Temple I at Tikal, Guatemala, after restoration.
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“...THE MUSEUM had always been an anthropological-archaeological institution with a unique collection of ancient and primitive art. It was world famous for its archaeological research (1), particularly in the Old World, and had survived the general decline of university museums in America and England. Its future lay in what had always been its strengths.”

Froelich Rainey’s observations, as the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology’s longest-serving Director (1947–1976) (2), written shortly after the Museum’s centenary, remain tellingly prescient. From its almost accidental beginnings in 1887—when obtaining objects for the collections and the then University Provost’s galleries was a paramount concern—to its international research and educational eminence today, Penn Museum mirrors the development and growth of scientific inquiry in the modern world. In 120 years the Museum has taken shape as a major historic building around its collections, and then, tellingly, as these collections and the research associated with them has grown, has expanded in labyrinthine and myriad ways. Today, as the forces of globalisation imprint themselves in every walk of our lives, the Museum with its treasures from all the Continents faces the challenge of reinventing its mission. Archaeology, anthropology and museology are no longer intellectual pasttimes but an increasingly fundamental part of a new globalised order.

Initially, a great treasure-house of archaeological collections assembled by leading archaeologists and anthropologists of the day, like many university museums, Penn Museum reinvented itself after World War II as a research institute concentrating upon the excavation of great sites in many countries. These two phases were elided together during the 1970s as a mission to serve its urban and regional communities—especially schoolchildren—was added to its list of museological tasks. Since then, facing the first decades of the digital age, this venerable institution is coming to terms, like so many major museums, with contemporary standards of curating and making its collections accessible, while meeting its obligations to report on its past excavations, and attempting to serve strikingly differing stakeholders in the metropolitan area of Philadelphia and, of course, in the University of Pennsylvania’s collegiate association, the Ivy League.

1 Rainey, 1992, p. 125.
A Brief History of the Collection

The archaeological results for the first fieldwork year, 1889—an expedition to Nippur in what today is Iraq—were modest by the standards of later years. Steadily, the compelling urge to collect grew greater and the Museum sponsored explorers such as Robert Burkitt in Guatemala and much later Chester Gorman in Thailand (3) whose adventures remind us of the celebrated Indiana Jones movies, with archaeologists facing bandits, diseases, camp destruction by fire, and other dangerous pursuits. The romance of collection and discovery from the ‘Tlingit of Alaska to the spectacular clearance and excavation of Tikal in Guatemala are an inherent part of the Museum’s often grandiose history.

At the heart of the Museum’s early strategy was a will to assemble collections from the great civilisations. The grandiloquence of the Museum building project itself tacitly made references to a classical heritage. Its collections were strategically intended to develop this theme. The roll-call of projects is breathtaking. So, between 1889 and 1900 the Museum was the first American institution to carry out archaeological excavations in the Near East. The expedition to the site of ancient Nippur in Mesopotamia (Iraq), organised by John P. Peters, funded by the Babylonian Exploration Fund, and directed by John Punnett Peters and Herman V. Hilprecht, revealed a library of inscribed cuneiform tablets that have formed the basis of our understanding of the first literate society in the world, the Sumerians. Iconic photographs at the time by John Henry Haynes show Arab workers removing dirt in baskets to reveal portions of the sprawling ruins (4).

Pre-eminent amongst these witnesses to the great civilisations are the breathtaking finds from the joint expedition with the British Museum (1922–1934) at the great Mesopotamian centre of Ur of the Chaldees (now in modern Iraq). What began as an effort to search for the roots of narratives from the Hebrew Bible yielded unsuspected splendours in the form of burial goods recovered in the Royal Cemetery. The tombs, dating to 2650–2550 BCE, contained a wealth of objects of gold, lapis lazuli, carnelian, and other semi-precious stones—furnishings reflecting the apogee of the Sumerians. Justly famous for their luxuriant beauty, these objects in combination with contextual evidence from Ur helped Sir Leonard Woolley to create an archaeological story about the ancient wealth and privilege surrounding an individual identified as Queen Puabi.

Egypt likewise captivated the founding fathers of the Museum. In the early 1890s the Museum was a sponsor, through the Egypt Exploration Fund, of the fieldwork of Flinders Petrie. By 1907 the generosity of Eckley B. Coxe, Jr., permitted the Museum to outfit its own archaeological expeditions. David Randall-MacIver and Leonard Woolley excavated a number of sites in Lower Nubia, including cities, military fortresses, and cemeteries. In addition, Randall-MacIver discovered and identified the unknown Meroitic culture, which inhabited this area from 100–300 CE.

Randall-MacIver’s successor, Clarence S. Fisher, a prolific excavator of ancient Egyptian remains, worked at some of the best-known and important Egyptian sites, including Giza, Dra Abu el-Naga (Thebes), Memphis, and Dendereh. His most famous discovery was that of the Palace of the pharaoh Merneptah (circa 1236–1223 BCE) at Memphis, a major royal centre spanning several millennia. The palace’s painted and inscribed columns are now a major feature of the Museum. In addition to its notable Middle Kingdom collections, the Museum also is known for its magnificent New Kingdom (1539–1075 BCE) holdings. From Abydos comes a statue of Setepenr, an overseer of priests who served under Egypt’s Queen Hatshepsut; from Herakleopolis, a large seated statue of Ramesses II; from Memphis, a relief with the face of a man from the ceremonial palace of Merneptah, son of Ramesses II; and from Thebes, a fragment of the Book of the Dead. In the early 20th century the Museum also investigated sites in Nubia, where equally important revelations emerged. A stele from Buhen, for example, shows a Kushite ruler as the equivalent of an Egyptian ruler and documents the ex-
istence of a significant African kingdom long before the Karanga Kingdom of Great Zimbabwe in sub-Saharan Africa or Jenne-Jeno in western Africa. Two statues from Buhen are examples of people from less regal walks of life. One portrays a Nubian individual whose livelihood was that of the specialised occupation of scribe, while the other is a much lower-ranked person, a gardener.

From its outset, equally important to Museum scholarship were the lands and peoples bordering the Mediterranean. One of the earliest projects was the discovery and subsequent excavation by the redoubtable Harriet Boyd Hawes of the Minoan Bronze Age village of Gournia on Crete. Pottery in the Museum’s collections and bronze tools from this site inform us about aspects of the daily life and activities of the celebrated Minoan civilisation. In Italy the Museum engaged Arthur L. Frothingham, Secretary of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, to oversee excavations of the spectacular Etruscan warrior tombs at Narce and Vulci in 1895–1897. In this formative period for the Museum an expedition was also sent to the great Roman colony of Minturnae in Latium, Italy. The result was a spectacular assemblage of Roman busts now on display in the Roman Gallery.

Much later, in 1950, Rodney Young began excavations at the ancient Phrygian capital of Gordium in Central Turkey. The ancient city was occupied at various times from the Early Bronze Age up to the medieval Seljuk period, but it is particularly important for documenting the 1st millennium BCE culture of the Phrygians, who flourished under King Midas in the late 8th century BCE. In 1957, with the opening of the great tumulus and the unearthing of the so-called tomb of Midas, the expedition made one of the most spectacular archaeological discoveries of the 20th century.

But the Museum’s pioneers were also engaged in fostering the discipline of anthropology. Ethnographers were despatched to the Americas, Africa and Oceania and, like the archaeologists, returned with major collections. Spectacular among the Museum’s holdings are Inuit (Eskimo), Northwest Coast, Plains, and Hopi artefacts, Guatemalan textiles, South American Amazonian featherwork, and items from sub-Saharan Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo) and Sierra Leone, as well as striking bronzes and other objects from the Kingdom of Benin in West Africa.

George Byron Gordon, who eventually became Museum Director (1910–1927), travelled to Alaska in 1905 and 1907 to study and collect artefacts among the Eskimo. The pioneering linguist Edward Sapir, one of the founders of the discipline, began his career at the Museum and in 1909 visited the Uintah reservation in Utah to study the language of the Utes. The indefatigable research conducted among various nations of northeastern North America between 1908 and 1950 by Frank G. Speck, founder of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, helped preserve vital information about many tribes of this area. He studied and worked with the Penobsot in Maine, the Naskapi in Labrador, and the Iroquois in New York, as well as many others. In 1912 the Museum appointed Louis Shotridge, a native Tlingit from southeastern Alaska, as Assistant Curator in the American Section. Shotridge took extended trips between 1915 and 1932 to collect artefacts and information among his own and neighbouring peoples in Alaska and British Columbia. Concurrently, William B. Van Valin collected ethnographic material among the Eskimo and excavated ancient remains at Point Barrow, Alaska (1917–1919). Later, from 1930 to 1935, Frederica de Laguna conducted further pioneering archaeological and ethnographic work in Alaska.

Another pioneer, Edgar B. Howard, explored for evidence of Palaeolithic remains in North America. His ground-breaking excavations at Clovis, New Mexico (1933–1937) and in Eden Valley, Wyoming (1940–1941) established his reputation as one of the discoverers of the original inhabitants of the Continent. No less influential was J. Alden Mason, curator of the American Section from 1926 to 1955, who undertook archaeological, ethnographic, and linguistic expeditions throughout North, Central, and South America. He is best known for his linguistic studies among the indigenous people of northern Mexico, including the Tepehuan in 1948.

One of the most active archaeologists operating on behalf of the Museum was Robert Burkitt, who excavated sites in the highlands of Guatemala for over twenty years (1913–1934). His investigations at ancient Maya sites such as Chamá, Chocolá, and Ratinliuxil provided the Museum with remarkable collections. The ancient city of Piedras Negras, deep in the jungle of the Petén, Guatemala, and known for its elaborately carved and well-preserved monuments, was the site of the Museum’s first large-scale excavation of a Maya ruin. The project, led by J. Alden Mason and Linton Satterthwaite, lasted from 1931 to 1939. Mason returned to Central America in 1940 to excavate in Panama at Sito Conte. Following earlier work at the site conducted by Harvard University, Mason uncovered a large number of burials bearing beautiful painted pottery and outstanding gold ornaments. Linton Satterthwaite excavated at Caracol and other sites in Belize between 1950 and 1953, continuing his particular interest in Maya hieroglyphic inscriptions and architecture.

Due to its inaccessible location in the jungles of the Petén, Guatemala, the ancient Maya city of Tikal was only briefly visited by explorers until the Museum organised a large-scale project of excavation and restoration with the assistance of the Guatemalan government (who constructed an airfield nearby to make the project possible). Beginning in 1956, under the successive leadership of Edwin Shook, Robert H. Dyson, Jr, and William R. Coe, archaeological investigations cleared many of the important buildings and revealed the dynastic, architectural, and settlement history of one of the most important Maya cities (1, 5).

Another Museum anthropologist, Ruben E. Reina, travelled widely over a number of years among the contemporary Maya living in the highlands of Guatemala (1950s–1970s). His ethnographic research led to seminal studies on their social organisation and the relationship of technology and culture, specifically the production of pottery. He also directed two archaeological projects in Guatemala and made an ethnohistorical study of the archives of the Indies in Spain to develop a comprehensive view of the Maya people during the time of the Spanish Conquest. No less significant were the excavations by William R. Coe, Christopher Jones, and Robert J. Sharer at Quiriguá, Guatemala (1974–1979) and recently by Sharer at
Copán, Honduras (1988–2000), where the architectural history of the acropolis was identified by tunnelling into the early buildings.

Further south, in South America, Max Uhle, a German philologist and archaeologist, explored Bolivia and Peru between 1895 and 1897. By uncovering the various levels of Inca and pre-Inca occupation at the ancient religious centre of Pachacamac in Peru, he established the initial understanding of the cultural history of the Andean region of South America. Two decades later, William C. Farabee spent three years (1913–1916) exploring the Amazon and its tributaries, identifying and studying the vast diversity of indigenous people found in this area of the world. Amongst the many other expeditions to South America was Vincenzo Petruulo’s to Mato Grosso, Brazil, in 1931, followed by two further expeditions to Venezuela in 1933 and 1934–1935. Establishing his headquarters at the headwaters of the Paraguay River, Petruulo studied the Bororo, and then travelled north to the unexplored area around the tributaries of the Xingu River where he made contact with people who had never before met westerners.

Museum scholars have also concentrated on aspects of human biology, as they can be determined from the examination of skeletal remains. This scientific focus provides details about human variation as it is known during modern and historic times, and is a baseline that can be used to suggest features of prehistoric variability as distant in time as the Palaeolithic, or Old Stone Age. The Samuel Morton collection of human skulls, for example, was made during the early and mid-19th century, and some of its holdings demonstrate aspects of global human variability.

The days of obtaining objects for Museum collections ended in the 1950s, due in part to the establishment of antiquities laws by many countries seeking to retain and preserve their cultural heritage. But Museum scholarship and research continued with increased vigour. Archaeological expeditions by the Museum in the second half of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century have included more than sixty expeditions to such locations as Abydos (Egypt), Vrokastro (Crete), Hasanlu (Iran), Corinth (Greece), Mongolia, Lake Titicaca (Peru), and Pech de l’Azé (France). Of especial note is the fact that three UNESCO world heritage sites have evolved out of the Museum’s investigations at Ban Chiang (Thailand) (6), Copán (Honduras) and Tikal (Guatemala). Now, too, the Museum is actively engaged in building an archaeological park at Mount Lykaion in Greece.

2Much of the history is taken from Madeira, 1964; Winegrad, 1993; Pezzati, 2002.
3See Richard Zettler in this volume.
5Dien, 1983.

The Museum in Asia

Beginning in 1896 and continuing until 1901, three University of Pennsylvania students—William Henry Furness III, Hiram M. Hiller, and Alfred C. Harrison, Jr.—made several extended trips to Borneo, India, and Japan, as well as other parts of South and Southeast Asia, on behalf of the Museum. This energetic team collected articles of daily life and documented cultural practices of people who were little known to outsiders at the time. As in other parts of the world, these founding fathers of the Museum established a template for research and collecting in Asia that continues to this day with the Museum’s current ground-breaking excavations in Laos (see Joyce White’s contribution to this volume) and its ongoing research on
the finds excavated at Ban Chiang, Thailand.

One of the most exceptional of early expeditions was to northern Japan. This was led by Hiram Hiller, a physician and amateur ethnologist, who interrupted his medical career to accompany Furness to gather collections for the Museum (7). While in Japan, Hiller met Dr Stuart El-ridge, author of an essay on the arrow poison used by the Ainu; this triggered a deep interest in these “curious people”. Hiller returned in 1901 and, recalling his fascination for this group, identified an appropriate collaborator—Jenichiro Oyabe. Oyabe, author of A Japanese Robin-son Crusoe (1898) had previously had an extraordinary life in the USA before returning to Japan as a missionary. Hiller noted in his diary, “It was lucky for me that he came, for he turned a doubtful undertaking into an enthusiastic quest. He was indefatigable, intensely in earnest, a trained student, and an agreeable companion—all essentials when you go to Yezo to visit the Aino [sic]...” Taking a steamer to this remote region the two companions and a student, Ryunjiro Shirai, arrived in May 1901.

For the following month, often in inclement weather, in arduous conditions—all recorded by Hiller in his diary and supplemented by photographs—the expedition visited countless villages. Hiller aimed to make notes on Ainu “manners and customs” as well as collect for the Museum (8). A particular passion was those objects associated with Ainu religion or “superstitions”, though these were often difficult to procure. Hiller records one old man’s reluctance, observing that a deputation would await him if his actions were known to his fellow villagers. The prize acquisition was a bear skull in a village near Mori on Volcano Bay. This formed part of the annual bear ceremony and was only obtained because the headman who owned it did not care to be called Ainu and had “turned Japanese”.

Hiller and Oyabe were particularly fascinated by the relationship of the Ainu to the folk called koropok-guru, associated with the pits to be seen near many villages. This led them to undertake excavations and a rectangular pit near Niewan yielded ashes, charcoal, charred and broken bones, and flat round stones, but no trace of a fireplace. Oyabe was full of theories, whereas Hiller in his diary speculates that these pits were “ante-historic habitations”. By July, Hiller was delighted with his collection, ample notes and forty-eight lantern slides, and in July, before departing for Sumatra, despatched them to Philadelphia where by January 1902 the Ainu material was on display. “It looks 100% better than I thought such rough material ever could look”, Hiller observed in a letter to his wife. The collection now constitutes the centrepiece of the Museum’s Japanese holdings.

The Museum sent two archaeological reconnaissance expeditions led by Carl W. Bishop to China in 1915 and 1917. In 1931 Gordon Bowles travelled through Sichuan and part of Tibet making ethnographic collections, and near Canton he conducted a small excavation of prehistoric burials. In 1935–1936, W. Norman Brown, a Professor of Sanskrit at Penn (1926–1966), organised an excavation at Chanhu-daro, Pakistan (9), that was directed by Ernest Mackay and sponsored by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and the American School of Indic and Iranian Studies.

The Museum returned to Southeast Asia in 1953 when Rodney Young and Schuyler Cammann excavated in Afghanistan at Balkh—the presumed capital of ancient Bactria—and at the Buddhist monastery of Kunduz. Carleton S. Coon (10) was one of the last “generalist” anthropologists, proficient in archaeology, physical anthropology, and cultural anthropology. His main areas of study were human prehistory and the problem of race. He excavated Palaeolithic remains in Afghanistan in 1954.
in 1956–1957 he took a trip to East and South Asia to document the cultural and physical diversity of human populations in these areas. Further east, at Mohenjo-Daro, Pakistan—the largest and best-preserved Harappan (2500–1500 BCE) city in the Indus Valley—George F. Dales directed archaeological excavations (1963–1965) to reassess earlier work by the Indian Archaeological Survey (1920s–1930s) in an attempt to understand the decline of the civilisation, The Museum pursued further excavations in the region under the direction of Gregory L. Possehl, who focused upon the issues of urban origins. Possehl excavated three sites in the state of Gujarat, India, including Rojdi (1982–1993), which redefined the chronology for the region and shed light upon the decline of Harappan civilisation. Today, the Museum, following its successful excavations in Thailand at Ban Chiang (1974–1975), is building new bridges across the frontier to Laos where Joyce White is leading a new mission to chart the as yet poorly documented Neolithic cultural history of the region.

The Museum in the World Today

Participation in a post-Colonial age calls for those of us from developed countries to be flexible, indeed, reflexive, as we construct new processes, identifying the consequences carefully. “This means going beyond the evident narrowness (verging on narcissism) of the existing self-acclaimed ‘self-critical epistemological awareness’ to draw on a deeper and more wide-ranging set of analyses.”8 In the later 20th century, conscious of this new ethos, the Museum began to shape a new role appropriate to the fast changing if as yet incipient stages of globalisation.

The Penn Protocol

Significantly, the Museum led the way into a new age when it radically reassessed its acquisitions policy.9 On April 1st, 1970 Penn Museum published a protocol entitled “Regarding the Illicit Trade in Art Objects”, which in many ways was reiterated in the subsequent November 1970 “UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property”, and upheld by the United States Congress in the January 1983 “Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act” (Public Law 97-446). As a result all objects considered for acquisition since 1970 have been reviewed in the light of the

7University of Pennsylvania Museum Archive UPM S4-14286, T4-893.
UNESCO Convention. Meanwhile, objects offered to the Museum and imported into the United States prior to the adoption of the UNESCO convention of 1970, have been considered in the light of the laws in place in their countries of origin at the time of their documented appearance in the United States.

In the interests of conserving archaeological sites, gaining scientific information, and preserving our own prehistoric past, the Museum further affirmed that it would not knowingly in the future acquire materials unscientifically or illegally excavated in the United States in compliance with the Antiquities Law of 1906, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and related legislation.

The Museum also stated that it would not knowingly acquire ethnographic specimens exported from those countries which have established laws prohibiting the export of such materials. It will not knowingly acquire ethnographic materials which were improperly removed from their original places, or materials known to be currently used for religious or ceremonial purposes, without the permission of the specific groups or individuals who have jurisdiction over the services relevant to these materials, to the original producers, their heirs, or other properly constituted legal representatives. Since November 1990 the Museum has specified that it will only collect Native American human remains in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 101-601. Human remains, regardless of origin, will be accepted and accessioned into the collections only after a case-specific legal and ethical review is presented and accepted by the Director and the Collections Committee.

NAGPRA
The Museum has taken an active and constructive role in implementing the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA). Frequently guided by and working with the National Park Service, the Museum has recognised the importance of repatriating objects to Native communities. Notwithstanding the complex legal issues involved, it is probably fair to state that the act has brought the Museum and Native communities closer together. In a nutshell it is actively engendering not simply interest in (and contemporary recording of) the objects obtained in the Museum’s earlier collecting era, but also fostering a deeper cultural understanding of these objects as well as the needs of capacity building in these Native communities in order to curate these returned objects to modern standards. Clearly, this new dialogue opens a window upon the promotion of tolerance of cultural diversity, while simultaneously promoting cultural heritage tourism and, on occasions, assisting in the revival of craft traditions.


Place-making
The Museum has long been involved in place-making without perhaps readily appreciating it. The Museum building itself, of course, has nurtured its own distinctive identity in the city of Philadelphia and the Delaware Valley. Over the past thirty years it has not only fostered a strong academic tradition in the fields of archaeology and anthropology, but served as an interface between some 50,000 school children per annum and the diverse cultures of the distant and recent pasts spread over all the continents (11). Equally, its Egyptian galleries have been the setting for weddings and parties, lending a veneer of history to the wider community’s cultural comprehension. The University, too, has turned to this location as a setting for great events, including the making of awards to world leaders such as Mikhail Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher (12). As Eric Hobsbawn wrote: “The history
which became part of the fund of knowledge or the ideology of nation, state or movement is not what has actually been preserved in popular memory, but what has been selected, written, pictured, popularized and institutionalized by those whose function it is to do so."12 The Museum, in other words, whether it is the context for an American Institute of Archaeology lecture or a Harry Potter Day, has re-established itself as a place with a global reach. Now, with the World Wide Web, that global reach becomes all the more significant. Having played a major role in the creation of places—UNESCO World Heritage Sites like Ban Chiang in Thailand, Copán in Honduras and Tikal in Guatemala—it is timely to assess how virtual and real place-making can be developed.

The current plan to make an archaeological park at Gordion in Turkey, scene of fifty years of active fieldwork by the Museum, like the proposed park at the sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Lykaion in the Peloponnese of Greece, must be only a preliminary step towards making the Museum’s research records and its capacity for training (at all levels) accessible to such places. As such, in the new 21st-century world order, far from being marginalised as museums are eclipsed by other attractions, the Museum has an increasingly critical role to play. Part and parcel of this new movement, as many countries around the globe grasp the significance of cultural heritage tourism not only for their revenues but chiefly for the purposes of identity-building (and branding), is the need to control looting and the illicit trade in antiquities and stimulate, instead, community building around archaeological sites. The Museum, active in combating the trade in illicit antiquities since 1970, is now about to launch the Penn Cultural Heritage Center. This new centre will specifically train communities and law enforcement officers, as well as students, in a new set of values appropriate to the 21st century.


Conclusion

Taking a wide-angled look at how the global archaeologist must face his/her future, one issue seems clear: academic archaeology along with community-based museology has to discover its place in a global society. Finding successful road maps for building a modern tradition of archaeology, anthropology and museology for the successful development of the Museum and its associated archaeological sites will depend not upon the examination results or, indeed, papers delivered at international congresses, but, as in earlier years, upon establishing benchmarks in world cultures that project the social value of our shared cultural knowledge in contemporary terms. The onus upon First World archaeologists and anthropologists in centres like Penn Museum is to look beyond their trenches and their desktops and to contribute to building a global archaeology where the divisions are replaced by discourse. It requires us to be proponents of value and best practice as well as cultural histories. Most of all, it necessitates our academic tradition coming to terms with the post-Colonial circumstances in the world and actively seek to play a part in order to combat the growing business of

Disneysque heritage pastiche that threatens to marginalise the discipline. We must prepare all the communities assembled under the Museum’s roof for a new era, focusing upon many different forms of capacity building. In essence, this means being as radical in an increasingly virtually connected world as the founding fathers of the Museum were in the 1880s.
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