Il quartiere artigiane di S. Restituta di Lacco Ameno (Ischia) e i suoi reperti* (Rome, 2017).

<sup>11</sup> Heilmeyer 2013 (see note 9), p. 126, no. 1.

<sup>12</sup> For more on this and the following, see F. Zimmer et al., eds., *Die griechische Klassik – Idee oder Wirklichkeit*, exh. cat., Antikensammlung Berlin (Darmstadt, 2002), pp. 96–110, 155–61.

<sup>13</sup> See note 5.

<sup>14</sup> See Zimmer et al. 2002 (see note 12), p. 97, (K. Jaspers).

<sup>15</sup> According to the title of a magazine published by the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Berlin from 2013 onward.

<sup>16</sup> A. Schwarzmaier et al., *Die Antikensammlung*, Berlin 2012, 218 f., no. 122, inv. no. 1987.2 (H. Heres).

<sup>17</sup> For more on this and the following, see: A. Alexandridis and W.-D. Heilmeyer, eds., *Archäologie der Photographie* (Mainz, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 26–28.

<sup>19</sup> Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (New York, 1977), p. 9.