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Abstract. During his trips to Cyprus in 1870 and 1873, the German orientalist and diplomat, Paul Schröder, visited L. Palma di Cesnola’s excavations at Golgoi twice. The first visit, together with Cesnola, took place in spring 1870, very soon after or even during the actual fieldwork. According to his travel notes and diaries, Schröder obtained photographs of the finds during this visit, which he sent to Berlin. This contribution tries to identify these photographs and to put them in the context of the early photographic documentation of Cesnola’s Golgoi finds. It constitutes the fifth chapter on Schröder’s archives, following the ones published by S. G. Schmid in volume 49 (2019) of the Cahiers, and by A. Cannavò and S. G. Schmid in volume 50 (2020).

Introduction

Luigi Palma di Cesnola’s activities in and around ancient Golgoi in the 1870s have been the subject of a series of more recent contributions. The apparent need to discuss these activities
stems from the well-known inaccuracies (to say the least) of Cesnola’s accounts in general. Every additional element related to his activities and finds therefore must be welcomed, especially if it concerns eye-witnesses of the time. Such is the case with Paul Schröder’s descriptions of his visits at Golgoi. He visited the region of Athienou and the excavated sites on two occasions: the first time during his first trip to Cyprus in the spring of 1870, and again in the spring of 1873, during his second trip to Cyprus. It will therefore be important to evaluate whether he really saw one or several of the excavated sites while work was still ongoing. The main element of the present contribution, however, deals with another aspect of Schröder’s visits to Athienou/Golgoi: he refers to photographs of the Golgoi finds that he allegedly sent to Berlin in 1870. If this is true and if these photographs can be identified, they will constitute a very early testimony of objects found by Cesnola in Golgoi, in all likelihood even the first of such documents. As with other documents related to early archaeological activities in Cyprus, the photographs, too, will have to undergo a critical review.

Schröder’s two extended trips to Cyprus have been briefly dealt with in a previous article. For our current purpose, it is important to remember that our main source for the first trip are the carefully edited travel journals of Schröder. As a few pages of his travel notes on the same trip have also survived, we are able to conclude that he made the notes on the spot while travelling (mostly on horse or mule back), while the journal was edited later, when he was comfortably at a writing desk and could even use secondary sources. Although Schröder’s recording and documenting technique must have been the same for his second trip three years later, the material preservation is slightly different: within Schröder’s archive at Jena, only the travel notes survive; the journals do not. However, for the second trip we can also use the published accounts, i.e. (edited) letters Schröder wrote to Heinrich Kiepert, on whose behalf he carried out the trip. The different preservation of the material elements of Schröder’s documentation affect our perception of the two trips importantly: the preserved accounts of the 1870 trip allow for a day-to-day reconstruction of the route, the geography, topography etc., sometimes even as detailed as indicating the minutes from one topographical spot to the next. By contrast, due to the absence of the travel journals, such a precise reconstruction is not possible for the 1873 trip. Although the travel notes sometimes give detailed accounts of time within a day, they contain...

Criticisms of Cesnola’s accounts started soon, first focussing on his ‘restorations’ of statues and subsequently also focussing on his excavations. The most famous dispute is probably the one about the so-called Curium treasure, already proven by Max Ohnefalsch-Richter to be a pure invention by Cesnola. On this see Masson 1984a; Masson 1984b; Masson 1984c; Schmid 2018a, pp. 75-77; for the conflict over restorations see Marangou 2000, pp. 304-329.

Schmid 2019. See also some additional reflections on the (Phoenician) inscriptions he recorded on these occasions: Cannavò, Schmid 2020.

Such as Engel 1841 or Sakellarios 1855 (and the other volumes by the same author).

almost no indication of exact dates. Thus, we know that Schröder landed on Cyprus on March 11 1873 and started a first tour two days later. This trip led him to the western side of the island and on the last day, or on the day before, he visited the region of Athienou. We further learn that the first tour took “more than 14 days” and that the second tour, which took him to the eastern side of the island, started on April 7. Therefore, the visit of Golgoi must have taken place on the very last days of March or the very first days of April 1873.\(^7\) This means that the second visit took place at a moment when Cesnola was not present on the island. He only returned later that year to undertake some additional fieldwork at Golgoi.\(^8\) For 1870, the reconstruction of Schröder’s tours is much easier (cf. infra): he left Larnaca at noon on 25 March 1870, arrived in Athienou in the afternoon and visited the excavations together with Cesnola on the morning of 26 March before leaving, around noon, to go back to Larnaca. In other words, Schröder had seen the excavations at Golgoi more than a month before Georges Colonna-Ceccaldi visited the site, also in the company of Cesnola, in May 1870.\(^9\)

According to Colonna-Ceccaldi (and Lang),\(^10\) the initial spark for Cesnola’s work at Golgoi was the accidental discovery of a colossal statue (Colonna-Ceccaldi) or head (Lang, and later also Colonna-Ceccaldi) by local villagers on 6 March 1870.\(^11\) Both Colonna-Ceccaldi and Lang agree that this first findspot was situated some two hundred metres to the west of a second findspot, the temple site.\(^12\) Considering their information together with Cesnola’s accounts, it becomes clear that the first spot exclusively yielded early objects (i.e. dating to the Cypro-Archaic period), mostly statues, and no inscriptions, while the second spot shows a longer chronological spectrum, ranging from the Cypro-Archaic to the Roman period, including a number of inscriptions.\(^13\) It is also widely agreed by scholars that the second spot is identical to the site de Vogüé briefly excavated in 1862.\(^14\)

**Identification and localisation of Cesnola’s sites according to Schröder**

Schröder’s account clearly confirms the existence and location of two sites.\(^15\) He states that he and Cesnola walked for 45 minutes in a SSE direction from the village of Athienou to the sites

---

7  Further assuming that Schröder took a few days off at Larnaca between the two tours.
8  Masson 1983, p. 280 with n. 7.
9  Colonna-Ceccaldi 1882, p. 39.
10 Colonna-Ceccaldi published a first account of his observations in the *Revue archéologique* of 1870. This led to a comment with some precisions by Lang (*Revue archéologique* 23, 1872, pp. 335-337) and to further contributions by Colonna-Ceccaldi in the same periodical. The easiest way, however, to understand the evolution of information and accounts on Cesnola’s activities at Golgoi is to read the relevant passages in Colonna-Ceccaldi 1882, pp. 39-64 and the comments by Masson 1983, pp. 275-281.
13 See previous note; cf. Cannavò, Schmid 2020 for some of the inscriptions.
14 See e.g. Hermamy 1989, p. 16.
15 The original German text is given below (text no. 1).
and gives a sketch of their location (fig. 1). In reality, the sites are located in ESE direction, hence the whole sketch of Schröder has to be slightly turned counter-clockwise as Schröder himself did in his 1873 travel notes (fig. 2). In the travel journals of 1870 he further describes the sites as being related to the toponym of “Ai Fotinu”, which is identical with Ag. Photos and the site of de Vogüé’s previous excavation. Schröder labels the temple site, located in a narrow valley between two hills, as no. 1 on his 1870 sketch. The site that was discovered first in 1870 is located at the western foot of the western hill and bears the number 2 (fig. 1). What is interesting, and differing from the reports by Colonna-Ceccaldi and Lang, is the chronological sequence of the activities as described by Schröder. According to him, the rock-cut cisterns of the western site (no. 2 on fig. 1) along the foot of the hill convinced Cesnola to start excavating there already in February. These excavations revealed a lot of fragmented statuary, mostly of what Schröder regarded as egyptian-phoenicianizing style and Schröder still saw fragmented remains on the spot during his visit. That we are indeed dealing with the first findspot is confirmed by his note that all statuary fragments were found on a very narrow surface.

Schröder continues saying that “about 14 days ago”, a villager found a nearly one-metre high colossal head at the second site, followed by the well-known story of Cesnola heading to the site at night and Lang coming the next morning. From the description and the following indication that Schröder sent a photograph of the colossal head to Berlin, it is clear that we are dealing with the extraordinary head of a male votary now in the Metropolitan Museum in New York (cf. here fig. 6). What is puzzling is the combination of objects, sites and chronology of discovery. If Schröder is correct, Cesnola would have started excavating at Golgoi already in February 1870. Somewhat later, the colossal head would have been discovered at the temple site, which lead to the excavations there. Schröder gives two more chronological indications for this discovery: it was “about 14 days ago”, hence around 12 March since his visit to the site takes place on 26 March. He gives another, indirect, indication when stating that he first heard news about the spectacular find when he was in Salamis. According to his 1870 travel journals, the visit of Salamis occurred on 12 March. Both indications therefore seem to fit and we would

---

16 His second geographical indication is wrong: he states the sites are close (10 minutes) to Melusha, a village that is actually situated ENE of Athienou. Consequently, he locates Melusha (and Aia) wrongly on his sketch (fig. 4), making clear that the location of the archaeological sites per se has to be correct. Melusha should be approximately at the spot (slightly more to the N) where Schröder marks “Aschia”. In his 1873 travel notes, Schröder drew an improved sketch (fig. 2), correctly locating Melusha and also indicating the site of Golgoi’s necropolis, a few minutes to the N of the village of Athienou. For the archaeological importance of these (and other) sites in the region of Athienou, see Hermary 2004.

17 For a contemporary map with the correct location, see Counts 2011, p. 47 fig. 4.2. Already on H. H. Kitchener’s map, Cesnola’s main site (the temple) has been correctly located with the indication “ruins” (as was the necropolis of Golgoi and the site of Athienou-Malloura: Hermary 1988, passim, esp. p. 16 with n. 9). See also fig. 3.

18 Interestingly, he did not claim any Assyrian influence, a hypothesis quite common then: Di Paolo 2015, p. 121; Caubet 2001.

19 Hence, the hypothesis that this might have been a bothros or favissa, probably related to the temple; cf. Counts 2011, p. 49.

20 Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 30-31 cat. 1 (inv. no. 74.51.2857).

21 ThULB, NL Schröder, Paul, II, 13, fol. 18v.
define 12 March as the terminus ante quem for the discovery of the colossal head, assuming that the news took at least one or several days to arrive to Salamis.

The problem is not only the differing chronology compared to Colonna-Ceccaldi and – more importantly – Lang, but also the fact that Schröder states that the colossal head comes from the temple site (no. 1 on fig. 1) and not from the “favissa” to the west of it (no. 2 on fig. 1). For the time being it is difficult to do anything else than simply making these discrepancies transparent. One will have to remember that Schröder visited the sites with Cesnola. It is therefore more than likely that the information about what was found when and where were provided by Cesnola himself. The same is true for the first statements by Colonna-Ceccaldi which were subsequently corrected by Lang, who was on the spot the very next day after the discovery of the colossal head (7 March). With these elements and owing to Cesnola’s bad reputation when it comes to such details, we may summarize the information as follows:

– Lang, Schröder and Colonna-Ceccaldi all recorded that there were two sites: the “favissa” to the west and the temple site slightly more to the east.22

One should verify whether a site located by the Cyprus Survey “120 m WSW of the chapel of Ag. Photios and 220 m NW of GO 3 [Cesnola’s temple]” (Ulbrich 2008, p. 301 GO 3) corresponds to the first site (“favissa”) excavated by Cesnola. The description of topography, location and finds perfectly fit, despite the fact that A. Ulbrich summarises all Cesnola finds under the temple site (Ulbrich 2008, pp. 297-301 GO 3). Max Ohnefalsch-Richter (1891, pp. 15-16 nos. 25-26) confirms the localisation of the two sites. He visited the sites considerably later, but he states that he employed Cesnola’s former work- and foremen as guides and informants on the spot.

Figure 1 — Sketch of the area of Athienou with Cesnola’s sites. From Schröder’s 1870 travel journal. ThULB NL Schröder, Paul, II, 13, fol. 35r.

Figure 2 — Sketch of the area of Athienou with Cesnola’s sites. From Schröder’s 1873 travel notes. ThULB NL Schröder, Paul, II, 12 (Mappe 2), fol. 34v.
All three visitors (Lang, Schröder and Colonna-Ceccaldi) agree: the “favissa” was discovered first, the temple later.

In all likelihood, the discovery of the “favissa” occurred on 6 March. For this point, one would give priority to Lang’s (and Colonna-Ceccaldi’s) account as he was there on 7 March. Schröder’s information that work started already in February is not necessarily erroneous, since it is possible that the villagers already commenced work there some days before finding the colossal head.\(^{23}\) The major difference would be that in his version, Cesnola had ordered the locals to start digging, while the other versions suggest a random discovery.

Lang’s indication that the colossal head comes from the first place, the “favissa”, seems more convincing. He is the only eyewitness other than Cesnola and his information is usually reliable. Further, Cesnola clearly tried to obscure the existence of the first site ("favissa"), initially pretending that all objects were found at one place (the temple).\(^{24}\) There is therefore a good chance that upon telling his version of the discovery to Schröder on 26 March, Cesnola also tried to attribute the head to the temple.

---

\(^{23}\) In any case, Cesnola knew the area of Athienou and its archaeological potential at least since 1866: Cesnola 1877, p. 109; Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 13.

\(^{24}\) As shown by Masson and others; cf. supra nn. 12, 17, 19. Again, Ohnefalsch-Richter did obtain the same information from his local informants (cf. n. 22).
Identifying the first (?) photographs of the Golgoi finds

In his travel journals, Schröder states that Cesnola had bought the colossal head for 20 Turkish pounds and adds that he (Schröder) sent photographs of this object as well as others to Olshausen\(^\text{25}\) in Berlin (cf. the original text below, no. 1). If this is correct, we would be dealing with photographs taken immediately after the discovery of the objects. However, one has to carefully verify the chronological order and the dates of the different elements of the description since Schröder, as pointed out above, wrote his travel journals subsequently. This is confirmed by two details in the same paragraph on the Golgoi finds. Immediately after mentioning the photographs, he states that he was informed about the price Cesnola had paid for the colossal head “later in Pera (Cyprus)”. He is referring to his visit to the village of Pera near the ancient site of Tamassos,\(^\text{26}\) which, according to his travel journals, he passed on 10 April 1870.\(^\text{27}\) A few lines further, we find a chronological indication that points to a date much later than his visit to Golgoi: here, Schröder states that he discussed the stylistic elements of the Golgoi finds with Perretié (\textit{sic}) in Beirut (cf. the original text below, no. 1).

He is referring to Napoléon Antoine Aimé Péretié (born 5.3.1808 in Marseille, died 8.4.1882 in Beirut),\(^\text{28}\) a French national who made a career in the French diplomatic service in the Levant and as an antiquarian.\(^\text{29}\) His surname is written variously as Péretié, Peretié, Perretié etc., while in official documents it is either Peretié\(^\text{30}\) or Péretié.\(^\text{31}\) He is mentioned several times in different functions for French consulates: from around 1829 to around 1834, he was working for the French consulate in Larnaca as a drogman and chancellor.\(^\text{32}\) In 1839, a “sieur Perretié” was nominated “drogman sans residence fixe”,\(^\text{33}\) while in December 1850 a Monsieur Perretié was chancellor of the French consulate general in Beirut and owner of a substantial collection of ancient jewellery.\(^\text{34}\) The post of French vice consul in Tripolis (Lebanon) mentioned for 1853,\(^\text{35}\)


\(^{26}\) Schröder specifies that he is talking about Pera on Cyprus in order to avoid confusion with the area of Pera in Constantinople, where a lot of European powers had their embassies, and where from 1871 onwards, the embassy of the German Empire was built as well. On the German embassy in Constantinople, see Schwantes 1997 and in a wider context Hort 2014, pp. 27-216, especially pp. 148-216.

\(^{27}\) ThULB NL Schröder, Paul, II, 7 (Mappe 1), fol. 31v.

\(^{28}\) For the dates, see Le Rider, Seyrig 1967, p. 9; Masson 1989, p. 42 n. 3.

\(^{29}\) The most detailed account on Péretié is by Cassimatis 2001.

\(^{30}\) \textit{Annuaire diplomatique de l’Empire français pour l’année 1839}. Strasbourg, p. 47.

\(^{31}\) Ministère du commerce, de l’industrie et des colonies, \textit{Bulletin consulaire français. Recueil des rapports commerciaux etc.}, 19. Paris 1890, p. 30, where a M. Péretié is listed as French consul in Larnaca. Cf. his report on the commercial activities of Cyprus for the years 1888-1889, \textit{Ibid.} pp. 314-324. As Hélène Cassimatis has pointed out (Cassimatis 2001, p. 217), this is Alfred, the son of Aimé, who was moved to Cyprus after his post in Baghdad (cf. \textit{infra} n. 43).

\(^{32}\) Cassimatis 2001, p. 217.

\(^{33}\) Colombel 1839, p. 396.

\(^{34}\) Saulcy 1853, p. 20.

\(^{35}\) Beauregard 1875, p. 6.
was probably only temporary, since, in 1855, we know that he was once more chancellor of the French consulate general in Beirut when he donated a valuable collection of medieval coins to the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.\footnote{“Découvertes et nouvelles”. \textit{Revue archéologique} 12, 1855, p. 113. On other coins from his collection, see Le Rider, Seyrig 1967, pp. 8-10.} By 1864 he was apparently promoted vice consul of France in Beirut,\footnote{Vogüé 1871-1874, vol. 3, p. 220 n. 1.} but at the beginning of that year he is still mentioned as first drogman of the French consulate there.\footnote{Vogüé 1871-1874, vol. 1, p. 7; \textit{ibid.} p. 8 for the impressive description of his collection of antiquities. Cf. Greenhalgh 2019, pp. 323-324. On Péretié’s collection of antiquities see e.g. Pottier, Beaudouin 1879 (calling Péretié chancellor of the French consulate).} Péretié was involved in the acquisition and subsequent selling of the famous Eshmounazar sarcophagus from Sidon in 1855\footnote{Cassimatis 2001, p. 219.} as well as in the discovery and acquisition of the Yehawmilk stela from Byblos in 1869\footnote{Vogüé 1875. Cf. Cannavò, Schmid 2020, p. 176 with n. 59.} and others more.\footnote{Masson 1983, pp. 19, 234 with n. 1; Masson 1993, p. 18; Cassimatis 2001, p. 219; for the tablet see Masson 1983, pp. 235-244 no. 217; Georgiadou 2010; Egetmeyer 2010, pp. 629-635; Körner 2017, pp. 230-233, 334-339.} Further, and this explains Schröder’s visit to him on his way back from Cyprus, Péretié was also well-acquainted with the archaeology and the antiquities of Cyprus, having lived there for some years as a young man and having frequently visited the island afterwards, including a trip around 1850 when he is mentioned having acquired and sold several important objects from Cyprus, the famous Idalion tablet first and foremost.\footnote{Dieulafoy 1887, p. 566. Shortly afterwards he apparently became consul in Larnaca (cf. \textit{supra} n. 31).} The family seems to have remained in consular affairs, since Alfred, the son of Aimé Péretié, became French consul in Baghdad a few years later.\footnote{Dieulafoy 1887, p. 566. Shortly afterwards he apparently became consul in Larnaca (cf. \textit{supra} n. 31).}

Clearly, Schröder’s visit to Péretié in Beirut must have occurred after his first trip to Cyprus. According to his travel journals, he returned to Larnaca from his round trips across the island on 11 April. As briefly mentioned in a previous contribution,\footnote{Cannavò, Schmid 2020, pp. 174-175.} he spent some time in Smyrna as acting consul on his way back to Constantinople. From Smyrna, he also wrote to Olshausen on 6 August 1870. Therefore, the visit to Péretié in Beirut can be dated between 12 April and 5 August 1870 and, consequently, the respective entry in the travel journal cannot be earlier than this period.\footnote{In all likelihood, Schröder did not write down the travel journals before getting back to Constantinople later that year.}

It might therefore seem doubtful that the photographs Schröder refers to can be dated as early as March 1870. Fortunately, the correspondence between Schröder and Olshausen offers further clues: in a letter Schröder sent to Olshausen on 28 March 1870, he explicitly states that he is attaching photographs of the Golgoi finds that were just finished (cf. the original text below, no. 2). We therefore have the \textit{terminus ante quem} of 28 March for the photographs. While Olshausen’s archives at the Geheimes Staatsarchiv, Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin contain many photographs (mostly pictures of family members), there is not a single one related to
Cypriot antiquities. This can be explained by the fact that only a few lines later in the same letter, Schröder asks Olshausen to forward the photographs, as well as the squeezes of some inscriptions he had sent as well, to the Direction of the Berlin museums. It is not completely clear to which institution or person Schröder wanted the photographs and squeezes to be forwarded. One possible candidate was the director general of the royal Prussian museums in Berlin, at that time Ignaz von Olfers (1793-1871) who held this position from 1839 to 1871. However, he had no particular affinity with ancient studies and for the last five years of his directorship was mostly ill. It is more likely that Schröder was thinking of Carl Friederichs, who not only was the director of the Antiquarium (from 1868 to 1871), but who also had a profound knowledge of Cypriot antiquities following his visit to the island in 1869 and the subsequent acquisition of Cypriot antiquities, mostly from Cesnola, for Berlin.

To date, no correspondences between Olshausen and the Berlin museums could be retraced. Therefore, the best chance to find the photographs seemed to search the photographic archives of the Antikensammlung, the successor of the Antiquarium. As the respective parts of the photographic archives are organised topographically, it seemed logical to look for entries such as “Golgoi”, “Athienou”, or possibly “Larnaca” or more generally “Cyprus”. However, this proved to be unsuccessful. In the end, they were found under “New York” (figs. 4-5). All together, there are 16 prints of photographs illustrating Golgoi finds, pasted on nine cardboards. Consequently, we will have to verify whether these photographs can indeed be the ones of March 1870, or whether they were taken later, only after the objects were acquired by New York in 1873-1874. Everything indicates that the photographs were inventoried and pasted on cardboard later. This includes the indication “New York”. The photographs bear the inventory numbers 142 to 147 and 149 to 156. Numbers 142 to 147 correspond to finds from Golgoi that were made in late 1873, including the famous sarcophagus, the pillar capital and others more (cf. fig. 5). Number 148 is the photograph of a statue of a sitting Indian deity, sent to Berlin by the German consulate in Bombay. Finally, numbers 149 to 156 correspond to objects from Golgoi found in the spring of 1870 (figs. 6-13; cf. table 1). Only these last numbers bear the additional reference “379/70” in the inventory. This must refer to an administrative action within the year 1870 (probably the letter Olshausen sent to the museums), but the related documents could not be identified so far. As a

46 Some information on von Olfers can be found in Mehlitz 2010.
47 Carl (or Karl) Friederichs was also the person who apparently first directed Schröder’s interest to Cyprus, when informing him about the recent discoveries of Phoenician inscriptions there. Cf. Cannavò, Schmid 2020, p. 158 with n. 3-4. On Friederichs, see Lullies 1988. On his acquisitions of Cypriot antiquities for Berlin, cf. Schmid 2018b, p. 460 with further references.
48 Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 20; Masson 1992, pp. 146-148. According to the existing documents, the sale of the first part of Cesnola’s collection that went to New York was agreed upon in 1872-1873, while the purchase was finally accepted in 1874. Inventory numbers therefore start with the number 74.
49 Antikensammlung, SMB PK, Inventar der Photographien (Inv. 127); presently, the prints are stored in the photographic archive in shelf 45.2 under “Skulptur / New York”.
50 The sarcophagus and two stelae with capitals were allegedly found in November 1873: Colonna-Ceccaldi 1882, pp. 65-66.
51 Antikensammlung, SMB PK, Inventar der Photographien (Inv. 127) no. 148.
Figure 4 — One of nine cardboards with prints of Cesnola's Golgoi finds. Photographic archive of the Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, photographic inventory no. 127, entries no. 155 (top) and 156 (bottom).
Figure 5 — One of nine cardboards with prints of Cesnola’s Golgoi finds. Photographic archive of the Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, photographic inventory no. 127, entries no. 146 (top) and 147 (bottom).
Table 1 — Concordance between the various photographs and publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>~, ~, 8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>85, Philadelphia, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. 156 (fig. 13)</td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>231, 308</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>18, 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>~, 67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>340, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. 151 (fig. 8)</td>
<td>no. 4 (fig. 15)</td>
<td>74, 49, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>25, 49, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. 150 (fig. 7)</td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. 155 (fig. 12)</td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>~, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>118, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>68, 113, 100</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>26, 112, Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. 154 (fig. 11)</td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>~, 310, 249</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>31, 36, ?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>~, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Minneapolis, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>73, ~, ~, 9, 154, 105</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>33, 121, 326, ?, 128, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>~, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>113, 12, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. 152 (fig. 9)</td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>~, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>60, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>~, ~, ~, ~, ~, ~, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>316, 144, 145, 51, 121, 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>~, ~, ~, ~, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>97, 331, Berlin, Art market (2004), 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>241, 81, 351</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>? 86, Once Toledo, then art market (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. 153 (fig. 10)</td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>424, 352, 245</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>131, 83, Ringling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td>355, 29, 371</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>79, 12, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 19 (= no. 21)</td>
<td>40, 38</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Ringling, Ringling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>44, 61</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Ringling, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 21 (= no. 19)</td>
<td>40, 38</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Ringling, Ringling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 22</td>
<td>416, 233, 243</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>137, 23, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 23</td>
<td>239, 1, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>16, 22, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 24</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv. 149 (fig. 6)</td>
<td>no. 25</td>
<td>544, 237, 426, 497</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>?, 91, Copenhagen, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 26</td>
<td>~, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Ringling, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>no. 27</td>
<td>~, ~, ~, ~</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>?, ?, ?, ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Head only: Doell 1873, pl. VIII 5.
** Only the head is represented on the photograph in the fonds de Vogüé. The head must have been reassembled with the body at a later moment.
preliminary conclusion, it would seem that only at a yet-to-be specified moment after the transfer of the Cesnola collections to New York, the photographs were inventoried in Berlin. In addition, the fact that the photographs of the later finds were inventoried first, that there is an unrelated photograph of an Indian statue in between, and that only the photographs of the earlier finds bear the reference “379/70” suggests that we are dealing with two sets of Golgoi photographs: an earlier one of 1870 and a later one of 1873 (or slightly later).

The eight prints (and the photographs from which they were taken) from the earlier group in Berlin (figs. 6-13) are rather homogeneous in terms of technical and ‘aesthetic’ arrangements (on these aspects cf. also infra). The sculptures are either standing on the ground or on a small, dark table. In all cases the background is formed by a somewhat carelessly plastered wall. When the background is well visible, it always seems to be the same wall as the same irregularities can clearly be identified on several prints. If the sculptures had to be put in an upright and stable position, this was always done with small stones, either on the ground or on the small table.

Further evidence for an early date of the photographs figs. 6-13 (March 1870) can be obtained by comparing the prints in Berlin with other prints of the Golgoi finds. We shall start with an album of photographic prints that Cesnola dedicated and sent to Count Federigo Sclopis in Turin in September 1870. Most of the objects represented on the Berlin prints can be found in the Turin album as well, but, with one exception, the photographs are not identical. As the wall with corresponding irregularities in the background suggests, only the photograph of a Herakles-Melqart statue (fig. 7) is identical. The other prints from the Turin album already show a more advanced attempt to produce professional photographs, since the wall in the background is systematically covered by a dark textile. However, the two sets of photographs were

---

53 For the over-life size statue now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (inv. no. 74.51.2453), see Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 228-230 cat. no. 302.
54 Corresponds to Bombardieri 2015, p. 231.
probably taken in the same room or environment, since the visible parts of the wall seem very similar and the small table appears to be the same on both sets.

An even more advanced presentation can be observed in the photographs published in “The Antiquities of Cyprus” in 1873.\(^{55}\) Here, the background is completely covered by a dark textile and, in most cases, the ground as well, no matter whether soil or a piece of furniture. Another added feature in most photographs of this album is the scale. Prints from photographs of that album seem to have circulated rather widely, as at least four prints preserved in the photographic archive of Winckelmann-Institut, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (fig. 14) indicate.\(^{56}\) According to the inventory, they stem from the archive of August Kalkmann.\(^{57}\)

As a preliminary conclusion, we can summarize that the prints preserved in Berlin (figs. 6-13) represent the earliest stage of technical and photographic evolution of all known photographs of the Golgoi finds. This is supported by additional evidence equally confirming the early date of the Berlin prints: the volume of the Cesnola collection, compiled by Johannes Doell and published in 1873, contains many illustrations, all of them drawings.\(^{58}\) In the introduction to his volume, Doell clearly states that he was sent to Cyprus in June 1870 for eight weeks\(^ {59}\) and that the illustrations of his book (drawings) are all based on photographs and reproduced with the highest accuracy.\(^ {60}\)

When comparing his drawings with the Berlin prints, it becomes evident that most of them are identical (cf. table 1), meaning that Doell used the same prints as prototypes for his drawings.

---

\(^{55}\) Newton 1873; cf. many comments in Marangou 2000 and Bombardieri 2015.

\(^{56}\) Fig. 14 does correspond to pl. 10 in Newton 1873 (= Hermaty, Mertens 2014, pp. 72-73 cat. no. 59, inv. no. 74.51.2471).

\(^{57}\) August Dethard Kalkmann (born 24.3.1853 in Hamburg – died 17.2.1905 in Berlin), classical archaeologist at the University of Berlin; cf. Bettelheim 1907, pp. 54-57 (F. Hoeber).

\(^{58}\) Doell 1873.

\(^{59}\) Doell 1873, p. 2.

\(^{60}\) Doell 1873, p. 5.
Since he was in Cyprus in the summer of 1870, this gives another terminus ante quem for the Berlin prints.61

The most valuable evidence, however, comes from a letter sent by Aimé Péretié to Melchior de Vogüé on 12 May 1870.62 Lucie Bonato already briefly pointed out the importance of this letter and its content 20 years ago,63 but the full potential of these documents is yet to be made. The letter, sent from Beirut to Paris, contained 27 prints of photographs of Cesnola’s Golgoi finds,64 accompanied by short descriptions on the back of most prints and a list giving the same information as on the back of the prints.65 Cesnola sent these elements to Péretié in Beirut and asked him to urge the Louvre to buy his collection, a task that Péretié forwarded to de Vogüé with the letter of 12 May.66 From the 26 photographs, all of them necessarily with a terminus ante quem of 12 May 1870, eleven show a carelessly plastered wall as background, while fifteen show a dark textile as background, sometimes with the wall appearing on the sides (cf. table 1). The eleven photographs with the wall as background in de Vogüé’s archive include all eight Berlin prints (cf. figs. 8 and 15), while three of them have no correspondence in Berlin (cf. table 1). Further, six out of the eight photographs from the Fonds Vogüé that are also preserved in Berlin, bear a description on the back specifying that they were found in March 1870 at Golgoi.67

In conclusion, it is evident that the eight prints in the photographic archive of the Antikensammlung in Berlin (figs. 6-13) are the ones Schröder sent to Olshausen on 28 March 1870. They correspond with what appears to be the first series of photographs taken of the Golgoi finds only a few days after their discovery.68 These first photographs show a carelessly plastered wall as background. From the photographs sent by Cesnola to Péretié no later than early May 1870, we learn that there are three additional photographs from the same series. A second

61 Also the article about Cesnola’s discoveries in Cyprus published by Hiram Hitchcock in the July 1872 issue of Harper’s Monthly Magazine used some of these prints as a prototype for the drawings; cf. infra nn. 144-145. But since it was published two years later, it is less interesting for determining the date of the Berlin prints.
63 Bonato 2001, p. 194 with n. 34.
64 One print was sent twice, so we are dealing with prints taken from 26 photographs.
65 The short notes written on the back of the prints are clearly from Cesnola’s hand. The list with the same information but written on a separate paper as well as continuous numbers written on the back of the prints are from another hand, possibly Péretié’s or de Vogüé’s.
66 As well as with two subsequent letters dated Beirut 22 June 1870 and 12 July 1870 respectively. They also contained prints with Golgoi finds, but we shall not deal with them further as only the first letter is important for establishing the date of the Berlin prints. Technically, it is possible that it was Schroeder who handed over the first photographs to Péretié on Cesnola’s behalf, as it is also possible that the contact with Péretié was established by Cesnola. In any case, already the year before, Friederichs visited Péretié in Beirut after leaving Cyprus, where he was a guest of Cesnola: Friederichs 1872, 51 (describing “Perretié” as an antiquarian, without mentioning his diplomatic functions).
67 The same date and findspot is also indicated on the back of six photographs from de Vogüé’s archives with a textile as background.
68 But probably already in Larnaca: on the one hand, the various accounts suggest that the finds were soon transported to Cesnola’s “museum” in Larnaca and, on the other hand, the corresponding general setting of the first and the second series of photographs points to the same storage facility.
series of photographs shows first attempts to cover the background wall with a dark textile. According to the prints sent by Cesnola to Péretié, the production of this second series must have started by early May 1870 the latest, and it cannot be excluded that it was contemporary with the first series.\(^{69}\) Interestingly, only two of the 15 photographs from Vogüé’s archive with a dark textile as background are found in the Turin volume (cf. table 1),\(^{70}\) despite the fact that more of the illustrated statues and heads are common to the two photographic collections. This indicates that we can probably expect a third series of photographs, still with a dark textile as background.

\(^{69}\) In this case, the designation as first and second series would refer to the background decoration rather than to a chronological difference. However, observations on the objects represented on the photographs suggest at least a short chronological interval; cf. infra.

\(^{70}\) These are the prints illustrated by Bombardieri 2015, pp. 219 and 225.
background but realised later than early May 1870 and before September 1870, when the Turin album was sent to count Sclopis.

There is good reason to believe in the existence of even more photographs belonging to one of three series identified above. When looking at Doell’s 1873 book and asking which photographic prototypes he used as the basis for the lithographs of his plates, we see that he largely resorted to the photographs that are equally assembled in the Turin album. Since the photographs in the de Vogüé series show only limestone sculptures and do not document terracotta figurines or vases, these genres were naturally not reproduced from these photographs in Doell’s book. However, for the limestone sculpture the ratio of the templates used can be clearly quantified: on the 13 plates in Doell’s book, 35 objects were drawn from photographs of the de Vogüé series, while 112 lithographs are based on photographs of the Turin series. A much more interesting observation, however, is that we are not yet able to determine the photographic prototypes for a whole series of lithographs in Doell’s book, since the corresponding motifs are missing from both the de Vogüé series and the Turin album. This concerns – compiled only for the limestone sculpture – Doell’s cat. nos. 54 (pl. II,3), 62 (III,10), 98 (IV,3), 128 (VI,8), 149 (V,3), 150 (V,5), 166 (VI,12), 220 (VII,5), 221 (VII,4), 222 (VII,12), 253 (IX,1), 362 (X,3), 374 (X,4), 417 (X,18), 785 (XII,9), 807 (XIII,11), 826 (XIII,16), 835 (XII,10). Taking into account the obvious arrangements according to size, motif and style as recognisable in the known photographs, then for the missing 18 objects we have to reckon approximately 8 photographs of limestone sculpture that are unknown so far. This is quite an important number, given the 26 photographs in the de Vogüé series and the 47 photographs in the Turin album devoted to limestone sculpture.

Independent of the exact date and evolution, the swift production of several important series of photographs of (partially) the same objects from Golgoi between spring and autumn of 1870 underlines the importance Cesnola gave to photography for promoting his finds.\(^71\) This leads to the question who might have been the photographer(s). For the photographs reproduced in the Turin album, Olivier Masson and later Luca Bombardieri proposed Johannes Doell as a possible candidate.\(^72\) While this remains a possibility, it is chronologically impossible for the photographs and prints that circulated before June 1870, when Doell arrived in Larnaca.\(^73\)

Looking at the various series of photographs taken of the sculptures from Golgoi in 1870, it is noticeable that numerous objects appear in more than one photograph. This is to be expected, of course, if one assumes that the most important pieces in the collection were documented photographically. However, it is quite remarkable that many of the pieces that are...
photographed more than once are photographed in almost identical orientation. This is not surprising in the case of objects such as the statue of the three-bodied Geryoneus, which has a clear view side due to the composition and is therefore seen and photographed frontally. However, there are many objects for which the photographer did not choose a frontal view, but a more or less pronounced oblique angle (cf. fig. 8). The orientation of the objects was not done for compositional or structural reasons, nor because of the state of preservation or because the piece could only be brought to stand in this way. It was rather an aesthetic decision, depending entirely on the personal taste of the photographer. This is all the more true when it comes to pieces in which different states of preservation are documented. For example, the statuette of a youthful adorant in the series with the plastered wall (no. 11a, cf. table 1) is shown in a slightly oblique view and, after the right forearm has been added, was photographed again from exactly the same perspective. However, since a large number of photographs from the different series of 1870 show such motivic parallels and the overlaps affect all three series, the only conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the photographer was the same in all cases. It is therefore more than likely that all photographs from 1870 were made by the same person. Doell is out of the question (cf. above). Whether the argument that Cesnola himself is shown sitting next to the statue in the photograph of the "priest with dove" of the Turin album is sufficient to exclude him as the photographer in general is unclear. As will be discussed below, it cannot be ruled out that Besbes – who in turn is posing next to the object in one of the photographs of the colossal bearded head (cf. fig. 19) – also lent Cesnola a hand and, after jointly (?) arranging the scene, took the exposure when Cesnola took his seat next to the statue. In any case, it is clear that Cesnola either produced himself or had photographs taken previously, before the excavations at Golgoi. After the discoveries at Golgoi, but clearly before

---

74 Vogüé's series no. 3; the photo in the Turin album: Bombardieri 2015, p. 212 (= Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 252-253, cat. no. 340, inv. no. 74.51.2591).
75 E.g. in fig. 8, the bearded statue in Egyptianizing dress (Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 65-66, cat. no. 49, inv. no. 74.51.2467) on Vogüé's series no. 4 and in the Turin album: Bombardieri 2015, p. 192; the female lyre player (Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 188, cat. no. 234, inv. no. 74.51.2480) on Vogüé's series no. 4 and in the Turin album: Bombardieri 2015, p. 198. There are many more examples not illustrated here, cf. Vogüé's series no. 11 b = Turin album, Bombardieri 2015, p. 184b (= Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 37, cat. no. 12, inv. no. 74.51.2460); Vogüé's series no. 2 = Turin album, Bombardieri 2015, p. 18c., p. 235b (= Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 41, cat. no. 18, inv. no. 74.51.2849, pp. 163-164, cat. no. 194, inv. no. 74.51.2820); Vogüé's series no. 6a = Turin album, Bombardieri 2015, p. 27a (= Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 116, cat. no. 118, inv. no. 74.51.2826); Vogüé's series no. 1a = Turin album, Bombardieri 2015, p. 202 (including plinth with feet) (= Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 92, cat. no. 95, inv. no. 74.51.2460). Many more examples could be mentioned.
76 Bombardieri 2015, p. 220 (= Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 112-113, cat. no. 113, inv. no. 74.51.2482).
77 Bombardieri 2015, p. 216 (= Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 42-45, cat. no. 22, inv. no. 74.51.2466).
78 Bombardieri 2015, p. 183 (= Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 30-31, cat. no. 1, inv. 74.51.2857).
79 For example, in a letter to the Hermitage in St. Petersburg, dated 2 January 1870, Cesnola specifically mentions "he had taken photographs" of his Dali objects: Masson 1992, p. 139. It further seems that Friederichs' visit to Cesnola in 1869 was motivated – within others – by photographs of the latter's finds that were shown around in Berlin in spring and summer 1869; cf. Archäologische Zeitung 2 (27), 1869, pp. 63, 68 (reporting the sessions of the Berlin archaeological society of 6 April and 1 June 1869).
the arrival of Doell, Cesnola mentions photographs of his objects.\textsuperscript{80} Further, from a letter of Tiburce Colonna-Ceccaldi to Cesnola, dated Paris, 27 April 1870, one learns that Colonna-Ceccaldi received photographs of the Golgoi finds from Cesnola and that he was showing them around in Paris.\textsuperscript{81} Another proposal stems from Anna Marangou who thinks that Cesnola himself took the photographs, which were then used by Doell as prototypes for the lithographies of his 1873 publication.\textsuperscript{82} Marangou adds further evidence suggesting that Cesnola would have been responsible for the majority of, if not all, photographs of his antiquities until his return to Cyprus in late 1873, when he hired a professional photographer from Beirut.\textsuperscript{83} While Cesnola indeed took pictures\textsuperscript{84} and definitely had a camera, with the increasing number of photographs being discovered from various archives, it seems difficult to suppose Cesnola took all photographs, developed the negatives and reproduced prints, while simultaneously organising his digs, keeping up his correspondence with possible buyers and, finally, now and then taking care of consular affairs that involved frequent travels on the island. On the other hand, his insistence on his photographic work probably indicates that a good deal of photographs were indeed taken by himself.\textsuperscript{85} We could perhaps assume that he trained one of his workmen, possibly the notorious Besbes, to assist him with the photographs and production of prints.\textsuperscript{86}

The photographs as source of information concerning the antiquities of Golgoi

With an improved understanding of the production date of the various photographs depicting Cesnola’s finds from Golgoi, it is also easier to understand the history of the objects they

\textsuperscript{80} For instance, in another letter sent to St. Petersburg on 25 Mai 1870: Masson 1992, pp. 141-142. The chronology of the letters sent to the Hermitage in St. Petersburg and – via Péretié – to the Louvre in Paris also shows that Cesnola was trying to negotiate with both institutions at the same time, promising exclusivity to each of them… (cf. the next note). To Schröder he told that he would prefer to sell the Golgoi finds to Berlin, since the Antiquarium had previously bought objects from him (cf. infra, text no. 2).

\textsuperscript{81} Masson 1992, p. 143. Colonna-Ceccaldi specifically mentions Melchior de Vogüé as a contact. Therefore, Vogüé had already seen photographs of the Golgoi finds (probably the same ones) a few days before the letter of Péretié reached him; cf. supra n. 62.

\textsuperscript{82} Marangou 2000, pp. 111, 289.

\textsuperscript{83} Maranagou 2000, pp. 110, 112, 140, 207, 246-247.

\textsuperscript{84} See for example a photograph of one of his daughters with handwritten legend indicating that Cesnola took the picture: Marangou 2000, p. 108.

\textsuperscript{85} See e.g. Marangou 2000, p. 110 with n. 1, referring to a letter of Cesnola to the Trustees of the British Museum, dated 14 December 1872, where he insists that he took many photographs.

\textsuperscript{86} Cf. infra for some additional thoughts. The quantity of photographs and especially prints must indeed have been important, since many visitors were given prints of Cesnola’s objects. This is confirmed by information provided by Juan de Dios de la Rada y Delgado, who visited Cesnola’s collection on 22 August 1871 (according to Pasqual 2021, p. 641, while Rada y Delgado 1876, p. 691 dates the visit to September of the same year) as a member of a Spanish royal archaeological commission aboard the frigate Arapiles and who also obtained prints from Cesnola.
For a better result, one will have to wait until the prints from Vogüé’s archive are fully published. However, some preliminary observations can already be made at this stage. Most objects depicted on the early Golgoi photographs entered the collections of the Metropolitan Museum in New York, together with the largest part of Cesnola’s collections (cf. table 1). From there, some objects (including some from our photographs) were later auctioned and subsequently acquired by John Ringling, who bequested them to the Ringling Museum in Sarasota. This is true for a male head wearing a conical cap or helmet (fig. 10). Since this object is featured on more than one photograph from the earlier series, it can further help to clarify the chronological evolution of the series, and of the objects themselves. On fig. 10, a photograph from the first series with the wall as background, the head stands alone, while on no. 19 of Vogüé’s prints, a photograph from the second series with a dark textile as background, the same head is shown mounted on a torso (cf. table 1) and as such first entered the collections of the Metropolitan Museum and subsequently of the Ringling Museum. Naturally, the photograph with the head on its own (fig. 10) has to be earlier than the photograph with the head mounted on a torso (Vogüé’s no. 19).

Moreover, we can conclude that their often-criticised restoration must have occurred very soon after the discovery of the objects and their transport to Larnaca. Interestingly, Doell used both prints as prototypes for his drawings, obviously not connecting the head alone with the restored statue. This indicates that he did not systematically verify (all) original objects, but had to rely on the photographs.

---

87 As did Luca Bombardieri when comparing the illustrations from the Turin album with the ones in Newton 1873: Bombardieri 2015, pp. 34-41.
88 For the history of the collections, see Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 13-22; cf. Masson 1996.
89 On the Cypriot antiquities in the Ringling, see Kershaw 1983; Karageorghis 2001.
90 The Ringling, inv. no. SN28.1914; Kershaw 1983, p. 54 no. 95 (http://emuseum.ringling.org/emuseum/objects/27220/figure-male; accessed 13 July 2021); cf. Faegersten 2003, p. 38 with n. 158; p. 64 with n. 455; p. 120 with n. 117.
91 And in the Turin album: Bombardieri 2015, p. 225.
92 Doell 1873 no. 40 (restored statue); no. 245 (head only).
93 One would suppose that in the summer of 1870 Doell (also) worked with the originals on the spot at Larnaca,
Several prints of the Vogüé’s series (no. 11; cf. table 1), however, show that the mending and restoration work had already begun when the first series of photographs (with the plastered wall as background) was taken. For instance, the famous votary statue, known as “priest with taking notes etc. The final redaction of his text was probably done later, back in St. Petersburg, using his notes and the photographs. Therefore, when writing the final text, he could no longer verify observations on the original objects.
dove" is shown on Vogüé's series (no. 13) in three-quarter view against the plastered wall as background. Its head however, still isolated and not mended to its body, can be seen on one of the photographs with the black cloth as background, on Vogüé’s series (no. 23b). This supports the assumption that this photograph may have been taken earlier than the one in front of the plastered wall. The second example is even more evident: the print of Vogüé’s series (no. 11) shows, between two small-format votive figures, the larger-than-life statue of a bearded adorant with a conical helmet. This statue was not found intact either, but with its head broken off. As a separate object, i.e. before the reunion with its body, this head can be seen on another print of Vogüé’s series (no. 18), again in the middle of a group of three. This photo also belongs to the second series (the one with the black background) and is thus definitely contemporary or even earlier – if one does not want to assume that the head was only temporarily placed on the body when the photo of the entire statue was taken. In this case, this hypothesis is clearly contradicted by the fact that the head appears to be in better condition in the individual photograph than in the group photograph: the left auricle is still intact, whereas a small bump is already visible in the photograph of the ‘first series’. In the Metropolitan Museum today, the head not only shows a bruised ear, but also a larger part of the nose is missing. This is not yet visible in the two photos, nor in the photograph of the Turin album.

In fact, during the few months of 1870 we can document now with photographs, many statues were damaged. Whether this happened during their transport to Larnaca, or while in store within the huge amount of finds, cannot be determined. The background of one of the pictures in the Turin album, showing the anthropoid marble sarcophagus from Kiton or the surrounding area, indicates that the storage conditions were cramped and the finds were kept close together and stacked on top of each other. Undoubtedly, the objects suffered damage there, as can also be seen in the photographs.

For instance, several pictures in the Turin album show individual heads of votive statues with intact noses, while they are already damaged in the photographs of the Vogüé’s series. This fact not only proves the sometimes rough handling of the antiquities, but also that several photos in the Turin album were taken before the corresponding pictures in the Vogüé’s series. As already mentioned above, the Turin album was composed of photos from different series.

---

94 Hermay, Mertens 2014, pp. 42-45, cat. no. 22, inv. no. 74.51.2466.
95 Hermay, Mertens 2014, p. 37 cat. no. 12, inv. no. 74.51.2460.
96 The completed statue appears in Doell 1873 on pl. I.13 (after the photograph in the Turin album, Bombardieri 2015 p. 184), the isolated head on pl. VIII.7 (after the photograph of Vogüé’s series, no. 18).
97 Bombardieri 2015, p. 205.
98 Hermay, Mertens 2014, pp. 373-374 cat. no. 495, inv. no. 74.51.2454.
99 A detailed comparison of the Turin photos from 1870, which show the objects in a better state of preservation than in the photos published by Newton in 1873, has already been made by Bombardieri 2015, pp. 35-41.
100 Cf. for instance Bombardieri 2015, p. 234 no. 2 with Vogüé’s series (no. 22, 2), or Bombardieri 2015, p. 234 no. 4 with Vogüé’s series (no. 22, 3). Interestingly, although Doell uses numerous images from the Turin album series, in both cases he used the photographs from the Vogüé’s series as a source for his drawing (Doell 1873, pl. VIII, 10-11).
Crucially, however, it also includes photographs that were made at an earlier stage than the photographs in the Vogüé’s series.

On print no. 19 in de Vogüé’s series (cf. table 1) a statue of a richly adorned votary in Egyptianizing dress and missing both legs and the right arm is depicted. This statue also ended up at Sarasota.101 Not directly concerning the subject of this contribution – since the photo belongs to an 1873 (or slightly later) series –, another object (the torso of a female statue on the print on the top left of fig. 5) also entered the collections of the Ringling.102

Another item depicted in the early Golgoi photographs seems to have taken a different path: the head of a youth wearing a wreath that appears dwarfed by the colossal head on fig. 6 (third from the left) is now in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen (fig. 16).103

In this case, the newly identified photographs from Berlin contribute to secure a provenance for the head.104 Two very similar heads were found at Golgoi by the mission of Duthoit in 1865105 and the newly attributed head in Copenhagen confirms the existence of a rather homogeneous group of comparable votaries there. The Copenhagen head was bought in 1891 in Paris at the auction of the collection of Julien Gréau. Its previous whereabouts seem unknown, i.e., for the time being, we can only hypothesize that it was sold during one of Cesnola’s London sales in 1871.106

For many objects depicted in the early Golgoi photographs the current location could not (yet) be ascertained (cf. table 1). This also concerns the female head on the far left on fig. 6. It is definitely identical to no. 544 in Doell’s catalogue.107 Antoine Hermary and Joan Mertens thought that this piece on Doell’s illustration was identical with a similar head allegedly from Idalion.108 While the comparison with Doell’s drawing already made this identification problematic, with the newly identified photograph at hand it is impossible. The mistake probably goes back to John L. Myres’ 1914 catalogue of the Cesnola collection: he already identified the correct object from Cesnola’s 1885 Atlas (no. 660), but associated it with the wrong number in Doell’s 1873

101 The Ringling, inv. no. SN28.1913 according to the internet site: http://emuseum.ringling.org/emuseum/objects/24104/figure-male (accessed 13 July 2021). However, in Kershaw 1983, p. 54 no. 91 the same inv. no. is ascribed to a male votary with Egyptian style hairdress that bears the inv. no. SN28.1912 on the internet site (http://emuseum.ringling.org/emuseum/objects/19250/figure-male, accessed 13 July 2021). Kershaw 1983, p. 54 no. 94 is clearly the statue we are looking for. Here, it bears the inv. no. SN28.1912, as it does in Faegersten 2003, pp. 276-277 cat. no. 20. Obviously, there is confusion between SN28.1912 and 1913 and, for the time being, the correct number remains to be determined. The print appears in the Turin album as well: Bombardieri 2015, p. 225. A very similar but better-preserved statue remained in the collections of the Metropolitan Museum: Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 67 cat. no. 51, inv. no. 74.51.2603.


103 Karageorghis et al. 2001, p. 130 cat. no. 38 (inv. no. 598b).

104 With the provenance from the sanctuary at Agios Photios and given the typological uniformity of such heads, they represent in all likelihood ‘normal’ votaries and there is no reason to identify them with Demetrios Poliorcetes as previously proposed (Karageorghis et al. 2001, pp. 130-131 cat. nos. 38-39).


106 On these (and many other) occasions of dispersing antiquities from Golgoi, see Masson 1996, pp. 7-8 and passim.

107 Doell 1873, p. 47; pl. X, 5 (544).

108 Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 171 cat. no. 207, inv. no. 74.51.2807; the reference ibid. to Cesnola’s Atlas (Cesnola 1885, pl. XCVII no. 660) is correct and it illustrates the same object.
Since we therefore must exclude no. 660 of Cesnola’s *Atlas* for the female head on fig. 6, the next question is whether the head went to the Metropolitan Museum at all, or, as the male head now in Copenhagen (fig. 16), was sold previously. Looking at Cesnola’s *Atlas*, it is easy to identify our head as no. 1145. The state of preservation has deteriorated considerably between the 1870 photograph (fig. 6) and the depiction in the 1885 *Atlas*, including a deep cut in the lower part of the neck. The head belongs to a group of Roman imperial sepulchral busts that were set up as acroliths and therefore have a large recess to accommodate a wooden post below. This construction technique weakens the neck and explains the nature of the break.

A to date unpublished photograph of four such funerary busts from the Cesnola collection has been preserved in the archives of the British Museum, which shows our head still completely intact and from approximately the same perspective as the photograph in the damaged state in the *Atlas*. The identification is thus clear. Interestingly, no. 1145 from the *Atlas* seems not to be included in Myres’ handbook from 1914, nor in the 2014 publication by Hermary and Mertens, leading to the question of its whereabouts. Cesnola indicates that all heads on plate CXLV of the *Atlas* were “found in different tombs in the necropolis (Golgoi)”. This information is remarkable as there is, to date, no information that Cesnola excavated the necropolis of Golgoi as early as March 1870, the confirmed date of our photographs. On the other hand, its interpretation as a funerary bust is clear, even though not a single bust has been found *in situ* so far. Further, the three heads next to the colossal head on figure 6, as well as the female statue on the right of figure 8, indicate that Cesnola already retrieved statuary from the temple site by 28 March (the *terminus ante quem* for our photographs). Since the early observers insist on the fact that exclusively ‘older’ statues derive from the first spot, the “favissa” to the west of the temple site, in all likelihood the four objects have to be attributed to the temple site, since they belong to later periods (Hellenistic and/or Roman).

For other objects, the photographs of March 1870 document a yet unrestored condition. Such is the case with the beautiful statue of a bearded male votary in Egyptian dress (fig. 9, left). On our photograph, the left arm is missing shortly above the elbow. Doell depicts the same condition but from a more frontal perspective. Therefore, he must have consulted another photograph. In the London album of 1873, the left arm is preserved until shortly above the

---

109 Myres 1914, p. 213 cat. no. 1330.
110 Cesnola 1885, pl. CXLV, no. 1145.
111 The corresponding form of the break on both sides of the huge cut in the lower neck supports the identification with no. 1145 from the *Atlas*.
112 Cf. Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 376; Buchholz 2010, pp. 37-40 with a list of the known examples to date.
113 London, British Museum, GR Miscellaneous Photographs 2 no. 61.3c.
114 Cesnola 1885, description of pl. CXLV.
115 Given Cesnola’s generally very ‘flexible’ dealing with such details, this would not be a major concern for the identification of the head.
117 Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 73-74 cat. no. 60 (inv. no. 74.51.2472).
118 Doell 1873, pl. II, 8 (no. 43). Doell used the same photograph that is featured in the Turin album: Bombardieri 2015, p. 200. This is a photograph of the second series, with the dark textile as background.
wrist,\textsuperscript{119} corresponding with the actual state of preservation. The addition of the lower left arm and the elbow, therefore, occurred between autumn 1870 and 1873. From a note by Charles Balliard, who worked as a restorer for the Metropolitan Museum from 1879 onwards,\textsuperscript{120} we learn that he repaired the left shoulder and the left arm of the statue.\textsuperscript{121} When comparing the three photographs representing the various stages of the sculpture, \textit{i.e.} the photograph of March 1870 (\textit{fig. 9}), the photograph in the 1873 London album\textsuperscript{122} and a recent picture of the statue,\textsuperscript{123} it becomes clear that upon the first attempt to attach the lower part of the left arm something went wrong: on \textit{fig. 9}, the left shoulder of the statue, as far as it is preserved, seems perfectly intact and offers a smooth contour line.\textsuperscript{124} The picture in the 1873 London album clearly shows that a part of the upper left arm and the shoulder was removed and, once the lower arm was attached, smeared over with another material, showing a kind of bump at the junction with the original left shoulder. Finally, the recent pictures show a more homogenised surface, probably the result of Balliard’s intervention.\textsuperscript{125}

Other examples where the fast and immediate restoration process can be traced based on these photographs, include the unusual votive statue of an unbearded youth in a peculiar garment.\textsuperscript{126} In a photograph of the “first series” in Vogüé’s series (no. 11), the figure’s left forearm is missing; in the photograph in the Turin album (and in Doell’s subsequent illustration), it is attached.\textsuperscript{127}

The photograph of the huge Herakles-Melqart (\textit{fig. 7}), also illustrated in the Turin album and hence provided with a \textit{terminus ante quem} of September 1870, does not yet show the legs pasted to the torso, but already the small club in the left hand that is now understood as a modern restoration (using an ancient club that belonged to another statue of Herakles).\textsuperscript{128} The same situation was already described and illustrated by Doell,\textsuperscript{129} including the drawing after the same photograph, bringing the \textit{terminus ante quem} for the existence of the club to the summer of 1870.\textsuperscript{130} As we now know that the photograph \textit{fig. 7} has a \textit{terminus ante quem} of 28 March 1870, the club must have been added to the hand shortly after the discovery of the statue, probably immediately after its transport from Golgoi to Larnaca.

\textsuperscript{119} Newton 1873, pl. 11.
\textsuperscript{120} Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 21; on Balliard see also Merrillees 2010, pp. 112-117 and \textit{passim}.
\textsuperscript{121} Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{122} Newton 1873, pl. 11.
\textsuperscript{124} As does the picture in the Turin album: Bombardieri 2015, p. 200.
\textsuperscript{125} In all likelihood, the 1885 \textit{Atlas} already represents the altered state, though the photograph is taken from the other side: Cesnola 1885, pl. XLIII. Therefore, we can date Balliard’s intervention between 1879 and 1885.
\textsuperscript{126} Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 112-113 cat. no. 113, inv. no. 74.51.2482.
\textsuperscript{127} Bombardieri 2015, p. 220; Doell 1873, no. 114, pl. V.12.
\textsuperscript{128} Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 228-229 cat. no. 302.
\textsuperscript{129} Doell 1873, pp. 37-38 no. 178, pl. VII 9.
\textsuperscript{130} Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 228-229 cat. no. 302.
Many of the objects we see in the photographs from 1870 are now clearly altered: not because of accidental damage, but intentionally. This often involves the smoothing of fractures or the removal of remnants of the body. For example, in the case of the bearded head on fig. 12, the rest of the left shoulder has been worked off.\textsuperscript{131} In general, many of the heads appear to have been sawn straight off at the neck - probably not to mount them on an unrelated statue, but to give them a more pleasing appearance when socketed separately.\textsuperscript{132} This ‘embellishment’ makes any attempt to convincingly attribute individual heads with corresponding

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.49\textwidth]{figure12}
\caption{Print of a photograph illustrating Cesnola’s Golgoi finds. Photographic archive of the Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, photographic inventory no. 127, entry no. 155.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.49\textwidth]{figure13}
\caption{Print of a photograph illustrating Cesnola’s Golgoi finds. Photographic archive of the Antikensammlung, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, photographic inventory no. 127, entry no. 156.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{131} Hermary, Mertens 2014, p. 94 cat. no. 87.
\textsuperscript{132} As a quick consultation of the illustrations in Hermary, Mertens 2014 shows, this phenomenon can be observed in numerous objects of the Cesnola collection, and does not only concern the finds from Golgoi.
Figure 14 — Print from Newton 1873 (pl. X). Preserved at the photographic archive of Winckelmann-Institut, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, inv. 553 (from the archives of August Kalkmann).

Figure 15 — Print of a photograph (the same as fig. 8) illustrating Cesnola’s Golgoi finds. Archives Nationales (Pierrefitte-sur-Seine), Fonds Vogüé, 567AP/217.

Figure 16 — Head of a male votary wearing a wreath in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, inv. no. 598b. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.
bodies extremely difficult. It is unclear when these finishes were carried out; they may be associated with the transfer to New York. The photographs from Newton 1873 still show the state of 1870, for that matter.

Formal and iconographic features of the photographs

Without the original glass negatives and precise written information, only some general and speculative remarks concerning Cesnola’s equipment can be made. Consequently, the following approach of reconstructing Cesnola’s working method as a photographer is extremely hypothetical, having to rely on probabilities and comparisons where one would wish for hard evidence (i.e. glass negatives and / or exact accounts). To begin with, we may with good reasons assume that he could afford the costly enterprise of maintaining a private photo studio at the consul's house in Larnaca. This may seem a trivial piece of information, but it nonetheless offers a sound basis for any attempt to evaluate the circumstances of production and contents of the photographs taken by Cesnola during his years on Cyprus. Apart from technical and formal aspects, the actual contents of the images will have to be considered: do the photographs refer to their spatial and temporal context – and if so – how? Did the photographer Cesnola attempt to create a relationship between the archaeologist Cesnola and the objects from his excavations by staging them repeatedly and in different ways? In other words: may we assume a conscious narrative behind Cesnola’s photographs that transcended the functional aspects of selling Cypriot antiquities?

In the 1870s, when photography was neither a new nor an old technique, the photography of archaeological finds had become more and more about the staging of finds as precious artefacts. The tradition of doing this is, of course, a very old one. But now, with dry collodium plates at hand, photography became easier even in difficult circumstances, as they could often occur on Cyprus: although there surely were many bright and sunny days for good lighting, the equipment had to be imported from afar and finding good glass for the plates must have been difficult at times.

---

133 On early photography in Cyprus see Bonato, Karageorghis, Yakoumis 2011; Krpata 2019; Kaba 2020. The first known photographs (calotypes) are by Louis De Clercq dating from 1859/1860. Cf. above for the likely possibility that Cesnola was indeed the photographer of the discussed objects.

134 The first time Cesnola mentions himself as the photographer of his excavation finds is in a letter from 7 February 1869 he sent to Hiram Hitchcock. He probably had learned photography for the purpose of his excavations. On Cesnola’s photographic work: Marangou 2000, pp. 109-113; Bonato, Karageorghis, Yakoumis 2011, p. 65; Krpata 2019, p. 73.

135 Theoretically, also another positive-negative method – the calotype – is a possibility, although it was already outdated by that time: Frizot 1998, pp. 91-101; Max Ohnemalsch-Richter and John Thomson were using (dry) collodium plates: Krpata 2010, pp. 4-6; Filser 2018, pp. 149-151; Thomson 1985, p. XV. Another aspect might be the type of paper Cesnola used: the Berlin prints are common salt paper (as seem to be the Paris prints), and the same applies to the Turin album.
Roughly half a century before the first photographic studios in Cyprus opened (those of Eduardo A. Carletti and John P. Foscolo), Fox Talbot and Hippolyte Bayard (and many others) introduced the artificial staging of (pseudo-) ancient artefacts as a main theme of photography, as was exactly predicted by François Arago when he introduced Daguerre’s invention to the French academy in 1839. The standards of this kind of photography by the time of Cesnola’s Cypriot years were thus quite high and many renowned photographers worked in the field of documenting European and Asian art history with results that steadily replaced the long supremacy of academic drawing (fig. 17). The Alinari Brothers’ company, which was founded in 1852 in Florence, and prospered perceptibly during the last quarter of the 19th century, marks the climax of this development of photography.

Extremely important for our understanding of what Cesnola expected from his photography is, of course, the Turin album: fortunately, this selection, composed by Cesnola himself, survived. In gilded letters (fig. 18) the book cover gives the general information on the prints: what is represented? Where do the objects come from? Who made the photographs? When were the objects found (and the pictures taken)? Three pieces of textual information are highlighted in capital letters: PHOTOGRAPHIES – GOLGOS – 1870. While going through the album one cannot miss the fact that all prints are in a very similar vertical format and obviously not much cropped, thus establishing a basic formal unity which

---

136 On Foscolo and Carletti see: Malecos 1992; Krpata 2019, p. 75; Kaba 2020, passim.
137 On these aspects, see Filser 2017, pp. 9-23; Filser 2018, pp. 143-146; Filser 2019, pp. 77-79; Filser 2020, pp. 228-235.
138 On the relation between photography and drawing in archaeology, see Klamm 2007. On the object on fig. 17, the left forearm of a colossal bronze statue found at Civitavecchia, see Helbig 1963, pp. 614-615 no. 841.
139 On the Alinari company, see Fratelli Alinari 2002; Jolivet 2006.
140 Bombardieri 2015; cf. above for the chronology.
is followed throughout the volume. The photograph showing Herakles-Melqart appears heavily cropped in the Berlin print (fig. 7). This indicates that the two prints were used for different purposes: the Berlin print reflects an economic cut showing only the motif without considering general standards of composition.

Escaping the conformity of the rest, however, the first photograph in the Turin album (fig. 19) is conspicuously larger than the other prints and thus may yield information about the complete sizes of the glasses Cesnola used and about the format of his camera. Interestingly, he chose a motif that not only places one of his most prominent finds at the beginning of his album, but which is also rich in information regarding his photographic and archaeological work. Next to the colossal limestone head, his foreman Besbes appears with his right hand resting on the tip of the sculpture’s headdress. Obviously, Besbes—who might have acted

141 Alternatively, it could be argued that the larger format might suggest the use of a second camera, but there is so far no such information.
142 Bombardieri 2015, p. 183: the famous colossal head, here on fig. 6; cf. Hermary, Mertens 2014, pp. 30-31 cat. no. 1, inv. no. 74.51.2857.
143 Besbes (or Bechbech, Beb-shesh etc.), drogman and foreman, is frequently mentioned in Cesnola 1877; cf. Masson 1992, pp. 149-150. Masson (ibid.) established that Besbes, despite the (sur-)name, must have been of Greek Cypriot origin and, indeed, he is mentioned as “Constantino Besbes, United States Consular Interpreter” in official documents (Index to the Reports of Committees of the House of Representatives for the First and Second Sessions of the Forty-Sixth Congress, 1879-80, vol. II. Washington 1880, Report no. 279 “General Louis P. di Cesnola”, p. 6). A glimpse of Besbes’ importance for Cesnola’s success as excavator and antiquarian is given by Hogarth 1889, pp. 17-19 (including the lengthy footnote pp. 18-19), pp. 30-31 (see already Hogarth et al. 1888, pp. 169, 262); cf. Masson 1997, p. 16; Marangou 2000, pp. 126-127. It would be very interesting to carry out further research on this fascinating personality and verify, amongst other things, whether he might be identical with...
as his photographic assistant as well – was included not because the heavy sculpture needed to be supported, but to provide a living scale within the photograph and to lend credibility to the handwritten note that states the 0.87 m from tip of head to fringe of the beard. Much could be said about the romanticising placing of ‘oriental genre figures’ next to archaeological objects, but we will leave this point aside.144 More important, in our context, is the fact that the figure of Besbes urges the beholder to think about Cesnola’s excavations, which otherwise do not appear graphically in the album. Even the blurred motion may be interpreted in that respect, giving Besbes an active appearance that fits well with his role when digging.145 Such references to the successful excavation works at Golgoi are the rationale behind the enlarged (and thus emphasized) format of this first print, which seems to assume the role of a frontispiece that links cover and content. In the Berlin archive, we find two carelessly cropped prints, one showing Cesnola among his finds, the other Besbes standing behind a headless statue and clutching to its shoulders (fig. 5).146 Although the motif of holding on to the excavated object, which can be regarded as an established iconography of self-staging

Figure 19 — First photograph from Cesnola's Turin album. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Biblioteca, Num. 111.119.


144 Filser 2017, pp. 11-12; Filser 2018, pp. 46-47; Filser 2020, pp. 228-235. The photograph of Besbes with the colossal head also served as prototype for a drawing published in Hiram Hitchcock’s article in the July 1872 issue of Harper’s Monthly Magazine; cf. next note. The question of the (high) value of such romanticising photographs especially for Cyprus has been dealt with in Kiely 2019, especially pp. 51-59.

145 Which does not mean the blur (= the moving of the person) was intentionally provoked; on such aspects of real live in early (Cypriot) photographs see Kiely 2019, pp. 57-59. As it was common, the motion blur has been eliminated in the drawing published in Harper’s Monthly Magazine from July 1872, which was based on this shot: Marangou 2000, p. 138; Bombardieri 2015, pp. 46-48.

146 Prints from the same glass plates also appear in a series of photographs that were bought by the former Cyprus Popular Bank Cultural Centre from the Paris market in 1998, now belonging to the Bank of Cyprus: Marangou 2000, pp. 2, 15; cf. ibid. p. 109 for the history of acquisition.
archaeologists of that time, is very similar in all three cases, these two rather casual shots are much less iconic in character and they would not work well as teasers in a respective album. This holds true for another print in Berlin (fig. 6) as well, which shows the colossal Golgoi head among other finds from the same spot. Apart from the same archaeological context, the choice of putting the four heads in a row may seem quite arbitrary, especially considering that the huge size differences do not allow for good focusing, which explains why the smaller heads fade out. However, Cesnola knew exactly why he arranged things the way he did. It may be more than an educated guess that in such cases he willingly put up with formal and compositional deficiencies in order to convey a message by combining different modes of staging his finds. The first plate of the Turin album – foreshadowing the 1873 take of the same object by Stephen Thompson for the London catalogue – may thus be kept in mind as a reminder: at the US-American Consulate in Larnaca, Cesnola obviously had the means to create staged photographs, using backdrops and adjusting the objects in whatever way he needed, even though all photographs seem to have been made in normal day-light without any kind of artificial lighting (compare the exposures of Thompson for the 1873 catalogue!). However, many of his photographs do not even try to disguise the impression of rather hastily made exposures by the use of improvised and temporary aids, leading to quirky arrangements that at times show the precious finds piled up like worthless junk. There is, of course, no reason to assume that Cesnola acted in a hurry or under pressing economic circumstances, although, in many cases, he decided against the visual tactics that transformed an objet trouvé to a stand-alone piece of art, albeit visually decontextualized. For some reason Cesnola preferred different modes of representing his finds, one of these modes apparently comprised the staging of the hardships of field archaeology by using wooden sheds as mobile photo studios for exposing the finds to the camera and tents as darkrooms. But in contrast to many of his rivals, for example Max Ohnefalsch-Richter, there is no reason to assume that he actually worked in this manner. Sure enough, the fine quality of his prints do not suggest any difficult circumstances (e.g. fluctuating and hot temperatures, dirty water etc.) during production. Even though we cannot presume a professional photographic studio at the consul’s house in Larnaca, the reason why Cesnola used cobble stones (as one would expect, for example, from an excavation site) to adjust his finds, may be that he understood the use of photographs as visual evidence. In addition to the obvious worth of the finds themselves, which was evident to potential buyers, the photographs also emphasize his person and his extremely fortunate excavations. Compared to Max Ohnefalsch-Richter’s photographic visual strategies, Cesnola seems to have employed a very different way of using photography as a medium to support his archaeological undertakings: certainly less creative and maybe

148 Newton 1873, pl. XVIII.
149 For example, Bombardieri 2015, p. 237 (cf. the Berlin prints, here figs. 6, 8-9, 12-13). Generally, there is an attempt to organize the finds according to material and genre. In the case of the photograph just discussed (Bombardieri 2015, p. 237), Cesnola wanted to assemble pieces with Cypriot inscriptions.
150 Filser 2018, p. 151.
151 Filser 2018.
of less documentary value than that of his German rival, but much better for promoting both business and career.

The newly identified Berlin prints demonstrate how Cesnola seems to have employed specific tactics to corroborate the story of his archaeological entrepreneurship. Viewed individually, every print is no more than an old photograph, ruthlessly cropped (with all probability by Cesnola himself) and thus reduced to the importance of what is depicted (and written on it). However, in the broader context of Cesnola’s photographic oeuvre, the Berlin prints emerge as important pieces of a steadily growing puzzle, which will finally allow for a much better understanding of how this central figure of Cypriot archaeology exploited photographic tools for his specific interests. Obviously, at the end of the 19th century photography was much more closely linked to social background and status than in later periods when the camera became the democratic medium par excellence. Only by thorough comparison with the works of related archaeologists-photographers in Cyprus (such as Ohnefalsch-Richter) and beyond (for example Karl Humann)\textsuperscript{152} will it be possible to understand why photography was employed in a certain manner by a certain person at a certain time.

**Schröder’s documents containing information on Cesnola’s excavations at Golgoi**

Despite the general brevity of his descriptions and observations, Schröder offers a few interesting details about Cesnola’s activities in the neighbourhood of Athienou. For the purpose of this paper, we reproduce two elements: first, the relevant passages from his 1870 travel journals and, second, an extract from a letter he wrote to Justus Olshausen in spring 1870. These documents are equally important in order to define the possible date of the photographs illustrated here as figs. 6-13 (cf. above).

1. **Schröder’s text on Golgoi from his travel journals**

The short passage reproduced hereafter is an extract from Schröder’s travel journals of his 1870 trip to Cyprus. They are preserved, together with the remaining documents of Schröder, at the Thüringer Landes- und Universitätsbibliothek (ThULB) in Jena (Germany).\textsuperscript{153}

Sonnabend. [26 March]
Früh 8 Uhr. Mit Cesnola zu Fuß zu der Fundstelle, die ¾ Stunden südsüdöstlich von Afienu nahe bei dem Dorfe Melussa (Melusia) liegt (10 Min.). Die Stelle selbst führt bei den Bewohnern der Umgebung den Namen Ai Fotinu, wahrscheinlich von einer Kirche dieses /

\textsuperscript{152} Karl Humann and his travel companion Felix von Luschan produced the excellent photographs (from colloidum dry plates with a smaller and a larger camera) for the publication of their voyages in Asia Minor themselves, which is why they explicitly stated that they could abstain from employing a photographer: Humann, Puchstein 1890, p. 157.

\textsuperscript{153} ThULB NL. Schröder, Paul, II, 13, fol. 34v – 36v; cf. for the context Schmid 2019.
Namens, die früher hier gestanden haben μισθ mag. Hier lag das alte Golgoi; noch jetzt heißt ein Terrain, nahe bei Ai Fotinu, etwas mehr nordwestlich gelegen, Γόργους offenbar eine uralte Reminiscenz an die alte Stadt Golgoi die hier stand. (Man passirt die Stelle Gorgous wenn man von Afieno nach Ai Fotinu geht.)

[sketch]

Ai Photinu liegt zwischen zwei Hügeln, die ein ziemlich enges kleines Thal bilden. Hier vermutete schon der Graf de Vogüé, der im Jahre 1865(?)

die Insel Cypern im Auftrag der französischen Regierung bereiste, das alte Golgoi; er ließ in dieser Thalsenkung Ausgrabungen machen (durch welche Indicion geleitet?), gab sie jedoch wieder auf als er nichts Bedeutendes fand. Hätte er nur etwas mehr Geduld gehabt u. wäre er einige Schritte weiter nordwärts gegangen, so würde er auf die Tempelstätte Cesnola’s gestoßen sein. Er hat dieselbe sogar schon berührt, wie die von Vogüés Ausgrabungen herrührenden Erdhaufen noch zeigen. / Daß auf diesem ganzen Hügelterrain westlich das alte Golgoi stand, oder wenigstens eine alte Stadt, beweisen verschiedene in den Fels tief hinabsteigende Cisternen. So sieht man zwei Cisternen am westl. Fuße des westlichen der beiden Hügel, zwischen denen Cesnola’s Tempel liegt; Cesnola, durch diese Cisternen aufmerksam geworden, ließ sie im Februar hier graben u. fand auch auf einem Fleck Landes von nur wenigen Quadratfuß eine Menge von Trümmern, namentlich Statuen im egyptisch-phönizischen Stile. Da dieselben jedoch alle arg verstümmelt und wertlos waren, so ließ er alle diese Antiquitäten an Ort und Stelle liegen, wo ich sie selbst noch gesehen habe. [Diese erste Fundstätte Cesnolas ist auf dem Situationskärtchen durch 2 bezeichnet].


(fol. 36v)


2. Letter from Paul Schröder to Justus Olshausen, 1870

Several letters from Schröder to Olshausen form part of the extensive archives of Justus Olshausen, preserved at the Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz (GStA PK) in Berlin.\footnote{GStA PK, VI. HA, FA Olshausen, B I Nr. 7 (Lit. Schm-Schu).} For the purpose of the present contribution, we will only reproduce an extract of one letter, the remaining correspondence having been dealt with in a previous article.\footnote{Cannavò, Schmid 2020 with additional information on Olshausen.}

Letter dating from 28 March 1870:
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