ABSTRACT

Edward Capps understood the need for a periodical such as *Hesperia* and promoted its establishment as part of an overall program of reform that he introduced early in his tenure as chairman of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (1918–1939). Since its first appearance in 1932, the journal has succeeded where previous efforts at creating a periodical for the American School failed. In this essay, the author discusses the motivating forces that between 1927 and 1932 prompted the creation of *Hesperia*, and considers several of the longer-term consequences of its editorial policies for the research program and intellectual life of the School.

INTRODUCTION

The creation of *Hesperia* was an incontestably significant event in the history of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA). The journal succeeded, where previous efforts had failed, in establishing a stable periodical for the School. Since 1932, it has facilitated the rapid dissemination of research by members of the ASCSA, particularly the results of excavations, while, at the same time, maintaining high standards of production. *Hesperia*’s accomplishments over the past 75 years deserve ample praise and respect. But a celebration also offers occasion for reflection.

*Hesperia* has, in the course of its life, been transformed from the shape envisioned for it by its founders. Thus, as we now look to the future and wish *Hesperia* να τα χιλιάσει, it seems worth considering the origins of the journal, clearly one of the more successful ventures in archaeological publishing initiated under the auspices of a professional academic organization in the 20th century. What were the circumstances in which *Hesperia* was established? What perceived needs was it intended to fill? What role did its founders imagine that the journal would play in the life of the School? Answers to these and other questions may help us not only to appreciate the accomplishments of *Hesperia* and its successive Publications Committees and editors, but also to comprehend the extent to which the journal has
influenced the character of research supported by the ASCSA, and perhaps also its institutional image.

Records of the activities leading up to the appearance of the first issue of *Hesperia* in 1932 are, of course, accessible (if not generally known today) to the School community: in Louis Lord’s *A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1882–1942: An Intercollegiate Project*, Lucy Shoe Meritt’s *History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1939–1980*, and in the published *Annual Reports* of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. These accounts are, however, for the most part teleological, naturally choosing to describe policies as finally established and implemented, rather than the debate and discussion that led to their creation.

In what follows, I attempt first to explain why leaders of the School felt in 1927 that there was a need for a journal such as *Hesperia*. For this purpose, I rely largely on published sources. I have also tried to inject a human element into the story of the journal’s origins between 1927 and 1932 by drawing on unpublished documents. Here I have turned to records curated in both Athens and Princeton, and, since my purpose is to contrast published and archival accounts, I quote extensively from the former as well as the latter.²

THE BEGINNINGS

The first published reference to the journal that would become *Hesperia* occurs in a report submitted at the May 1929 meeting of the Managing Committee of the School. George H. Chase, representing the Publications Committee, announced the following:

During the year the Chairman has communicated several times with Professor Carpenter in regard to the possibility of establishing a periodical to be issued and managed in Athens along the lines of the Annual of the British School, the Athenische Mittheilungen, and the Bulletin de Correspondance Hellenique. The feeling of the Committee has been that as soon as the excavation of the Agora is started such a publication would serve excellently for printing annual preliminary reports such as surely ought to be undertaken . . . . The title “Hesperia” has been suggested . . . . The understanding among the members of the Committee has been that such a periodical would contain in general longer articles and reports of excavations by present or former members of the School.³

2. Documents in the ASCSA Archives in Athens that concern the founding of *Hesperia* are located in sub-series ADMREC 208 (“Committee on Publications”); ADMREC 309/2 (“Managing Committee: The Athens Office”); ADMREC 318 (“The Director of the ASCSA”); ADMREC 401 (“The ASCSA’s annual budget, reports, and statements to and of the Treasurer to the Trustees, fundraising, gifts and correspondence bearing to the financial administration of the ASCSA”); and ADMREC 1001 (“Correspondence of the Director”). Many documents that concern the later history of *Hesperia* remain in the care of the ASCSA Publications office in Princeton. More recent minutes of the Publications Committee may be consulted there, and are cited here without more specific reference.

I have not examined materials in the archives of the Archaeological Institute of America, although information there might further illuminate some of the issues that I discuss (for the AIA Archives, see especially Allen 2002).

3. *Forty-Eighth Annual Report, 1928–1929*, p. 16. Chase was Professor
A fascinating train of discussions and events beginning in 1927, however, led up to the preceding announcement. From unpublished records in the ASCSA Archives that date to 1927 and 1928, it is clear that the real inspiration, protagonist, and father of Hesperia was Edward Capps (Fig. 1), not Rhys Carpenter, the director of the School, nor Chase. It was Capps who conceived of the urgent need for such a periodical and who promoted its establishment as part of an overall program of reform that he introduced during his two decades (1918–1939) as the chairman of the Managing Committee of the ASCSA.

FALSE STARTS: EARLY PERIODICALS OF THE ASCSA, 1881–1897

Why had the ASCSA not been successful in establishing a journal prior to the first number of Hesperia in 1932? The British School, after all, issued the Annual of the British School at Athens for 1894–1895, the Bulletin de correspondance hellénique has been published continuously since 1877, and the first number of the Athenische Mitteilungen of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut appeared in 1876.

Certainly, from the time of the foundation of the School in 1881, members understood that periodicals were required to publish the work of its members. Annual Reports of the Managing Committee were issued, as was a Bulletin of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and what was planned to be an occasional collection of Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens." In this way, three separate viewpoints could
be expressed—those of the Managing Committee, the director, and the students of the School. The content of these published reports included overviews of the annual accomplishments of the School, retrospectives, and, from time to time, detailed expositions of the results of epigraphical missions and of excavations in Athens, Attica, Boiotia, the Corinthia, Euboia, the Argolid, Lakonia, and western Turkey. Papers, first and foremost, were intended to serve as the primary vehicle and “proper permanent memorial” for the presentation of research by members of the ASCSA.5

Papers did not flourish, however. The last issue (volume VI) appeared in 1897. From then until 1932 the American Journal of Archaeology (AJA) and Art and Archaeology, both organs of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), served as the primary place of publication for articles by members of the School.6

It seems to have been the School’s close ties to its parent organization, the AIA, that inhibited the development of a regularly published periodical for the ASCSA, although from its founding the School had assumed its own identity and was financially independent. Already in 1888 there had been talk of producing an academic journal under the auspices of the ASCSA, but the proposal was resisted by Arthur Lincoln Frothingham, the editor of AJA. He feared competition and committed himself to accommodate the needs of the School in any way necessary were the School not to continue with its plans. In the end, Frothingham’s promises were not realized: publication of work of the School was delayed, and the ASCSA “lost the prestige” that an independent publication was thought to provide.7

EDWARD CAPPS AND THE PUBLICATION PROGRAM OF THE SCHOOL

The creation of Hesperia reflects, in large part, the desire of the ASCSA to increase its endowment during Capps’s chairmanship of the Managing Committee. Such a concern had come into play even before discussions about an American franchise in the Agora were initiated in 1924, although the need to publish the results of these excavations was also ultimately instrumental in encouraging the School to launch a new journal.8

Capps, justifiably proclaimed as the second founder of the ASCSA, struggled to put the School on a solid financial footing.9 Already in his first report to the Trustees (for 1919–1920) he outlined a very specific platform for his chairmanship: increase the number of institutional members of the School; pursue fieldwork at Corinth aggressively; establish an endowment in support of research; build a hostel for women; and double the general endowment.10 A vigorous program of publication of archaeological field-
work was central to the fulfillment of his objectives. Capps stressed this priority in his report to the Trustees:

The Chairman shares with the other members of the Committee the feeling that, while we have every reason to be proud of the work of research accomplished by our representatives in Athens, the time has come when the publication of discoveries which we have announced to be of the first importance must be pushed to early completion. Certainly the time has now come when no other task or preoccupation should be allowed to interfere with the prompt appearance, one after the other, of the books on the Erechtheum, the Propylaeum, and Corinth. Corinth should, in fact, come first. It is therefore urgently recommended that every effort be made, by all the officers and committees concerned, to bring the three volumes mentioned to immediate completion. And the work already done at Corinth should be adequately reported in preliminary publications before further excavations are undertaken, or funds solicited for them.11

Books, in Capps's view, were, however, only one essential aspect of a healthy program of publication. A journal might lower costs by providing a less expensive alternative to monographs. Capps had, in fact, no sympathy for the attitudes shared by some members of the School. Carl Blegen's behavior, for example, was a major annoyance, since cost overruns in the production of Prosymna, his lavish presentation of the results of the excavation of a Mycenaean cemetery near the Argive Heraion, were unprecedented.12 Still worse, as he complained to Carpenter, was the assumption that excavation results should appear in book form:

In recent years the idea seems to have grown up into formidable proportions that the only proper publication of anything is a book. We ought to get away from this notion and at an early stage after the completion of an excavation the Director should decide, at least provisionally, whether the final publication would best be made in the Journal of the School, in AJA, or in a book.13

Expenses of publication in a periodical could be covered by a subscription list.14 There were further opportunities to economize, since the Agora's use of Hesperia might be subsidized from its own separately appropriated funds.15

Capps's emphasis on publication of archaeological fieldwork reflects the fact that he considered it to be a critical tool in his quest to set the School on a sound financial footing. Excavations were the most visible public face of the ASCSA, and thus a great attraction for potential donors to endowments.

12. Blegen 1937. For cost overruns in this instance, see Capps to Carpenter, November 24, 1931 (ADMREC 318/2, folder 3).
13. Capps to Carpenter, November 24, 1931 (ADMREC 318/2, folder 3).
14. Capps to Carpenter, November 28, 1928 (ADMREC 318/1, folder 4).
15. Chase to Carpenter, February 11, 1932 (ADMREC 208/1, folder 4).
CONTROL OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICITY
IN THE SERVICE OF THE SCHOOL

It was important for Capps to control both the School’s excavations and the dissemination of their results. In the early years of his chairmanship, he tried to employ publication to this end, but was frustrated in his attempt. He had, for example, asked Bert Hodge Hill, the director of the ASCSA (1906–1926), to produce a summary of the accomplishments of the ASCSA at Corinth for the October 1922 issue of the popular magazine *Art and Archaeology*. Hill’s failure to expand his text as a guidebook to the excavations was a source of exasperation for Capps and contributed to Hill’s dismissal in 1926.  

If Capps was to succeed in managing publicity about the School’s excavations, it was critical that he take steps to hold the reins more tightly. Even before Hill was removed, he had broken the director’s stranglehold over the Corinth Excavations by appointing Harold North Fowler as editor of its publications. But after Hill’s departure, other threats loomed.

Blegen, Hill’s assistant director, had been lured to the University of Cincinnati by William Tunstall Semple, head of the Department of Classics there, and by an ambitious chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Cincinnati, George Warrington. Both Semple and Warrington sought to build “a strong Department of Classical Archaeology” in Cincinnati, while maintaining and fostering warm relations with the ASCSA. Blegen, however, appears to have been of two minds after 1926. Although he had accepted the post of acting director in 1926–1927, once ensconced in Cincinnati, he and Hill embarked on an enterprise that had the potential to undermine the ASCSA’s monopoly on American archaeology in Greece.

In 1927, both men took steps to establish an independent international center of archaeology in Athens. The first project planned for the center was a collaborative excavation at Eleusis, directed by Hill and Konstantinos Kourouniotis, the director of the Greek Archaeological Service. Such a scheme was possible since a decree had been issued by the Greek Ministry of Education that permitted foreigners to excavate in Greece outside the auspices of their respective national schools of archaeology.

From Capps’s perspective, the threat to his financial program for the ASCSA must have been obvious. Under his chairmanship, excavations of the School had increasingly received support from various member universities that funded excavations conducted jointly or independently under the

---

16. See Lord 1947, pp. 146, 171–172; Fowler 1922. *Art and Archaeology* (published between 1914 and 1934) was the precursor of *Archaeology* magazine; it functioned as an organ of the AIA, but was edited and distributed by the Washington Society of the AIA rather than the central office, regarding itself as “an independent fiefdom” within the AIA (Dyson 2002, p. 161). See Lord 1947, pp. 190–192, for the struggles between Capps and Hill that led to the latter’s “retirement.”

17. Years later, Capps explained his motivations in a letter written to Carpenter (Capps to Carpenter, January 1, 1929 [ADMREC 318/1, folder 6]): Fowler’s original appointment as editor of the Corinth publications “was made necessary by the fact that somebody had to be put in charge in order to get things done over Hill’s head.” Once that matter had been addressed, Capps saw no reason to appoint a successor, thinking that it would be best if Carpenter assumed the responsibility of the Corinth editorship; he might work in collaboration with Chase.

18. Capps to Carpenter, January 2, 1928 (ADMREC 318/1, folder 6).

19. See further Davis and Gorogianni 2005, pp. 96–99, concerning this significant incident in the history of foreign archaeology in Greece.

Such partnerships permitted a considerable expansion in the School’s program of fieldwork. The actions of Blegen and Hill in 1927 thus threatened to divert existing resources contributed by member institutions, while at the same time a new international center might well deprive the School of contributions from other donors in the future.

Capps imagined that Blegen, Hill, and Kourouniotis intended to hurt the School in just this way. The situation was, in his eyes, grave. Finally, by warning that Greece could lose the ASCSA’s support for the Agora Excavations, he convinced Kourouniotis to suspend the decree permitting fieldwork by foreigners independent of national schools and to affirm that Americans would be allowed to conduct fieldwork only under the auspices of the ASCSA.

In a more general way, the “Hill Affair” also imperiled Capps’s ability to manage the image of the ASCSA by enrolling rivals for the control of information. Blegen and Hill were vociferously supported by their wives, Ida Thallon Hill and Elizabeth (Libbie) Pierce Blegen, “the ladies,” as Capps disparagingly referred to them. Already by the later 1920s, Libbie Blegen had emerged in the English-speaking world as a significant voice for Greek archaeology: her “News Items from the American School of Classical Studies at Athens” first appeared in *AJA* in 1924. Capps now feared that her brand of reportage, if turned against the School, would distract readers from its accomplishments. He wrote:

> Another matter that is being discussed pretty generally has to do with Mrs. Blegen’s News Items from Athens—her playing up to the Greeks in every possible way, her deliberate ignoring of American activities, etc. . . . The last report in *AJA* has set up something like a scandal, it is so generally commented upon. It seems to me that our only means of remedying this situation is to provide ourselves a regular official report of the School’s activities for the Journal.

Capps’s conspiracy theory may have been correct. Blegen, Hill, and Kourouniotis were lifelong colleagues and friends; see Davis 2000, pp. 86–87; 2003, p. 152.

---

21. See Lord 1947, Appendix III, pp. 295–308, esp. p. 295; Meritt 1984, pp. 203–220, esp. p. 203. This development marked a significant divergence from the practice of other countries, excavations of which continued to be governmentally sponsored and centrally coordinated by national schools in Athens.

22. The extent of Blegen and Hill’s support in Cincinnati is not clear (Capps to Carpenter, January 2, 1928 [ADMREC 318/1, folder 6]). Warrington reportedly believed that Blegen did not want to work under the auspices of the American School again and thought that he could find another way to continue in Greece, by personally seeking permission to explore and to conduct test excavations. Capps thought that Warrington would not support Blegen if his actions threatened the well-being of the School.

23. See Lord 1947, p. 205, for a sanitized version of this episode. Relevant archival documentation includes, in the archives of the University of Cincinnati, UA-83-15, box 1, folder 9, and, in the ASCSA Archives in Athens, ADMREC 701/1, folder 4: Capps to Kourouniotis, February 19, 1927, and Kourouniotis to Capps, March 31, 1927, where assurances are given to Capps that permits will only be issued to Americans via the ASCSA; ADMREC 318/1, folder 6: Capps to Kourouniotis, March 8, 1927; also 318/1, folder 6: Capps to Carpenter, January 2, 1928, where reference is made to the affair. The principle that no foreigner could conduct excavations in Greece except under the auspices of a foreign school was confirmed later in 1928 (see Morris 1994, p. 35), eliminating concerns over a presidential decree of January 21, 1928, to the contrary (Petrakos 1982, p. 198, Π.∆. 30 Δεκεµ-βρίου [ΦΕΚ 6, 21-1-1928 τ. Α’]).

24. Blegen 1924.

25. Capps to Carpenter, January 2, 1928 (ADMREC 318/1, folder 6). Although Capps criticized Libbie Blegen for emphasizing the achievements of Greek colleagues, in the same letter he expressed his awareness that, since 1926, a rift had developed in Athens. George Mylonas, the bursar of the School from 1926 to 1929, was no friend of Carpenter’s and there was a perception that the School did not respect Greek archaeologists. Capps proposed that the School improve its image by commissioning Benjamin Meritt to publish in *AJA* a review of work by Greek scholars. He further suggested that Yeoryios Oikonomos be invited to lecture in the United States.
CREATION OF A PERIODICAL FOR THE ASCSA

I hope that a copy of *Hesperia* is on the way, so that I can have it to gloat over on the steamer.  

By 1927, it was clear to Capps that the ASCSA required its own journal. In the midst of building campaigns and capital fund drives to increase the School's endowments, it was undesirable to share the limelight with the AIA by employing *AJA* and *Art and Archaeology* as the principal organs for the publication of ASCSA excavations. The attention of the American public, particularly that of potential patrons, needed to be focused squarely on the ASCSA as the exclusive representative of American archaeology in Greece. A new journal produced under the auspices of the ASCSA might, in turn, reflect the official policy of the Managing Committee of the School, and not the voice of a member, particularly one like Libbie Blegen, who could neither be influenced nor controlled.

Rising costs in production and printing were lending an increased sense of urgency to the matter. Many book-length manuscripts had recently been submitted to the Publications Committee, each of which required a substantial subvention, and expenditures would certainly increase further when excavations in the Agora began. The availability of new funds, raised by Capps to subsidize the expense of publishing the results of excavations, made the production of a journal feasible and such a periodical was expected to alleviate at least some of the financial pressure on the School.  

Nevertheless, it was another five years before Capps would gloat over the first issue of *Hesperia*. In the following pages I review, in chronological order, from 1927 to 1932, some of the most significant stages in the genesis of the journal, basing my text almost entirely on unpublished archival documents.

Formal discussions about a periodical began in 1927, with reference to Benjamin Meritt's studies of the Athenian calendar. Chase wrote the following to Carpenter:

Professor Capps raises the point whether this is not a good time to discuss the publication of an annual, and has asked me to write you my ideas. I have long believed that the publication of an annual for long articles, reports of excavations, etc. was highly desirable, and the principal doubt in my mind has been the financial one. Now, apparently with the new Publication Fund we shall have the money to swing an annual unless we are very extravagant.

Chase believed that this annual should be published in Athens:

... almost impossible if a committee here [in the United States] had to decide all kinds of minor points. Personally, certainly, I should be very glad to have the Publications Committee relieved from any responsibility except such as it might give in an advisory capacity.

Chase and Capps imagined that in its physical dimensions the annual should resemble Blegen's *Korakou*. Meritt's "book" would comprise its first number.

---


27. See Lord 1947, p. 136, regarding fund-raising in support of Corinth publications.

28. Chase to Carpenter, October 14, 1927 (ADMREC 208/1, folder 4).

29. Chase to Carpenter, October 14, 1927 (ADMREC 208/1, folder 4). For *Korakou*, see Blegen 1921. The book's pages measure 22.8 x 30.5 cm, slightly larger than the size ultimately assumed by *Hesperia*. 
It is clear, however, that already there was not total agreement among the leaders of the School about the nature of the new publication. Carpenter chose to rush Meritt’s work to printers in Athens without awaiting further orders from the Executive Committee, the Managing Committee, or the Publications Committee. His personal reservations concerning Chase’s ideas are partly preserved in a handwritten draft in Athens:

“Annual” commits us to a yearly product of uniform format.

2) If we excavate the Agora, we shall need a vehicle of publication whose tenor will be very different from such a research monograph as the “Athe Cal.” Either the results of the Agora dig will be pub. in this Annual or, if we create a separate Bulletin, we shall be hard put to it to find adequate material for an Annual in addition to the Agora dig.

3) Meritt’s A.C. and D and C’s Bassae and Diez’s Mosaics could be called “Monographs of the Am. School” without prejudicing the issue, and we could decide about the Annual when we know its relation to the Agora problem.

If on the other hand we list all these as “Annuals,” the third of them would have to wait until 1930 to appear.

In general, I suggest creating an Annual and using it probably for reports long accounts on excavation and finds and 2) for articles too long for the A.J.A.

1) I do not want to hold up M’s “AC” [Athenian Calendar] till other material is accumulated. If we print it alone as No. 1 of the Annual, it is likely that our Annual will entirely change its character within a couple of years, since [text ends]33

In any case, by the summer of 1929, a formal proposal from the Publications Committee to the Managing Committee seemed to establish the future periodical of the ASCSA and also addressed other details. But preparations dragged and it was in the end an affair outside the walls of the ASCSA that brought matters to a head and convinced the School to move quickly to put Hesperia into production.

31. Chase to Carpenter, November 19, 1927 (ADMREC 208/1, folder 4). Reference is there made to a relevant letter from Carpenter to Chase, October 29, 1927, which I did not find in Athens. See also Meritt 1928 (his resultant book on the Athenian calendar).

32. “Diez’s Mosaics” appeared as Diez and Demus 1931; Dinsmoor and Carpenter’s publication of the temple at Bassai (Lord 1947, p. 166) was never published; see Cooper 1996, pp. 3, 31–35.

33. Carpenter, undated (ADMREC 208/1, folder 4). Paragraph numbers, strike-throughs, and insertions are indicated as in the original (insertions in small type). It is unclear if the substance of these notes was ever conveyed in full, or in part, to Chase or Capps.

34. See above, p. 22 and n. 3. For the formal proposal, see the report of the Publications Committee to the Managing Committee dated May 11, 1929. It read as follows: “That the Publications Committee be authorized, whenever in the judgment of the Committee and with the approval of the Managing Committee such action is desirable, to undertake the establishment of a periodical to be issued and managed in Athens at an expense of not more than one thousand dollars annually” (Forty-Eighth Annual Report, 1928–1929, p. 17). Capps had prompted Chase, who then asked Carpenter to draft this proposal (Chase to Carpenter, November 30, 1928 [ADMREC 208/1, folder 4]). Carpenter had obtained production and printing estimates from the Hestia Press in Athens (Chase to Carpenter, January 18, 1929 [ADMREC 208/1, folder 4]; Carpenter to Chase, February 28, 1929 [208/1, folder 4]). The British School of Archaeology and the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut were also consulted in order to estimate circulation (Chase to Carpenter, April 20, 1929 [ADMREC 208/1, folder 4]; Carpenter to Chase, May 11, 1929 [208/1, folder 4]; Chase to Carpenter, June 21, 1929 [208/1, folder 4], with reference to a letter from Carpenter to Chase, May 28, 1929, which I did not find in the ASCSA Archives).
In 1931, the AIA and *AJA* faced a particularly grave crisis in leadership, as America sank deeper into the Great Depression. The policies of Ralph Van Deman Magoffin, the president of the AIA (1922–1931), had roused the ire of many classicists in major eastern and midwestern universities. Magoffin, an author of popularizing books about antiquity, sought to reach a broad audience with his message. Not only was he criticized by many professional members for wanting to draw *Art and Archaeology* more closely to his vision of a central mission for the institution, but he was also castigated for undermining the research profile of the AIA. Capps was one of his most vocal critics and was especially concerned because *AJA* still served in 1931 as the School’s regular vehicle for the publication of preliminary excavation reports.

Capps’s feelings were clearly expressed in a letter that he wrote to Carpenter early in 1931. He there discussed frankly the relationship between the School and *AJA*. Capps predicted that, at the next meeting of the Council of the AIA, Magoffin would control sufficient proxy votes to win approval from the AIA Council to alter the character of *AJA* and force Elderkin to resign as its editor. He speculated that Magoffin would then try to popularize the journal by making it a substitute for *Art and Archaeology*. In Capps’s view, the ASCSA was the most significant factor in the health of *AJA*:

> . . . since a very large part of its contributions emanate from us . . . . We obviously cannot allow the interests of the School to be [vacat] to the distinctly propaganda policies of the Institute . . . . the time has come when we ought certainly to launch a quarterly Journal for the School . . . . solicitude for *AJA* having been put aside, we would use our Journal for the usual run of articles no matter what their length, and by allowing for a certain flexibility as to the size of the several numbers in each volume, we could even take care of articles of 40 to 50 pages on occasion.

In the end, Magoffin did not stand for reelection, and Louis E. Lord, his rival, became president of the AIA (1931–1936). The AIA, however, remained in debt for back payments in support of a fellowship that it continued to provide to a student in attendance at the ASCSA, and Capps commented that “it would be a relief to be dissociated from so futile and low-grade an organization as the Institute.”

Capps imagined that, in time, *AJA* would sink to the low level of quality that he ascribed to *Art and Archaeology*. Such dire straits might present a real

---

35. See Dyson 2002, pp. 162–164. For officers of the AIA and editors of *AJA*, see Allen and Hebert 2002.
36. Capps to Carpenter, February 27, 1931 (ADMREC 318/2, folder 3). Capps’s excuse for writing was to inform Carpenter that he had instructed George W. Elderkin, editor of *AJA* (1924–1931), to spare no expense in reproducing illustrations for Carpenter’s paper on the sculpture of the west pediment of the Parthenon, predicted to be a highpoint of the June issue; the School would provide a subsidy. In the end, the study was published in volume 1 of *Hesperia* rather than in *AJA*.
37. Politics of the AIA had been the topic of a recent conversation that he had had with Elderkin and with T. Leslie Shear, director of the Corinth Excavations.
38. Capps to Carpenter, February 27, 1931 (ADMREC 318/2, folder 3). Up to this point, Capps and members of the Publications Committee had been careful to protect the interests of *AJA* (Chase to Carpenter, October 17, 1927 [ADMREC 208/1, folder 4]; Chase to Carpenter, January 19, 1928 [208/1, folder 4]; Report of the Publications Committee, May 11, 1929 [Forty-Eighth Annual Report, 1928–1929, pp. 16–17]; Chase to Carpenter, January 28, 1930 [208/1, folder 4]).
40. Capps to Carpenter, December 30, 1931 (ADMREC 318/2, folder 3).
opportunity for the School to “secure” *AJA*’s subscribers if it now decided to produce a quarterly, rather than an annual. Capps even considered the possibility that the ASCSA might launch a journal for American classical archaeology:

[The journal] would still be issued as the organ of the School. While representing American research in Classical Archaeology, it would be open to contributions from others precisely as the *Mitteilungen* and *BCH* are.  

In 1930, the Publications Committee had given Carpenter general instructions concerning production.  

By early 1931, more specific policies were being relayed. Carpenter decided to print the journal in Vienna since he judged that the Hestia Press in Athens lacked personnel with sufficient experience in composing English text. Great care was taken in the choice of typeface, paper, and format. Carpenter also seems to have made the final choice concerning the name of the new periodical. He had “come to favour ‘Hesperia’ with a subtitle: ‘Being the Journal of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens.’”

It was decided that the first issue of *Hesperia* would appear in January 1932. As the director of the ASCSA, Carpenter would serve as general editor, although it had long been assumed by Capps that editing would eventually be carried out by the excavation directors:

It had, however, also been recognized that Carpenter and his successors would require help from an assistant or managing editor. The School’s librarian might undertake this role:

It does not take a great deal of training to make a pretty good Editor. . . . The chances are that a woman would be considerably easier to find than a man of equal capacity both for editing and for the library, and I should [*vacat*] that even with these two jobs there would still be a good opportunity for productive work; as much, for instance, as a hard-working Professor in America has.

41. Capps to Carpenter, December 30, 1931 (ADMREC 318/2, folder 3).  
42. Chase to Carpenter, January 28, 1930 (ADMREC 208/1, folder 4). Members of the Publications Committee, the director of the ASCSA, and the chairman of the Managing Committee continued to discuss form and content; see the report of the Publications Committee to the Managing Committee, May 10, 1930 (*Forty-Ninth Annual Report, 1929–1930*, p. 37).  
43. Capps to Carpenter, April 1, 1931 (ADMREC 318/2, folder 3); see the report of the Publications Committee to the Managing Committee, May 9, 1931 (*Fiftieth Annual Report, 1930–1931*, pp. 56–57). Several of the School’s publications had, however, been previously printed in Athens at the Hestia Press (Meritt 1984, p. 243). On the School’s association with the printers Adolf Holzhausens Nachfolger in Vienna, severed by World War II, see Lord 1947, pp. 266–267; Meritt 1984, pp. 243–245.  
44. Carpenter to Chase, June 22, 1931 (ADMREC 208/1, folder 4). The name had been proposed already in 1929, in a report of the Publications Committee; see n. 3, above.  
45. Capps to Chase, January 17, 1929 (ADMREC 208/1, folder 4).  
46. Capps to Carpenter, March 23, 1929 (ADMREC 318/2, folder 1).
THE IMPACT OF HESPERIA

_Hesperia_ was born in 1932 as an annual, then published quarterly from 1933 onward. Members of the ASCSA viewed the publication with immediate and justifiable pride: “The format and press work of _Hesperia_ were excellent. The new journal secured wide recognition and praise. It was another of Capps’s great contributions to the School’s upbuilding.”\(^{47}\) Capps himself worked tirelessly to increase the subscription list, writing letters in his own hand to colleagues and libraries.\(^{48}\) _Hesperia_ succeeded in keeping powerful patrons of the School, such as John D. Rockefeller Jr., abreast of the progress of the Agora Excavations.\(^{49}\)

The table of contents of the first issue lists a diverse collection of articles by members of the School: Rhys Carpenter, Oscar Broneer, Lucy Shoe, and Homer Thompson. Both art history and field archaeology are represented; the focus is on Athens and Corinth.

As anticipated, _Hesperia_ soon received a host of submissions from the Agora Excavations. Two fascicles per year were initially reserved for primary presentation of discoveries—a strategy announced in a facsimile handwritten letter from Carpenter that was bound inside the cover of the first volume. More generally, however, the new journal would accommodate the results of research and exploration “by members of the School staff” that were “too extensive for inclusion as short articles in the standard archaeological journals.”\(^{50}\)

It was the view of Capps and Shear that _Hesperia_ should serve the Agora Excavations by presenting discoveries to both scholars and laymen. Consecutively numbered reports were to be published exclusively in _Hesperia_ as separate issues of the journal. These, when the excavations were completed, would tell “the entire story of the successive campaigns” and would serve to elicit “a large body of criticisms and suggestions from the ablest specialists, at home and abroad, in every field.”\(^{51}\)

Thus, already in the first year of its existence, _Hesperia_ seems admirably to have satisfied the needs for an official ASCSA periodical, as these had been perceived in 1927. It is not my purpose to follow the detailed history of the journal further, a topic that lies outside my remit. In conclusion, however, I do intend to address what I see as several consequences of the journal’s creation that were unanticipated by its founders.

Ian Morris has suggested that the Agora Excavations contributed to raising “Hellenist archaeology and the professionalisation of the American School to new heights,” and that the sheer abundance of discoveries unearthed “has kept researchers busy ever since, cataloguing and publishing in the approved manner, and masking the need for any more explicitly theoretical approaches to the historical significance of the evidence.”\(^{52}\) One might further suggest that _Hesperia_ has also played a role in helping to create an American archaeology in Greece that has been insulated from developments in world archaeology.\(^{53}\)

It might even be argued that _Hesperia_ has served to separate the ASCSA from the larger world of classical archaeology. Although the idea was mooted by Capps, _Hesperia_ was not created as an international journal of classical archaeology. The geographical range of papers published in it by members and alumni of the School in the 1930s and 1940s was almost

49. Rockefeller praised the School for informing him; see Lord 1947, p. 255.
50. The letter, on ASCSA stationery, bears the header "Athens, March 1932." See Cullen’s editorial, p. 2, Fig. 1, in this issue.
51. Capps 1933, pp. 89–90. The dissemination of results was considered so urgent that, from 1935 to 1939, weekly reports were issued by Shear, first as mimeographed sheets, then as printed circulars (Shear 1935–1939).
52. Morris 1994, p. 35.
53. Similarly, the journal may have contributed to the “Great Divide” that opened between classical and other archaeologies after the 1950s; see Renfrew 1980; Snodgrass 1985; Dyson 1989.
entirely restricted to areas within the borders of the Greek state, the majority concerned with Athens, Attica, and Corinth. Articles were almost never accepted in languages other than English and only exceptionally from scholars outside the School’s community. Although, in 1942, the chairman of the Publications Committee of the School asked the Managing Committee “for authority to consider for publication articles submitted by alumni of the School and publications submitted upon invitation by others than alumni of the School,” this exigency was forced only by the realities of World War II: many members of the School were unable to submit papers and there was from time to time a shortage of copy.

After World War II, *Hesperia’s* status as a closed shop was reaffirmed in 1949, when the Managing Committee voted “that the pages of *Hesperia* be confined to present or past members of the School, and that any request for an exception be referred to the Executive Committee.” This policy was incorporated in the “Regulations” of the School as article IX.4. In 1958, the School reasserted its monopoly over the dissemination of information concerning American excavations in Greece by adding a clause to the regulations (IX.3) that required excavators to obtain prior permission to publish elsewhere. It was only in 1976 that the way was opened for submissions to *Hesperia* from scholars who were not alumni.

In normal circumstances the Publications Committee was “obligated to print all articles written by the School’s representatives and concerned with excavations conducted by the School. If an article or part of an article seemed to the Committee not ready for printing, it has been the practice for the Chairman of the Committee or the Managing Editor of Publications to work through the article with the author to obtain a product satisfactory to all concerned.” In 1970, priorities for the publication of manuscripts were formalized. Reports by field directors—those of the School’s own excavations as well as those of its member institutions—were to be accepted without review and to be printed immediately. Submissions by staff, members in Athens, and scholars assigned to study finds from the School’s excavations were also to be published automatically, in order of receipt and upon the recommendation of the director of the School, the ASCSA professor of archaeology, or the director of an excavation.

54. The same was true of excavations sponsored by the ASCSA; see Davis 2003.
55. Daux 1947 was the first article to appear in *Hesperia* that was not published in English.
56. Meritt 1984, p. 246. Issues of *Hesperia* published in the 1940s and early 1950s were thus replete with contributions on topics not closely related to excavations of the School, submitted by scholars who had not been members of the School, among them Doro Levi (1944 and 1945), war refugee and future director of the Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, and Markellos Mitsos (1946, 1947, 1949, 1950, and 1953), director of the Epigraphical Museum, head of the Greek Archaeological Service, and a frequent visitor to the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton.
59. In 1976 (minutes of the Publications Committee meeting, October 23), changes to the School regulations permitted submissions from “staff members of contributing institutions writing on non-School material.” In 1982 (minutes of the Publications Committee meeting, October 17), restrictions were again loosened to allow “articles by scholars who are not members of the School or its supporting institutions . . . when in the opinion of the Editor and the Publications Committee they have particular relevance to the School’s work.” In slightly different wording, these two decisions are incorporated in article IX.4 of the School’s regulations.
61. Meritt 1984, pp. 252–253. The priority system was first explicitly described in the minutes of the Publications Committee meeting on October 18, 1970.
The only papers subjected (in some cases) to peer review were articles by alumni of the School that were not concerned with material excavated by the School.\textsuperscript{62}

One consequence of these practices was that \textit{Hesperia} did not become a fully refereed journal until 1990 and, in this regard, it differed in its historical development from other major American archaeological journals.\textsuperscript{63} Contrary to the admirable desires expressed by Capps and Shear, the reports of American field projects in Greece were thus long deprived of the fruitful benefits of critique from impartial scholars, and the intellectual interchange and broadened perspectives that peer review can promote.\textsuperscript{64}

\textit{Hesperia} now "welcomes submissions from all scholars working in the fields of Greek archaeology, art, epigraphy, history, materials science, ethnography, and literature, from earliest prehistoric times onward," and is proud to be a fully "refereed" publication.\textsuperscript{65} The work of any scholar may be considered and the journal's geographical scope encompasses the entire Greek world.\textsuperscript{66} Indeed, procedural transparency and a broad brief seem proper for a journal that seeks to keep pace with the interests of its readers inside and outside the ASCSA, which themselves reflect the altered realities of an increasingly globalized academic world. \textit{Hesperia} is no longer the periodical of its infancy, and there can be little doubt that, in its maturity, it will continue to prosper during its second 75 years.

\textsuperscript{62} Procedures for refereeing such free submissions were codified in a resolution of the Publications Committee passed on October 18, 1970. The minutes from the meeting specify that “the editor may accept an article if she considers it 1) worthy of publication and 2) appropriate to the pages of \textit{Hesperia}; if there is any question in the Editor’s mind, the article is referred to one or more members of the Publications Committee or an outside reader with competence in the subject dealt with in the article; if there is question in that or those advisers’ minds, it is read by all members of the Committee and discussed by them before rejection.” This is not to imply, of course, that the Publications Committee itself did not exercise broad editorial control over the publications of the School; its members had long volunteered their services in reading book manuscripts and proofs (Meritt 1984, pp. 241–242).

\textsuperscript{63} The minutes of the Publications Committee meetings on March 3, 1990, and October 25, 1990, record these changes. The category system was discontinued, and all articles were henceforth to be peer-reviewed. In contrast, the \textit{Journal of Field Archaeology} was peer-reviewed from its inception in 1974 (I am grateful to Al Wesolowsky for this information). \textit{American Antiquity} published its peer-review policy in the early 1980s (Anonymous 1983, p. 429). Although the editorial policies of \textit{AJA} were printed only recently in the journal (Anonymous 1991, p. 1), all manuscripts had previously been subjected to critical scrutiny by editors, an advisory board, and external referees (see Kleiner 1986, p. 379).

\textsuperscript{64} Cf. Renfrew’s (1983, p. 7) comments on reports by contract archaeologists in the United States, published without “the adequate process of wide peer review which genuine publication automatically provides.” See also Derricourt 1996, pp. 55–58, and, more generally, Harnard 1983, regarding the purpose and value of peer review.

\textsuperscript{65} As announced on the inside cover of each issue of the journal and on the School’s Web site: http://www.ascsa.edu.gr/publications/ hesperia.htm and http://www.ascsa.edu.gr/publications/publications.htm.

\textsuperscript{66} For discussion and clarification of the journal’s current scope and policies, see the editorials in \textit{Hesperia} 69 (2000), pp. 1–2; 73 (2004), pp. 1–6. See also Cullen, this issue.
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