


Agata Kubala 

(University of Wrocław)

---

## FROM GREECE TO WROCŁAW

### Eduard Schaubert's Antiquities Collection

#### Abstract

Among the collections of artefacts owned by German collectors and transferred to Polish museums after the Second World War, the set of objects created by Wrocław-based architect and antiquities collector Eduard Schaubert (1804–1860) clearly stands out. The collection was created over the period of twenty years that he spent in Greece and was brought to Wrocław by Schaubert in 1850. After his death, in 1861, the objects, along with a collection of drawings and handwritten accounts documenting them, were partly sold and partly donated by his heirs to the Royal Museum of Art and Antiquity at the University of Wrocław (then the University of Breslau). The collection, which at the time it was handed over to the Wrocław museum numbered more than 300 objects, fits into the collecting culture of the era in which it was created, and Schaubert himself is a representative of the international community of philhellenic collectors dominating the landscape of European collecting in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The vast majority of objects that were once in Schaubert's collection have not survived to this day due to the Second World War and the post-war turmoil. These preserved are scattered in two museums today. The preliminary reading of the published inventory lists of the antiquities' collection owned by Schaubert, prepared by August Rossbach who recorded the original state of the collected set, and a brief analysis of the preserved objects reveal the collection's heterogeneity. Diversity was probably part of the original idea, from the moment Schaubert started his collection. It is also significant that the artefacts included in the collection were usually mass produced in series and either purchased or discovered privately, that is, acquired without precise archeological data. These are the main features that distinguish a typical philhellenic collection of antiquities, that is, a collection created from the philhellenes' need to contact the

ancient original as “touching the past” and to preserve the material remains of the glorified “cradle of art and knowledge” – ancient Greece.

**Keywords:** Eduard Schaubert, Philhellenism, collecting antiquities, nineteenth century

## INTRODUCTION

Until the nineteenth century, the interest in collecting objects of antique provenance was rather insignificant in Wrocław. Silesian collectors of the modern era, the vast majority of whom were aristocracy and scholars, had always included such objects in their collections, but the pan-European fascination with antiquity in Silesia mainly manifested through antique coins added to collections – their presence has been documented since the sixteenth century (Mencfel 2010: 81f). One of the first such collections was the one created by Bishop Johann von Turzo, an enthusiasts of ancient history, who collected Greek and Roman coins that he purchased during his stay in Rome at the court of Pope Alexander VI Borghese (Paulinyi 1931: 4). The collections of the very few Wrocław-based antiquities collectors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in addition to ancient coins, also comprised other single antique artifacts from the Mediterranean, including the Egyptian mummy owned by a well-known collector, Laurentius Scholz, which was studied and described by a Wrocław poet and surgeon, Andreas Gryphius (Gryphius 1662). However, we should emphasize that the antiquities in the Silesian collections of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were mainly local findings, extracted from prehistoric burial grounds. Although there were collections in which the antiquities were dominant in terms of number of exhibits<sup>1</sup>, no collection was exclusively composed of such items. Until the nineteenth century, there was not a single collection in Silesia limited only to antique objects, and antiquities other than coins were rare in Silesian collections in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Mencfel 2010: 95). The rapidly growing interest in antiquity, observed in the eighteenth-century Europe, which manifested also in Greek and Roman antiquity collections becoming more popular, did not seem to affect Lower Silesia, perhaps, as noted by Michael Mencfel (2010: 96), not only because such artifacts were only

1 For example, the collection of Wrocław-based scholar Christian Stieff or the pastor of Maszel, Leonhard David Hermann, cf. Mencfel 2010: 93nn.

available at exorbitant prices in Europe, but also, and perhaps above all, because there were no suitable role models.

The situation remained unchanged in the first half of the nineteenth century. Published in Breslau in 1826, the work by Johann Georg Knie and J.M. Melcher listed several significant local collectors, but none of them owned antiquities (Knie, Melcher 1826: 902f). There were also no such specimens in public museums established in Wrocław at that time. The collection of Greek and Roman antiquities created by Eduard Schaubert, which he brought to Wrocław in 1850, was thus the first of its kind in his native city. Therefore, Schaubert, an architect educated in Berlin, was the first collector of antiquities from Wrocław, whose active participation in this field is evidenced by the preserved, albeit only in a small part, collection that he created during his stay in Greece between 1830 and 1850. Before we discuss his collection, I suggest we take a look at its creator, who played a significant role not only in the history of nineteenth-century antiquities collection-making, but also in the history of Greek archaeology. In this context, it seems important to relate basic facts of his life, and especially twenty years that he spent in the “Hellenes’ country,” which could have sparked the idea of collection-making and prompted Schaubert to start and gradually expand his collection.

#### EDUARD SCHAUBERT – FROM AN ARCHITECT TO THE ENTHUSIAST AND COLLECTOR OF ANTIQUITIES

Schaubert (Fig. 1) was born in 1804 and began his education at a grammar school in his native city, Wrocław, which at that time was called Breslau and was part of the Prussian state, where a thorough education reform by Wilhelm von Humboldt had already been in place. Von Humboldt, in a manner typical for the first decades of the nineteenth century, loved ancient Greece. His reform, introduced in 1810, emphasized a thorough study of the language and history of ancient Greece (Junkiért 2013: 19). Schaubert, like his peers, thus received a thorough classical education, which was one of the characteristics, along with a general and boundless admiration for classical Greek antiquity, of those who participated in social discourses in Germany, in the first half of the nineteenth century. His studies in Berlin, which in the 1820s was the center of German philhellenism, undoubtedly contributed to his increased interest in Greek antiquity,

which had been instilled in him in grammar school (gymnasium) – especially since his main academic teacher was then the leading philhellenist architect of that period, Karl Friedrich Schinkel<sup>2</sup>. Berlin was thus, most probably, the place where the young architect from Wrocław developed firm philhellenist ideas. However, on his first study trip following graduation, he visited not Greece, which had just regained its independence and opened up to Western travelers, but Italy. It was only there that he decided to go to Greece. Most likely, the decision was made under the influence of his friend from Berlin and his travel companion, Stamatios Kleanthes who himself hailed from Greek Macedonia. It is possible that General Carl Wilhelm von Heideck, a philhellenist involved in the struggle for Greek national liberation, whom Schaubert met in Rome, also played a role in convincing him to visit the country. It is very likely that he told Schaubert and Kleanthes about career prospects opening up for architects in Greece, completely destroyed by the war. We cannot rule out that this ultimately convinced Schaubert to leave and start his career in the “Hellenes’ country”. His activities in the first years of his stay in Greece seem to indicate his strong affiliation with philhellenist ideas. He certainly came to Athens with an ideal image of the city as it used to be in antiquity, and which significantly influenced the plan of modern Athens he prepared together with Kleanthes for the newly formed Greek government (Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994: 515). However, after completing that assignment, along with a few more in which he was involved during his first years in Greece, his authentic interest in Greek antiquity, described by his collaborator and friend, German archaeologist Ludwig Ross (Minner 2006: 91), has led him to stop practicing his learned profession. From that moment, Schaubert devoted all his energy and time to archaeological work, which included both excavations and restoration work on the Acropolis in Athens, and drawings executed to document the surviving ancient structures in Greece.

The initial phase of Schaubert’s collecting work seems to be related to the situation which he witnessed in Athens right after his arrival. He must have been very impressed by what he saw: fragments of antique structures lying everywhere in the streets, as rubble from ruined buildings, once incorporated into the walls of old town houses, which were then reduced to rubble during the national liberation war. Schaubert wrote about it in a letter to his friends dated January 1832 (von Quast 1834: 1f). The fact that he started his collection could

2 For a wider perspective on German philhellenism see Marchand 1996.

therefore be linked to his desire to rescue the relics of the glorified Greek classical past from complete destruction, but it also fulfilled his wish for philhellene self-creation. In this context, it is also significant that some of these architectural fragments came from the Acropolis in Athens, which was the 'Mecca' of the nineteenth century Western European philhellenes, whose common feature was the almost fanatical idealization of ancient Greek art. Already in the eighteenth century, we can see a sharp increase in the interest in antiquity. A very important impulse was certainly provided by the discoveries of Old Roman centers, Pompeii and Herkulaneum. However, in the second half of that century, there was a clear turn towards the art of ancient Greece, and especially the Greek classical "golden age". This was due to Johann Joachim Winckelmann and his monumental work *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst* (1755). The belief in the absolute superiority of Greek art of the classical period, expressed in this work, imbued this period in the history of Greek art with a mythical quality, which in the first two decades of the nineteenth century led to a firm primacy of ancient Greece over Rome among Western Europeans. This mythical vision persisted throughout that century, shaping artistic tastes of subsequent generations of Europeans. One of the effects brought by this special phenomenon – which by then was dubbed philhellenism, and, spreading in a new form and with new strength in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth century, formed an uncontested engine of cultural change – was the popularization of Greek antiquities collections. Thus, Greece – perceived as a true source of European art – became the natural destination for expeditions, which were also driven by the availability of original artifacts sought by collectors. In the first decades of the nineteenth century, the boundless and almost uncritical admiration for Greece's classical past transformed into an almost pan-European epidemic. The growing wealth of the society at the beginning of that century led to the emergence of a large number of private collectors who had the means to collect items corresponding to their tastes (MacGregor 2007: 237), and these tastes had by then been shaped mostly, but not exclusively, by Greek antiquities, which suddenly became easily accessible. One way of acquiring them, much easier from 1830 when Greece regained its independence, was to travel to the cradle of European civilization. The spread of philhellenist ideas in Europe resulted in a rapid influx of Western travelers into Greece, most of whom were keen to collect artifacts, whenever an opportunity arose (Tsigakou 1981: 24). Tempted by the opportunities offered by the newly established, pro-European country where collectors could acquire

by then highly desirable Greek originals, newcomers competed with each other in the rush to collect the ancient remains and they were prepared to pay high prices for these items in an increasingly active antiquarian market in Athens.

The fact that Schaubert started collecting antiquities almost immediately after his arrival in the Greek capital and then gradually expanded his collection, like many other philhellenes, seems to prove that he was indeed one of them. His twenty-year stay in the „the Hellenes’ country“ allowed him to create a collection of considerable size, which he brought to Wrocław when he returned to the city in 1850.

The collection most probably started with ancient architectural details collected during Schaubert’s strolls through the ruined streets of Athens. These old shards were, as he wrote himself, scattered on all the streets in the city, often [originating] from very beautiful monuments (von Quast 1834: 2). The same situation was reported by another eyewitness, Ludwig Ross, mentioned above, who arrived in Athens in the summer of 1832 (Ross 1863: 149). Seeing a large number of easily accessible relics of the classical past, which featured so prominently in his upbringing, could certainly be the impulse that prompted Schaubert to start his collection, especially as his education was also imbued with veneration of all that was part of the Greek antiquity. This process probably began just after his arrival in Athens, as in the letter, quoted above, dated only two months following his arrival (von Quast 1834: 2), Schaubert described the architectural bits used as ornaments in a large atelier of the newly constructed house. This was confirmed by a drawing made two years later by a Danish architect and Schaubert’s collaborator, Christian Hansen, depicting this atelier (Fig. 2). Another evidence of the early presence of architectural details in the collection is provided by Hansen’s drawings of the antefixes, made during his close cooperation with Schaubert, that is, between 1834 and 1836. The objects represented in the drawings are almost identical to those preserved as part of the Wrocław architect’s collection. One of them, made in Athens in February 1834 – like the atelier drawing – has even been signed as one of Schaubert’s possessions (Bendtsen 1993: 240, no. ChrH.208, ChrH.209). The painting made in the same year, also ascribed to Hansen (cf. Fig. 1), indicates that the “spoils” consisted not only of architectural fragments of the destroyed antique buildings, but included other objects of ancient provenance. They were undoubtedly part of the collection, which must have already existed at the time when Hansen executed both of his artworks. One vessel, a ladle depicted first from the left, has

survived to this day as the only one of the antiquities represented in the painting, albeit it has been damaged (Fig. 3).

However, the objects depicted in Schaubert's portrait, like his other additions to the collection, could also have been acquired in other ways, not only by searching through the rubble lying on the streets of Athens. In the first half of the nineteenth century, selling antiquities was a common practice in Greece, done by the local people in response to the rapidly growing demand for ancient objects. This phenomenon intensified in the 1830s, after Greece regained its independence, and was driven by the growing number of Western aficionados of ancient artifacts visiting the "land of the Hellenes". The accounts of Western European travelers (cf. e.g., Ross 1855: 57; Bracken 1975: 53; Haugsted 1996: 305) and Greek citizens (Wünsche 1993: 44) who witnessed such practices leave no doubt as to what happened. Schaubert probably also received offers to buy antiquities – he mentioned one such instance in his diary of excavations carried out together with Ross at the site they suspected to be the grave of Koroibos (Lehmann 2003: 166). While he noted the finding of the brown Corinthian helmet, he also wrote: *About six months ago, I was offered to buy a very similar, perfectly preserved one, which was allegedly found in a grave in Mycenae. It should now be in Denmark*<sup>3</sup>. However, there is a possibility that the helmet mentioned by Schaubert never reached Denmark and was finally bought by him. Among the surviving items in his collection, there is a very well-preserved Corinthian helmet (Fig. 4), which, according to the information given by Schaubert himself to his relatives, was found in Mycenae. This is noted by August Rossbach, who in 1856–1898 was the director of the Royal Museum of Art and Antiquity, where the Wrocław architect's collection was sent after Schaubert's death (1877: 123, no. 1), and who received that information from the collector's nephew, Otto Schaubert. This would mean that Schaubert used every opportunity to enrich his collection with new objects, including those he purchased. Such an opportunity, in addition to offers that were addressed directly to him, also arose while he was purchasing antique objects for the Royal Museums in Berlin, as commissioned by the management of this institution between 1843 and 1848 (Bończuk-Dawidziuk 2012: 323f). During this assignment he probably used – as many other collectors<sup>4</sup> and agents acting on behalf of major European museums did –

3 Quoted from Koepp 1890: 146, footnote 65, translated from German by the author.

4 As we can conclude from autobiographical considerations of an Austrian diplomat and collector Anton Prokesch von Osten, published by his son, the creating of a varied and impres-

a well-developed network of local antiquities merchants and the so-called *grave diggers*, who were then working either legally or illegally in Greece (Galanakis 2012). The first antiquities store was established in Athens in 1840 by a certain Pavlos Lambros. He was soon followed by other merchants, and many similar shops mushroomed in the Greek capital (Galanakis 2012). However, we do not have any information to determine whether Schaubert cooperated with any of the antiquities traders active in Athens during his stay in the city. We also don't know whether he made private purchases in addition to official transactions for the Berlin museum.

The opportunities to enlarge his collection were provided by his private journeys in Greece, both mainland and islands, as evidenced by the drawings made during these expeditions and mentions in the texts published by his fellow travelers or, finally, by the information included in surviving Schaubert's travel diaries.<sup>5</sup> Two expeditions in particular were noteworthy. The first one was a trip Schaubert made with Ross to the Aegean Islands in 1843, during which they visited, among others, Thera and Melos. In the diary published two years later, in an entry from 8 August, Ross mentioned finding a terracotta relief sculpture depicting Helle riding on a ram in one of the graves discovered there (Ross 1845: 19). It is now kept in Berlin, like other objects from the German archeologist collection (Jacobsthal 1931: 18, pl. 18). An identical relief sculpture, differing only in its stage of preservation, was part of Schaubert's collection and is now among the artifacts which survived to this day (Kubala 2019: 413, cat. 33, il. 37). It is therefore very likely that both came from the same source, although Ross did not mention finding another identical relief sculpture. In the second chapter of another publication of his (referenced as Ross 1855), while discussing the finding of terracotta reliefs in the graves of Melos and Aegina, Ross mentioned the fragments of terracotta figurines from the same source that he had in his possession. In the same context, he also mentioned he had small terracotta figures found in Plataia. He added that objects of this type, although of much better quality, coming from gravel located in Aegina, Melos and Attica, were in the possession of other collectors, Baron Rouen, Count Prokesch von Osten and

sive collection was possible through collaboration with a large number of assistants, with whom he kept in touch, both in Greece and in the Middle East. Cf. Bertsch 2005: 467.

5 They are currently kept at the Altes Museum in Berlin, so far unpublished. I wish to thank Martin Maischberger, PhD, the deputy Director of the museum for making them available to me to read.

Consul Gropius. Although the German archaeologist did not mention Schaubert, we can assume that at least some examples of terracotta figurative art from his collection (Rossbach 1877: 120ff) came from the same locations, given that they visited these sites together. From another trip to Boeotia in 1848, Schaubert certainly brought new objects for his collection. Their descriptions and drawings are included in the diary he kept during that trip<sup>6</sup>. On page XI, under number 47, he sketched the vessels he found in the graves in Teumessus, located on the plain of Thebes. The fact that they were part of his collection is confirmed by a list of collected objects made by Rossbach (1877: 116, no. 2). Two of the seven vessels shown in the drawing have survived to this day (Kubala 2019: 405, Catalogue no 16 and 17, il. 19, 20). Below the vessels, on the same page of the diary, there is another drawing, numbered 48, representing a scarab found, according to the information provided, in Schimatari near Tanagra. Next to the drawing there is a short description of the finding. Currently considered missing, the scarab was listed by August Rossbach among the objects from Schaubert's collection transferred to the museum (Rossbach 1877: 125, no 1).

The objects that were added to Schaubert's collection could have been found not only in ancient graves he discovered during his travels in the Greek islands, but also in Athens and its surrounding area. In one of his publications, mentioned above, Ross also described his exploration of graves in Piraeus. He was then accompanied by Schaubert, who made drawings of the grave stelae found during these explorations (Ross 1855: 43). In this context, Ross mentioned two white-ground *lekythos* from his own collection, which may have come from these graves (Ross 1855: 45). It cannot be ruled out that three vessels of this type from Schaubert's collection (cf. Rossbach 1877: 118f, no. 1–3), of which one has survived to this day (Fig. 5), came from the same place, as did the *alabastrones* recorded in the collection inventory made by August Rossbach (1877: 119, no. 5.1). According to Ross' account (1855: 25), they were frequently found in the graves discovered in this port town. The objects found in the graves of Attica discovered together with Ross could also have been added to Schaubert collection. In the graves they explored, Ross (1855: 39ff) records the presence of small vessels, mainly *lekythos*, and brown tools of small size, including *strigilis*. At least some of them could have made it to Schaubert's collection and to those owned by other collectors. This was probably not a rare practice at that time. Precious furnishings of one of the graves discovered by Ross in Athens

6 *Reise in Böotien. Sommer 1848*, Altes Museum, Berlin, reg. no 49/49 (unpublished)

were gifted to Queen Amalia of Greece (Ross 1855: 37), equally valuable items found by him in the tomb of the “servant of Isis” were offered to King Louis I of Bavaria, the father of the Greek monarch (Ross 1855: 39). In fact, the practice of taking some of the objects found in the graves to add to his own collection has been declared by Ross himself, albeit not directly. When discussing the graves discovered on Aegina, he reported that an “interesting little vessel” was found in one of them, depicting Heracles and Iolaus fighting against the Lernaean Hydra (Ross 1855: 47f). The vessel, which has been lost, was certainly part of Schaubert’s collection, as confirmed by a list made by August Roszbach, recording the same place of origin (Roszbach 1877: 117, no. 5), and in publications by Clemens Konitzer (referenced as Konitzer 1861) and Otto Roszbach (1889: 6ff), who discussed the list. Interestingly, Ross never mentioned the fact that the vessel was finally added to the collection owned by his friend and collaborator. This means, in fact, that both the island and Attica necropolises explored with Ross could have been the source of the vast majority of objects from Schaubert’s collection: vessels, both clay and stone, bronze artifacts or figurative terracotta art, stamps, coins and engraved gems, for which there are no record of where they have been found. All these items were mentioned by Ross (1855: 11–72) as being part of the graves he discovered, or which had previously been uncovered. Many of the items in Ross’s collection and collections of many other philhellenes probably had the same origin. The German archaeologist noted that many of the graves he examined had already been opened. As an example, he brought up the island of Aegina, where more than 1,000 ancient burial sites were thus uncovered in the 1830s. The objects they contained, he added, were scattered around the world. Among those who purchased antiquities from Aegina, Ross mentioned a well-known collector, Baron de Rouen (Ross 1855: 47). Ross (1855: 57f) also described the necropolises dug up by local farmers in the 1840s in the area of the famous Peloponnese antiquity sites, Corinth, Sparta, Sicyon or Tenea, from which they extracted objects, mainly vases and small bronze artifacts, and sold them to visitors.

The time that elapsed between the first (confirmed by a letter from the beginning of 1832, cf. von Quast 1834: 1f) and the last (a diary of the journey to Boeotia in 1848) confirmed cases of acquiring objects for the collection indicates that the collecting process took several years. The gradual expansion of the collected set with new acquisitions was most probably done in two ways – through exploration both in Athens and other regions of Greece, carried out either independently or together with Ross, and by purchasing the new items from both legal

and illegal sources. The surviving diaries of Anton Prokesch von Osten, who stayed in Greece at the same time as Schaubert, reveal that the author created his own collection of antiquities using such methods (Bertsch 2005: 507f).

## SCHAUBERT'S COLLECTION OF ANTIQUITIES

In Schaubert's collection, apart from Greek antiquities, there were also items of Egyptian and Roman provenance. Schaubert never visited Egypt. Together with Hansen, they planned such a trip, but never implemented the plan (Haugsted 1996: 146). He most likely acquired Egyptian antiquities in Athens. This was certainly the case with the objects of Egyptian origin from Hansen's collection, which were purchased by him in that city in 1846 (Bundgaard et al. 2011: 116, note 21). At least some objects of Roman provenance were acquired by Schaubert during his trip to Italy in 1854. They complemented his rich collection brought four years earlier from Greece. His visit was recorded in the *Paßregister der preußischen Gesandtschaft zu Rom 1816–1870*. This information was provided by Friedrich Noack in a publication about Germans in Rome (referenced as Noack 1927), who used the above register as one of his sources. He noted Schaubert's visit to the Eternal City from 19 June to 14 July 1854 (Noack 1927: 516). Richard Foerster (1867: 5) mentioned that, according to his knowledge, Schaubert brought some artifacts from Italy, but these were only insignificant and worthless items. Foerster's approach is interesting – as a scientist, he probably evaluated the artistic and historical value of the findings, probably not understanding their proper value, markedly emotional for Schaubert as a Philhellene.

After the collection was brought to Wrocław, Schaubert did not part with it for the next ten years, until his death in 1860, keeping the collected objects in his family house at 15, Blücherplatz (now Plac Solny), where he settled after his return. A year after his death, the collection was transferred, partly as a gift, partly by way of purchase, to the then Royal Museum of Art and Antiquity, which in 1862, following the acquisition of this spectacular collection, was renamed the Archaeological Museum of the University of Breslau (Bończuk-Dawidziuk, Palica 2015: 233).

The original composition and the number of items that the collection included are well known. The collection of around three hundred pieces of antique

art<sup>7</sup> and 1,437 coins, was until the start of the Second World War a very precious part of the items kept at the University of Breslau's archeological museum. While the collection was being transferred, it turned out that a certain batch of objects was destroyed. The missing parts were replaced with other fragments. This was the case, for example, with the relief from Melos depicting Helle riding on a ram (cf. Kubala 2019: 413, cat. 33, il. 37). The missing head of the animal was replaced with a horse's head from another relief of the same kind. As a result of the war or the postwar turmoil, a large part of the collection has disappeared. Only about one-fifth of the original collection (except coins) was preserved and is currently scattered between two museums. In 1946, the vast majority of the surviving objects were transferred to the National Museum in Warsaw. The remaining surviving items are kept in the Museum of the University of Wrocław, the heir to the pre-war institution to which the collection was transferred following Schaubert's death.

A preliminary reading of the published inventory of Schaubert's collection of antiquities, made by August Rossbach (cf. Rossbach 1861; 1877) and recording its original composition, or even a cursory look at the preserved objects allows us to see its great heterogeneity. Such heterogeneity was most probably intended already when Schaubert initiated his collection, which is partly signaled by two preserved iconographic registers of certain parts of the collection, namely the painting (Fig. 1) and the drawing (Fig. 2) representing the Wrocław architect in his Athens atelier. Both were made in 1834, that is, in the first years of the collection. The heterogeneous character of the collection is a major feature but does not constitute the only distinguishing characteristics of the antiquity collection typical for the first half of the nineteenth century. Equally important is the fact that the artifacts that make up the collection belong to the category of mass products, made in series, purchased or acquired through private search, and thus ones for which there were no exact archaeological data. In addition, philhellene collections created in Greece after regaining its independence, in contrast to those created in the late eighteenth and the first three decades of the nineteenth century, are marked by an almost complete absence of "marbles" and other spectacular works of Greek art, due to restrictions in line with which Greek officials were obliged to reclaim all such objects for the future

7 We cannot determine their exact number. The author of both surviving inventories of the collection, A. Rossbach sometimes listed several objects under one item, without specifying their number, see e.g. Rossbach 1861: 45, no 121; Rossbach 1877: 125, no 5.

national museum. This is reported, for example, by the Danish Consul General in Athens, Christian Tuxen Falbe, who in 1834 attempted to acquire, as he himself described it, something really valuable for the collection of the Danish successor to the throne, the later ruler, Christian VIII, an avid collector of antiquity (Bundgaard et al. 2002: 172). The collections created after 1830 consisted mostly of small objects of everyday use or small pieces of larger works. They were sometimes supplemented with plaster casts and drawings of inaccessible originals. The objects that once made up the collection of the Wrocław architect satisfy, as we will see, these criteria, thus fitting into the model of philhellenist antiquities collecting. Schaubert's collection contained over 40 metal items. The most numerous set within this category were bronze objects. Among them, there were Greek mirrors, figurines or their fragments, vessels, a Corinthian helmet, tools or arrow heads. Within the 'metal' collection, there was also one unidentified iron object and fragments of gold products. Only fourteen bronze objects survived the turmoil of war and now are part of the collection held at the National Museum in Warsaw as examples of Greek artistic craftsmanship.

Due to the regulations introduced in Greece during the rule of Otto Friedrich Ludwig, or because of Schaubert's personal belief that they should be kept in a museum, his collection did not include monumental marble sculptures. It only included small marble artifacts, none of which were higher than 14 cm, according to August Rossbach (1877: 122). The 'marble' group consisted of eight objects, seven fragments of figures and one complete small statue. The only surviving artifact, currently in the collection of the Museum of the University of Wrocław, is a plinth depicting human feet and a fragment of tree trunk with a trace of snake still discernible on it. The context of the representation suggests that the statue was most probably a representation of Apollo.

Pottery constituted an important part of Schaubert's collection. Within the set of more than sixty items, the majority were small vessels. One exception was one of the three white-ground *lekythos*, preserved until today (cf. Fig. 5), which is almost 48 cm in height. The majority of the collected vessels were examples of Greek oriental and black- and red-figure pottery (Kubala 2019: 404ff, cat. no. 15–31). The oldest vessel is a ladle representing Mycenaean ceramics of the late Bronze Age or early Iron Age (cf. Fig. 3). The terracotta items were only slightly less numerous. There were fifty-five of them, small in size and with preserved traces of polychrome ornaments. Twenty of these objects have survived, including relief sculptures from Melos and architectural details such as antefixes, waterspouts, or fragments of simas and cornice. Among the items

that did not survive, there were complete representations of human figures, deities or other mythological figures, and animals (Rossbach 1877: 120ff, no. 1–17, 19–22, 24–30).

The extensive collection of the Wrocław architect also contained a number of carved gems, including those in the form of scarabs, made of various types of precious and non-precious stones and glass, decorated mainly with images of realistic and fantastic animals.

Apart from the above categories of objects, Schaubert's collection also included an impressive set of Greek, Roman and Byzantine coins. None of them have survived, but we know the types of coins that were in it, since in 1868 the collection was studied by a numismatist Julius Friedländer, the Director of the Royal Numismatic Cabinet at the Berlin University, who drew attention to the collection's chronological and topographical diversity<sup>8</sup>.

To make the picture of Schaubert's collection complete, I need to mention the presence of plaster casts of sculptures, relief sculptures and architectural details, made in Athens, Rome and Naples during Schaubert's stay in Italy in 1854. The collection catalogue lists, among others, copies of the chapter and an upper fragment of the Monument of Lysicrates, the statue of Pan, the torso of the statue of Athena and fragments of grave stellae made in the capital of Greece, as well as copies of the sculptural pairing of the Tyrannicides and the Capitoline Venus brought from Italy (Rossbach 1877: 13ff). However, it seems that they were not as important for Schaubert as the ancient originals, because after they had been brought to Wrocław, he kept them in the basement of his house, from where they were only removed after his death (Rossbach 1877: 114).

The analysis of the collection leads to yet another conclusion. Creating his collection of antiquities, the Wrocław architect meticulously acquired not only entire objects, but even small fragments of antique art pieces, all of which he collected considering as superior not their category or quality of workmanship, but their authentic ancient origin. Such an approach fits well the new model of collection-making, sparked by the increasingly widespread idea of philhellenism. The emergence of the independent Greek state created favorable cir-

8 Friedländer's catalogue has not been published. It was included in the handwritten inventory of coins belonging to the collection of the University of Breslau's Archeological Museum at that time, made in 1872, cf. *Inventare des archäologischen Museums an der Königlichen Universität zu Breslau, II. Catalog der Münzen*, which is now kept at the Archeological Museum in Wrocław, ref. no. DzDN-AN, MA/A/364.

cumstances not only for the realization of romantic visions created by Western European philhellenes, based on the assumed idealistic image of Greece and their declared love for everything hailing from Greece. This allowed the philhellenes to satisfy their own desire to own ancient Greek artifacts. Schaubert thus appears to be a typical nineteenth-century collector, the philhellene, whose behavior was decidedly marked by his love for antiquity and whose collection was the material expression of this attitude. The antiquities collection created by the architect from Wrocław – or rather the circumstances and the way in which it was put together (this particular set, like other, similar collections was, among other factors, the result of field research) – reflect not only changes in the antiquities collection-making at the turn of the centuries and in the first half of the nineteenth century, but also the contribution of the Philhellene collectors, including the architect from Wrocław, to the development of both field archeology and theoretical archaeology<sup>9</sup>. The latter had been supplied by them with plentiful research material long before the professional archeologists started to appreciate the significance of excavation (along with the emergence of new field-work methods) for proper reconstruction of the past.

## Bibliography

- Bendtsen M. 1993. *Sketches and Measurements. Danish Architects in Greece 1818–1862*. Copenhagen: Kunstakademiets Bibliotek.
- Bertsch D. 2005. Anton Prokesch von Osten und Griechenland. Vom Kriegsberichterstatte des griechischen Freiheitskampfes zum ersten österreichischen gesandten. In: H.-D. Blume, C. Lienau (eds.). *Der fremde und der eigene Blick. Reisen und Reisende in Griechenland. Choregia. Münsterische Griechenlandstudien*, Heft 4. Münster, 61–102.
- Bończuk-Dawidziuk U. 2012. Eduard Schaubert. *Schlesische Lebensbilder*, 11, 323–332.
- Bończuk-Dawidziuk U., Palica M. 2013. Zbiory dzieł sztuki. In: J. Harasimowicz (Ed.). *Księga Pamiątkowa Jubileuszu 200-lecia utworzenia Państwowego Uniwersytetu we Wrocławiu*, Tom II: *Universitas litterarum Wratislaviensis 1811–1945*. Wrocław: Uniwersytet Wrocławski, 529–545.
- Bracken C.P. 1975. *Antiquities Acquired. The Spoliation of Greece*. London: David & Charles.

9 Some artifacts from Schaubert's collection were studied by experts, the results of this research were published, see e.g. Konitzer 1861; Foerster 1867; Rossbach 1889.

- Bundgaard Rasmussen B., Jensen J.S., Lund J. (Ed.) 2000. *Christian VIII and the National Museum. Antiquities, Coins, Medals*. Copenhagen: [The National Museum of Denmark!].
- Bundgaard Rasmussen B., Lund J. 2002. On the Creation of the Collection of Classical Antiquities in the Danish National Museum. *Pharos. Journal of the Netherlands Institute in Athens*, 10, 169–178.
- Galanakis Y. 2012. *Of Grave Hunters & Earth Contractors: A Look at the "Private Archaeology" of Greece*. [online]. Available from: <http://www.chs-fellows.org/2012/11/15/of-grave-hunters-earth-contractors-a-look-at-the-private-archaeology-of-greece/>, accessed on 10.11.2020.
- Gryphius A. 1662. *Mumiae Wratislavienses*. Wratislaviae: Sumptibus Viti Jacobi Drescheri.
- Haugsted I. 1996. *Dream and Reality. Danish Antiquaries, Architects and Artists in Greece*. London: Archetype.
- Jacobsthal P. 1931. *Die melischen Reliefs*. Berlin: Heinrich Keller.
- Junkiart M. 2013. Historyzm wobec starożytności w dziełach J.J. Winckelmannna, W. von Humboldta i F. Schlegla. Próba rekonstrukcji i zarys polskiej recepcji. *Slavia Occidentalis*, 70/2, 7–25.
- Knie J.G., Melcher J.M. (eds.) 1826. *Geographische Beschreibung von Schlesien preußischen Antheils, der Grafschaft Glatz und der preußischen Markgrafschaft ober-Lausitz*, Erste Abtheilung, Heft 5, Breslau: Größel.
- Koepp F. 1890. Eduard Schauberts handschriftlicher Nachlaß, *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 5, 129–148.
- Konitzer C. 1861. *Herakles und die Hydra. Beschreibung der Schaubert'schen Vase "Herakles und die Hydra" im königlichen Museum für Kunst und Alterthum an der Universität Breslau. Gruss zur Feier des 50jährigen Jubiläums der Universität Breslau im Namen der archäologischen Gesellschaft*. Breslau.
- Kubala A. 2019. *Filhellenizm a rodząca się nowoczesność. Kolekcja starożytności Eduarda Schauberta w świetle zachodzących zmian*. Kraków-Wrocław: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- MacGregor A. 2007. *Curiosity and Enlightenment. Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century*, New Haven-London: Yale University Press.
- Marchand S.L. 1996. *Down from Olympus. Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1950*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mencfel M. 2010. *Skarbce natury i sztuki. Prywatne gabinety osobliwości, kolekcje sztuki i naturalistów na Śląsku w wiekach XVII i XVIII*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG.
- Minner I.E. 2006. *Ewig ein Fremder im fremden Lande. Ludwig Ross (1806–1859) und Griechenland. Peleus. Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Griechenlands und Zyperns*, Bd. 36. Mannheim-Möhnesee: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Noack F. 1927. *Das Deutschtum in Rom seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Bd. 2. Stuttgart-Berlin-Leipzig: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

- Papageorgiou-Venetas A. 1994. Athens: The Ancient Heritage and the Historic Cityscape in a Modern Metropolis. *The Archaeological Society at Athens Library*, 140. Athens.
- Paulinyi O. 1931. Johann von Turzo, Bischof von Breslau. *Schlesische Lebensbilder*, Bd. 4: *Schlesier des 16. bis 19. Jahrhunderts*, Breslau, 1–6.
- Quast A.F. von. 1834. *Mittheilungen über Alt und Neu Athen*. Berlin: George Gropius.
- Ross L. 1855. *Archäologische Aufsätze*. Leipzig: Von B.G. Teubner.
- Ross L. 1863. *Erinnerungen und Mittheilungen aus Griechenland*. Berlin: Rudolph Gaertner.
- Roszbach A. 1861. *Verzeichnis der Gypsabgüsse und Originalien antiker Bildwerke im Königlichen Museum für Kunst und Alterthum an der Univeristät Breslau*. Breslau: Grass, Barth und Comp.
- Roszbach A. 1877. *Das archäologische Museum an der Universität zu Breslau*. Breslau: Buchdruckerei Lindner.
- Roszbach O. 1889. *Griechische Antiken des Archaeologischen Museums in Breslau*. Breslau: Victor Zimmer.
- Tsigkakou F.-M. 1981. *The Rediscovery of Greece: Travellers and Painters of the Romantic Era*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Wünsche R. 1993. Antiken aus Griechenland – Botschafter der Freiheit. In: R. Heydenreuter, J. Murken, R. Wünsche (eds.). *Die erträumte Nation. Griechenlands Wiedergeburt im 19. Jahrhundert*. München: Biering & Brinkmann GbR.

## List of illustrations

- Fig. 1. Hans Chr. Hansen, *Eduard Schaubert*, c. 1834, oil on paper on canvas, 36 x 43 cm, Photograph: Kit Weiss. Courtesy of the Museum of National History, Frederiksborg castle.
- Fig. 2. Hans Chr. Hansen, *Eduard Schaubert in his atelier*, February 1834, pencil on paper, 15 x 8.7 cm, Copenhagen, Danish Royal Academy of Fine Arts, sketchbook 18541. After Haugsted 1996: 228.
- Fig. 3. Ladle. Height with the handle 15 cm. Late Helladic III. Photograph: Wojciech Małkowicz. Courtesy of the Museum of the University of Wrocław.
- Fig. 4. Corinthian helmet. Bronze. Height 23 cm. Last quarter of the seventh century BC. Photograph: Piotr Ligier. Courtesy of the National Museum in Warsaw.
- Fig. 5. Attic white-ground lekythos by the Triglyph Painter. Height 47.7 cm. Between 430 and 420 BC. Photograph: Piotr Ligier. Courtesy of the National Museum in Warsaw.



Fig. 1



Fig. 2



Fig. 3



Fig. 4



Fig. 5