the ruler of Egypt. In the context of the times his achievements far outweighed his defects. It is true that he engaged in excavations at several sites at the same time and concentrated upon the recovery of inscriptions and art works with little concern for context, but he was an able, professional Egyptologist whose monopoly of major excavations in Egypt, by virtue of his office, saved many sites from the archaeological bandits who had preceded him. Mariette’s unique legislation protecting Egyptian antiquities was approved—amongst the world’s earliest such legislation. It is due to this legislation that the Antiquities Organisation has the legal obligation to expropriate at the lowest reasonable price land upon which significant ancient remains have been found. Mariette also established the nucleus of a national museum, which created a mechanism inhibiting the flow of antiquities out of the country. Later the museum became the repository for thousands of art works and artifacts recovered by excavators working under the more permissive regimes of Mariette’s successors, Maspero and later Directors-General. The later history of the Antiquities Organisation and Cairo Museum is given elsewhere in this magazine. (See p. 45.)

The principles and methods of well-controlled, carefully recorded archaeological excavation were introduced into Egypt during the 1860’s and ’80’s, quite soon after they had been begun to be established in England and Europe. The two men mainly responsible were an Englishman, Flinders Petrie, and an American, George Reisner. Many of the excavators active in Egypt well into the 1930’s had been trained by Petrie or Reisner, but never by both! Throughout their long careers the two men remained respectfully remote from each other, their implicit professional rivalry being accentuated by marked differences in personality and techniques of excavation and analysis. Both were combative and rather autocratic, although Reisner mellowed over the years and Petrie always had an unexpected streak of impish humor. In his 70th year, laden with academic honors and one of the ‘grand old men’ of Egyptology, Petrie chose to recall in his memoirs that as a young man surveying the pyramids at Giza he found “for outside work in the hot weather, vest and pants [underwear] were suitable, and if pink they kept the tourist at bay, as the creature seemed to him too queer for inspection!”

The advent of scientific archaeology in Egypt brings us to the beginning of the story of Egyptology at the University Museum, for the Museum was closely associated with this innovation. For many years after 1890 it was one of the main sponsors of Petrie and others of his “school” of Egyptologists. It engaged (in 1906) was David Randall Maciver, who had worked in the field with Petrie, and who trained Charles Leonard Woolley, subsequently to become famous for his discovery of the ‘Royal Tombs’ at Ur. About 1916, the University, and the British Museums! Finally, Clarence Fisher, Egyptian curator and field director from 1914 to 1925, had spent several years working with Reisner before his appointment to the Museum, as had his successor, Alan Rowe.

THE MUSEUM IN THE FIELD

“To be a good (archaeological) finder one needs a peculiar quality which is not altogether erudition—the hog which is most lucky of finding truffles is not always the fattest, best eating hog—on the contrary.”

SARA YORKE STEVENSON

Sara Stevenson’s sense of humor, of which the above is a good example, enlivens her correspondence and publications. The two ‘hogs’ she referred to were well known to her, being the distinguished Egyptologists Flinders Petrie and Edward Naville. She hastened to tell her correspondent that “I beg these gentlemen’s pardon for the homely simile,” but the incongruity between it and their late Victorian dignity must have amused her. Equally typically, her remarks had a serious point. Petrie had just been replaced by Naville as the excavator for the Egypt Exploration Fund, from whose excavations the Museum at that time obtained most of its Egyptian antiquities in return for the financial support it provided the Fund. “My private opinion is that the . . . Fund . . . has made a great blunder in parting with Petrie,” she wrote; “his successor has not his ‘nose.’” Irresistibly, the simile of the hogs followed.

Mrs. Stevenson’s concern was natural. From 1889 to 1908 she devoted much of her formidable talents and energy to both the development of the Museum as a whole and its Egyptian Section in particular. The vigor, adaptability and perseverance, tempered with tact and good humor, that she brought to these tasks characterized her life as a whole. Her background was unusually varied. Born of American parents in Paris in 1847, she spent most of her first fifteen years there and, while enjoying a sociable life, first became interested in antiquities and research into them. By 1862 her family had settled in Mexico, where she joined them and lived for five years during the turbulent reign of the French-imposed “Emperor” Maximilian. Subsequently the family moved to Vermont, but in 1868 Sara Yorkie, as she was then, aged 21—went to Philadelphia and
settled in with some aged relatives, of whom she was very fond. The ancestors of her father, Edward Yorke, had settled in Pennsylvania in 1728. Her pleasures in Philadelphia included a regular “evening supper of oranges, nuts, crackers, cheese, beer and port with the blind uncle, with whom she spent every evening until late each night, hotly discussing her habit of late hours” (Sara Yorke Stevenson, A Tribute from the Civic Club of Philadelphia, 1923, 10).

In 1905 Yorke married a Philadelphia attorney, Cornelius Stevenson, and while maintaining an active social life—“much as sociedad people do today,” her obituarist in 1923 somewhat tartly remarked, “but with more decorum and better manners” (op. cit. 10)—in a few years she became deeply involved with the city’s civic, philanthropic and educational affairs, an involvement which lasted until shortly before her death in 1921. In 1905 she had severed her connection with the University Museum (then the “Free Museum of Science and Art”) and three years later, when her family’s financial situation deteriorated, Mrs. Stevenson had, with characteristic aplomb and resilience, augmented its income by becoming a lecturer and columnist—“Peggy Shippen’s Diary, a Chronicle of Events”—for the Philadelphia Public Ledger (her work continued until 1920, as did a curatorship in the Pennsylvania Museum at Memorial Hall, Fairmount Park, now the Philadelphia Museum of Art) and many other activities, including strong participation in the women’s suffrage movement. In 1921, some months before her death, she was publicly honored by prominent Philadelphians and she received a bountiful amount for many friends, some of fifty years, duration or more. On the place cards was inscribed her motto: “Why not tell the truth with a smile?”

Mrs. Stevenson’s vital role in the founding and development of the University Museum is described elsewhere (see p. 33). Here we are concerned with her curatorialship of the Egyptian and Mediterranean Sections (1890 to 1905). As curator, Mrs. Stevenson had two main ambitions, in the first of which she was ultimately unsuccessful: she had hoped that the Museum could establish its own field-work in Egypt, through the agency of the American Expedition to Greece (1896). Tunneling into the temple of Amenemhet III, which turned out to be insurmountable, was to engage a competent excavator.

As we have seen, Mrs. Stevenson’s first choice, Rosher, was a failure, but while in Egypt in 1890 she made other contacts. Edward Neville suggested that he excavate for the Society the important funerary temple of Nebhpetre Mentuhotep (ca. 2090-2030 B.C.) at Deir el Bahri. This Xth Dynasty king had emerged from a period of conflict and civil war and had inaugurated a cultural renaissance.

Nothing came of the idea. Mrs. Stevenson also tried to get James Quibell, a Petrie “tramme,” to excavate for the Society while maintaining his position with the Antiquities Organisation, but his superiors forbade it. In Quibell the Museum would have had a man who was not only determined to be a successful and “lucky” excavator, but one renowned for his severity and shrewd good humor. Later, according to one story (perhaps, like all the best stories, apocryphal), when the excavation of Tutankhamun’s tomb during the 1920’s had created tensions which provoked the archaeological supervisor of the work, Howard Carter, into a temper outburst, what left on the site and rife with petrified creatures, Quibell was instrumental in returning to the excavations where his expertise was essential to the work. They were good friends and Quibell’s cable from Cairo, “Dear Carter, I hear you have thrown down your bucket and spade and refused to play,” helped to restore his sense of perspective.

For a brief and, to us, exciting period it looked as if the Museum and Reiner, then beginning his career, might join forces. Mrs. Stevenson met Reiner in 1896 and was initially not enthusiastic: he had not yet gained any field experience (although he was determined to do so) and she thought him too partial to the development of Coptic Egyptological field-work. Reiner did have strong professional and emotional ties with his grandfather who was one of Napoleon’s German soldiers and Reiner himself had been trained by German Egyptologists (and was amongst the best in the world). But he was also a thorough-going American, who was born in Indiana and had spent his whole life in the United States, and devoted his long career from its outset to the promotion of American Egyptology. In fact, Reiner’s German ties eventually became traumatic for him. His long-time assistant and colleague Doves Dunham records that in 1914, when war broke out, Reiner spent hours pacing up and down in his office—“weighing such evidence as he could gather as to the rights and wrongs of the war. Then, after many days of anguished thought, he made his decision, perhaps the hardest of his life. I remember the tears welling out of his eyes as he expressed his judgement that the Allies were in the right and his decision to take that side, which meant for him the breaking of all ties with his friends.” (Doves Dunham, Recollections of an Egyptologist, 15.)

Despite Mrs. Stevenson’s initial hesitance she was soon in correspondence with Reiner. Mrs. Rhoeb Hearst, a prominent and very wealthy member of the American Exploration Society, had become his patron and in 1899 he sent Mrs. Stevenson a list of sites, one of which he might excavate for the Society. Unfortunately, Mrs. Hearst soon left the Society and decided to support Egyptian field-work for the University of California, with Reiner as its excavator. Later, in 1905, Reiner formed the association with Harvard and The Boston Museum of Fine Arts which was to last for the rest of his life. Nevertheless, from time to time he generously responded to requests for advice from the University Museum, which also, in various ways, has periodically had indirect contacts with his work, as when it employed his former assistants Fisher and Rowe, and now through the Pennsylvania-Yale Expedition to Gaza (see page 90). In her other ambition as curator Mrs. Stevenson was outstandingly successful. She wanted to build up a collection of excavated material, of works of art and objects that would be thoroughly representative of all periods and regions of ancient Egypt. In fact, she ensured a steady flow into the Museum of items which were not only of perennial interest, but frequently of outstanding historical or aesthetic value, by encouraging the support by the American Exploration Society (see page 17) of the Egypt Exploration Fund, a society founded in England by Amelia Edwards (another charming but formidable lady) and others to promote scientific excavation in Egypt. In return for its financial support the Museum, through the American Exploration Society, received an often substantial share of each year’s finds.

Mrs. Stevenson always maintained good relations with the Egypt Exploration Fund and its excavators, relations based on a combination of her genuine respect for scholarship and diplomatic skills. A series of letters in the Museum archives in the characteristic (to those who have consulted his field notebooks) excorable hand of Petrie reveal that Mrs. Stevenson was particularly successful with this prickly genius. Petrie was often complained that some museums failed to appreciate the material sent them from his excavations and Mrs. Stevenson noted that many people thought Petrie was, while unique, “almost impossible to get along with and full of angles.” His manner of course his personality was rather rugged, not devious! But her letters to him were genuinely and warmly respectful as well as diplomatically flattering. “You are,” she told him, “the father of our [Egyptian] department—for to you we owe it that we are and have.” Petrie was appreciative and ensured that the Museum benefited in the allotment of his very scarce time.

Mrs. Stevenson then had succeeded in firmly linking the University Museum to what was, despite its faults, one of the most innovative and fruitful phases in Egyptological field-work. During this phase the full dimensions of the ancient Egyptian cultural expression began to emerge for the first time. This experience, insofar as it can be reconstructed, has been described in a variety of ways by writers on Egypt, but to bring out the significance of the Museum’s contribution to our understanding of that experience we must emphasize
certain points and themes. All attempts at reconstructing Egyptian history and culture are necessarily incomplete, because so little data is available as compared to what existed, or even to the data that has survived but still awaits excavation or recording. However, attempts at reconstruction must be made and, if they are to convey the depth and texture of the ancient culture, must make fullest possible use of both the available textual and archaeological data. Each partially compensates for important gaps in the other.

We must also try to see Egypt, at any period, as a whole and not become over-influenced by the impression conveyed by a few major or comparatively well-explored sites. In fact, three major themes provide a usefully broad frame of reference in trying to understand the nature and development of Egyptian history and culture, and the Museum's role in contributing to that understanding. The first theme is that of the royal centers at which resided the royal dynasties which governed Egypt throughout the last three millennia B.C. During the long periods of stability and national unity in Egyptian history these royal centers enjoyed great human and economic resources and were responsible for major social, intellectual, artistic and technological advances.

However, a second theme—that of the provinces—is equally important. Ancient Egypt consisted of a series of regions, each subtly different in geography from the others, while overlaying the regions was a second pattern of historically significant divisions, the 'nomes,' or provincial political units. During periods of political stability provincial resources were vigorously exploited by the royal centers, while provincial society was strongly influenced by the cultural and artistic modes of the centers. When, during periods of national disunity, the royal centers weakened, the provinces asserted varying degrees of political independence, and considerable cultural and artistic variety developed throughout the country. Our third theme is that of the towns, which linked the royal centers and the provinces. At any historical period there was a network of such towns, consisting of a tiny number of national capitals and a much larger number of provincial towns. In our terms, even the largest of these towns must have been comparatively small, for the total population of ancient Egypt probably never exceeded four or five millions; but they were the physical focus and expression of those concentrations of people and resources which were the foundations of the major advances at the centers and the innovations and experiments in the provinces.

By becoming a major sponsor of the Egypt Exploration Fund and, later, of a second organization, the British School of Archaeology in Egypt (founded by Petrie), the University Museum was one of the institutions responsible for a rich documentation of these themes. This sponsorship was strongest from 1890 to 1907, but was periodically revived (1913-15, 1924) when the Museum's own Egyptian fieldwork slackened. The aims and methods of Petrie and those he trained and employed were innovative and ambitious. Petrie's basic aim was to reconstruct, by combining textual and well-documented archaeological data, the totality of Egyptian society, "weaving," as he wrote in 1885, "a history out of scattered evidence using all material of inscriptions, objects, positions and probabilities." (W. M. F. Petrie, 79 Years in Archaeology, 115.) He and his followers therefore worked at sites in many different parts of Egypt and paid as much attention to the remains of the middle and lower classes as to those of the elite.

Of course, the results often failed to live up to the ideal. What in fact was attempted was a vast sampling technique, in which hopefully representative elements of sites were examined but others, sometimes equally important, were overlooked. The pace of the work was intense, because Petrie had early become afraid that much vital information was being lost as sites were affected by the expanding agricultural system or sacked by antiquities dealers, and as a result, field techniques of excavation and recording, even as practiced by Petrie himself, often failed to meet his own standards. Publication was rapid, in order to make data available to Egyptologists in general, but much important detail was omitted; and Petrie's followers failed to attempt the substantial interpretive studies required if their work
was to have the scholarly impact it de-
erved. Petrie himself wrote voluminously
on Egyptian history and culture, sometimes
with great insight but often with a super-
ficiality or dogmatism which lessened the
value of his work.

Nevertheless, the fundamental effects of
Petrie and his ‘school’ were extremely
positive. His comprehensive approach to
the study of ancient Egypt has made an
inestimable impression upon the work of
later generations of Egyptologists, and he
himself applied to the data powerful anal-
alytical methods the more developed uses
of which are only now becoming fully
apparent. A striking example is his method
of ‘sequence dating’ or establishing a rela-
tive chronology for artifacts found in both
prehistoric and historic cemeteries; out-
lined by Petrie in 1901, sequence dating
was the first step toward the more
soptimized techniques now being applied
very successfully to Egyptian material.

Petrie also set the precedent for the orderly
classification of the many categories of
prehistoric Egyptian art and for the study of
their geographical and cultural significance.
This classification was based in large part
upon the enormous masses of data recov-
ered by him and others’ field-work, much of
which came to the University

Museum. The geographical range of the sites
with which the Museum was Indirectly involved
is immediately seen on the map (Figs. 19,
20), while chronologically all periods were
covered, from prehistoric to Roman and
Christian times. To Petrie and his followers
Egyptian history and culture was a con-
tinuum, and although they concentrated on
pre-Hellenistic sites they did not neglect
later material when circumstances made it
available to them. The characters of the
sites were also very varied. Cemetery sites
were frequent (about 30 in all), represent-
ing many provincial areas as well as royal
centers like Giza and Memphis. Some
temple sites (about 14) were excavated, as
were a large number (13) of town or settle-
ment sites. The excavation and study of
the latter were often inadequate by mod-
ern standards, but recognize an appreci-
ation of the importance of urban archaeology
in Egypt, which was to largely disappear in
the forties and fifties and has only begun to
revive in recent years.

Only a few of the many sites involved
can be singled out for specific reference. At
Naqada and Ballas, Petrie found vast pre-
historic cemeteries enabling him to recon-
struct the character and chronology of
Egyptian culture in preliterate (i.e. before
1900 B.C.) times, while at Hierakonpolis
Quibell and Green explored one of the
earliest of the royal centers, a late pre-
historic-Early Dynastic town yielding
extraordinary works of art. Subsequently
Petrie excavated at Abydos, the tombs of
Egypt’s earliest historic kings—those of
Dynasty I—and documented the rise of
historic civilization in Egypt. At Kahun
Petrie discovered a Middle Kingdom (ca.
1980-1700 B.C.) town, and studied the
social stratification revealed in its carefully
laid out plan and the associated artifacts.

He also spent several seasons at Memphis,
an immensely complicated site which was
a royal center or northern capital from ca.
3100 to about 300 B.C. Finally, we should
note that the Museum was a sponsor of
excavations at Naukratis, a town which
was the earliest Greek settlement in Egypt
(ca. 7th century B.C.) and received impor-
tant papyri on administrative and religious
matters from the Greco-Roman towns at
Oxyrhynchus and El Hibeh. The greater part
of the extraordinary range of materials
received by the Museum as a result of
these and other excavations arrived during
the curatorship of Mrs. Stevenson.

DAVID RANDALL MCLAVER AND AN
EXTRAORDINARY PROVINCE

In 1905 Sara Yorke Stevenson, then
president of the Museum’s Board of Mana-
gers, resigned all her Museum positions,
apparently to express disagreement with
the Board’s handling of a famous dispute
about Hilprecht, Curator of the Babylonian
Section. By then Mrs. Stevenson and her
colleagues had firmly established the vi-
bility of the Museum and during the nextive years it rapidly evolved. The number of
archaeological and ethnographic expe-
ditions was increasing, while an expand-
ing collection and staff were not only outgrow-
ning the building constructed in 1896, but
required a more coherent administrative
system. In 1910 E. E. Brinley Cox, Jr.,
became President of the Board; C. C.
Harrison, formerly the University’s Pro-
visor, became chairman of a building
committee; and an energetic, formidable
Canadian, George Byron Gordon, was
appointed Director. The Museum now
‘took on the exciting air of the seat of a
storiied empire,’ as Percy Materia, Jr.,
sentily put it, (Men in Search of Man, 30); but
like all empires it first encountered vigo-
rous opposition from satraps who had
flourished under an earlier, looser regime.
Hilprecht clashed with Gordon, went on
leave in 1910—‘defiantly taking the keys of
the Babylonian Section with him’ (op. cit.,
27)—and retired in 1911. The same year
Mclaver, the Museum’s first professional
During that first year in Nubia, Maciver discovered a rich provincial culture with strong connections with Late Roman and Byzantine Egypt and initiated the first comprehensive study of some of the well preserved Nubian brick churches which had survived from the medieval period. The same year he saw for the first time the Byzantine churches and fortresses of Turkey and Greece and, with enthusiasm, linked them with characteristic boldness to his current work in Nubia. Maciver argued there was "a straight line through from Pagan Nubia of the 1st century before Christ to Gothic churches of the 11th century" and proposed that he, on the Museum's behalf, 'should launch out on a grand historical study of medieval Greece, especially of the medieval architecture and in so doing lay the foundations .. of an historical-architectural department in our Museum such as no other institution has attempted.' Maciver sensed that his superiors might be a little taken aback by these bold schemes and joked to Gordon, "unless you intend to get a mighty great new Museum built you had better not get more like me into it, for the present building will not hold so many." In fact, 'the Byzantine scheme' was not to their liking, but it took Gordon what he perhaps euphemistically described as "a good many talks" before Maciver could be persuaded to drop it.

Maciver was thus forced to channel his energies into the Nubian work, through which—with substantial assistance from Woolley who had been appointed Assistant Curator—he contributed significantly to several areas of knowledge. What made Lower Nubia a most unusual province of ancient Egypt was its frontier position between Egypt and other important African groups, which made it the setting for strong cultural interactions between the two. Moreover, conditions of preservation were unusually good and Maciver, who liked to excavate settlements as well as cemeteries, considerably enhanced our knowledge of Egyptian urbanism and its effect upon the indigenous Nubians.

The lower Nubian population was apparently always ethnically and linguistically different from the Egyptian; but in ancient and medieval times Egypt periodically sought control of the region to secure a southern border and exploit Nubia's trade routes and natural resources (especially gold). Maciver and Woolley were amongst the earliest recorders of a fascinating pattern in which indigenous Nubian cultures maintained distinctive characteristics for long periods, but were often strongly influenced—and sometimes totally subverted—by Egyptian culture.

Reinier in 1907-1908 demonstrated that this pattern went back into prehistoric times, but Maciver concentrated on the historic period as represented at several sites.

For example, in 1907-1908 he excavated a settlement of the C-group, the indigenous Lower Nubian culture from ca. 2200 B.C. onwards. This settlement clearly reflected the increasing influence of Egyptian architectural norms upon the C-group, and only one other C-group settlement of comparable size has ever been excavated.

On a much larger scale was the great Egyptian fortress town at Buhen, which dated to the Middle and New Kingdoms (ca. 2000-1000 B.C.). Two seasons were spent at Buhen, and one of the best preserved examples of ancient military architecture in the Near East, and much data of great historical value was collected. Maciver was over sanguine about the completeness of the excavation; a subsequent British expedition spent eight profitable seasons on the site. The full implications of the material found by Maciver in the town and nearby cemeteries, together with the British material, are emerging only today and show that in the later Middle Kingdom a permanent Egyptian colony (instead of the rotated garrisons of Dynasty XII) developed at Buhen. Like others in Nubia, this provincial town grew wealthy as it capitalised upon the growing weakness of the Egyptian royal centers at the time, but eventually it fell under the control of an intrusive Kushite (Upper Nubian) Kingdom which exploited the expertise of the Egyptians. Later, in the New Kingdom, Buhen again came under the rule of Egypt proper. Only one other of the many Egyptian fortresses in Nubia (Mirgissa) has been as historically revealing as Buhen.

Maciver's single greatest achievement however was one not fully acknowledged in recent histories of Lower Nubia, the literal discovery of its Meroitic culture. He fully realized the importance of the discovery—he and Woolley, he wrote, had given "to the history of southern Egypt a new chapter"—but in each he reached in his pioneer study of Meroitic Nubia are, with a few exceptions, the same as those of more recent researchers, who have found it alarming difficulty to keep their new curator's enthusiasm confined to Nubia.
bruck towns and villages, parts of one of which Wooley excavated. They were politically linked to the great kingdom of the Sudan, and were dominated locally by rulers living in a few major fortified towns. From the cemeteries of Shabul and Karanog MacLver recovered hundreds of artifacts, revealing an extraordinary amalgam of local, Meroitic, Egyptian, and Hellenistic-Roman influences, the range of which he demonstrated at the same time remaining anemic to the originality of this regional culture. In important areas of his material and intellectual culture MacLver considered the "Nubian less of a copyist than an adapter; he stamped his borrowings with his proper genius and evolved something which at any rate had the merit of originality."

CLARENCE FISHER: AN UNKNOWN ACHIEVEMENT

Coxe's enthusiasm for Egyptological research remained undimmed after MacLver's departure and in 1914 Gordon recruited a new Egyptian Curator, Clarence Stanley Fisher. Fisher spent most of the next nine years in the field, accomplishing an enormous amount of work of which much was of major significance, yet his career with the Museum was, in a professional sense, a tragic one. He began under favorable auspices; Petrie thought highly of him and Reisner, for whom he had worked, believed Fisher had the ability and opportunity to become "the most important archaeologist in Egypt." But when Fisher left the Museum in 1925 all his major work was—and still is—unpublished and his achievements are so poorly known that he is assigned an undeservedly peripheral place in the history of American Egyptology.

Fisher's advantages included a supportive Museum Director, a generous endowment left for Egyptological research by Coxe when he died in 1916 and a favorable environment for foreign archaeologi- cal activity in Egypt. The causes of his problems can only be guessed at, but were to some degree rooted in his very merits as a person and an archaeologist. Fisher was very experienced in the field, and had a special orientation to architectural recording and history. He graduated as an architect from the University of Pennsylvania in 1897, worked with the Nippur expedition from 1897 to 1900, and subsequently assisted Reisner in Egypt and at Samaria in Palestine. From Reisner he learnt good field techniques and elaborate if time-consuming methods of recording and documentation, but found difficulty in bringing his results into a publishable form.

This was partly due to the pressure of an intense excavation schedule, but also reflected Reisner's influence and Fisher's own limitations. Reisner liked to analyze his material in elaborate and sometimes numbing detail before publication, which meant that excavation and publication were typically far apart in time. Fisher's only important Egyptological publication—a minor cemetery at Giza—came out in 1924, nine years after the excavation. It is an excellent record of data and of architectural interpretation, but is not a major piece of archaeological scholarship; Fisher lacked Reisner's brilliance and had never received any formal Egyptological training.

Fisher was to a degree a good organizer, and had a sound and well-informed concept of the needs of Egyptian archaeology; sites representative of all periods of Egyptian history should be systematically excavated "on thoroughly scientific lines," the extant temples carefully recorded and a "corpus of all existing Egyptian archaeological material" should be prepared, being made useful for ready reference by means of card indexes. However, he devised research schedules which eventually proved too much for his health and personal equilibrim. Punishing schedules were not unusual then, as Petrie, Reisner and others worked long seasons with what to us seems tiny staffs, but Fisher's efforts were excessive. From 1915 to 1919 he worked each year at two major sites, moving from Memphis to Denderah when the water table became uncomfortably high at the former. Later, his plans verged on the fantastic; in 1919-20 he proposed to Gordon that he be responsible for excavations in Egypt, Palestine and Babylonia and, in fact, from 1921 to 1923, Fisher did alternate between Memphis and Dra Abu el Naga in Egypt and Jugh Shub in Palestine.

Fisher's health was seriously affected by his work load in 1919, and began to break down in the early twenties. The physical strain was further exacerbated by his tendency to become involved in emotionally draining disputes. In 1922, for example, Fisher complained to Gordon that his field assistant Greenless (recommended by the eminent Egyptologist Francis Llewellyn Griffith) "is very young and inexperienced and has pronounced Bolshewiki ideas. These views make him assert an independence of all authority."
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I have tried to help him but he has a habit of pointless criticism which is most annoying.” Queried by Gordon, Griffith wrote: “Neither my wife nor I can conceive of Greenlee (who had been Griffith’s student) having or expressing Bolshevik views or anything bordering on insubordination unless someone or something has driven him to a state of lunacy! Has he been working too hard?” The exchanges read like passages from a Wodehouse novel, but the problem was a real one. Reisner had noted years earlier that Fisher was “liable to error where his personal feelings are concerned” and Fisher in fact during his career quarreled too often and too seriously—with Reisner, Petrie and several of his own assistants—to have been always in the right.

Inevitably, Fisher and Gordon also had a major falling out. For many years Gordon was sympathetic to Fisher and appreciative of his field-work, although, as a director devoted to increasing the Museum’s collections and its public educational role, he sometimes grew critical at Fisher’s long absence in the field. Subsequently, Gordon became increasingly concerned about Fisher’s problems with his subordinates and at the same time expressed increasing impatience at Fisher’s inability to produce, after 1919, the major monumental art works with which Gordon wished to embellish his expanded Museum. In 1923 Fisher, who had then been back at the Museum some time, quarreled with Gordon and resigned, taking up what appears to have been a happier and, in terms of publication, more productive archaeological career in Palestine.

The vicissitudes of Fisher’s career however should not detract from his very real achievements in Egyptology, which we hope will in turn be fully published and appreciated. Fisher had a strong interest in the archaeology of the people living in ancient Egypt, as well as that of the gods and the dead; urban and settlement sites attracted him as much as temples and cemeteries. His director, Gordon, was not unsympathetic to an interest in the less pretentious aspects of ancient Egyptian culture. In 1916 he publicly stated that no “object, however humble, is without significance in the reconstruction of the past” as attempted in the Museum’s exhibits (The Museum Journal, VII, 2, 68). However, at the same time Gordon made it clear that major monuments were also desired, for the “might of Egypt” must be represented in the Museum by “sculptured stone and hammered bronze” (ibid. 86). Fortunately, in Egypt urban sites typically included monumental temples and palaces, and Fisher, having first applied for the ancient town mound of Tanis (which turned out to be reserved for the French) and considered that of Sais, another major Delta site, finally settled on Memphis. The results met both his and Gordon’s expectations, although Fisher’s other choices of sites were less productive in monuments and contributed to the final break with Gordon.

Fisher, perhaps the only Egyptologist who had previous experience working on the complex town mounds of Mesopotamia, was not put off by the similar, equally difficult town-sites of Egypt. Memphis was a major challenge to the excavator and, since no visible major temple complex like that of Karnak at Thebes

had survived, had generally been avoided by Egyptologists. Petrie alone had carried out serious excavations there (1909-1913) with results which were very variable in quality. Memphis is enormous in size. It was for millennia a major royal center, having been founded perhaps at the opening of Dynasty I (ca. 3100) and having remained of great importance into Roman times. Its history, in terms of periodically rebuilt temple complexes and the build-up of overlying town strata, was very complex while the site itself lay in the cultiv-
Bueno and apparently Woolley at Karanog] Fisher equated strata with building levels, whereas they are in fact usually much more complex entities; and he made no study of the thousands of stratified sherds he must have encountered. The latter would have been an invaluable record and facilitated both the relative and the absolute dating of his superimposed building levels and their stratified matrices.

Merneptah’s palace, as recorded by Fisher, greatly enriched our understanding of the original appearance of such structures, for the building burned and collapsed at an early date, sealing off many fallen architectural elements such as massive inscribed stone columns and doorways. No other of the few excavated Egyptian palaces has been so rich in architectural data. The exact nature of the palace remains uncertain however, because Fisher was unable to recover its surrounding complex. It was quite possibly a ceremonial palace, meant only for periodic, short visits by the king but not lived in permanently by him, and lying at right angles to the axis of an (as yet undiscovered) temple with an east-west axis. Such palaces are found in the later New Kingdom (ca. 1300-1100 B.C.) royal funerary temples, and an earlier, more elaborate ‘temple-palace’ occurred under Akhenaten (ca. 1379-1353 B.C.) at Amarna.

Despite the importance of his Memphis work, Fisher’s greatest archaeological achievement was his excavation in the cemetery of Denderah, a major provincial center in southern Egypt. It was an important cult center, probably from prehistoric times, of the popular goddess Hathor and supported a substantial town from early historic into Hellenistic times; its cemetery therefore reflected both local and national cultural fluctuations which were historically important. Fisher applied Reisner’s methods—with the idea of working the site like one ploughs a field, leaving no place to chance or unexplored”—to a large area previously sampled by Petrie, Where Petrie reported about 140 tombs, Fisher recorded over 2000.

Petrie’s and Fisher’s material, which has been studied by Henry Fischer and Ray Slater Humphre, covered mainly the time-span from the later Old Kingdom into the late Middle Kingdom (ca. 2560-1700 B.C.) and is particularly informative on a fascinating historical period, the First Intermediate Period when the royal centers became seriously weakened. The provincial governors buried at Denderah in Dynasty VI were, in some cases, conspicuously wealthy, reflecting perhaps a drainage away into the provinces of the wealth once largely monopolized by the royal centers. Further provincial vitality was attested by distinctive styles demonstrated in tomb superstructures and the inscribed stelae affixed to them, styles peculiar to Denderah and provinces adjoining it. During the disturbed times following Dynasty VI Denderah became a fortified town, and its prosperity, as reflected by grave-goods, dropped, until it revived again during the national reunification achieved by Dynasties XI and XII (ca. 2040-1798 B.C.).

In addition to giving important historical data, Fisher’s records also document an archaeological sequence of tomb-typological ceramic and other artifacts for the period ca. 2500 to 1700 B.C. which is rivaled at very few other provincial sites.

Fisher’s third major project (1912-1923) was the excavation and recording of Dra Abu el Naga, a section of the West Bank cemetery of the great royal center of Thebes. This site includes the inscribed and decorated tombs of some of Egypt’s highest officials of the period ca. 1290-1085 B.C., but Fisher’s valuable architectural and archaeological records were not complemented by cleaning and epigraphic work of comparable quality. A new Museum expedition began work at the site in 1967 to make up for these deficiencies (see p. 50).

ALAN ROWE AND THE MYSTERIOUS PYRAMID OF MEYDUM

One of the most striking symbols of the intellectual and economic powers of the royal centers of ancient Egypt was the rapid evolution in the size and style of the pyramids during the first half of the third millennium B.C. These great monuments dominated the ‘residence-cemeteries,’ i.e., the cemeteries of the royal centers in which the reigning king, his relatives and highest officials were buried and at which major technological and artistic advances were made. About 76 kilometers south of Cairo is one of the most mysterious of these pyramids, a massive stone ruin still rising about 300 feet high at Meydum. Our increasingly better understanding of this monument and its associated archaeological remains is based mainly upon data collected under the partial (Petrie) or total (Alan Rowe) sponsorship of the University Museum, [For photograph, see cover.]

By whom, and when, was this great pyramid built and the impressive residence-cemetery surrounding it laid out and begun? The question is important, for the Meydum pyramid itself was originally designed as a step pyramid, like those of Dynasty III (ca. 2700-2660 B.C.), but was transformed into the first true pyramid, the type so familiar to us from Dynasty IV (ca. 2660-2500 B.C.) Giza and later sites. Moreover, the associated funerary temple and causeway and the adjoining cemeteries of royal relatives and nobles, as we shall see, comprise the earliest examples of the classic ‘residence-cemetery’ of the Old Kingdom. Strangely, the identity of the royal builder of Meydum has not survived in any explicit form, but many scholars have believed him to have been King Snefru (ca. 2700-2670 B.C.), primarily because the ancient Egyptians, at least from the 15th century B.C. on, themselves thought so. If true, this would make Snefru the greatest monumental builder of all Egyptian history, for he was certainly the builder of two further pyramids at Dahshur to the north. These three pyramids, if combined, would have created a pyramid nearly twice the size of the pyramid of Snefru’s son Khufu (Cheops), the single largest pyramid ever built. Equally intriguing is the present state of the pyramid, for of all the completed, massive stone pyramids of the Old Kingdom it has suffered the most damage, having lost about 20% of its original content, mostly from the exterior casing.

When the University Museum decided, in 1928, to resume excavations in Egypt, it was natural that Alan Rowe, the field director chosen, should have been attracted to Meydum. An Englishman, Rowe had learnt excellent excavating and recording techniques from Fisher (with whom he worked at Beth Shan in Palestine in 1922) and Reisner. Already an enthusiastic
Egyptologist, Rowe presumably became particularly interested in the history, art and architecture of Old Kingdom Egypt, while serving as Neisser's assistant at Giza from 1923 to 1925, during which time he was Rowe who actually discovered the famous tomb of Hetepheres, the mother of Khufu or Cheops, builder of the Great Pyramid. Noting that the pyramid of Meydum, if dating to the reign of Snefru or thereabouts, was critical for an understanding of the evolution from the early step pyramids, with their small-scale masonry, to the true pyramids built of megaflint blocks, Rowe anticipated that excavations at the Meydum pyramid and its nearby ‘residence-cemetery’ would ‘provide much new light’ upon the transition from Dynasty III to Dynasty IV (The Museum Journal, XX, 2, p. 118). He was also careful to stress that magnificent art treasures had been found by earlier excavators at Meydum, clearly being aware that although Gordon had died in 1927, his successor as Director, Horace Jayne (1929-1940), followed Gordon’s shrewd policy of encouraging excavations which were both scientifically important and likely to yield outstanding as well as culturally representative items for the Museum’s collections.

Rowe, like most of his contemporaries, was convinced that Snefru had built the Meydum pyramid, and even suggested in 1923 with a mass of well-documented detail, both archaeological and textual. He was, in an academic sense, more of a professional Egyptologist than Neisser or Fischer and, unlike either of them, could read Egyptian hieroglyphs with some proficiency. In 1930, Gordon had urged Neisser to learn hieroglyphs; Neisser promised ‘I shall have a try as soon as I can, but it takes longer than I think you realize’, and in fact never did so. However, the evidence was scanty, and Rowe’s enthusiasm sometimes outstripped his scholarly caution. In 1931 or 1932 he wrote to the Museum on a discovery which had much excited him, and the Museum authorities, not in earlier and later succeeding in distinguishing fact from speculation in Rowe’s lengthy report, published a statement that Rowe had found a limestone slab on which is carved... a portrait of Snefru. The fact that the portrait was found in a quarry in the area where previously the pyramid clearly indicates that it is a work contemporary with the Fourth Dynasty... It is perhaps the only contemporary portrait of King Snefru that has ever been found in Egypt’ (The University Museum Bulletin, 3.5, 1932, p. 111). In fact, the ‘slab turns out to be a fragment of a small (8.3 cm. high), roughly shaped stone stela, bearing a crudely carved royal figure which is unidentified, although Rowe thought he could make out Snefru’s name in shallowly scratched hieroglyphs. Even if the stela does represent Snefru, it could be an example of a much later period.

As an unpublished research paper by James Weinstock has argued persuasively, the real importance of Rowe’s excavations around the pyramid itself and in the cemeteries was to delineate in detail the funerary temple and causeway and to discover good evidence that Snefru had been active at Meydum, but almost certainly to complete a pyramid largely built by his predecessor, King Huni, who must have been buried there. Snefru himself was probably buried in the ‘northern’ of his two pyramids at Dahshur. The Meydum pyramid was perhaps also responsible for the fact that Snefru himself had two pyramids. The southern Dahshur pyramid abruptly changes angle and is ‘bent,’ and hence a second, more suitable pyramid had to be built. Kurt Mendelssohn has argued in The Riddle of the Pyramids (1974) that the Bent Pyramid’s ‘adaptations of the University of Pennsylvania and subsequently has had a most distinguished career.
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two seasons (1955, 1956) at Memphis he made some serious mistakes in archaeological techniques and interpretations due to the inexperience of himself and his staff. However, his correspondence and publications reveal that Anthes’ powerful scholarly mind gradually came to appreciate the importance of good excavation techniques and the value of properly interpreted archaeological data. He also began to develop a comprehensive plan of excavation designed to solve some major archaeological and historical problems of Memphis. “Only a coordinated system of horizontal and vertical cuts is adequate for the understanding of a site which has accumulated under changing living conditions in contrast to the consistent activity of wind and sand in the desert,” he wrote, and added, the “main object of excavating (at Memphis) should be the stratigraphy as it applies to the site of an ancient city.” [R. Anthes, Mit Rahineh 1956, pp. 2-3.]

The large-scale project which he envisaged as an expansion of the 1955-56 work would contribute significantly to a “greater pattern...the understanding of the topography, the history and the economic development of Memphis through more than one and a half millennia.” (The University Museum Bulletin, 21, 2, p. 12)

Although this larger project was never effected, the results of the work Anthes had done were most valuable, and his discussions of them interwove textual and archaeological data with a scholarly depth and richness never achieved by any of the previous directors of Museum projects in Egypt. The small temple of Ramesses II which Anthes excavated raised, as he showed, many questions about the character of the Ramesside remains in the southeast sector of Memphis (which included the palace of Memnoni) excavated by Fisher and re-investigated by Anthes). Further, he demonstrated that a huge
brisk enclosure wall surrounding the temple complex of Pah, god of Memphis, was Roman and not, as generally thought, Ramseside in date. Some of the recovered artifacts were also of great interest. A large stone libation basin (32 centimeters high) reproduced in miniature the huge towered walls which had surrounded the Pah temple in Ramseside times, and a repre- sentation of a man and woman of ca. 1250 B.C. showed them as "almost life-size on a single slab" which is "hardly known else- where in Egypt." (The University Museum Bulletin, 21, 2, p. 20).

Why were Anthes' proposals not put into effect? The Museum, in the '50's, had emphasized more strongly than ever before its "traditional dedication to scientifically valuable excavation and had recognized that the archaeologists' post today is not trinkets, but knowledge," especially since most countries refused any more to divide antiquities with the foreign expeditions, a practice that had found them (Percy C. Madeira, Jr., Men In Search of Man, p. 60). However, the older (and perfectly reasonable if limiting) Museum policy of sponsoring field-work which combined important scientific re- sults with others of more popular appeal was still powerful. In this regard Memphis compared unfavorably with the other field projects of the period. At Cordon, a richly equipped royal tomb—perhaps of the legendary Mida—had been discov- ered; and although other projects were concerned mainly with urban centers, each had a special and unusual feature: El-Libi was Gibeon, where the sun stood still for Joshua; Tikal was dominated by extraordinary pyramid temples, reaching a height of 270 feet; and Hasanlu lay in an archaeologically unknown region.

Memphis, by contrast, was a site almost too familiar; it was so well known, after all, that in the 18th century Memphis in Tennessee received its name presumably, like Cairo and Karnak in Illinois, to create "an atmosphere of grandeur." D. J. Bourn- stin, The Americans. The National Experi- ence, p. 280). Moreover, it lacked the obvious monumental structures, monumental rich- ness (in terms of visually striking artifacts) of other sites. An eminent and influential visitor from the University, during the excavation, was back ominously of Anthes' excavation that "work is not likely to result in worthwhile discoveries of objects"; and once the sub- 

stantial investment of time and money required by Anthes' expanded plan was realized, the Memphis project was terminated. Anthes accepted the situation gracefully because of the Museum's own scholarly development, his Memphis project was before its time.

During the next five years the archaeo- logical picture in Egypt changed rapidly as the Egyptian government encouraged the redevelopment of large-scale foreign archaeological activity in Egypt. Since the 1900's for reasons which were understandable, divisions of finds had become less favorable, and eventually ended altogether; and the government "supervision of (foreign) excavation in Egypt became stricter and was often responsive to anti- foreign feeling expressed in the Egyptian press and parliament" (John Wilson, Signs and Wonders upon Pharaoh. The Story of American Egyptology, p. 194). Naturally, archaeological work as a whole, as a result, diminished. But in 1959, Egypt, now a fully independent and self-confident nation, reinstated more generous terms, first to encourage work in Lower Nubia, soon to be inundated by Lake Nasser, the new Aswan Dam reservoir, but subse- quently also in Egypt proper. During the '60's United States government funding of archaeological work in Egypt dramatically increased and for American institutions in general, and the University Museum in particular, a new and expansive phase of Egyptian field-work began. But that story is told elsewhere in this magazine (pp. 46 ff.).

The Egyptian collection of the University Museum came into being during the last decade of the 1800's. It was then that Dr. William Pepper, Provost of the University, backed by Dr. Charles C. Harrison, Chair- man of the Ways and Means Committee, had "conceived the idea of drawing wealthy and prominent Philadelphians who were interested in archaeology but not particularly in the University into an asso- ciation which would tie them and the institution together. This he did through the formation in 1889 of the University Archaeological Association—the beginning of the University Museum. (Percy C. Madeira, Jr., Men in Search of Man.)

Prior to that time there had been sporac- dic gifts of Egyptian objects made to the University, but the creation of the Archaeological Association served as the nucleus of a definite interest in Philadel- phia in Egyptology.

In 1900, an Egyptian and Mediterranean Section of the Museum was formed, and naturally Sara Yorke Stevenson became the first curator, a post which she held for fifteen years. Her tenure was a time during which the general direction of policy was set, rules and regulations to which the 'Egyptian Section specifically and the Museum in general still adhere. In a letter written just before the turn of the century she stated her belief and that of her colleagues, that the collection should be available not only to scholars "as a basis for original and comparative study, but also to public school teachers and pupils, as well as the people at large who can enjoy at home some of the benefits derived from foreign travel and a visit to the great state museums of Europe."

It was a collection which had already, by the later part of the century, outgrown its temporary space in College Hall. When the "new" University Library, in 1930, granted its permission to use one of the rooms therein, the objects quickly took over the available space, and it was clear that something more accommodating had to be provided.

In 1962, Mrs. Stevenson had been elected a member of the Board of the Department of Archaeology and Paleontology. With that honor added to her list of credentials, she campaigned hard for the new museum to be called the "Free Museum of Science and Art"—a name still visible on the front of the present building. A site was selected, plans were drawn up, and pledges were solicited. There were some temporary discouragements with the fund-raising, of which Mrs. Stevenson had put up tight. She even handled the more mundane prob- lems as well, as indicated by her own description of the building site in 1895: "... as the East wind blew—such dense black clouds of smoke swept over the space on which we stood that Mr. Straw- bridge and I... begged Dr. Pepper to pause and consider... We therefore notified the architects to devise some plan by which the work could be started on the