

This publication is a result of the European Union-funded Horizon 2020 research project: CoHERE (Critical Heritages: performing and representing identities in Europe). CoHERE received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 693289.

Chapter 4

Excavating a Wonder of the Ancient World: Danish Classicism in the Field

Starting out from the basic question of where Danish classical archaeologists have been active in the field, this chapter digs deeper into the discourses of heritage and identity that underpin their fieldwork in the Mediterranean. Specifically it investigates Danish archaeological fieldwork in Bodrum, Turkey (ancient Halikarnassos), which began in 1966 and which has continued until very recently.¹ This fieldwork is closely tied to and a direct outcome of a particular kind of academic classicism that has motivated European scholars for centuries to search out material remains of great civilisations outside of their home countries, attesting to a variety of imagined geographies in the process.

The chief protagonist of this chapter is Kristian Jeppesen (1924–2014), whose scholarship, in spite of its singular direction, is characteristic of Danish academic classicism as practised in the twentieth century. Jeppesen's work in Bodrum focused on the Mausoleum, a monumental funerary complex constructed in the mid-fourth century BC for the burial of the Karian satrap Maussollos and his sister-wife Artemisia II in the heart of the ancient city. From the Hellenistic period onwards, the Mausoleum was included in the lists of world wonders compiled by Greek and Roman authors, giving birth to a concept with a remarkable longevity and resonance right up until the present day. Even in antiquity, the design of the Mausoleum provided a model for other monuments, such as the second-century BC Lion Tomb at Knidos and the first-century BC Mausoleum of Augustus in Rome. Much later, key features of the Mausoleum, notably its stepped pyramid roof, served as reference-points in twentieth-century architectural classicism around the world.² For example, well

¹ Turkish perspectives on this fieldwork will be discussed in forthcoming publications from the CoHERE project.

² Notable examples include the tower of St George's, Bloomsbury, London (1730), the House of the Temple,

before Jeppesen’s excavations began, architectural references to the Mausoleum were known in Denmark. As we saw in the previous chapter, the stepped pyramid of Kampmann’s 1906 expansion of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek was inspired by contemporary reconstructions of the Mausoleum (Fig. 3.4; and see Østergaard 2011, 10–20). Not long after, the National Exhibition in 1909 in Aarhus included a building presented by the Danish Post and Telegraph and adorned with a pyramidal roof that again referenced the Mausoleum (Fig. 4.1; Bender 2008).³ The act of excavating the Mausoleum thus held considerable symbolic capital, both internationally and in the Danish context. Although they were rarely made explicit in Jeppesen’s work, the discourses of classicism traced in preceding chapters are instrumental in legitimating the fieldwork as well as the form of its presentation to Danish audiences. This chapter will begin by discussing the history of classical field archaeology in the Mediterranean, in order to investigate the particularities of the Danish work in Bodrum. The following two sections focus on Jeppesen’s efforts to excavate and to reconstruct the Mausoleum, focusing especially on how his academic training produced very particular forms of classical heritage. Finally, we turn to the issue of how the archaeology of Bodrum has been approached by Danish archaeologists in more recent work, as well as some of the challenges that currently face Mediterranean field archaeology more generally in light of the changing relationship between Europe and Turkey.

Classicism in the Field

The practice of sending archaeologists to foreign countries has a long and chequered history, which scholars in recent years have linked to naive realism and cultural imperialism in both its formal and informal guises (Díaz-Andreu 2007, 99–130; Siapkas 2017, 130–132). Most accounts of the origins of the discipline have indeed tended to neglect the contribution of what Benjamin Anderson has called “local interpreters”, that is, the “people for whom a given object formed part of everyday experience” (Anderson 2015, 452). Recent work on the historiography of classical archaeological practice has thus shed an increasingly critical light on the legacy of Euro-American work in

Washington DC (1911–1915), the Los Angeles City Hall (1926–1928), and the Shrine of Remembrance, Melbourne (1927–1934).

³ This was just one of the exhibition’s references to classical architecture; among others were a triumphal arch and a victory column closely referencing those of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius in Rome. On the exhibition and its reception of classical antiquity, see Nørskov 2008, 19–21.

Mediterranean countries. Margarita Díaz-Andreu, for instance, points to the close ties between nineteenth-century archaeological practices and deep-rooted contemporary ideologies such as nationalism and colonialism (Díaz-Andreu 2007; see also Shanks 1996; Kohl, Kozelsky and Ben-Yehuda 2007). Furthermore, in his work on the history of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, Jack Davis pinpoints the academic *habitus* that profoundly shaped that institution's history during its formative years (Davis 2003, 148). Davis argues for the need to unsettle the epistemological security that continues to underpin agendas and approaches within the discipline, such as the tendency to focus predominantly on monumental architecture dating to the classical period. This selective approach to classical field archaeology is also strikingly evident in Jeppesen's work at Bodrum, as we shall see.

The development of the discipline of classical archaeology over the course of the nineteenth century underlined its increasing role as an arena for competition for political prestige among European nations, not least through the acquisition of monumental antiquities sourced in the Near East and the Mediterranean (Jenkins 1992; Prettejohn 2012, 38–103). From the middle of the century, north-west European nations founded archaeological institutes (or “schools”), primarily in Rome and Athens.⁴ Fuelled by the practices of classicism in contemporary society, large-scale excavations undertaken by European nations starting in the mid-to-late nineteenth century increased the intensity and ambition of archaeological fieldwork in the Mediterranean. Foreign schools and museums sponsored sustained fieldwork campaigns, often competing against each other in order to secure the most prestigious sites in intensive negotiations with local governments and landowners (Marchand 1996, 75–115; Dyson 2006, 86–132). This new era began in 1875, when the newly unified German state opened excavations at Olympia, site of the ancient Olympic Games. In 1892, the French school that was already active on Delos launched excavations at Delphi. The Americans soon followed, beginning work at Corinth in 1896. Excavations often required the demolition of entire villages, as well as the routine clearance of post-classical layers without any

⁴ These institutes remain important to the disciplinary infrastructure of the study of the ancient world, facilitating fieldwork and maintaining important libraries as well as being involved in a range of research and training activities (for a critique, see Shanks 1996). The Danes were relative latecomers to this practice, with their first such institute opening in 1956 in Rome, followed by another in 1992 in Athens and, most recently, in 2000 in Damascus.

form of documentation. Many of the objects uncovered – even whole buildings – were transferred to museums in the countries that had sponsored excavations, in spite of local opposition from both populations and politicians (Hamilakis 2013). Yet these large-scale and long-running excavations remain an important legacy of the discipline; German, French and American archaeologists are thus still active at Olympia, Delphi, and Corinth respectively. They have furthermore defined more generally how archaeological knowledge in the Mediterranean is produced and presented, effectively constituting a particular form of academic colonialism.

Danish archaeologists were present in the Mediterranean from early in the nineteenth century, through the activities of prominent travellers and scholars (Rathje and Lund 1991; Christiansen 2000, 18–33). These included the philologist Peter Oluf Brøndsted, who participated in several excavations in Greece between 1806 and 1811 (cf. chapter two), as well as the naval officer Christian Tuxen Falbe (1792–1849), who conducted excavations in the 1830s at Carthage, whence a number of finds are now in the National Museum in Copenhagen (Liventhal 1986). These initiatives followed in the footsteps of Danish scientific expeditions in the Mediterranean and Near East that constituted major nation-building investments sponsored by the king. These included the Royal Danish Arabia Expedition (1761–1764), whose only returning member Carsten Niebuhr reached as far as Yemen and India, collecting and describing a wide range of materials along the way and bringing a large number of objects home to the Royal Kunstkammer (Sortkær 2008; Hansen 2016).

At this time, Danish classical archaeology was closely tied to the National Museum, although a university chair had also been established (Johansen 1943; Riis 1979).⁵ The chair was often held jointly between classical philology and archaeology, as in the case of Brøndsted. In 1859, Johannes Ludovicus Ussing (1820–1905) was appointed to this chair at the University of Copenhagen (Ussing 1906, 101, 105–6). He had previously defended a dissertation in Latin on the ancient names of Greek vases in 1844 (Ussing 1844). Although Ussing never excavated himself, he travelled extensively in Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt, and published widely on his archaeological journeys

⁵ In this context, it is worth noting that the introduction of prehistory in Danish universities was a later development, with an associate professorship in Nordic archaeology not being filled until 1929. It was not until 1941 that the first professorship in Nordic and European Prehistory was occupied (Johansen 1943, 166). Since 1949, classical archaeology has also been taught at Aarhus University, a relatively new university founded in 1928.

(Ussing 1873; 1882). As member of the board of the Carlsberg Foundation from 1887 to 1902, he was instrumental in paving the way for Danish excavations in the Mediterranean, academically as well as financially (Ussing 1906, 227–228). The Carlsberg Foundation had previously sponsored expeditions to Greenland (Glamann 1976, 128–129), and Ussing actively promoted his ambition that Danish archaeologists should begin excavations of their own in the Mediterranean. In his posthumously published memoirs, Ussing notes how the new era of large-scale excavations in the second half of the nineteenth century had carved out a new role and importance for archaeology, urging Danish scholars to follow the examples of their European (and American) colleagues:

It is no wonder that everyone who loved classical antiquity and was waiting to see it present itself in its true form was eager to participate in the momentous clear-up. Germany's example was followed by other great nations. France, England, North America, Russia and Italy spent considerable amounts on it. But should not also the smaller states, whose interest and eagerness were no less than the others, should they not also be able to contribute to this common work in the service of culture? And was Denmark not particularly beckoned there, the land which not only by its investigations into the Nordic and prehistoric archaeological field occupies a leading position in this science, but also within classical archaeology both through scientific works and with its rich museums, has acquired the claim to inhabit the inner circle? (Ussing 1906, 227–228).

Ussing here directly evokes the imagined geography of classicism, in which Denmark's place is secured by two elements: first, by the material heritage of its rich collections of classical antiquities, whose importance was self-evidently displayed as a claim to Danish ownership of classical heritage and thus membership of the "club" of European nations that undertook their own excavations (revealing referred to as "clear-up") in the Mediterranean; and second, by the contributions of Danish academia to the discipline of archaeology, going back to the efforts of Jürgensen Thomsen and Worsaae. Ussing describes these scholarly achievements as giving Denmark access to the "inner circle" of nations that work in the service of European culture.

Through his advocacy of archaeological excavation Ussing played a fundamental role in the development of Danish field projects in the Mediterranean by securing the economic support of the Carlsberg Foundation. The search for a suitable site then began. Changes in Greek legislation made it increasingly difficult to export any antiquities that were found, and sites such as Kleonai and Nemea on the Greek mainland were thus dismissed, as was Cyrene in modern Libya (Ussing 1906, 228). However, the archaeological potential of western Asia Minor was becoming increasingly apparent through the German and Austrian excavations at Ephesus, Priene, and Pergamon (the latter being the topic of Ussing 1897). Eventually, the choice of site for the first major Danish excavation in the Mediterranean fell upon the acropolis of Lindos on the island of Rhodes, then part of the Ottoman Empire. The main campaigns were carried out between 1902 and 1905, although work continued at a smaller scale until the outbreak of the First World War. Excavations were led by Karl Frederik Kinch and Christian Blinkenberg, then curator at the National Museum (Ussing 1906, 228–229; Blinkenberg 1941; Dyggve 1960; Dietz and Trolle 1974, 9–16). The contribution of the Carlsberg Foundation amounted to the large sum of 60,000 Danish kroner (equivalent to 4.15 million DKr at 2017 rates), beginning its tradition of funding Danish field archaeology in the Mediterranean. The excavations on the Lindian acropolis followed nineteenth-century practices, with the removal of vast amounts of earth and large-scale demolition of post-classical houses and buildings. Many of the important finds from the excavations were sent to the Danish National Museum, where they still constitute an important component in the classical exhibitions (see chapter three). Through archaeological excavation and with the help of a private foundation, Denmark had thus acquired another rich hoard of antiquities that served to consolidate its place as a European nation rooted in classical heritage.

The work at Lindos was followed by excavations in Kalydon, Greece (1926–1935), and Hama, Syria (1931–1938). Figure 4.2 shows the location of these and other Danish fieldwork projects in the countries around the Mediterranean. Viewed through this geographical lens, Danish classicism in the field has two main centres. The first centre is the eastern Mediterranean, with particular emphasis on Greece, Syria and, to a lesser extent, Turkey and Cyprus.⁶ This demonstrates just how

⁶ This work in fact extends as far as the Arabian Gulf, not least thanks to the efforts of P. V. Glob (1911–1985) (Højlund

much classical field archaeology owes not only to Hellenism, but also to the long tradition of European “expeditions” to the Near East and beyond, as with the Danish example of Niebuhr’s eighteenth-century travels. Although Denmark was never a colonial power in the Mediterranean, its scholarly endeavours were indeed repeatedly tied to various degrees of informal colonialism. The second centre is Italy, with particular emphasis on Rome and its immediate vicinity, often focusing on imperial monuments and constituting a counterpoint to the Hellenic outlook of many other field projects. It is also worth noting some of the gaps. Beyond Tunisia, there is, for example, a notable absence of any work in the western Mediterranean. The choice of sites to excavate primarily reflects the interests of individual Danish archaeologists, but it is also revelatory of how archaeology is believed to be able to contribute to a sense of Danish and European identity construction. Hellenism is a strong component in the emphasis of excavation of sites that have yielded Greek material culture, a trend that is also clear on the broader Euro-American scale (Davis 2003, 163). Indeed, in the formal and informal communication relating to the planning and execution of classical field projects, one repeatedly encounters the tropes of classicism identified in chapter two.

Excavating the Wonder

We turn now to Bodrum, to explore the links between classicism and archaeological practice in more detail. The primary attraction for Danish archaeologists in coming to Bodrum was the considerable scholarly prestige attached to the reconstruction of the Mausoleum, but the Danes were far from the first to explore this wonder of the ancient world. Even before the age of modern archaeology, numerous scholars and explorers had sought to reconstruct the original appearance of the Mausoleum (*Maussolleion* 2, 119–214). The Mausoleum is described by several ancient authors, most importantly Pliny and Vitruvius, who give us the names of famous classical Greek sculptors and architects involved in its construction, as well as crucial information about the layout and dimensions of the monument and its place within the city (*Maussolleion* 2, 13–101; Jenkins and Waywell 1997). These texts remain fundamental to our understanding of the Mausoleum, and a whole volume of the excavation series initiated by Jeppesen is dedicated to squeezing every little

1999). Jeppesen participated in Glob’s expedition to the island of Failaka, Kuwait, where he excavated a small Hellenistic period temple (published as Jeppesen 1989).

technical detail out of them (*Maussolleion* 2). On this basis, the Mausoleum is reconstructed as a quadrangular structure some 45 m tall, with a pyramidal roof, and adorned with a rich assortment of statues and sculpted friezes. The Mausoleum itself was situated on an enormous, 25,000 m² terrace that constituted the key component in the larger city plan laid out by Maussollos when he moved the Karian capital from Mylasa (modern Milas) to Halikarnassos (*Maussolleion* 3). It is not known when or how the Mausoleum fell into disrepair, but the region's frequent earthquakes may have been a contributing factor. Generally, Halikarnassos's history during the first millennium AD is poorly known and has been the subject of only limited research (Poulsen 2011). In contrast, the demolition of the Mausoleum in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is well documented. At this time, architectural blocks and sculptures from the Mausoleum site were removed by the Hospitaller Knights to the Zephyrion peninsula for the construction of the castle of St Peter, the most dominant monument in the city even today.

Eyeing the prize of excavating a wonder of the ancient world, early archaeological exploration in Bodrum followed the pattern of colonial-style classical archaeology described above. In 1852, Charles Newton had left his curatorial position at the British Museum to become vice-consul on Lesbos, which placed him close to the considerable archaeological treasures on the Aegean coast (Jenkins 1992, 171–183; Cook 1997). The diminishing power of the Ottoman sultan increasingly allowed European scholars to carry out extensive archaeological exploration and to transport their finds back to their home countries. Newton arrived in Bodrum in November 1856 on the British warship *Gorgon* with a crew of 150 men (Newton 1862, 86). His excavations at the site of the Mausoleum began two months later. At this time, Bodrum was a small fisherman's village with a mixed population of Muslims and Christians. In 1857, Newton unearthed a rich cache of sculptures, including colossal statues commonly identified as Maussollos and Artemisia, as well as the so-called Amazon frieze, which were shipped back to London. Today it is in the galleries of the British Museum that one comes face to face with most of the sculptures that originally adorned the Mausoleum (Jenkins 1992, 97–99). Newton's export of the Mausoleum's sculptures led to clashes with the Ottoman authorities, who consequently strengthened their antiquities laws in order to deter Europeans from transporting them out of the country (Díaz-Andreu 2007, 112–113). Attempts to reconstruct the Mausoleum from this point onwards were based on the results of

Newton's excavations as well as the subsequent investigations by Alfred Biliotti in 1865, which aimed to locate further sculptural finds for the British Museum (*Mausolleion* 3.1, 117–173).

Almost one hundred years after Newton's expedition to Bodrum, Jeppesen turned his attention to the Mausoleum. Jeppesen first trained as an architect at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, being awarded a diploma in architecture in 1949, and then obtained a degree in classical archaeology from the University of Copenhagen in 1952. This interdisciplinary profile is sometimes referred to as archaeological *Bauforschung* (historical architectural research), which, as the name indicates, is a discipline with a particularly strong research tradition in Germany (Gruben 2000). *Bauforschung* is a technical and empirical discipline that combines the precise recording of architectural remains with a deep practical knowledge of how Greek and Roman architects worked. Jeppesen's first introduction to Turkish archaeology came through participation in 1950–51 in the Swedish excavations at the important Karian sanctuary of Zeus at Labraunda, some 60 km inland from Bodrum (Jeppesen 1999, 39; 2011). In 1958, Jeppesen was appointed to the professorship of classical archaeology at Aarhus University, where he was responsible for the development of a small study collection which, under his curatorial oversight, developed into the Museum of Ancient Art and Archaeology, containing plaster casts of classical sculptures and a small collection of antiquities, mostly pottery and coins (Guldager 1993; Bilde 2000). His design and displays in the museum were rooted in his own research interests, focusing in particular on the Parthenon, one of the most important monuments of European classicism, and later the Mausoleum of Halikarnassos. Also in 1958, Jeppesen defended his higher doctoral dissertation or *Habilitation*, a study of three major monuments in mid-fourth-century BC architecture with the Mausoleum as his first case (Jeppesen 1958). His normative comments on the selection of case studies go to the very core of classicism, which is also expressed in the dissertation's title, *Paradeigmata*:

Deliberately I have concentrated on items of *primary* importance in the history of architecture, presenting problems too complicated to be dealt with in terms of an encyclopedia, and such, particularly, for the reconstruction and interpretation of which a fresh study of the sources might prove especially rewarding (Jeppesen 1958, xvii,

emphasis added).

After scrutinising the primary sources and reviewing the multitude of Mausoleum reconstructions put forward across several centuries, Jeppesen concluded that more work carried out with modern excavation methods would be required to advance the issue further. Yet this did not restrain him from proposing a series of new reconstruction drawings of the Mausoleum in the dissertation (Fig. 4.3; Jeppesen 1958, 61–64, figs. 48–51). This early reconstruction looks radically different to those that he proposed after his excavations in Bodrum (see below). In the dissertation's other two case studies, on the Arsenal of Philo in the Piraeus and the Ionic Portico at Eleusis, he followed a similar approach, closely studying the textual and archaeological evidence and then proposing new reconstructions by way of conclusion.

In noting that Newton had “left a considerable part of the immediate surroundings of the site wholly untouched or just partially explored”, the text of Jeppesen's dissertation foreshadowed his later work at the Mausoleum (Jeppesen 1958, 152). Beginning in 1963, he thus repeatedly visited Bodrum, where he investigated architectural fragments from the Mausoleum that had been reused in various parts of the Castle of St Peter, often with the sculptural decoration hidden inside its walls. Through this meticulous work, which required great attention to small details and the well-trained eye of an architectural connoisseur, he discovered further fragments of the Amazon frieze (*Maussoleion* 1, 9–10). These finds once again suggested to him that further aspects of the many mysteries of the Mausoleum could be illuminated if new excavations were carried out at the site.

On 13 April 1966, with the support of the Carlsberg Foundation, Jeppesen thus began excavations at the site of the Mausoleum, although first on a very limited scale. The social and political context was very different in Turkey in the 1960s than it had been in the time of Newton or of the Danish work at Lindos at the beginning of the century. In the wake of the First World War and the subsequent War of Independence, the Ottoman Empire had been transformed into the Turkish Republic under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938). A process of modernisation and Westernisation had been implemented, including the translation of classical Greek authors into Turkish (Williams 2013, 123). Similarly, taking inspiration from Europe, Turkish archaeology became subsumed and developed within this new nationalist project (Özdoğan 1998; Bonini Baraldi, Shoup

and Zan 2013). The export of antiquities uncovered by foreign excavations was no longer possible. Bodrum had been transformed as well (Mansur 1972). At the beginning of the twentieth century, its Greek population was exchanged with Muslims from Crete (Mansur 1972, 10–11). Due to its isolated location, Bodrum was frequently put to use by the authorities as a place to which political dissidents were exiled. In 1925, the author Cevat Şakir Kabaağaçlı (1886–1973) arrived as a prisoner and fell in love with the town, beginning a life-long engagement with its people and history. Using the pen name of the Fisherman of Halikarnassos (*Halikarnas Balıkcısı*), Şakir helped to revive local and national interest in archaeology as well as in the role of ancient authors, notably Homer. In his writings and radio shows, he criticised the Western focus on Athens and the contributions of Greece, whereas he believed the contribution of Anatolian culture to have been overlooked (Williams 2013, 126). He also played a key role in attracting new visitors to Bodrum, which increasingly developed into a flourishing resort town. From the late 1960s onwards, foreign tourists began to visit, paving the way for the town’s development into one of the most popular resorts in the Mediterranean and the large-scale construction of hotels, bars and restaurants (Mansur 1999). The rapid expansion of the town and other parts of the peninsula has in turn necessitated a string of rescue excavations over the years. Finds from these excavations, in addition to the unique and important shipwrecks excavated by the US-based Institute of Nautical Archaeology, populate the Museum of Underwater Archaeology, which opened officially in 1964 and is housed in the castle (Alpözen 1983).⁷

Jeppesen’s initial excavations focused on areas not investigated by Newton, tracing the walls that supported the massive terrace on which the Mausoleum was situated. However, in 1970, the opportunity arose to re-excavate the site of the Mausoleum in its entirety (*Maussolleion* 1, 13). This operation was made possible, in Jeppesen’s own words, through the acquisition of the Mausoleum plot “for a cheap buck and a bottle of whisky” (Jeppesen 1999, 46). The large quantities of earth that were uncovered in this campaign were used for the construction of Bodrum’s new marina. As part of this large-scale work over the following years, the Mausoleum tomb chamber was exposed

⁷ Important to the archaeology of Bodrum is also the town’s sponge diving community, which identified numerous underwater archaeological finds, in turn attracting foreign archaeologists. The Institute of Nautical Archaeology, founded in 1973 by George Bass, thus has a presence in the town stretching back to the 1960s.

(*Maussolleion* 4). The Mausoleum was excavated down to its foundation and a series of pre-Maussollan structures were identified underneath (*Maussolleion* 6). An undisturbed sacrificial deposit with the remains of five oxen, twenty-five sheep or goats, eight lambs, three roosters, ten hens and eight pigeons was excavated on the staircase leading to the tomb chamber, constituting one of the most significant scientific outcomes of Jeppesen's work (*Maussolleion* 1, 21–110). The eighth and final field season at the Mausoleum concluded on 31 July 1977. Over the course of eleven years, the Danish excavations had uncovered thousands of architectural fragments and a large number of small finds. They had furthermore left an enormous hole in the ground that only to a very limited degree enabled visitors to understand the monumentality, complexity and innovative architecture of the Mausoleum.

After the completion of the excavations and right up until a few years before his death in 2014, Jeppesen returned to Bodrum year after year in order to study the fragments in pursuit of a new and more precise reconstruction of the Mausoleum. The post-excavation phase of the project continued for more than twenty years, and the final of seven volumes publishing its main results appeared only in 2004 (*Maussolleion* 6). In his publications of the Mausoleum, Jeppesen never explicitly addressed how this work contributed to our understanding of the ancient world at large. Its importance was largely self-explanatory, following a logic closely tied to the tropes of classicism and the reasoning that he followed in the selection of case studies for his dissertation. Jeppesen's work on the Mausoleum thus emphasised the importance of "a wonder of the classical world" whose architectural reconstruction had been fiercely debated for centuries and which now finally had come up for robust revision on the basis of modern archaeological excavations and fresh architectural observation (*Maussolleion* 1, 9–10). The European fascination with the building across several centuries was what made his studies worthwhile. Jeppesen's approach to the Mausoleum and classical heritage more generally was rooted in the discourses of Hellenism that had emerged in nineteenth-century Europe and that informed his aesthetic sensibilities. This is evident from his choice of monuments to work with, as he sought out historically significant and unique examples of classical architecture. His approach was technical and down-to-earth, true to the traditions of archaeological *Bauforschung*. Jeppesen indeed stayed true to the ideals of classicism throughout his career. For example, he wrote a book on the Erechtheion, proposing a bold (but rarely accepted)

theory for a new location of this important classical Athenian landmark on the basis of a re-reading of a textual source (Jeppesen 1987). One of the last papers he ever published even offered a “fresh approach to the problems of the Parthenon frieze” (Jeppesen 2007), yet another revered monument of classical Greek architectural sculpture whose iconography has puzzled scholars for centuries.

Jeppesen’s scholarly interests are furthermore evident in the small exhibition space that he constructed on the Mausoleum grounds, soon after the completion of the excavations in 1977.⁸ It was officially opened in 1983 (*Maussoleion* 5, 8). Every single label, every single display, even the building itself was designed by Jeppesen. The Mausoleum museum thus constitutes a unique document to one scholar’s vision of the Mausoleum and the practices of classicism that informed it. It has a dual function: one part houses the storerooms for Jeppesen’s excavations, and the other exhibits the results of the Mausoleum excavations to visitors. The exhibition focuses primarily on architecture, secondarily on (architectural) sculpture, displaying significant architectural fragments unearthed in Jeppesen’s excavations, parts of the Amazon frieze discovered in the castle, and casts of those now in the British Museum. Only two pieces of the large amounts of pottery unearthed in the Mausoleum excavations are on display. Long didactic texts in Turkish and English (accompanied by architectural drawings) explain the highly technical issues relating to the reconstruction of individual parts of the monument itself, as well as its place within the history of classical Greek architecture. The museum also houses three-dimensional models of the urban layout of ancient Halikarnassos and the Mausoleum, which will be discussed in more detail below. The only attempt made to tell the long-term history and significance of the site consists of a series of photographs of Euro-American classicising architecture. This privileging of a particular past – in this case, the fourth century BC and its Western afterlife – is typical of European archaeological projects working in the Mediterranean, at least until very recent times. No attempt is made to place the monument within its longer ancient history or more modern, Turkish, context. The sense of isolation from the outside

⁸ A project to preserve and exhibit the Mausoleum to the public was sketched as early as October 1975. This project aimed to cover the entire site with a large roof of 35 by 40 m. According to the plan, which was not fully realised, visitors would be allowed to enter the Mausoleum, including the tomb chamber itself. The Mausoleum museum was sponsored by the Danish International Development Agency (Danida) and the Turkish Ministry of Culture.

world that one encounters inside the museum is further emphasised on the outside by the modern wall that surrounds the Mausoleum site. This wall was constructed to control access to the Mausoleum (and to charge visitors an admission fee), but has the palpable side effect of completely insulating it from its immediate environment.

Jeppesen's research agenda was firmly rooted in *Bauforschung* and its underlying ideological framework, in which classical Greek monuments are studied as possessing an eternal value and intrinsic importance. This can be observed both in his excavations of the Mausoleum and the museum that he constructed at the site. Early Danish fieldwork in Bodrum in this sense followed the long-term trajectory of the European colonisation of scholarship that has been intensively studied in many parts of the eastern Mediterranean, including other parts of Turkey (Özdoğan 2005), Greece (Hamilakis 2013) and Egypt (Meskell 2000; 2005). The informal colonial legacy of the project is indeed evident from the official title of his project, the Danish Archaeological Expedition to Bodrum, a title also used in the publications of the Mausoleum. The classical heritage produced through Jeppesen's excavations was in many ways a direct outcome of a particular *habitus* deeply rooted in Danish (and European) academia. The power to produce and define knowledge of the classical world did not lie in the hands of the countries of origin, but was colonised by the European nations and the academic practices that they followed (Hamilakis 2016; 2007, 57–125; Jezernik 2007). Thus while the excavations took place in a complex modern geopolitical setting, they focused exclusively on producing knowledge that fitted within a paradigm developed in Europe in the nineteenth century and that fed into the Danish subscription to classicism. The next section looks in more detail at one significant example of this, namely Jeppesen's substantive efforts to reconstruct the Mausoleum and thus to restore (some of) its original grandeur.

Reconstructing the Wonder

The fact that the Mausoleum is a seemingly lost wonder of the ancient world has gripped the imagination of European scholars and artists for centuries. As in the case of other seemingly lost wonders, reconstruction is an occupation with remarkable longevity as well as considerable ingenuity. Literally hundreds of different reconstructions have been put forward in the past five centuries. Before Newton's excavations, these reconstructions were based entirely on the ancient texts for which they were sometimes intended as illustrations, as in the case of Cesariano's

translation of Vitruvius, published in 1521. Newton himself did not publish a reconstruction of the Mausoleum, but several influential proposals were made on the basis of his excavations by R. M. Smith and R. P. Pulland (Bury 1998; *Maussolleion* 5, 210). These were later revised in an influential and very evocative reconstruction of the Mausoleum proposed by the German *Bauforscher* Fritz Krischen in a posthumously published volume that discussed and reconstructed every one of the seven wonders of the ancient world (Krischen 1956, 69–86). In light of the Mausoleum’s poor state of preservation, engagement in such reconstruction work is a powerful example of imaginary geography at work in scholarly practices. Indeed, every proposed reconstruction of the Mausoleum blends in different ways fact with what will arguably always be some degree of fiction or fantasy.

In light of this persistent tradition of undertaking reconstruction, and indeed Jeppesen’s background as an architect, it was only natural for him to propose new reconstructions of the Mausoleum. Indeed, we saw earlier how he had already proposed a series of reconstruction drawings of the Mausoleum in his 1958 dissertation (Fig. 4.3). Jeppesen even cited the opportunity to re-evaluate Krischen’s reconstruction as one of the main reasons to begin new excavations at the site of the Mausoleum (*Maussolleion* 1, 9). While Jeppesen’s excavations were still ongoing, he published preliminary reports that included revised reconstructions and offered new, more detailed proposals of the Mausoleum (Jeppesen 1976, 57). As discussed above, the reconstruction of every possible architectural detail of the Mausoleum would occupy Jeppesen for the rest of his life. Through his own proposals, Jeppesen actively engaged in this scholarly game of reconstruction, even upping the stakes through the authority of his eleven-year excavation campaign at the site of the Mausoleum. He was clearly aware that the crowning achievement of any archaeologist working on the Mausoleum was to propose a new, seemingly more accurate and persuasive reconstruction.⁹

Yet Jeppesen’s attempt to reconstruct the Mausoleum was not only a scholarly practice confined to paper. As early as 1974, he had begun experimental work on a three-dimensional scale model of his

⁹ This is also clear from the fact that he collected photographs of the display of his reconstruction in museum exhibitions around the world, as well as his repeated attacks on competing reconstructions, see *Maussolleion* 5, 15–18, 207–218. As expected, Jeppesen’s reconstruction has not been accepted by all scholars. Most recently it was critiqued in a popular book by Wolfram Hoepfner (2013).

reconstruction of the architecture and sculptural decoration of the Mausoleum (Jeppesen 1976, Taf. 14–15; *Maussolleion* 1, 18). This work continued for the next twenty-five years, and produced one of the most significant, concrete legacies of the project, namely two 1:50 scale reconstruction models of the Mausoleum that are displayed both on site at the Mausoleum Museum in Bodrum and in the Museum of Ancient Art and Archaeology in Aarhus. Currently, the Aarhus model is displayed as an isolated monument in a glass case (Fig. 4.4), whereas the Bodrum model is part of a larger display that also depicts the terrace on which it was located, thus giving a better sense of its placement within the larger urban setting intended by Maussollos (Fig. 4.5).¹⁰ Both models were made in collaboration with Aksel Søndborg, who participated as technician in the Mausoleum excavations in 1967 and 1970. Søndborg was trained as a cabinetmaker and had extensive experience working in a local furniture workshop, before coming to the Museum of Ancient and Archaeology, where he stayed for twenty-five years until his retirement. A striking feature of Jeppesen and Søndborg's Mausoleum model is how its materials and composition identify the origins of its makers. The choice of wood, the lack of added colour, and the generally minimalist style of reconstruction thus display a distinctively Nordic aesthetic sensibility. At the same time, the model follows a general trend among such archaeological reconstruction models in preferring a generally minimalist style in order to signify scientific objectivity.

Model-making has in fact a long history in relation to the study of the classical world, in which it has been used as an object of dissemination in museums and as a souvenir in private collections. Going back to sixteenth-century Italy, cork scale models were made of famous monuments, often depicting them in a romantic state of ruination, as imaginative reconstructions, or some hybrid thereof (Kockel 1993; 1998). Travellers on the Grand Tour purchased many of these as souvenirs. The English architect John Soane (1753–1837) thus amassed a large collection of cork models, including Pompeii, Palmyra, the Temple of Vesta at Tivoli, and the Tower of the Winds at Athens, which are still on display in his London residence, along with his extensive collection of antiquities. In this case, the models offered a means through which a collector could lay some claim to ownership over monuments in foreign lands and of a size that was otherwise out of reach. The

¹⁰ Originally the Aarhus model was also placed in a larger setting with an indication of the extent of the temenos.

massive 1:250 plaster reconstruction of third-century-AD Rome begun by the archaeologist Italo Gismondi (1887–1974) for Mussolini’s Museo della Civiltà Romana but not completed until 1971 is another influential model reconstruction. In this case, the monumental size and meticulous detail in the reconstruction of particular buildings were designed to awe the public and to induce a particular sense of nostalgia for the glorious past of imperial Rome that fitted into Fascist propaganda. Other models of Ostia and Villa Adriana were also undertaken by Gismondi and prominently displayed in Italian museums (Filippi 2007, 275–280). A similar three-dimensional plaster model of Lindos is on display in the Danish National Museum, where it functions as a didactic tool that gives visitors a sense of the dramatic landscape in which the Danish excavations operated, but also reminds them of Danish scholarly claims to this Mediterranean island (see chapter three). Scale models of this type offer many advantages. By their scaled-down nature, they allow for a bird’s-eye view of monuments that would otherwise be difficult to grasp, and by presenting three-dimensional reconstructions, they allow viewers to understand better the original appearance of particular monuments. However, the practice of reconstruction was in other ways also a way of getting to grips with the occasional disappointment of confronting often rather meagre archaeological remains that rarely compare with the grandiose descriptions of them in ancient texts (Scott 2014, 274–275).

For Jeppesen, the practicalities involved in the making of a reconstruction model of the Mausoleum were a means of unlocking the difficult testimonies of the ancient textual sources and the results of his archaeological excavations, especially the hundreds of small architectural fragments unearthed, in line with the practical approaches so closely aligned with *Bauforschung*. Numerous revisions and tweaks were made to the models over the following twenty-five years while Jeppesen was preparing his final publication of the Mausoleum – a project that was not completed until 2002 (*Maussolleion* 5). It thus continued to be a work in progress, as a model of experimentation, refinement, trial and error. The model offered him an experimental tool to explore the detailed and highly technical questions that he had set out to ask about the reconstruction of the building’s original appearance and sculptural decoration. This comes out in a discussion of work on the model that he undertook between 1987 and 1989, the outcome of which was a version he dubbed the “Cambridge–Uppsala model” (Jeppesen 1992; 1999, 53). This model helped him to make sense of

the problems he had encountered in trying to combine the different sources: “when I had the opportunity to proceed experimentally by means of a three-dimensional model.... it proved possible to interpret these sources of evidence in terms making complimentary sense” (*Maussolleion* 5, 7). In this sense, the model embodies the totality of the archaeological knowledge produced by Jeppesen’s work on the Mausoleum, by turning immaterial knowledge into material form.

Yet Jeppesen also exploited the visual appeal of the Mausoleum model in other ways. On several occasions, it acted as an evocative stand-in for the hole in the ground where the Mausoleum had once stood. Through its display in both Bodrum and Aarhus, the model constitutes some of the most direct hands-on heritage that emerged from Jeppesen’s excavations, especially since so few of his finds were displayed in the site museum. The model furthermore plays a leading role in several of Jeppesen’s publications. It served, for example, as the frontispiece of his 2002 volume on the superstructure of the Mausoleum, his final contribution to the series (*Maussolleion* 5). The model in this case is visually framed as the climax of his research on the Mausoleum. It stood in for the invisibility of the Mausoleum, offering a more effective tool of communication than the two-dimensional drawings that dominated the more technical archaeological reports stemming from the excavations. The model plays a similar role in popularising work on the Mausoleum. A local Aarhus newspaper used an illustration of the model in an article published in 1980, with a caption reading: “Model of the Mausoleum, built by Aksel Sønderborg, on the basis of the results of the Danish expedition. Now for the first time since antiquity one gets a complete picture of how this world wonder looked” (Garde 1980). The model thus offered two things – a unique and previously unavailable sense of completion, as well as a solution to an archaeological puzzle, a metaphor that Jeppesen uses himself in the accompanying interview in reference to the process of working on the Mausoleum.

The more general appeal of the archaeological imagination embedded in the practice of model-making was not lost on him either. An interview with the newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* dating to February 1999 is particularly revealing in this regard. The interview is littered with the common archaeological tropes of mystery, secrets, and riddles unearthed from the ground through archaeological excavation. In the interview, Jeppesen expressed some of his aspirations for his excavations: “My wish was and is to get to the bottom of the secrets that lie buried here. I decided

that I wanted to reconstruct the main features of this building [*i.e.* the Mausoleum], as far as it was possible” (Nyholm 1999, 2). The caption underneath the photo of Jeppesen that shows him on site in the tomb chamber of Mausollos reads:

The Danish archaeologist Kristian Jeppesen loves to solve riddles and enthusiastically engages with the riddles that others believe to be unsolvable. He believes that he has solved about 80 per cent of the riddle [of reconstructing the Mausoleum] and he has built a model that can be seen in the museum in Bodrum (Nyholm 1999, 2).

The model – and by implication the archaeological site of the Mausoleum itself – is here, again, framed as a puzzle that has been solved by the detective archaeologist, a common trope in the public perception of archaeological practice (Holtorf 2007, 75–83).

In the early 2000s, Jeppesen again turned to the issue of reconstructing the Mausoleum, but this time on an altogether larger scale. In cooperation with the Danish architect Johannes Exner (1926–2015), he proposed a full-size reconstruction of the Mausoleum in its original location. Although this project has so far not been realised, it is testimony to some of the issues that currently face the Mausoleum, such as how to preserve the site for the future, as well as how to present its relatively meagre remains as one of the wonders of the ancient world. Indeed Jeppesen and Exner’s reconstruction proposal hinted at future projects to come. Since 2017, a local foundation called the Akdeniz Ülkeleri Akademisi Vakfı (officially translated as the Mediterranean Countries Academy Foundation) has thus taken up some of their ideas and is actively promoting the reconstruction of the Mausoleum to its full original height, using glass and steel, citing Jeppesen as one of the originators of their reconstruction proposal.¹¹ The explicit aim of the new project is to restore the grandeur of Bodrum’s Karian past and to reclaim the city’s role as home to one of the wonders of the ancient world. Jeppesen’s wooden model hinted at such possibilities, but is clearly not sufficient for the ambitions of Bodrum in the twenty-first century. Reconstruction is thus much more than a

¹¹ The plans were officially presented at the Mausoleum International Workshop in Bodrum, 5–6 May 2017. For information on the work of the foundation, see www.academia.org.tr.

trivial matter. It plays into contemporary ambitions about the use of archaeology for local and national identity construction.

Beyond the Mausoleum

This section looks briefly at Danish fieldwork in Bodrum since the completion of the Mausoleum excavations in 1977, in order to discuss how the nature and interpretive framework of this work is indicative of the changing academic and political landscapes in which it operates. The ongoing fieldwork certainly highlights changes in archaeological practice, but is equally reflective of the increasingly uneasy relationship between two fundamentally different imagined geographies. On the one side, we can observe a continued Danish investment in archaeological fieldwork that is deeply rooted in classicism, and a particular conception of classical heritage that attracted Jeppesen and many other European scholars to the Mediterranean in the first place. On the other hand, we have the contemporary politics of the Turkish Republic, since 2003 under the leadership of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's Justice and Development Party (JDP), which has applied a nationalistic and increasingly neo-Ottoman agenda in its approach to heritage sites and monuments (Aykaç 2018; Bozoğlu and Whitehead forthcoming). In response to the complex accession talks and the ongoing refugee crisis, the relationship between Turkey and the EU has become increasingly strained in recent years. All of these developments have important implications for the contexts in which archaeological knowledge is produced. During the fifty-year period that Danish archaeologists have been active in Bodrum, public and political expectations of archaeological scholarship have thus changed dramatically, in Turkey and in Denmark, as well as in Europe more broadly (Human 2015).

Poul Pedersen, who after 1970 had worked closely with Jeppesen, was the first scholar to expand the Danish fieldwork to the wider urban setting of ancient Halikarnassos (Table 4.1). Pedersen's initial work focused on the Mausoleum terrace and its place in the urban grid of Halikarnassos, which was part of Maussollos' re-foundation of the city (*Maussolleion* 3; Pedersen 1999a; 1999b). He later expanded to areas further beyond the Mausoleum, including the defensive walls that circle the city, and the Salmakis fountain, an important monument that celebrated the mythical foundation of Halikarnassos (Isager and Pedersen 2004), as well as to the Zephyrion peninsula, where he attempted to locate the remains of Maussollos's palace and its "secret" harbour described by Vitruvius (Pedersen 2009). Pedersen's main interest lies in the study of Greek

architecture, continuing the tradition of *Bauforschung*. His work focuses, for example, on the concept of the Ionian Renaissance, first developed by W. B. Dinsmoor in 1950 to describe the innovative architecture of fourth-century BC western Asia Minor and its origins in the hybrid cultural environment at the intersection of the Greek and Persian worlds (Pedersen 1994). He thus also situates Halikarnassian developments in a larger social and cultural framework.

1966–1977	Excavations of the Maussoleion
1978–ongoing	Topographical research in the city of Halikarnassos
1988	Geophysical investigations by the Doric Stoa and the Temple of Mars
1990–1993	Excavations of the “House of Charidemos”
1991	Excavation of Hellenistic house
1991–ongoing	Investigations of inscriptions from Halikarnassos
1992–1993, 2002–2004	Excavations in the castle (“Palace of Maussollos”)
1995	Investigations of the Salmakis fountain
1998–2000, 2013–2014	Investigations of city walls, the Myndos gate and late antique necropolis

Table 4.1. Overview of Danish archaeological projects in Bodrum (compiled by Jakob Munk Højte)

Since the 1970s, Danish fieldwork has investigated many parts of the increasingly urbanised landscape of Bodrum and has even covered the wider region of the peninsula, as in Anne Marie Carstens’ surveys of Karian tombs and Hekatomnid ruler ideology (Carstens 2002; 2009). The fieldwork has never followed a masterplan, but developed in an ad hoc fashion as new opportunities appeared, always working in close cooperation with Turkish archaeologists at the Bodrum Museum of Underwater Archaeology. Notably, in the early 1990s, Birte Poulsen excavated a late Roman complex (the so-called House of Charidemos, currently in its publication phase), and she later turned her attention to a late antique necropolis outside the Myndos gate in the western

part of the modern city (Mortensen and Poulsen 2016). Both projects were initiated in response to rescue excavations. The studies that have appeared based on this work, while often following long-standing paradigms of classicism, demonstrate a broadening of scholarly interests both in their temporal and theoretical scope, addressing, for example, much more explicitly questions relating to social and cultural history across the *longue durée*. The change in focus from individual monuments to broader urban dynamics reflect changes within the discipline of classical archaeology more generally that are apparent in the case of other Euro-American projects in Turkey, such as, for example, Ephesus and Sagalassos. They also reflect the changing discourses around classicism in the classroom (see chapter two) and museums more broadly (see chapter three), noticeably by engaging in issues such as the meeting of cultures and the manipulation of memory. Postcolonial perspectives have thus been introduced to rectify the frequent tendency in European scholarship to look at Karia (and western Asia Minor more generally) from an exclusively Greek perspective (Davis 2003, 160), addressing at least some of the concerns about European biases that are seen in the writings of the Fisherman of Halikarnassos.

The fiftieth anniversary of Danish fieldwork in Bodrum was celebrated with an exhibition that opened in the Museum of Ancient Art and Archaeology in Aarhus in 2016. The Bodrum project indeed has a special place in Danish archaeology as the longest-running project outside the country's borders. Yet since 2014, no permission has been issued by the Turkish authorities for Danish archaeologists to work in Bodrum, in parallel with the plight of many other international teams that are increasingly experiencing similar difficulty in obtaining permissions to carry out excavations. The situation has been summarised bluntly by the English ancient historian Peter Thonemann in a recent review of a new volume on the results of late antique archaeological projects in Asia Minor:

Over the past few years, the political climate in Turkey has become increasingly hostile to European archaeologists, and many of the innovative fieldwork projects summarised in this volume have been shut down by Turkish authorities on the flimsiest of pretexts. The priorities of the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism are explicitly driven by the aesthetic preferences of revenue-bearing foreign

tourists, and gleaming white marble columns are back at the top of the agenda (Thonemann 2018, 262).

While we may object to the tone of Thonemann's remarks and its underlying neo-colonial ironies and paradoxes, his comments capture well the current situation in which two sets of imagined geographies are increasingly finding themselves on collision course.

The Imagined Geographies of Archaeological Practice

To paraphrase the title of David Lowenthal's seminal work (Lowenthal 1985), to Danish classicists, the past may well be a foreign country, but its material remains will furthermore very literally always be located in a foreign country, with all of the social, economic, and political ramifications that this entails. In their movements across modern borders, their engagements with local authorities, and with financial and institutional support from their home country, Danish archaeologists have thus operated within a very particular imagined geography, with the seemingly objective aims of recovering and reconstructing classical heritage, following a long-running tradition of European archaeology that goes back to the eighteenth century. This chapter has thus traced some of the trajectories of Danish archaeological fieldwork in Bodrum, and how through its ongoing excavations and publication projects it has produced a specific kind of academic capital. Jeppesen's excavation and reconstruction of the Mausoleum, a wonder of the ancient world, is one of the most significant outcomes of this particular kind of classicism. Increasingly, however, the academic *habitus* that is apparent in Jeppesen's work (and that of some of his successors) is being challenged by postcolonial perspectives within the discipline, as well as by significant shifts in contemporary international politics. In some ways, the archaeological fieldwork in Bodrum offers an opportunity to re-centre Danish classicism away from the Othering that is inherent in many European engagements with Turkey (Wintle 2016), but this potential has so far not been fully realised.