

REPORT

OF

W. J. STILLMAN

ON THE

CESNOLA COLLECTION.

PRIVately PRINTED.

THE COUNCIL AND MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN
NUMISMATIC AND ARCHÆOLOGICAL
SOCIETY OF NEW YORK.

Gentlemen :—In response to the resolution of your Society of date, January 20th, I have the honor to report that, having examined the evidence, accessible at this point, bearing upon the question of the authenticity and archæological value of the collection known as the Cesnola Collection of Cypriote Antiquities, I find that, while it contains many objects of unquestionably great value to the science of archæology, its utility to students of that science is seriously diminished :—

First. By a deplorable recklessness of attribution as to the localities of discovery, which makes it quite impossible to determine the place in the general archæology of Cyprus to which the several pieces can be assigned ;

Second. By evident repairs and alterations in certain pieces, and a thorough system of concealment of the original surfaces of others, and those the most important, which makes it impossible to decide whether they have, or have not, undergone similar alterations ; and,

Third. By attributions which assign an important part of the Collection to a single deposit, although the evidence, both internal and external, points indisputably to the non-existence of the supposed deposit.

With regard to the first point, viz.: RECKLESSNESS OF ATTRIBUTION, the most important evidence is found in the various reports of his discoveries made by Col. di Cesnola himself, in which the same object is variously attributed at various times, in a manner which proves such looseness of statement on this important point,

as to show either, that he had no perception of the importance of exact localization, or, that he did not know where many of the objects were really found.

This is shown by the contradictions contained in various communications of Col. di Cesnola, in reference to the *provenance* of certain of the objects, and especially by the predilection for assigning pieces to the Temple of Golgoi which had been found elsewhere, and had been formerly attributed to other finds.

The contradiction between Col. di Cesnola's *Cyprus* and his Report to the Royal Academy of Turin, taken together with the contradiction of Col. di Cesnola's own versions by Ceccaldi, Lang and Doell, and the fact that no one but Col. di Cesnola has seen the pretended Temple of Golgoi, will, I believe, in the light that I shall have to throw on Col. di Cesnola's declarations later in my report, convince the Society that the existence of the Temple of Golgoi is not based upon sufficient authority to be considered as an archæological fact; consequently, the attribution of statues or other objects to that Temple cannot give grounds for archæological conclusions.

The following discrepancies occur between *Cyprus* (Am. Ed.) and other statements and authorities :

"CYPRUS"—American edition.

P. 54 and pp. 435 (No. 98), 433 (No. 52):
Two "Sepulchral Cippi" from LARNACA.

P. 81. "Terra-cotta from SOLI,"
Vide Index, p. xvii.

(Remark the addition of the body of Endymion to the fragment of a statuette of Aphrodite).

VARIOUS AUTHORITIES.

1. J. Doell's No. 787: From DALI.
2. J. Doell's No. 785: From ALAMBRA

1. Catalogue of Cesnola's Auction Sale, Paris, 1870, No. 180: Found at CITIUM (Larnaca).

2. *Gazette Archéologique*, 1877, p. 51, refers to the above Sale-Catalogue.

3. L. Heuzey's *Catalogue des Figurines antiques de terre cuite du Musée du Louvre*, p. 197, No. 235, refers both to *Cyprus* and the above Sale-Catalogue.

The names of the localities mentioned in the Sale-Catalogue were copied by Mr. Froehner from Col. di Cesnola's letters.

P. 94(text): A procession composed of six terra-cotta groups, found in a single grave at ALAMBRA. *a.* Horseman car-

1. J. Doell's Pl. XIV, Nos. 937-942. Dali or Alambra.
2. Ceccaldi (*Magasin Pittoresque*, July,

rying two large jars. *b.* Donkey with panniers. *c.* Chariot with three musicians. *d.* Chariot with a man. *e.* Chariot with a woman. *f.* Chariot with a MAN, "PROBABLY REPRESENTING THE CHIEF PERSONAGE OF THE PROCESSION."

1876, and *Monuments Antiques de Chypre*, etc., p. 131. *et seq.*, 1882: Six terra-cotta groups from one tomb of the Valley of Dali, published as representing "Une partie de campagne à IDALIE dans l'antiquité." . . . "C'est une partie de plaisir où ne manquent ni le vin, ni les victuailles, ni la musique."

In the Metropolitan Museum, Central Park, this procession has been increased to nine principal groups, and is described in the official catalogues as representing a funeral procession.

3. *Short Guide to the Cesnola Collection*, 1880, p. 13: "Case 17, No. 265^{a-k}" —A procession from a single grave; on the bier is (No. 265¹) the mummied figure of a Semitic Venus, WHO PROBABLY REPRESENTS THE DEAD WOMAN.

4. *Hand-Book No. 2. Potteries of the Cesnola Collection*, p. 42: "No. 265^{a-k}" —A procession found in a grave at Alambra . . . No. 265¹ looks like a bandaged mummy . . . Its face is covered by the well-modelled mask of a cow. The procession MAY BE THE FUNERAL OF A WOMAN, in which case the figure of the Semitic Venus represents the deceased. The cow's mask placed over the face may be the symbol of the goddess' protection, since the cow was the animal of more than one Eastern goddess."

P. 141, Fig. 6: Female head from the Temple of GOLGOI, 1870.

Revue Archéologique, 1869. Vol. XX, Pl. xvi, p. 208; and G. C. Ceccaldi's *Monuments Antiques de Chypre, de Syrie et d'Egypte*, Pl. xviii, Fig. 1, p. 299. Discoveries of T. C. Ceccaldi at TRICOMO in the Carpas, 1869. In the Louvre, since 1870, under No. N 3497.

P. 150: "Terra-cotta horsemen," from the Temple of Golgoi.

J. Doell, in his Preface, p. 7, says that no terra-cotta objects were found in the Temple of Golgoi.

P. 152, Fig. 1: Female figure from the TEMPLE OF GOLGOI. Western side

Photographs sent by Mr. L. P. di Cesnola to Mr. Clarence Cook: "FOUND

of Temple, April, 1870.

P. 159 : "Two FOOT-STOOLS," found in the north-east corner of the TEMPLE of Golgoi in April, 1870.

P. 161 : Pl. XIII. Statue holding head of ox."

Museum Catalogue, No. 39 : TEMPLE of Golgoi, 1870.

AT SALAMIS," after 1873. (See Mr. Cook's pamphlet, p. 35.)

Atti della R. Accademia delle scienze di Torino, Vol. XI. (Adunanza dell' 2 Gennajo 1876). Di Cesnola's Report, found in the NECROPOLIS of Golgoi, after di Cesnola's return to Cyprus. (After 1873). Described and illustrated under the name of FUNERAL BAS-RELIEFS. See Pl. IV of the *Atti*.

1. *Harper's Magazine*, July, 1872, p. 207, described pp. 206 and 207: "Found at SALAMIS." See also Mr. di Cesnola's testimony.

2. Mr. L. P. di Cesnola's letter of 24 Dec., 1868, copy communicated by W. Froehner : "J'ai dernièrement trouvé une statue colossale en pierre (tête et pieds cassés) qui tient dans une main une tête de bœuf parfaitement conservée. Barbe frisée, lèvres peintes en rouge, de même les narines et les pupilles. Triple couronne (un bras manque). Trouvée à Golgos où M. de Vogüé a fouillé."

3. J. Doell, Pl. VI, No. 124 : Not found in the Temple of Golgoi. *Vide* Preface, p. 8.

It will be seen that by consulting Doell, the writer in *Harper's Magazine*, and Col. di Cesnola himself, we read of three statues bearing the head of an ox, while only one such statue, the one now in the Metropolitan Museum, is known to exist.

P. 207 : "Colossal terra-cotta head." PAPHOS.

P. 230 : "Terra-cottas found at SOLI."

Harper's New Monthly Magazine, July, 1872, p. 194 : "Terra-cotta, from DALI."

1. (Head on the left). J. Doell, No. 1052, Pl. XV : LARNACA.

2. (Statuette), Catalogue of Cesnola's Auction Sale, Paris, 1870, No. 201 : "Found at LARNACA." Photographed.

3. (Head on the right). *Scribner's Magazine*, Dec. 1871, p. 184 : "Marble Heads found at PAPHOS."

P. 243 : "Terra-cottas, life-size."
CYTHREA.

P. 285 : "Statue of Veiled Female found at FASULI." (1874-1875).

(In the *Tribune Extra*, No. 47, Nov. 27, 1878, Col. di Cesnola publishes the same cut as representing one of his discoveries, and as one of the objects in the Metropolitan Museum of Art).

P. 344 : (Fig. 2, foot of page 344.) "Stone statuettes from Temple of Apollo Hylates." HYLE, 1874-75.

P. 414 : Inscriptions No. 3 and 4.
PALÆO-PAPHOS.

P. 416 : Inscription No. 8. "From
PALÆO-PAPHOS."

Fig. 1. Catalogue of Cesnola's Auction Sale, Paris, 1870, No. 208, p. 18 : "Found at PAPHOS."

Fig. 4. *Harper's New Monthly Magazine*, July, 1872, p. 206 : "Terra-cotta, from PAPHOS."

Revue Archéologique, 1869, Pl. v, Fig. 3; and G. C. Ceccaldi's *Monuments Antiques de Chypre*, etc., Pl. xvi, Fig. 3 : Discoveries of T. C. Ceccaldi at DALI, 1869. See *Art Amateur*, Jan., 1883.

Revue Archéologique, 1869, Pl. xvi, No. 2, and *Monuments Antiques de Chypre*, etc., Pl. xviii, Fig. 2. Statue discovered at TRICOMO (1869) by T. C. Ceccaldi, in the Louvre since 1870, under No. N 3498.

G. C. Ceccaldi's *Monuments Antiques de Chypre*, etc., pp. 193 and 194 : Found at "the Salina, near LARNACA."

G. C. Ceccaldi's *Monuments Antiques de Chypre*, etc., p. 195 : Found at "the Salina, near LARNACA."

With contradictions like the above brought to their notice, I believe the Society will not differ from my conclusions, that but little reliance can be placed on the local attributions of the objects in the Museum, and that small assistance, therefore, can be drawn from them to illustrate the archæology of Cyprus.

With reference to the second point, viz.: REPAIRS AND ALTERATIONS, I am of opinion that, in general, the damage done is not material, and that no evidence of repairs appears in the great majority of the objects. But there can be no question that certain objects have been greatly affected by *restoration*, and that many of the principal pieces of sculpture have been covered by a coating of some composition, whose only purpose can have been to conceal the evidences

of repairs. This is entirely illegitimate, and in itself justifies suspicion. In some cases, notably in the so-called archaic sarcophagus (*Cyprus*, p. 111), it is indisputable that extensive repairs have been made, since the evidence of them appears in the clamps in the interior of the sarcophagus, while externally they are so completely concealed by dexterous manipulation and the use of the composition alluded to, that it is scarcely possible to perceive that any repairs have been made. This will appear more evidently on the front of the sarcophagus, which, as a whole, is evidently genuine but restored. This is contrary to the practice of all archæological museums, where the part supplied is always to be readily distinguished. To a certain extent this diminishes the value of the object and its authority, because it implies always the possibility of the entire sculptured surface being recut and leaves it open to a suspicion of indefinite alterations. The pretext that our climate makes this necessary as a protection is ridiculous.

But the sculpture of the back of the sarcophagus is, in my opinion, of a later epoch. Its style of design has nothing in common with that of the front—it has none of the *naïvete* of archaic or even good archaic work. It is clearly a barbarous imitation of Greek designs, and may possibly have been composed from fragments of vase-design of late archaic work ; but a careful examination of the details of execution has strengthened my suspicion that it is a modern forgery of uncertain date, and that the back of the sarcophagus had originally no sculpture. The execution of this part is clumsy and unintelligent, the muscle-markings have not even the definiteness of conventional archaism, the forms are flabby and weak ; while, if we compare the treatment of the foliage on the two sides, we shall readily perceive the difference in the spirit of the two reliefs. The larger sarcophagus (*Cyprus*, Pl. XIV–XV) is so clumsily repaired that there is little difficulty in following the reparations.

When restorations are made in good faith there is no attempt to hide them, while the new surface in the Cypriote sculptures seems to have been acted on by acid to give the effect of the corrosion due to time, and this, with the wash which was applied afterwards, has the effect of entirely effacing any evidence of late recutting. As the chief value of this class of sculptures is in the indication of

style and original condition, the consequence of this tampering with the surfaces is the proportional destruction of the archæological value of the work, as every archæologist knows.

Any piece of antique sculpture so treated, offered to any of the European museums, or to an intelligent dealer in antiquities, would be rejected, or accepted only as of impaired value, both pecuniarily and archæologically.

It is true that Col. di Cesnola declared that : " In the entire "collection I have not made a single restoration of any object or "part of any object in stone," but even his own admission, in the Feuardent-Cesnola libel suit, shows that this can only be taken as true in the sense that he personally did not make any such restoration, but contented himself with directing them to be made by his workmen—a mere subterfuge.

It is not necessary that I should notice at any length this tedious and, as it seems to me, injudiciously conducted case, which, on account of its having the appearance of a personal difference between the parties, prejudiced all the important issues, and by referring to an ordinary jury, matters which could be determined only by a jury of experts, failed to throw any light on the question ; nevertheless, this trial did bring to light certain facts which to the archæological world must be convincing.

In his examination Col. di Cesnola made, amongst others, the following admissions, which, in themselves, impeach his general declaration.

* * * * *

(2365) Q. Well, before being packed, that photograph 190, was made ? A. Yes, sir ; I took that as I took all the other photographs of my things : I had it all packed up and it was sent to New York, and remained for perhaps two years, or three years, in 14th Street unpacked.

Q. Never exhibited ? A. Never exhibited, but unpacked. When we went to Central Park I took all these cases to Central Park, and there I unpacked among others this case. I am not quite sure that I did unpack it myself. I believe it was Mr. Prime who unpacked it himself, and the pieces were found there and turned over to the repairer, with orders to put them together. That is all, as far as I can remember, about this Sphinx.

Q. Now, is it true that legs were made—new legs were made wholly of plaster ? A. It was impossible that they were all plaster. They were chips of the legs in front and rear, which, of course, required a support of plaster to keep the

pieces together. As you can see, the legs are very tender and the thing very big ; but there is not a single leg there that is made of full plaster as I remember—the back of it ; the front is stone mostly.

Q. Then, I understand you that the legs of this Sphinx, as now exhibited, include the broken fragments of the original limbs ? A. Yes, sir.

Q. All the legs ? A. All the chips and pieces of the legs ; which had been kept.

Q. And they are completed by the use of plaster ? A. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

(2409) Q. That hand is part plaster, and you can see the break, down here, where it is mended ? A. Yes, sir. The upper part of the hand is plaster, but there are some traces of the fingers beneath it.

Q. (By Mr. Bangs.) By the upper part of the hand, what do you mean ? A. From what I have been able to remark, with the assistance of sculptors, is that there seems to be traces of fingers right on the stone, and Mr. Gehlen filled up these fingers and made it whole. The balance is made of plaster and is not the original hand. It might be removed here in Court, if you want to.

* * * * *

Q. Wasn't that undercutting done by Baillard ? A. He was cleaning it, and in cleaning it he enlarged it with a piece of wood [this alludes to the mirror in the hand of the " Little Venus."]

Q. When did he do that ? A. When he cleaned it.

(2645) Q. Four years ago ? A. In 1879 ; yes, sir.

Q. Then its shape and appearance have been altered in modern times ; four years ago is pretty modern, is it not ? A. I do not understand your question.

Q. Didn't you say the other day that this undercutting was done by Mr. Baillard with a wooden stick, or a soft piece of wood ? A. I said that the traces were all there, and in taking the encrustation off with a piece of wood, he went deeper than the original was perhaps ; I did not say that he made it.

* * * * *

(2647) Q. Then you know what stuff there has been put between the ankles ?

A. There is nothing there between the ankles.

Q. You know what the little wash is ? A. I said so already.

Q. Did you see it in Cyprus ? A. In Cyprus there was no such wash.

Q. When was it put on ? A. In Central Park.

Q. Then its appearance has been altered since it went to the Central Park ? A. I do not see any difference in it.

Q. Is the point of junction apparent as it was in Cyprus ? A. No, sir, certainly not.

Q. Then this change has taken place, that the point of junction has been concealed ? A. It is not concealed ; it can be seen.

Q. Didn't it used to be just as apparent as it was in the ankles? A. It was all covered up, before the Committee washed it; you could not see the joint at all.

Q. What covered it up? A. This bit of cement, and then it was covered with a little wash, which I ordered to be done.

Q. What do you call that, an attachment, a repair, or a restoration. A. I call it a repair.

* * * * *

Q. Is it a fact, that after the plaintiff's charges were made, you ascertained that ten or fifteen articles on which Gehlen had worked, retained the work which he had done upon them? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you were indebted to the plaintiff for that discovery, were you? A. Yes, sir.

(2764) Q. It was an honest, true, faithful charge of his, was it not, as far as it respected those ten or fifteen statues? A. No, sir; it did not specify one of those pieces; that is the joke of it.

Q. But he put you on the track of it first, didn't he? A. Yes, sir; and I am very much obliged to him, too.

Q. Now, as to those ten or fifteen, has anything been done to them since? A. No, sir; they have been washed—sponged, and satisfied ourselves and the Trustees, and the order of the Trustees was to leave them—

Q. Now, stop one moment, if you please, Mr. di Cesnola; has anything been done to those ten or fifteen statues since that discovery that you made at the instigation of the plaintiff? A. Done what?

Q. Has anything been done in the way of removing Gehlen's work, or does it remain there yet? A. Exactly as it was there, except by sponging them off.

* * * * *

Q. (By Mr. Bangs). Wasn't it Mr. Savage that called your attention to the fact that the legs of the little Hercules were made? A. Yes, sir.

(2881) Q. And you made the same promise to him that you had about the bird? A. What promise?

Q. You said that Savage first called your attention to the little Hercules? A. I don't know about little Hercules.

Q. Wasn't your attention called to the made legs by Mr. Savage? A. I don't remember that.

Q. That Sphinx there, No. 35, Exhibit 190, contained in the red album; where was this red album picture of that Sphinx taken? A. I don't remember; let me see it, (picture shown witness) in Cyprus.

Q. Where there appear vacancies, or gaps, in this album picture, how have they been supplied, there appearing to be no such gaps in the image as it stands there now—by plaster and stone? A. By plaster.

Q. Who did that work? A. Mr. Baillard, in Central Park.

Q. Did you see it done? A. No, sir; but I gave him the pieces to put together, and I suppose he filled up the gaps.

Q. And how do you characterize that work ? A. A proper repair.

Q. But some of the old fragments were missing, were they not ? A. Yes, sir ; but you have the shape of the leg, which shows how it was.

Q. But the work does not consist merely of the adjusting of old fragments and putting them together ? (2882) A. Yes, sir ; that plaster was put in merely to support the leg.

Q. But that support is furnished by putting into the figure something that was not there before ? A. Very naturally.

Q. That is the fact ? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that is the work of a modern artist, or modern workman ? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that work covered up with a wash also ? A. Yes, sir ; the repair was covered up.

I make no note of the instances in which Col. di Cesnola's testimony is directly negatived by other witnesses, whose position we are not here to estimate, but the following cannot be well passed over :

COL. DI CESNOLA'S TESTIMONY.

(2223) Q. Who was this Mr. Sturgis of whom you speak ? A. He was one of the Trustees in charge of the building arrangement in 14th Street ; I suppose he was especially in charge of it, but I am not sure ; as I say, I was not connected with it.

Q. Mr. Russell Sturgis ? A. He was, in fact, the man from whom I had to get my orders. * * * *

Q. Were any of the other Trustees active in that same matter ? A. There was Mr. Prime, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Weston, Mr. Rhinelander, and Mr. Hoe, Jr.

Q. Now, in regard to Mr. Gehlen's work there, what had you to do with that ? A. Mr. Gehlen was employed by the Trustees ; I had nothing to do with it ; I did not know the man before I went there ; I found him put in charge there, and Mr. STURGIS said : 'THIS IS THE MAN I EMPLOYED TO MAKE ALL REPAIRS THAT HE WANTS TO YOUR STATUARY, so that it can go up-stairs and be placed on exhibition ;' I took it for granted that the

THE TESTIMONY OPPOSITE CALLED OUT
FROM MR. STURGIS THE
FOLLOWING REPLY.

(*Not put in evidence on the trial.*)

"To the Editor of the Evening Post :

"SIR :--In the reports of the Feuerd-Cesnola suit, session of the 20th of December, General di Cesnola is quoted as saying in answer to questions by jurors "RUSSELL STURGIS IS MAINLY RESPONSIBLE FOR GEHLEN'S REPAIRS AND RESTORATIONS."

"I have written to General di Cesnola, calling his attention to this report and begging him to contradict it, supposing, as I must, that his words have been incorrectly reported. But, as I am so far away, I cannot well await his answer before taking other steps to contradict the statement ascribed to him.

"FOR THAT STATEMENT IS WHOLLY UNTRUE. I NEVER HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH ANY OF MR. GEHLEN'S WORK

man knew his business, and I merely pointed out the pieces and told him how they should be repaired and put together; I told him, however, that nothing should be made permanent, as the collection was going to be put on exhibition temporarily only in that building. * * *

A Juror :—I should like to ask whether this statue of Hercules, when this statue was restored, was restored in Mr. di Cesnola's presence, or whether he knew of its being done.

Q. Were you present when it was done? A. No, sir ; it was done in 14th Street, in the other building.

Q. (By a Juror) : Were you in this country at the time? A. Yes, sir ; I was here at that time, BUT I DID NOT KNOW OF IT.

(2854) Q. Was it done clandestinely? A. Not that I know of. * * *

Q. (By a Juror) : Was it done by your orders? A. Not at that time ; I was not connected with the Museum at that time. I did have instructions to see that repairs were properly made of everything, but I went away afterwards, and what was done during that time I do not know ; I cannot say whether it was on exhibition in 14th Street or not ; I don't know. THE REPAIRER WAS APPOINTED BY THE TRUSTEES ; MR. STURGIS APPOINTED HIM, AND I WAS MERELY A STRANGER THERE. * * * * *

Q. I would like to ask you a question, and I would like to have you give me a direct answer to the question. * * * Did you, concerning that statue, give Mr. Gehlen any directions whatever? A. I have not the slightest recollection.

Q. You did give him some general

UPON THE SCULPTURES OF THE CESNOLA COLLECTION.

"At the time of the unpacking of the first Cesnola Collection, I was a Trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and a member of the Executive Committee. The Douglas Mansion in West 14th Street, had been hired for the Museum, and I had volunteered to superintend the alterations necessary to fit that house and its appendages for the uses of the Museum. For this purpose I visited the house three or four times a week, and during all the time that I was so employed General di Cesnola was busy unpacking and arranging his collection, 'the first Cesnola Collection,' as it is commonly called. He had assumed the charge of its arrangement in the 14th Street building, and, to the best of my remembrance, was busied in that long and arduous task all through the latter spring and summer of 1872, for perhaps four, perhaps five months. Mr. North, and afterwards Mr. Gehlen, were employed in cleaning, repairing and mounting statues, busts, etc. I seldom saw them at work, as I had but rarely any occasion to pass through their workshops, my own especially undertaken duty keeping me at the Museum building already too long. I seldom saw any statue or bust until after it had been put in place. As regards the repairs or restorations, the mounting and placing of the sculptures, I often conversed with Gen. di Cesnola, exactly as any other member of the Board of Trustees might have done. BUT I NEVER HAD GIVEN TO ME, NOR ASSUMED, ANY AUTHORITY OVER THESE MATTERS. I NEVER DIRECTED ANY REPAIRS, NOR ADVISED ANY, NOR INFLUENCED, NOR SOUGHT TO INFLUENCE IN ANY WAY, THE MANNER

directions to repair, did you not? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You do not wish to be responsible for the condition of that statue, BUT YOU DESIRE TO PLACE THE RESPONSIBILITY UPON MR. STURGIS, DO YOU? A. To a CERTAIN EXTENT, YES, SIR.

Q. Did he give Mr. Gehlen directions to make that repair? A. That, I don't know; as a general thing he did not.

Q. DID YOU HEAR MR. STURGIS GIVE ANY DIRECTIONS WHATEVER TO MR. GEHLEN ABOUT REPAIRING STATUES? A. YES, SIR, I DID; MR. GEHLEN DEPENDED UPON HIM.

Q. THEN, MR. GEHLEN WAS NOT RESPONSIBLE TO YOU? A. NO, SIR.

(2856) Q. Is it your wish and understanding—is it your wish that the jury should understand—that you do not consider yourself responsible for anything that Mr. Gehlen did? A. MOST CERTAINLY; I want to be responsible for the work done in Central Park after I was made Director, but not for the work done in 14th Street by Gehlen. I AM NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THAT.

Q. (By Mr. Choate.) Did I understand you to say that you remember no particular instruction given by anybody about this statue? A. None whatever.

Q. Mr. Gehlen, not being responsible to you, you never interfered or meddled with him in any way, did you? A. I do not understand what you mean.

Q. Was he independent of you?

Witness : Meddled with what?

Counsel : DID YOU EVER INTERFERE OR ATTEMPT TO CONTROL HIM? A. NO, SIR; CERTAINLY NOT, I HAD NO POWER TO CONTROL HIM.

OR EXTENT OF REPAIRING OR RESTORATION. And the statement copied above from the *Tribune* of the 21st December IS ABSOLUTELY AND WHOLLY FALSE.

"I have made a similar declaration upon oath before the Consul of the United States at this place, and have sent it to New York, where it can be used if needed.

" R. STURGIS.

" 56, Via del Prato,
" Florence, Italy, January 4."

I further append parts of the testimony of Mr. Gehlen, the repairer, and of Mr. H. G. Hutchins, Superintendent of the Metropolitan Museum, while in Fourteenth Street :

FEODORE GEHLEN, being duly sworn on behalf of plaintiff, testifies as follows :

Direct-examination by MR. BANGS :

Q. Do you live in this City? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where were you born? A. I was born in Europe.

Q. Of what country are you a native? A. Westphalia.

Q. What is your present residence in this City? A. My first residence was at South Fifth Avenue, twenty-five years ago.

Q. And how long have you lived there? A. About three years.

Q. What is your business,—that is what is the business that you were brought up in? A. A cabinet-maker.

Q. That includes work on furniture? A. Yes, sir; and some carvings, too.

Q. Carvings of what? A. Wood.

Q. You make all sorts of fancy articles? A. Yes, sir; fancy articles, and inlaid work.

Q. Were you ever connected with the Metropolitan Museum of Art? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did that connection commence or begin? A. I started, in the first place, in 53d Street and Fifth Avenue. That is where I started.

Q. The location of the place when you were first employed by it was at 53d Street and Fifth Avenue? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you remain there all the while the Museum was located there? A. No, sir. I stopped as soon as my work was done, and I went again to it in 14th Street.

Q. After it moved to 14th Street, you were employed by the Museum? A. Yes, sir.

Q. How were you employed,—by the day or the month or the piece? A. By the day.

Q. Do you remember how long a period of time you worked at Fifth Avenue and 53d Street? A. Six months at Fifth Avenue.

Q. And how long were you working at 14th Street? A. Two years almost.
* * * * *

Q. Who called you in at that time? A. Mr. di Cesnola, or Russell Sturgis.

Q. Which one was it? A. Russell Sturgis; and he introduced me to Mr. di Cesnola.

Q. Then, whom did you make your bargain with? A. I think with Mr. Sturgis or Mr. di Cesnola. I don't know any more. It was one or the other. I knew Mr. Russell Sturgis alone at that time, and as I came there, he introduced me to Mr. di Cesnola; and from that moment on I commenced to work there.

Q. Did Mr. di Cesnola tell you anything that he wanted you to do? A. Yes, sir, he told me everything.

Q. What did he tell you he wanted you to do? A. To repair statues and to mount them; to restore statues and mount them. Sometimes, a little repairin was done, but the most was restoring, and some repairing and mounting.

Q. What do you mean by mounting them? A. To put them on pedestals or boxes.

Q. Have you seen this little statue of Venus here? A. Yes, sir.

Q. By mounting, you mean putting it on such a pedestal as that on which Venus now stands? A. Each figure has a small pedestal; and that is what I mean by mounting.

Q. Can you tell whether Mr. di Cesnola said anything more to you, or went more into details, than you have already mentioned. Did he tell you how, or by what means, or what things he wanted you to restore, or in what way he wanted that restoration or repair made? A. Almost all those things were brought to me in my shop, and I had my assistant there to help me move them around. Mr. Charles Henckel was my assistant.

Q. What did Mr. di Cesnola tell you with reference to repairs and restorations? A. He wanted everything as much as possible correct as it was originally.

Q. Was that after his first collection had arrived from Cyprus? A. The first collection was all there.

Q. When you first went to 14th Street? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it packed or unpacked? A. Some pieces were packed out; that is, most of those big statues were packed out. Only the vases and those kind of things were packed in—vases, pots, &c.

Q. The large statues were unpacked? A. Yes, sir. They were almost all put in the Museum in another place.

Q. And were there any fragments or broken pieces anywhere—arms, legs, heads, &c.? A. There were different pieces broken. There were three pairs of bases, with feet on them, and some other fragments of arms and legs and different heads.

Q. Were they in boxes or out of boxes? A. They were most out of boxes.

Q. Were there some in the boxes? A. I could not tell you that particularly. I did not care for that. Most of the things were brought to me in my shop, and I worked on them.

Q. Where there were broken parts, limbs or heads, legs or arms, which were broken off, was there anything done to them. Or did Mr. di Cesnola tell you what particular statue these broken parts originally belonged to? A. Sometimes I had to shave off a little from one side or another—

Q. Suppose there was a head. Was there anything about that head by which you could distinguish which particular statue it had originally belonged to? A. No, sir; nothing was marked. * * * * *

Q. You used the saw to join the parts together, did you not? A. No, sir.

If it was rough underneath, I sawed it straight ; or, sometimes, if I had to put other feet underneath, I used to saw it to make the parts straight to fit them together.

Q. And when you used the saw, there were some parts that you put together after you used the saw? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you use the chisel for? A. To make the two parts fit together. And if one part was bigger than the other, I had to even it.

Q. What materials, apart from the tools, did you use to make the things stick together? A. If I wanted a solid piece, I took a stone and built it up with plaster around it.

Q. What kind of plaster? A. Plaster Paris.

Q. How did you make things stick together? A. I had my own cement for that.

Q. What do you mean by your own cement? A. I made a composition which is my own composition. It is a secret. I won't tell that.

Q. It was solely for the purpose of making parts adhere together? A. Yes, sir; to make it solid.

Q. Do you remember the largest object on which you did any repairing or restoring? A. Yes, I remember Hercules.

Q. What did you do with Hercules? A. I took the body with half a leg on the right side of it, and there was no left leg on the left side.

Q. What was that leg made of? A. Of fragments and pieces that Mr. di Cesnola brought to me. He brought all those pieces to me and so I took another base with feet, which were standing near together—the feet were standing near together—without a body, and I used them on that statue. I could not use that body in that way. You see the feet did not correspond to the body, they had another shape; the figure stands in this way, AND SO I HAD TO CUT THAT FOOT OFF WITH A SAW AND SET IT FURTHER OUT ON THIS FIGURE. (Witness illustrating).

Q. Did anybody give you directions in regard to that. Did anybody direct you how to do it? A. My boss wanted me to make it correct; it was to stand upright, and so I had to do it.

Q. WHO WAS YOUR BOSS AT THAT TIME? A. MR. DI CESNOLA.

Q. Did you ever speak to him about this Hercules afterwards? A. No, sir. It was a sure thing. He wanted to put the pieces together, and I had to cut a hole through it and secure it underneath with nuts; and in the joints that was chipped out, I could not leave those without making them smooth, so I filled them up with plaster.

Q. We are talking now about this particular statue. What had you to do with it, and did anybody give you any directions in regard to what you were to do to this particular statue? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who? A. MR. CESNOLA TOLD ME TO PIECE ON A WING ON IT, AND TO MAKE A TAIL, AND TO DO WHATEVER WAS NECESSARY.

Q. Was the dove attached to the statue? A. Yes, sir.

Q. At the time? A. Yes, sir, it belonged to it. That dove belonged to it.

Q. Was it fastened to the statue? A. No, sir, it was loose on the hand.

Q. Did you ever see it off or away from the statue? A. Yes, sir, it was all loose, and to save it, he told me to put it on.

Q. Where was the dove? A. In Fourteenth Street.

Q. In what part of Fourteenth Street?—On what part of the statue was it, and was it attached to the statue? A. It was given to me with the statue.

Q. By whom? A. By Mr. di Cesnola.

Q. Do you remember any other large object on which you did work of that description? A. Yes, I made some heads. I made one where there was only a face, and some I made new;—I made some new lips.

Q. Did you put that head on anybody, or anything, after you had made it up in that way? A. I made up many heads.

Q. What part of the face did you have to begin with—I am speaking now of the particular one about which you said that you made up the head and you only had the face. You made the back of the head? A. I had many heads—

Q. You spoke of a particular one where you only had a face. Did you have the whole face to begin with? A. Yes, sir.

Q. The chin, the lips, the nose and all? A. Yes, sir.

Q. What did you do with that? A. I made back hair on it; ears and hair, etc., and whatever there was, to make it correspond with the rest.

Q. Was it a male or a female head? A. Almost a female head.

* * * * *

Q. Do you remember any image on which you did put sandals? A. Yes, sir, half a new foot, and a sandal, and bands on it to tie it up.

Q. You don't know whether this is the figure upon which you put the sandals or not? A. No, sir.

Q. You did find a head and body separate? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you put a head on the body? A. Yes, sir; I remember that too.

Q. Who gave you the head? A. Mr. di Cesnola gave me the head.

Q. How did you unite the head to the body? A. Some with dowels, and some I only cemented.

Q. What part of it consisted of cement? A. Some heads naturally belonged to it.

Q. This particular head, we are now speaking of: this one I now show you? A. I put the head and arm on.

* * * * *

Q. Please tell me again; I don't remember what you said yesterday. A. I got the body from Hercules—I got Hercules with the club in his hand and the left arm is the hand with the club and the arm was off and the club was loose and so I fastened that on, and then I got a base with two feet to make on that statue and those feet were from another body and the feet were standing so—near to-

gether—as you see many others there—and then to make those do for this statue it was necessary to cut one foot off and to stand it that way (illustrating) as this Hercules there with this club in the hand, and then these fragments of the legs.

MR. H. G. HUTCHINS, being duly sworn on behalf of the plaintiff, testifies as follows :

Direct-examination by MR. OUDIN :

Mr. Oudin offers in evidence the photographs of a statue. Marked Exhibit 20.

Q. You stated I believe that Mr. Gehlen had done some thing to the bird. What was it ? A. The tail of the bird, I stated, was made of wood, covered with plaster by Gehlen in the repair room at the 14th Street building, before it was placed on exhibition in 14th Street.

Q. Have you ever heard the defendant express an opinion or say anything about that bird ? A. I have heard Gen. di Cesnola compliment Gehlen upon the work upon that particular statue, saying that it was satisfactory. Gen. di Cesnola was present from day to day as that work was going on.

Q. How many objects that were worked upon by Gehlen did Gen. di Cesnola see while Gehlen was working on them ? A. All the heavy work was repaired and placed in position for exhibition before Gen. di Cesnola went back to Cyprus. That work was done by di Cesnola's order.

Q. Any of it in his presence ? A. A great deal of it ; yes, sir.

* * * * * * * * * * *

A. Well, he told Mr. Gehlen to put a hand on here, or a foot on another place on different statues, pointing to those objects.

Q. While Mr. Gehlen was at work ? A. Yes, sir ; while he was at work di Cesnola was often present and showing him.

Q. How often was he present while this was going on ? How many days in the week, and how many hours in the day ? A. While the collection was arranged —while the first collection was being arranged, it was done by di Cesnola, as I stated before. Gehlen was working in the basement, and di Cesnola and myself were working in the upper rooms, and he would go down from time to time into the basement.

A thorough examination of the important pieces of sculpture in the Museum and of all additions that have been made, after the removal of the wash which now conceals the original surface, is necessary to determine their archæological value, as well as to restore them to their condition when found, if that be still possible,

and so make them of some definite authority with students. The doubt that necessarily hangs over them at present is a diminution of value in every sense of the word.

I need hardly call the attention of the Society to the curious case of the "Little Venus," and the undercutting with a "wooden stick." The stone, around the mirror, is clearly new cut and treated with acid, and at least one member of the Society saw the statuette when the mirror was of a different shape. No expert could have failed to see that this was newly cut.

With reference to the third point, viz. : Attributions assigning an important part of the collection to a single deposit, the principal instance of which I would call attention to, is the so-called Curium Treasure, an account of which Col. di Cesnola gives in *Cyprus*. So elaborate and circumstantial is this description, that it must be considered as his capital discovery, upon which his claim to honesty and credibility must stand or fall. If his account of the Treasure, as described in *Cyprus* is true, then all prior conclusions as to the archaeology of the Island must be modified. Mr. Newton, of the British Museum, seems to have been led, after a partial examination of the Treasure, to doubt its assigned epoch. He found pieces of gold work which he would not attribute to an earlier date than the time of Alexander, while Rev. C. W. King, in *Cyprus*, attributes them to the "beginning of the fifth century before our era." (Appendix to *Cyprus*.)

I was led, by the suspicion thrown on the genuineness of the Curium find, to scrutinize closely the collection of jewelry at the Metropolitan Museum. On two occasions I examined it with archaeological friends, and we agreed that, while some of the objects were certainly of great archaeological value and to be envied by any museum in the world, a great part of them were of late Greek work, many of them being funeral jewelry made for the purpose of adorning the dead; in fact, such as is to be found in all the tombs in the Greek islands dating as late as the Roman conquest and even later. Some were even Byzantine, barbaric, and

mediæval, with some counterfeits, and one pair of earrings of the 19th century, machine-made, and of base gold.* It is impossible, even for an instant, to grant a collective antique character to this Treasure.

I had printed in the *New York Times*, a statement giving the numbers of some of the articles whose authenticity I impeached. The removal of all the numbers from the collection was the only notice taken of my communication, thereby rendering any reference to them, for the purpose of substantiating or disproving my conclusions, altogether impossible.

The statement of Mr. Max Ohnefalsch Richter, that on the spot described in *Cyprus* and which can be easily identified, there is no indication of any such vault as Col. di Cesnola describes, is, of itself, a startling declaration, especially on account of the great importance which the archæological world has attached to this discovery. The statement of Mr. Richter is as follows :

" Among many other supposed exaggerations of the famous Col. Luigi Palma di Cesnola is the so-called treasure of Curium. I lately visited Curium, and carefully interrogated all the witnesses I could find among the laborers employed by L. P. di Cesnola, and was able carefully to compare their statements with my own observations made on the spot and with the results obtained by Messrs. Williamson & Co., and the objects excavated by Mr. G. Hake, in 1882, at Curium for account of the South Kensington Museum which, although I did not see them, furnish, from what I have heard and read, a part proof that the so-called Treasure of Curium of L. P. di Cesnola, is a pure invention of the imagination. * * * One word more concerning the position of the imaginary Treasure of Curium : L. P. di Cesnola describes at some length in his book that he found a piece of mosaic, near some large columns under which he was fortunate enough to discover the entrance door of the treasure chamber of the Temple, and he gives in his book an illustration of the said mosaic. I myself found some portion of this piece of mosaic which Cesnola himself ordered his workmen to destroy utterly, but which they failed to do. I found the columns and the described scenery of the hill and of the platform of the hill, in the centre of the ruins of the ancient city of Curium. The unfortunate part is that near the mosaic and colums nothing of value was discovered, and no deep excavations were made there by Cesnola's workmen, and worse still, between this place on the hill and the spot outside the town to the West of the plain, where was found the rich necropolis and the richest tomb containing so many objects, there is a space of several hundred yards."

* See Perrot and Chipiez, where they are included amongst the Curium jewels. Plate 576 E.

This direct charge against Col. di Cesnola was published in the *Cyprus Herald*; and drew naturally from the Colonel a menace of prosecution for libel, to which Mr. Richter replied challenging the Colonel to bring a suit where the facts could be proven; but this menace, with the exception of attempts to impeach the character of Mr. Richter, is all that the charge has evoked in defence of Col. di Cesnola.

Independent investigators have tried to find the treasure-vault with no better success than Mr. Richter, and up to this date nothing has been brought forward to invalidate his positive assertion that the vault does not exist.

There is evidence which confirms this direct charge. We have the positive declaration of Mr. di Cesnola's assistants that they never assisted in any such excavations on the Temple's site as he describes, and that they knew nothing of the Treasure. The Cypriotes are not, under any circumstances, a trustworthy race, and a declaration from them, in order to impress them with the necessity of telling the truth, must be sworn to before the priest or the local authorities. Too much importance should not be attached to their statement, unless corroborated by other and independent testimony. But Col. di Cesnola has himself given confirmation to the accusation, that the Temple Treasure is a pure invention. At the moment of the discovery of a great tomb which contained so much of the "Treasure," he writes to Mr. Clarence Cook as follows:

"ISLAND OF CYPRUS, CURIUM, Aug. 23, 1875.

"DEAR MR. COOK:— You are probably surprised at my long silence, and not seeing anything published concerning my explorations, you have probably come to the conclusion that either they have been fruitless or that I gave up my researches.

"Never I have been so successful as at present, but Dr. Schliemann's conduct toward the Turkish Government has been such as to bring upon me any amount of restrictions and vexations in my diggings, and prudence requires (as long as I intend to remain in Cyprus) to keep quiet and not to publish the result of my late discoveries.

"I have been encamped on this mountain for nearly six weeks, for the purpose of taking notes for my book more than anything else, yet, a few days ago, my good luck, and perhaps the experience I have acquired in *discriminating* a good

from a bad spot, permitted me to discover a ROYAL TOMB, in which I found such a treasure of *gold*, *silver* and *bronze* objects, as to throw into the shade Schliemann's Treasure of Priam. Over nine *pounds in weight* of gold ornaments, consisting of bracelets, necklaces, earrings, armlets, signet-rings, rings, medallions, etc., etc., some very beautifully wrought.

"In silver, I found vases, cups, bowls and pateræ, bracelets, rings, etc. In bronze, many tripods, some three feet high, which were probably *portable altars*, large vases, etc., etc., etc.

"At Amathus I discovered two Sarcophagi, one full of sculptures in high relief (Assyrian style) and the other like the marble one in the New York Museum, but with a very fine Greek colossal head of a woman sculptured on it.

"The treasure found here, like the sculptured sarcophagus of Amathus, belongs to a very REMOTE PERIOD, and represents Assyrian and Egyptian art. I mention to you all these findings, not for publication, but to show you I am working. You may, if you like, mention in a general way in the *Tribune* that my researches here continue very successfully, without mentioning my findings.

"If the Trustees of the New York Museum had signed the contract they made with me, the Museum would be now the rightful owner of whatever I found, which is worth in money three or four times the amount the Trustees had agreed to pay me.

"My book is going on, but it cannot be published until I have finished my explorations and I have *removed* from *Cyprus*, far away from the greedy grasp of the Turkish Government, all my findings.

"Endeavor, please, to read this *griffonage* of mine, and believe me ever

"Faithfully yours,

L. P. DI CESNOLA.

In the evidence given by Col. di Cesnola in the libel suit, he makes the following confirmatory statement :

"(2166) I found the ruins of a town, etc. . . . and in four "chambers of the ROCK-CUT TOMBS I found a quantity of gold, silver "and bronze ornaments."

And, in *Cyprus*, we read :

"One of these places, where eight shafts of columns of a brownish granite lay imbedded in the ground, attracted me more particularly, and wishing to measure some of them, I had two removed and found their diameter to be $22\frac{1}{2}$ inches and their length 18 feet. Under these shafts appeared a mosaic pavement, composed of small tessellæ of marble and stone of four different colors—red, white, brown, and blue, inlaid in different patterns, and forming large lotus flowers. The columns had damaged the pavement considerably in falling, yet the whole design can be easily traced. After their removal the mosaic was found to be entirely broken up at several places, not by the force of the columns falling upon it,

but by some treasure-seeker, who, probably, after having dug six or seven feet deeper, and having met with the eastern foundation of the building, had broken it up, and finding nothing beneath, had evidently abandoned the undertaking as unprofitable. This mosaic was laid upon a layer of charcoal about two feet thick and beneath the charcoal there was a bed of sand about eight inches thick.

"After carefully surveying the place, I decided to continue the excavation beneath that portion of the mosaic, inasmuch as it sounded quite hollow. In fact, after digging some twenty feet deeper than the treasure-hunter had gone, I discovered a gallery, excavated in the rock, eleven feet four inches long, four feet ten inches wide, and scarcely four feet high. One end of it evidently communicated with the building above, though only two stone steps, also cut in the rock, now exist. At the other end I found a doorway, carelessly closed by a stone slab. As soon as this stone was removed there appeared an oven-shaped cavity, filled to within a few inches of the roof with fine earth, which, as usual, had percolated from above. After the removal of some three thousand baskets of this earth, another opening appeared in the north wall, which led into an inner room filled in like manner. I descended into the first chamber for the purpose of examining it, and while poking into the remaining earth with my foot rule, I struck something hard, which turned out to be a bracelet, with several other gold objects in a small heap. This was unusual, as when gold ornaments are discovered in a tomb, they are invariably found mixed with bones, showing that they had been worn by the person buried.

* * * * *

"When the second chamber was half emptied a third one was discovered, and a week later the doorway of a fourth made its appearance. A whole month was spent in simply removing the earth from these four rooms ; but a layer was left in each of them, as usual, about a foot and a half deep. It is between this layer and the pavement that the sepulchral contents are always to be found. This performance my diggers call 'trimming the tomb.' When this was accomplished the gang was ordered off to some other work. I descended at last, and accompanied by the foreman and a man carrying a lantern, began to examine diligently each room. These rooms had been roughly excavated in the limestone rock, by means of a copper or iron tool scarcely half an inch wide, the traces of which are plainly visible everywhere. Three of the rooms are very nearly of the same size, the fourth is a little smaller. [Here follows plan.]

* * * *

"After having measured each room and searched in vain for some inscription on the walls, I retraced my steps to room C in which a few weeks before I had discovered the gold ornaments. The layer of earth was searched by my foreman, carefully and delicately, with the point of his knife ; afterwards he passed it twice through his fingers ; this done, the man with the lantern took away this earth, again examining it, in case anything had been passed unobserved. The fellow bracelet to that found a month before was soon discovered not far off, in company with two gold signet-rings having scarabs in agate with Egyptian representations engraved upon them ; also four pair of earrings and many gold beads, some of which were still strung alternately with rock-crystal beads upon a gold

wire, and had as a pendant a little rock-crystal vase finely cut. I now remarked for the first time the TOTAL ABSENCE OF HUMAN REMAINS and SEPULCHRAL VASES and concluded that THESE VAULTS MUST HAVE BELONGED TO THE BUILDING ABOVE.

"Although no statuary or architectural fragments existed above these four rooms, with the exception of the granite columns already mentioned, yet I am convinced that the structure must have been a TEMPLE to which the VAULTS must have served as TREASURE CHAMBERS."—*Cyprus*, pp. 301-305.

In the letter to Mr. Cook, the distinct announcement is made that the discovery was that of a "ROYAL TOMB," and that it had been discovered "a few days ago," notwithstanding which Col. di Cesnola gives a very complete list of objects found, comprising more than are at present contained in the Curium Treasure.

The relation in *Cyprus* is as minute as the most exacting critic could ask. He finds, at a depth of twenty-six or seven feet, "a gallery excavated in the rock, eleven feet four inches long, four feet ten inches wide and scarcely four feet high. A whole month was spent in simply removing the earth from these four rooms, but a layer was left in each of them, as usual, about a foot and a half deep."

A careful plan of these chambers is given, with measurements of all dimensions to the inch; but it unfortunately differs in all its dimensions from a similar plan previously sent by him in his official report to the Trustees. Col. di Cesnola takes pains to say, after this preliminary excavation was done, and before the treasure was extricated from its bottom layer of earth: "I now remarked for the first time the total absence of human remains and sepulchral vases, and concluded that these vaults must have belonged to the building above." But this must have been before writing to Mr. Cook that it was a "royal tomb," as the Catalogue of the *trouvailler* was then complete. If Col. di Cesnola had known anything of archaeology he would have known that the mosaic and columns described above must have belonged to a temple of ROMAN time, or a BYZANTINE chapel, yet "in the rubbish removed from the SURFACE of the mosaic were found several SCARABS and CYLINDERS in serpentine with rough carvings upon them, a silver ring and three CYLINDERS were also discovered beneath the mosaic pavement, in the direction of the

" two stone steps, near a piece of wood which may have been, from
" its shape, part of a ladder."

Analyzed with care, the statement of the author of *Cyprus* amounts to this:—He found a mosaic under some prostrate granite shafts which he had removed. The mosaic had been laid on a layer of charcoal and sand. It had already been excavated by some treasure-seeker to the depth of "six or seven feet," and abandoned. Still, finding that the mosaic sounded quite hollow, he decided to dig deeper, and went twenty feet farther than the other treasure-seeker, and he came on this passage cut in the solid rock. Yet, he is persuaded that "the chambers must have belonged to the building above." But the mosaic pavement had not been disturbed, except by treasure-seekers! How, then, had access been given to the depositors of the treasure? And how were the objects found *on* the mosaic, left there? At the epoch when this treasure is supposed to have been hidden, and for centuries after, mosaics were unknown, and granite does not appear in any Greek temple. But, granting all these incongruities to be reconciled, how has all trace of the treasure-vault so utterly disappeared that no one can find it again? The importance of this point will escape no one. We have waited a year for some sign from the Director of the Museum which shall give the clue to the mystery that hangs around the hiding place of the Curium treasure, but no reply has been given except abuse of Mr. Richter and of whoever arraigns the Director. If the treasure-vault ever existed, it must still be there, under the mosaic; and no one can suppose that Mr. Richter, holding a position under the English government in Cyprus, would dare to declare that no such vault exists, when the evidence of its existence might at any time confront him.

It must be remembered that this is no vague and haphazard charge. It is not a simple accusation that a statue has been mended, or that a forgery has, perhaps accidentally, been substituted for a genuine antiquity. Escape from such charges might reasonably have been made by attributing the errors to the careless statement of an imperfect recollection. But here is a deliberate, detailed account of a discovery which occupied a month, and whose results are deliberately grouped and compared with Schliemann's Hisarlik treasures, catalogued, illustrated, published, and exhibited

to this day in the Museum as the "Curium Treasure," whilst, on the other side, a distinct declaration is made by a responsible official of the insular government of Cyprus, that no such discovery has ever been made, and that no such treasure-vaults exist, a declaration which is confirmed by the fact that no search has yet discovered them, and that to this day Col. di Cesnola has not in any public way met the charge, or taken any steps to prove the actual existence of those elaborate vaults, cut in the solid rock.

In reply to a statement of the above facts, printed in the *New York Times*, a correspondent, signing himself "Patron of the Metropolitan Museum," wrote in the *Commercial Advertiser* of Nov. 25, 1884, a letter containing accusations against Mr. Richter, accompanied with a declaration by a former servant of Col. di Cesnola. This was not made in legal form, nor did it contradict Mr. Richter's allegation as to the Curium Treasure. This was followed later by a similar attack in the *Mail and Express*, with two more declarations, neither one of which was sworn to nor of the least legal force; and, singularly enough, neither asserted that the Curium Treasure ever had an existence.

As against this vague and general denial we have the testimony of two of Col. di Cesnola's assistants, Christofi Christodulu and Theocharis Kutzochairos, the latter, the man who afterward disowned his own assertions, as stated above. Yet, this recantation of Theocharis sworn to before no magistrate, and without even his mark in place of signature, has a peculiar significance, inasmuch as the Cypriote Greeks are generally willing to tell any amount of falsehoods, but are very averse to sign either their name or make their cross to a false declaration, as they have a singular superstition about lying on paper. I must leave the weighing, one against the other, of Theocharis' contradictory statements, to the judgment of those who have read his original declaration, which was published in full in *L'Homme*, a French journal of archæology, of August 10, 1884. It gives in detail the names of the localities from which most of the articles in the Curium Treasure were taken. A single passage of this declaration, which in its entirety has a circumstantiality and an air of sincerity which are very unlike the vague statements printed in the *Mail and Express*, will show its

purport : " In the book of Cesnola, which you show me, I see united " in the so-called treasure many objects coming from different tombs " of Curium, Amathonte, from other parts of the Island and from I " know not where. I worked a year and a half at Curium, and I see " here most of the best articles from hundreds and thousands of " tombs, united in one treasure invented by L. P. di Cesnola. L. P. di " Cesnola is far from the truth when he affirms that we took a month " only to take the earth from the four chambers of the so-called " treasure of Curium. This work was done in several days. It is also " another imposture to pretend that in the four chambers, given in " *Cyprus* as treasury of Curium, no bones were found. We have on " the contrary discovered many." The entire declaration made by Theocharis to Mr. Richter, accords perfectly with the other indications which I have pointed out, and those who know the insular Greeks under Turkish rule, will have no difficulty in accounting for the latter statements of Theocharis, without accepting his denial of the truth of his earlier testimony. Much less will Mr. Richter be believed on any such evidence to have perverted the truth ; his character and his position prevent any such supposition.

I give here the affidavit of Christofi. The declaration of Theocharis, which is of the same general purport and even more minute in its denial of the statement in *Cyprus* is omitted, because it is not sworn to, and has since been disowned by Theocharis. It must be remembered that the rich tomb of which both Christofi and Theocharis speak, and which seems to have been the suggestion for the treasure-vault, is described by both of them as located in the Necropolis of Curium, and at a considerable distance from the Temple site, but distinctly known as a tomb of the usual type.

AFFIDAVIT OF CHRISTOFI.

(Published in *L'Homme*, March 25, 1885.)

" I call myself Christofi Christodulu. I am a Cypriote and my native village is Scia (near Dali.) I have digged together with Theocharis Kutzochairos, near Episkopi, during one year.

" I have worked on the hill of the place of the terrace, which is made of small stones and different colors and patterns. (He means Cesnola's mosaic, published in his book *Cyprus*, German Ed. Pl. LIV, 1. Am. Ed. p. 301—

M. O. R.) I remember it quite well, because the American said if we could cut out this terrace (he always means the mosaic in question.—M. O. R.) and bring it to Larnaca he would pay us a thousand pound Bakshish. We found the terrace (mosaic) broken, and Theocharis told to the older Cesnola that he did break it himself before, ordered by the younger Cesnola, Alexander, for whom he digged time before there. We were waiting (expecting) very much, but we could not find anything, and as the work was very hard between these stones and cement, we did not go more down as about $1\frac{1}{2}$ orgia (one orgia is equal to the length which can be embraced by full-grown persons.—M. O. R.) *But we could not find anything there.* There, in fact, L. P. di Cesnola was present and sitting on a chair near the place.

"The richest tomb, of which a part of the articles illustrated in the book *Cyprus* of the American, under the head of 'Curium,' or 'Treasure of Curium,' is not situated on the hill, where the terrace was found and CAN BE SEEN TO-DAY, but down in the plain in the east from the hill, near the old Church of Agios Armoenis, and more near the village of Episkopi. From the 'terrace' on the hill to this 'tomb' in the plain is a great space. (I measured it 1,425 paces.—M. O. R.)

"Not Theocharis but myself did find first the tomb. The tomb may have been deep about three orgias, perhaps about one orgia earth and after we came over the rock. Originally the first sign of a tomb's cutting in the rock was found by the man *Savas* from the village of *Pirga*. He died before about five years, after the beginning of the English occupation. The spot was left by Savas. He said there is no tomb. After I came and I understood there must be a tomb. I digged a larger hole and I came to the tomb's road. During nearly the whole work for and in this very rich tomb, Cesnola was not present. After having finished nearly the whole tomb and digged through its three chambers (only a very small part of one of the three tomb's chambers remained untouched) we packed up all the best things and went to Larnaca. We could also not find there the American as he was at Ormidia. From Ormidia we turned back. The American came after to Episkopi and the place in question. We opened again the tomb and not again by the tomb's road, but by the hole over the tomb's roof and middle chamber. We worked through the very small part of earth, which did remain and we found only two other gold rings with stones but nothing else. All the other articles of gold, silver, bronze were found by the first great work; but also this first work in the tomb with the knife did require not much more than about three days. By the second work, as Cesnola came back to Episkopi I am sure we had not more as one day's work. I am also sure that during the whole work as well as by the first, as by the second, the Cesnola did never descend in the tomb. He saw the place from upon. But I do not know if afterward in my absence he did descend into the tomb.

"The tomb (that I am sure) was only composed by three and never by four chambers. The tomb's road was large and corresponding with the middle chamber. Also there in the roof of the middle chamber was cut a nearly round hole or canal and about so large. (Christofi shows with his hand a diameter of about three English feet.—M. O. R.) This is the hole, which we used by the second opening of the tomb for enter. Every one of the three chambers was more or less round and fo

not very regular shape and on one side more straight and not at all so regular as in the American's book and his ground plan appears. I see here wrong the place of the tomb's door, wrong the four chambers, wrong also the long passage on the side (Christofi is meaning the passage in the end of Chamber F of Cesnola's invented ground plan.—M. O. R.) the shape and the disposition of the tomb's chambers is more similar to your sketch, which you made, Mr. Richter, after my description, and which I see here on paper. [Here follows sketch, omitted.]

"It will be the best we re-open the tomb, Mr. Richter, that you see yourself with your own eyes what it was. It is a long time since, and I would not like to make any mistake in my declaration.

"We found an enormous deposition of great quantity of *bones*, but most in a high degree of decomposition, as in all these tomb's in the neighbourhood. But the existence of many bones could be made out and here and there were found also small pieces of better preserved bones. The great quantity of subjects were put without any order in this place. We did not find at all a gold-chamber, a silver-chamber, a bronze-chamber. Here pottery vessels, or bronze vessels, there gold ornaments or silver ornaments. Great disorder. Articles of the different materials all mixed together. Very rich the tomb was, no doubt. We filled up three or four segar boxes with gold and silver articles, as the silver things were larger and did require much more room as the gold things. We left many articles of pottery in the tomb after having broken them ourselves, because Cesnola's order forever was this : ' *You have to break all these articles that have no value for me.*'

"Many of the things, those you show me illustrated in Cesnola's book, as being found in one place and in the so-called temple treasure, are not found near the 'terrace,' (where nothing was found) but they were also not found in the rich three-chamber tomb, but elsewhere.

"Such things as you show me here, and you call them 'cylinders,' of the shape like a lamp's glass, only very small, of black stone and engraved, such curious things I do not remember to have seen a single one in my whole life. (Stern's *Cyprus*, Pl. LXXV, LXXVI, LXXVII. Am. Ed., Pl. XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, 1-32).

"The stone, or what you call it, the agate object, I do not remember to have seen ; I am meaning this here. (Stern's *Cyprus* Pl. LIV, 3. Am. Ed., p. 309). (Theocharis says the article is coming from Amathus.—M. O. R.)

"The thick bracelets with inscription (Stern's *Cyprus* Pl. LIV, 2. Am. Ed., p. 306) were not found in the rich three-chamber tomb. I am sure these two bracelets with inscriptions were found by Theocharis or a man called Giannis, from the village of Masfiloti, and in the same time and on the same day as I was working on the hill and the 'terrace' place, (Cesnola's mosaic) and in presence of Cesnola. After Cesnola started for Larnaca, and we remained alone in this time of his absence, we found the rich three-chamber tomb. The bracelets in question were found down in the plain and nearer by the Carob-trees on the end of the land of the church.

"If the plate (Stern's *Cyprus* Pl. LVI, 4. Am. Ed., p. 316) is of gold, I am sure it was not found in our rich three-chamber tomb, because we did not find

there any one of gold. Such chain or chains (in such state as illustrated in Stern's *Cyprus*, Pl. LIX, LX, LXI. Am. Ed., Pl. XXII, XXIII, XXIV) I never saw. We found many links of gold and silver chains, but often, or as a rule, the chains were broken in pieces.

"The bottle (Stern's *Cyprus*, Pl. LXII, 1. Am. Ed., p. 325) I did not see, I do not know if Theocharis found it, because I did not see all the articles which Theocharis found because I was often working in another chamber than Theocharis.

"The cart (Stern's *Cyprus*, Pl. LVII. Am. Ed., p. 331) was found by me, but in another tomb. I digged up the object and did put it near the tomb's entrance. At once Theocharis descended in this tomb, as he did not know the place where the object was, he broke it with his feet before I could hinder it. So if the article is now entire, it must have been glued together by the American. In the same tomb I found two small figures of pigs of pottery, a marching female figure of pottery, a gold ring, a silver ring, a silver plate, a round, small opaque glass, some common pottery, all at the same tomb, together with the cart of stone.

"The fine big jar (Stern's *Cyprus*, Pl. LXVIII. Am. Ed., Pl. XXXIX) was not found, I am sure, in the rich three-chamber tomb in question.

"It seems to me impossible that we could have found nearly eighty gems, as illustrated in the American's book as coming from one place. I cannot remember sure how much we found there, but certainly much less, as he is saying. I told you I worked near Episkopi one year.

"His X mark.

CHRISTOFI CHRISTODULU.
Schia, (Nicosia District) Cyprus.

"In the District Court of Limassol. Certified
to be the true mark of Christofi
Christodulu,

[SEAL]

"BLUMERI,
Reporter, D. C.

"LIMASSOL, 27, 6, '84.

"Translated to him by me, and certified correct by him in my presence.

"(V. R.)

"THEOD. E. MAUROGORDATO.

"LIMASSOL, 26, 6, '84."

It will be seen that the declarations of Christofi and Theocharis, fitting as they do with circumstances on which no doubt can reasonably be thrown, are by themselves confirmatory of Mr. Richter's original charge, of my own conclusions drawn from the examination of the Treasure itself in the Museum, and of the original state-

ment of Col. di Cesnola in his letter to Mr. Cook. Moreover, in *Cyprus*, this magnificent *royal tomb*, with its nine pounds of gold eclipsing Schliemann's find at Hissarlik, does not appear amongst the discoveries.

The difficulty of placing this question in its true aspect to the public is double: Firstly, it seems improbable that any person in the position of Col. di Cesnola should commit the fraud of which he is accused; and, Secondly, public opinion is preoccupied by the previous discussion as to the authenticity of the Cypriote statuary, culminating in the Feuardent-Cesnola libel suit. With the general merits of that *cause célèbre* we have nothing to do. The facts brought out during the trial, which have a distinct value in evidence as to the general merits of the investigation committed to me, are undisputed, and will be found in their proper place. To the general and unscientific public, the question of restoration and revamping of antiquities can have no importance, and it was the height of absurdity to seek, in the verdict of a common jury, for any valuable conclusions thereon. The evidence, on that portion of the question, addresses itself only to the archaeological mind; because only an archaeologist can appreciate the injury done by a false attribution, or the recutting or alteration of a statue. This consideration can alone account for the utter indifference of the Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum to the importance of the question thus raised.

But, the part of the question which has been committed to me, involves accusations of an entirely different nature, and it has nothing to do with the issues raised by the libel suit, and the present paper containing the result of my investigation consists entirely of new matter, for the first time collected, and given to be examined as a whole.

The chief issue here, and I might say the decisive one, is whether the "Treasury of Curium" exists or not, and this can be authoritatively settled—meanwhile the immense preponderance of testimony is against the existence of the subterranean vault. No motive appears for Mr. Richter to attack the discovery of Col. di Cesnola, and the penalty of misrepresentation in such a case is too sure and too grave to be incurred without motive.

From the above *resume*, which includes the most important circumstances bearing on the general question in respect to which the American Numismatic and Archæological Society have appointed me as reporter, the members of the Society will be able to draw their own conclusions. If they judge that the evidence in respect to the various points I have made, is not sufficiently complete, I would add, that, with regard to the first and second points, there is no opportunity to strengthen the evidence, except by inviting some impartial European expert of acknowledged authority to visit and examine carefully the objects in the collection. Even such an examination could only be satisfactory with the consent of the Trustees to an open and unrestricted investigation, which, of course, does not lie in the power of your body to control. But, with regard to the third and general question of the actuality of the Temple-treasury of Curium and the Temple of Golgoi, absolute evidence can be obtained by sending to Cyprus a Commission *ad hoc*. This might be advisable in view of the decisive importance of this single question, the determining of which is, at this phase of the matter, the answer as to the trustworthiness of the declarations of the author of *Cyprus*, and the consequent value of his attributions and his work, upon which the archæological value of the Museum for students very largely depends.

The question, as it now stands, is an open scandal not to be closed by personalities.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

W. J. STILLMAN.

NEW YORK, March 28, 1885.



THOMPSON & MOREAU

PRINTERS

NOS. 51 & 53 MAIDEN LANE

NEW YORK