This lecture addresses the work and influence of J. J. Bachofen, Sir Arthur Evans, and James Mellaart: three scholars whose reconstructions of prehistoric matriarchies and goddess worship blended the scholarly with the fantastical. Reflecting the theme of “Classicism(s) and Orientalism(s),” the lecture takes a closer look at how and why these men insisted on an association between the East and powerful femininity – an echo of a distant matriarchal past – and how this model offered a potent alternative to hegemonic histories of (Greco-Roman) antiquity.

Frederika Tevebring (London)

Great Goddesses of the East: Matriarchal theories and historiographic models

This lecture addresses the work and influence of J. J. Bachofen, Sir Arthur Evans, and James Mellaart: three scholars whose reconstructions of prehistoric matriarchies and goddess worship blended the scholarly with the fantastical. Reflecting the theme of “Classicism(s) and Orientalism(s),” the lecture takes a closer look at how and why these men insisted on an association between the East and powerful femininity – an echo of a distant matriarchal past – and how this model offered a potent alternative to hegemonic histories of (Greco-Roman) antiquity.

Ulf R. Hansson (Rome)

A Passion for Systems: Adolf Furtwängler (1853-1907), Classicism, Panionism, and the Experience of Large-Scale Archaeology

Adolf Furtwängler is considered one of the pioneers of modern classical archaeology with an impressive bibliography of noteworthy studies, many of which have made a deep and lasting impact on the discipline. Often described as one of the chief exponents of positivism in archaeology, Furtwängler’s work was deeply affected by his first-hand experience of large-scale archaeology and his publications reveal his talent for structuring great masses of archaeological material in large systems—his students even called him “the Linnaeus of Classical Archaeology”. Embracing every aspect of the emerging modern discipline, Furtwängler was also a stern traditionalist whose almost winckelmannian classicism and engagement with contemporary discourses on Panionism and East and West often interfered with his analyses and conclusions. This paper discusses some of the apparent paradoxes in Furtwängler’s work and its reception.