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Résumé. Paul Schröder (1844-1915), orientaliste allemand, a d’abord travaillé comme dragoman (interprète) pour l’ambassade impériale allemande à Constantinople, puis comme consul et consul général à Beyrouth (1869-1909). Pendant ce long séjour en Orient, il effectua de nombreux voyages en Asie Mineure, Syrie, Cis- et Transjordanie, mais également à Chypre. Ses deux voyages à Chypre (1870 et 1873) sont partiellement connus, surtout le second, sommairement publié sous forme de lettres de Schröder au géographe allemand Heinrich Kiepert. En revanche ses archives, pour autant qu’elles sont préservées, sont passée inaperçues jusqu’à présent. À la Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek de Jéna sont en effet conservées des archives Schröder contenant de nombreux documents liés à ses voyages, également ceux à Chypre. Nous avons choisi de présenter ici trois aspects étroitement liés aux voyages chypriotes de Schröder ; mais ces considérations sont sans rapport direct avec ses cahiers de notes et ses journaux de voyage, qu’il est prévu d’éditer et de publier en tenant compte de leur contexte. Ce premier aperçu devrait néanmoins donner une idée de l’intérêt pluridisciplinaire de ce genre d’études d’archives.

Introduction

The name Paul Schröder may be randomly familiar to people with a keen interest in late Ottoman Cyprus or in 19th century travel accounts on the island. He should be further known to specialists of the Phoenician language since this was the subject of his initial academic career (cf. infra). However, due to a rather complete absence of related publications, the real value of his travels to Cyprus has remained largely unknown to date. As it turns out, rather substantial archival material related to various travel activities of Schröder is preserved at the Thüringer Universitäts– und Landesbibliothek (ThULB) in Jena (Thuringia).¹ The present contribution aims at giving a first idea of these documents,

* Several persons contributed to the research while preparing this contribution, Dr. Uwe Dathe and his colleagues from the Thüringer Universitäts– und Landesbibliothek at Jena in the first place. Will M. Kennedy (Erlangen) kindly corrected and edited the English text.

¹ ThULB NL Schröder, Paul. I became aware of this thanks to a request by Robert Merrillees about three years ago who was looking for the archives of Paul Schröder (for his contribution about Cypriot antiquities in Istanbul: Merrillees 2017), which we then were able to localise in Jena. His interest was, among other things, related to the photography of the colossal Bes statue that is also discussed below.
as far as they concern the island of Cyprus, and to illustrate them with a few examples. However, the totality of the Cyprus related material needs much more investigation and shall be the subject of forthcoming publications.

Gustav Albert Paul Schröder was born February 1st 1844 in Elsterwerda (Saxony).\(^2\) After attending the Latin school in Halle/Saale, he studied history and Oriental languages at the universities of Halle and Berlin. In 1867 he was promoted Dr. Phil. in Halle on account of a dissertation entitled “De linguae Phoenicae proprietatibus”. From this work stems the publication of a book *Die phönizische Sprache. Entwurf einer Grammatik nebst Sprach- und Schriftproben. Mit einem Anhang enthaltend eine Erklärung der punischen Stellen im Pönulus des Plautus* (Halle 1869), a book that is still quoted by specialists of the Phoenician language including those dealing with Cyprus.\(^3\) In the same year he entered the diplomatic services of the Prussian kingdom, becoming the German Empire shortly afterwards, as a dragoman (interpreter) at the general consulate/embassy in Constantinople; a position he held until 1882. From 1882 to 1885 he served as consul in Beirut and from then until 1888 again as a dragoman of the German embassy in Constantinople. He seemingly was not happy to have been ordered to return to Constantinople and his file in the political archives of the German Foreign Ministry in Berlin shows that he intensively tried to get back to his former position as a consul or a similar position.\(^4\) This occurred in 1888 when he was appointed consul general for Syria with residence in Beirut, a position he held until his retirement in 1909 when he and his family returned to Germany, first to Berlin and later to Jena, where he died on October 13, 1915. As a fun fact, one can add that Paul Schröder (as German consul general in Beirut) has a kind of cameo appearance as secondary character in the historical novel *Abschied von Sansibar* by the Swiss writer Hans-Rudolf Lehmann (aka Lukas Hartmann).\(^5\)

During the 40 years he spent in Constantinople and Beirut, Schröder travelled extensively. Best known are two detailed trips to Cyprus in 1870 and 1873. Particularly the latter journey is well known because Schröder reported his travel experiences in

---

2. For a short biography of Schröder see Pohlsander 2007; Pohlsander 2004.

3. Giusfredi 2018, p. 111 n. 3; Amadasi Guzzo 2015, p. 29-32. Indeed, Schröder had already dealt with inscriptions from Cyprus in his book: Schröder 1869, p. 227-232. Of course, in the book of 1869 he had to do so without autopsy of these inscriptions. This is also true for the Greek-Phoenician bilingual dealt with in the contributions by Giusfredi 2018 and Amadasi Guzzo 2015 (Schröder 1869, p. 156-157 n. 1, p. 232 pl. V 5). Nevertheless, on his second trip to Cyprus in 1873, Schröder went to Larnaka tis Lapithou and copied both inscriptions himself. Consequently, he reported his readings to Kiepert (Globus 33/34, 1878, p. 136; cf. infra n. 6) and in the notebooks of the 1873 trip, both parts can be found as sketches (ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 12, 1 fol. 18r).


5. Hartmann 2013, p. 20. 42-43. 133. 177-181. 254; the acquaintance of Schröder with the family of Emily Ruete (born Salme bin Said bin Sultan, princess of Oman and Zanzibar) can be considered historic since she was living in Beirut for several years and her son, Said Ruete (later Rudolph Said-Ruete) was serving at the German Imperial consulate in Beirut under Schröder for one year in 1894-95: Said-Ruete 1932, p. 27; Donzel 1993, p. 97-101. 111-112.
several letters to the famous geographer Heinrich Kiepert (1818-1899) who published them in the 1878 issue of the periodical *Globus.* This marks the same year when Kiepert published a map of Cyprus (cf. *infra*), when public interest in Cyprus was temporarily at its highest, following the British acquisition of the island. On several occasions, Schröder published shorter articles about inscriptions he had seen in Cyprus, or inscriptions he saw elsewhere, but with a Cypriot provenance. However, these contributions are hardly known today. On many occasions, his shorter and longer travels led him to various places

---


7. Schröder 1872; Schröder 1880; Schröder 1881 (some of the inscriptions Schröder had not seen himself, but squeezes and sketches were sent to him by Demetrios Pierides and Max Ohnefalsch-Richter).


9. In addition to the contributions quoted supra n. 3, one can add f. ex. Bombardieri, Cannavò 2016, p. 45-46.
in Asia Minor, Syria, Lebanon, Judaea and Transjordan. He usually kept diaries from his trips with *itineraria*, descriptions and sketches. These elements, together with preparatory information he collected, including maps, geographical, economical, climatic and other information about the regions he planned to travel, form the bulk of his archives in Jena. In addition to his personal interest for antiquities (especially, but not exclusively, for inscriptions), he meticulously observed geography, topography, climate, flora and fauna. For his accounts, he was using compass, thermometer and barometer, but he seems not to have been a photographer. Nevertheless, from several trips, he had photographs taken by other people. Unfortunately this seems not be true for Cyprus. On some photographs resulting from a trip to Transjordan in 1898 and taken by Gottlieb Schumacher, Schröder is depicted together with fellow travellers and these seem to be the only known photographs of him so far (Fig. 1). Therefore, in these pictures he was 54 years old, while during his trips to Cyprus he was 26 and 29, respectively.

On some occasions, his own, private, scientific interest during his travels overlapped with those of the wider interests of his employer, the German Empire. For instance, when he travelled to Transjordan in 1905, including a visit to the Nabataean city of Petra, he spent considerable time visiting – and using – parts of the Hedjaz Railway that were currently under construction or just finished. Although the Hedjaz Railway was officially built under the sole responsibility of the Ottoman Empire (contrary, for instance, to the Baghdad Railway), German engineers played an important role in its construction and the German government had obvious strategic interests in the enterprise. As far as it can be deduced from the diaries and notes, his two trips to Cyprus were much less related to official purposes. The archives in Jena contain different elements related to Schröder’s visits to Cyprus in 1870 and 1873 respectively. For both travels there are preparatory elements, such as older maps copied by Schröder’s hand and many excerpts from older publications dealing with the island as well as press clippings, schedules of ships attending Cyprus etc. For his own records, Schröder apparently used notebooks that he filled directly while travelling, using a pencil. The writing in these notebooks often is rather careless indicating that it was really produced on the spot. His diary entries obviously were written after the respective trips and in a clearly more careful handwriting, mostly using an ink pen. For some portions of the 1873 trip, both elements are preserved and can be directly compared (Figs. 2-3). In most cases it is not clear how much later the diaries

10. *The complete picture of which Fig. 1 is a close up, showing the ruins of Jerash from the north,* was published in Schumacher 1902, p. 125 fig. 1.


13. *The sketches on Figs. 2-3 represent the bridge over the Gialias river near the village of Pirogi (Pyroi), a crucial point on the highly important Larnaca-Nicosia road. The bridge sketched by*
Figure 2. Two pages from Paul Schröder’s notebooks of his 1873 trip to Cyprus describing and illustrating his way from Larnaca to Nicosia, passing over a bridge near the village of Pirogi (Piroy, etc.). ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 12, 1 fol. 4v. 5r.

Figure 3. A page from Paul Schröder’s diary of his 1873 trip to Cyprus describing and illustrating his way from Larnaca to Nicosia, passing over a bridge near the village of Pirogi (Piroy, etc.). ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 7, 2 fol. 16r.
were written. At least as far as the letters to Kiepert are concerned, they were written after Schröder had returned to Constantinople (cf. below) and it cannot be completely excluded that the same is true for the diaries. In any case, for the 1873 trip the carefully written diary is covering only the period from March 11 to March 14 on 36 pages, while the two notebooks for the same trip fill some 300 pages and cover the period from March 13 to April 20 with some days missing, especially between April 14 and April 20. The situation seems to be inversely different for the 1870 trip: In this case two diaries (called *itineraria* by Schröder) filling some 175 pages and covering the period March 4 to April 11 are preserved in Jena, while no notebooks could be identified so far.

Schröder was replaced in 1893 by a new iron bridge: Markides 2014, p. 59-60; Jeffery 1918, p. 182; Bellamy 1903, p. 20, 21, 45. Schröder passed there on March 13th 1873 on his way from Larnaca to Nicosia. This is likely to be the same bridge mentioned in Ohnefalsch-Richter 1913, p. 339 as being the only existing major bridge in the island in 1878, dating to the “Medieval” period, and again the same called by Baker 1879, p. 57 a “Turkish” bridge.

14. According to the letters published in Globus, Schröder landed in Larnaca on March 11, started his travels across the island on March 13. The last date mentioned in Globus is April 14 (Globus 33/34, 1878, p. 185). Since Schröder writes that he returned the following day to Larnaca (April 15), we can assume that he spent some days in Larnaca before leaving the island. This is confirmed by the entries in the notebooks, where the last pages mainly concern Larnaca and its immediate surroundings.

15. At present, it cannot be excluded that some of the unbound scrap pages with notes and sketches actually belong to the 1870 trip. However, further investigations are needed in order to be able to report more precisely on them.

Figure 4. A page from Paul Schröder’s notebooks of his 1873 trip to Cyprus sketching villages, distances and directions between Ktima (Nea Paphos) and Polis. ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 12, 1 fol. 73r.
Despite the fact that the notebooks and diaries contain much more information that could easily be dealt with separately, such as the precise location of L. P. di Cesnola’s excavations at Golgoi as well as some of the objects found there,\textsuperscript{16} it seems more satisfying to edit and publish them as units as they are preserved. Therefore, for this short contribution, we shall focus on some elements that have already lost their initial context of Schröder’s travel accounts, or do not belong to them directly.

I. The map of Cyprus

One of Schröder’s important contributions to the knowledge about Cyprus was his collaboration with the above-mentioned geographer Heinrich Kiepert in order to create a new map of the island. As becomes particularly clear from the letters Schröder had sent to Kiepert from his second trip to the island in 1873, his routes were partially defined by Kiepert’s desiderata in order to complete his knowledge about the exact position of villages or about the distances between villages etc. Schröder’s notebooks are full of sketches and scraps that clearly served the subsequent drawing of maps (Fig. 4).

In this respect, a letter preserved in Jena is of particular interest.\textsuperscript{17} It was written by the notorious Luigi Palma di Cesnola\textsuperscript{18} and is dated Larnaca, November 16\textsuperscript{th}, 1875:\textsuperscript{19}

“Consulat des Etats-Unis en Chypre,
Larnaca le 16 Nov 1875.
Cher Docteur
C’est depuis longtemps que je n’ai eu le plaisir de savoir de vos nouvelles. J’avais le désir de vous écrire mais j’étais tellement occupé dans mes explorations et dans la préparation de mon livre sur l’île de Chypre que je n’ai rien pu faire. On m’a écrit de Berlin ou de Leipsig que vous allez bientot publier un livre aussi sur cette île – J’espère / que vous m’en enverrez une copie n’est ce pas? Et la carte de Chypre quand serat elle publiée?
Pourrais je m’en procurer une ou deux copies bientôt? Je vous serai obligé si vous pouvez me donner quelques renseignements sur cette affaire, car je me servirai de cette carte pour mon livre – Je vais commencer quelques fouilles ici a Kition ou Citium dans le meme endroit où j’ai trouvé les inscriptions pheniciennes que vous avez publié.\textsuperscript{20} Si j’en trouverai d’autres comme c’est bien probable vous aurez les premiers estampages.
Le Dr. Siegismund va bientot arriver ici en Chypre selon ce qu’il m écrit.\textsuperscript{21}


\textsuperscript{17} ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 7, Mappe 2, fol. 29r – fol. 30r.

\textsuperscript{18} On Cesnola see (selection): Bombardieri 2015; Marangou 2000; Mc Fadden 1971.

\textsuperscript{19} Cesnola’s letter is transcribed without corrections. Obviously, he was no friend of French accents and sometimes the French phrases are quite close to Italian wording, Cesnola’s mother tongue. Nevertheless, his French is good and easily understandable.

\textsuperscript{20} Schröder 1872; in his contribution, Schröder refers to a previous publication of these inscriptions by Emil Rödiger (Rödiger 1870) that is insufficient due to the bad quality of the used squeezes.

\textsuperscript{21} The German philologist Justus Siegismund, who died after falling in the tombs of Amathus in 1876: Violaris 2002; Masson 1987; Lier 1892; Cesnola 1877, p. 271, 348.
Figure 5. Map from an article about Luigi Palma di Cesnola’s discoveries in Cyprus, published on page 38 of the Supplement to Harper’s Weekly of January 13th 1877.

Figure 6. Map of Cyprus by Heinrich Kiepert with information by Paul Schröder, published in Cesnola 1877.
Adieu cher Docteur
Croyez à mes sentiments d'amitié.
Tout à vous
LP di Cesnola”

Cesnola’s motivation for writing to Schröder is quite obvious: He was about to publish his book “Cyprus: Its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples” and needed a good map of the island. Apparently, during all the period Cesnola was excavating in Cyprus and occasionally publishing accounts of his findings, providing the audience with a reliable map of the island was not his main concern. For example, in an article about Cesnola’s activities that was published on January 13th 1877 in the Supplement to Harper’s Weekly, a random map of Cyprus is used (Fig. 5) that shows some serious mistakes both in terms of topography as well as in naming modern and ancient places (Idarium for Idalium, Gotgos for Golgos etc.). Obviously, Cesnola was looking for a better map and since he had met Schröder upon the latter’s visits to Cyprus, he must have been aware of the map that Kiepert was preparing with the help of Schröder. As far as preserved, there is no reply or other item related to Cesnola’s request in Paul Schröder’s archives in Jena, but Schröder must have responded positively and directed Cesnola to Kiepert as the published book (1877) contains a map of Cyprus (Fig. 6) that bears the legend “A Map of Cyprus, reduced from the coast survey by Captn. Graves, the interior from a map constructed after the itineraries of Dr. P. Schroeder by Dr. H. Kiepert Prof. Berlin Univ. 1877”.

One year later, nota bene the year of the beginning of British administration of Cyprus, the official map by Kiepert was published (Fig. 7). Clearly, this map was a remarkable progress for the geography and topography of the island as becomes clear from contemporary appreciations. The high demand for a reliable map at the time, especially of the interior of the island, can be observed from Löher’s rather dramatic account how difficult it was to obtain such information in 1875.

22. Cesnola 1877.
23. One can ask why Cesnola did not use some of the available – and better – maps, for instance de Mas Latrie’s map of 1862 (Stylianou 1980, p. 152-153, 414 no. 211).
25. Cf. Stylianou 1980, p. 153, 416 no. 216; the edition of 1877, as mentioned in Stylianou 1980, p. 416, is not known to me, with the exception of the map as used by Cesnola 1877. Since the copy of Kiepert’s map held in the collection of the Berlin State Library (formerly in the royal Prussian collection) has an ugly spot of red ink spoiling part of it, the reproduced copy here derives from Yale’s Beinecke Rare Books & Manuscript Library.
Figure 7. Map of Cyprus by Heinrich Kiepert, realised with the information provided by Paul Schröder.
Yale University, Beinecke Rare Books & Manuscript Library, 509 1878, https://brbl-dl.library.yale.edu/vufind/Record/4171226

Figure 8. Map of Cyprus by Paul Schröder, realised in 1871; unpublished.
ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 7, 2 fol. 78r.
explicitly states Schröder’s cooperation: “The greater part of the routes in the interior are constructed from careful observations, made during two journeys in 1870 and 73 by Dr. Paul Schroeder, first interpreter of the Imp. German Embassy at Constantinople”. Indeed, several elements show that Schröder actively contributed to the creation of Kiepert’s map. As already mentioned, he had taken numerous notes for almost every single part of his trips in Cyprus allowing the cartographer to precisely structure the interior of the island (Fig. 4). Furthermore, after his first trip, Schröder had realised a map of his own (Fig. 8). The vignette says that the map was drawn by Dr. Paul Schröder in 1871. To date, we can assume that the pink dotted lines should represent Schröder’s trips in Cyprus in the year 1870. Compared to Kiepert’s map of 1878, there is still quite some information lacking in Schröder’s map of 1871, confirming, therefore, the hypothesis that the second trip of 1873 served the collection of additional information. Probably a kind of intermediate state is also present in Jena in form of a partially preserved map showing roughly the western half of the island (Fig. 9). According to the legend, it is a “Compilation of all existing topographical data, preferably after the English costal map, Unger & Kotschy, and the unedited drawings of Cerrutti (in the Royal Library at Berlin, from L. Roß’ and C. Ritter’s estates), as well as Drummond’s map of 1745 and Mas Latrie’s sketch. By H. Kiepert”. It seems that this served Schröder as a working tool in order for him to complete with the information collected on his trips. And indeed, there are different layers of information in different colours on the map (Fig. 9): ink pen, pink, and pencil, at least the pencil should correspond to Schröder’s additional information or corrections. There is also a pencil drawn map, most probably of Schröder’s hand (Fig. 10) that is one of four sheets, covering the complete island and being yet another intermediate state towards the final map as published in 1878.

What becomes clear from all of this, is the truly important and valuable part that Paul Schröder played in the realisation of Kiepert’s map that, in its own right, was a major achievement. As a matter of fact, this was the best map of Cyprus until Horatio H. Kitchener’s detailed map was published in 1885. Still, one has to bear in mind that Kitchener’s map was completed with the help of the entire survey department of the newly established British administration of Cyprus, while Kiepert’s map was mainly the result of two enthusiasts’ painstaking work. How close the cooperation between the two men must have been can be deduced by the systematic route-sketches Schröder produced during his trips in Cyprus, especially in the 1870 notebooks (Fig. 4). These show a very similar technique as the one used by Kiepert in his notebooks during a trip to Palestine.
and Transjordan in 1870.\textsuperscript{31} Also, some sketched topographical views by Schröder closely resemble similar ones by Kiepert.\textsuperscript{32}

Last, we have to add a few words about Heinrich Kiepert and Cyprus. The map that was finally published in 1878 was not Kiepert’s first occupation with the island. In Kiepert’s archives, preserved at the State Library in Berlin, there is a small, hand-drawn map of Cyprus, bearing the legend “Cyprus[,] for Prof. C. Ritter designed by H. Kiepert[,] 1844” (Fig. 11).\textsuperscript{33} To date, it was not yet possible to precisely state for which of the many works Kiepert carried out for Carl (or Karl) Ritter (1779–1859), one of the founding-fathers of scientific geography,\textsuperscript{34} this map of Cyprus was drawn. One could think of Kiepert’s “Atlas of Hellas and the Hellenic Colonies”, first published in 1846.\textsuperscript{35} However, the map of Cyprus in the atlas is an attempt of illustrating the islands ancient (= antique) topography and it is far inferior to the level the map of contemporary Cyprus shows (Fig. 11).\textsuperscript{36} The comments to that map specify the consulted sources, complain about their incompleteness and refer to the prospect of an improved version after a trip to Cyprus planned by Kiepert.\textsuperscript{37} This, however, seems not to have occurred since in the improved second edition five years later the map appeared unchanged and without further comment.\textsuperscript{38} Finally, in the “New atlas of Hellas and the Hellenic Colonies” that was published in 1872, there is an updated version of the map of ancient Cyprus that comes much closer to Fig. 11, although it is focussing on the ancient topography of the island as did the previous versions.\textsuperscript{39} In the comments to this map, one can read that it is based on Mas-Latrie’s sketch and that it is hoped that the publication of Dr. Schröder’s travel accounts of his trip of 1870 will contribute to a remarkable improvement of the situation.\textsuperscript{40} In consequence, it seems

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31} Zögner 1999, p. 51, 53, 55, 57.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Zögner 1999, p. 72 fig. 9.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Kart. D 5960 Vs (Cypern[,] für Prof. C. Ritter entworfen von H. Kiepert[,] 1844); published in b/w in K. Lenz, “Heinrich Kiepert – seine Stellung und Bedeutung in der Geographie”, in Zögner 1999, p. 20.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Lenz 1981; Zögner 1979.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Kiepert 1846.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Ibid. pl. XX 2.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Ibid. the comments to pl. XX in the “Zweites Heft”: “… für das Innere von Kypros konnten nur die Reiseberichte von Pockocke, Niebuhr, Olivers, Masiti (sic!), Kinneir, Leake, Hammer, Richter, alles höchst unvollständige Quellen, benutzt werden, so daß hier noch viel zu thun bleibt, wie auch die schätzbare Bearbeitung der alten Geographie von Kypros in dem neuesten Werke darüber: Kypros, eine Monographie von W. Engel, Berlin 1841, zeigt, – Lücke, die ich auf meiner bevorstehenden Reise zu vervollständigen denke…”.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Kiepert 1851, pl. XX 2.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Kiepert 1872, pl. 12.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Ibid., Vorbericht“ p. 6, comments on pl. 12: “Kypros konnte bei mangelnder, aus den älteren Reiseberichten nicht zu gewinnender Detailkenntniss, nur nach der kleinen, aus Mas-Latrie’s Entwurf hervorgegangenen, in der Müller’ schen Ausgabe der Geographi Graeci Minores (Paris bei Didot) veröffentlichten Karte, berichtet durch die neue englische Küstenaufnahme, gezeichnet werden: eine gründliche Verbesserung der Kartographie dieser Insel steht durch die Veröffentlichung von Dr. Schröder’s Bericht über seine Forschungsreise im Frühjahre 1870 in naher Aussicht”.
\end{itemize}
Figure 9. Part of a map of Cyprus showing the western half of the island, realised by Heinrich Kiepert in preparation of the map fig. 7; unpublished. ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 7, 2 fol. 60r.

Figure 10. Part of a map of Cyprus showing the western part of the island, probably realised by Paul Schröder in order to be completed with information from his trips; unpublished. ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 7, 1 fol. 1r.
clear that the map illustrated here as fig. 11 must be an attempt of rendering the modern topography of Cyprus, compiling from the same sources as the ones referred to in note 37. Further, the comments from Kiepert’s 1872 atlas clearly confirm the importance of Schröder’s travels in Cyprus for the cartography of the island.

II. The discovery of the Bes colossus in 1873

It is the merit of Robert S. Merrillees to have drawn, in a detailed way, attention to various aspects of the Cypriot collection in the archaeological museum at Istanbul, formerly the Imperial Ottoman Museum. Within the many and important details of his research, he also reminded of an otherwise forgotten discovery of Olivier Masson, who first drew attention to the fact that Paul Schröder must have been involved in some way in the handling of what must be considered the first photograph of the colossal Bes from Amathus, since 1874 in Istanbul. Indeed, in one of the notes that announced the discovery of the spectacular sculpture, Ernst Curtius had mentioned that a drawing clearly illustrating the Bes still (or again?) laying on the ground (Fig. 12) was “taken after a photography sent by the German consular agent, Mr. P. Vontiziano in Limasol, a keen friend of antiquity, to Dr. Schröder in Constantinople”. Consequently, R. Merrillees

41. Merrillees 2017, p. 49-120 and passim.
43. Hermary 1981, p. 28-31, no. 22. Recent discussions return to the dating of the statue, the traditional late date (3rd c. CE) initially proposed for the Bes from Amathus being questioned, among others, by Hermary 2007 (proposing a late Classical or Hellenistic date and presenting fragments from a second colossal Bes from the agora of Amathus [on these see Tassignon 2009]); cf. Parlasca 2009, passim, esp. 260 for a dating in the early 5th c. BCE; on the date of arrival in Istanbul cf. infra n. 57, 59.
44. Curtius 1874, p. 145: “Sie ist nach einer Photographie gemacht, welche der deutsche Consularagent, Herr P. Vontiziano in Limasol, ein eifriger Freund des Alterthums, an Herrn Dr. Schröder in Constantinopol geschickt hat”.

Figure 11. Map of Cyprus realised by Heinrich Kiepert (for Carl Ritter) in 1844. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, IIIC, Kart. D 5960 Vs.
started looking for the papers of Paul Schröder and was led to the *Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek* from where he was informed that no such photograph exists within the Schröder papers.\(^{45}\) While this information is correct, Jena might not have been the only place to look for the photograph. Since Curtius indicates that the drawing for the *Archäologische Zeitung* (Fig. 12) was realised after the photograph,\(^ {46}\) the person producing the drawing must have been in possession of the photograph, at least temporarily. Since there is no such photograph in Jena, there is thus a good chance that it remained with Curtius or within the archives of the *Archäologische Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, editing the *Archäologische Zeitung*. Unfortunately, the archives of the *Archäologische Gesellschaft zu Berlin* do not contain anything related to the *Archäologische Zeitung* of 1874.\(^ {47}\)

\[
\text{Figure 12. Wood engraving of a colossal Bes statue discovered in 1873 in Amathus (Cyprus).}
\]

From a short contribution by Ernst Curtius after a photograph sent by J. P. P. Vondiziano to Paul Schröder (Curtius 1874, 145).

However, the letter of Vondiziano that accompanied the photograph is still within Schröder’s papers in Jena.

\(^ {45}\) Merrillees 2017, p. 65. In the same time, R. Merrillees’ attempt to localise the photograph can be considered the beginning of contemporary interest in Paul Schröder’s archive for the study of late 19\(^{th}\) century Cyprus; cf. *supra* n. 1.

\(^ {46}\) A common procedure during that period, because the quality of many photographs did not favour their printing in publications and/or because of the elevated costs of printing photographs compared to drawings.

\(^ {47}\) The archives of the *Archäologische Gesellschaft zu Berlin* are kept at the central office of the German Archaeological Institute (DAI) in Berlin; I owe the information about these archives to Johanna Mueller von der Haegen (DAI, Berlin). A next possibility would be to work through Curtius’ papers held at the *Universitätsbibliothek* in Bonn.
Letter of J.P.P. Vondiziano to Paul Schröder:

Limassol 18 Octobre 1873.

Mon très-respectable docteur:
J’ai l’honneur de vous confirmer ma dernière lettre, à présent je me fais un devoir de vous envoyer en inclus une photographie d’une statue d’Hercule trouvée dernièrement à Amathonde. Elle est colossale puisque la tête seule a 1m. 10c. de longueur. La barbe semble assyrienne, mais la statue servait, à ce qu’il paraît, de source; car la tête du lion manque et elle se rattachait au corps de la statue en moyen de deux chevilles. À présent elle est la propriété du Gouvernement bien que le Consul d’Angleterre pretende l’avoir acheté aussitôt trouvée. Veuillez bien je vous prie Monsieur le Docteur me dire si ce cela vaux quelque chose.

J’ai l’honneur d’être avec le plus profond respect
Votre très humble & très obéissant
serviteur
J.P.P. Vondiziano

Monsieur
Monsieur Le Docteur Schröder
Interprète de la Légation Imperiale d’Allemagne &c. &c.
en Constantinople

The letter gives further information confirming the identity of the Vondiziano in question and it confirms in general terms what is already known from other sources. The “consul of Britain” in the letter is likely to be Petros G. Loiso (Loïzou, as well as other variants), as Merrillees was able to show, the British consular agent or British vice-consul in Limassol, according to the different sources dealing with the Bes affair. The letter also confirms that Loiso only pretended to be the owner of the statue, but that it was already in possession of the Ottoman administration. Further, Vondiziano writes that Loiso had bought the statue as soon as it was found. This is an interesting detail, because according to most accounts Loiso claimed to be the owner of the land on which the statue was discovered and, therefore, making it difficult to understand why he would buy the statue. Edhem Eldem drew Robert Merrillees’ attention to a report in the Pall Mall Gazette no. 2735 of November 20th 1873, and according to this account, Loiso had rented the land in question and did indeed pay the workmen that discovered the statue.
Therefore, Vondiziano’s report, despite its regrettable shortness, seems to be correct even in such details. The earliest precise date in connection with the discovery of the colossus is October 11 1873, when Loiso wrote to the acting British consul in Larnaca about the discovery. Vondiziano’s letter to Schröder dates from October 18th, hence exactly a week later. As he writes, this is already his second letter to Schröder, and it can be assumed that the first letter was written immediately upon the discovery and the news of it spreading out.

As is well known, the Ottoman administration was successful in claiming the statue and it was eventually shipped to Constantinople. In a rarely quoted paper about the Bes statue, first published in the newspaper La Turquie in February 1874, Philipp Anton Dethier states that the statue had arrived in Constantinople “last week”. Since I only know this contribution from an extracted version, bound together with other contributions, I was not able to verify the exact date of the publication, and, hence, of the statue’s arrival in Constantinople. No matter what one may think about the scientific value of Dethier’s paper about the Bes, for the author it must have been a real pleasure to write in detail about the statue that was so heavily disputed as to whom it belongs and to which museum it shall be sent. Although not involved in the Bes issue from its beginning, even the notorious Luigi Palma di Cesnola tried to muscle in. As a consequence, a conflict arose between Dethier and Cesnola, also because the two men fought over the export of Cesnola’s collection in the same year of 1874 and Dethier being significantly responsible for the “donation” of a substantial part of that collection to the Imperial Ottoman Museum. No surprise then, that Cesnola’s appreciation of both the Museum in Constantinople and its director was quite limited. In the same edition of Harper’s Weekly Supplement of January 13, 1877 that made use of the map illustrated here as Fig. 5, Cesnola wrote about the Bes: “Nevertheless, during my absence from Cyprus in 1873

---

56. As analyses of other correspondences of the late 19th century from Cyprus with the rest of the world indicate, there used to be a weekly postal ship connecting the island. Therefore, letters usually were written in order to be just on time on the postal ship. If this assumption is correct, and Vondiziano wrote his letter of October 18th on time to be shipped the same or the next day, then his first letter should date from approx. October 11th (in order to reach the previous ship) and, therefore, written more or less immediately after the whole Bes issue started. From the vivid account in Magda Ohnefalsch-Richter’s book (Ohnefalsch-Richter 1913, p. 339-341), one would conclude that under Ottoman administration the postal ships reached the island only every 14 days (ibid., p. 340: “Unter der Türkei liefen Österreichische Lloydschiffe die Insel nur alle vierzehn Tage und nur Larnaka an und gab es überhaupt kein Postamt”); dito Seiff 1875, p. 65; cf. also Aymes 2014, p. 61-64.
58. It is a bound book from the library of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens.
59. Merrillees 2017, p. 62 is more precise, giving the week of February 16th.
60. For details s. Merrillees 2017, p. 62-64.
fragments of a colossal statue, cut out of the calcareous stone of the island, were exhumed there [Amathus]. Its style is very archaic. The head has a beard trimmed after the Assyrian fashion. It holds a lion without a head by the hind-legs. It has all the appearance of being the titular divinity of Amathus, namely, “Melkart,” the Phoenician Hercules (probably used at a later period for decorating a public fountain, as the head of the lion was cut, and a square hole pierced through the neck of the animal for the introduction of a metal pipe). After great deal of official correspondence between the British consul at this place, who pretended to have claims upon that monument, and the Governor-General of the island, the latter got the best of the argument, and at a cost of nearly $500 in gold it was shipped to Constantinople, and is now deposited in the “Imperial Ottoman Museum of St. Irene;” but really it is an irony to hear called by such high-sounding names a dirty, small magazine of antiquities without any order or classification, and in the middle of which stand ten or twelve drums belonging once to the ferocious soldiers called Janissaries, destroyed by Sultan Mahmoud half a century ago. Dr. Dethier, a German scholar, who has been appointed director of the so-called museum with a high-salary, and whose duty, as he told me, amounts next to nothing, has published the colossal figure above named in an illustrated newspaper of the Turkish capital; he believes it to represent Bacchus.”

The interesting question as to Vondiziano’s motivation for writing the letter to Schröder is likely to remain unanswered, since there are no other elements related to the Bes issue in Schröder’s papers. Obviously, the two men knew each other; they must have met during at least one of Schröder’s visits to the island, the second one dating back only a few months before the discovery of the colossus. Vondiziano was generally interested in antiquities, not only from the Limassol area but also well into the area of Paphos. But why does he ask Schröder about the value of the Bes, especially since the statue was already in the hands of the Ottoman administration? Did Vondiziano hope to interest the Germans to enter the ring as well in order to obtain the statue? In any case, this did not happen; with exception of the agitation by Loiso and Cesnola, there were no serious attempts to dispute the Ottoman authorities’ claims to the statue.

In a short contribution about Phoenician inscriptions from Kition, published in 1881, Schröder briefly mentions the “colossal image of a bearded deity” found in the ruins of Amathous, without giving any further information as to the place or circumstances of discovery. Moreover, when he refers to a photograph of the statue, it is to “a very good photograph of this statue produced by the photographer Berggren of Constantinople.” There is no word about the picture Vondiziano had sent 8 years before.

63. Schröder 1881, p. 429.
64. Schröder 1881, p. 429, n. 3: “Eine sehr gute Photographie dieser Statue hat der Photograph Berggren in Constantinopel hergestellt”. He is referring to Guillaume (Per Vilhelm) Berggren, a well reputed Swedish photographer (cf. Dewitz 1988, p. 150; Wigh 1984). This photograph must be considered lost. At least, no corresponding entry could be detected in the detailed lists of known photographs by Berggren put together in Wigh 1984, p. 89-105.
III. Paul Schroeder on Pyla

When reading Paul Schröder’s letters to Heinrich Kiepert, as they were published by the latter in the periodical *Globus*, one can trace the route Schröder accomplished in Cyprus in 1873.\(^{65}\) As already stated, the letters were written after Schröder had returned to Constantinople. Hence, the first letter is dated Constantinople, May 30\(^{th}\) 1873 and describes the beginning of Schröder’s excursions from Larnaca to Nicosia (Levkosia in Schröder’s words) via Peroghi (cf. Figs. 2-3). From there he went to Lapithos, Myrtou, Morfou, Levka towards the remote area of Tillyria. First stop there was Galini, followed by Pyrgos, Kamps and the Kykkos monastery. Then he went on to Prodromos, to the summit of the Troodos, and downwards to Ktima passing through or nearby (among other places) Kilinia, Tsada, Messogi, Anavargo, Lemb. From Ktima the way led to to (in Schröder’s words) Kuklia and Limasol, Amathus, Tochri (for Tochni), West of Stavrovouni, Alambra until Dali. From Dali he went westwards to Pera, down to Levkosia and via Athienou and Golgoi to Larnaca. The second letter was written at Böyükde\(^{66}\) on Juli 30\(^{th}\) 1873. It describes a trip starting at Akanthu, along the coast to Davlo, offering the possibility to climb up to Kantara, and further via Heptakomi and Platanissa to Jalusa. The next chapter\(^{67}\) leads from Jalusa to Rizokarpaso, and via Stylo and Afendrika to Cap Andreas. From there,\(^{68}\) Schröder returned to Rizokarpaso and then further to Galinoporni. In a next letter,\(^{69}\) dated Böyükde\(^{66}\) (sic), August 15\(^{th}\) 1873, he describes the way from Galinoporni to Komagialu/Komajalu, Ag. Theodoros and Trikomo, further via Laphathos to Levkoniko and finally via Vatili, Tremethusia and Kellia to Larnaca.

Looking at these routes, one immediately observes a gap between the end of the first and the beginning of the second letter. At the end of the first, Schröder returned to Larnaca after the lengthy trip that had taken him from there to Nicosia, through the Tillyria, across the Troodos to Ktima, along the coast to Amathus and Dali, again to Lefkosia via Pera and back to Larnaca via Athienou. At the beginning of the second letter, however, he starts at Akanthou on the northern coast and continues describing his tour around the Karpass peninsula before returning to Larnaca. This gap apparently needed an explanation in the eyes of Kiepert as well, and so he added a footnote at the beginning of the second letter, just after the word “Akanthu”, explaining that “Dr. Schröder had reached this place on the northern coast of Cyprus at the beginning of April, coming from Larnaca, via Pyla,

\(^{65}\) In the following, I give only a very summary description of his routes, omitting many villages and places, ruins etc. The aim is simply to show the general sequence. A detailed analysis will be undertaken when studying the complete notebooks.

\(^{66}\) Probably to be read as Böyükde, a quarter of Istanbul.

\(^{67}\) This is part three of the accounts, published in a next issue of *Globus*. But since it bears the same date and place as the previous part two (Böyükde, July 30\(^{th}\) 1873), it is likely from the same letter Schröder had sent to Kiepert.

\(^{68}\) Again, this part is in the next volume of *Globus*, but is clearly the continuation of the previous one and it does not bear a date or place as would be the case with a separate letter.

\(^{69}\) In this case, the letter starts in the middle of the contribution in *Globus*. 
Pergamo, Kóntéa, Prastió, and Levkoniko”. This is exactly the trip that is described in a “letter to Kiepert II” preserved at Jena. It seems as if Schröder had forgotten to send the letter covering the trip between Larnaca and Akanthou, or the pages covering that part from a longer letter.

The letter reads as follows:


Brief an Kiepert II.

Verehrter Herr Professor!

Meinem Versprechen gemäß, beehre ich mich Ihnen in gegenwärtigem Briefe mit meinem vorläufigen Bericht über meine kyprischen Streifzüge fortzufahren.


70. Globus 33/34, 1878, p. 152: “Diesen Ort an der Nordküste Cyperns hatte Dr. Schröder Anfangs April von Larnaka aus über Pyla, Pergamo, Kontéa, Prastió und Levkoniko erreicht”.

71. ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 7, Mappe 2, fol. 45r – fol. 46v.

72. As will be shown, the letter as it is preserved in Jena ends in the middle of the account. In its present state, it does not correspond to a complete letter either.
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Clearly, the most interesting part of this passage is the observations about R. Hamilton Lang’s excavation of a sanctuary at Pyla.73 According to the inscriptions, the sanctuary

---

73. For Lang’s excavations there and the objects he found – as far as they can be identified – s. Masson 1966, p. 11-21; Ulbrich 2008, p. 357-358 KI 13. A new study of the sanctuary aiming at
must have been devoted to Apollon Magirios and Apollon Lakeutes, while the statues that can still be attributed to it indicate the worship of Apollon as well as at least one female deity; based on the iconography of the finds likely to be Artemis. Schröder’s comments are of particular interest, because, as we will see, he had visited the site twice, once in 1870 (when Lang was still living on the island) and again on April 5, 1873 (after Lang had left in 1872), the latter one being the visit he reports to Kiepert. As for the antiquities, in the letter Schröder starts by mentioning tombs in the calcareous mountains around Pyla.

He then continues stating that “here, Mr. Lang had found a mass of statues, mostly of Egyptian style, as well as an astonishing number of small terracotta figures, representing all possible genres (horsemen, small chariots with horses and ladies sitting therein, once a complete procession of chariots, horses, horsemen etc. – presumably everything only toys for children)”. He continues indicating that he visited the findspot, situated 5 minutes from the village. It is clear that this visit means the temenos of Apollon. The question is, however, whether the objects described above can also be attributed to the temenos or whether we have to understand them as having been found in the mentioned tombs.

In his account of the Apollon temenos, Georges Colonna-Ceccaldi also mentions many terracotta figurines, more specifically dancing priestesses. It may therefore be quite securely assumed that all objects described by Schröder should be attributed to the Apollon sanctuary. He mentions Egyptian style statues in the same sentence as the terracotta figurines, and it is unlikely to suppose quantities of (stone) statues being discovered in the tombs although such discoveries are not mentioned elsewhere (Colonna-Ceccaldi, Ohnefalsch-Richter etc.). If this assumption is correct, Schröder’s account gives precious additional iconographical information of the votives in the Pyla sanctuary, since nobody else describes them in such detail.

His description of the well-built stone structure, which he refers to as a cistern, can be roughly paralleled with Colonna-Ceccaldi’s report of stone built architecture. Of further
interest are his observations of many fragmented statues that he compares with specimens of the Cesnola collection, including references to the catalogue of Johannes Doell,\textsuperscript{79} and adding that they would well adorn any museum despite their fragmentary condition. He finally discusses some inscriptions that he had seen and copied in the courtyard of Lang’s Tchiflik at Pyla. This raises the question whether indeed this was happening in 1873, since Lang had left the island in the year before and partially sold the Pyla finds to European Museums, such as the British Museum and the Louvre, or gave them to Cesnola. With some exceptions, all this already occurred in 1872.\textsuperscript{80} Although it cannot be completely excluded that Cesnola might have left the antiquities given to him by Lang in Pyla before exporting them on his own, in my opinion it is more likely that Schröder combined information from 1870 and 1873 when writing about Pyla to Kiepert. In his letter, he mentions several Greek inscriptions and one in Cypriot characters. So far, no sketches or drawings of the Greek inscriptions could be found in documents related to the 1873 trip. However, he made a sketch of two of these inscriptions in his 1870 diary (Fig. 13).\textsuperscript{81} At this point things start getting complicated, because it seems that Schröder’s informations do not correspond with the only account that is roughly contemporary: the one by Georges Colonna-Ceccaldi.\textsuperscript{82} Schröder speaks of “several Greek inscriptions, of which two (on altars) were devoted to ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ ΜΑΓΕΙΡΙΩΙ (in the other written ΜΑΓΙΡΙΩΙ)... One of the two altars stems from a ΜΝΑΣΙΑΣΙΠΝΥΤΙΛΟΥ and a third one from a ΦΙΛΑΙΜΕΝΕΣΠΝΥΤΙΛΟΥ”. So, Schröder describes three “altars”, two with dedications to Apollon Magirios. One of these was dedicated by Mnasias, son of Pnytilos, while a third one, without mention of Apollon Magirios, was dedicated by a Philaimenes, son of Pnytilos. This does correspond to the sketches from 1870 (Fig. 13), showing two blocks with Greek inscriptions. The text says: “At the farm of Mr. Lang I also found the following 2 inscriptions: 1 On a block, in shape of an altar [sketch with ΦΙΛΑΙΜΕΝΕΣΠΝΥΤΙΛΟΥ]; 2. [sketch with ΜΝΑΣΙΑΣΙΠΝΥΤΙΛΟΥ/ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ ΜΑΓΙΡΙΩΙ]”. In addition, some dimensions of the blocks are given. Before discussing them, there is a small detail further

\textsuperscript{79} Doell 1873. Therefore, Schröder must have had access to Doell’s work, only a few weeks after it was published, given that the letter to Kiepert dates from July 19th 1873.

\textsuperscript{80} Masson 1966, p. 13-14. 23 with further references. Objects from Lang’s excavations at Pyla entered the Louvre on March 7 and July 4, 1872, as well as in 1874: Hermary 1989, p. 20. Not all items were sold directly by Lang, some through art dealers such as Hoffmann in Paris. The items in the British Museum were inventoried in 1872: Masson 1966, p. 14 n. 7. The most spectacular object, the over-lifesize statue now in Vienna, had left the island already in 1871 and arrived in Vienna in 1872: Bernhard-Walcher 1999, p. 30-32, Masson 1966, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{81} ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 13, fol. 32v.

\textsuperscript{82} Colonna-Ceccaldi 1874, p. 91-92 = Colonna-Ceccaldi 1882, p. 198-200; cf. the comments by Masson 1966, p. 19-21. Colonna-Ceccaldi was attached to the French consulate in Beirut from September 1866 to October 1871 when he returned to France. His frequent visits to Cyprus certainly gave him the occasion to follow the progress of Lang’s excavations at Pyla, but his account was published only five years later in 1874. Hence, the situation is comparable to that of Schröder who had visited Pyla a first time only shortly after Lang’s excavation and a second time three years later, shortly before the letter to Kiepert was written.
confirming the hypothesis that Schröder was partially relying on his 1870 diary when composing the 1873 letter to Kiepert: The sketch from 1870 clearly shows the lunar sigma C at the end of ΦΙΑΙΜΕΝΕΣ (cf. Fig. 13), as indicated by Colonna-Ceccaldi as well. However, in the letter to Kiepert three years later, he first wrote the lunar sigma C before correcting into the normal Σ. Upon copying from the 1870 diary, he probably no longer trusted his sketch and decided to write the regular sigma. Other differences with Colonna-Ceccaldi concern both inscriptions. In the inscription of Philaimenes, Schröder gives the Pi of the fathers name with a shorter right leg (as in the other inscription), while Colonna-Ceccaldi does not. Further, on the other inscription, Schröder indicates only the first letter in the upper line (M) as missing while he indicates the first letter of the lower line (A) as existing. Colonna-Ceccaldi states that both are missing. At the end of the two lines, Schröder does not indicate the final Y in the upper line, but has the final I in the lower, Colonna-Ceccaldi gives the inverse (Y present, I absent). The most important difference is, however, that Colonna-Ceccaldi indicates these two inscriptions as being

84. For Masson 1966, p. 20, Colonna-Ceccaldi’s combination of lunar sigma and Pi with two equally long legs indicates a later date.
written on the same block, one on the front and the other on the right side (as seen from the front). Schröder seems to write (and draw) of two separate blocks. Colonna-Ceccaldi describes the block as being square at its base with each side 54 cm long. On three sides there is a slight inclination towards the top, while the rear is straight, which (for him) indicated that the rear side was posited against a wall. In any case, this description so far would support Schröder’s drawing of his block 1, where he indicated a upper width of 52 cm (hence, only slightly less than Colonna-Ceccaldi gives for the base) and a height of 70 cm (again corresponding well to Colonna-Ceccaldi’s 69 cm). The drawing and dimensions of Schröder’s second block, however, do not fit at all. The length of 62 cm is far too long, and neither his sketch nor the text make any hint of the two blocks belonging together. Another difference concerns the position of the inscriptions on the block(s). Colonna-Ceccaldi distinguishes the base properly, a small strip of 6.5 cm (probably of height, although he calls it “largeur”, width), and a kind of cornice or crowning on top, measuring 12.5 cm in height. So far, this would roughly fit Schröder’s sketch of block 1, but Colonna-Ceccaldi places the letters on the strip, while Schröder draws them on the crowning. As exposed above, for 1870 we have Schröder’s diaries, but so far not the notebooks. Hence, he must have first transcribed the sketches and subsequently the text from his (not preserved) notebooks to the diaries.85 We also cannot exclude that some information was lost or mixed up. On the other hand, Schröder was an experienced specialist in epigraphy and one should trust him of being able to proper sketch blocks and letters. The dimensions of the second block seem not to concord with any of the other blocks mentioned by Colonna-Ceccaldi, so the mystery remains unsolved for the time being.

85. As is indicated by the dimensions of the two blocks on Fig. 13 that were added in pencil, probably at yet a later state than the transcription that is done with ink pen.
As for the syllabic inscription, no trace was found in the 1870s documents so far, but it is copied at the end of the second notebook for the 1873 trip (Fig. 14). While it is without narrative context, it clearly shows Schröder’s attempts to obtain a good copy of it, since he wrote some lines more than once. This is the inscription that was published in 1876 by Schmidt, indicating that his figure is based on a sketch by Schröder. At least this inscription must have remained on the island after the departure of Lang and it was last seen in 1876 in Larnaca.

In conclusion, the three different but in the end related aspects presented here from Paul Schröder’s legacy clearly show the interest of further detailed analyses. Moreover, one has to bear in mind that his papers in Jena contain other interesting aspects of his travels in Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Transjordan etc. As for Cyprus, there are numerous highly diverse observations ranging from careful notes about folkloric songs up to observations about the economy of the entire island, but also of the different regions and villages. A mass of information concerns aspects of the island’s ancient past and, here, Paul Schröder may indeed become an important eyewitness. He probably is the last known visitor to Cyprus before the beginning of British administration that had such a sound and broad formation in ancient sciences. He came just in time to meet, on the spot, with figures such as Luigi Palma di Cesnola and Robert Hamilton Lang and he had a chance to visit some of their freshly excavated sites giving indications of their precise locations, objects discovered etc. He was a keen observer and copier of inscriptions in Greek, Latin, Phoenician and Cypro-syllabic scripts and, since he was firm in all these languages and scripts, his testimony is likely to fill quite some gaps.

But also in a broader context his testimony about late Ottoman Cyprus is likely to provide important insights as he travelled to – at his times– very distant and isolated places on the island (such as the region of Tillyria) that were hardly ever visited by Europeans before 1878.

Institut für Archäologie, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

86. ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 12, 2, fol. 50r.
87. Schmidt 1876, p. 3-4 pl. VI 2a.
88. Cf. Masson 1983, p. 302-303 no. 304. However, in the notebook of 1873 (Fig. 14) Schröder copied only the inscription, not the shape of the stone. Typically, this would be something he did when writing his notes into the shape of a diary or something like the letters to Kiepert (or to Schmidt).
89. Masson 1983, p. 302 n. 4-5. The date of discovery by Schmidt 1876, p. 3 (April 1873), identified as wrong by Masson, evidently refers to Schröder’s second visit on April 5 1873. But the statement “and still there” could be reliable.
90. For a first, very limited, approach see Schmid, Fiema forthcoming.
91. Globus, 33/34, 1878, p. 136-137.
92. Emile Deschamps, writing about his trips in Cyprus between late 1892 and early 1894 still reports that the inhabitants of the Tillyria region allegedly were “living like animals” (Deschamps 1898, p. 173: “... et dont les habitants sont dits, dans l’île, « vivre comme des animaux. »”); on Deschamp’s travels to Cyprus cf. Frigerio 2000-01; for a more complete approach to the region of Tillyria see Christodoulou, Perdikis 2010.
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