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Excavating Our Past grew out of a Presidential Colloquium of the same name at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) in Chicago on 28 December 1997. The colloquium, organized and chaired by the editor, was suggested as a way of stimulating scholars to dig into the organization’s own rich and varied stratigraphy through its recently catalogued archives (Scott 1997). Most papers delivered at that session are included here as well as several additional essays from individuals who have worked extensively with the archives (for abstracts of this and other papers in the Colloquium, see AJA 102 [1998] 364–6). These essays highlight the history and development of the AIA, an organization of professional archaeologists and informed lay members devoted to the interpretation of material culture and the social fabric of the ancient world. Subjects include the founders, institutions, practitioners, and the times that shaped them. Whereas a certain distance is often advantageous when writing history, many of these authors have played a vital role in the AIA, and their unique perspectives, both internal and external, enrich and privilege the discourse on the Institute and its involvement in the discipline of archaeology in the United States.

Intellectual historian Peter Novick has described several approaches to the writing of history. The “internalist” approach concentrates on what goes on in the Institute itself, “slighting or ignoring its relationship with the surrounding environment” while the “externalist” focuses “on one or another
aspect of that external relationship” (1988, 9–14), the AIA’s interface with elements and events outside the Institute. A number of papers stress the social, cultural, political, ideological, and economic conditions that influenced the course of the Institute and its work. The goals of this volume are not only to document and celebrate the Institute’s history, but also to provide a self-reflective history about the nature of the AIA for the membership and greater understanding of the Institute and its impact for those outside of it. The authors critically examine various aspects of the AIA in order to analyze the way in which individual members of the AIA and the Institute itself have influenced, and felt the influence of, the discipline of archaeology as practiced in the Mediterranean, Mesopotamia, and the Americas.

To commemorate the centennial of the founding of the AIA, Phoebe Sheftel (1979), Homer Thompson (1980), and Sterling Dow (1979; 1980), addressed aspects of its history in several articles. Past president of the Institute, Stephen Dyson, characterized these as “antiquarian in nature and somewhat self-congratulatory in tone” and criticized practitioners of classical archaeology for their lack of introspection in contrast to those engaged in anthropological archaeology (1985, 459). Since then, a number of relevant histories of European archaeological institutes and foreign schools, and a few broader studies of the intellectual genealogies of classical archaeology have been published, such as Morris (1994), Marchand (1996), and Shanks (1996). In 1996 Nancy de Grummond published a useful two volume Encyclopedia of the History of Classical Archaeology with short articles on key individuals, sites, and institutions. With the exception of the articles, however, none of the above sources pays particular attention to the AIA and its role. Lamenting the limited published commemorations for “important anniversaries like the centenaries of the Archaeological Institute of America and the American Journal of Archaeology,” Dyson published Ancient Marbles to American Shores: Classical Archaeology in the United States in 1998, a year after this colloquium took place.

The present volume, like Dyson’s, is designed to address that need, by commemorating the centennial of the AIA Annual Meeting in December 1998. Whereas Dyson’s somewhat polemical but illuminating historical synthesis focuses on the discipline of classical archaeology, Excavating Our Past includes an examination of all spheres in which the AIA has been active. Thus, it is the first book specifically focused on the broader history of the Archaeological Institute of America.
The first seven contributions in this volume cover largely 19th-century initiatives. Nancy de Grummond addresses the intellectual currents, particularly in the 18th and early 19th centuries, which sparked the creation in Europe of those learned societies meant to communicate new findings and to fund and publish the results of expeditions devoted to classical archaeology which preceded and inspired the AIA. Contextualizing AIA founder Charles Eliot Norton, Elizabeth Will relates his impact on a number of fields and traditions beyond the Institute from Dante and Donne to the preservation of Niagara Falls. Will cites Norton’s consummate prestige as critical to the founding of the AIA. My own contribution examines the Institute’s earliest Mediterranean excavations at Assos from 1881 to 1883 and the difficulties experienced by early excavators as they tried to forge careers in the new profession. Caroline Winterer offers a study of Norton’s founding vision for post-graduate studies in Greece, realized in the establishment of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA), which harmonized the divergent objectives of broad exposure, cultivated erudition, and narrow specialization. Within the changing intellectual atmosphere of the latter half of the 19th century, this humanistic goal of cultivated erudition gave way to professionalized scientific training. Phoebe Sheftel eschews the Whig interpretation of history where principles of past progress are emphasized in order to ratify and glorify the present. She offers a glimpse of what might have been and expands her 1979 treatment of the AIA’s ambitious, but tortured and unsuccessful, bid for American control of the hotly contested site of Delphi (which ultimately was awarded to the French). Neil Silberman uncovers the nationalistic and religious agendas and biases that shaped early AIA involvement in southwest Asia and North Africa and anticipates the AIA’s role in preservation ethics and outreach with modern inhabitants of ancient lands as well as traditional audiences.

Bridging the 19th and 20th centuries, James Snead’s essay examines the AIA’s fickle treatment of American archaeology. Snead, Russell, and Dyson each highlight the AIA’s repeated efforts toward outreach, and several contributors single out the seminal role of Francis Kelsey in this regard. Snead shows how the AIA grew through the creation of local affiliated societies, specifically in the southwest, and how these in turn communicated to the national office the lay public’s interest in American antiquities. He also underscores the tensions between the Hellenist agenda of the east coast and the conflicting interests of societies located in the midwestern and western
parts of the country. James Russell follows Kelsey’s impulse into Canada and documents his creation of the AIA-Department of Canada in 1908. Power plays between the U.S.-based general secretary and his Canadian equivalent contributed to the collapse of this short-lived venture, to which World War I dealt the coup de grace. Russell’s essay represents a significant expansion, contextualization, and clarification of the brief account of the history of classical archaeology in Canada in general from between the wars to the present by Alexander McKay (1994, lxi–lxiii). Building on ideas expressed in his aforementioned 1998 ethnography of classical archaeology in America, Stephen Dyson treats the interwar period with its threats of Bolshevism and International Modernism as a return to the secure roots of western civilization, a concept which, according to Turner (1999, 384), was conceived by Charles Eliot Norton. Dyson highlights the financially disastrous struggle between individuals intent on restricting AIA membership to academic professionals working in the Mediterranean and others who attempted to popularize archaeology by reaching out to a lay audience in order to save the AIA, whose membership plummeted from 3,460 in 1930 to 1,121 in 1945 (1998, 221). Dyson also reviews the battles between those who preferred that the AIA focus its funds on the academic American Journal of Archaeology (AJA) and those who fought for Art and Archaeology, the popular publication that was the forerunner of Archaeology magazine. Thus, the two flagship publications of the AIA in the 20th century reflect the dual and sometimes dueling nature of the organization’s membership, of which only about one-quarter of the total are professionals. Clemency Coggins delineates the consciousness-raising struggle within the organization concerning issues of cultural property as academics struggle to balance scholarship, ethics, and the AIA’s reliance on the patronage of collectors and museums. This, too, constitutes a form of outreach as the AIA attempts to inform the public about archaeological sites and objects as finite resources deserving legal protection. Finally, Harrison Eiteljorg’s contribution details the challenge and opportunities represented by computer technology and demonstrates how the AIA-List, support of virtual reality projects, and electronic publishing are helping the Institute reach out to the mushrooming audience in cyberspace.

Several important themes in the history of the Institute touched upon in these essays receive fuller treatment below while other issues, not the subject of discrete essays, but important to the larger picture of the history of the Institute, are also treated here. Critical for an understanding of the climate
in which the AIA was founded are the political and cultural agendas of Hellenism, the 18th-century sociopolitical concept that idealized ancient Greece as the cradle of European culture, and its 19th-century legacy in Romanticism, where one sought to escape the realities of industrialization by contemplating the aesthetic perfection of a timeless classical Greece (Clarke 1989; Trigger 1989; Morris 1994, 11; Shanks 1996; Dyson 1998, xi; and Winterer, this volume). From the time of Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–1768) European intellectuals viewed Greece as the childhood of Europe and, by extension, that of the United States as well, and saw classical antiquity as their cultural pedigree. In particular, the writings of German Protestant philosophers, classicists, and art historians privileged Hellenism partly as a reaction to the French Catholic lock on Rome (Trigger 1989, 66). The Greek War of Independence (1821–1830) further galvanized the bond between Europe and Greece, especially in Germany, where great importance was already imparted to the classical world as evidenced by the 10 university chairs of archaeology established by 1848 whereas in France, England, and the United States, there were none at that time (Shanks 1996, 95).

James Turner’s recent biography of Charles Eliot Norton (1827–1908) records details in Norton’s life that shed light on his role and that of the AIA in 19th-century intellectual discourse. Norton the institution builder was uniquely situated socially, financially, and intellectually to found such an organization (Will, this volume). Well-educated both at home and at Harvard (although he never took an advanced degree), Norton had intimate and often personal knowledge of early archaeological initiatives and pioneering excavators. After meeting Ephraim Squier (1821–1888), who had explored and excavated remains of the Moundbuilders in Ohio in 1847 and had coauthored Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley (1848), Norton wrote an account of “Ancient Monuments of America” for the North American Review 68 (1849, 466–96). He joined the broadly based American Oriental Society, founded in 1842, which opened a classical section in 1849 for “the cultivation of classical learning, so far as auxiliary to oriental research.” He read Austen Henry Layard’s (1817–1894) account of his discoveries at Nineveh. On a business trip at age 22 Norton crossed the subcontinent of India and visited many of its monuments, both ancient and modern. As he made his way home in 1850 he met pioneering geologist Charles Lyell (1797–1875) and Darwin’s evolutionist colleague Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) in London. Cuneiform decipherer Henry Rawlinson
(1810–1895) escorted him through the galleries of the British Museum where they viewed Layard’s bulls and other glorious antiquities such as the Elgin marbles. After touring Rome, Veii, Tivoli, and Sicily, an inspired Norton wrote an article on the catacombs of Rome (Turner 1999, 64, 91, 133, 140–2, 150–1). These experiences distracted him from his work as an East India trader, but contributed decisively to his lifelong interest in archaeology. The sum of this wealth of experience was a uniquely prepared and fertile mind, open to a broad range of archaeological interests.

In America Congregationalists gravitated toward biblical studies while Unitarians were drawn to the classical world (Patterson 1995, 26). Although he benefited from his privileged exposure to the archaeological remains of the New World (in his acquaintance with Squier) and the Old World through his travels and meetings with scholars, as the son of a staunch Unitarian, Norton was drawn to Hellenism and grew to appreciate its cultural capital while still retaining an appreciation of American antiquities. Like most members of the Boston intelligentsia, Norton was enamored of European cultural tradition and respected German erudition in the field of classical scholarship. His familiarity with European learned societies and museums through his extended travel and residence abroad heightened his awareness of their absence in America, barely a century old and still recovering from a bitter civil war.

Charles Eliot Norton and the other founders of the AIA believed in the social role of archaeological research in providing a material background of Greece and Rome useful for fostering high culture in the growing American middle class of their times (Will; Winterer, this volume). Norton and other intellectuals felt that the burgeoning American middle class in the last quarter of the 19th century was culturally impoverished, and they viewed classical archaeology as one means of combating the gross materialism of post-Civil War industrialism. He himself asserted that “of all civilized nations,” the United States was “the most deficient in the higher culture of the mind, and not in the culture only but also in the conditions on which this culture mainly depends” (1889, 36). The fruits of archaeology would provide models for the moral and aesthetic improvement of American society. Thus, the early members of the AIA Executive Committee (most of whom were Cambridge academics or Boston elite) were preoccupied with fostering on American shores an appreciation for what they perceived as the superior cultural values of a static ancient Athens in order to uplift American
aesthetic awareness. Such were the cultural politics of classical archaeology in America during the second half of the 19th century.

Following the semi-centennial of the German Archaeological Institute, in April 1879 Norton circulated a timely proposal to create a learned society that would promote a broad-minded agenda of “archaeological and artistic investigation and research” signed by 11 Bostonians and Harvard faculty members. Embracing the contemporary European humanistic rhetoric of professionalization distinguishing scientific archaeology from gentlemanly antiquarianism, he stressed “the increasing interest in archaeological science…the importance of historical and artistic results of properly conducted explorations, . . . in the New World as well as in the Old . . . in order to encourage and aid the efforts of individual explorers, and to send out special expeditions such as no individual could readily undertake,” adding that America “has had little share in the splendid work of rediscovery of the early civilizations of the Old World.” In anticipating the benefits accruing “not only to the science of archaeology, but to Classical and Biblical studies, and to the fine arts, by quickening the interest in antiquity” (AIA Archives, box 1.3), Norton placed himself firmly within the text-based humanistic tradition of archaeology as handmaid to philology.

On 17 May 1879 the AIA was formed in Boston, the “Athens of America,” and Norton was elected its first president. Although there was clearly a Bostonian and east coast bias to the new organization as was common for the time, Norton had a grander vision and solicited members or “associates from all parts of the country.” He wrote that “the name ‘Archaeological Institute of America’ had been adopted because our agents would then be considered as representing a national and not merely a local society; and also because similar . . . societies abroad had similar titles.” In so doing he validated the recently strengthened post-Civil War national consciousness in America, conformed to established European tradition, and allowed for future growth across the nation (AIA Archives, box 1.3).

**Excavations**

The impetus for this new organization was clearly national pride as much as concern for establishing cultural foundations. Norton was very much aware of recent German archaeological activities. In the decade following the unification of Germany in 1870, the Germans, intent on *Kulturpolitik*, had
secured prize sites where they practiced “big archaeology”: Troy, Olympia, and Pergamon (Emerson 1889, 48–56; Marchand 1996). In 1879 Heinrich Schliemann (1822–1890) had just begun his sixth season at Hisarlik (Troy); Ernst Curtius (1814–1896) had been excavating Olympia since 1875, and by 1878 the Germans had established a presence at Pergamon. The French had been excavating Delos and were looking for other ancient sites on which to stake their claim, and Ferdinand Fouqué had just published the French explorations on Thera (Santorin et ses Éruptions). Norton and other elite Bostonians did not wish the United States to be left out of the nationalistic intellectual scramble for access to the ancient world and its patrimony.

From its founding in the 18th century, European classical archaeology was dominated by the search for original works of art for museums and private collections (de Grummond, this volume), hence the focus on major sanctuaries and public spaces of city-states where such treasures were displayed in antiquity. By recovering and exhibiting Greek statues, vases, and other antiquities, European countries showed “their commitment to Hellenism, their civilized status, and also their imperialist might” (Shanks 1996, 82). The AIA founders felt keenly the competition with France and England, and especially Germany, for archaeological sites as well as for original works of art for museums. Since German unification, the pace had quickened and the recent acquisition by the Germans of literally tons of ancient sculpture from the site of Pergamon for a new museum in Berlin (Emerson 1889, 48–56; Marchand 1996) posed a formidable challenge, prompting concern on Norton’s part that America had “taken small part in work of this sort, and has reaped but small benefit from it” (April 1879, AIA Archives, box 1.3).

The Executive Committee of the fledgling AIA was not merely concerned with its “influence on the progress of Greek studies, but also . . . [with] the contributions it may make to the resources of our museums and universities.” Norton solicited institutional support and pledged to “increase the collections of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts or the select collection for the purposes of instruction in Harvard College” and “the Art Gallery of New Haven” if the Institute secured financial support from them (AIA 1880, 24). Thus was set in motion the plan to exploit sites within the weakened Ottoman empire, which had lenient antiquities laws that allowed ancient works to be exported. Since the Ottomans were conveniently perceived by imperialist Europeans as the “other” and thus easily taken advantage of, European and AIA archaeologists simply “saved”; that is, exploited, archaeological sites and cultural patri-
mony within the empire and related their finds to classical or ancient near eastern civilizations (Gates, 1996). Nevertheless, the goal of acquiring antiquities as an end in itself was problematic to Executive Committee member Francis Parkman (1823–1893), anthropologist and author of the famous Oregon Trail. At the second Annual Meeting he asserted that the purpose of the AIA was “the acquisition of Knowledge and not the acquisition of objects or works of art” (Minutes, 15 May 1880, AIA Archives, box 1.1), an idea less than consonant with founders who had also recently established the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

The Mediterranean-based agenda of Norton and others conflicted with the vision of some founding members of the AIA who felt that the Institute should be more involved with fieldwork within its own shores. It was initially unclear whether the AIA would locate archaeology within the humanities (philology) or the natural sciences with its emphasis on human origins and variety of cultures. As archaeology struggled to define itself in America there was a power play between those aesthetes who valued classical archaeology for its potential to raise the cultural standard of the population and those who preferred the intellectual puzzles of the new field of prehistoric archaeology with which New World archaeology was identified (Lubbock 1865; Stocking 1987). Norton, who was interested in both (although he was ultimately more concerned with ancient Greece), and three of the attendees of the first meeting of the new AIA on 14 April 1879, formally expressed an interest in the archaeology of the Americas (Snead, this volume). At the time Americanists were concerned about the destruction of sites in the west that was occurring with rampant development and took a Darwinian interest in prehistoric humanity, which they believed could be explored in America itself. The debate that emerged within the Institute could be characterized as the childhood of Europe versus “the childhood of all humanity” (Trigger 1989, 68).

When Norton chose John Wesley Powell (1834–1902), one of the chief contributors to American archaeology and director of the Bureau of American Ethnology (founded like the AIA in 1879), to address the subject of American archaeology at the second Annual Meeting of the Institute, the classical constituency almost revolted at the thought that the inferior American aborigines would be the focus of their high-brow efforts (Minutes, May 15, 1880, AIA Archives, 1.1). Even Norton, the mediator and initiator of Powell’s invitation, betrayed his own bias: “While the archaeology of America offers many instructive analogies with the prehistoric archaeology
of the Old World, it affords nothing to compare with the historic archaeology of civilized man in Africa, Asia, and Europe” (AIA 1880, 20–1). This stance later prompted Powell to lament that “our archaeologic [sic] institutes, our universities, and our scholars are threshing again the straw of the Orient for the stray grains that may be beaten out, while the sheaves of anthropology are stacked all over this continent; and they have no care for the grain which wastes while they journey beyond the seas” (1890, 562).

Despite the classical agenda of the founder and the majority of his committee, the first AIA-sponsored archaeological expedition actually took place in the American southwest under Adolph F. Bandelier (1840–1914) from 1880 to 1885 and was published in 1892. Moreover, the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Institute included presentations on recent progress in both classical and American archaeology (Emerson 1889; Haynes 1889). But Bandelier was aware of prejudice within the Institute which in 1882 received donations of $5,620 for classical work and $200 for American and spent, respectively, $10,266.64 on Assos and $2,456.90 in America (Bandelier to Mrs. Lewis Henry Morgan, 18 July 1883, in Lange and Riley 1966, 49, n. 31). After that early effort, however, the AIA only expended a modicum of energy on the New World (Snead, this volume), and in spite of a reaffirmation of interest in “promising archaeological studies by investigation and research in the U.S. and foreign countries” expressed in the Act of Incorporation of the AIA in 1906, American Eurocentrism took precedence by the late 1880s and has remained paramount ever since. After World War I virtually all subsequent AIA operations occurred in the Old World, a focus that has continued to this day (Hinsley 1986).

The AIA burst onto the international archaeological stage with excavations at the classical site of Assos in Turkey between 1881 and 1883 (Allen, ch. 3, this volume). Although challenged by the exigencies of an inhospitable isolated site and the director’s youthful inexperience, in the eyes of a contemporary archaeologist this excavation “remains the most noteworthy instance of the capacities of the American people for encouraging and carrying to successful conclusion an enterprise of discovery on classical soil. It certainly served the purpose, at the very outset, of justifying in the distrustful eye of European criticism the existence of the Archaeological Institute of America” (Emerson 1889, 61). During the first decades of its existence the AIA indeed suffered many false starts in sponsoring fieldwork in the competitive world of Mediterranean archaeology, including aborted or stillborn
excavations at sites such as Knossos, Croton, Cyrene (Allen, ch. 3, this volume), and Delphi, (Sheftel, this volume). By contrast, its expedition to Assos achieved a number of the Institute’s goals, although the tardy publication of excavation results, foreshadowing a chronic problem that persists in the discipline to this day, lessened the impact and may have had negative consequences for future excavations, notably with respect to fundraising. Although its sponsorship of excavations at Gortyn in 1894–1895 was successful, the Institute eventually left excavation to its subsidiary organizations, such as the ASCSA and other foreign schools, museums, local societies, and universities, partly as a result of the difficulties involved with securing sufficient funds to undertake such endeavors.

**Funding**

Large-scale archaeology presented an enormous challenge for the ambitious AIA because major excavations in the United States could not count on the government support that was enjoyed by archaeologists of the great colonial and imperial western European powers. This was emblematic of the emphasis in the United States on private enterprise initiatives and a failure of the federal government to sponsor cultural and artistic endeavors. So, initially, the Institute relied on private subscriptions exacted from its Boston members to support the Assos excavations (AIA Archives, box 1.3), but this inefficient method could not compete with the lavish public funding of large comprehensive projects sponsored by European countries. Lack of adequate financial support was cited by John Sterrett (1851–1914), a pioneering American classical archaeologist, as a major cause for the initial failure of Americans to compete with Europe: “The work done hitherto by America in archaeological research has always been unsatisfactory, has always been incomplete, and with few exceptions it will have to be done over again by more scientific, more systematic expeditions working with larger resources; for the research done by Americans has always been crippled by slender and inadequate means.” Then he contrasted it with the “really scientific, systematic, exhaustive work pursued to a finish” characteristic of digs sponsored by “France, Austria, and Germany whose governments, understanding the value and importance of real idealism in molding national character, supply their scholars with ample means wherewith to carry on research” (1911, 12). Foundering from a lack of adequate support, the AIA expanded its financial
base by broadening its constituency, enhanced in 1884 by the creation of local societies in New York and Baltimore (Allen and Hebert, app. 3, this volume). This had the effect of creating new channels for patronage by local societies and individual sponsors who collected funds for work in particular geographical regions or supported specific expeditions, such as Catherine Lorillard Wolfe (1828–1887).

In the 20th century important private donors, such as James Loeb (1867–1933), Allison Armour (1863–1941), William Semple (1881–1962) and Louise Taft Semple (d. 1961), John D. Rockefeller, Jr. (1874–1960), and others stepped into the breach and bankrolled classical excavations. Private foundations and the National Geographic Society also raised funds for excavations. Whereas Americanist archaeology began to receive federal funding with the creation of the National Research Council’s Division of Anthropology and Psychology in 1919 and large-scale federal support for archaeology in 1933 (Patterson 1986, 133; 1995, 73), classical archaeology’s dependence on private patronage only began to change with the advent of the Social Sciences division of the National Science Foundation (NSF) in 1954 and, more importantly for the AIA, the archaeology research section of the National Endowment of Humanities (NEH) from the mid 1970s to 1995, though funding levels fluctuated (Patterson 1986, 16; 1995, 116–7; Dyson 1998, 228, 283). In general, NEH funding for archaeology favored big projects and so continued the tradition of architectural archaeology begun at Assos (Allen, ch. 3, this volume) and represented today by excavations at the Athenian Agora that began in 1931 (Patterson 1995). In the 1970s NSF-sponsored anthropological archaeology and NEH-sponsored classical archaeology increasingly went their separate ways as a close affiliation with philology and art history tended to increase the isolationist position of classical archaeologists within the larger discipline of archaeology, which elsewhere had undergone a paradigm shift both in its discourse and agenda after 1960 (Patterson 1995, 116–7). This separation culminated in the AIA’s acute financial crisis in the 1980s (Sheftel, timeline, this volume). Following a short period of severely reduced funding from the NEH beginning around 1995, when once again private philanthropy was key to the support of American excavations, government funding began rising again in the late 1990s. Revenues from Archaeology magazine hit an all-time high in the 1990s and helped to bolster the finances of the Institute, but these began to drop in 2000, ushering in another era of fiscal crisis.
Foreign Schools

Competition with European powers also involved the establishment of semi-autonomous American overseas research centers and schools around the Mediterranean to stimulate scholarship and facilitate fieldwork. Mindful of the French (1846) and German (1874) research centers already established in Athens, Norton noted that a similar American school might “enter into honorable rivalry with those already established” and pushed for the establishment in 1881 of the American School of Classical Studies (AIA 1880, 25), the first of its kind (Winterer, this volume). Various scholars weighed in with their visions for the School. Pioneer American archaeologist, Joseph Thacher Clarke (1856–1920) expressed concern over the discipline’s prevailing tendency to place archaeology as an adjunct to philology and called for “a revolution in the presentation of the classics” that would bring about “a rejuvenation of philological studies by that living knowledge of antiquity gained by practical archaeology.” Comparing philologists to the Cyclops for their blindness to material remains, he hoped that the School in Athens would be something more than a “philological seminary” and urged that a “material discipline of the science of antiquity” be created (1889, 90–1, 101). Yet Allan Marquand (1853–1924) of Princeton wrote Norton that he “was particularly pleased to find the School from the start dealing with practical archaeological questions and not expending all its energy on language” (31 March 1883, AIA Archives, box 4). Although philological competence has always been a requirement for admission, excavation has been an important component of the school’s agenda from its inception, when it served as a vehicle for AIA fieldwork, and has remained critical throughout its history with numerous early excavations of short duration around Greece and major long-term excavations at Corinth and the Athenian Agora now when it is functionally independent from the AIA.

East versus West

Although Norton’s elite vision dominated the 19th century and was well suited to the times, a very different approach was required for the 20th century, during which outreach has been a critical and recurrent theme. In the 1880s and 1890s two factions emerged: the eastern establishment dominated by large corporations and bankers from Boston to Washington and what Thomas
Patterson has called the core culture, from the south, midwest, and west (1995, 44–5). The tension between Hellenist and Americanist constituencies that was present from the Institute’s infancy in Boston soon was aggravated as the AIA expanded to the west and eventually resulted in friction between east coast Hellenists and midwest and western societies more interested in local native American remains (Snead, this volume). Patterson maintains that the split between the eastern establishment and the populist core culture occurred after 1890, although class alliances dominated by elite factions of each still existed (1986, 20; 1995, 44–5). As certain presidents reached out to create an audience for the AIA, differing interests of these two factions often reflected the conflicting agendas of professional elites and enthusiastic lay members. Partly as a result of these tensions, AIA membership had declined around the turn of the century, and new strategies were needed to create a broader base, a larger audience. The individual chiefly responsible for implementing such an outreach was Francis Willey Kelsey (1858–1907), AIA president from 1907 to 1912 and professor at the University of Michigan. A man of unlimited energy, daring, and popular appeal, Kelsey ignited enthusiasm, recruited new members, and extended the AIA’s base to the midwest, western states, and Canada (Snead, Russell, and Dyson, this volume).

Professionalization and Employment

Other problems plagued the AIA in its early years. As the Institute ambitiously undertook the sponsorship of excavations, its practitioners in the field looked for related employment at home, but the transition from amateur to professional was difficult for these AIA pioneers (Allen, ch. 3, this volume). Opportunities for excavating existed, but the newness of the field meant few permanent jobs. As late as 1889, no chair of archaeology had been created in an American college or university. Since American museum collections fell far short of those in Europe (Emerson 1889), they required few specialized curators. Although higher education was a “minor growth industry” in the United States between 1870 and 1890, and the number of institutions rose from 582 to 1,082 (Patterson 1995, 47) for the rare academic positions for which experienced excavators might apply, college administrators increasingly demanded advanced training in an attempt, as they did for other fields, to codify academic requirements, standardize methods, and disseminate information (Ross 1994, 292).
One victim of this situation was Joseph Thacher Clarke, Norton’s protégé in the AIA’s first generation of practical archaeologists (Allen, ch. 3, this volume). Between 1881 and 1887 he directed or was slated to direct almost every AIA initiative in the Mediterranean and looked to the future optimistically. He observed that “it has first become possible to the younger generation to-day to enter into full possession of the milk and honey of Greek perfection. And this possibility is almost wholly due to the investigations of practical workers upon classic soil, and to those archaeological scholars who have taught the world the true value of the materials thus obtained” (1889, 103). Lacking philological training and an advanced degree, however, Clarke failed to find employment in the profession, dropped from view, and later left archaeology altogether. Against his will, he abandoned the profession while others wandered from one academic position to another, joined museum staffs, or purchased antiquities for collectors. Those archaeologists who succeeded in academia were those with advanced degrees who were able to combine archaeology with philology, such as Alfred Emerson (1859–1943) and John Sterrett, both professors of Greek.

The situation gradually improved in the 20th century with archaeology being taught at a number of colleges in departments of Classics, fine arts, and anthropology. After World War II the G.I. Bill extended higher education to hundreds of thousands of veterans. By the 1960s colleges and universities were likely the main source of employment for archaeologists with Ph.D.s, and the vast majority of archaeologists who were hired in the 1960s and early 1970s were men who then taught the Baby Boom generation. As the number of archaeologists increased, so did the membership of the AIA, from 955 in 1944 to 2,271 by 1950 to 6,753 in 1970 (Patterson 1995, 80–1). But in the early 1970s the expansion in academia ground to a halt. In 1980 the Annual Meeting included a panel on unemployment, which examined the constriction in prospects for AIA archaeologists and complacency and crisis in classical archaeology in general (Dyson 1989a). In 1995 the AIA surveyed its members and estimated that a quarter to a third of its membership was in some way active professionally; that is, holding an advanced degree, publishing, giving papers at conferences, receiving grants, participating in fieldwork, or devoting a significant amount of their time to archaeology. Of those, over a third live in the northeast. Of the 58% who hold Ph.D.s and 26% who hold M.A.s, 41% hold degrees in an area of archaeology with the others in classics, art history, anthropology, ancient history, etc. (Cullen 1999, 6–7).
Employment figures are not yet available, but the recent “Expedient and Expendable: Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty in Classics and Archaeology” session at the Centennial of the Annual Meeting in 1998 examined the trend toward exploitation of a highly qualified but underemployed work force, which services both the AIA and the discipline of archaeology as a whole.

Women in Archaeology

The topics of women in the AIA and gendered archaeology are, unfortunately, neither the subject of any essay in this volume nor singled out in the AIA histories so far cited. Curtis Hinsley has charged that between 1850 and 1900 archaeology was “almost exclusively a male exercise” where women were “to observe, appreciate, and admire. To the extent that women participated in archaeology it was as audience, helpmates, or preservators: curatorial roles” (1989, 94). In this way Fannie Bandelier (d. 1936) and other wives excavated with their husbands beginning in the 19th century. From its inception, the AIA included women among its members. A number became involved as patrons of expeditions, co-founders of local societies, or as society presidents. Tobacco heiress Catherine Lorillard Wolfe of New York, a substantial donor to the ASCSA, funded the first American archaeological expedition to Mesopotamia for the AIA led by William H. Ward (1835–1916) in 1884 (Fox 1971). President of the Boston Society of the AIA and a prominent book artist, Sarah Wyman Whitman (1842–1904) designed the seal that was used on the title page of the new series of the AJA inaugurated in 1896 (see frontispiece), a modified version of which can be seen on the cover of the AJA today. Sarah Yorke Stevenson (1847–1921) first broke with what Hinsley calls the tradition of “the male presentation to metropolitan females” (1989, 88). Predisposed to an interest in archaeology from living in Mexico before her married life in Philadelphia, she corresponded with Frederic Ward Putnam (1839–1915), curator of Harvard’s Peabody Museum and a founding member of the AIA. Stevenson became an amateur Egyptologist who helped found the Department of Archaeology at the University of Pennsylvania, became curator of antiquities and president of the Free Museum of Science and Art at Penn, later known as the University Museum, co-founder of the Mediterranean Section of the American Exploration Society, president of the Pennsylvania Society of the AIA, and a member of the AIA Council. In 1893 she served as vice president
of the jury for ethnology at the famed Columbian Exposition in Chicago and later was sent to Rome and Egypt on special archaeological missions for the American Exploration Society. Elected a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a member of the American Philosophical Society and the American Oriental Society, Stevenson received an honorary degree of Doctor of Science from the University of Pennsylvania (National Cyclopaedia of American Biography 13, 83–4).

As women's colleges opened their doors to a new generation of students, they also provided professional status for those receiving advanced education. Smith College was singled out in a review of “Recent Progress in Classical Archaeology” for its “choice selection of casts of the most instructive Greek and Roman sculptures, in historic sequence.” (Emerson 1899, 93). Annie Smith Peck (1850–1935), who later taught at Smith, was the first woman to enroll as a regular student at the ASCSA in 1885. Because women were initially only tolerated as second-class members at the School and treated accordingly, in 1898 a fellowship in the name of Agnes Hoppin was provided by the Hoppin family because “the activity of the School for women students was limited to a certain degree” (Lord 1947, 94).1 Smith College graduate May Louise Nichols, the first woman to win a fellowship in archaeology at the School, was also the first appointee to the Hoppin Fellowship. (Lord 1947, 82). Fellow Smith alumna Harriet Boyd (1871–1945) was the first woman to receive an AIA Fellowship in its first 16 years of existence and later succeeded Nichols as Hoppin Fellow (Ibid.). When denied the opportunity to excavate with the School because of her gender (Allsebrook 1992, 228), Boyd used her fellowship funds to initiate her own fieldwork at Kavousi on Crete.3 After publishing the Kavousi results in the AJA, she earned her M.A. from Smith in 1901. At the AIA’s 1900 Annual Meeting, Boyd presented the findings of her first season and, as a result of this lecture, she secured the sponsorship of Stevenson’s American Exploration Society in 1901 for her new excavations at Gournia. She also became the first woman to speak nationally as traveling lecturer to local AIA societies on Gournia in 1902. Seeking to foster a “network of female interaction” in the Gournia excavation and publication (Picazo 1998, 211), Boyd involved Smith alumnae, including Blanche Wheeler (1870–1936) and Edith Hall (1877–1943).⁴ Only four years after the close of her excavations, she published the first archaeological monograph on a Minoan site in 1908. Before she abandoned fieldwork for family responsibilities, Harriet Boyd
(Hawes) taught Greek archaeology, epigraphy, and modern Greek at Smith from 1901 to 1906. She received the college’s first honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities in 1910 and lectured at Wellesley from 1920 to 1936, thereby creating a powerful role model for her students. Edith Hall (Dohan) earned her Ph.D., and, despite having children, managed a career in museum curatorial work and served as Book Review Editor for the AIA (Thompson 1971, 497). Both were honored in the centennial celebration of American excavations on Crete and at the AIA’s Annual Meeting in 2001.

For the rest, progress was slow and less dramatic. Where statistics exist, although there was a general decline in percentages of women enrolled in colleges from 1920 (47.1%) to 1940 (40.1%) and 1958 (35.2%), the percentage of women who were AIA members in the same period rose from 37.4% in 1935 to 40.1% in 1957 to 40.2% in 1964 (Patterson 1995, 81, 83). Yet the percentage of women presenting papers at the AIA Annual Meeting remained well below that of the female membership itself: 21.6% in 1923, roughly 20% in the 1930s and 1940s, 26.5% in 1953–1954, declining sharply to 15% from 1957 to 1962 and then rising again to 22% from 1963 to 1968 (Patterson 1995, 82). Still, women’s participation exceeded that of their sisters at the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) where they constituted only 9–13.6% of the membership from 1936 to 1956, 12.5% in 1960, and 14.7% in 1969, yet gave 13.8% of the papers at their annual meeting between 1935 and 1941, 3.9% from 1946 to 1955, 10.2% from 1956 to 1960, and 7.5% from 1965 to 1968 (Patterson 1995, 82–3). “Survivorship” remains a problem as women professionals drop out for a variety of reasons: slower progress through academic ranks, greater percentage of part-time employment, fewer and smaller grants, family responsibilities (Boyd Hawes), with those successful professional women more likely to remain unmarried or have higher divorce rates (Kelley 1992, 85–6).

In 1994 Shelby Brown and Tracey Cullen helped to found the AIA Subcommittee on Women in Archaeology, following the 1970s lead of colleagues at the American Anthropological Association. Among its mandates are the monitoring of women’s status in the field and the encouragement of archaeological research involving the concept of gender. In 1996 the subcommittee conducted the first census by the AIA of its professional members. The preliminary analyses of these and other data show that roughly one quarter to three tenths of the total membership is professional or active in
the field. Of those, 45% are female (Cullen and Keller 1999, 6). They comprise just slightly less than half of the total professionally active membership of the Institute, but they publish significantly fewer books, articles, and reviews than their male counterparts and are thus less visible in the profession and receive less recognition. Although women have recently contributed half or more than half of the papers presented at the Annual Meeting, for the AIA invited lecture series, including society lectures and the prestigious endowed lecture tours only 26% of the invitees were women, a number which rose to 29% in 1996 and 1997 (Cullen and Keller 1999, 7). In sum, women have been in the field in large numbers for fewer years, have fewer tenured positions, and have more adjunct or temporary positions. Fewer women marry and still fewer have children (Cullen 1999, 7). Those who do, because of family responsibilities, tend to conduct fieldwork less frequently than their male peers (Cullen and Keller 1999, 7).

Recent statistics show a kind of gender bias in the discipline whereby men often do the fieldwork and women, the “archaeological housework”; that is, the classification, study, and analysis (Gero 1985, 344). This is borne out by a consideration of ASCSA field projects in Greece from 1900 to 1980, where 12% of the 49 projects were directed by women (five from 1900 to 1940 and two from 1940 to 1980). Figures from 1982 to 1994 show an increase to 27% (Cullen 1996, 413). Looking toward the future, there is progress in the increasing number of female Ph.D. recipients who find work and publish in the field. But gender equity is another matter with a “rarity of women in disciplinary histories, and in the higher ranks of academia, museums, and contract firms. . . . The disadvantaged status of women is made resoundingly clear . . . perpetuated by the structured values of archaeology itself” (Cullen 1995, 1045). Certainly in his centennial memoir Dow (1979, 10) chose to focus on “the important accomplishments of Archaeology . . . [and] the great men,” treating women as an afterthought at best, an oversight in part corrected here.

Within the ranks of the Institute, out of 28 AIA presidents, only four (one-seventh) have been women, the first being elected in 1965. An even worse situation can be seen at the AIA where only two out of 17 editors-in-chief have been women (Allen and Hebert, app. 1, this volume). Fewer than one-ninth of the prestigious Norton lecturers have been women (Murray, this volume). The Institute’s record with respect to prestigious awards given to women is slightly better. The Gold Medal Award for Distinguished Archaeological Achievement, recognizing career contributions, was awarded to women only
four times during the first 19 years of its existence (1965–1983), but since then women have received 11 out of 20 medals awarded, including 5 of the last 10 conferred. The situation of the Pomerance Award for Scientific Contributions to Archaeology, however, is less encouraging. Only 3 of 29 awards have gone to women since the prize was first awarded in 1980 (Allen and Hebert, app. 2, this volume), although this may be attributable to the fact that there are fewer women engaged in the sciences in general and archaeometry in particular. There is parity in the receipt of the Wiseman Book Award. Finally, women exceed men as recipients of AIA research fellowships (Allen and Hebert, app. 2, this volume).

Theoretical Orientations and the “Great Divide”

Recent recognition of women in the AIA has not necessarily aided the subcommittee’s mandate to encourage research on gender in archaeology. Already in 1993 scholars questioned why there has been such resistance and apathy regarding a feminist agenda in the organization, noting that the AIA has been sluggish in its support of feminist scholarship in classical archaeology. Brown reviewed works concerning archaeology and gender, a subfield inaugurated by anthropological archaeologists Margaret Conkey and Janet Spector (1984) who, in their discussion of the past as a dynamic construct, document androcentric bias in the interpretation of the archaeological record. Brown concluded that “feminist analyses of ancient art undertaken in the past decade have appeared in volumes edited by classicists, anthropologists, and art historians rather than by classical archaeologists,” yet she discerned a growing interest within the AIA in the “social and symbolic significance of art and architecture,” which could create a feminist-friendly environment for the analysis of gendered behavior in the archaeological record (1993, 245, 259). Thus, the subcommittee has supported colloquia on relevant topics at most of the recent Annual Meetings.

The long-standing general reluctance of the AIA to consider gendered interpretations of archaeological remains and past societies is related to the larger problem of its relationship to archaeology as a broader discipline. Situating the AIA within the practices of the discipline of archaeology in the United States as a whole from 1879 to 2001 is a complex subject only briefly touched upon here. Renfrew (1980), Snodgrass (1985), Dyson (1981; 1989b; 1998), and others have all addressed this issue far more extensively
with regard to classical archaeology versus the rest of the discipline of archaeology. Patterson (1995, 37, 51) has charged that the creation of the AIA marked a change in view of archaeology from the study of ancient societies to ancient remains. Dyson maintains that the turn away from the *altertumswissenschaft* of German classical archaeology towards a privileged position for philology over archaeology, the primacy of the big dig, and fine art connoisseurship from 1920 to 1950 contributed to the decline in the vigor of the discipline in the United States (1998, 218). Yet, from the time of Boyd’s work at Gournia, a limited contingent of AIA members has been excavating and publishing prehistoric sites in innovative, interdisciplinary ways. Among these are three AIA gold medal recipients: Robert Braidwood, who explored paleoenvironmental issues beginning in the 1940s in Iraq; William McDonald, who conducted surveys of southwestern Greece from the 1950s onward; and George Bass, who pioneered new methods and technology for underwater archaeology from the 1960s to the 1980s. As they dealt with economic and demographic problems through settlement patterns, raw materials access, new technologies, and quantitative analysis, some prehistoric Aegean archaeologists tended to ally themselves more and more with anthropology while most classical archaeologists clung to textual and traditional approaches at urban sites where excavations continued for decades. Thus, much of the AIA’s agenda remained unchanged from the concerns of the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

With the “New [Processual] Archaeology” of the 1960s and 1970s Americanist and classical archaeologists grew increasingly estranged. American scholars in anthropological archaeology and some Europeans took the lead in theoretical issues, interdisciplinary approaches, and high-technology applications of science to the field. These were not easily incorporated by text- and event-based archaeologists in the AIA as evidenced by Colin Renfrew’s plenary address, “The Great Tradition versus the Great Divide,” at the 1979 Annual Meeting celebrating the Institute’s centennial (Renfrew 1980). The AIA’s traditional architectural and object-oriented archaeology, closely affiliated with art history, focused on the empirical rather than the theoretical, the historical event rather than the processes and systems behind it.

Traditional classical archaeology became “cut off from the mainstream of that kind of intellectual advance which can manifest itself in several disciplines at the same time” (Snodgrass 1985, 37, 33). Dyson wryly observed
that “a 1985 AIA program was not materially different from one in 1935 both in format and in topics covered by the papers” (Dyson 1989b, 133). The *AJA*’s New World Book Review Editor was dropped in 1973, and although the *AJA* was committed to representing a “wide range of points of view and methods . . . [as] a showcase for the diversity of scholarship,” the excellent series of reviews of Americanist archaeological literature was discontinued as falling outside its geographical and chronological boundaries (Kleiner 1986, 1). Dyson complained that the *AJA* “showed no interest in either theory, method, or innovative approaches to archaeology as survey and environmental analysis” (1985; 1989b, 133).

The effects of the paradigm shift in the outlook of the AIA that began in the area of prehistoric and Bronze Age Aegean archaeology can be seen in the AIA abstracts of innovative papers, posters, workshops, and colloquia presented at the annual meetings of the last 15 years. Innovations crept in, such as the first *AJA* fascicle in 1995 on “Science in Archaeology,” and book review editors covering more books on archaeological method and theory, gender research, virtual archaeology, paleoenvironment, demography, and landscape archaeology than ever before. Current *AJA* editorial policy solicits “new interpretations, theories, methods of inquiry, the announcement of important discoveries, synthesis of recent research in a particular field, and critical discussions of significant questions and problems, specifically inviting contributions from the sciences and social sciences relating to the art and archaeology of the ancient world” (Hitchner 1999, 1). A perusal of the 1999 *AJA* shows articles not only on major excavations as before, but also on experimental archaeology, social organization, gendered interpretations, and intellectual history. The present book review editors “present the new methodologies and techniques that related areas and disciplines introduce,” seeking “a balance . . . that reflects both established and new archaeologies.” (Rehak and Younger 1999, 699).

Morris (1994) and Shanks (1996) have outlined ways in which the discipline of classical archaeology has moved and must continue to move toward the tradition of anthropological archaeology to keep in pace with the field of archaeology as a whole. Much has been done to bridge the “divide” as AIA classical archaeology is incorporated into the theoretical and methodological practices of postprocessual archaeology, which seeks to marshal the tremendous body of data closely associated with texts for interdisciplinary approaches to classical archaeology (Snodgrass 1985, 37).
New Challenges and Initiatives

The AIA has been encouraging new initiatives in archaeology in a number of ways. In his 1979 plenary address Colin Renfrew exhorted the AIA to help promote and fund publications, and the new monograph series, of which this volume is a part, began in 1993. It has also expanded the range of awards it confers annually to recognize excellence (Allen and Hebert, app. 2). The Centennial award honored the most important single contribution to archaeology in the AIA’s first 100 years, the development of $^{14}$C dating by Willard F. Libby. The James R. Wiseman Book award recognizes excellence in publication. The Undergraduate Teaching award celebrates the ability to communicate effectively to students. The Kershaw award honors outstanding local societies of the AIA while the Martha and Artemis Joukowsky Distinguished Service award and Public Service award commend critical stewardship and volunteer efforts in the field. Finally, the Conservation and Heritage Management award honors those stewards who are protecting cultural patrimony and archaeological sites for future generations. These awards and the increased AIA research fellowships: Olivia James, Harriet and Leon Pomerance, Helen Woodruff, Anna C. and Oliver Colburn, Kenan Erim, and the Woodruff Traveling Fellowships reflect the Institute’s concerns with sustained achievement, innovative scientific methods and technologies, responsible publication, and enhancement of outreach through teaching and local programs (Allen and Hebert, app. 2, this volume). In addition, Archaeology magazine launched a television series in the 1990s and a children’s magazine, Dig, in 1995.

Already in 1979 Sheftel noted that “conservation and preservation have become watch-words for a modern society increasingly aware of its devastating effect on the fragile remains of history. The Institute has moved to become an effective force working to safeguard both the known as well as the yet undiscovered monuments of man’s past. To this end it has proposed strong measures to deter individuals and institutions from the acquisition of stolen artifacts, has worked with other organizations in determining professional criteria for selecting archaeologists to participate in federally funded projects, and has supported measures to insure the preservation of archaeological sites for the future” (1979, 17). From its early interest in acquiring classical objects for American museums the Institute increasingly has taken a strong stance on cultural property issues, beginning with nascent attempts
to preserve monuments of early native Americans in 1899 to its present role as ever-alert watchdog and strong advocate against the sale of antiquities from clandestine excavations on the art market (Coggins, this volume).

Increasingly, AIA archaeologists must bridge the divide between academia and the public and participate in the critical cultural debates so as to remain visible and viable and make its positions known in the field of archaeological ethics in the 21st century. Leaving the ivory tower of academia in 1999, officers of the AIA engaged publicly with collectors and journalists to address issues of cultural property at the Columbia University conference on that topic and tackled the White House concerning a questionable appointment to the federal government’s Cultural Property Advisory Committee (Coggins, this volume). The presidential panel on the “Politics of Archaeology in the Global Context,” a topic explored at the 1999 Annual Meeting, documents AIA commitment to responsible ethics on a global scale. Two workshops at the 2001 meeting stressed archaeology education for the public and the need for excavators to present their sites to the public effectively. And most recently, the AIA’s president protested the destruction of cultural patrimony in Afghanistan.

In piecing together the agendas behind the founding and shaping of the AIA in its first century and beyond, we achieve a better understanding of its position and role in the wider context of global archaeology. A relevant and proactive AIA is key in the 21st century, and outreach is critical. The identity politics and culture wars of the late 20th century among minority and marginalized groups in the United States brought demands of recognition and rights based on those identities as well as the beginnings of ethnic studies programs (Patterson 1995, 130, 134). In archaeology this has led to the juggling of competing viewpoints (whether of dominant or submissive cultures) of the archaeologist as well as claims for restitution of patrimony to countries exploited by past imperialist practices, including the United States itself. “The deconstruction of American heritage has led to the recognition and acknowledgment of a multiplicity of cultural pedigrees” (Patterson 1995, 134) not just that which was privileged by Norton and the founders of the AIA. With growing awareness of cultural complexity and global responsibility, the AIA and its archaeologists must continue to speak out in public fora to inform the widespread interest in the field nurtured by the National Geographic Society and popular media. At the cusp of the millennium the Institute flourished with more than 100 local societies, 11,500
members, and over 200,000 subscribers to *Archaeology* magazine (Katz 1998, 366). Although the number of societies has since risen to 104, the membership now stands at fewer than 9,500. As the founders tried to negotiate their way between an archaeology celebrating civilization (Greece, Rome, and the Bible) and that exploring humans as part of the natural world (the Americas), we are challenged to unite our “multiple dispersed almost hermetically sealed centers of gravity with disparate or even divergent interests” (Patterson 1995, 138) through communication and cooperation. The Institute’s task in the 21st century is to unite text- and monument-based archaeology with the methods and theoretical bases of its anthropological cousin and reach out to an interested public.
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NOTES

1 The AIA archives are housed in the Institute’s headquarters in Boston, Massachusetts. All citations throughout the volume refer to box and file. They are cited with permission of the former AIA Executive Director, Mark Meister.

2 With the brief exception of 1922–1923 women were not allowed to live at the School before 1929 and had to find their own accommodations (Vogeikoff-Brogan 2000). Richardson, ASCSA director, actively excluded women from his excavations in Sparta and a portion of the School trip to the Peloponnese. Similarly, the British School at Athens...
admitted women in the 1890s, but denied them access to studentships or fellowships until 1910, and residence in the hostel as well as participation on digs until after World War I (Waterhouse 1986, 132).

3 Boyd submitted her excavation report to the ASCSA director, who ignored it and only mentioned his own in his annual report for 1899–1900, although her dig was under the auspices of the School (Lord 1947, 298).

4 Hall won the last Hoppin Fellowship and later excavated her own site on Crete.

5 Both Boyd and Hall attended private secondary schools and Smith College, and both later taught Classics, an acceptable field for women (Bolger 1994, 49). Among Boyd Hawes’s Wellesley students is my own professor, Phyllis Williams Lehmann, who has had a distinguished academic career at Smith, participated in American-sponsored excavations at Samothrace, authored a volume and edited final reports on those excavations, and co-founded the Western Massachusetts society of the AIA.

6 The AIA compares favorably with its younger counterpart, the SAA, which elected its first woman president in 1986 and appointed a woman the first editor of its journal, *American Antiquity*, in 1981.

7 The curious numbers are attributable to the multiple recipients of the award in 1993 and 1994.

8 The children’s magazine won several prestigious prizes before being sold in 2001.