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In addition to her scholarly work, Veronica Tatton-Brown is well known throughout the world of Cypriot archaeology for the assistance she has given many scholars and students over 30 years to study the rich Cyprus collection held in the British Museum. Her dedication in making the collections accessible extended beyond the thousands of artefacts in her care to encompass the extensive archival material on the history of the Cyprus collection in the 19th century preserved in the Greek and Roman Department. This is a resource she herself did much to disseminate through her own research on the subject during her years as a curator. This interest in the history of the subject culminated in her edited volume, *Cyprus in the 19th century AD. Fact, fancy and fiction* (Oxford, 2001), the result of an international conference at the British Museum in 1998 in memory of that great historiographer of Cypriot archaeology, Olivier Masson.

This volume included contributions from eminent scholars who have benefited from her assistance, many of whom later paid tribute in a dedicated edition of the *Cahier du Centre d’Études chypriotes* (*Cahier* 35, 2003). Veronica’s personal contribution to *Cyprus in the 19th century AD* was an invaluable survey of all the archival sources related to the history of the Cyprus collection in the British Museum in the 19th century.2 This was a somewhat daunting task, given the scale of the material which is largely unindexed and scattered across numerous departments. The result is an indispensable guide to a largely unpublished resource which reflects the emergence of modern Cypriot archaeology as represented by the collections (and personalities) in the British Museum.3

In this context, my tribute to Veronica is an annotated transcript of the original excavation notebook from the Turner Bequest excavations conducted by the British Museum in Kourion in 1895 (H.B. Walters, *Notes at Curium*, in the archive of the Department of Greece and Rome, referred to as the Notebook in this paper). The results of these important excavations were published in a summary fashion in 1900 by H.B. Walters, part of a volume dedicated to the Turner Bequest discoveries (*Excavations in Cyprus*, 56–86; henceforth *Excavations*).4 This report included descriptions of the sites explored and brief, but frequently incomplete, lists of the contents of the tomb groups allocated to the Museum under the antiquities legislation of the time. Moreover, it did not include the approximately one-third of the finds assigned to the Cyprus Museum, which were summarised very briefly in M. Ohnafalsch-Richter and J. Myres’ *Catalogue of the Cyprus Museum (1899)*, 181–2 (henceforth CCM).

Many of the finds were subsequently described in greater detail in catalogues published by the British Museum between 1899 and 1926 (such as pottery, terracotta, gems, jewellery, silver and bronze) but with rather limited discussion of their original context. More recent scholars have also included material from the BM excavations at Kourion in studies of individual object types (see bibliography below); while they have paid more attention to the original context, they have generally been hampered by the incomplete nature of the published documentation. However, Donald Bailey, a colleague of Veronica at the Greek and Roman Department for many years, included much valuable archival information on the original find-spots of lamps from Kourion in his meticulous revised edition of the lamp catalogue of the British Museum originally published by H.B. Walters in 1914.5 Furthermore, his study of the finds from Tomb 73 of the Turner Bequest excavations at Kourion published in *Cyprus in the 19th century AD* also made extensive use of this resource, and was a major influence on the final form of this paper.6

However, a comprehensive account of all the material excavated at Kourion in 1895, particularly in terms of original tomb groups and other contextual associations, together with the relevant archival material preserved in the Department of Greece and Rome, has not appeared until now. In 2009, the objects from the Turner Bequest excavations allocated to the British Museum, along with other finds from the Kourion area, were published as part of the *Ancient Cyprus in the British Museum Online Research Catalogue*.7 This is a project generously supported by the A.G. Leventis Foundation and represents a major initiative to present the entire Cypriot collection in an on-line format for the general public, students and scholars. It is important to note that the A.G. Leventis Foundation previously sponsored Veronica’s creation of a dedicated Cyprus gallery in the British Museum in 1987,8 in addition to supporting the publication of two editions of her popular book on ancient Cyprus.9 Their support of the British Museum is part of its long-standing and enlightened policy of encouraging institutions with large Cypriot collections to broaden public knowledge of the archaeology of the island.10

The annotated transcription of the field notebook presented here is intended as an additional source of information on the excavations of 1895 complementing the Online Research Catalogue and the original published account. It provides many valuable details omitted from *Excavations*. These include lists of objects recorded but not subsequently kept, sketch maps of the areas excavated showing specific tomb locations (often more detailed than those found in *Excavations*), as well as descriptions and plans of some of the original tomb contexts. This information I hope will aid students of the ancient Kourion area in further understanding this rich archaeological landscape, but also provide an insight on the working methods of the BM team at the dawn of modern excavation on Cyprus. While this article cannot provide a comprehensive account of the background to the Turner Bequest excavations, or of the progress of archaeology in Cyprus in the 19th century, it is offered as a small contribution.
to the on-going (and as yet largely unwritten) history of the subject. It is in part inspired by Veronica’s presentation of the corresponding Enkomi notebook in an article published in the Cahier du Centre d’Études Chypriotes; an appropriate place given the central role this journal has played in charting the historiography of the island’s archaeology in the 19th and earlier 20th centuries. Veronica’s major contributions to the subject, directly or indirectly, are evident through many of its issues.

The excavation

After four very fruitful months at Amathus in the winter and spring of 1893–94, the Turner Bequest excavations, initially funded from a bequest of £2,000 by Ms Emma Tournier Turner in 1892, were transferred to Kourion (Fig. 1). The ancient city was known to students of ancient Greek history principally for the role played by its king Stasanor in the failure of the Cypriot revolt against the Persians in 499–498 bc, as recounted by Herodotus (V, 113). The latter also noted that the inhabitants of the city in his time claimed to have been descended from Argive settlers. The site, with its dramatic coastal acropolis and extensive ancient cemeteries, was also very familiar to travellers, archaeologists and collectors, having been described and repeatedly excavated in the latter half of the 19th century by a succession of visitors. These included the redoubtable Luigi Palma di Cesnola in 1874–75, whose published account is often unreliable, especially where it relates to the discovery of the famous ‘Curium Treasure’.

Official British Museum interest in Kourion however began almost 20 years before the Turner Bequest excavations of 1895. Charles Newton, first Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities, was sufficiently inspired by Cesnola’s account of the ‘Curium Treasure’ in his Ancient Cyprus. Its cities, tombs and temples (1877) that he attempted to organise an official museum expedition to the site. In particular, he wanted to complete the exploration of the ‘Treasure Chamber’, whose description forms a vivid part of Cesnola’s chapter on Kourion and took up a significant part of Newton’s review. Newton compared Cesnola’s book with Schliemann’s account of Mycenae, regarding both as important sources of information on the progress of early Greek art. Surprisingly for someone with Newton’s sources of information on the archaeology of Cyprus prior to 1878 (including his museum colleague Samuel Birch who was in regular correspondence with Cesnola between 1870 and 1881), the American consul’s narrative was taken at face value as a mark of ‘energy and sagacity’. There are no hints of the charges of exaggeration or mendacity the book (and its author) would later attract, despite the fact that alternative versions of the origin of the treasure seem to have been in circulation by this time. Perhaps Newton was simply championing the underdog in the same way he had supported Schliemann, especially as both books appealed to a broad, amateur audience steeped in the Hellenic enthusiasm of the time. More importantly, both volumes permitted the sort of large-scale comparisons between sites and cultures which he felt were essential to tackling the major archaeological questions of the day. In any event, Newton never got to test his opinion on Cesnola’s work at Kourion. Despite a visit to Cyprus in 1879 to explore the prospects for archaeological work on the island – which included a trip to Kourion in the company of a local peasant who had worked for Cesnola (but who was unable to identify the location of the ‘Treasure Chamber’ whether through ignorance or other motives, as Newton recalled in his report to the Trustees) – the British Treasury refused to grant the necessary funds for official museum excavations. These had to wait until the Turner Bequest expedition of 1895.

The antiquities of Kourion however continued to attract archaeological attention. George Gordon Hake, who worked at Kourion on behalf of Lt (later Lord) Kitchener and the South Kensington Museum, lamented the plundered state of the area already in 1882. He nevertheless discovered many hundreds of objects of Iron Age, Hellenistic and Roman date in the necropoleis of the ancient city. They came from at least 70 tombs at one cemetery, and from an unspecified number of tombs in another area, probably the same as Sites E and A–B respectively of the later British Museum excavations (Fig. 1). Newton was offered some of these finds for the museum, but turned them down. This was probably because the objects had been collected for aesthetic reasons (in line with the instructions of the South Kensington Museum) so no tomb groups were preserved intact. Newton may have believed that as a consequence the material had limited archaeological and historical value, especially for the purpose of establishing firm dates for the finds. Given that he was aware of the ancient tradition that Kourion was founded by Argive settlers mentioned above, it is also likely that he hoped any excavations conducted there would cast light on the ‘Mycenaean Question’, in which case it was essential that some basic archaeological controls were exercised in the exploration of the site. In any case, none of the material excavated by Hake was of Late Bronze Age date.

Despite this history of previous excavation, and his own considerable success at the site, Hake advised in his report that the site was by no means exhausted, noting that ‘the country all around is one vast cemetery’. Indeed, he was soon followed by a commercial archaeological syndicate organised by J.W. Williamson in 1883–84. This work was carried out by the government inspector Max Ohnefalsch-Richter, who also excavated for other clients around Kourion during the 1880s, including Lady Annie Brassey, much of whose large collection of Cypriot antiquities seems to have come from this area. De Castillon’s expedition from the Louvre in 1886–7 was the last campaign at the site licensed under the old system before the new High Commissioner, Sir Henry Bulwer, restricted excavation permits to official bodies such as the Cyprus Exploration Fund (CEF), which was established in 1887. Given this background, especially the long-term interest in Kourion within museum circles, it is not surprising that when funds became available for excavation on Cyprus, Newton’s wishes were finally carried out almost 20 years after he first recommended the site to the Trustees.

The agents employed by the museum to run the practical matters of the excavations, Charles Christian and J.W. Williamson, were in a good position to know the archaeological potential of the area, since the latter had organised the commercial expedition here in 1883–84. Also, as at Amathus the previous year, proximity to their Limassol business ventures seems to have determined their degree of interest in the excavations and they may well have persuaded the Museum to excavate at Kourion to facilitate their own
interests and convenience. The negotiations between the two parties recorded in the surviving correspondence reveal that Christian and Williamson agreed to accept a fixed commission of 10% from the money spent on the excavations for their services rather than a quarter share of the value of the finds as originally proposed. This may have provided a disincentive to travel too far in order to supervise the work, as was the case for later excavations they organised for the museum at Enkomi and Maroni: this certainly accounts for some of the deficiencies of the work sponsored by the museum throughout the 1890s. Nonetheless, this arrangement marks an important shift in the way archaeological work was organised on Cyprus by taking the profit motive out of the day-to-day conduct of excavations: the era of commercially-driven archaeological work was over.

The excavations themselves were directed by H.B. Walters, an assistant in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, between 24 January and 11 April 1895. The surviving sources provide no indication of the number of workmen employed, but the total cost amounted to £542 17s 8d, which presumably included Christian and Williamson’s commission and the cost of transportation of the finds to London. Walters compiled the Notebook in the field (or soon after) and also wrote the main published account in Excavations in Cyprus which draws closely on the original notes. Over the course of the excavations, he also wrote four long letters to the Principal Librarian (henceforth PL), that is the Director, of the Museum, providing a narrative of operations and summarising the most important discoveries. In addition, he sent occasional reports to the Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities, A.S. Murray. Although usually less detailed than the Notebook that formed the basis of Excavations, these letters sometimes provide information omitted from these other sources: as we will see presently, both notebook and contemporary letters occasionally provide an insight into the first impressions and judgements of the excavator which, although sometimes vague or incorrect, reveal details which the later, more polished version choose to omit, in part because they did not fit within the overall interpretative framework presented in Excavations.

One example of this is the treatment of Site D (Bamboula). Here Walters uncovered many tombs of Early and Late Bronze Age date (Figs 1, 4). The latter, rich in imported Mycenaean pottery, were interpreted as the cemetery of the Argive founders of Kourion mentioned by Herodotus (V, 113) and Strabo (XIV, 6,3), resulting in the neglect of most of the evidence for the local Cypriot culture. Walters also mentions the remains of buildings in same area as the tombs, though he made no effort to investigate this aspect of the site further or to provide any further details:

The nature of the ground on this present site also suggests that it may once have been a city - with a raised plateau in the centre from which the ground in which the tombs have been found slopes in terraces to the north, and more gradually to the south, on which side there are traces of buildings or constructions of some kind; while there are also traces of foundations on the raised platform, which at the present time is worn down to the bare rock in most places.

These are probably traces of the LBA settlement which the American archaeologist John Daniel excavated in the same area in the 1930s and 1940s, though by this time no architectural remains were visible on the surface. The close association of burial and habitation areas is now regarded as typical of many LC settlements, a phenomenon only recognized after Schaeffer’s initial excavations at Enkomi in 1934. He realized that the British Museum team, who opened 100 Late Bronze Age tombs there the year after the excavations at Kourion, had overlooked the contemporary settlement. Like the Swedish team who followed them in 1930, they interpreted the remains of ashlar-built structures as Byzantine in date and therefore unrelated to the adjacent tombs (see Crewe, this volume). At both Kourion and Enkomi, the BM team probably assumed that burial and habitation areas were customarily separated, as in Mycenaean and Greek settlements, rather than spatially integrated as is commonly attested in the Near East throughout the Bronze Age.

This ‘Mycenaean’ interpretation of Bamboula had further consequences. As Fitton has observed, both Walters and his superior Murray consistently dated the Mycenaean finds at Kourion and Enkomi as late as the 7th century BC, thus ignoring recent discoveries and research, including that of Newton, which correctly advocated a much higher chronology for the Late Bronze Age. One of the results of this mistaken belief was that much of the local ceramic material – both ‘actual’ Late Bronze Age wares, and the later ‘Greco-Phoenician’ pottery of the CG and CA periods (thought by Walters and Murray to be nearly contemporary with the Mycenaean material, and, confusingly, sometimes found together in the same tombs at Bamboula) – was regarded as less interesting on aesthetic and historical grounds because neither fitted into their evolutionary scheme of Greek art. The result of this prejudice is visible throughout the Notebook, where the degree of effort taken in exploring and documenting the five sites examined is closely related to the nature and date of the finds. Mycenaean and Greek material was valued at a much higher premium than locally produced artefacts, many of which were ignored as a result. However, as the following transcription suggests, the listing of discarded objects made in the Notebook suggests a nascent awareness of the need to keep a record, however unsatisfactory, of all the major finds, if only to satisfy the Trustees and the Government Inspector that correct procedures were being followed.

The Notebook

The Kourion notebook is a hard-bound journal of over 100 pages of unlined blue paper, approximately 20cm by 25cm in size, inscribed on the spine ‘H.B. Walters, Notes at Curium’. Unlike the Enkomi notebook from the following year’s work, much of which appears to be a tidied-up copy done at a later stage that in many cases simply records the finds from specific tombs with limited topographic or contextual information, the Kourion notebook as it exists today appears to be a genuine working journal, almost certainly compiled during the campaign itself or very soon after from notes taken in the field. Some of the corrections in the text may indicate mistakes in copying entries from another source, such as notes made on a day-to-day basis. The narrative follows the sequence of excavations in five areas around the acropolis and village of Episkopi (named A to E and shown on Figs 1, 3 and 4), together with the various changes of location of the excavation team, including return visits to sites previously opened, between 24 January and 8 April 1895. The account lists the contents of 118
tombs (and notes the existence of others) at five separate cemeteries, in addition to describing the discoveries at the only non-funerary site examined by the expedition, the sanctuary in ‘Site C’ (Fig. 7). The ordering of the tombs, therefore, follows the sequence of excavation, as opposed to the general chronological order (arranged by site) from Early and Late Bronze Age (Site D), Cypro-Geometric (Site A), Cypro-Archaic and Cypro-Classical (Site B) to Hellenistic and Roman (Site E) found in Excavations in Cyprus.

The main text of the account is written on the right-hand page of the notebook, with the left-hand side given over to comments, dates on which individual tombs were excavated, sketches of tombs plans, and bibliographical references and notes added subsequently (Fig. 2). The latter are omitted here unless directly relevant to elucidating the transcription. The original text of the original manuscript is in black ink for the most part; later additions are usual distinguishable. The capital letter ‘N’ after the tomb number, usually in red ink but sometimes in black, indicates that the group was assigned to the Cyprus Museum and was presumably added after the division of the finds. Numbers in red ink in the left-hand margin of the tomb group entries (but sometimes in black or in pencil) represent the Museum registration numbers for the Kourion material in the sequence 1896,2-1.1 to 400. These were added to the notebook in the museum when the objects were entered in the departmental registers in 1896.

Many items lack such numbers, indicating they were not registered by the museum at the time, though some of these were identified during the digitisation of the material (see below). More strikingly, a considerable number of the object entries throughout the notebook, especially in the earlier part of the text dealing with Sites A and B, were subsequently crossed out (see Fig. 2). According to a marginal note in the first page of the text, these ‘were not retained either for the B.M. or Nicosia’. This is largely because they were regarded as being of little interest to the excavators, as many were common Iron Age painted wares of White Painted, Bichrome and Black-on-Red type which occur in great abundance in tombs of this date. For example, the text of Excavations (p. 80), though interestingly not the Notebook itself, informs us that about 60 ‘Graeco-Phoenician’ vessels from Tomb 56 were not kept, while most of the non-deleted entries in the corresponding part of the Notebook were also not registered. This suggests a very high degree of selection at several stages before the ‘tomb group’ finally reached the museum. Needless to say, plain or undecorated pottery is barely mentioned at all, and never as individual items. Common glass vessels in the Roman tombs were similarly treated, such as the 33 bottles discovered in Tomb 61, only three of which were preserved.

The exact fate of these deleted objects is unknown, but along with discarded tomb finds which were not recorded at all (as is likely for instance in Tomb 73, see below), it is probable that many were given or sold to other collectors on the island, especially since both Christian and Williamson dealt in antiquities before and after the Turner Bequest excavations. A letter of 3 February 1894 from A.H. Smith to the Principal Librarian records the intention to sell ‘several hundred pieces of common earthenware and glass’ from the excavations at Amathus which were not kept either by the BM or the CM. (This was after the excavation of 110 tombs out of the 320 explored in total, giving a good impression of the scale of such selectivity.) It is likely that discarded material from Kourion was dealt with in the same way, but there is no record of this in the surviving archives. The same volume of letters contains numerous responses from museums, learned institutions and colleges throughout the United Kingdom thanking A.S. Murray for his offer of duplicate antiquities, again from Amathus, revealing another channel by which the original tomb groups were dispersed. Material from Kourion was donated to Eton College. (Items from Enkomi excavated the following year also found their way to other institutions as gifts or exchanges.)

A.S. Smith noted in a letter to the Principal Librarian that the cost of transporting much of the ordinary material, even to Limassol, exceeded its market value, making it expedient to dispose of it locally; this may also explain Myres’ habit of giving intact large vessels to the local population for use as storage jars, perhaps as a means of cultivating good relations with the site workers and their families.

The sites excavated by the British Museum

The Kourion area has been extensively explored by many teams since 1895, whose results have superseded the interpretations of the BM expedition. It is not the aim of this paper to provide a detailed account of this subsequent work, but it is useful to outline the areas in which the original excavations were carried out and to flag the key publications from more recent archaeological activities. The Turner Bequest excavations extended over a wide area around the ancient acropolis, but concentrated their efforts in five main areas designated Sites A–E, marked on Fig. 1. However, it is clear from the description of operations in the notebook and from the accompanying sketch maps (which formed the basis of the maps in Excavations with relatively few modifications, though some were omitted from the final volume) that most of these sites extended over rather large areas with uneven coverage and effort according to the physical conditions and the likelihood of good results. One of the more valuable aspects of the Notebook is that it includes maps of Site A, C and E, showing the specific location of tombs and topographical features, which were not included in the published account, possibly because the finds were regarded as less significant than those from Sites B and D. Conversely, several maps of Sites B and D were included charting the progress of the excavations over the course of the campaign, though none exists showing the results of the second phase of the excavations of Site E.

Site A (Fig. 5)

Site A was a cemetery located in a low-lying field between two watercourses in the coastal plain 0.8km east of the acropolis. Only three days was spent examining the area, revealing a few surface graves (or mnemeia) and half-a-dozen chamber tombs at a deeper level, which contained large amounts of Cypriot pottery (Tombs 1–6). Part of this cemetery, in a field known as Kaloriziki-Mersinoudia, was excavated between the 1930s and 1950s by P. Dikaios, J. Benson and G. McFadden. This provides a well documented sample of tombs from the Bronze to Iron transition (Late Cypriot IIIB and CGIA) down to the end of the Cypro-Archaic period and into CC I. However, as Steel has demonstrated, Benson’s assertion that the site overlapped with the latest activity at the LBA site of Kourion-Bamboula (Site D...
below) was mistaken, as the main phase of the cemetery began in CGIA. The Cypro-Geometric material from this cemetery was particularly rich, especially in metal goods and pottery, echoes of which are found in the more meagre sample from the BM tombs. This area was probably the main elite burial ground in the Kourion area in the earlier part of the Iron Age, relating no doubt to the early phases of the historical city-kingdom. The famous Kourion sceptre and luxury bronze objects confiscated from looters in 1903 may have come from this cemetery, but Goring has shown that it cannot definitively be assigned to Tomb 40 as McFadden argued.

**Site B (Fig. 6)**

This much larger area was located immediately west of Site A, separated from it by a small river, around the small church of Ayios Ermoyenis after which the cemetery is sometimes named. The burial ground extended over a large area from the foot of the acropolis down to the original shoreline to the south. Part of the cemetery had already been explored by Cesnola, who provided a short description from his 1875 excavations, a fact which is noted on the sketch map of the area provided in the Notebook (Fig. 6). Many of the tombs described by Hake as ‘Graeco-Phoenixian’ in date were found here in 1882, while de Castillon followed in 1886–87. Both were drawn here by Cesnola’s earlier activities. The BM team returned to this site over the course of the season on no fewer than three occasions: 29 tombs in total (Tombs 7–14; 20–27; 71–83) were described in the Notebook, but numerous others seem to have been passed over without comment as empty or unimportant: the sketch plan in the Notebook also shows the location of unfruitful attempts.

The Pennsylvania Museum expedition to Kourion excavated nine intact Hellenistic and Roman chamber tombs in 1940–41, in addition to recording numerous other funerary features such as monolithic sarcophagi and grave monuments near the entrances to the tombs. Rescue excavations by the Department of Antiquities between the 1960s and 1990s have revealed tombs of similar date, but also a monumental built tomb – the first discovered at the site – in 1989. The surviving features such as monolithic sarcophagi and grave monuments near the entrances to the tombs. Rescue excavations by the Department of Antiquities between the 1960s and 1990s have revealed tombs of similar date, but also a monumental built tomb – the first discovered at the site – in 1989. The recorded material includes a Cypro-Archaic II to Cypro- Classical date for the use of the tomb; significantly, some of the jewellery closely matches several items from the Curium Treasure, suggesting that this was one of the tombs opened by Cesnola in 1874. More recent work by the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus and the late Danielle Parks explored further traces of this extensive burial ground close to the so-called Amathus Gate of the city. These include Hellenistic to mid-Roman chamber tombs cut into the rock-face of the acropolis, heavily quarried in later Roman times, as well as numerous monolithic sarcophagi and cist graves representing a reuse of the area for burial during late antiquity.

### Site C / Temple Site (Fig. 7)

Located north of the main acropolis near the ancient stadium, Site C actually comprised a number of separate areas. The plan of the Kourion area published in *Excavations* (Fig. 1) gives the impression that the site was rather small, but the sketch in the Notebook and the written description in the text, indicates that the finds were distributed over a considerable area. The first site was a cemetery near a track-way approximately 0.8km north of the Old Paphos road in which were explored a number of seemingly intact chamber tombs (Tombs 15–18). These contained ‘quantities’ of local pottery of Cypro-Archaic I–II date (mostly not kept) together with some surviving skeletons which were recorded in situ in the case of Tombs 15 and 17. Rock cut tombs on the south side of the modern road opposite the stadium have produced a number of important epitaphs in the Cyriot Syllabic script, probably dating from around the 6th century BC. Although none of these tombs has been excavated undisturbed, both the use of the script and the prominence of their location, suggest the relatively high status of their occupants. Both cemetery clusters were probably related to the ancient road leading past the city to the west of the island.

The second part of Site C, later renamed the ‘Temple-Site’, was a rural sanctuary located in a small valley to the south-west nearer the stadium. A surface grave (Tomb 18) excavated early on in the campaign produced a Hellenistic female figurine which may in fact have come from the sanctuary. The most important discovery here was a statue base with a biographic inscription in alphabetic Greek and Cyriot Syllabic script dedicated to Demeter and Kore and dating from the 4th century BC. This was found with many stone and terracotta figurines and other offerings ranging in date from the Cypro-Classical to the Hellenistic periods, including fragments of a marble statue described as an ‘inferior’ Kndian Aphrodite. Coins of Roman date suggest a later use of the sanctuary, but these may also have come from some of the surface graves reported in the same area. A separate burial ground seems to be represented by Tomb 19 which was discovered further to the south-west ‘below the stadium’ according to the Notebook, representing a third concentration of material. The recorded contents, assigned to the CM, included a woman-and-pitcher jug, from which a late Cypro-Archaic to early Hellenistic date can be inferred. The sketch map also shows several adjacent features labelled ‘empty tombs, plain pottery’ which are not mentioned in the Notebook text.

Renewed excavations in the area of the sanctuary in the 20th century did not identify the location of this sanctuary, but a votive deposit of figurines at Tourkos close to the general location of the BM sanctuary may be connected with it. A small early Christian basilica was also discovered in the vicinity, beneath which were found traces of an earlier shrine of Hellenistic date. Both the pre-Christian shrines in this area and the later church were probably located close to an ancient road and served the needs of passing travellers or visitors to the hippodrome as well as the local suburban or rural population.

### Site D (Fig. 8)

This site was centred on the top and northern slopes of a small ridge called Bamboula to the north of Episkopi, close to the road leading towards the bridge over the Kouris River to Erimi to the east. Tombs 27 to 50 and Tombs 86 to 109 belong to this cemetery, predominantly LBA in date with some burials from the CG and CC periods, some in reused older chambers. A handful of EBA burials (Tombs 97–98) were also uncovered in the small cluster of tombs (96–99) recorded as being 0.8km south-west of the summit (and indeed off the map published in *Excavations*), though the exact location of these is uncertain as no remains of Bronze Age date are known so far in this
direction. On the other hand, Tomb 58, which contained Red Polished pottery and a bronze dagger with a hooked handle of EC–MC date, is said to have been found during preliminary explorations half a mile to the south of Bamboula. This almost certainly refers to the well-known ECIII–LCIA cemetery and settlement site of Phaneromeni. This area was first systematically excavated in 1955 and later between 1975 and 1979, providing valuable evidence for the archaeological history of the immediate area before the occupation of Bamboula in LCIA. It is possible that both groups of pre-BA burials recorded in the Notebook in fact belong at the site of Phaneromeni and that the location of Tombs 96–99 given in the Notebook is inaccurate. This solution however raises the problem of the original find spot of the LCII–III tombs, which would surely be out of place at Phaneromeni. Perhaps, as Daniel originally suggested, some (but surely not all) details of the published plan are simply not reliable, though there is no reason to doubt the general distances mentioned by Walters. MC (or possibly LCIA) material found at Episkopi in 1964 attests to another focus of settlement activity of this date, in which case the location of a contemporary burial ground 0.8km south of the summit of Bamboula in the direction of the modern town is not impossible.

Later excavations by J. Daniel in the 1937–39, 1941 and 1948 uncovered 40 tombs of a similar date range as the BM discoveries, relocating several of the older BM tombs in the process, viz. 50, 53 and 102, and 104 (the latter actually a well or cistern). The excavation and recording was more thorough, providing a representative sample of local Cypriot material than had been preserved or noted by the earlier team. Daniel also revealed a much greater time-depth for the LC burial ground extending from LCIA2/B to the end of LCIIIA. Significant fragments of BM Vase C391, a Late Helladic IIIA pictorial crater decorated with women framed by ‘windows’, were found in Daniel’s Tomb 17–17A. In 1969 these were reunited with their London counterparts to form an almost complete vessel, now on long-term loan to the Cyprus Museum (Karageorghis, this volume); similarly, sherds from BM Vase C501, a large LM IIIB octopus stirrup, were generously offered to the British Museum by the University of Pennsylvania Museum in 1957. Numerous LBA burials have also been uncovered in more recent rescue excavations by the Department of Antiquities.

Extensive remains of the contemporary LC settlement were also uncovered during the Pennsylvania excavations. These include a circuit wall with several towers on the west side of the site facing the Kouris River, numerous houses and workshops, and intriguing (but poorly understood) evidence for urban planning, such as a kerbed road 2.5m wide running for over 75m in Trench 15, an adjacent monumental well, and a large artificially levelled area (or ‘Agora’ as Daniel termed it) in Trenches 12–14 just below the summit.

There was also evidence for later occupation, including indications that the LBA town wall had been restored several times in the CA and CC periods, while the reuse of older tombs was also noted. What purpose the site served in this period remains unclear, though the ‘reformation’ of the settlement may be connected with the development (or emergence) of the historical city-kingdom of Kourion. Daniel’s premature death and the consequent delay in the publication of his discoveries left numerous questions about the site unresolved, especially given the major development elsewhere in the Kouris Valley area since his excavations. The more recent excavations on the settlement by the State University of New York in 1987 were inconclusive, while those by the University of Cincinnati since 2001 have only been published in preliminary form. The existing reports suggest a similar range of burial and structural material as the older excavations, though the specific claims made about the nature and date of these new discoveries remain to be confirmed.

Daniel also excavated a tomb of the Cypro-Classical period 300m to the south of Bamboula, closer to the village where tombs of the Cypro-Archaic period have also been discovered over the years. Given the distance between here and other tombs of this period at Bamboula, there was presumably another settlement focus around the modern village, confirmed by other finds of Cypro-Geometric to Roman date.

Area E (Fig. 9)
Area E extended along a ridge opposite the acropolis running north of the road leading from Episkopi to Paphos and was part of the extensive Yerakarka burial ground which was used from Archaic to Roman times. The first part of the site investigated was near the ruined church of Ayia Chrysanayiotissa (Tomb 59 to 70) while later on in the season the team moved further west (Tomb 110 to 118). The preserved finds are predominantly Hellenistic and Roman, with the notebook revealing some details of the tomb types of these periods. Walters noted that both Cesnola and Williamson had excavated extensively here in the previous decades. Hake, who also seems to have worked this area, nonetheless examined more than 70 tombs with some degree of success, to judge from the large numbers of Roman lamps and glass vessels which he found here. The extended nature of the ancient cemetery may be explained by the fact that it probably followed an ancient road which ran in this direction. The area was one of the major burial grounds of the city from Cypro-Archaic to Roman times but the cemetery has not been investigated systematically in modern times.

Notebook: editorial notes
Numbers in square brackets before entries are added for purposes of enumeration. The entries sometimes differ from the order of items in the list of tomb groups in Excavations, especially where objects were not kept. In many places, rough maps and sketches on separate sheets have been pasted into the pages of the text, perhaps cut from notebooks used in the field: these are noted in the text in square brackets in the appropriate place, with the more informative examples reproduced as illustrations. The numbers in square brackets at the end of the entry are the Department of Greece and Rome registration numbers for the main Kourion sequence (1896,2-1.1 to 400), followed by British Museum Catalogue numbers where appropriate. Some of the items in the registration sequence cannot be assigned to a specific tomb, so not every registered item is mentioned in the notebook. For convenience, a list is included at the end of this article. BM or CM in square brackets after each tomb number refers to whether the tomb was assigned to the British Museum or the Cyprus Museum.

Minor corrections to the original text are usually not indicated except in the case of the crossed-out entries of objects.
not retained – which are typed in italics – or where other significant details have been corrected or deleted. Where crossed-out text is given in the transcription, it is put in italics in square brackets to preserve as much as possible the syntax and sense of the final version. Other text in square brackets and regular font represents editorial comments or explanations of the layout of the original manuscript. The punctuation and capitalising of the original text is followed as closely as possible. In many places, Walters uses dashes rather than full stops or commas to punctuate the entries; these have been kept for the most part but some punctuation marks have been added to aid the reader.

Each tomb entry is followed by an editorial comment noting divergences from the main published accounts Excavations and CCM and the archival sources (principally the four letters of Walters to the Principal Librarian (12 and 24 February, 23 March, 23 April, 1895). Bibliographic and other details are provided where appropriate, such as for the later work at Bamboula by Daniel where older BM tombs were rediscovered, and for material assigned to the Cyprus Museum referred to in the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (henceforth SCE) volumes IV/IC and I½ or the relevant volume of the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum (abbreviated as CVA). The reader should refer to the Kourion section of the Ancient Cyprus in the British Museum On-line Research Catalogue for full documentation of the objects preserved in the British Museum, and to the Cyprus Museum for their share of the finds from the 1895 excavations which were not examined for the present study.

Text of Kourion Notebook
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SITE A Begun 24 Jan. 1895 [Figs 3 and 5]
The following objects were found in a μνημείον or surface-grave one of a group along the north-east side of the site (see plan)

Tomb 1 [BM] 24 Jan. 1895
[1] Egyptian scarab of greyish-black colour [1896,2-1.93; Gem 152]
[2] Bronze bowl
[3] Bronze ring broken in three, and fragment of another
[5] Cypriote pottery
[6] Oinochoe of black ware, with ribbed body
[7] do of red ware – egg shaped body- trefoil mouth, black and purple bands
[8] do of red ware – shape as last – plain red ware
[9] do with black bands on drab – twisted handle
[10] do of black bands – shape as b.f. oinochoae
[12] Small globular vase – black on drab – concentric circles [1896,2-1.290; Vase C886]
[13] Small jug with black bands
[14] Cup with one handle. Black bands on drab
[16] Skyphos – black bands on red
[17] Vase of shallow flower-pot shape, drab with diaper patterns in black [1896,2-1.89; Vase C708]
[18] do do do – smaller, drab with diaper patterns in black

In the neighbourhood of this μνημείον – small black jug with pointed base.

[On the opposite page] No other μνημείον contained any objects of interest or importance – a few others were excavated towards the S.E. of the site.

Comments: Excavations, p. 81 lists six items, though number six is a composite entry ‘Bronze bowl and numerous Cypriote vases, with concentric circles, etc., and plain pottery’. None of these was registered.

About the middle of the east side we came upon a group of [half a dozen] five Cypriote tombs close together – all of which were full of earth and consequently their shape and size could not be accurately ascertained. With the exception of tomb II none of them contained many objects. They were none more than 10 ft. below the surface. After a few tentative efforts on the W side of the field, which yielded no results, the site was abandoned on Jan. 26th.

Tomb 2 [CM]
Cypriote pottery:
[1] Large amphora with black bands, and concentric circles on neck
[2] Small stamnos with black bands on red
[3] Large stamnos of plain black ware having a groove round the shoulder with a spout – perhaps used as a ψύκτηρ
[4] Jug with egg-shaped body and trefoil mouth – black bands on red
[5] [Small jug] Jug with egg-shaped body – black bands and concentric circles on buff
[7] Small jug of plain red ware
[8] Jug with spout in body – black bands on red
[9] Jug with plain lip – black bands and rings on red
[10] Small jug with flat body and trefoil mouth – red circles on red
[12] Lekythos with globular body – black and red bands and concentric circles on buff
[14] Jug with trefoil mouth – black bands on drab

[On opposite page, pasted into the Notebook]
Gray steatite scarab inscribed with double clump of lotus flowers, and the praenomen of Thothmes III [sketch] Men-Xeper Ra and a device. About 8c 500 [see Tomb 1, 1 above]

[Below this is a pencil sketch of Site A also pasted on a separate piece of paper: Fig 5]
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Tomb 2 cont.
[15] Lekythos with globular body and concentric circles in black on drab
[16] Lekythos with globular body and concentric circles in black on drab
[17] Lekythos in black and purple on drab
[18] Large bowl of red ware
[19] Deep bowl with black bands and concentric circles on red, inside and out, one handle broken off
[20] Bowl of plain ware – no handles
[21] Bowl with one handle – black rings on red
[22] Bowl with two rows of concentric circles on exterior – black on red
[23] Bowl with no handle – red ware
[24] Two large bowls in fragments – black bands and rings on red
[25] Bowl with tongue-pattern on lip – black and purple
[26] Pinax – broken – red and black Vandyke border – black rings underneath
[27] Small lamp of red ware – lip much bent in
[28] Foot of vase – black glazed
[29] Tripod of red ware
[30] Three fragments of bronze fibulae – one with a bowl of porcelain and silver attached

Comments: Walters includes this tomb in his first letter to the PL noting that ‘some of the shapes are unusual and curious’, though the group was subsequently assigned to the CM. CCM, p. 182 list nos 29–30, specifically C.M. 4840–4842, belonging to Myres’ Type iii; Gjerstad’s Type 4b and Giesen’s Type X.
Excavations, p. 81 states 'Tomb 3 and 4 – a series of “Graeco-Phoenician” vases, none considered worth preserving'. The deletions in the Notebook suggest that the finds were sifted several times in the Notebook, but nothing was registered. Excavations, p. 82 lists nos 3–4 as ‘Cypriote pottery’ and nos 5–6 as ‘Graeco-Phoenician’ vases, none considered worth preserving'. The deletions in the Notebook suggest that the finds were sifted several times before being discarded altogether.
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**Tomb 3 [BM]**
- Large amphora – black bands and concentric circles on red
- Stamnos with black bands and concentric circles on red
- Jug with globular body and trefoil mouth – patterns in black on red
- Upper part of large bronze lebes and several fragments of the same
- Fragment of a vase with globular body – concentric circles, vertical and horizontal in black and red
- Part of a vase like a candle stick, of plain red ware
- Large bowl – black rings on drab
- Small bowl – red ware
- Phiale of red ware – black bands on exterior
- Fragment of a vase with globular body – concentric circles, vertical and horizontal in black and red

**Tomb 4 [BM]**
- Tall jar of red ware with side-handles and cylindrical mouth
- Lekythos with globular body – circles and bands in black on drab
- Askos in the form of a rude bird. Black and purple stripes

**Tomb 5 [CM]**
- Bronze pan from a pair of scales
- Large stamnos – black bands and circles on red
- Large stamnos – black bands on red
- Large stamnos – black bands and circles on red
- Small bowl – black rings on drab
- Bowl of red ware – black bands and circles
- Bowl of plain red ware
- Large stamnos – black bands on red
- Fragment of iron
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**Tomb 5 [CM]**
- Bronze fibula broken but complete [1895, 2–1.95; Bronze 1953]
- Phiale of red ware – black bands on exterior
- Large amphora – black bands on drab ground
- Large stamnos – black bands and concentric circles on red
- Jug with globular body and trefoil mouth – patterns in black on red
- Jug with globular body – black bands and rings on buff
- Jug with trefoil mouth and three-ribbed handle – red ware

**Tomb 6 [BM]**
- Tall jar of red ware with side-handles and cylindrical mouth
- Lekythos with globular body – circles and bands in black on drab
- Askos in the form of a rude bird. Black and purple stripes

**Tomb 7 [CM]**
- In the 6φ0109 of this tomb were found seven alabastra of coarse red ware, one of which was kept.
- Objects found:
  1. Alabastron of coarse red ware
  2. Small alabaster vase
  3. Bronze mirror
  4. Bronze nail
  5. Fragment of iron
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**Sketch of Site B in pencil and black ink [Fig. 6]**
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**SITE B**

A field about 100 yds. west of Site A, about 400 yds. due south-east of the Acropolis – we excavated several tombs towards the N. side of the field, but only two contained any objects. Adjoining no. 7 was a large tomb with 6φ0109; which had been completely ransacked – like many tombs on this site it had been invaded by water, and the soil was very soft and muddy.

**Tomb 7**

In the 6φ0109 of this tomb were found seven alabastra of coarse red ware, one of which was kept.
- Objects found:
  1. Alabastron of coarse red ware
  2. Small alabaster vase
  3. Bronze mirror
  4. Bronze nail
  5. Fragment of iron
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**Tomb 6 [BM]**
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Numerous [several] unsuccessful attempts were made in the two fields to the north and north-west of Site B – but hardly a single object was found – nothing worth presenting – although we covered all the ground up to the foot-path – a rough sketch-map appended on this page.
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Numerous fragments of bronze (presumably part of the lebes mentioned in the Notebook) but these were not registered.
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Numerous [several] unsuccessful attempts were made in the two fields to the north and north-west of Site B – but hardly a single object was found – nothing worth presenting – although we covered all the ground up to the foot-path – a rough sketch-map appended on this page.

In the ground on either side of the footpath we were slightly more successful. The first tomb (no. 9) which produced any results was led to by the existence of a stone projecting in the foot-path, beneath which...
was a tomb containing among other specimens of plain pottery a ‘woman-and-pitcher’ vase. Meanwhile one tomb (no. 10) in the E. angle of the field to the north of B was excavated, and contained besides a considerable quantity of plain pottery of the Roman period some specimens of gold, silver, and bronze. On the north of the pathway nothing was found, but immediately upon it, close together, were two of three tombs of interest.

Contents of Tomb 9 [BM]
[1] Woman-and-pitcher jug – dark red-brown ware [1896,2-1.98; Vase 1077].

Comments: Excavations, p. 82 and fig. 141

Tomb 10 [BM]
About 10 ft. below the ground, with two long chambers meeting at an angle, one higher than another. One or two genuine Greek objects were found, but the majority were of the Roman period (numerous plain vases) – and it would appear that a tomb of about 500 bc. had been plundered and used again in Roman times.
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Contents of Tomb 10
[1] Small amphora of f. p. period with diaper pattern in black and white dots [1896,2-1.99]
[2] Gold ring with backing of gem (now lost) in green stone [1896,2-1.100; Finger Ring 1242]
[4] Two bronze mirrors
[5] Support of bronze mirror, with Gorgoneion and palmettes [1896,2-1.104; Bronze 245]
[6] Three silver spirals
[7] Small silver ring
[8] Bronze spiral
[9] Two fragments of bronze pins (?)
[10] Two fragments of iron fibulae (?)
[12] Bronze bowl in fragments (incomplete)
[13] Two leaden bracelets ending in snakes’ heads [1896,2-1.101-102; Jewellery 1601*]
[14] Several fragments of some large iron object

Comments: Nos 6–7 are probably the four silver spirals listed in Excavations, p. 82 no. 7, but not registered. The other metal fragments are no longer identifiable.

Tomb 11 [BM]
Near the pathway – unimportant
[1] Piece of dark green marble (?) [1896,2-1.106]
[2] Fragment of iridescent Roman glass
[3] Fragments of green glass vase
[4] Fragments of opaque white vase

Comments: No. 3 was not registered. Excavations, p. 82 also mentions a fragment of yellow glass vase, with shallow flutings identified as 1896,2-1.339.
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Tomb 12 [CM]
On the extreme W. of the site – a very deep tomb – nearly 20 ft. – but containing very little.
[1] Bronze disk with a hook in the centre (smashed – only centre piece preserved)
[2] Ring of pale yellow glass
[3] Small gem of pale yellow glass

Comments: CCM, p. 182 lists no. 3.

Tomb 13 [CM]
A remarkable tomb, with many ramifications. We first excavated a sarcophagus (7’ 3" x 3’ 7" x 3’ 6” – 4’ thick) – outside measurements – which however contained absolutely nothing. It was not much below the ground-level. In the ground near it were found:
[2] Part of a glass vase
[3] A Roman lamp (plain)

On the east of the sarcophagus was found a door of hewn-stone, leading into a large tomb with two or three side-chambers, but it was absolutely empty, and had presumably been plundered, together with the sarcophagus.

[Sketch of tomb on opposite page]

Comments: CCM, p. 182 mentions nos 1 and 3. The tomb index in SCE IV/1D appears to attribute several BR bowls to this tomb (13.1392 and 1394; also Tomb 29 below) but this may be an error or a mis-print based on the source cited (see also SCEIV/1C, pp. 140, 179).
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2 Feb. 1895
The next site attempted was immediately under the rock of the acropolis, to the east of the gateway – a site where there are many evidences of tombs and other constructions. In the βόη κάμνο, one tomb (no. 14) were found the fragments of a large vase of plain red ware with a head of Hathor in relief – but nothing else was done, and the site was abandoned after that day.

Tomb 14 (a μνημείον) [BM]
[1] Fragments of large vase of plain red ware with head of Hathor in relief [1896,2-1.107]

4 Feb. 1895
A move was made today to a site a good deal higher up the valley up which the old Papho road [runs], and with a view to seeing whether the land was worth purchasing, some tentative excavations were made. The first site chosen was a little way above the pathway leading northwards from the road about half-a-mile from the latter. Three tombs were excavated here, of no great size, but with complete skeletons, and containing large quantities of Cypriote pottery – some very fair specimens.
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SITE C [Fig. 7]

Tomb 15 [BM]
[1] Large amphora – short neck – rows of concentric circles and black and purple bands on drab
[2] Large jug with spherical body, trefoil mouth, a two-ribbed handle – vertical circles in black and white and intersecting concentric circles – drab ground
[3] Similar jug – black concentric circles and purple rings (all vertical) on buff – hole in side [1896,2-1.369; Vase C865]
[4] Similar jug – vertical circles and rings in black on red
[5] do do – black and brown concentric circles on drab
[6] Stamnos of black ware with grooves round the shoulder and spout – perhaps used as a ψύκτηρ
[7] Vase in the shape of a candlestick
[8] Lekythos with globular body – black and red concentric circles on buff [1896,2-1.288; Vase C278]

[A pencil-drawn sketch of the tomb has been stuck on a separate piece of paper below the inventory: a rectangular chamber with a short dromos on the long side (slightly off-centre, to the left); extended inhumation to left of the doorway, head facing the entrance; the circles drawn on the floor close to the back and right-hand wall of the chamber appear to represent grave goods.]

Comments: The tomb was apparently assigned to the BM as two items were registered, but it is not listed in Excavations, nor in Walters’ first letter to the PL.

Tomb 16 [BM]
[1] Two Stamnoi – black bands on brown – black concentric circles on drab
[2] Small stamnos – black and purple bands on drab
Excavations to the BM as two items were registered, but it is not listed in Remarks: as with Tomb 15, this tomb group was apparently assigned to the BM as two items were registered, but it is not listed in Excavations nor in Walters' letter to the PL.
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Tomb 17 [BM] [Fig. 10]
[1] Two large jugs – spherical body – trefoil mouth. Two-ribbed handle – vertical black and purple rings and bands of concentric circles on drab
[2] Two similar jugs – black and purple concentric circles each side – vertical band of concentric circles between
[3] Jug with spout, plain lip and handle – black and purple bands and concentric circles on shoulder
[5] Do – black ware – horizontal fluting all over
[7] Do – spherical body – black and purple bands and concentric circles on drab – handle lost

Fig. 10

(A pencil-drawn sketch of tomb has been stuck on the opposite page: sketch of Greek cross with convex terminals inscribed in a circle intersecting and vertical concentric circles on red)

Comments: Nothing from this tomb is mentioned in the GR register, Excavations, Murray to PL, or CCM.
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6 Feb. – 9 Feb.
A return was made to Site B [Fig. 6], the extreme eastern edge, and several tombs were opened, with the following results:

Tomb 20 [CM]
[1] A small gold spiral
[2] Large jug with black and purple vertical rings and concentric circles on drab
[3] Lekythos with globular body and intersecting bands and concentric circles in black and purple on drab – lip broken
[4] Small stamnos with black and purple bands and concentric circles on shoulder – drab ground
[5] Plain bowl – red with black rim

Sketch of Greek cross with convex terminals inscribed in a circle pasted into the right-hand margin

Comments: Murray et al. 1900, p. 82 ‘Cypriote pottery, none of which was kept for the Museum’.
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Tomb 23 [CM]
[1] Jug with two-ribbed handle, plain lip, and spout – black bands and concentric circles on buff ground
[2] Two small lekythi with spherical bodies – red concentric circles on pale red ground
[3] Small jug with spout – black and white bands and concentric circles on red ground
[4] Small red pelike
[5] Small jar with side-handles – plain red
[6] Simpulum with looped handle – dark red ware

Comments: CCM, p. 182 ‘Six common Cypriote vases (red ware and concentric circles)’
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Tomb 24 [BM]
[1] Large amphora – black bands on light brown – on the shoulder, a bird and a sort of Maltese cross [1896, 2-1.397; Vase C763]
[2] Jug with spherical body – eyes on lip – intersecting and concentric circles in black on red

Comments: Excavations, p. 82 mentioned only no. 1.

11–13 Feb.
Two more tombs were opened on this site close to tomb 10 (v. supr.). The second (no. 26) contained some Greek objects – and it is unfortunate that the immediate neighbourhood of these tombs should have been previously worked to such an extent, as many more Greek objects might have been found.
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Tomb 25 [BM]
[1] Small bronze earring in three pieces
[2] Terracotta man on horseback (many found at Amathus) [1896, 2-1.111; Terracotta A217]
[3] Small stamnos – concentric circles on drab ground
[4] Small red bowl with black rim
[5] Stamnos – black patterns on drab ground
[6] Two fragments of bronze fibula

Comments: Excavations, p. 82

Tomb 26 [BM]
A large deep tomb with two chambers.
[1] Late b.f. kylix in fragments – Dionysos and Maenad each site [1896, 2-1.114]
[3] Black basalt scarab with ibex [1896, 2-1.194; Gem C342]
[4] Five terracotta horses – nude Cypriote type [1896, 2-1.112/221; Terracotta A221, A222]
[5] Terracotta Kanephors do do
[6] Piece of gold leaf
[7] Brown lebes
[9] Ficile bell – black and purple bands [1896,2-1.133; Terracotta A226]
[10] Jug as before – black-on-red – large and small circles

[Page 20] [The following page consists of three sketches of Site D at different scales and showing successive stages of the work: two smaller ones are pasted into the left-hand side of the notebook, the larger plan, drawn directly on the page on the right, shows all the tombs excavated in Site D and was the basis of the map on p. 6 of Excavations [Fig. 8]]

[SITE D] 11 Feb. 1895–23 Feb. [Fig. 8]
On Feb. 11th a start was made on a site close to the S. side of the new Papho road, just above the Erimi bridge, about half-a-mile from Episkopi. Little was discovered on Monday except a few fragments [of White Painted Wheelmade III ware 1896,2-1.2,327; Vase C729], but on Tuesday a notable discovery was made in the shape of a Mycenaean kylix with cuttle-fish in fairly good preservation [1896,2-1.2; Vase C608]. This was followed by the discovery of similar remains, chiefly fragments, but sufficient to show that the spot must represent a Mycenaean settlement [and the lie of the ground seems to suggest an acropolis below which on the sloping terraces below which lie the tombs [original syntax]]. If so, it [must have been the predecessor of the site now known as Curium, and] may possibly have been the original foundation of the Argive colony mentioned by Strabo [XIV, 6.3].

[Page 21] [Tomb 27 (CM)] 11 Feb. 1895
[1] Terracotta figurine of bull – legs broken – has had a lamp on his head (similar one found at Salamis) [C.M. 467; A1252]
[3] Two fragments of a vase with white patterns on black ground

[Page 22] [Tomb 28 (BM)] 12 Feb.
[1] Mycenaean kylix with cuttle-fish (a few separate fragments)
[3] [Lamp?] Milking-cup with handle and long spout (in fragments) – patterns in red on pale red ground [1896,2-1.327; Vase C729]
[4] Plain bowl of red ware
[5] Sard scarab with Egyptian hieroglyphics [1896,2-1.1; Gem 153]

[Page 23] [Tomb 29 (CM; BM ?)] 13 Feb.
[1] Tall jug with patterns of diagonals in matt-colour – coarse red ware – flat handle (Base-ring ware) [ware name added later] (CM A1069)
[2] Two bowls with one handle and no foot – black patterns of network etc on drab – round the rim and upwards from the foot
[3] Bowl of similar shape – coarse red ware
[4] Small vase on high foot with three handles – hatched lines in black on drab
[5] Fragment of pseudamphora – patterns in red on pale red

[Page 23] [Tomb 30 (BM)] 11 Feb. 1895
[1] Pseudamphora in fragments – patterns in black and red [1896,2-1.384; Vase C504]
[2] Parts of other pseudamphorae
[3] Two pieces of bronze
[5] Fragments of stamnos, probably Mycenaean – three small handles – scale pattern red-black on drab (on shoulder) [1896,2-1.389; Vase C439]
[6] Small pyxis of stone or terracotta without lid [1896,2-1.8]
[7] Neck of large vase (three fragments) – red bands on buff
[8] Fragments of vase with spiral patterns in black (pattern worn) on greenish-grey ground [1896,2-1.386; Vase C537]
[9] Fragments of vase with black (turning to red) bands on drab ground
[10] Small vase (incomplete) – black patterns on drab
[12] Fragments of black ware with cable-moulding in relief

[Page 24] [Tomb 31 (BM)] 13 Feb.
[1] Bowl in fragments – chequers and tree-patterns, black on pale red
[2] Two-handed lekythos (Cypriote shape) with black bands on red – Mycenaean technique [1896,2-1.9; Vase C571]
[3] Fragments of bowls with chequer and diamond patterns in black on drab

[Page 24] [Tomb 32 (CM)] 13 Feb.
[1] Part of a Hittite seal in black basalt – incised design of two deer and a tree
[2] Two stone weights, perforated

Comments: Excavations, p. 79 mentions only nos 1–3 and 5; 4 was not registered.

Notes:
[1] Mycenaean kylix with cuttle-fish (a few separate fragments)
[3] Two pieces of bronze
[5] Fragments of stamnos, probably Mycenaean – three small handles – scale pattern red-black on drab (on shoulder)
[6] Small pyxis of stone or terracotta without lid
[7] Neck of large vase (three fragments) – red bands on buff
[8] Fragments of vase with spiral patterns in black (pattern worn) on greenish-grey ground
[9] Fragments of vase with black (turning to red) bands on drab ground
[10] Small vase (incomplete) – black patterns on drab
[12] Fragments of black ware with cable-moulding in relief

Comments: Excavations, p. 79 lists 1, 4–6 and 8. The ‘fragments of Mycenaean and white-slip ware’ are presumably the other ceramic items mentioned in the notebook. These, and the ‘two pieces of bronze’, were not registered in the main Kourion sequence.

Comments: Excavations, p. 79 also mentions nos 1 and 3 but they were not registered.

Comments: Mentioned in Walters’ second letter to the PL but the group was assigned to the CM. CCM, p. 181; SCE IV/D: weights (p. 545).
Tomb 33 (BM)  
[1] Small Mycenaean vase – wavy black lines on drab [1896,2-1.328; Vase C721]  
Comments: Excavations, 1900, 79 and fig. 129.

Tomb 34 (BM)  
[1] Large Mycenaean amphora in fragments (about 70) – on either side two men in chariot with two horses – quivers, and tripods surmounted by wreaths – black turning to red on buff ground. [1896,2-1.10; Vase C338]  
[2] Two small gold beads [1896,2-1.11.73; Jewellery 792, 790]  
[3] Porcelain object [with sketch of oblong object with rounded terminals, perforated on one end, the number 81 preceding it has been crossed out, perhaps because confused with a similar picrolite object from Tomb 98 registered as 1896,2-1.91]  
Comments: Excavations, 79 mentions only nos 1–2 and 4, the latter was not registered, nor no. 5. According to a note next to a similar item in Tomb 42, this ‘hat-shaped’ vase is a Base Ring II Y-shaped carinated bowl with wish-bone handle.

Tomb 35 (CM)  
[1] Two beads and fragments in green enamel  
[2] Three fragments of pottery, with black bands on drab  
[3] Nine fragments forming a bowl, with chequers and diamonds in black on drab  
Comments: CCM, p. 191: ‘two green enamel beads c.f. C.M. 630. Fragments of White Slip Ware (II.4)’.  

Tomb 36 (BM)  
[1] Stamnos of red ware with hieroglyphic [drawing] painted on shoulder [1896,2-1.12]  
Comments: Excavations, p. 79 only mentions no. 1 but the hieroglyphic sign is no longer visible, if indeed this is the same object, on what is a small Plain White Wheelmade II crater.

Tomb 37 (BM)  
[1] Various fragments of pottery – Mycenaean style [1896,2-1.370,374; Vase C505]  

Tomb 38 (BM)  
[1] Marble vase  
Comments: Excavations, p. 79 (tombs numbered together). The Mycenaean fragments assemble into a more-or-less complete stirrup jar; the marble vase was not registered.

Tomb 39 (BM)  
[1] Two beads as before and one ring-shaped [1896,2-1.13,74]  
[2] Handle of vase, of peculiar shape  
Comments: Excavations, p. 79 only mentions no. 1.

Tomb 40 (CM)  
[1] Small vase with scale-pattern – black on drab ground  
[2] Bowl with chequer patterns, black on drab, as before  
[3] do in fragments  
[4] Jug of black ware in fragments, with cable-moulding in relief  
Comments: CCM p. 181: ‘Small Mycenaean vase with scale-pattern. Two White Slip Ware bowls (II.4). Jug of black ware (I.2) with cable-pattern in relief’; SCEIV/1C: Mycenaean stirrup jar (p. 349).

Tomb 41 (CM)  
[1] Small marble vase  
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[2] Alabaster vase  
[3] Pseudophaenor with bands and chevron patterns  
[4] do plain red ware  
[5] Alabastron with black rings on drab  
[6] Small vase with two small handles (as [Tomb] 29)  
[7] Mortar of basalt, on three legs  
[8] Stone vase with thick flutings (resembling a jelly-mould)  
[9] Small vase of black ribbed ware – small handle  
Comments: This tomb is mentioned in Walters’ second letter to the PL but the group was assigned to the CM. He notes that ‘the Mycenaean remains were all at a lower level than the Cypriote which might imply several periods of use. The description of what seems to be a Bucchero vessel (no. 9), as well as the fluted stone vessel (no. 8) could represent a LCIIIC-IIIA burial later than the LCIIIB–early IIC horizon of the Mycenaean wares. CCM, p. 181; SCEIV/1C: Mycenaean (pithoid jar, 306; stirrup jar, p. 349); SCEIV/4D: faience bowl (p. 523); stone (mortar, p. 537; Unclassified stone, p. 543); CVA Cyprus I, pl. 25,8, p. 31.
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[12] Two gold rings and two gold beads  
[13] Stone bead as before  
Comments: Excavations, p. 79 mentions no. 3, a BR II Y-shaped carinated bowl with wish-bone handle but the other fragments were not registered.  
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[13] Three stone beads as before [1896,2-1.75]  
[16] Two fragments of a pseudophaenora.  
[17] Fragments of Cypriote pottery  
[18] Two gold ornaments [added later; sketch on right-hand margin labelled 'two gold ornaments' with question mark]  
Comments: Excavations, p. 79 mention only nos 1–3 and ‘fragments of pottery’. No. 1 is further described as depicting ‘a Gryphon guarding a sacred tree’. Only one of the beads listed under no. 3 was registered.

Tomb 44 (BM)  
[1] Bronze spear-head [1896,2-1.18; Bronze 53]  
[2] Skyphos with stem – concentric circles, black on drab – small handles  
[3] Phiale (one handle broken off). Cypriote patterns in purple on black – triangles of lozenge and chevron patterns – cross in centre [1896,2-1.20; Vase C745]  
[4] Terracotta figure of grotesque man with r. hand to face and l. on pubes [1896,2-1.19; Terracotta As]  
Comments: Walters’ second letter to the PL lists ‘three rude terracotta figures’ (supra nos 4–6) while Excavations, p. 79 mentions other terracotta figures in addition to no. 4 supra (his no. 4) as coming from a later ‘Graeco-Phoenician’ burial. These two and the ‘skyphos’ (supra no. 2) were not registered in the Kourion sequence.
Tomb 45 [BM]
[1] Three fragments of Mycenaean pottery (one with [quiver] murex)
[2] Stone pestle (?) of black basalt [1896,2-1.21]

Comments: Excavations, p. 79 mentions only no. 2.

Tomb 46 [CM]
[1] Stone celt or axe-head
[2] Weight with hole in top (stone)

Comments: Listed in Murray’s second letter to the PL but the tomb was assigned to the CM. CCM, p. 181: The axe-head is C.M. 670.

Tomb 47 [BM]
[1] Four fragments of bronze pins
[2] Stone head (as before) [1896,2-1.76]
[3] Fragment of black ware (three parallel ribs)
[4] Fragment of Mycenaean vase with unintelligible subject (black on drab) [1896,2-1.373; Vase C680]

Comments: Excavations, p. 79 mentions only 2 and 4.

Tomb 48 [BM]
[3] Stone head as before [1896,2-1.77]

Comments: All three items listed in Murray et al., 1900, p. 79 (though only two rather than six Mycenaean chariot crater sherds).
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Tomb 49 [CM]
[1] Bowl with black patterns on white ground – chequers and rude fleur de lys etc.
[2] Two fragments of similar bowl

Comments: CCM, p. 181 (White Slip bowl (II.4)).

Tomb 50 [BM]
[1] Fragments of Mycenaean vases with figures and black bands on buff ground [1896,2-1.265; Vase C501, a large LM III octopus stirrup jar]
[2] Fragments of pseudamphorae
[3] Vase of rock-crystal (flat cup on stem)
[4] Leaf-shaped gold ornaments (3) [1896,2-1.24, 71, 72; Jewellery 796–798]
[6] Terracotta head [1896,2-1.218; Terracotta A3]
[7] Bone disc [1896,2-1.252]

Comments: Excavations, p. 79, no. 6 mentions ‘fragments of Mycenaean pottery’ in addition to the LM III vase, but none were registered in the Kourion sequence; supra no. 3 was omitted from the later list, presumably not kept by the excavators or the Museum. This tomb was re-excavated by Daniel during the Pennsylvania Museum expedition to Kourion in the late 1930s, his Tomb 26. The chamber was oval, measuring 3.35 x 4.2m and 2.2m high, and was approached by a rectangular dromos 1.3 x 1.35m with a small niche in the west side. Sherds from the octopus stirrup jar (supra no. 1) were discovered during this campaign and reunited with the BM fragments in 1957 to form a substantially complete stirrup jar. Daniel also found an ivory button, numerous Cypriot sherds and a fragment of a BR figurine.

Tomb 51 [CM]
[1] Bronze object [perhaps the head of a pick or similar tool] (part of plough share)

Comments: CCM, p.181 (C.M. 609).

Tomb 52 [BM]
[1] Bronze ring
[2] Barrel-shaped Cypriot lekythos – black bands on drab [1896,2-1.25; Vase C778]

Unnumbered

Bronze dagger – handle ending in hook (Cypriot)
Fragment of Mycenaean vase – black bands on buff
Fragment of terracotta female figure – in relief

Comments: Excavations, p. 79 also mentions a stone weight and ‘fragments of bronze’, presumably including no. 1, but neither was registered. He also notes that the tomb was ‘apparently of later date, about the 7th century BC’ which is correct for no. 2. The unnumbered items belong to a LC group, possibly an earlier period of use of the tomb if they were found in the same chamber as the IA objects.
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Tomb 53 [BM]
[1] Fragments of large Mycenaean (?) vase as from Tomb 34 – on one side two persons in chariot – on the other, panels with a female figure in each – incomplete [1896,2-1.26; Vase C391]
[2] Numerous fragments of Mycenaean vases

Comments: One of the two chambers (along with Tomb 102 below) comprising a single mortuary unit.

Tomb 54 [BM/CM]
[1] Numerous fragments of pseudamphorae and other Mycenaean pottery
[2] Two large olpae of Ayia Paraskevi type (one transferred to B.M.)
[3] Several bowls of Ayia Paraskevi type

Comments: Included by Walters’ in his second letter to the PL but assigned to the CM apart from one of the items listed under no. 2 supra. CCM, p. 181: ‘Numerous fragments of Mycenaean pottery. Large jug and series of bowls of White Slip Ware (II.4)’; SCE IV/1C: WS II bowl (p. 465; CM A130).

Tomb 55 [BM]
[1] Mycenaean three-handled vase on high stem – three snakes in black on drab, three times repeated [1896,2-1.28; Vase C463]
[2] Similar vase with spiral patterns [1896,2-1.331; Vase C462]
[3] Pseudamphorae – black bands on buff [1896,2-1.29; Vase C520].
[4] Large jug (broken) of Ayia Paraskevi type

Comments: Excavations, p. 80. No 4 was not registered.

Tomb 56 [BM]
[1] Three Cypriote jugs of usual type with intersecting circles etc. – black on red.
[3] Large stamnos – black on red – concentric circles on shoulder
[4] Small stamnos – black on red
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Tomb 56 ctd.
[5] Large bowl – concentric circles outside – black on red
[6] Small bowl – black rings inside on red
[7] Plate with patterns outside – chevrons and diamonds – black on red [1896,2-1.900; Vase C731]
[8] Jug with trefoil mouth – black bands on drab in Mycenaean style [1896,2-1.88; Vase C775]
[10] Small spindle-whorl of dark green stone

Comments: Excavations, p. 80 lists nos 2 and 7–9 in addition to around 60 ‘jugs, bowls and amphorae of Graeco-Phoenician type, mostly with concentric circles’ which were not kept apart from no. 2. More than any other tomb at Kourion, with the possible exception of Tomb 73, this illustrates the highly selective nature of what was kept by the BM excavators. Interestingly, this detail is not emphasised in the Notebook, while Walters’ to the PL (second letter) notes simply ‘a large number of Cypriote vases...’
Tomb 57 [BM]  
[1] Pseudamphora (Mycenaean) [1896, 2–1.30; Vase C521]  
[2] Two small jugs in Mycenaean style [1896, 2–1.69, 366; Vase C593, C598]  
[3] Primitive female figure – Alambra type – r. leg broken [1896, 2–1.32; Terracotta A2]  

Comments: Excavations, p. 80.

Tomb 58 [CM]  
A bronze dagger (Cypriote) with hooked handle

Comments: The pottery is probably Red Polished ware which, together with the location, suggests the BM team worked briefly at the EC-MC site of Phaneromeni further down the ridge on which Bamboulia is situated. [BM] p. 181. C.M. 558.
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Site E  25 February 1895 [Fig. 9]  
Site D being worked over (at least the one field acquired) a fresh start was made at the S.E. end of the hill on which the ruined church stands, about half way between Episkopi and Curium – just above the old Paphos road. It seems probable that all the tombs here are of Roman date. Both Cesnola and Williamson have excavated about here. [see Excavations, p. 7 for a narrative of excavations at Kourion. The absence of any reference to Hake’s work in this area is unusual, especially as Newton mentions only 1–4. The registered Excavations, p. 84 lists or alludes to all these items but the group was assigned to the BM. ]
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Tomb 59 [BM]  (μυηκευον) – 25 Feb  
[1] Rude terracotta figure of bird [1896, 2–1.117; Terracotta A225]  
[2] Rude terracotta figure of horse [1896, 2–1.118; Terracotta A223]  
[3] Rude terracotta figure of man on horseback (usual Cypriot type) [1896, 2–1.119; Terracotta A218]  
[5] Two fragments of amber  
[6] Two stone beads

Comments: Excavations, p. 84 mentions only 1–4. The registered object listed as no. 4 is an undecorated glass cylinder.

A large tomb (see plan [Fig. 11]) but containing very little – two skeletons – stone in door of tomb – sides roughly squared.  
[1] Bronze mirror and two mirror cases  
[2] Bronze spatula or stylus (tip broken off)  
[3] Gold earring with filigree work  
[4] Small gold pendant in shape of vase  
[5] Two stone beads and one gold vase  
[6] Small stone gem (?)

[Sketch stuck into the opposite page [Fig. 11]]

Comments: CCM, p. 182. Probably used in the 5th – 4th centuries BC in date to judge from the vase-shaped earring but possibly at other times as well.

Tomb 61 [BM] (Roman)  
A similar tomb – two skeletons side by side  
[1] Piece of gold-leaf  
[3] 2 glass cups and two glass jars [1896, 2–1.299–300]  
[4] 13 Roman lamps – one with figure of Cupid (?) in relief – one with male figure [1896, 2–1.120, 291; Lamp Q2293, Q2393]  
[5] Bronze mirror and two small bronze discs

[Sketch of tomb stuck onto left-hand page [Fig. 11]]

Comments: Excavations, p. 84 lists 1–4, though notes that only three of the 33 glass vessels ‘of the usual type’ listed under no. 3 were kept. See Lamp vol. III, p. 292 for an account of the tomb.

Page 32

Tomb 62 [CM] (Roman)  
As the second tomb – stone in doorway – very deep (15 ft. 4 in.)  
Shelf at far end on which the corpse was laid – bones scattered about but no objects except on shelf  
[1] Fourteen glass bottles  
[5] Bronze mirror-case [1896, 2–1.196; Bronze 2426]  
[6] Four lamps – one with rosette and one with pomegranate plant (?) [1896, 2–1.121–122; Lamp Q2424, Q2493]

[In right-hand margin] Several Roman vases

Comments: Excavations, p. 84 omits nos 1–2, which presumably were not kept, along with two of the lamps in no. 6. See Lamp vol. III, p. 292 for an account of the tomb.

Tomb 63 [BM]  
Very small – corpse on shelf  
[1] Two alabaster vases, broken – one with stopper  
[4] Bronze disc  
[6] Silver pin with large head, and fragments of two others [1896, 2–1.125; Jewellery 3029]  
[7] Lead vase  
[8] Two small bronze [handle (?)] objects [sketch of handle with looped terminals attached to what appears to be a rectangular plate [1896, 2–1.225]

Comments: Excavations, p. 84 lists or alludes to all these items but the alabaster vases and fragments of metal were not registered. It is not clear is 1896, 2–1.225 is a bracelet (no. 5) or one of the bronze items listed under no. 8.

Tomb 64 [CM]  
[1] Two silver rings with stone settings  
[3] Nine small silver spirals  
[4] Cypriote pottery

Comments: CCM, p. 182.
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Tomb 65 [BM]  
[1] Three pieces of gold-leaf (one with raised patterns) [1896, 2–1.126, 273–276 (?)]  
[2] Numerous small fragments of gold leaf  
[3] Gold earrings (2)  
[4] Ivory ring with female head to l. in relief (Roman)  
[5] Small bronze box, cylindrical  
[6] Bronze mirror

Comments: Excavations, p. 85 describes this as a ‘frontlet of gold leaf with traces of palmette patterns, and fragment of another’. The registration numbers written in the margin refer to ‘fragments of gold-leaf, four in number’ from Tomb 65 or 69. These can no long be identified, though there are numerous unregistered fragments of diadems of this common type from Cyprus in the GR collection which may have lost their original numbers.

Tomb 66 [CM] 1 March  
[1] Head of terracotta statuette – male child (cupid?)  
[2] Numerous small fragments of gold leaf  
[3] Gold earrings (2)  
[4] Small stone gem  
[5] Small bronze disc  
[6] Cypriote pottery

Comments: Walters, in his third letter to the PL, mentions this tomb but the group was assigned to the BM. CCM, p. 182. ‘Head of terracotta
Tomb 68
[BM]
[1] Bronze fibula (as from tomb 6) [1896, 2-1, 127; Bronze 1952]
[2] Small bronze spiral
[3] Other fragments of bronze

Comments: Excavations, p. 85 mentions no. 1 only.

Tomb 71
[CM]
[1] Late b.f. lekythos (as amaphora from Tomb 10 [supra 1896, 2-1, 99]) – in fragments – with network pattern
[2] Two alabaster vases
[3] Lamp of black ware (Greek of 4th century bc)

[Sketch on opposite page labelled Tomb 71 showing a shaft and a sarcophagus straddling the pathway, with a large rectangular shaft to the left]

Comments: CCM, p. 182.

Tomb 72
[BM]
A large circular tomb – probably robbed and used again in Roman times.

[Sketch on opposite page labelled Tomb 72 showing a sarcophagus with a large rectangular shaft and a small circular shaft to the left]

Comments: CCM, p. 182.
In other part of tomb
[30] Bronze archaic Greek female figure – very fine – in Spes attitude – has support of some object [1896, 2-1.158; Lamp Q3862]
[31] Bronze jug with high handle [1896, 2-1.161]
[32] Bronze candelabrum of common Cypriote type – in three pieces [1896, 2-1.159–159] (Another not numbered – incised Gorgoneion) [33] Bronze Strigil (broken) [1896, 2-1.163; Lamp Q3862]
[34] Bronze mirror
[35] Bronze phiale
[36] Bronze lamp-stand on three feet [1896, 2-1.305; Lamp Q3862]
[37] Silver bowl – two handles
[38] Alabaster vase [1896, 2-1.334]
[39] Bronze objects [1896, 2-1.231–234] (Lamp Q3862bis, Bronze 2369, 2242)
[40] Silver ring and rock-crystal intaglio with good design of youth holding a hare to which a dog leaps up – Cypriot syllabary. [1896, 2-1.157; Gem 502: there is a sketch of the inscription on the opposite page of the notebook]
[41] Gold ring – intaglio of youth reclining [1896, 2-1.154; Finger Ring 61]
[42] Bronze stand and two bronze stylis [1896, 2-1.159, 230; Lamp Q3862; Bronze 2690]
[43] Two silver bracelets ending in snakes heads [1896, 2-1.1343; Jewellery 1633]
[44] Fragments of iron object
[45] Silver coin

Comments: Excavations, pp. 82–3. The contents of this tomb, the richest from the BM excavations at Kourion, have been thoroughly restudied by Bailey and Hockley with reference to all the available sources, so a detailed discussion is unnecessary. It suffices to say that the various lists of objects differ to some degree and, as with other tombs, not all the items were preserved or subsequently registered. The tomb was triple-chambered, constructed perhaps in the late Cypro-Archaic period and possibly reused or extended in Roman times, which would explain the later material. Perhaps the most significant observation to make is that the tomb was said to be intact when excavated. If this is true, the inventory of objects found in the tomb is almost certainly incomplete, given the lack of a single piece of local Cypriot pottery. As Bailey has noted, this is highly unlikely for a tomb of this date, especially in the light of the large quantities of such material found by the excavators in other tombs (such as the 60 odd items not kept from Tomb 56 alone, or the high levels of discards in Site C.)

Tombs 77 [BM]
A very large Roman tomb with a very long dromos
[1] Bronze mirror case [1896, 2-1.323]
[2] Twenty fragments of ivory bodkins and similar instruments
[3] Garnet and pale green stone beads (2)

Comments: Excavations, p. 85 lists all the registered items. No. 3 and seven of the items in no. 6 were not registered.

Tombs 78 [BM]
[1] Late b.f. Kylix in fragments – Gorgoneion in centre [1896, 2-1.175]
[2] Bronze mirror [1896, 2-1.176; Bronze 246]
[3] Silver bracelet, three rings, and spiral [1896, 2-1.284, 338; Finger Ring 17, Jewellery 1602]
[4] Several long strips of bronze, probably from the binding of a chest [1896, 2-1.177–180]

Comments: Excavations, p. 83.

Tombs 79 [CM]
[1] Upper part of small terracotta figure – Egyptian type – 1. arm lost
[2] Upper part of terracotta female figure – Cypriote type
[3] Upper part of rude terracotta figure
[4] Two Cypriote stamni – patterns in black and purple on drab
[5] Silver phiale
[6] Silver plated bronze bowl
[7] Bronze candelabrum – Cypriote type
[8] Iron strigil – broken
[9] Bronze bowl
[10] Gold ring with dark green stone setting
[12] Do with green stone setting on swivel
[13] Numerous silver bracelets and other fragments
[14] Silver beads and fragments of rings
[15] Numerous gold beads forming necklace
[16] Small green stone


Tombs 80 [BM]
[1] Pair of gold earrings ending in lion’s heads [1896, 2-1.181–182; Jewellery 1728–9]
[2] Silver coin – drachm of Alex. Gt. – uncertain mint
[3] 46 gold beads [1896, 2-1.183; Jewellery 1604]
[5] Bronze mirror case [1896, 2-1.325] (Another not numbered – incised border-line) also spatula

Comments: Excavations, p. 83. There is no record of the coin in the Coins and Medals Department register.

Tombs 81 [BM]
[1] Seven beads of various materials
[2] Two fragments of bronze ring
[4] Greek terracotta figure of Tanagra type [1896,2-1.185; Terracotta A444, 2865]
[5] Bronze bowl, mirror [1896,2-1.318], and spatula

Comments: Excavations, p. 83 mention only 3-5. The earring is Roman in date, suggesting reuse of the earlier Hellenistic tomb.

Tomb 82 [CM]
[1] Leaden pyx
[3] Fragment of bronze and of porcelain

Comments: CCM: p. 182. No. 3 is not mentioned and may not have been registered.

Tomb 84 [CM]
[1] Gold ring
[2] Small silver box with head in relief
[3] Some Cypriote stamnoi not kept

Comments: CCM, p. 182.
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Tomb 83 [BM]
Three tombs together [Sketch of three squared chambers and a shaft on the right margin of the page, indicating the location of the gem, ‘Mycenaean’ vase and gold. On the opposite page is a (presumably underground) feature in the shape of a horse shoe. There is a circular lobe at the junction of the two prongs labelled ‘shaft’ and a larger lobe at the end of one of the prongs. No other explanation is given as to what it refers to.]
[1] Gold chain necklace of very delicate work [1896,2-1.186; Jewellery 1959]
[2] Gold ring with intaglio – female head to l. [1896,2-1.189; Finger Ring 67]
[3] (Two) bronze mirrors and ten fragments of bronze [1896,2-1.315]
[4] (Two) Three silver bowls, one broken [1896,2-1.301,336; Silver 12]
[6] Seven gold beads and two small gold spirals [1896,2-1.187-188; Jewellery 1591-2]
[7] Silver ring [1896,2-1.190]
[8] Four bone beads (one of burton shape)
[9] Mycenaean vase (much broken) – red band on buff [1896,2-1.192; Vase C668] [Sketch in right-hand margin]
[10] Silver ring with scaraboid setting – intaglio design (archaic) of Herakles in knielauf to l. with bow and club [1896,2-1.191; Gem 475]
[12] Three fragments of do. do. do. [1896,2-1.306-308; Lamp Q385, 3857]
[13] Black glaze kylif in fragments (Greek) [1896,2-1.395]
[14] Woman- and-pitcher jug in fragments – richly ornamented and coloured red, blue, green etc. [1896,2-1.326]
[16] Iron stand

Comments: Excavations, pp. 83–4 does not mention no. 4 or the beads in 6 or 16. Only two of three silver cups were registered, though one is no longer identifiable: as only one was mentioned in Excavations (p. 66 and fig. 79), it is possible that the second registered item may have disappeared (or decayed beyond preservation) before 1900. Only the foot and base of the shaft of the bronze candelabrum is now preserved. This was a relatively rich tomb in use from the end of the CA and into the CC periods, but as with Tomb 73, the rarity of locally-made pottery suggests highly selective preservation by the excavators.

Tomb 85 [CM] 15 March
[1] Fragments of iron sword
[2] Numerous fragments of bronze cuirass, shoulder plates etc. with patterns in relief

Comments: This is mentioned is Walter’s third letter to the PL, but the group was assigned to the CM. CCM, p. 182
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18 March 1895
Site B being pretty well exhausted a return was made to site D, and at the same time a preliminary investigation made on a site on the pathway just outside Episkopi beyond the church. The latter proved quite unsuccessful. On site D during the first few days very little was found beyond fragments of Mycenaean and Ayia Paraskevi pottery – the tombs (when found) having been robbed – altogether the second visit to the site was unsuccessful, and it would seem that the area of the Myc. necropolis was very limited.

Tomb 86 [BM]
[1] Bowl of Ayia Paraskevi type [1896,2-1.31; Vase C231]
[2] Four fragments of Mycenaean vases

Comments: Murray et al. 1900, p. 80.

Tomb 87 [CM]
[1] Head of terracotta bull – Cypriote
[2] Mycenaean bowl with red band
[3] Three fragments of Mycenaean vases

Comments: CCM, p. 181. No 1 is C.M. 469; no. 2 is identified as a possible local imitation of Mycenaean ware (CVA Cyprus I, pl. 26,1 [FS 219 semi-globular cup, LHIIIA1]; pl. 29,7 [FS187(?)] small jug, late LHIIB); SCE IV/1D also attributes a faience jar to this tomb (p. 524;7; C.M. G. 88).

Tomb 88 [BM]
[1] Mycenaean vase with wavy black lines [1896,2-1.387; Vase C316]
[2] Two rude terracotta figures of animals – broken

Comments: Excavations, p. 80. The items in no. 2 were not registered.

Tomb 90 [BM]
[1] Mycenaean bowl with red bands [1896,2-1.332; Vase C662]

Comments: Excavations, p. 80 ‘shallow bowl with small handles and concentric circles in red on buff; sub-Mycenaean’. The bowl is actually a LHIIB import.
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Tomb 89 [BM]
A double tomb – the first chamber Mycenaean, the second Cypriote, of considerably later date.

[1] Bronze bowl
[2] Two small Mycenaean vases, one with black, one with red bands [1896,2-1.386; Vase C591]
[3] Fragments of pseudamphorae and other Mycenaean vases
[4] Stone plate
[6] Soap-stone do. do. [1896,2-1.41]
[8] Alabaster vase – goose-head on handle [1896,2-1.393]
[10] Stone vase with shallow flutings [1896,2-1.92]
[12] Three pestles of black basalt [1896,2-1.38-40]
[13] Five bronze bowls and mirrors
[14] Fragments of enamedled vase in white, green, and yellow [1896,2-1.33]
[15] Two Cypriote bowls with circles and diaper patterns [1896,2-1.35 (?), 36 (?), 223 (?); Vase C659; C660; C718]
[16] Part of bone flute (?) [1896,2-1.251,253, 255-256]
[17] Bronze spatula
[18] Cypriote bowl with spiral pattern in low relief [1896,2-1.364; Vase C723]
[19] Bone disc with rosette in low relief [1896,2-1.34]

Comments: Excavations, p. 80 omits one each of the vases listed in nos
Tomb 91 [CM]
[1] Mycenaean jug
[2] do three-handed vase with red hatched lines
[3] Bronze axe-head
[4] Stone vase and three stone beads

Comments: CCM, p. 181; SCE IV/1C: Mycenaean (pp. 306, 328); SCE IV/D: stone (bead, unclassified, p. 540; vessel, unclassified, p. 543).

Tomb 92 [BM]
[1] Two bronze bowls, found one inside the other [1896, 2-1.34]
[2] Shallow Mycenaean bowl

Comments: Both items are listed in Excavations, p. 80 but only one of the bowls was registered.

Tomb 93 [CM]
[1] Five stone beads, one with incised circles

Comments: CCM, p. 181. SCE IV/1D: stone (bead, unclassified, p. 540).

Tomb 94 [BM]
[1] Terracotta bull – Cypriote type [1896, 2-1.42; C1005; C10]
[3] Bronze spear-head and dagger as [Tomb] 58 [1896, 2-1.43-44; Bronze 54-55]

Comments: Excavations, p. 80, noting the similarity of the spear-head with that from Tomb 44.

Tomb 95 [BM]
Two chambers – between 60 and 70 Cypriote vases found
[1] Eight Cypriote jugs with concentric circles of the usual type

Comments: Excavations, p. 80 which notes that nothing was kept for the Museum, another example of the high degree of selectivity employed by Walters.

On site about ¼ mile to S.W.

Tomb 96 [BM]
[1] Two bronze bowls
[2] Cypriote bowl with spiral pattern inside, purple on drab [1896, 2-1.333; Vase C713]
With this [3] Terracotta draped female figure – head lost

Comments: The only registered item (no. 2) is a WPW III bowl of LCIIIIC-III A date. The figurine, described as Graeco-Phoenician in date, clearly represents a later period of use of the tomb, or else an intrusion from another context.

Tomb 97 [CM]
Two chambers
[1] Schnäbel-kanne of Alambra type, with knobs
[2] Askos of drab ware with high handle
[4] Two green stone and one bone spindle-whorl
[5] Lekythos with knobs and indentations – Alambra type buff ware


Tomb 98 [BM]
Two chambers
[1] Schnäbelkanne – primitive Cypriote – red ware [1896, 2-1.359; Vase C10]
[2] Lekythos (handle lost) – incised knife-patterns – red glaze [1896, 2-1.45; Vase C84]
[3] Part of globular spout-krater with knife patterns [1896, 2-1.46]
[7] Terracotta model of circular shield – black patterns on red [1896, 2-1.53; Vase C1005]
[8] Two Cypriote lekythoi – one with concentric circles – one black bands
[9] Two Cypriote jugs with concentric circles – one red – other drab with spout [1896, 2-1.329; Vase C864]
[10] Terracotta ram – black and red stripes on drab [1896, 2-1.394; Terracotta A224]
[12] Terracotta, two figures of men on horseback. [1896, 2-1.219-220; Terracotta A219, A220]
[13] Stone bead [1896, 2-1.50]

Tomb 99 ctd.
[14] Bronze fibula and three other fragments [1896, 2-1.228; Bronze 1947]
[15] Lekythos with incised knife-pattern – neck broken [1896, 2-1.47; Vase C55]
[16] Four small objects of soap-stone pierced with holes [1896, 2-1.78-81]
[17] Small plate of red ware – patterns painted in red and yellow [1896, 2-1.55; Vase C1002]
[18] Terracotta group – man climbing tree at the foot of which are two wolves (?) [1896, 2-1.54; Terracotta A215]

Comments: All the contents of this tomb, apart from the two (Iron Age) jugs listed as no. 8 above, were registered and subsequently listed in Excavations, p. 81. None of the sources indicates if the later burial, which included Cypro-Archaic terracottas of the 7th century BC, was found within a reused Bronze Age chamber or whether a new chamber was added to the existing tomb at this time.

Tomb 99 [BM]
[1] Bronze object (tweezers?)
[2] Green stone object with hole at one end [1896, 2-1.58]
[3] Two bronze knife-blades [1896, 2-1.56-57; Bronze 56]

Comments: Excavations, p. 81 does not include no. 1, which presumably was not registered. No. 4 is described in the Register as being made of soap-stone and 1¼ inches long, but the object is no longer identifiable in the collection.

Tomb 100 [CM]
On old site [the main Bamboula site]
[1] Bronze bracelet
[2] do knife
[3] Small Mycenaean (?) vase – two side-handles
[4] Part of primitive Cypriote terracotta female figure – two pieces

Comments: CCM, p. 181. No. 4 is C.M. 466; SCE IV/D (terracotta, p. 512; bronze knife, p. 477); Catling 1964, p. 126, 4.

Tomb 101 [BM]
[1] Pseudamphora in fragments [1896, 2-1.385; Vase C522]
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**Tomb 102** [See Tomb 53 supra] [BM]
- Fragments of Mycenaean vase with figures found in tomb 53 [1896,2-1.26; Vase C591]
- Numerous fragments of Mycenaean vases with bands, scale and spiral patterns
- Fragment of terracotta hand holding a bowl like that of a pipe – with a hole communicating with a stem (broken) [1896,2-1.64; Terracotta A8]
- Terracotta object like a double salt-CELLAR [1896,2-1.65; Terracotta A421]
- Fragments of blue and white glass vase [1896,2-1.261–262]
- Fragments of black and yellow enamelled vase as from [Tomb] 89 [1896,2-1.259]
- Bronze fibula [1896,2-1.61; Bronze 57]
- Nineteen gold beads [1896,2-1.266–267; Jewellery 2018–2019]
- Basalt intaglio of bull or goat crouching to r. [1896,2-1.62; Gemini 103]

**Comments:** Excavations, p. 81 also lists a group of nine gold beads [1896,2-1.266–267; Jewellery 2019]. It is clear from Daniel’s later re-excavation of the area in 1903 that Tombs 102 and 53 were in fact two chambers of the same complex connected by a pit dromos of the usual LBA type (his Tombs 17–17A). The tomb had clearly been opened before the BM visit: not alone does this explain the occurrence of sherds from the same vases in both chambers, but also the likely disarray in which the previous visitors left the area seems to have hindered, or at least discouraged, a more thorough examination of the surviving deposit. The finds from Daniel’s expedition demonstrate that the tomb was far from exhausted (though this was realised only after the complete excavation of the chambers at the urging of the foremost Grigoriou). These include numerous WPW III bowls (unlikely to have been completely ignored by Walters if they had found any), gold and silver jewellery, and masses of Late Cypriot and Mycenaean sherds, as well as redeposited human bone. Benson estimated the date range of the tomb to extend from LCIIA to LCIIIB though an end date in the context of his belief that Bamboula was an acropolis or inner city with burials located around the edges of the settlement.

**Tomb 103** [CM]
- Five bronze bracelets
- Eight green stone beads with incised circles
- Lower part of a porcelain Egyptian figure
- Iridescent glass bead

**Comments:** Listed in Walters’ fourth letter to the PL but assigned to the CM. CCM, p. 181; SCE IV/1D (faience, unclassified, p. 520; beads, unclassified, pp. 530, 540).

**Tomb 104** [assignment unknown]
A λάξανος; some 60–70 ft. deep
- Fragments of pseudamphora and other Mycenaean vases

**Comments:** Excavations, p. 81: ‘like a well, about 70 ft. deep; contained fragments of Mycenaean vases, none preserved’. Daniel suggested that this was the well discovered in his ‘Trench 19 on the eastern side Area E, a large cluster of tombs outside the built-up area.

It should not be confused with the large stone-lined well in Daniel’s Area B just below the summit of the hill.
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**Tombs 105–109 on the αλώνια – on the highest part of the site. 4–8 April**

This observation counters Daniel’s suggestion that the map of the area published in Excavations was complete inaccurate. He argued that the burials in this cluster lay further to the south below the summit of the hill, not in the centre of the settlement. This must be understood in the context of his belief that Bamboula was an acropolis or inner city with burials located around the edges of the settlement.

**Tomb 105** [CM] 28 March
- Bowl of Ayia Paraskevi type
- Three stone beads
- Terracotta bull – much injured
- Elongated lekythos of red ware


**Tomb 106** [BM]
- Fragments of pseudamphora and other Mycenaean vases
- Top of vase in form of rude bull’s head [1896,2-1.65; Terracotta A7]

**Comments:** Excavations, p. 81 omits no. 1. Walter’s fourth report to the PL mentions simply ‘Fragments of Mycenaean pottery’ for tombs 106–109.

**Tomb 107** [BM]
- Jug with flat handle – patterns in white on drab ground [1896,2-1.361; Vase C155]
- Bronze object (tweezers? Cf. Richter, Kypros pl. 146, 6B, p (Ayia Paraskevi) [note in a different hand, refers to M. Ohnefalsch-Richter, Kypros, the Bible and Homer (London, 1893)] [1896,2-1.66; Bronze 58]
- Two bowls of Ayia Paraskevi type [1896,2-1.67; Vase C230]
- A few Mycenaean fragments

**Comments:** Excavations, p. 81 mentions only one of the two WS bowls and no fragments of Myc. pottery.

**Tomb 108** [CM]
- Six skyphoi – drab with black patterns – early Cypriote [i.e. early Iron Age]
- Small lekythos – black bands on drab
- Cypriote aryballos – black concentric circles on drab
- Iron object
- Fragment of Mycenaean vase

**Comments:** CCM, p. 181. The parallel cited for no. 1 (C.M. 954, from Kouklia) suggest a transitional or early Iron Age date, perhaps CG I or II. The Mycenaean vase could be an heirloom, an intrusion or a misclassified fabric.

**Tomb 109** [BM]
- Two jugs of plain drab ware with strainer-spouts [1896,2-1.330; Vase C703]
- Small Mycenaean jug – red-brown bands on drab [1896,2-1.68; Vase C594]

**Comments:** Excavations, p. 81.

Site finished off 8 April 1895
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Site E – Continued 28 March–8 April 1895

A series of excavations was made all along the ridge above the Papho road continuing from Site E – but after the first five or six days no more tombs were found – a move was then made to Site C, to conclude the excavations. All the productive tombs were fairly near together – to the east.

[The second series of tombs excavated in Area E was not shown on any of the maps in the Notebook]
Tomb 110 [BM]  A very large tomb with two ‘ovens’ at one end
[1] Two Roman vases of red ware with painted wreaths, one green, the other black [1896, 2-1.197-198; Vase Cat. 97, 98]
[2] Roman lamp with knobs [1896, 2-1.199; Lamp Q 500]
[3] Small bronze mirror [1896, 2-1.310]
[4] Bronze stylus and spatula [1896, 2-1.229; Bronze 2367]

[Sketch of Tomb 110 stuck onto opposite page: Fig. 13]

Comments: Excavations, p. 85. The ‘Roman vases’ are late Cypro- Classical or early Hellenistic in date, suggesting two periods of use for the tomb. SCE IV/1/C (p. 160) attributes a BR jug (CM 1163), to this tomb, but this may be an error or a misprint, similar to those mentioned earlier for tombs 13 and 26.

Tomb 111 [CM]  Plain rock-cut chamber
[1] Three Cyproite stamnoi – black and purple on drab – concentric circles in bands, and rings (a small plain jug fixed in the top of one)

Comments: CCM, p. 182.

Tomb 112 [BM]  As last – very long δρόμος
[1] Four small bronze earrings
[2] Bronze mirror [1896, 2-1.320]
[3] Five stone and glass beads [1896, 2-1.87]

[on opposite page] Numerous Romano-Cyproite vases, lamp on bracket in wall.

Comments: Excavations, p. 85 lists all three entries but only the mirror and one of the beads was subsequently registered. The pottery which was not preserved is further identified as ‘Roman and Cyproit wine-jars’(? and other vases’ while the lamp hanging on the wall is described as made of terracotta.
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Tomb 113 [CM/BM]  A large tomb about 10 ft. down (17" 10" x 10" 9" x 7") with δρόμος with gabled roof of heavy stones (full of stelae and rubbish) – three loculi of considerable length, and two large recesses at the end containing sarcophagi – one with an inscription on the side (of which a squeeze was taken).

ΜΗΤΡΟΔΟΡΟΣ
ΜΗΤΖΝΟΣ
+ ΡΗΣΣΗ
+ ΑΙΠΕ

[Excellent Metrodoros, son of Metonos, Fairwell!]

[1] Numerous glass bottles of the usual type
[2] Two glass cups, three saucers, and ring
[3] Nine bronze coins and two fragments of mirrors
[4] Lead caps and another object
[5] Five lamps with subjects
[6] Two bone spindle-whorls, one with spiral pattern
[7] Bronze mirror and spatula
[8] Small gold ring

[Pencil sketch of tomb stuck onto opposite page: Fig. 13]

Comments: Mentioned by Walters in his fourth report to the Pl., and described in several places in Excavations (pp. 59, 64 and 85) because of its architectural and epigraphic interest. Above the second recess mentioned above was a niche blocked with a stone which contained a capsu (urn) full of cremated bone. The tomb list on p. 85 mentions two bronze coins of the ‘first century, Greek or Roman Imperial’ but the remainder of the contents were assigned to the CM. The coins were not registered by the museum, possibly because they were of common type. CCM, p. 182 omits the gold ring (supra no. 7). The inscription, ‘copied but not preserved’ according to Excavations, p. 64, is included in Mitford 1971 (no. 150, p. 294) though he reads the patronymic as ‘Metronos’ and gives the wrong tomb number (13 instead of 113), presumably a misreading of Walters’ text in both cases. According to Mitford, the tilted chis may have a Christian significance, in which case this provides very early evidence for a Christian presence in Kourion in the 2nd century AD to which period he dates the text. While the suggested date of the inscription is reasonable, the ‘crypto-Christianity’ of the deceased is more speculative and cannot be proven from the letter forms themselves.80

Tomb 114 [BM]  30 March
A large tomb containing several sarcophagi and loculi – mostly robbed.
[1] Numerous glass bottles
[2] Two glass jars, one with pinched-in sides
[4] Yellow glass bottle [1896, 2-1.201]

Comments: Excavations, p. 85 lists all the registered items, the remainder presumably not entered in the museum collection. The name on the lamp (no. 6) was subsequently read as Romanesia by Bailey (Lamp vol. III, p. 334, Q2659: there is also an account of the tomb on p. 293).

Tomb 115 [BM]  [1] Hydra of Tarentine fabric in fragments – ribbed body with band of ornament – design in white and yellow on shoulder – sort of toilet-scene (see Vase Cat. IV. Introd.) [1896, 2-1.205]
[2] Glass saucer with remains of letters painted in black
[3] Four Roman lamps (gladiators etc.) [1896, 2-1.204; Lamp Q 2494].
[5] Four bronze mirrors and other fragments
[7] Three glass cups and numerous bottles

Comments: Excavations, p. 85 correctly recognised that there were at least two burial periods in the tomb, one from the earlier 3rd century BC and a later deposit around the late 1st or early 2nd centuries AD. The register also lists 1896, 2-1.258, a Hellenistic Red Slip bowl, as coming from either Tomb 115 or 118: the absence of any reference to this in the Notebook under Tomb 115 suggests the latter tomb is the correct one, especially as the entry for Tomb 118 mentions a bowl of red ware” (see below). See Lamp vol. III, p. 293 for an account of the tomb.

Tomb 116 [CM]  [1] Four Cyproite juglets with concentric circles, black on red
[2] Bowl – similar – on high stem
[3] Four glass beads (two blue, two black)
[4] Small porcelain figure (Satyr?)

Comments: CCM, p. 182. The description of the finds possibly suggests a Cypro-Archaic date.

Tomb 117 [BM]  [1] Fragments of vase of coarse red ware – with two Satyric heads in relief (similar found in Williamson’s Cos excavations, 1884) [note added later in a different hand] [1896, 2-1.208, 257]
[2] Fragments of archaistic b.f. vase with dolphin, palmettes, and other patterns, black on buff [1896, 2-1.335]
[3] Amphora handle with stamp [1896, 2-1.400] [Sketch of inscription]
[4] [added in margin] Terracotta bell-shaped object [1896, 2-1.209]

Comments: The two fragments listed in no. 1 are not of the same fabric and come from two separate vases. Excavations, p. 85 mentions five fragments of no. 2 (two now joined) which were registered as 1896, 2-1.335: there is now no sign of the dolphin motif which may have been misidentified. The terracotta ‘bell’ is the base of a vessel or possibly part of a chariot model. It is mistakenly attributed to Tomb 118 in Excavations.
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Tomb 118 [BM]
[1] Glass bowl (broken) and four cups
[2] do amphora, variegated [1896,2-1.207; Glass 360]
[3] Two lamps with subjects (hare and eagle) [1896,2-1.206; Lamp Q2411]
[4] [In red ink] Bowl of red ware [1896,2-1.258]

(on page opposite) Site E finished 8 Apr. 1895, but no objects were found during the last four days.

Comments: Excavations, p. 85, mistakenly ascribes the ‘terracotta bell’ from Tomb 117 to this group. The register describes 1896,2-1.258, a Hellenistic Red Slip bowl, as coming from either 115 or 118, but the latter seems to be the original findspot given its occurrence in the Notebook. See Lamp vol. III, p. 293 for an account of the tomb.

Site C – continued – 9 April 1896 [Fig. 7]
[In margin opposite in black ink] It is possible that this is the site referred to by A. di. Cesnola in his Salaminia, p. 7. ²³

The land was acquired on which tentative excavations had been previously made – but the first day yielded no results. On the second day, on the site numbered as tomb 18, where a Greek terracotta head had been previously found, operations were begun, and a few hours digging proved that the site was that of a building and not of tombs. From the inscription (v. infra.), it may be presumed that the building was a temple or shrine of Demeter and Kore. Numerous fragments of Cypriot statuettes were also found.

Thursday 11st inst. was wet and nothing was done except to close the excavations.

[1] Inscription on base of statuette (in two pieces) [1896,2-1.215; Inscription 968a]
ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙ ΚΑΙ ΚΟΡΗ ΕΥΧΗΝ
ΕΛΛΟΘΙΚΟΣ ΠΟΤΕΙΣΙΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ

[Excavations, 64: Δήμητρι και Κόρη εὐχήν
Ελλόοικος Ποτείσιος Ἀνέθηκεν]

[The syllabic text follows: Fig. 15]

The Cypriote syllabary runs
ta-ma-ti-ri | ka-i-se | ko-na-i | (e)lo-no-i-ko-se | po-te-si-o-se | (a)-ne-te-ke-i-[te]- | ka-i

Comments: Excavations, p. 84. As is apparent from Fig. 15, this is the final version of the transliteration reached after numerous crossings out and corrections in the notebook; the reading was amended in the notebook, in Excavations, p. 64 and later by Masson (Inscriptions Chypriotes Syllabiques no. 182) in the light of a modern scholarship on the script.²²
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Other finds
[2] Marble fragments of hands and arms, perhaps from statuette to wh. inscription belongs
[3] Part of marble head of Aphrodite (below life-size – right side broken away) – type of Knidian [probably 1972,1-18.1] [Fig. 16]
[5] 24 Roman bronze coins
[6] Late Greek inscription: ΣΩΪΛΟΥ (not kept) [rendered as ΣΩΪΛΟΥ in Excavations, p. 64]

Terracotta statuettes and fragments
[7] Seven female hydrophoroi (some fragmentary) [1896,2-1.211; Terracotta A416 (2901)]
[8] 13 male heads mostly in head-dresses [1896,2-1.213; Terracotta A417]
[9] Large male head (Cypriote) of priest
[10] 4 female figures [1896,2-1.210; Terracotta A415 (2903), A214]
[12] 8 female heads – mostly Greek [1896,2-1.213-214; Α417 (2909), A418]
[13] 11 horses and six fragments of horses and chariots

Comments: According to Walters’ fourth letter to the PL, the finds from the Temple Site were divided in the usual way, with one-third of the finds assigned to Nicosia. The much shorter list in Excavations, p. 84, mostly corresponding to the registered items, suggests that further selection took place before the finds were dispatched to London, or that some were not registered on arrival. The marble head of ‘Aphrodite’ was mentioned in Excavations (p. 84, no. 12) but not registered in the main Kourion sequence, despite its obvious importance as a classical object. As the original bill of lading preserved in Excavations in Cyprus: Correspondence confirmed that the object was indeed sent to London in the same crate as the bi-graphic inscription, it was initially presumed to have been lost sometime since 1900. However, in March 2009, my colleague Dr Peter Higgs identified a marble head matching this description among a group of fragments registered as coming from Ephosos which we believe to be the one from Kourion [1972,1-18.1]. The head is actually an early Hellenistic portrait bust, though would have been regarded as a ‘Knidian’ type in the 1890s. Details of the issues of the bronze coins are also provided in Excavations, but no record of them exists in the Department of Coins and Medals; these also are not mentioned in the bill of lading and may have been cited in Excavations for historical interest. Several of the terracottas are also detailed, though the remainder are described in Walter’s final letter as being ‘of no great interest’ which might explain their fate. They may have been given to other institutions without any record being kept. For the CM share, CCM, p. 182 lists a series of terracotta statues and fragments. Woman and hydriae. Bearded priests (heads). Horses and chariots.
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[1] [On a slip of paper pasted over a list of ancient historical sources for the history of Kourion]
NAAPROXONICHTOFYOY
ΧΑΙΠΕ

[rendered as Ναπρόξονιχοτούγογού χαίπε in Excavations, p. 64; Mitford 1971, no. 147]

From a stone built into ruined church of Chrysanagiotissa (?) between Episkopi and Curium. 28 Feb. 1895
2’5” x 1’8” x 4 – top-hand corner broken

[2] Stele from same site
Ht. 2’ 3”
Diam. of top 1’ 8”

ΛΟΥΚΕΙ
ΧΑΙΡΑΙ
ΝΑΑΡΧΟ

[rendered as Λούκει Χαίρε Νααρχο in Excavations, p. 64; Mitford 1971, no. 290]

Comments: The text of these funerary inscriptions, and that of Ζοϊλος above, is included in Excavations, p. 64, which adds that the latter example was a cylindrical cippus. None were kept. See Mitford 1971 for a discussion of the inscriptions from Kourion.
Appendix: Objects with no tomb assignation

The following objects were registered in the Kourion sequence but not assigned to a tomb. The Bronze Age items can tentatively be regarded as coming from Site D. The remainder may be related to the adjacent entries in the Register, at least in terms of the general areas, but there is little consistent order in the list of tombs in this respect as the material was not registered consistently according to order of excavation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vase</th>
<th>Material and characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896, 2.1-2: 82 (spindle-whorl LBA); 83–85 (ivory hinges from a box, LBA (?); 233 (bronze ring); 263–264 (fragments of faience vessels of LBA date); 268–269 (gold earrings – not a pair); 272 (Jewellery 1818), bull's head earring, CC or Hellenistic in date; 287 (Vase C873), Cypro-Archaic globular jug; 295 (base of faience conical goblet, LBA); 312–313 (bronze nails); 375 (Mycenaean sherd; LBA); 377 (sherd of Black on Red ware); 379–382 (four sherds of White Slip ware; LBA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

As is clear from the preceding transcription, one of the chief values of the Kourion notebook is that it records many details, such as descriptions of the burials themselves (including sketches of tomb plans) and their exact locations, which were omitted from the published sources. It also provides valuable information on objects listed but not kept by the excavators, or which are no longer identifiable in the BM collections because of loss of their original registration numbers. This demonstrates very clearly that tomb groups currently preserved in London and Nicosia do not represent what was originally found, even allowing for incomplete excavation methods, by revealing successive phases of selection from the initial excavation in 1895 to their registration and publication between 1896 and 1900.

The stages of selection begin with the plain wares of all periods which were ignored altogether as well as groups of plain and common pottery or glass vessel which are mentioned in passing but not kept. This is followed by common pottery and glass items (and other objects) which were listed in the Notebook but subsequently deleted, presumably disposed of on Cyprus. The fact that material from Sites A and B in particular was subjected to this treatment might indicate that the burial deposits were relatively undisturbed, or that the chambers were easier to explore because they had not collapsed. Conversely, the handful of items recorded from many graves, especially from Site D, could be interpreted as reflecting the disturbed nature of the deposits or the physical condition of the simpler chamber tombs of Late Bronze Age date. However, the excavation history of the linked chambers 53 and 102 discussed above also demonstrates the rather poor excavation methods which missed many items, some quite valuable ones. The limited number of deletions in tombs of Site D may also reflect a decision not to record discards here, perhaps reached after the earlier experiences at Sites A to C. The single preserved example of Plain Wheelmade wares from Site D (1896, 2.1.12 in Tomb 36, a Plain White Wheelmade II crater) seems to illustrate this fact, as such types are unlikely to have been of interest to earlier excavators and tomb robbers. Further, some material listed for retention may subsequently have been chosen for disposal before being dispatched to London or Nicosia in 1895 to reduce transport costs. A further stage of selection is evident here, where items from tombs allocated to the British Museum and listed in the Notebook were not registered in 1896, perhaps because they were regarded as duplicates of common type. As noted above, not everything listed in the tomb groups in Excavations was actually registered: as some of the entries describing material not subsequently kept clearly served to provide information on the original context, perhaps some of the items no longer identifiable in the collection were not intended for registration; or, they were simply overlooked when the register entries were being made, as seems to be the case with the two bronze rings found near Tomb 6 or even the important marble female head from the Temple Site, for reasons we can no longer determine. The decay of delicate materials over time, in some cases apparently even before the publication of Excavations in 1900, together with numerous reorganisations of the stores, including war-time evacuations, caused some final, though unintended selection of the original finds. In effect, both the unsystematic nature of the excavations, combined with the aesthetic and archaeological judgements of the excavators in assessing what was worth preserving, resulted in a highly selective sample of the original tomb groups. They are not typical tomb deposits, whether intact or looted, of the kind found in modern excavations.

While highly unscientific by modern standards, and not always fully aware of recent developments in Classical archaeology of the time, particularly the ‘Mycenaean Question’,24 the Turner Bequest excavators nonetheless ‘represent one of the earliest attempts to systematically present archaeological material in a clear and coherent format’.24

Although the excavators were highly selective in the material they thought worth preserving, reflecting the art-historical biases of 19th-century museum archaeology, Steel has noted how they nonetheless established the principal of sorting objects by tomb groups and type which underlies the basis of later, more scientific approaches to the archaeology of the island. In particular, the Turner Bequest excavations at Kourion (Site D) and Enkomi, together with later museum campaigns at Maroni, Hala Sultan Tekke and Kavldhia between 1897 and 1899, laid the foundations for the understanding of the Late Bronze Age topography of the island.25 The results from sites of later date, particularly Amathus and the post-Bronze Age areas of Kourion (Sites A–C and E, as well as the Iron Age material from Site D) were also significant, though they are generally less well known because of the emphasis the BM team (but also later scholars) placed on their Bronze Age discoveries.

Significantly, John Myres was invited to continue the work of the Cyprus Exploration Fund in 1894, and later to reorganise the collection of the Cyprus Museum, because of his involvement in the Turner Bequest campaign at Amathus; this provided him with his initial experience of excavation, but also no doubt alerted him to the administrative problems which hindered the development of archaeology on the island, as expressed in the devastating preface to his CCM of 1899.26

Modern excavators rightly deplore this approach to the archaeological record, especially the neglect of plain and common wares which underpin the chronological system later developed by the Swedish Cyprus Expedition. Nonetheless, the policy of recording what was subsequently discarded reflects some degree of awareness of the need to account for what was found at the time, if only to satisfy the museum authorities that correct procedures were being followed and that public money was being spent appropriately. Unsatisfying as the surviving record – both material and archival – clearly is, this policy
resulted in a surprisingly high proportion of the Cyprus collection in the British Museum excavated in the later 19th century having a secure provenance. Interestingly, the same can be said of earlier bodies of material acquired by the museum from the 1850s to the 1870s, from collectors such as Christy, Colinagh and Lang, which were secured largely through the agency (and foresight) of Charles Newton.87 Newton also advocated this policy for tombs excavated at Ialysos in 1868, and appears to have urged Ohnefalsch-Richter to do the same when the latter excavated on behalf of the British Museum in the earlier part of the 1880s.88 Just as the Turner Bequest excavations fulfilled Newton’s wish to excavate at Kourion, the methods employed can be seen to represent an attempt to institutionalise his archaeological methods and insights which previously were exercised at a distance.

Regardless of the degree of scientific rigour seen in the original work, understanding the circumstances under which Cypriot archaeology developed remains an important part of the modern discipline. In particular, it serves as a corrective to what can be described as a progressivist approach to the history of archaeology which assumes that 19th-century diggers were pursuing the same aims as their modern ‘descendants’ and thereby failing to live up to professional standards not actually developed or widely adopted for several generations after their time.89 In hindsight, the 1890s marked a watershed in archaeological developments throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. Tsountas’ synthesis of Schliemann’s Mycenaean discoveries into a broader cultural narrative appeared in 1897;90 Evans’ initial investigations into the Minoan civilisation only began to be realised on the ground in 1900;91 while, as previously noted, Myers’ work on reorganising and systematising the collections of the Cyprus Museum resulted in the first overview of Cypriot archaeology, in the form of the Catalogue of the Cyprus Museum.92 Nonetheless, the efforts of inspired individuals must be viewed alongside other excavators who continued to adhere to older practices and assumptions, or who were hampered by political, institutional and financial constraints, conditions which in reality prevailed long into the 20th century.93 Further, although Myres’ is widely regarded as the first modern archaeologist on Cyprus, the published account on his rapidly executed excavations of 1894, though more detailed and analytic than Excavations, itself falls far short of a proper site report.94 Although the deficiencies of these early campaigns, as well as the subsequent treatment of the material assigned to the Cyprus Museum, were due in part to official apathy towards the heritage of the island, there were also very real divergences of opinion on what role public bodies should play in regulating excavation, or what the underlying benefits of archaeology actually were, particularly in the period after 1878: as both Merrillees and Angelides have stressed, the new administration was faced with numerous other, doubtless more pressing, social and economic problems.95 In this context, the methods and aims of early excavations must be assessed first of all within the social, political and institutional (including museological) contexts of their times, a perspective which analyses based on purely archaeological criteria frequently neglect.

Several authors have stressed the political and economic advantages enjoyed by privileged bodies such as the British Museum in obtaining permits, negotiating with landowners and in determining the division of results from excavations, often to the detriment of the Cyprus Museum, but also the academic authority which their subsequent interpretations of the discoveries were able to command.96 This forms part of a broader interrogation of the politics of 19th-century archaeology from a post-colonial viewpoint, which recognizes that the material past of Cyprus was enveloped by western political and intellectual hegemonies that produced a distorted, orientalized picture of the island’s past. This is a legacy which arguably continues to this day in the ambiguity with which ancient Cypriot material culture is placed within the broader archaeological narratives of the Mediterranean world.97 However, while there is no doubt that the BM excavators came laden with questionable Eurocentric assumptions about contemporary and ancient Cyprus, they were very much of their time in this respect, especially before the development of modern classificatory schemes for the island’s antiquities permitted a more nuanced and localised understanding of its remote past. Further, although they received direct encouragement from the British administration in their work, they were subject to the same regulations as other excavators: in fact several directors of British Museum-excavated sites note the strictness with which officials ensured that the Cyprus Government received a fair division of the finds under the existing laws.98 Wright has also stressed the importance of understanding the original Ottoman law of 1874 in its original context, especially as it remained substantially in force until 1905 and was a central influence on excavation until then. In particular, the problematic issue of partage, abolished in 1905 but reinstated to encourage foreign excavations on the island in the 1920s, was not finally resolved until the early years of the Cyprus Republic.99 In sum, the growing official (and indeed public) appreciation of the value of antiquities occasioned by the CEF and BM campaigns doubtless led to greater public control of the excavation and export of antiquities which culminated in the 1905 Antiquity Law which, although imperfect in many respects, can be said to mark the birth of modern archaeological attitudes on the island.100
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Figure 1: Map of the Kourion area showing the location of sites A to E at the British Museum campaign in 1895, from Excavations, 56.
About the middle of the east side we came upon a group of half-cylindrical tombs close together - all of which were full of earth and consequently their shape and size could not be accurately ascertained. With the exception of Tomb II none of them contained many objects. They were none more than 10 ft. below the surface. After a few tentative efforts on the W side of the field, which yielded no result, the site was abandoned on Jan. 26.

**Tomb 2.**

Cypriote pottery:

Large amphora with black bands and concentric circles on neck.

Small stem cup with black bands on red.

Large stemless of plain black ware having a groove round the shoulder with a spout, perhaps used as a yoke.

Large jug with egg-shaped body & trefoil mouth, black bands on red.

Small jug with egg-shaped body, black bands & concentric circles on buff.

Small jug - trefoil mouth, black bands on red.

Small pet jug of plain red ware.

Jug with spout in body - black bands on red.

Jug with plain lip, black bands and rings on red.

Small jug with flat body and trefoil mouth, red circles on red.

Small lekythos of black ware.

Lekythos - plain red ware.

With globular body, black and red bands and concentric circles on buff.

Oinochoe - trefoil mouth, black rings on drab. squat body.

Jug with trefoil mouth, black bands and rings.
Figure 3 Sketch map of the Kourion area showing location of tombs in Sites A–C
Figure 4 Sketch map of the Kourion showing location of tombs in Sites A–E before the second phase of excavations in Site E
Figure 5 Sketch map of Site A
Figure 6 Sketch maps of Site B showing all the excavated tombs. This formed the basis of the published plan on p. 60 of Excavations.
Figure 7 Sketch map of Site C
Figure 8 Sketch map of Site D drawn at the end of the work in this area, showing all the tombs excavated. This formed the basis of the plan published on p. 61 of Excavations.
Figure 9 Sketch map of Site E, before the second phase of excavations

Figure 10 Sketch plan of Tomb 17 (Site B)

Figure 11 Sketch plan of Tombs 60 and 61 (Site E)
Figure 12 Sketch plan of Tomb 76 (Site B)

Figure 13 Sketch plan of Tomb 110 (Site E)

Figure 14 Sketch plan of Tomb 113 (Site E)

Figure 15 Transcription of the Cypriot Syllabic inscription from Site C (Temple Site) showing many emendations of the text
Figure 16 Hellenistic marble head from the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore (Site C/Temple Site) rediscovered in the Museum stores in 2009 (British Museum GR 1972,1-18.1)