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INTRODUCTION

"Do not reproach someone older than you, for he has seen the Sun before you." (The Instruction of Amenemope, ca. 1400 B.C.)

The story of Egyptology at the University Museum is fundamentally that of the men and women who for over 80 years staffed the Egyptian Section and were responsible for the major contributions that section has made to our understanding of ancient Egypt. Some of these people, such as Rudolf Anthes, Henry Fischer and other Egyptian Section staff members of recent years are happily still alive and vigorous. The others are at least partly revealed to us in hundreds of letters preserved in the Museum archives and in the published reminiscences of themselves and their contemporaries. They varied greatly in character and personality; they had their successes and their failures, their virtues and their follies, and all of these will emerge in the course of this article. But basically the record is one of outstanding achievement, a record that challenges us, their successors, to equal, if not even surpass, their accomplishments with respect and affection we dedicate this memoir to them.

Nothing could more appropriately introduce our story than the visit of Sara Yorke Stevenson, first curator of the Egyptian Section, to Cairo in 1899. This shrewd and vigorous Philadelphia lady immediately set about trying to organize the University Museum’s first Egyptian field project. The task was a formidable one and Mrs. Stevenson’s experiences were very different from those of the many well-off tourists who flocked to Egypt at that time. As John Wilson made vividly clear, they found a trip to Egypt “an easy and fascinating way to see the East."

"From Shepheard’s [a famous hotel in Cairo], with a vivid decor in pseudo-pharaonic style] famous terrace, over a coffee or a lemon squash, one could sit idly and watch the teeming throng sweep past: Egyptians in from the villages returning one’s stares openly, barefooted Nubians of great dignity, two-wheeled donkey carts, and then shouts and a rumble as an open landau carrying some fat Turkish dignitary in a red turban careened past, preceded by running seizes who cleared the way with sticks. Veiled ladies rode by, fiercely guarded by eunuchs. A diplomatic carriage would have a fiercely moustached kavass mounted beside the driver and clothed in brilliant costume and carrying a curved saber and staff as insignia of his master’s ‘sublimity.’ ‘Those tourists who tired of Cairo could sail upstream in comfortably appointed sailing house-boats or steamers and visit the tombs and temples of ancient Egypt and the picturesque native villages beside them. (John Wilson, Signs and Wonders upon Pharaoh, A History of American Egyptology, 72-74.)"

Mrs. Stevenson had little opportunity to enjoy this leisurely life. The Egyptian government at this time was controlled by a British consul-general and Egyptological affairs were the responsibility of British, French and other foreign scholars and bureaucrats. Her commission was to deal with these gentlemen, who represented different, often competitive national factions and were often on bad terms with each other. Mrs. Stevenson soon made a forthright assessment of the situation. "I never in my life saw such intriguing," she wrote. "Politics-science-personal rancor is
all mixed up." Her chosen agent and assistant, a young man called Rosher, had proven ineffectual, a fact Mrs. Stevenson accepted with a good-tempered realism which was one of her greatest assets. "One must have a genius for diplomacy to steer an enterprise through Egyptian conditions today," she noted; and as for Rosher, "one cannot expect a Tallyrand or a Roebling combined at a guinea per diem."

Although Mrs. Stevenson contacted the English and American Egyptologists in Egypt, seeking a suitable excavator for the Museum, her principal item of business was a proposal that the American Exploration Society, which had been founded to secure funding for Museum expeditions, should pay for the removal of colossal statues and massive inscribed architectural elements which were partially exposed at Tanis. Tanis was a remote site in the northeastern Delta and the monuments would be taken to the National Museum in Cairo. In return, she requested that the Egyptian government assign duplicate material from Tanis—i.e., statues or architectural elements which were more or less identical with the material to be deposited in the Cairo Museum—to the University Museum.

Loret, the French Director-General of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization, quite properly turned down the proposal, for this was one of the rare occasions when Mrs. Stevenson's enthusiasm led her into an error of judgment. As Loret pointed out, the appropriate way to recover antiquities was to have properly conducted excavations at Tanis followed by a division of the finds between the two museums. Sensing that Loret might be vulnerable because of rivalries within the antiquities organization and the more generalized tension between the British and French, long-time rivals and now uneasy collaborators in Egypt, Mrs. Stevenson continued to promote her proposal with tact, skill and perseverance. She won the support of important government officials through argument and persuasion (pragmatically, she also considered bribery, but wisely rejected it). Pursuing Loret to Aswan, 580 miles south of Cairo, she made a final appeal, but he was obdurate. As her hopes for the project faded, Mrs. Stevenson's charitable feelings towards the ineffectual Rosher cooled; somewhat wapsishly she remarked: "I instructed him to go at once to Mr. Pettie— to put in two or three months' (excavation) at Denderah under him (so that he might justify his winter's employment)." (For Pettie and his connection with the Museum, see pp. 17 ff.)

The artifacts Rosher found were sent to Philadelphia, but in fact the first Egyptian antiquities received by the Museum had arrived (from Petrie) in 1890, the year Sara Stevenson was appointed curator of the Egyptian and Mediterranean Section. Since the Museum itself had been founded only three years earlier, in 1887, it is true to say that the history of the Egyptian Section reflects in microcosm the evolution of the Museum as a whole. For many years in the Egyptian as in some other Museum sections different individuals were respectively responsible for mastology, excavation and teaching. Until the Museum's excavations in Egypt ceased in 1932 its Egyptological field directors, while usually entitled curator, came to Philadelphia only periodically for intensive curatorial and publication work. The day-to-day management and exhibiting of the large and growing Egyptian collection was left to others, who were not professional.

Details of the Tombs Excavated at Dendera

By C. R. Chatan, Professor of Antiquities, University of Pennsylvania, in the course of his work for the American Exploration Society, Philadelphia, 1896.
collections, with research, public education and university teaching emerging as the vital links between these two topics.

The current and very active and expansive phase of Museum field-work in Egypt, which began in 1967, is described elsewhere in this issue.

We must not forget however, in the need for simplification, those factors other than personal and professional activity which shaped the lives and careers of our predecessors in the Egyptian Section. These factors will emerge as critical ones from time to time in our story. The most important intellectual influence upon the professional Egyptologists associated with the Section were of course the Egyptological concepts and research methods prevalent at the time, but these changed significantly from generation to generation. All Section staff members were inevitably affected by the general, always gradually changing intellectual climate, especially in so far as it was relevant to the study and exhibition of the texts and artifacts of ancient societies.

Egyptology at the Museum was strongly affected by the changing policies of that institution over 90 years and by the different personalities of the men and women who were successively the chief officers of the Museum. Also directly impinging upon the field-work were conditions in Egypt itself. From 1882 onwards Egypt was engaged in a continuous struggle—often hidden, sometimes overt and turbulent—to make itself independent of foreign rule, a struggle that did not finally end until 1952. In addition, there were both before and after this date periodic major social and economic reforms which affected the status of foreign archaeological expeditions. Egypt has been and continues to be one of the most hospitable countries in the world to the foreign scholar and excavator, but the vicissitudes of its history through this century inevitably at times seriously affected the Museum's work.

Beyond Egypt itself other events of wider significance—two world wars, the great depression, other international political and economic fluctuations, the relationships between Egypt and the United States—also affected that work for both good and ill.

THE UNIVERSITY, THE MUSEUM AND THE STUDY OF ANCIENT EGYPT

"The Eckley B. Cox, Jr. Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania did solid but unsensational work in Nubia and then moved north to Denderah and Memphis." [John Wilson, Signs and Wonders upon Pharaoh, A History of American Egyptology, 151]

This quotation, the only substantial reference to the University Museum's Egyptological program in the best and most authoritative history of American Egyptology so far written, brings out a curious paradox. Over the years the Museum's Egyptian Section has greatly enlarged knowledge and understanding of ancient Egypt, but this fact has not had the impact in either the scholarly or the public world that it should have. This is not the fault of careful and generous historians like John Wilson, but is due to a disservice the Museum has done itself. It has always employed well qualified Egyptologists who consistently chose sites of major importance, sites yielding masses of new and valuable information carefully recorded and documented. This represents however only one aspect of the work of an archaeological or epigraphic expedition. Without subsequent research, synthesis and publication or, in plain terms, the writing of scientific monographs and papers, and popular books and articles, this laboriously and expensively gained knowledge is of little value to the scholarly world or the interested public in general. And, in fact, of the eight Egyptian field projects directly sponsored by the Museum between 1966 and 1976 four of the most important have either been only very partially published or hardly published at all.

We must not over-exaggerate the Museum's Egyptological achievements. Compared to those of other United States institutions, it did not enjoy the very substantial financial resources which supported the extensive Egyptian field projects of New York's Metropolitan Museum from 1910 to 1918 or which have maintained the epigraphic expedition of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago in the field since 1924. Nor was the University Museum associated over a long period with a single brilliant and productive archeologist who was virtually always in the field, as the Boston Museum of Fine Arts was with George Reisner from 1908 to 1942. Nevertheless, in contrast with the work of these institutions that of the University Museum is consistently underestimated; its contributions were major and important to an unappreciated degree and this is largely because a much larger proportion of the work of the other institutions referred to has been published. At the moment therefore we can describe the University Museum as a major contributor to our knowledge of ancient Egypt only in a qualified sense, anticipating the full publication of its rich stores of important Egyptological data.

As we try to demonstrate what it was that was important about the material recovered by the Museum in Egypt we must take into account the fact that Egyptology has been a vigorous and changing discipline. Any good piece of work done in the past will provide data valuable enough, if sufficiently well recorded, to contribute to our understanding of what we think of today as the most important aspects of Egyptian history and culture. But the work of each of our predecessors must also always be evaluated with reference to the scholarly standards and preoccupations of his particular generation of Egyptologists. Research priorities and values change significantly over the years and what seemed legitimate in the circumstances existing at one time might no longer be acceptable in the changed circumstances of a later period of study and research.

Egyptology is a young discipline, which in a real sense came into existence in September 1822 when the young Jean François Champollion burst into his brother's office in Paris, threw a bundle of papers on the desk, cried "I have got it!" and promptly collapsed into an exhausted stupor for five days. After months of intense intellectual effort, overwhelming false leads to their baffling or discouraging conclusions, Champollion had suddenly fully grasped the nature of the hitherto largely untranslatable hieroglyphic script.