The past year marked important milestones in the history of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA): 125 years since the founding of the School, 80 years since the dedication of the Gennadius Library, and 75 years since excavations under the School’s auspices began in the Athenian Agora. Continuing in the spirit of celebration, we can now also look back with pride at 75 years of *Hesperia*.

In March 1932, Rhys Carpenter, the director of the ASCSA, announced the launching of a new journal—*Hesperia*—intended to “serve as a convenient and accessible means of presenting to our colleagues and to the archaeologically interested public authoritative and definitive accounts of the School’s various enterprises” (Fig. 1). The announcement, a handwritten letter bound into the first fascicle, made clear that the journal would publish work by “members of the School staff” and especially the results of the newly opened excavations of the Athenian Agora.

While remaining true to its original mandate, *Hesperia* has evolved over the years from an in-house periodical devoted exclusively to publishing the work of the American School to a fully refereed journal with a wide readership and relevance to classical studies today. The current issue of *Hesperia* is larger than usual, a concrete expression of the health of the journal: annual submissions have tripled since 1998, the diversity of articles submitted begins to keep pace with the breadth of the School’s own research profile, and readership has greatly expanded. *Hesperia’s* 75th anniversary provides us with an occasion not only for celebration and nostalgia, but also for consideration of the journal’s history, and for speculation about its future.

In recognition of *Hesperia’s* first 75 years, the 2007 volume will showcase the journal’s traditional strengths—archaeological fieldwork, epigraphy, topography, and the monuments of Greece—while also featuring papers on early democracy, cult iconography, ancient comedy, ceramic technology, funerary practices, Hellenistic architecture, and island colonialism. The chronological and geographical contexts of these articles extend from prehistory to the present, and from Italy to the Black Sea. Articles on the Athenian Agora and Corinth are planned for each issue in 2007, as are reports on other leading excavations and surveys (e.g., Kavousi, Azoria, and Plataiai).
The American School of Classical Studies at Athens takes very special pleasure in presenting to you herewith the first number of its new periodical "HESPERIA". The researches and explorations recently undertaken by members of the School staff have produced results which are deserving of publication, yet are too extensive for inclusion as short articles in the standard archaeological journals. "HESPERIA" was accordingly founded to serve as a convenient and accessible means of presenting to our colleagues and to the archaeologically interested public authoritative and definitive accounts of the School’s various enterprises.

Particularly, the excavations of the Ancient Agora of Athens, which the School commenced in 1931, will find in "HESPERIA" their first full presentation, beginning with this journal’s next volume.

May I beg, therefore, your kind co-operation in calling to the attention of libraries, universities, museums, and professional students the existence of our periodical?

Very sincerely yours,

Rhys Carpenter,

Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
The archives of the ASCSA offer rich opportunities for tracing the intertwined histories of *Hesperia* and the School, and an archival article has also been scheduled for each of the four issues of 2007. Fittingly, the first is an essay in this issue by the incoming director of the School, Jack Davis, on the circumstances surrounding the establishment of *Hesperia* in 1932, and the implications for the School’s later history. Subsequent articles will explore the “invention” of Byzantine archaeology at Corinth in the 1920s and 1930s; the use and abuse of the Schliemann Archives; and the beginnings of American study tours in Greece, focusing on a previously unpublished diary of Harold North Fowler, a student in the first class of the School who went on to become a leading figure in the field. Closing this issue is another departure for *Hesperia*, and one that points to the future: an essay by Josiah Ober and his colleagues exploring the new and transforming landscape of online publication and archiving in classical studies.

**HISTORY OF THE JOURNAL**

Fifty years were to pass after its founding before the American School successfully established its own journal—much longer than the time taken by other foreign archaeological schools in Athens.¹ The results of the School’s work had previously been published in the *American Journal of Archaeology (AJA)* and *Art and Archaeology*, but as Davis recounts in his essay, strained relations between the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) and the ASCSA and the perception that *AJA* would no longer be able to publish accounts of the School’s work in a prompt—or properly scholarly—manner gave incentive to the founding of *Hesperia*. The opportunity for Americans to excavate the Agora of Classical Athens, and the prospect of a wealth of articles relating to those excavations, also spurred the decision.

The character of the planned periodical provoked much discussion in the years leading up to its appearance, with consensus first favoring an annual, then a series of papers, and eventually a quarterly that might compete successfully with *AJA*. Names proposed included *Papers, Second Series; Memoirs and Notes; Annual of the American School at Athens; and Classical Archaeology*, followed by an unspecified subtitle indicating the ASCSA.² Carpenter argued against *Papers*, writing in February 1928 that “in general, it suggests to my ear something flimsy, ephemeral, and without a proper binding. . . . On the whole, the courageous thing is to call it an annual and make it one.”³ In March 1931, Capps wrote to Carpenter that Chase and

---

¹ The number of years between the founding of the foreign archaeological schools in Athens and the first appearance of their journals varied: for the German Archaeological Institute, three years; the Italian School, five; the British School, eight, and the French School, 31. For a more detailed account of the history of *Hesperia*, especially the early years, see Meritt 1984, pp. 240–273, and also Davis’s article in this issue.

² See letters in the ASCSA Archives in Athens from George Chase, chairman of the Publications Committee, to Carpenter, dated January 19 and February 24, 1928, and January 28, 1930, ADMREC 208/1, folder 4; and from Edward Capps, chairman of the ASCSA Managing Committee, to Carpenter, March 11, 1931, ADMREC 318/2, folder 3. I am very grateful to Jack Davis for sharing the results of his research in the ASCSA Archives with me and for providing me with copies of relevant documents (cited here by ADMREC series numbers).

³ Letter from Carpenter to Chase, February 7, 1928, ADMREC 208/1, folder 4.
Fowler “feel that the title should some way designate the School.”
We do not know who proposed the winning title, but Carpenter eventually came to favor *Hesperia, Being the Journal of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens*. In June 1931, in a letter to Chase, Carpenter wrote:

It is very important that there should be a brief title which could serve as a catchword, and “Hesperia” is at least as good as “Ausonia.” To call the publication the “Journal of the School” would probably lead to confusion between it and the A.J.A., and the abbreviation “J.A.S.” which it would inevitably bear would not be very distinctive or desirable. Quoted as “Hesperia” it would stand out much better.

Both Hesperia, from ἕσπερος (the evening star), and Ausonia refer to western lands, and one can speculate that the primary intent of the founders was to refer in the journal’s title to America, located at the far western edge of the classical world. Additional mythological associations of the name Hesperia with the Garden of the Hesperides or Aeneas’s landfall in Italy would add to the fancifulness of the name. In the neutral plural, the term ἑσπέρια might also refer more generally to “western matters,” appropriate for a journal focused on the origins of western civilization.

The first volume of *Hesperia* was published as an annual, after which, and down to the present day, the journal has appeared as a quarterly. From the beginning, visual documentation was an important complement to the text. Until the last issue of 1946, all illustrations (with the exception of oversize foldout drawings) were integrated into the text, a practice that was resumed in 1999 after decades in which photographs were printed on plates and (usually) placed at the back of the issue. From 1933 until 1950, one to three issues of each volume dealt with the presentation of the Agora excavations. Forty such fascicles appeared in all, in some cases devoted to a single long article, complete with index, while more often featuring several articles.

From 1932 until 1939, the journal was managed by successive directors of the School in Athens, published by Harvard University Press, printed in Vienna, and distributed for $3 a volume. A Publications Committee, chaired by Chase, acted in an advisory capacity. In 1939, a new Publications Committee was founded, chaired by Benjamin Meritt, and entrusted

---

4. Letter from Capps to Carpenter, March 11, 1931, ADMREC 318/2, folder 3.
5. Letter from Carpenter to Chase, June 22, 1931, ADMREC 208/1, folder 4.
6. I thank John Traill, Olga Palagia, and especially Mark Landon for their thoughts on the possible meanings attached to the name *Hesperia*. Landon points out that the reference to the School’s western origins finds a good parallel in the Danish publication on classical archaeology, *Acta Hyperborea*.
7. Curiously, the seal displayed on the cover and title page of the initial issues (1932–1939) was not the one adopted officially by the ASCSA Managing Committee in 1891 (Lord 1947, pp. 62–63), which appears on Carpenter’s letter of introduction (Fig. 1) and on every ASCSA publication today. Both seals display the same graphic elements—a Panathenaic amphora bearing the image of Athena, encircled by an olive wreath and inscribed with a line from the *Eumenides* (999), παρ- θένου φίλας φίλοι, “Ye beloved of the beloved maiden” (trans. Lord 1947, p. 62). The early *Hesperia* seal, however, bears a date of 1886, along with a reference to the ASCSA Trustees, whereas the official seal of the School refers only to the ASCSA and 1881, the date that the Managing Committee was established.
8. E.g., Thompson 1934. Agora issues were not the only issues of *Hesperia* to consist of one long article, constituting forerunners to the journal’s Supplement series; see, e.g., Hetty Goldman’s (1940) account of her excavation in Lokris, which opens with the wonderful line “Halae Acropolis has been long a-digging” (p. 381).
with “full authority to accept or reject manuscripts submitted for Hesperia,” and a managing editor was also named, Paul Clement at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. The Institute generously offered free office and storage space to the publications program of the School, and from that time onward, all aspects of the journal have been managed from Princeton. In 1996, Publications joined the U.S. administrative offices of the School at their current location on Charlton Street.

Remarkably few editors have produced Hesperia over the past seven and a half decades. Following Clement, Lucy Shoe Meritt and Marian Holland McAllister—both from Bryn Mawr College—assumed the editorship for 23 and 25 years, respectively, as part of the larger position of editor of ASCSA Publications. Kathleen Krattenmaker and Kathleen (Kerri) Cox each served as editor of the journal for a year, after which, in 1999, I took on the position. It was only with Krattenmaker’s tenure that the position of editor of Hesperia was created as distinct from that of head of Publications.

Throughout the years, the Committee on Publications has played a critical part in shaping the journal, establishing policy and, until recently, deciding which articles would be published in a given year. A look back through the minutes of Publications Committee meetings and the ASCSA Annual Reports reveals much discussion about who could publish in Hesperia, and on what subjects. In 1949, a hierarchy of articles was conceived, and a system of priorities was formally codified in 1970, with School excavations always favored in terms of scheduling. Articles by ASCSA alumni on non-School material could be considered, although they were given the lowest priority and, if there was any doubt of their quality, they were to be reviewed by a member of the Publications Committee or an outside reviewer. The journal became fully refereed by outside reviewers only in 1990. Before this date, excavation directors were expected to vet manuscripts from their own excavations, and members of the Publications Committee also assessed every submission. As the ASCSA journal

9. See the report of the ASCSA Executive Committee, Fifty-Eighth Annual Report, 1938–1939, p. 81; also Meritt 1984, p. 245. My thanks to Sarah George Figueira for her invaluable help in combing through Annual Reports and in organizing relevant sets of committee minutes from the records stored in the ASCSA Publications office in Princeton.

10. See the report of the Publications Committee in the Sixty-Ninth Annual Report, 1949–1950, p. 65; also Meritt 1984, pp. 245–246. For the long and close association of the Institute for Advanced Study and Princeton University with the ASCSA, and the impact of such Princeton notables as Capps, Meritt, Homer Thompson, and T. Leslie Shear on the programs of the School, see Dyson 1998, pp. 168–185. Hetty Goldman, one of the earliest women to publish in Hesperia, was also the first woman appointed as research professor at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, where she spent much of her academic career (Dyson 1998, pp. 92–95; 2006, p. 187). For Capps, see Davis’s essay in this issue.

11. The exemplary and long-term efforts of Meritt and McAllister are particularly impressive when one considers the many duties subsumed under the position of head of Publications. They not only edited and proofread manuscripts for Hesperia and the monograph series, but they worked closely with the Publications Committee in assessing manuscripts, and also handled budgetary matters. In addition, they oversaw subscription fulfillment, printing, and storage needs—often under severe financial constraints—while managing at the same time to maintain a research profile in the discipline. McAllister also ushered in a succession of new typesetting methods during her term, abandoning the use of traditional hot-lead typography in favor of Ibycus and TeX computer systems that were better able to accommodate epigraphic and numismatic conventions, thus setting the stage for fully digital production on personal computers.

12. See Meritt 1984, pp. 252–253, and Davis, in this issue, pp. 33–34, for the limiting of Hesperia’s pages to ASCSA members and the subsequent priority system established for publication.
of record, however, *Hesperia* accepted without question most articles by School members on School projects.

Concerns raised regularly at Publications Committee meetings included the rising costs of production, ways to attract new subscribers, and the ebb and flow of articles, sometimes too few (as during World War II and again during the 1980s and early 1990s) and other times too many, creating a worrisome backlog. Periods of drought tended to open the journal to new directions, with generally happy results. The 1940s and early 1950s saw a swell in articles not derived from School projects, and by scholars outside the School. In 1981, an issue (vol. 50:4) was devoted to the publication of papers given at the ASCSA centennial symposium on “Greek Towns and Cities,” a decision that was prompted by the low number of regular submissions, but one that turned out to have been wise: according to records compiled by JSTOR, the well-known digital archive of scholarly journals, “Greek Towns and Cities” is the issue of *Hesperia* most often viewed online and printed.

In 1983, the Managing Committee of the School passed a resolution (article IX.4) that opened the journal to a wider range of submissions than had previously been the case. While still primarily a forum for School members to publish School material, the journal from that time forward has invited scholars not affiliated with the ASCSA or its cooperating institutions to submit articles if their research is of “particular relevance to the School’s work.” A liberal interpretation of this clause has slowly led to more diverse contents in the journal and to an increase in readership, a benefit more fully realized with the inclusion of *Hesperia* in JSTOR and the availability of an online version of current and back issues to all subscribers. Since 1998, a formal statement of the scope of the journal—and the several fields from which submissions are welcome—has appeared on the inside cover of the journal. Also in the front matter of every issue since 1998 is a statement endorsing the AIA’s ethical stance on the publication of antiquities.

In 2003, an international Advisory Board for *Hesperia* was appointed, whose primary charges are to encourage and occasionally review new submissions and to advise the editor on a range of issues. Although members of the Publications Committee no longer evaluate individual articles, they continue to formulate policy decisions affecting the journal. Today’s editorial policy and goals remain, as stated in an earlier editorial in this space, that “*Hesperia*, as the School’s flagship journal, reflect the increasingly wide range of scholarship in Greece, as well as the full breadth of disciplinary approaches currently taken to the study of the Greek world.”

13. See Davis, in this issue, p. 33, n. 56.
15. Minutes of the Managing Committee meeting, May 14, 1983.
16. The fields currently listed are Greek archaeology, art, epigraphy, history, materials science, ethnography, and literature. The decision to follow the AIA in its ethics policy is first recorded in an addendum to the minutes of the Publications Committee meeting on November 3, 1979, and is included within the wider statement of ethics in the ASCSA Regulations (article X).
THEMES AND TRENDS

As articulated by Carpenter in his open letter (Fig. 1), *Hesperia* was initially reserved for the publication of ASCSA research by members of the School, and the focus of that research—Greece and “things Greek”—was in keeping with the vision he set out in 1927:

> We should encourage Byzantine investigation, especially in connection with the Gennadius collection, and pre-Hellenic research, especially in excavation; but our ultimate reason for existence must always and necessarily be the pre-eminence of things Greek over things un-Greek, or pre-Greek, or post-Greek. It is in so far as we insist on this old faith of the Humanists . . . that our school will have a torch to hand down to future days. 18

This goal of privileging things Greek, and often Classical, is undeniably a continuing theme in the articles published over the years in *Hesperia*. Excavations in the civic center of Classical Athens contributed to this focus, just as the British School’s excavations at Knossos and Phylakopi led to a strong emphasis on Aegean prehistory in their *Annual (BSA)*, a trend that continues today. 19 At the same time, several of the earliest Agora reports in *Hesperia* focus on material from the Geometric, Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine periods. 20 Indeed, as Kostis Kourelis will discuss in an upcoming issue, the Byzantine period is well represented in articles published during the first decade of *Hesperia*. ASCSA work on prehistoric sites such as Kavousi, Mochlos, Korakou, and Zygouries had been published years earlier in *AJA*, *Art and Archaeology*, or as monographs, but articles on Aegean prehistory do not appear in *Hesperia* until 1937, with Saul Weinberg’s report on prehistoric Corinth and Hazel Hansen’s study of pottery from the north slope of the Acropolis. 21

The majority of articles published in the first decades present material culture from mainland Greece, usually Athens or Attica and, to a lesser extent, the Corinthia. Most concern classical antiquity, although some titles point to surprises, making it dangerous to generalize: “The Medieval Pottery from Corinth” (1934), “Fauvel’s First Trip through Greece” (1936), “The Avar Invasion of Corinth” (1937), “Turkish Pottery from the

---


19. For a year-by-year comparison of the number of articles on Aegean prehistory in *Hesperia* and *BSA* over the past two decades, see Cherry and Talladale 2005, p. 2, fig. 2.1; representation in *BSA* far exceeds that in *Hesperia*. The American and British schools differ in their overall mission and character as well as in their journals: from the beginning, the ASCSA has been devoted to classical studies, combining archaeological and literary pursuits. This orientation is clear from the School’s mission statement and is still reinforced today by the requirement that prospective regular members pass examinations in ancient Greek and Greek history. In this respect, the ASCSA differs not only from the British School, but also from the other foreign archaeological schools in Athens. For the repercussions of this policy for the ASCSA, see Davis 1994, pp. 398–401; 2001, pp. 431–432.

20. See, e.g., Dorothy Burr’s (1933) article on a Geometric house and Protoattic deposit, Homer Thompson’s (1934) study of two centuries of Hellenistic pottery and Sterling Dow’s (1936) consideration of Hellenistic Panathenaic amphoras, Arthur Parsons’s (1936) description of a Roman water mill, and Alison Frantz’s discussions of Byzantine paintings (1935) and pottery (1938).

21. Weinberg 1937; Hansen 1937. In later years, the representation of prehistory in *Hesperia* would increase considerably, as Carl Blegen, John Caskey, Thomas Jacobsen, Joseph Shaw, and others published the results of their excavations.
Agora” (1942), “Skeletal Material from Attica” (1945), “A Roman Poet Visits a Museum” (1945), and “A Greek Folksong Copied for Lord Byron” (1945).\textsuperscript{22} Many titles, including those just listed, are blunt statements of the material discussed (“An Alabastron by the Amasis Painter” [1939], “The Akanthos Column at Delphi” [1941], “Greek Inscriptions” [1952], and so on),\textsuperscript{23} with the authors showing little interest in identifying any particular perspective or ideology informing their approach. Rarer, yet nevertheless present from early on, are articles of a more avowedly synthetic, problem-oriented, or analytical bent, such as Oscar Broneer’s “Hero Cults in the Corinthian Agora” (1942) and Donald Kagan’s “The Origin and Purposes of Ostracism” (1961).\textsuperscript{24} The particular appeal of the special issue on Greek towns and cities may lie with the broader perspective taken by its authors.\textsuperscript{25}

The assumption permeating many articles in the journal, particularly from the early years, is that the data can stand alone, and that they are inherently interesting—which in many cases they are. Indeed, in a journal of record such as \textit{Hesperia}, the author’s voice often appears to be of less importance than the material or site presented; consider the customs still followed in \textit{Hesperia} of placing the author’s name in small print at the end of an article rather than on the title page, and of citing excavation monographs as, for example, \textit{Agora XXV} rather than Lang 1990.\textsuperscript{26} Informing these practices is the unspoken view that, as classical scholars, we are in service to a higher calling, one that transcends the individual.\textsuperscript{27}

Although many topics are discussed in the pages of \textit{Hesperia}, it is probably safe to say that for much of the journal’s history, the majority of articles invoke classificatory schemes (often elaborated in catalogues), backed by extensive comparanda. Some have criticized the descriptive approach to material culture characteristic of much of the writing in \textit{Hesperia}, arguing that it has contributed to the isolation of classical archaeology from theoretical and methodological trends in world archaeology.\textsuperscript{28} Few, however, would deny that the journal serves an important purpose in documenting primary data from fieldwork. The wealth of architecture and artifacts presented in great descriptive detail reflects the active excavation and research traditions of the School, and continues to provide an invaluable database for generations of students and scholars.

The roster of excavations reported in the pages of the journal is impressively long: a partial list includes (in addition to the Agora and Corinth) the
north slope of the Acropolis, Samothrace, Halai, Elateia, Plataiai, Panak-
ton, Eutresis, Isthmia, Kenchreai, Nemea, Phlius, Tsoungiza, the Argive
Heraion, Lerna, Franchthi Cave, Halieis, Nichoria, Kommos, Kavousi,
Mochlos, Pseira, Chrysokamino, Azoria, and Ayia Irini on Kea. While
many would agree with the recent assertion by the director of the School
that “the excavations in the Ancient Agora of Athens . . . represent the
American School’s most important contribution to Greek archaeology,”29
the cumulative contribution of research published in Hesperia on a wide
range of sites—of all sizes and periods, urban and provincial, on the main-
land, Crete, the islands, and in neighboring territories—surely rivals the
research presented from the Agora alone.

Regional survey too has found its place with increasing frequency in the
pages of the journal. Despite the early call to arms by William McDonald
in 1966, when he urged the support and publication of interdisciplinary
regional survey projects, the School was initially reluctant to assume re-
sponsibility for publishing surveys in Hesperia.30 McDonald himself did
not publish the results of the Minnesota Messenia Expedition in the jour-
nal, although he did publish two excavation reports on Nichoria.31 The first
survey to appear in Hesperia was conceived as part of the excavation program
of Kavousi (1983), followed rapidly by reports on the Argolid Exploration
Project (1986, 1987), the Nemea Valley Archaeological Project (1990),
the Vrokastro Survey Project (1992), the Western Mesara Project (1993),
and, most recently, by the Pylos and the Durrës Regional Archaeological
Projects (1997–2005 and 2003, respectively) and the Eastern Korinthia
Archaeological Survey (2006).32 By contrast, topographic and landscape
reconnaissance studies have a long and illustrious history in Hesperia, per-
haps exemplified best in the work of Eugene Vanderpool, but a tradition
still carried on today, for example, in the study of boundary markers (horoi)
in the foothills of Mt. Hymettos, a survey of towers on Leukas, and the
tentative identification of a Mycenaean site in the Corinthia as Strabo’s
Homer’s Orneai.33

29. Tracy 2005, p. 25. For the most
recent reports on excavations in the
30. McDonald’s (1966) essay in
Hesperia is a warm tribute to Blegen,
whom he praises for stressing the value
of survey archaeology in Greece already
a quarter of a century earlier (Blegen
1941). The School’s initial reluctance to
publish survey material is evident from
the minutes of the Publications Com-
mittee meetings held on October 1,
1986, and March 28, 1987, at which
the Nemea Valley survey was briefly
discussed. Regional survey was still in
its infancy in Greece in the early 1980s
(note, e.g., the crusading tone of many
of the papers in Keller and Rupp 1983).
See Cherry 2003, p. 139, fig. 9.1, for a
graph showing the number of articles
on survey published in 15 archaeological
journals (including Hesperia) between
1966 and 1998; from the early 1980s
on, the number rises dramatically, al-
though survey is still the subject of a
small proportion (7%) of articles pub-
lished overall, “clearly indicating its mi-
nority status,” as Cherry (p. 138) notes.
31. McDonald 1972, 1975. The
reports on Nichoria, like the prelimi-
nary reports on Franchthi Cave (Jacob-
sen 1969, 1973a, 1973b), are notable
for their strong interdisciplinary char-
acter and the early integration of geo-
logical studies, radiocarbon dating, and
detailed analyses of botanical, faunal,
and human remains.
32. Kavousi: Gesell, Day, and Coul-
son 1983; AEP: van Andel, Runnels,
and Pope 1986; Runnels and van Andel
1987; NVAP: Wright et al. 1990; Vro-
kastro: Hayden, Moody, and Rackham
1992; Mesara: Watrous et al. 1993;
PRAP I–VII: Davis et al. 1997; Zang-
ger et al. 1997; Bennet, Davis, and
Zarinebaf-Shahr 2000; Lee 2001;
Stockler 2003; Davies 2004; Alcock et
al. 2005; Durrës: Davis et al. 2003;
EKAS: Tartaron et al. 2006. The inter-
disciplinary nature of regional survey,
together with a new model of scholar-
ship in which the single authorial voice
of the project director is replaced by a
more democratic byline, has spawned a
correlated trend in Hesperia toward
multi-authored articles, with the record
to date (11 coauthors) held by both the
Western Mesara Project and EKAS.
33. Langdon 1999; Morris 2001;
Marchand 2002.
A close look at the approximately 1,400 articles published in Hesperia over the past 75 years would no doubt pay dividends in the recognition of subtle trends reflective of the social, political, and academic constraints under which the contributors were working. While I had initially hoped to attempt such an analysis here, the task proved too large, and I will instead comment briefly on a few obvious trends in the journal’s pages. I have touched upon the first already—the growing diversity of approaches resulting from the expansion of the chronological, geographical, and conceptual limits on what forms an acceptable and interesting submission to the journal. Commissioned articles and issues have been featured increasingly over the years (e.g., fascicles in honor of ASCSA luminaries, as well as thematic issues on Greek towns and cities, Hellenistic studies, architectural terracottas, and, most recently, the Mycenaean feast).  

From the 1960s on, articles on archaeological science have proliferated: discussions of flora, fauna, and human remains appear separately and as part of larger excavation reports; geomorphology, GIS, and geophysical survey add a host of new methods and possibilities to fieldwork; and studies in materials science address topics as varied as the composition of an unusual cement, the early use of tin, pigments in Bronze Age frescoes, ceramic fabrics, the provenance of lead in the Aegean, and metalworking techniques. Finally, areas such as ethnography, marine archaeology, economic geography, the history of archaeology, and experimental archaeology, although still uncommon, are represented more often in recent years.

As the journal expands in its breadth of archaeological coverage, it is contracting in one major area: epigraphy. Excavation by the ASCSA in the Athenian Agora initially unearthed a wealth of inscriptions, and their publication by Benjamin Meritt, James Oliver, Sterling Dow, and W. Kendrick Pritchett (among others) filled many pages of the journal and set a high standard for those who followed. While a long tradition of publishing epigraphy in the Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens had previously existed, the eminent historian J. K. Davies has observed that a “new standard of epigraphical reportage and accessibility [was] set and maintained by Hesperia from 1932.”

By the 1960s, articles on epigraphic topics made up nearly half of the papers published in Hesperia. A rough calculation, however, shows that the proportion has been steadily declining: only 15–20% of articles published in the past 15 years pertain to epigraphy. The decreasing length of the journal has meant that articles on epigraphy must be briefer, and this has implications for the quality of the research presented. In recent years, the journal has published fewer longer articles on epigraphy, and the number of pages devoted to the subject has decreased accordingly.

34. Special issues have been dedicated to several individuals on the occasion of their 80th birthday: Bert Hodge Hill (vol. 23:1, 1954), William Dinsmoor (35.2, 1966), Carl Blegen (35.4, 1966), Rhys Carpenter (38.2, 1969), and Oscar Broneer (43.4, 1974). An issue devoted to Hellenistic studies (51.3, 1982) was dedicated to Virginia Grace and Dorothy Thompson, and another was published in honor of Charles Williams (66.1, 1997), acknowledging his long tenure as director at Corinth and his prolific publication record. For architectural terracottas, see vol. 59:1 (1990), edited by Nancy Winter. For the Mycenaean feast, see vol. 73:2 (2004), with guest editor James Wright.

35. E.g., Wesolowsky 1973; Jacobson 1973a; Klippel and Snyder 1991; Bookidis et al. 1999; Liston and Papadopoulos 2004; Tartaron et al. 2006. For materials science, see, e.g., Farnsworth and Simmons 1960; Immerwahr 1966; Coleman 1973; Davis and Williams 1981; Gale, Stos-Gale, and Davis 1984; and Mattusch 1991. The Wiener Laboratory at the ASCSA, which itself has just celebrated its 15th year of operation, has greatly fostered such work as part of the School’s research and publication profile.


37. Davies 2002, p. 225. I thank Molly Richardson for calling my attention to this passage.
of the annual epigraphic index further attests to this decline: the index in the 1968 volume was 21 pages long, while the indexes of the last several years have been little more than a page or two.\textsuperscript{38} This trend is unfortunate, particularly in light of a recent survey of ASCSA Managing Committee members; when asked which sorts of \textit{Hesperia} articles they valued most, 35\% of the respondents said epigraphic studies.\textsuperscript{39}

An informal poll yielded an array of possible explanations for this trend in \textit{Hesperia}'s coverage: the dwindling supply of new inscriptions from American excavations; the successful competition of journals such as the \textit{Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik}; the more frequent assignment of new inscriptions to a new generation of Greek, Italian, Turkish, and Albanian epigraphers, who tend to publish elsewhere; the involvement of several senior scholars on the new edition of \textit{IG II}; and the preference for publishing the results of study in monographs rather than in articles.\textsuperscript{40}

The final trend that I will comment briefly on is the significant increase in the number of women writing for \textit{Hesperia} in recent years. Despite the undeniable influence of such leading female scholars as Dorothy Burr Thompson, Lucy Shoe Meritt, Virginia Grace, Alison Frantz, Hetty Goldman, Dorothy Kent Hill, and Mabel Lang, they were not nearly as prolific in publishing as their male counterparts, together contributing 59 articles to \textit{Hesperia} in the course of their long careers. By contrast, epigraphers Benjamin Meritt, James Oliver, Michael Walbank, and Stephen Tracy have contributed 127 articles; fieldwork directors Homer Thompson, Oscar Bronner, John Caskey, and Charles Williams have added another 106 articles; and Eugene Vanderpool alone contributed 40 titles. Not only is the output of articles by these men impressive, but the period over which they published is also considerable; Benjamin Meritt and Homer Thompson, for example, both published articles in the journal from 1933 to 1981. Not surprisingly, then, a look back over the past 75 years reveals that nearly three-quarters (74\%) of \textit{Hesperia} articles have been written by men.

If, however, we compare the first 15 years of articles with the past 15 years, a significant improvement in the representation of women can be seen: of the 222 articles published between 1932 and 1946, 78\% were written by men and 22\% by women, while of the 243 articles written between 1992 and 2006, 64\% are by men and 36\% by women. Judging only from epigraphy in \textit{Hesperia}, especially in recent years, when non-epigraphists more often incorporate epigraphic texts into broad discussions that cross disciplinary boundaries (see Davies 2002, pp. 237–246). This point notwithstanding, the trend in \textit{Hesperia} toward fewer epigraphic articles would still seem to be evident.

39. The 68 responses received from the questionnaire sent out in 2005 constitute an admittedly small, but presumably representative, sample of \textit{Hesperia}'s readership. The other categories of articles valued most by respondents were excavation and survey reports (39\%), and art historical (18\%) and historical (8\%) studies.

40. Those consulted included Angelos Chaniotis, Molly Richardson, Stephen Tracy, John Traill, and Peter van Minnen.

On the subject of books taking precedence over articles, Traill wryly commented (pers. comm.) that “scholars, epigraphers above all, like to hoard their treasures until they can release them in a blinding display of incontrovertible intellect.”
an impressionistic survey, it would seem that women more often publish art historical articles and the finds from excavations and surveys, while men more often publish the results of fieldwork projects (of which they are usually the directors), architectural studies, epigraphy, and historical discussions.

The relative contributions of men and women to Hesperia can also be evaluated in terms of article submission and acceptance rates. Over the past eight years (1999–2006), 56% of the articles submitted have been written by men and 44% by women; the acceptance rates for men and women are nearly identical, 64% and 63%, respectively. Statistics collected by the Committee on the Status of Women and Minority Groups for the American Philological Association (APA) for 18 journals in classical studies (including Hesperia) provide a broader context for Hesperia’s figures: of the roughly 650 articles considered for 2002, 64.5% were by men and 35% were by women, with virtually identical acceptance rates for both sexes. In short, the recent figures for Hesperia are encouraging, suggesting a more vigorous representation of women publishing in classical archaeology than in classics, and approaching their proportional representation in the field.41

READERSHIP AND READER RESPONSES

The early years of the journal attracted a small but consistent core of a few hundred subscribers. The strategy formulated by Chase in 1928 for “securing a paid circulation” was “to make [the journal] so good that people will have to have it.”42 The subscription list has grown steadily through the decades, expanding not only in numbers but also in geographical coverage. A close look at the 1967 subscriber list to Hesperia shows that most of the 433 institutions and 142 individuals who subscribed to the journal were located in North America or western Europe.43

Today’s considerably larger subscriber base, although still primarily made up of libraries and classics departments in North America and Europe, is drawn from 44 countries around the world. The further availability of Hesperia online through JSTOR since 2001 has dramatically increased the accessibility of the journal. A report supplied by JSTOR in December

41. For the most recent APA report, see Gaca 2004. The journals considered are primarily classics journals and all are based in the United States and Canada. For efforts to determine a baseline for the relative numbers of men and women active in classical archaeology, primarily in North America, see Cullen 1996, pp. 412–413; 1999; 2002, p. 435. Using the rough measures of the AIA Directory, the respondents to an AIA questionnaire, and the subscriber list to AJA, I have estimated that women in the 1990s made up ca. 45–50% of the field. For comparisons between men and women publishing in Aegean prehistory in Hesperia and AJA, and comments on gender issues in archaeological publishing in general, see Cullen 2005, pp. 59–63.

42. Letter from Chase to Carpenter, February 24, 1928, ADMREC 208/1, folder 4.

43. My thanks to Charles Watkinson for suggesting the following comparisons and for making available the 1967 subscriber list to Hesperia.
2006 indicates that individuals at 1,681 institutions from 73 countries have viewed or printed articles from the journal; while most of the viewers are in the United States, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Canada, others are now found in South America, eastern and northern Europe, Asia, the Middle East, Russia, and Africa.\footnote{I am very grateful to Heidi McGregor and Jeffrey Hovis at JSTOR for their enthusiastic support, and especially to Hovis for generating reports summarizing the \textit{Hesperia} articles accessed by JSTOR subscribers. The figures cited in this paragraph are based on a report created on December 14, 2006.}

Since last December, the number of institutional participants in the division of JSTOR that includes \textit{Hesperia} has continued to grow—in March 2007, the tally stood at 2,069—making the journal accessible to more readers than ever before. In 2006 alone, 89\% of all available \textit{Hesperia} articles were viewed online and 90\% were printed. In total, users in 2006 viewed articles 75,890 times, and printed them 39,153 times.\footnote{J. Hovis (pers. comm.). The number of times an article is viewed or printed is counted independently. One should also remember that, at any one time, the most recent three years of the journal are not available on JSTOR.} It is gratifying and somewhat startling to feel the world shrink as we share the journal with readers in Estonia, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Singapore, Macau, El Salvador, Brazil, Kenya, Uganda, and Zimbabwe, to mention only a small sample from the JSTOR community.

What are the responses to the journal of this new wave of readers? Reports provided by JSTOR allow us to tally the articles most often accessed by individuals at institutions of varying sizes. I have checked these reports several times over the past years to “take the pulse” of readers and to gauge the public’s level of interest. The article attracting the most “hits” overall from 2001 to 2006 (ranked by an aggregate score of viewings plus printings) is Lisa Little and John Papadopoulos’s “A Social Outcast in Early Iron Age Athens.”\footnote{Little and Papadopoulos 1998.} The popularity of this article—an osteological and social study of a human skeleton found in the Agora—is perhaps due not only to the reputation of its authors and to its subject matter, but also to its intriguing title. Another article consistently high in the rankings, again with a title that promises a discussion of broad appeal, is Kimberly Flint-Hamilton’s “Legumes in Ancient Greece and Rome: Food, Medicine, or Poison?”\footnote{Flint-Hamilton 1999.} The article most often printed from JSTOR over the past six years is the first report of the Pylos survey, by Jack Davis and his colleagues.\footnote{Davis et al. 1997.}

The \textit{Hesperia} articles most frequently accessed through JSTOR are by no means limited to those published recently. Homer Thompson’s 1937 report on the buildings on the west side of the Agora is among the top 25 accessed, as is Rodney Young’s 1951 report on “An Industrial District of Ancient Athens.”\footnote{Thompson 1937; Young 1951.} Looking over those articles most often requested, one can see that archaeology, art history, prehistory, epigraphy, history, physical anthropology, and floral and faunal analyses are all featured. It is no surprise to find that the majority of articles consulted concern Athens, especially the Agora and the Acropolis, while others pertain to architecture,
sculpture, vase painting, excavation and survey, and landscape evolution—as we have seen, all major strengths of the journal’s coverage.50

While the JSTOR reports are invaluable in assessing which articles are of broad appeal, surveys bring home with a vivid immediacy readers’ reactions to the journal. Respondents comment on the subjects published, the editing, the look of the page, and even the feel of the cover. The questionnaire sent in 2005 to the ASCSA Managing Committee51 garnered a range of responses. Some offered praise—“conscientious editing and sound choice of referees”; “current work is published quickly”; “publication of original material, high standards required of authors, high technical level”; “the reporting of discoveries both current and past with full documentation and serious argumentation”—while others reflected serious concerns: “boring articles”; “apart from the occasional article on survey archaeology, there is little in Hesperia that reflects the rich diversity of theoretical and methodological voices in Mediterranean archaeology”; “general lack of post- Classical”; “too many uninteresting sherds”; and “unadventurous scholarship.”

A similar questionnaire sent to ASCSA alumni 30 years ago52 elicited some poignant, astute, and often funny responses:

Authors: “I think the journal’s pages should be opened to a wider range of authors as with B.C.H. and Ath. Mitt. The recent decision to accept articles from any member of a contributing institution is a move in the right direction.”

Editorial standards: “Hesperia has been blessed with superb editors. The high quality of the journal (its distinguished reputation is indisputable) has been due largely to its superior editing.” But also: “To my knowledge, none of the editors has ever made any attempt to make it more readable, which would be highly desirable.”

Award for understatement: “The reading in Hesperia is on the dry side.”

Most harsh: “Most of the articles seem unnecessary.”

Most tactful: “It is only the press of time that keeps me from being a regular reader of Hesperia.”

Most discouraging: “I have never seen Hesperia.”

The future? “Only more money could make Hesperia better.”

When asked what should be changed, readers in 2005 offered the following suggestions: “balance the data reporting with interpretative work, both archaeological and art historical”; “[make] covers less stiff and slippery”; and a wistful statement with which many might agree: “I have always wished Hesperia included more broad, interpretive work, articles that attempted to provide perspective on broad questions.”

50. In addition to the articles mentioned above, other articles most often accessed over the past six years include Ridgway 1971; Mark 1984; Watrous 1991; Zangger et al. 1997; Robertson 1998; Bookidis et al. 1999; and Hedrick 1999. See also nn. 25 and 46, above.

51. See n. 39, above.

52. The questionnaire itself could not be found in the ASCSA Archives in Princeton, but we do have a compi-
CONCLUDING REMARKS

As we celebrate 75 years of publishing *Hesperia*, we can take pride in the journal’s history and vitality, while also acknowledging that there is work to do in further expanding its scope and readership. The direction in which the journal has been moving for many years—opening its doors to a wider spectrum of approaches, subjects, and scholars—would surely have met with approval by the founders of the School. Charles Eliot Norton, in particular, sought to establish both the AIA and the ASCSA as institutions that would further the “study of Greek thought and life to the best advantage,” as a way of enriching the reservoirs of classical learning not merely for a few highly trained scholars but for educated people everywhere.53

While there can be little question that academic specialization has won out over general education in the heavily footnoted pages of *Hesperia*, the increasingly problem-oriented and interdisciplinary nature of our field and the expansion of areas explored—both conceptual and geographical—are reflected in the journal. The emphasis throughout the journal’s history on the importance of the visual, on material culture in its most exalted and lowly forms, in addition to the authority of inscriptions, has produced a rich database of finds and findings. The many images published in *Hesperia* over the years, including photographs and drawings of artifacts and artworks, architectural reconstructions, aerial photographs, contour maps, and field plans, together with the detailed description and analysis characteristic of the journal, comprise an invaluable documentary record of Greek material culture, and constitute a major contribution to classical scholarship.

Material culture—and often a single artifact or class of artifacts—has long served as the centerpiece of many *Hesperia* articles, but in recent years it is more explicitly used as a way into larger social and political complexities. The iconographic program on an Attic sarcophagus, for example, leads us to consider the dynamics of patronage, family histories, symbolism behind the choice of decorative themes, and the nature of sculptural production during the Roman Empire.54 Similarly, a Hellenistic moldmade bowl serves as a springboard from which to explore processes of innovation, competition, and the reception of new styles, and to consider the ways in which the formation of the archaeological record itself may affect our recognition of cultural change.55 On a grander scale, the many field projects published in *Hesperia* now routinely employ a host of specialists with different perspectives and skills with which to contribute to a richly textured diachronic picture of the past at a single site or across a large region. It is hoped that articles such as these (and others too numerous to mention), which present their subjects in impeccable detail while also probing wider implications, will continue to fill the journal’s pages, and that *Hesperia* might truly come to reflect the diversity of approaches encompassed by classical studies today.

The current issue offers a wide variety of articles. The authors—nine women and seven men—include professors of all ranks, research scientists, and a graduate student who hail from the United States, Canada, France, the United Kingdom, and Greece. They work in departments of archaeology, anthropology, history, political science, classics, and geology, and in

---

53. Norton 1903, esp. p. 351. See Winterer 2002 for Norton’s “ideal of cultivated erudition” and the intellectual context in which the AIA and the ASCSA were founded.
an independent research center, a museum of natural history, and a laboratory of archaeology. Readers will find in the following pages, in addition to Davis’s essay on the origins of *Hesperia*, a discussion of a new fragment from the Agora of the Athenian calendar of sacrifices, an exploration of funeral ritual at Iron Age Kavousi, a consideration of the “beautiful Medusa” in vase painting, a reexamination of Eleusinian iconography on the Mondragone relief, a field report and social analysis of a cemetery at Roman Kenchreai, and a petrographic study of Byzantine and Frankish cooking wares from Corinth inspired by the extensive work of Charles Williams on Frankish Corinth. The final essay, on digital publishing in classical studies, is particularly timely in view of a recent joint statement by the AIA and the APA endorsing digital formats for scholarly publication.

Before closing, I wish to thank the many individuals who contribute to the publication and the professionalism of the journal, not all of whom can be named in this space. First and foremost are the many authors who submit their research to the journal and the referees who give so generously of their time to critique submissions, often in astounding detail. The members of the *Hesperia* Advisory Board and the ASCSA Publications Committee offer help on many fronts, as do my colleagues in the Publications office in Princeton: Charles Watkinson, Sarah George Figueira, Carol Stein, Timothy Wardell, and Michael Fitzgerald. Sarah, in particular, who recently completed her 25th year with ASCSA Publications, is critical to the smooth functioning of the journal, being responsible for overseeing the review process and typesetting articles. Carol too deserves special thanks for her attention to detail and her digital expertise, which have saved many a day. Molly Richardson has served *Hesperia* for many years as informal epigraphic consultant and proofreader *par excellence*, and has stepped in twice as interim editor. The journal has also benefited recently from a pool of remarkably talented freelance editors and proofreaders: Mark Landon, Karen Donohue, Priscilla Keswani, Nancy Winter, Irini Marathaki, and Jennifer Sacher. Finally, a special note of appreciation is due to John Traill for his cheerful compiling of the epigraphic index each year—2006 marked the 38th year he has contributed this index to the journal. To all of these individuals I offer my warmest thanks. Together we can look forward to the continued flourishing of *Hesperia* in the coming years.

---

56. Coincidentally, a major study of the Athenian civil calendar was planned in 1927 for the inaugural issue of *Hesperia*. The work appeared instead as a monograph: Meritt 1928.
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