



PHASELIS

Disiplinlerarası Akdeniz Araştırmaları Dergisi
Journal of Interdisciplinary Mediterranean Studies

Issue XII (2026)

Representing Pamphylia and Lycia in Hans Rott's Kleinasiatische Denkmäler (1908)

Zeynep DOĞANCI

 0000-0001-9416-1558



The entire contents of this journal, *Phaselis: Journal of Interdisciplinary Mediterranean Studies*, is open to users and it is an 'open access' journal. Users are able to read the full texts, to download, to copy, print and distribute without obtaining the permission of the editor and author(s). However, all references to the articles published in the e-journal *Phaselis* are to indicate through reference the source of the citation from this journal.

Phaselis: Journal of Interdisciplinary Mediterranean Studies, is a peer-reviewed journal and the articles which have had their peer reviewing process completed will be published on the web-site (journal.phaselis.org) in the year of the journal's issue (e.g. Issue XII: January-December 2026). At the end of December 2026 the year's issue is completed.

Responsibility for the articles published in this journal remains with the authors.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Citation Doğancı Z. 2026, " Representing Pamphylia and Lycia in Hans Rott's Kleinasiatische Denkmäler (1908)". *Phaselis* XII, 199-215.
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21282119

Received: 09.06.2026 | Accepted: 14.09.2026

Published: 22.10.2026

Type: Research Article

Editing: Phaselis Research Project
www.phaselis.org



Received: 09.06.2026
Accepted: 14.09.2026
Published: 22.10.2026
Type: Research Article

PHASELIS
PHASELIS XII (2026) 199-215
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21282119
journal.phaselis.org

Representing Pamphylia and Lycia in Hans Rott's *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler* (1908)

Hans Rott'un Kleinasiatische Denkmäler'inde (1908) Pamphylia ve Lykia'nın Temsili

Zeynep DOĞANCI *

Abstract: This article examines Hans Rott's 1908 work, *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien und Lykien*, not merely as a technical and empirical field report documenting Early Christian and Eastern Roman monuments in Pamphylia, Pisidia, Cappadocia, and Lycia, but as a text profoundly shaped by the institutional, theological, and Orientalist knowledge-production processes of late Wilhelmine Germany. Through a critical historiographical approach, the study analyzes Rott's itinerary selection, his systematic inclusion and exclusion of specific monuments, and his narrative language. The theoretical framework draws on Mary Louise Pratt's analysis of colonial representational practice and the "contact zone", Suzanne Marchand's study of German Orientalism, and Jaś Elsner's assessment of the A. Riegl & J. Strzygowski debate. Furthermore, the article examines how the Cunitz and Piper Foundations, Johannes Ficker's guidance, and the Alsace-Lorraine context structurally shaped Rott's research agenda. A comparison with Count Karl Lanckoroński's expedition demonstrates how the same geography was framed into fundamentally divergent historical narratives under varying institutional and funding networks. Ultimately, the study argues that Rott's text should be reread not as an uncritical repository of raw data, but as a document of knowledge production that renders its underlying institutional and ideological filters visible.

Keywords: Hans Rott, Pamphylia, Lycia, German Orientalism, Historiography of Archaeology.

Öz: Bu makale, Hans Rott'un 1908 tarihli eseri *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien und Lykien*'i, yalnızca Pamphylia, Pisidia, Kappadokia ve Lykia'daki Erken Hristiyan ve Doğu Roma anıtlarını belgeleyen teknik ve ampirik bir saha raporu olarak değil, geç II. Wilhelm dönemi Almanya'sının kurumsal, teolojik ve oryantalist bilgi üretim süreçlerince derinden biçimlendirilmiş bir metin olarak incelemektedir. Çalışma, eleştirel bir tarih yazımı yaklaşımıyla Rott'un güzergâh seçimini, belirli anıtları sistematik olarak dahil etme ve dışlama tercihlerini ve anlatım dilini çözümlemektedir. Kurumsal çerçeve, Mary Louise Pratt'ın sömürgeci temsil pratikleri ve "temas bölgesi" çözümlemesine, Suzanne Marchand'ın Alman oryantalizmi üzerine çalışmasına ve Jaś Elsner'in A. Riegl & J. Strzygowski tartışmasına ilişkin değerlendirmesine dayanmaktadır. Makale ayrıca Cunitz ve Piper vakıflarının, Johannes Ficker'in yönlendirmesinin ve Alsas-Loren bağlamının Rott'un araştırma gündemini yapısal olarak nasıl biçimlendirdiğini ele almaktadır. Kont Karl Lanckoroński'nin keşif gezisiyle yapılan karşılaştırma, aynı coğrafyanın farklı kurumsal ve finansman ağları altında temelden ayrışan tarihsel anlatılar içinde nasıl çerçevelendiğini göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak çalışma, Rott'un metninin eleştirisiz biçimde başvurulacak bir ham veri deposu olarak değil, altta yatan kurumsal ve ideolojik filtrelerini görünür kılan bir bilgi üretim belgesi olarak yeniden okunması gerektiğini savunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hans Rott, Pamphylia, Lykia, Alman Oryantalizmi, Arkeoloji Tarih Yazımı.

* PhD Cand., Akdeniz University, Mediterranean Civilisations Research Institute, Department of Modern and Contemporary Mediterranean Studies, Antalya, TÜRKİYE. zeynepdoganci@gmail.com | 0000-0001-9416-1558

Introduction

From the mid-nineteenth century onward, European scientific interest in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Levant and the Levant region underwent a fundamental structural transformation that extended far beyond individual Orientalist curiosity. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, expeditions were dominated by independent travellers and amateur antiquarians who set out relying on personal fortunes, a thirst for adventure, or aristocratic Grand Tour¹ traditions. In the rapidly changing atmosphere of the nineteenth century, these individual journeys were replaced by systematic, disciplinary expeditions financed by national museums, state-supported university chairs, military-geographical mapping institutions, and official or semi-official foundations². This process marked a professionalizing and institutionalizing phase in which archaeology, once regarded as an amateur pursuit, became a discipline integrated with the ideological and institutional apparatuses of the state³. This institutionalization functioned as an invisible yet rigid filter that determined not only the epistemological character of archaeological and philological knowledge produced in the field, but also which micro-geographies would be studied, which monuments belonging to specific historical layers would be documented and which would be ignored, and ultimately within what ideological framework this knowledge would be situated in imperial centres.

The discipline of archaeology, intertwined with colonial expansion and struggles for influence, became institutionalized as an asymmetrical mechanism of knowledge production through which archaeological capital and intellectual hegemony flowed unidirectionally from Northern and Western metropolises toward Southern and Eastern geographies⁴. B. G. Trigger (1984) conceptualized the role assumed by archaeology in the foreign policy of the European great powers during nineteenth century as “imperial archaeology”⁵. Accordingly, elites and state institutions in imperial centres positioned archaeological activities in overseas territories not merely as scientific progress, but as an instrument through which the nation’s prestige, its claim to being a founder of civilization, and its cultural superiority over European rivals were certified on a global scale⁶. Therefore, the national and local institutions and patronage networks that financed expeditions inevitably shaped in advance the empirical limits of observation and the research agendas of the scholars they sent into the field⁷.

The late Ottoman territories and Anatolian lands constituted one of the most intense arenas of conflict for these institutionalized practices of knowledge production and cultural appropriation by European hegemonic powers. From the mid-eighteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century, the Ottoman Empire became the direct focus of archaeological interest and of the race to “plunder the past” pursued by actors such as Britain, France, Germany, and Austria-Hungary, which were engaged in relentless imperial, diplomatic, and economic rivalry with one another⁸. This intense scientific and archaeological encirclement was not conducted under the guise of a neutral admiration for antiquity. On the contrary, it was

¹ Fletcher 2011, 142.

² Trigger 2006, 49-52; Díaz-Andreu 2007, 29-31.

³ Díaz-Andreu 2007, 1-3.

⁴ Said 2006, 97-100.

⁵ Trigger 1984, 368.

⁶ Díaz-Andreu 2007, 8-12.

⁷ Díaz-Andreu 2007, 108-112.

⁸ Bahrani et al. 2011, 13-16.

shaped by over national prestige, strategies for creating imperial spheres of influence, and a colonial logic of appropriation legitimized through the discourse of rescuing the ownerless and degenerated heritage of the Orientalist East⁹. As M. Díaz-Andreu (2007) also emphasizes, for European imperial powers, obtaining excavation and survey permits in regions such as the Ottoman lands, which were not officially considered colonies but were encircled by informal imperialism, turned into a race to plant geopolitical and cultural flags in the field¹⁰. European institutions textualized this geography, which they mapped and whose monuments they inventoried, and reconstructed it as a laboratory that either nourished the roots of Western civilization or documented the early phases of Christian history.

The work of the German art historian and archaeologist Hans Rott, published in 1908 under the title *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien und Lykien* (Asia Minor Monuments from Pisidia, Pamphylia, Cappadocia, and Lycia), presents one of the most concrete and characteristic products of this aforementioned institutionalized and politicized practice of knowledge production in the context of late Wilhelmine Germany. This expedition, financed by the Strasbourg-based Cunitz Foundation (Cunitz Stiftung) and Piper Foundation (Piper Stiftung), and directly supported administratively and logistically by the Imperial Governorship of Alsace-Lorraine (Reichsland Elsaß-Lothringen), yielded highly comprehensive field observations conducted by Hans Rott and his colleague Dr. Karl Michel during the spring and autumn of 1906¹¹. The expedition and the resulting text diverged radically from the mainstream German archaeological tradition, which traditionally focused on classical Greek and Roman antiquity in the Mediterranean. Instead, it aimed to document systematically the remains of the Early Christian and Eastern Roman periods in the regions of Pisidia, Pamphylia, Cappadocia and Lycia: church architecture, basilicas, monastic complexes, local fresco programmes and epigraphic material. In this respect, the work made the geography of Southern and Inner Anatolia an object of analytical inquiry on such a broad scale for the first time in the fields of Christian archaeology (Christliche Archäologie) and Late Antique historiography.

Based on the basis of the clues left by H. Rott in the preface (Vorwort) and between the lines of his text, it is possible to analyse the anatomy of the intricate institutional network behind this scientific expedition, the structure of the its funding sources, and the academic connections of the researchers. It is highly noteworthy that the project was grounded in a regional-national mission such as “the development of science and culture in Alsace” (Förderung der Wissenschaft in Elsaß), originating from the Alsace-Lorraine region, which lay at the centre of a tense debate over national belonging within the borders of the German Empire at the time, and that this mission was directed toward the Eastern Mediterranean geography. This situation reveals that H. Rott’s text was not simply a neutral archaeological inventory or an innocent field report, but rather the carrier of an institutional discourse and ideological filter compatible with Wilhelmine Germany’s religious, cultural, and geopolitical Eastern policies in the late Ottoman territories.

This article proposes to read Hans Rott’s text not only as an early archaeological record and source database, but as an ideological document of institutional knowledge production in its own right. While the study focuses on the logic underlying Rott’s itinerary selection, the specific monuments he chose to document in detail versus those he consciously or unconsciously

⁹ Çelik 2016, 2-4, 25-26.

¹⁰ Díaz-Andreu 2007, 99-100.

¹¹ Rott 1908, v-vii.

omitted, and the narrative language through which he conveyed these choices, it also aims to reveal the extent to which the geography of Pamphylia and Lycia was incorporated into European scientific discourse through which institutional priorities, religious hierarchies, and imperial perspectives. These questions are critical for understanding how the historiography of archaeology and art history in Anatolia was structurally shaped by the funding priorities of international institutions and for examining the long-term theoretical consequences of the region's academically fragmented representation. To execute this critical reading, the study draws on three complementary theoretical and historiographical sources:

M. L. Pratt's (1992) *Post-colonial Approach*: Pratt examines travel writing and geographical exploration narratives as practices of colonial knowledge production and domination¹². The concepts of "imperial eyes" and "contact zones", which M. L. Pratt introduced to describe the literature and which describe the asymmetrical spaces of colonial encounters take place, provide a functional analytical framework. They help examine how the act of seeing, categorizing, and textualizing a foreign geography by a European researcher was produced within a framework of institutional and ideological hegemony rather than mere individual observation¹³.

S. Marchand's (2009) *Study on German Orientalism*: Marchand explains how German academic and institutional structures formalized Oriental, Bible-based, and theological research at the turn of the twentieth century. By addressing the tense alliance formed among secular scientific practice, the state's geopolitical interests, and religious-national identity construction, this study enables us to contextualize Rott's funding network¹⁴.

J. Elsner's (2002) *Historiographical Critique*: Elsner discusses the famous "Orient or Rome?" debate between Alois Riegl and Josef Strzygowski, which erupted in European academia concurrently with the writing and publication of Rott's work. The category of Christian Eastern art formulated by J. Strzygowski which sought the origins of Eastern Roman and Early Christian art not in Rome, but in the original genius of the Near East provides the intellectual paradigm that directly determined what Rott looked for in the field, which ruins he deemed worthy of recording, and how he positioned them.

The primary method of this article is not structural analysis, traditional architectural typology, or iconographic comparison, but rather discourse and textual analysis. The study analyzes the logistical and ideological logic of Rott's (1908) itinerary selections, the structural gaps between the explicitly detailed monuments and the classical or Islamic-Ottoman structures that were ignored, and the Orientalist codes underlying his narrative language. Although Rott's 1908 text is the main primary source, the study will use *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens* (1892) the account produced by the Austrian expedition led by Count Karl Lanckoroński, which surveyed the same geography shortly before with entirely different aristocratic and classical priorities as the main comparative reference point to analyze the institutional representation produced by Rott's text¹⁵.

Theoretical and Methodological Framework

Reading Rott's (1908) text not merely as an archaeological inventory but as a document of institutional knowledge production becomes possible through the combined use of

¹² Pratt 1992, 4-7.

¹³ Marchand 2009, 333.

¹⁴ Elsner 2002, 358.

¹⁵ Lanckoroński 1892, 1-3, Cilt II.

complementary analytical approaches outside the traditional methodologies of art history and archaeology. As M. Díaz-Andreu and L. Coltofean (2024/2025) state in their work, studying the history of archaeology does not merely track the progression of past theoretical thought; it also deciphers the socio-political, economic, and institutional framework within which knowledge was formulated¹⁶. Therefore, this article adopts a critical method that reads the history of archaeology not as a one-dimensional chronology, but as a multi-layered network of power and knowledge relations. This section separately addresses the theoretical contexts that provide this methodological legitimacy and demonstrates how they are transformed into analytical focal points.

Mary Louise Pratt and the Representational Practice of Travel Writing

M. L. Pratt defines travel writing not merely as the transmission of personal experience, but as a representational practice through which Eurocentric ideology and the colonial gaze are systematically produced¹⁷. The concept of “imperial eyes”, which lies at the centre of the study’s theoretical framework, posits that the gaze of the European researcher is never neutral or driven by innocent curiosity, but rather reflects the priorities of metropolitan institutions, national interests, and a desire for planetary domination¹⁸.

The “seeing-man”, the central figure of this gaze, ostensibly appears to observe the geography before him as a passive observer, while in fact appropriating it at the textual level. M. L. Pratt (1992) characterizes this process as a strategy of “anti-conquest”. In this context, the traveler establishes European hegemony not by using direct violence like a military conqueror, but by classifying and cataloguing the geography under the guise of objectivity and scientificity. As M. L. Pratt argues, that behind this seemingly gaze lies a “planetary consciousness” that remaps the world within a Eurocentric hierarchy of knowledge¹⁹.

Another concept, the “contact zone”, defines the social spaces of encounter in which different cultures clash and influence one another within unequal relations of power such as colonialism or slavery. Travel texts produced in this zone construct the geography as a “dehumanized landscape” by stripping it of local peoples and their historical continuity. In this process, where local voices are suppressed, travel writing produces the knowledge object required by the metropolis, while incorporating local elements into the text only insofar as they serve Europe’s narrative of progress²⁰. This theoretical framework offers a crucial analytical key to understanding how the traveller’s relationships in the field and the notes he took became intertwined with the politics of science in the metropolis.

Suzanne Marchand and Wilhelmine German Orientalism

S. Marchand (2009) meticulously delineates how German academia institutionalized Oriental studies from the 1830s to the 1930s, and how, during in this process, a tense yet functional alliance was formed among secular scientific practice, the geopolitical interests of the state, and religious national identity construction²¹. Her study provides a robust theoretical scaffolding for making sense of the specific institutional context of Rott’s expedition.

During this period, the expanding boundaries of “Orientwissenschaft” (Oriental Studies) in Germany

¹⁶ Díaz-Andreu & Coltofean 2025, 1-18.

¹⁷ Pratt 1992, 4-11.

¹⁸ Pratt 1992, 7, 15.

¹⁹ Pratt 1992, 7-11.

²⁰ Pratt 1992, 5-10.

²¹ Marchand 2009, xvii-xxxiv.

were exceedingly broad. They operated through an intricate network among theological seminaries, university chairs, state museums, and the funding mechanisms of regional foundations. As S. Marchand (2009) demonstrates in her study, in the final quarter of the nineteenth century, theology and archaeological field research became intertwined in German academia in mutually reinforcing manner. According to this concept, called *Wissenschaft* in the German tradition, the aim was not merely to collect antiquarian knowledge, but to pass it through a critical filter and synthesize it into a systematic whole; every kind of data, from religious texts to archaeological finds, was reconstructed by passing through the filter of scientificity²². From the 1880s onward, as Protestant theology focused on the analysis of sacred texts and needed empirical data for the historical and philological verification of those texts, it turned toward the field, that is, toward the geographies of the Near East and Asia Minor. S. Marchand (2009) defines this situation as an organic alliance that theology established with institutes of antiquity and philological chairs in order to preserve its legitimacy as a rational science. This institutional and theoretical alliance shaped in advance not only the routes and budgets of the researchers sent into the field, but also the questions with which they would enter the field, the types of monuments they would prioritize, and the conceptual language through which they would present their findings²³.

The Strasbourg-based institutions that financed Rott's (1908) expedition were not outside this picture. From the perspective of the Alsace-Lorraine context, the mission of the Cunitz Stiftung to "develop science and culture" in this border region (Reichsland), which from 1871 onward struggled with a disputed problem of national identity within the borders of the German Empire, functioned both as a local strategy of legitimation and as a means of reinforcing German cultural and intellectual superiority throughout the empire. Rott's (1908) explicit presentation of his institutional identity by saying "we Alsatians" in the preface, and his association of this identity with a religious-archaeological enterprise in the Eastern Mediterranean, reveal that this is a case study to which S. Marchand's (2009) analytical framework can be directly applied.

Jaś Elsner and the construction of the "Christian East" category

The third contextual foundation for making sense of Rott's (1908) text is an art-historical debate exactly contemporaneous with the period in which he wrote his work. In his study of the two main works that laid the foundations of the discipline of Late Antique art history and of the theoretical conflict between their authors, J. Elsner (2002) addresses the polemic between Alois Riegl and Josef Strzygowski over whether the origins of Late Antique and Early Christian art were Rome-centred or Eastern in origin²⁴. J. Strzygowski (1901) seeks the origins of Eastern Roman and Early Christian art not in the Rome-centred Western narrative, but in the original creative tradition of the Near East, Anatolia, Iran, and Mesopotamia, and defends this thesis by placing the category of Christian Eastern art at the centre²⁵. Riegl (1901), by contrast, in his seminal work *Spättrömische Kunstindustrie*, foregrounds Roman continuity, the internal laws of artistic development, and continuity in the Mediterranean basin²⁶. J. Elsner (2002) utilizes both positions not only as politically and ideologically opposed poles, but also as a key to understanding the institutional, political, and philosophical motivations underlying these views and the forms of knowledge produced about Late Antique art²⁷.

²² Marchand 2009, xxix.

²³ Marchand 2009, 222-225.

²⁴ Elsner 2002, 358-370.

²⁵ Strzygowski 1901.

²⁶ Riegl 1901.

²⁷ Elsner 2002, 374-375.

When Rott's work was published in 1908, this academic tension was at its most intense in German and Austrian art-historical circles. The fact that Rott (1908) largely ignored classical Greek and Roman remains in Pisidia, Pamphylia, and Lycia and focused directly on the Early Christian layer, churches, basilicas, and fresco programs, indicates that in the field he acted precisely under the guidance of the "Christian East" paradigm formulated by J. Strzygowski (1901), which aimed to unsettle Roman hegemony. In other words, Rott (1908) determined what he would make visible in the field not only through institutional funding sources but also through the dominant art-historical paradigm of his age.

Multi-Layered Historiography and Method

These three approaches will be used together as a multi-layered reading strategy. This study, which adopts a multi-layered method instead of reading the history of archaeology merely as a linear chronology of discoveries, also derives its legitimacy from M. Díaz-Andreu and L. Coltofean's (2025) multi-layered approach to the historiography of archaeology²⁸. Analysing how archaeological knowledge was jointly constructed through networks among archaeologists, institutions, patrons, and intellectual paradigms is also the only way to comprehensively analyse the text. While M. L. Pratt's (1992) framework places Rott's (1908) text within a broader practice of colonial representation, S. Marchand's (2009) framework makes visible the specific institutional and financial mechanisms behind this representation. J. Elsner's (2002) framework completes the analysis by showing through which aesthetic and theological paradigms this institutional structure carried out its observational choices in the field.

In terms of method, the article does not undertake a traditional architectural typology analysis or iconographic comparison. Instead, three concrete analytical procedures are applied to the text. In the first step, as an itinerary reading, the logic of selection for documentation in the field will be addressed, and how Christian monuments were prioritized while classical antiquity was marginalized will be discussed. Second, the narrative language shaped under the shadow of the Christian East category will be examined. Specifically, the analysis will focus on which religious-Orientalist concepts and forms of categorization were used while describing the ruins will be analysed. Finally, through comparative positioning, the representations produced by the Austrian expedition led by Count Karl Lanckoroński²⁹ (1890), which surveyed the same geography very shortly before with entirely different institutional priorities (aristocratic, aesthetic, and focused on Classical Rome), will be used as the main reference point and methodological control group. For the analysis of the text under consideration, the funding institutions mentioned in the preface of the text, the expedition team that carried out the investigation, and the direction of the academic approach will first be delineated.

The Institutional Anatomy of the Expedition

In order to understand the knowledge produced by an expedition, it is necessary to make visible the institutional and financial structure that made that expedition possible. In studies of the history of archaeology, private correspondence belonging to institutions, foundation budget records, or diplomatic archival documents are generally sought as primary sources to decipher the hidden institutional mechanisms behind expeditions. However, as recent studies theorizing the archival sources of the discipline in M. Díaz-Andreu and L. Coltofean's (2025) specifically highlighted by Jensen (2024) handbook emphasize, the absence of official institutional archives

²⁸ Díaz-Andreu & Coltofean 2025, 22.

²⁹ Szemethy 2011, 332.

or restricted access to these archives should not be seen as an obstacle to conducting a critical institutional analysis. The study states that the prefaces, acknowledgements, and between-the-lines expressions of published archaeological reports can be read as public archival texts containing institutional networks and ideological patronage relations³⁰.

The preface to Rott's 1908 work offers, in this respect, a transparent and rich field of discursive archive. While listing his acknowledgments, the researcher also recorded the entire funding network of the expedition, the chain of academic relations, and how the project came into being³¹. This information clearly shows that the text was not merely a neutral field report, but the product of specific institutional priorities, personal academic connections, and a regional-national mission definition.

Funding Structure: The Cunitz and Piper Foundations

The expedition was jointly financed by two Strasbourg-based foundations: the Cunitz Foundation (Cunitz Stiftung) and the Piper Foundation (Piper Stiftung). The mission of both foundations was directly related to the development of science and culture in the Alsace-Lorraine region. In the preface to Rott (1908), this mission is explicitly expressed as "the development of science in Alsace"³². Rott clearly confirms the vital role of this funding in enabling him to enter the field by attributing it to the generosity of the travel grants and allowances provided to him by the foundations³³.

At first glance, it may appear contradictory that foundations foregrounding a goal of regional cultural development and local academia directed their funding to a religious-archaeological expedition in the Eastern Mediterranean. Yet this orientation was part of a broader pattern explaining how Wilhelmine German academia articulated research on the "East-Orient" with national prestige and cultural legitimacy. As Marchand (2009) shows, during this period scientific interest in the East in Germany functioned not simply as antiquarian curiosity, but as part of a race to strengthen the empire's international scientific reputation³⁴ and as a component of an identity project with religious-theological roots³⁵.

The specific context of Alsace-Lorraine sharpened this general picture even further. This border region, separated from France by the Treaty of Frankfurt in 1871, incorporated into the German Empire, and directly attached to the centre as a Reichsland, struggled with a painful problem of national belonging. In this fragile political climate, the mission of developing science within the University of Strasbourg assumed a dual function: both as a local intellectual strategy of legitimation and as a means of proving German scientific and cultural superiority across the empire. In the sections of her study examining the late Wilhelmine period, S. Marchand (2009) directly draws attention to the vital border-outpost mission that the University of Strasbourg (Kaiser-Wilhelms-Universität), re-established in 1872, carried for the German Empire. In this sensitive region directly attached to the centre (Reichsland), the channelling of local religious funds and foundations (such as the Cunitz and Piper foundations) into theological and cultural projects was a direct reflection of the effort to certify "the superior rationality and patronage of

³⁰ Jensen 2024, 49-50.

³¹ Jensen 2024, 48-71.

³² Rott 1908, viii: "...zur Förderung der Wissenschaft in Elsass".

³³ Rott 1908, viii.

³⁴ Marchand 2009, 335-348.

³⁵ Marchand 2009, 391-393.

German science” against the strong French intellectual influence in the region. Therefore, the transfer of the financial resources of the Cunitz and Piper Foundations to a Christian archaeology expedition in Anatolia was in perfect harmony with the strategy of Strasbourg academia both to spread the German Wissenschaft tradition in theology to the Eastern Mediterranean and to articulate the regional capital in Alsace-Lorraine with the empire’s global politics of prestige³⁶.

It is also understood from the preface to Rott (1908) that the expedition received direct administrative support and official permissions from the Imperial Governorship of Alsace-Lorraine (Kaiserliches Ministerium für Elsass-Lothringen)³⁷. This support at the level of an official state governorship constituted the administrative umbrella that enabled excavation and survey permits (irade-i seniyye and ruhsatnameler) before the Ottoman authorities to be accelerated through diplomatic channels³⁸. The fact that, alongside foundation funding, the official state-ministry channel was also directly involved indicates that the project was not merely an autonomous and personal academic enterprise, but had a state-supported semi-official character.

The Centre of the Academic Network: Johannes Ficker and “studien über christliche denkmäler”

The intellectual architect and institutional backbone of the expedition was Johannes Ficker, professor at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Strasbourg³⁹. In the preface, Rott (1908) describes J. Ficker as the soul of the whole enterprise⁴⁰. This characterization shows that J. Ficker was not merely a funding intermediary or institutional patron, but the principal figure who determined the orientation and conceptual framework of the research. Rott (1908) states that J. Ficker had already designed a similar research project that overlapped with his travel plan and had initiated it through Dr. Karl Michel, and that the two teams therefore joined forces⁴¹.

The boundaries of J. Ficker’s role in this project were quite broad. In particular, the fact that he played the largest part in securing the additional financial resources necessary for the Cappadocia leg, which was endangered due to budget constraints, and that he undertook the editorship of the “Studien über christliche Denkmäler” (Studies on Christian Monuments) series in which Rott’s findings were published, demonstrates that he structurally shaped the expedition both before and after it took place⁴². In other words, J. Ficker functioned as a frame-setter who directly determined what would be researched and through which ideological and scientific filter the findings would be presented.

The model developed by M. Díaz-Andreu and L. Coltofean (2024) for institutional histories of archaeology, in which metropolitan institutions discipline the field unilaterally through funding mechanisms, can be observed here in full embodiment. The metropolitan institution (the University of Strasbourg and the relevant foundations) determines the research agenda, directs the funding, and presents the knowledge obtained to the international public on its own institutional publication platform (through Dieterich’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung in Leipzig)⁴³.

The division of labour between H. Rott and K. Michel was also consistent with this institutional structure. While Rott undertook the architectural drawings, mapping, and

³⁶ Marchand 2009, 333-340.

³⁷ Rott 1908, viii.

³⁸ Çelik 2016, 11-14.

³⁹ Catalogus Professorum Halensis 2026, “Johannes Ficker”.

⁴⁰ Rott 1908, v: “die Seele des Ganzen”.

⁴¹ Rott 1908, v-vi.

⁴² Rott 1908, v-vi.

⁴³ Díaz-Andreu 2007, 108-112.

iconographic documentation, Dr. K. Michel took over the epigraphic, philological, and written material⁴⁴. The fact that the two researchers joined forces within a framework of Christian archaeology previously designed by J. Ficker indicates that the expedition was not a wholly independent personal discovery in the field, but rather had the character of completing an inventory whose boundaries had been institutionally drawn.

Comparative Context: Lanckoroński's Expedition

To better understand the institutional structure of Rott's (1908) expedition, it is highly instructive to compare it with Lanckoroński's expedition (conducted in 1884, published in 1890), which surveyed the same geography approximately twenty years earlier.

Count Karl Lanckoroński, an Austrian aristocrat of Polish origin, funded the expedition largely through his personal fortune, with the logistical support of the Austrian Ministry of Culture and Education, and was accompanied by the eminent classical architect Georg Niemann and the archaeologist Eugen Petersen⁴⁵.

The disparity in funding structures between the two expeditions profoundly influenced the nature of the knowledge they produced. Lanckoroński's published volumes omit specific details regarding the institutional or personal financing of the fieldwork. H. Szemethy (2011), however, demonstrates in his study that K. Lanckoroński's (1884) expedition was driven by aristocratic wealth, personal patronage networks, and the Viennese monarchical elite, inevitably skewing its research agenda toward classical Greek and Roman antiquity⁴⁶. Conversely, Rott's (1906) expedition relied not on personal wealth, but on an institutional and bureaucratic network comprising regional religious-academic foundations, university chairs, and state administration. Consequently, its agenda was exclusively oriented toward Christian archaeology.

As H. Szemethy (2011) illustrates, the imperial aristocratic motivation underpinning the Austrian expedition directly reflected the Habsburg Monarchy's pursuit of cultural-political prestige in the Mediterranean basin and its ambition to appropriate classical antiquity⁴⁷. In both instances, the institutional identity and nature of the funding sources directly dictated research priorities. For Lanckoroński, the Pamphylia-Lycia geography was largely the site of the magnificent architectural heritage of classical civilization, whereas for Rott and his supporting network in Strasbourg, the same region served as a theological and geographical laboratory to trace the origins of Early Christianity and the Eastern Roman world.

Analyzed through the lens of its funding structure, institutional ties, and academic network, the expedition culminating in Rott's text emerges as a rigorously organized enterprise of institutional knowledge production that left little to chance. The theological-cultural emphasis placed on Christian archaeology by the Cunitz and Piper Foundations, Johannes Ficker's intellectual guidance, and the national regional legitimization concerns inherent to the Alsace-Lorraine context pre-structured Rott's fieldwork. These factors predetermined his research questions, the types of monuments deemed worthy of documentation, and the conceptual framework used to present his findings. The subsequent section examines how this structural framework materialized in the field through itinerary selection, halting points, and documentation patterns.

⁴⁴ Rott 1908, vi.

⁴⁵ Lanckoroński 1890, iii-v.

⁴⁶ Szemethy 2011, 346-350, 373.

⁴⁷ Szemethy 2011, 331-335.

Itinerary and the Logic of Selection

An expedition's itinerary is never merely a geographical or logistical preference. The starting point, the duration of stays in specific cities, the selection of structures for detailed architectural measurement, and the relegation of others to a cursory glance are all conscious decisions. They reflect the priorities of institutional funding, the researcher's academic background, and the prevailing scientific paradigms of the period. In this respect, Rott's itinerary serves as a highly legible analytical text.

Itinerary Logic and the Focus on Christian Monuments

Rott initiated his expedition in İzmir, following a broad trajectory through Pisidia, Pamphylia, Cappadocia, and Lycia. While this sequence might initially suggest a linear geographical progression, his actual fieldwork was dictated not by proximity, but by the spatial distribution of episcopal centres and the density of Early Christian monuments. As Rott explicitly states, the primary objective of the expedition was to systematically determine the extent of Christian-era monuments across Anatolia⁴⁸.

Rott did not aim to discover the geography *de novo*; rather, he sought to ground-truth an inventory whose parameters were pre-defined by institutional priorities and a religious-academic agenda. S. Marchand (2009) elucidates how the drive toward historicizing sacred texts and church history a prominent trend in German academia at the turn of the twentieth century directly dictated the scope of archaeological surveys. The Protestant theological tradition, in particular, imbued Late Antique strata with a methodological sanctity, intentionally bypassing classical antiquity. This approach aimed to emancipate the origins of Early Christianity from the monopoly of the institutional Roman narrative, thereby materializing the empirical topography of religious history in Anatolia and the Levant⁴⁹. Viewed within this institutional and religious context, Rott's route from İzmir to Lycia and his reliance on episcopal maps were not a product of personal curiosity. Instead, it was the spatial manifestation of German Protestant academia's ambition to empirically map and inventory a sacred, theological geography.

From a comparative perspective, this methodological divergence is striking. Count Lanckoroński's expedition (conducted in 1884, published in 1890) surveyed the same geography through prolonged stays and highly systematic urban planning studies. In mountainous cities like Termessos and Sagalassos, the team executed major topographical surveys and produced detailed architectural measurements of theatres and temples⁵⁰. For Rott, however, these imposing classical cities served merely as temporary waystations en route to the Late Antique and Christian remains that constituted his true research focus.

Rott's priorities at each halt were determined solely by the settlement's ancient episcopal status or the presence of extant Early Christian monuments. Even in major metropolises such as Perge, Side, and Sagalassos, his focus bypassed their imposing classical heritage theatres, stadiums, Hellenistic temples, and urban grids in favor of the structural transformations these edifices underwent during the Christian era. Key examples include the conversion of pagan temples into basilicas, the repurposing of theatres as churches, and the transformation of ancient agoras into spaces of Christian ritual (Fig. 1).

⁴⁸ Rott 1908, viii.

⁴⁹ Marchand 2009, 250-256.

⁵⁰ Lanckoroński 1890, iii-v.

City	Researcher	Work Citation	Focused Structure	Period	Page/Vol. No
Sagalassos (Ağlasun)	Lanckoroński	Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens	Temple of Antoninus, Theatre, Agora, Heroon	Classical Roman and Hellenistic	129, 145, 152 (Vol. II)
	Hans Rott	Kleinasiatische Denkmäler	Eastern Church (Ostkirche), Episcopal Palace	Early Christian and Eastern Roman	15-16, 30
Adalia (Antalya)	Lanckoroński	Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens	City Walls, Hadrian's Gate, Classical Spolia	Roman Imperial Splendour	13, 26 (Vol. I)
	Hans Rott	Kleinasiatische Denkmäler	Panagia Church, Wall Inscriptions	Eastern Roman / "Christ-loving City"	32-45
Perge (Aksu)	Lanckoroński	Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens	Theatre, Stadium, Classical Fortifications	Classical Architectural Aesthetics	33, 40 (Vol. I)
	Hans Rott	Kleinasiatische Denkmäler	Lower Church (A), Upper Church (B), Liturgical Areas	Fourth-Century Early Christian	47-51
Side (Eski Adalia)	Lanckoroński	Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens	Theatre, Market Basilica, Ancient Harbour	Roman and Hellenistic Urban Plan	125, 132 (Vol. I)
	Hans Rott	Kleinasiatische Denkmäler	Church Ruins, Episcopal Metropolitan Status	Eastern Roman Structural Transformation	63-65
Aspendos (Belkıs)	Lanckoroński	Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens	Theatre (work of Zeno), Nymphaeum	Roman Imperial Architecture	85, 92 (Vol. I)
	Hans Rott	Kleinasiatische Denkmäler	Remains of the Single Church on the Acropolis	Christian-period Place of Worship	58, 61
Syllion (Yanköy)	Lanckoroński	Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens	Acropolis and Hellenistic structures	Ancient City Defence Systems	69 (Vol. I)
	Hans Rott	Kleinasiatische Denkmäler	Cisterns and small chapels	Middle Ages / Eastern Roman	56

Fig. 1 Comparative Structural Analysis Table of Hans Rott and Lanckoroński

The Systematic Exclusion of the Classical Period

The position of classical-period monuments in Rott's (1908) text is highly unequivocal. They are not the main object of the research, but mere contextual backdrops that provide geographical

and chronological context for Christian remains. The theatres, colonnaded streets, and temples of ancient cities are mentioned in the pages of the work only in passing, serving as transitional markers showing that the city was an important ancient centre. None of them was made the subject of detailed architectural description or measured drawing (Table 1).

When compared with Lanckoroński (1890), this act of exclusion assumes a profoundly structural character. While describing the late Eastern Roman phase of a magnificent structure in Perge, Lanckoroński implies that these additions disrupted the classical aesthetic using the expression "...assembled from completely different types of structural elements, patched together". Eastern Roman period architecture for represented the decline and degeneration of the classical tradition⁵¹. Rott, by contrast, regarded precisely the "patches" mentioned by Lanckoroński (1890) as the main object of investigation and documented in the finest iconographic and liturgical detail those Eastern Roman church remains that Lanckoroński had passed over in a few words⁵². The two researchers stood before the same monumental structure in the field, but looked through completely divergent and opposed hierarchies of seeing.

The instrumental position of the Ottoman period

In Rott's (1908) text, the Ottoman period, just like the classical period, occupies an utilitarian position; however, it is observed that this is a distinctly pejorative form of instrumentality. While classical-period monuments provide geographical context, Ottoman-period architectural interventions and living Muslim communities mostly appear as active agents of destruction inflicted upon the ancient and Christian heritage.

The treatment of the use of spolia in the Antalya walls is particularly noteworthy in this context. While Rott (1908) presents the inscriptions and architectural pieces here as the greatest evidence of Eastern Rome's defensive success and of the city's identity as a "Christ-loving city" (φιλόχριστον πόλιν), readable through the inscriptions on the walls⁵³, K. Lanckoroński frames the same use of spolia and the Ottoman/Eastern Roman layers of the walls as the "usurpation" or "swallowing up" of the original pieces of history⁵⁴.

In both approaches, the Ottoman period functions not as an independent and autonomous historical layer or aesthetic value, but as a secondary contextual element that explains the fate and deterioration of the ancient heritage. This instrumentality is the clearest indication that both expeditions constructed as their object of research not the living Ottoman geography, but the buried and idealized past beneath it.

Narrative Language and the Framework of Representation

When Rott's itinerary selection, stopping places, and patterns of documentation are evaluated as a whole, the Pamphylia-Lycia geography is represented in this text not as an integrated historical continuum with intersecting classical, Eastern Roman, Ottoman, and modern layers, but as a selective cross-section strictly confined to the field of Christian archaeology. This spatial and temporal compartmentalization was by no means accidental; it was a structural selectivity predetermined by the priorities of institutional funding, the religious agenda of the foundations, and the dominant art-historical paradigm of the period. The next section will examine how this

⁵¹ Lanckoroński 1890, 40.

⁵² Rott 1908, 46-51.

⁵³ Rott 1908, 26-28.

⁵⁴ Lanckoroński 1890, 13.

selectivity materialized in the narrative language and how the category of the "Christian East" shaped the tone of the text.

How a research text documents is as analytically decisive as what it documents. Although the narrative language of Rott (1908) gives the impression, on a superficial reading, of an objective and scientific practice of inventorying, a closer examination reveals a layered discursive structure that had internalized the dominant paradigms of the period, institutional priorities, and an Orientalist framework of representation. This section addresses four basic narrative patterns in Rott's text: the East-West dichotomy, the discourse of destruction, and the oscillation between scientific distance and colonial admiration.

The central question of Rott's (1908) text was not driven by idiosyncratic curiosity, but was a product of the art-historical writing of the period: Should the roots of Christian and Eastern Roman art be sought in the West or in the East? As J. Elsner (2002) shows, while Josef Strzygowski sought the creative energy of Early Christian art not in the Roman tradition but in the original genius of the Near East famously encapsulated in the *Orient oder Rom* debate Rott entered the field with this exact question and positioned every monument he found along this axis⁵⁵.

This practice of positioning appears in Rott's (1908) text as two separate movements. On the one hand, Eastern Roman architecture and iconography are framed as the original expression of the East; on the other hand, the Early Christian tradition is presented as a universal heritage that transcends this local originality. The region's monuments are thus placed within both a geographical and a theological hierarchy, in which the local is defined as belonging to the East, while the universal is defined as belonging to the common heritage of European Christianity. This framing functions as an invisible filter that directly determines which monuments Rott would document in detail and which he would pass over briefly.

In his statements concerning the record of destruction, Rott (1908) employs not merely an objective observation, but a discourse that produces a specific ideological framework. The following lines he wrote on the disappearance of Christian monuments reveal how the researcher internalized the mission of rescue: "It was discouraging to observe that the Early Christian monuments in western Asia Minor had mostly been demolished down to their foundations. It is therefore necessary to hurry, in order at least to rescue what has been reasonably preserved"⁵⁶. The discourse of "hurry" and "rescue" here shows that Rott was in full accordance with the institutional logic that determined his itinerary. The priority was not the monuments of the classical period, which were already known and documented, but the Christian heritage that had to be recorded before it disappeared.

The Legacy of the Institutional Gaze

Rott as an Uncritical Data Repository

After its publication, Rott's work became one of the standard reference sources for studies on Eastern Roman and Early Christian architecture in Pamphylia and Lycia. Subsequent research on church architecture, basilica typology, and fresco programmes in the region systematically used *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler* as a primary empirical database. While Peter Grossmann, a preeminent scholar of Eastern Roman architecture, analysed the architectural evolution of the

⁵⁵ Elsner 2002, 358-370.

⁵⁶ Rott 1908, vii-viii: "...daß die altchristlichen Denkmäler im westlichen Kleinasien zumeist bis auf die Fundamente abgetragen sind... so gilt es zu eilen, um das leidlich Erhaltene wenigstens zu retten".

churches of Lycia and Pisidia⁵⁷, many researchers such as Otto Feld directly benefited from Rott's 1908 measured drawings, sketches, and observations in registering early religious structures in Perge, Side, and Alahan, and in cataloguing architectural sculpture and stonework that have not fully survived to the present day⁵⁸.

In subsequent literature, Rott (1908) functioned almost without exception merely as an empirical data source, and the text itself was rarely subjected to critical analysis. The texts produced by European researchers in the Ottoman geography, as Z. Bahrani, Z. Çelik, & E. Eldem (2011) also address in their broader study, have often functioned in later academic literature as neutral data repositories. These texts themselves are rarely deconstructed as products of an ideological, institutional, and theological practice of production⁵⁹. Rott's (1908) text is the most concrete reflection of this hegemonic pattern in the specific case of Pamphylia-Lycia.

The Necessity of Historiographical Rereading

Rereading Rott's text as a document of knowledge production is not merely the satisfaction of a historiographical curiosity about the past; it is also methodologically necessary for understanding the present condition of the region's academic representation. As O. Moro Abadía & E. Lewis-Sing (2025) emphasize, the historiography of archaeology must now cease merely producing chronologies of discoveries and focus on a critical history of theory that questions through which theoretical and institutional filters past texts produced empirical data⁶⁰. If a critical historiographical rereading is not undertaken, the institutional filters of the past continue to be canonized in modern academia as empirical realities.

As Z. Çelik (2016) also shows, the ideological frameworks created by European archaeological texts produced in the late Ottoman geography still preserve their effectiveness and authority in modern academia today. Academic habits concerning which historical periods are prioritized, which types of monuments are considered worthy of preservation, and through which civilizational identity the region is defined carry the legacy of these early imperial texts⁶¹.

The three patterns observed in the specific case of this text by Rott (1908) namely, the disconnected treatment of the classical and Eastern Roman periods, the reduction of the Ottoman period mostly to contextual information, and the systematic exclusion of local narratives form the core of this inquiry. Assessing the persistence of this representational pattern in subsequent literature remains crucial for reaching comprehensive conclusions in future studies.

The Perspective Opened by Reading Together with K. Lanckoroński

Reading H. Rott (1908) comparatively with K. Lanckoroński (1890) reveals that two different institutional funding structures and religious-aesthetic perspectives produced two completely different pasts in the same geography. It clearly shows that neither of these constructed pasts reflects the plain reality of the geography, but directly reflects the institutional position of the researcher. When K. Lanckoroński's (1890) glorification of classical antiquity and H. Rott's (1908) gaze searching for religious memory are placed side by side, it becomes clear that both

⁵⁷ Grossmann 2001, 381-387; 2002, 42-45.

⁵⁸ Feld 1970, 151-157.

⁵⁹ Bahrani et al. 2011, 28.

⁶⁰ Moro Abadía & Lewis-Sing 2025, 122-135.

⁶¹ Çelik 2016, 2-5.

presented the region's holistic historical reality as ideologically selected cross-sections.

For subsequent studies on the region, asking what these early texts preferred to omit provides the possibility of a sound evaluation by making visible the structural gaps and selectivities of representation. Expressed through M. Díaz-Andreu's (2007) theoretical framework for the history of archaeology, the priorities of institutional funding, metropolitan institutions, and colonial/national competition profoundly shaped in advance not only the field research of that period, but also which questions later generations would find natural, legitimate, and scientific⁶². The critical deconstruction carried out in this article makes visible the legacies brought by this institutional inheritance in Anatolian archaeology and art-historical writing.

Conclusion

This article has attempted to read Hans Rott's 1908 work *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien und Lykien* not as a positivist field report merely documenting monuments in Pamphylia and Lycia, but as a document of knowledge production shaped at the intersection of late Wilhelmine Germany's institutional funding structure, the ethos of *Kulturprotestantismus*, and Orientalist epistemology. The representational gaps deciphered throughout the analysis materialize through the conscious exclusion of classical antiquity, the reduction of the local Muslim/Ottoman layer to an instrumental background, and the erasure of the region's multi-layered demographic reality in favour of a homogeneous Christian identity.

The filters governing H. Rott's (1908) itinerary selection, registration work, and narrative language did not arise from an individual traveller's curiosity. They were nourished by the financial agendas of the Cunitz and Piper foundations, Johannes Ficker's theological guidance, and the ideological categories produced by the A. Riegl & J. Strzygowski debate fundamentally rooted in the *Orient oder Rom* discourse in German and Austrian academies at the turn of the twentieth century. The positioning of the text in later literature as an uncritical repository of raw data laid the ground for these colonial and institutional filters to become canonized and made permanent in modern academia as empirical realities.

Precisely at this point, the necessity of a critical historiographical rereading appears as a methodological problem. As M. Díaz-Andreu and L. Coltofean (2024) indicate for the historiography of archaeology, disciplinary history must now cease merely producing empirical chronologies of discoveries and focus on a critical history of theory that places on the table the theoretical and institutional filters behind past texts⁶³. As Z. Çelik (2016) also points out, the value hierarchies created by these early imperial texts produced in the late Ottoman geography academic habits concerning which monument is important and which period is worthy of preservation still preserve their authority in modern regional studies today⁶⁴. The critical deconstruction carried out in this article opens the way for Anatolian archaeology and art-historical writing to confront the epistemological limits of this institutional inheritance and to rethink the region through a multi-layered and holistic historical perspective, purified of one-dimensional imperial representations.

⁶² Díaz-Andreu 2007, 108-112.

⁶³ Díaz-Andreu & Coltofean 2024, 22-35.

⁶⁴ Çelik 2016, 2-5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

- Bahrani Z., Çelik Z. & Eldem E. 2011 (Eds.), *Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753-1914*. Istanbul.
- Çelik Z. 2016, *About Antiquities: Politics of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire*. Austin.
- Díaz-Andreu M. & Coltofean L. (Eds.) 2024, *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Archaeology*. New York.
- Díaz-Andreu M. 2007, *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology: Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past*. Oxford.
- Elsner J. 2002, "The Birth of Late Antiquity: Riegl and Strzygowski in 1901". *Art History* 25/3, 358-379.
- Feld O. 1970, "Bericht über eine Reise in Kilikien und Lykien". *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 20, 151-157.
- Fletcher P. 2011, "The Grand Tour on Bond Street: Cosmopolitanism and the Commercial Art Gallery in Victorian London". *Visual Culture in Britain* 12/2, 139-153.
- Grossmann P. 2001, "Zur christlichen Baukunst in Pisidien". *Antike Welt* 32/4, 381-387.
- Grossmann P. 2002, *Christliche Architektur in Ägypten*. Leiden.
- Jensen O. W. 2024, "Archives, Oral History, and Histories of Archaeology". Eds. M. Díaz-Andreu & L. Coltofean, *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Archaeology*. New York, 48-71.
- Lanckoroński K. G. 1890, *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens, I. Band: Pamphylien*. Wien.
- Lanckoroński K. G. 1892, *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens, II. Band: Pisidien*. Wien.
- Marchand S. L. 2009, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship*. Cambridge.
- Moro Abadía O. & Lewis-Sing E. 2024, "'Genius', 'Precursors', and 'Great (White) Men' in the History of Archaeology". Eds. M. Díaz-Andreu & L. Coltofean, *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Archaeology*. New York, 121-140.
- Pratt M. L. 1992, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London.
- Riegl A. 1901, *Die spätromische Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn*. Wien.
- Rott H. 1908, *Kleinasiatische Denkmäler aus Pisidien, Pamphylien, Kappadokien und Lykien*. Leipzig.
- Said E. W. 2006, *Şarkiyatçılık: Batı'nın Şark Karşısındaki Siyasi, Entelektüel ve Ahlaki Egemenlik Pratiği*. Trans. B. Üner. Istanbul.
- Strzygowski J. 1901, *Orient oder Rom: Beiträge zur Geschichte der spätantiken und frühchristlichen Kunst*. Leipzig.
- Szemethy H. 2011, "Archaeology and Cultural Politics: Ottoman-Austrian Relations". Eds. Z. Bahrani, Z. Çelik & E. Eldem, *Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753-1914*. Istanbul, 331-375.
- Trigger B. G. 1984, "Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist". *MAN* 19/3, 355-370.
- Trigger B. G. 2006, *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge.

Internet Sources

- Catalogus Professorum Halensis 2026, "Johannes Ficker". Source: <https://www.catalogus-professorum-halensis.de/fickerjohannes.html> (accessed: 20.05.2026).

* Abbreviations of epigraphical editions and reference works follow the "Liste des abréviations des éditions et ouvrages de référence pour l'épigraphie grecque alphabétique (GrEpiAbbr – Version 03, Septembre 2024)" developed by the *Association Internationale d'Épigraphie Grecque et Latine*.