

...The Truth Is On The March...

(Emile Zola, 1840-1902)

by

Edmond R. Mansoor

...In any event, I do not despair in the least of ultimate triumph. I repeat with more intense conviction: the truth is on the march and nothing will stop her! It is only today that this affair has begun, since it is only now that sides have definitely been taken: on the one hand, the culprits who want no light at all on the business; on the other, lovers of justice who would lay down their lives for it. I have said elsewhere and I say again, when the truth is buried underground, it grows, it chokes, it gathers such an explosive force that on the day when it bursts out, it blows everything up with it. We shall soon see whether we have not laid the mines for a most far-reaching disaster in the near future.

(Emile Zola - Josephson, M. Macaulay, N.Y. 1928)

...Ce n'est pas, d'ailleurs, que je désespère le moins du monde du triomphe. Je le répète avec une certitude plus véhémence: la vérité est en marche et rien ne l'arrêtera. C'est aujourd'hui seulement que l'affaire commence, puisque aujourd'hui seulement les positions sont nettes: d'une part, les coupables qui ne veulent pas que la lumière se fasse; de l'autre, les justiciers qui donneront leur vie pour qu'elle soit faite. Je l'ai dit ailleurs, et je le répète ici: quand on enferme la vérité sous terre, elle s'y amasse, elle y prend, une force telle d'explosion, que, le jour ou elle éclate, elle fait tout sauter avec elle. On verra bien si l'on ne vient pas de préparer, pour plus tard, le plus retentissant des désastres...(Emile Zola).

Copyright 1993
Edmond R. Mansoor

New Address

EDMOND R. MANSOOR
3288 North Sawtooth Court
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362-3531
Phone: (805) 496-2012
Fax: (805) 373-6882

To

Etienne Drioton

*"un des égyptologues les plus complets de sa génération."
(Vandier)*

And to my father,

M. A. Mansoor

*whose conviction about the authenticity of his
Amarna Collection
has always been unshakable.*

Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Sworn Statement by Edmond R. Mansoor	2
<i>Avant Propos</i>	3
The Beginning of a Sad Story	7
A "Splendid Galaxy of Expert Opinion"	10
Serious Errors on MFA Letterhead.....	24
"Je Cherche un Homme..." (Sequel)	29
"J'ACCUSE..."	35
A Letter by Professor Leonard D. DuBoff.....	52
Deplorable and Detrimental Statements by a Few Egyptologists	57
Refusal by Stanford University Museum.....	69
Letter by Dr. Fred H. Stross.....	85
An "Expert Opinion"	88
Drioton: " <i>Homme de Grand Savoir</i> "	101
Dr. D. Wildung Joins the Non-Believers.....	106
Re: Letter by Professor Andreina Leanza Becker-Colonna	106
An Open Letter to Prof. Dr. Dietrich Wildung.....	110
An Open Letter to Professor E. L. Ertman.....	114
Re: "Artnews"--The Mansoor Amarna Collection	117
Scientific Illiteracy Observed: A Report by IFAR	121
Some Common Sense to Ponder.....	126

A Scientific Report <i>par Excellence</i>	130
Summary and Conclusions, Plus.....	141

Acknowledgements

The members of the M. A. Mansoor family find no words to express their eternal gratitude to all those who helped--**or are still helping**--us in our just cause. It is impossible to name here all the persons who stood by us, many--so generously and so graciously--donating their knowledge, precious time and effort to help us vindicate the Mansoor Amarna Collection. Their names are truly engraved in our hearts.

Our deepest thanks to all and particularly to:

Anderson, John P., Esq.	Gruner, Professor John W.
Arnal, Professor Robert E.	Habachi, Dr. Labib
Bach, Dr. Otto Karl	Hay, Professor Richard L.
Badawy, Dr. Alexandre	Hutton, Professor C. Osborne
Barbacki, Professor Dr. S.	Iskander, Dr. Zaki
Bariand, Dr. Pierre	Kirk, Professor Paul L.
Becker-Colonna, Professor Andreina L.	Learned, Mrs. Terry G.
Berger, Professor Rainer	Lucas, Mr. Alfred
Bernstein, Professor Marian	McDermid, Dr. Nancy C.
Blackwelder, Professor Eliot	Majewski, Prof. Dr. Kazimierz
Blanc, Dr. Philippe	Mikhail, Dr. Edward H.
Boreux, Dr. Charles	Mustafa, Dr. Zahira
Briggs, Mrs. Mitzi	Nolli, Monsignor Gianfranco
Cochran, Jr. John M. III, Esq.	Peterson, John S., Esq.
Compton, Professor Robert R.	Plenderleith, Dr. Harold J.
Corrigan, Dr. Robert A.	Pozerikides, Ms. Dimitra
De Freitas, Dr. and Mrs. Gabriel	Prévot, Professor and Mrs. Jacques
De Ment, Dr. Jack	Protsch, Prof. Dr. Reiner RR
Desroches-Noblecourt, Dr. Christiane	Saad, Dr. Zaki
Drioton, Abbé Etienne	Silver, Professor Leon T.
DuBoff, Professor and Mrs. Leonard D.	Stross, Dr. and Mrs. Fred H.
Du Bourguet, Père Pierre	Trapp, Dr. Richard L.
Ellis, Professor Linda	Turner, Professor Francis J.
Fogarty, Professor John P.	Varille, Mr. Alexandre
Frankenstein, Dr. Alfred	Ward, Mr. and Mrs. Jay
Gabra, Professor Sami	Xanthos, Honorable Judge George

Special thanks to Mr. Maurice G. Melkonian and Mrs. Terri Nigro

- 2 -

and to
Edgard, Michel, Nabila, Henri, George and Christine Mansoor.

E.R.M.

Sworn Statement

I, the undersigned, Edmond Robert Mansoor, born in Cairo, Egypt in 1923, do hereby swear to God the following:

1) All of what I am writing now or will write later, quote, speak, or say about the Mansoor Amarna Limestone Collection is true. This is, of course, according to facts or events known to me, to the best of my knowledge and recollections - having always God as my guide and in my conscience.

2) My father, the antiquary, M. A. Mansoor, who also made it his profession to buy and sell Egyptian antiquities as well as jewelry and other artifacts, was a man of superior integrity, second to none. He has never attempted to sell anything that seemed to him to be doubtful, let alone fake. He was indeed more than convinced of the authenticity of his Amarna Collection and those who have known him and who are still alive will attest to these facts.

3) Although on a few occasions we did send, through attorneys, letters to a few museums and/or a few Egyptologists concerning the unfounded opinion, letters and/or rumors they were spreading and which were detrimental to the Mansoors and to their Amarna Collection, we *never* sued anyone or any institution. Our intention was to put an end to misleading and pernicious statements that are not in accordance with facts.

Edmond R. Mansoor

Avant Propos

It has been most distressful for me to write this dissertation or, rather, exposé to denounce some educational institutions as well as scholars for their acts regarding the Mansoor Amarna Collection. It has also been painful and time consuming to review events and all the facts of the last forty-six years. Plus researching Egyptological facts, to read and refresh my memory of what I learned years ago. Maybe someday, hopefully in the near future, a professional writer will write the whole story with all the facts surrounding the unique and magnificent Amarna Collection. Perhaps another Emile Zola will show up or possibly a journalist will do it. Is there a journalist who would like to volunteer for the task?

At the beginning, let it be known that I am unaware whether some of the people mentioned in this publication are living or dead. I do know about some, but not all. Consequently, whatever I am about to quote or write will be done with all reverence and respect, both to the living and the dead, having in mind not vengeance, but redress. In most instances, I am omitting the words "the late" from my writing.

• • • • •

The idea of the present dissertation/exposé nurtured in me for twenty years, i.e., since the publication of "Je Cherche un Homme..." (1971). But what mostly prompted me to write it now is a shameful and revolting rumor that originated from a leading Egyptologist and which came to my attention not too long ago. The long-repressed, sad, and tragic events have ballooned in my whole being and since I cannot contain them any longer, I have to air them.

The Ignoble Rumor: From a reliable source and which I heard in the presence of three other respectable gentlemen, the Mansoors supposedly brought a lawsuit against a German Egyptologist who is now afraid to even come to the USA for fear of being arrested. Just what kind of nonsense is this? That rumor is just as bad as the ignominious one I heard some eighteen years ago and which, most regretfully, came from a museum director in the USA, who told someone that the Mansoors are so dishonest that they should all be in jail!

The Mansoors, of course, discount entirely these rumors as pure fabrications created behind the scenes, whispered or uttered by a few misinformed persons, and which are based upon their total inability to substantiate valid reasons for their unfounded negative belief regarding the Mansoor Amarna Collection.

There has been, and there is still, malicious gossip and rumors about the Mansoors or their collection on the part of a few American as well as German Egyptologists, and I fear that their phantasmagorical pronouncements have mesmerized some of their colleagues who prefer not to contradict them. It goes without saying that the ill effect of the above rumors is not helping the Mansoors to have people view their collection with a clean look without prejudice. It has somewhat reduced their chances of selling it. But this is of no great consequence as the primary goal of the Mansoors was to completely vindicate their Amarna Collection and this has been successfully done in a scholarly manner.

From the artistic as well as the impressive and irrefutable scientific evaluation obtained, the Mansoor Amarna Collection stands tall on its own merits. Even though it may not be so in the minds of a few misinformed, prejudiced, or incompetent persons who are scientifically illiterate, and even though the vile rumors or gossip are still hammering it relentlessly and ruthlessly, the Collection is gaining recognition and respect from many scholars, art lovers, as well as serious and educated people of the highest integrity.

Rumors are despicable. They are definitely irresponsible for scholars. Those who spread them debase themselves, their name and reputation, as well as their profession and institution. The norms of ethics and decency require from true scholars to fully and personally investigate, research and scrutinize objectively and thoroughly any scientific matter which they discuss or study and on which they issue a scientific opinion or statement. To associate oneself with prejudice or incompetence is tantamount to being prejudiced or incompetent. In short, scholars should form a scientific opinion based entirely on their personal scientific knowledge without interference from hearsay. And if per chance a scholar cannot reach a decision after his study, there's no shame in acknowledging or admitting it, as not only is it a shame to condemn unjustly, but it is certainly immoral and, we believe, a crime to do so.

• • • • •

The main object of this dissertation is:

- 1) To mostly prevent and condemn unfounded rumors about the Mansoors or their Amarna Collection.
- 2) To air out true facts so people will know the TRUTH about the Mansoor Collection, as, according to the Chinese, "truth is always the strongest argument."
- 3) To remind people that *errare humanum est*, in other words that one human being, Mr. William J. Young, expert of the Museum of Fine Arts of Boston made an error, and that another human being, Dr. John D. Cooney, a Curator of Ancient Art of the Brooklyn Museum, followed suit - basing his opinion on Mr. Young's...
- 4) To ask true scholars, and particularly the Egyptologists, to investigate and study the Collection not only because the Mansoors firmly believe and know it is ancient, and not only because all logical stylistic and scientific facts point decisively to that direction, but because it contains a wealth of information that could and would certainly shed more light on the artistic period of Akhenaten.
- 5) To ask the authorities of the Museum of Fine Arts of Boston, Massachusetts to deny and retract their valueless unscientific report dated April 14, 1949. To persist so obstinately in their silence concerning the Mansoor "problem" is in defiance of the most elementary norms of justice, ethics, and decency unbecoming "a citadel of the spirit of man" as the MFA Boston proudly calls itself.
- 6) To ask the Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, N.Y. to retract and apologize for letters written on their letterhead by two former Curators of Ancient Art and which we consider destructive and infamous to say the least. These letters will be reproduced later.
- 7) Not to embarrass anyone or any institution. When quotations or letters are reproduced, it is only to show that the Mansoor Amarna Collection has been erroneously, unjustly and/or unscientifically condemned. If my personal comments, remarks, and opinion are added, I believe I am entitled to make them not only to protect the Collection and

preserve the Mansoor reputation from calumnies, but also to dispel any doubt in the minds of the skeptical.

- 8) Finally, to prevent other individuals from going through a similar ordeal.

• • • • •

The reader should note that if I will be using "we" instead of "I" in most of the dissertation, it is because many of the events have happened to various members of the Mansoor family and some are writing with me--particularly Edgard, Michel and Henri Mansoor. The first one, Edgard, has deluged me with quotes from many scholars and lack of room does not permit me to include them all. The names and works of great Egyptologists like Aldred, Desroches-Noblecourt, Drioton, Martin, Redford and others are well known to him, and through the years and particularly in the last two, he has gratified me with an avalanche of remarks concerning the stylistic and artistic evaluation of our Amarna sculptures as compared to other authentic Amarnas in world museums. From the scientific aspect, Edgard read all the reports available on the Collection over and over, again and again, and he knows by heart most, if not all of the convincing and unquestionable evidence pertaining to the ancient surface patination.

• • • • •

I beg forgiveness and tolerance from the reader if at times I get personal. I also beg forgiveness and understanding if I display emotional outbursts, as when I am writing I simply cannot help remembering all the Mansoors went through in over forty years of uphill fight. Indeed, such deplorable memories can degenerate into outrage.

No true account can ever be given of what the Mansoors have spent in time, effort, or the hard-earned hundreds of thousands of dollars during what seems to be an eternity. Can any person of integrity do less when his lifetime's work or reputation is at stake or even in jeopardy?

No true account can ever be given of how much the members of the Mansoor family have suffered physically and emotionally in all those very long repressed years. How can they forget the tremendous frustration and exasperation sustained, and which they held back so long, when their numerous calls and cries for help to Egyptologists and museums went unheeded? How can I describe the angst, anger, and anguish, the anxiety and depression, the immense pain and torment we have endured in the last forty-six years? What words shall I find for the multiple wounds inflicted upon us and upon our Amarna Collection and which seem impossible to heal. And if and when they do and become ugly scars and stigmas, they are ruptured and bleed again and again from more and more blows! How much "blood," if any, can a director emeritus of an American museum draw "re the Mansoor 'problem?'"

• • • • •

To get better acquainted with the story of the Mansoor Amarna Collection, the writer suggests to the reader to refer to any or all of the following:

- 1) Stross, Fred H., in "ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY," Authentication of Antique Stone Objects by Physical and Chemical Methods. American Chemical Society, Washington, D.C., March 1960. pp. 17A-24A.

- 2) Stross, Fred H. and Eisenlord, W.J. "A Report on a Group of Limestone Carvings Owned by M. A. Mansoor and Sons." 1965.
- 3) Mansoor, Edmond R., "Je Cherche un Homme...," 1971.
- 4) Becker-Colonna, Andreina Leanza. "ANCIENT EGYPT - AN EXHIBITION OF EL-AMARNA SCULPTURES AND RELIEFS OF THE M. A. MANSOOR COLLECTION." San Francisco State University. 1975.
- 5) Nolli, Gianfranco and Becker-Colonna, Andreina Leanza. "IN DEFENCE OF THE MANSOOR-AMARNA COLLECTION." June 1986.
- 6) Becker-Colonna, Andreina Leanza. "ANCIENT EGYPT. IInd. Exhibition of Sculptures and Reliefs from the M. A. Mansoor El-Amarna Collection." San Francisco State University. 1986.
- 7) Becker-Colonna, Andreina Leanza. ANCIENT EGYPT - MANSOOR-EL-AMARNA COLLECTION. San Francisco State University. 1991.

The above publications can be obtained from libraries with extensive Egyptological books. If not found, copies, if available and while they last, can be obtained by writing on institution's letterhead to the authors.

Since my retirement, due to health reasons, my conscience has been bothering me constantly for not exposing to the world the truth about the Mansoor Collection. And, at this age in my condition, I cannot afford but to say the truth since at any time, I could take that long extended one-way trip to a Foreign Place...where I will have to account for my actions to the Great One. So, I will confine myself to the truth, so help me God.

E.R.M.

The Beginning of a Sad Story

The fascinating, incredible and indeed tragic story of the Mansoor Amarna Collection is impossible to tell in detail as a myriad of events happened since its acquisition. Unless we write a book in few volumes, which is not the case here, we shall never be able to do it completely. Nevertheless, we shall try to give a true account of some of the important and outstanding facts which will confirm to the reader that the Collection is incontestably ancient and indeed from the period of Akhenaten and Nefertiti, perhaps even the work of B'k and his students.

To get a clear picture, let the following facts be known:

- 1) M. A. Mansoor, our honorable and venerable father, started his reputable antique business in Cairo, Egypt in 1904. He acquired the first objects of the Amarna Collection in the early twenties and the last were purchased in the early forties. Precise dates or records are not available as his place of business in the world-famous Shepherd's Hotel, and all his inventory of unique and priceless treasures, were totally destroyed in the Cairo riots and fire of January 26, 1952, which leveled the old and historic hotel (cf. Nelson, Nina. Shepherd's Hotel. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1960, pp. 5-6).
- 2) The Collection was purchased from the antique dealer Tawadros Girgis Ghoubrial, a serious and respectable Copt from Quena, noted for his integrity.
- 3) In 1936, the University of Cairo purchased a white limestone bas-relief of Akhenaten to offer to King Farouk on the occasion of his ascent to the throne. About the same time, the Queen Mother Nazli bought a standing figurine of a princess to give Farouk as a birthday gift. And in the next twelve years or so, the king himself, who was an avid antiques and art collector, particularly of ancient Egyptian art, purchased ten more Amarna objects. All were purchased from M. A. Mansoor.
- 4) ***The Beginning of Deadly Rumors.*** In the late thirties, some Egyptian newspapers published photographs of Farouk's Amarna acquisitions. From fear of losing much business, two Cairo antique dealers, MM. Maurice Nahman and Phocion Tano, spread rumors that the Mansoor Amarna objects were spurious. In fact, Tano had the audacity to offer Farouk, for purpose of purchase, an ugly Amarna-type head in quartzite adding it was a forgery similar to the Mansoor Amarnas. Worried, the young King summoned to Abdin Palace Dr. Etienne Drioton, the illustrious Egyptologist, who was then Director General of the Egyptian Antiquities Department and who complied, taking along Dr. Charles Boreux, Curator of Egyptian Art at the Louvre and who was visiting Egypt at the time. After they were shown the Amarna sculptures, both Egyptologists congratulated Farouk and asked where he had gotten them. They visited the antiquary M. A. Mansoor afterwards admiring at length his Amarnas as well as the other ancient Egyptian relics he had in his "Shepherd's museum." From that time on and until he left Egypt in 1952, Dr. Drioton was a regular visitor to Mansoor's Gallery.
- 5) "Some of the objects were offered for sale to the Cairo Museum in the forties. As they represented objects of prime importance and value, one of the foremost experts in the fields of forensic chemistry and Egyptology, the late A. Lucas, was retained by the Cairo Museum to render an authoritative opinion regarding the objects. His short, but carefully considered report concluded that the evidence was strongly in favor of the authenticity of the objects." (Stross, Fred H. ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY, 1960. p. 18A). It should be noted that Alfred Lucas wrote 65 works in all, many of which still remain fundamental. Among them: *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*. Fourth Ed. rev. by J. R. Harris. Edward Arnold. London, 1962. A. Lucas, onetime chief chemist,

Egyptian Museum Laboratories, Cairo; consultant, forensic and geological chemistry. He was educated at the School of Mines, London, and the Royal College of Science and worked for eight years for the Government Laboratory in London. He also worked for nine winters with Howard Carter on the objects found in the tomb of Tutankhamen. For more references on Lucas, see *WHO WAS WHO IN EGYPTOLOGY*, The Egypt Exploration Society, London. 1972.

- 6) At the request of Dr. Ambrose Lansing, Curator of Egyptian Art at the Metropolitan Museum in New York, N.Y., who wanted to see some of the Amarna sculptures, the Mansoors came to the USA for the first time in 1947. After admiring and examining at great length the Amarnas they had with them at the time, Dr. Lansing was satisfied and convinced of their authenticity. Since a sizable amount of money was involved, he suggested to the Mansoors to submit the sculptures to Mr. William J. Young, Director of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts Laboratory, for the purpose of confirming their authenticity.
- 7) ***The Beginning of an Eternal Nightmare.*** Two Amarna heads were then examined by Mr. William J. Young who declared on October 27, 1947, i.e., 46 years ago, that: "We have had to throw the book at the objects as far as examinations are concerned.... The larger of the two heads was examined from a minute fragment and appears not to be a natural material," and that "it shows all the indications of being a made stone which could be fabricated in a great many ways." When challenged by the Mansoors on his assertion, Mr. Young submitted the sculptures to Professor E. S. Larsen, an eminent Harvard geologist. After a careful examination, Professor Larsen stated that the material was indeed a natural foraminiferous limestone. Despite the fact that Mr. Young had failed to recognize and identify the material as a natural limestone, he was allowed to proceed with his technical examination of the Amarna objects. This time he was given nine sculptures to ensure a wider variety of weathered surfaces for study. After a year and a half of discussions, correspondence, hesitation and preconceived thought on the part of Mr. Young that the sculptures were not ancient, he finally submitted the report of his findings on October 14, 1949, concluding that the objects were "of fairly modern origin" without in any way giving factual or rational scientific evidence for this assertion. It goes without saying that his report has been highly criticized by all scientists who have commented on it as we shall see later.
- 8) Since we, the Mansoors, were still residing in Egypt in 1949 and had not yet emigrated to the USA, we did not care too much at the time about Mr. Young's report, particularly that we were told by Egyptian scientists that it was not worth anything as it was meaningless and unscientific. The Egyptian Museum was still considering the purchase of the Collection. Consequently, we informed Dr. Drioton about Mr. Young's unfavorable opinion. To dispel any doubt, Drs. Zaki Iskander and Zahira Mustafa were asked, in 1950, to examine all 66 Amarna objects we had in Cairo at the time. (Dr. Iskander, formerly Chief Chemist of the Research Laboratory of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo; then Director General for Technical Affairs, Department of Antiquities, Egypt. Dr. Zahira Mustafa, Chemist of the Research Laboratory of the Egyptian Museum). Their long, detailed and indeed scientific report, dated November 28, 1950, was conclusive: "From all the above arguments and explanations, we find that all points favour the genuineness of all the objects under consideration."

In 1950, after the appearance of the reports of Lucas, Iskander and Mustafa, which we distributed widely to many Egyptologists and museums, we thought it would carry weight, particularly that the three eminent scientists were attached to the Egyptian Museum. But it was too late. It had just

the opposite effect. In fact, the favorable scientific reports infuriated the few American Egyptologists who had become champions of the negative opinion. Imagine how naive we were to think for a moment that they were going to retract or change their opinions since, as of the first phenomenal pronouncement of Young on October 27, 1947 that the stone was not natural, they were stating right and left that the Mansoor Amarna sculptures were forgeries!

Since the early fifties, the ugly gossip and rumors began to progress reaching eventually mammoth proportions as years went by. From despicable, they became ignominious. The reason? We were persisting in our appeals and the Amarna Collection became a "problem" to some Egyptologists and museum directors. As for the Mansoors, they became *personae non gratae* in certain museum circles. To our distress, we discovered that it is positively taboo to think of contradicting any opinion issued by some of the leading Egyptologists of the time. These few Egyptologists had an iron-clad grip on their colleagues who would not oppose them.

• • • • •

A "Splendid Galaxy of Expert Opinion"

It occurred to us in the late fifties that the positive reports we had of Lucas, Iskander and Mustafa may never be taken into consideration by American Egyptologists and museums since the authors were foreigners, two Egyptians and one British. Consequently, we had to secure others from eminent American and European scientists who might either verify or criticize the reports obtained: the one of Young and those of Lucas, Iskander and Mustafa.

From 1958 on, several sculptures from the Mansoor Amarna Collection were sent to renowned scientists in the fields of Geology, Petrology, Mineralogy, Chemistry, Microchemistry, and Geochemistry, in order to determine the time elapsed since the surface of the objects was shaped. To our knowledge, no ancient works of art have been subjected to as many and varied scientific tests as the Mansoor Amarna sculptures. Numerous relevant methods of examination were applied, and every aspect relating to the nature of the stone, surface patination, dendritic formations, erosion, surface pitting, organic excretions, resistance of the patina to solvents, chemical explanation of the patina formation, etc. was studied, and rational scientific evidence given clearly in detail as a result of each and every test.

Besides *Lucas, Iskander* and *Mustafa*, the distinguished scholars we are citing below were all unanimous in their conclusion that the sculptures are indeed genuine antiquities.

Dr. Robert R. Compton, Professor of Geology, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, was the first American scientist to be contacted in the USA, in 1958. He studied thirteen sculptures, among them the largest in the Mansoor collection, the nearly life-size bust of Akhenaten. He was also given the report of Young dated April 4, 1949 and the one of Iskander and Mustafa of 28. 11. 1950. He was not given the names of the experts who issued the two reports. We quote the last paragraph of Professor Compton's report before his conclusions; he wrote:

"Finally, with regard to the two reports already made on the Mansoor collection, that one dated 28-11-50 [of Iskander and Mustafa] seems to me to be well-founded petrologically. It covers many items that only someone with knowledge of Egyptology could present, and I note that this report concludes that the pieces are authentic. The report dated April 14, 1949, [W. J. Young's, MFA Boston] is based mainly on petrologic and mineralogic points, and I feel that most of these are weak, to say the least. As far as I can see, the fluorescence tests offer nothing to indicate the pieces are not old, nor does the author state just what is the "false condition" he refers to. His comments on his microscopic examinations, too, offer nothing tangible to cause question of the age and authenticity of the pieces, yet he somehow concludes that the pieces are 'of fairly modern origin.' Perhaps his error has been in comparing these pieces with ancient pieces that were weathered under different conditions, probably mainly exposed at the surface; however, it is impossible to judge his conclusions critically since he offers little evidence of how he arrived at them.

"My own conclusions may be summarized as follows:

- 1) The pieces are entirely of natural stone, with no fillings or paste of any kind.
- 2) All are weathered in a mechanical way that is exactly suitable to the conditions under which they are reported to have been found.
- 3) Attempts to duplicate this weathering by chemical means produced an entirely different effect than that on the surface of the pieces.

- 4) All other surface effects observed point strongly to the fact that the pieces are not forgeries.
- 5) Taking this work and the other reports together, it can safely be concluded that these sculptures are of ancient origin."

Dr. Eliot Blackwelder, Professor of Geology, Emeritus, Stanford University, California. Member of the National Academy of Science, 1959. It is noteworthy to mention his quote:

"I do not find the report of Mr. Young convincing. For many of his assertions he has supplied no satisfactory evidence."

Dr. Robert E. Arnal, Professor of Geology, San Jose State University, California, 1959. In his evaluation of previous reports, Professor Arnal wrote:

"I have read three reports evaluating the sculptures of the Mansoor Collection. The excellent report of Professor Compton, Stanford University, is obviously that of a well-qualified geologist. He brings several good lines of evidence, especially concerning the mechanical weathering, which favors strongly the authenticity of the sculptures. The report of Dr. Zaki Iskander dated November 28, 1950, is very extensive and indicates a broad knowledge of Egyptology. All his conclusions also favor the authenticity of the sculptures. On the contrary, the report of Mr. Young of the Boston Museum is mostly the expression of an opinion based on very weak evidence to say the least."

Also for his detailed and extensive report, Professor Arnal is indeed precise and unequivocal. His conclusions:

"I will summarize my conclusions by saying that:

1. The sculptures are made entirely of natural rock which contains no artificial filling.
2. The weathered surface is a natural one and was produced over a long period of time.
3. The fluorescence method is not reliable and any opinion on the authenticity of these sculptures based on the use of this method should be disregarded.
4. The artistic value of these sculptures has been established by one of the foremost experts in the field.
5. It can be stated that these sculptures are authentic and of ancient origin."

Professor Leon T. Silver, Geochemistry Laboratory, Division of Geological Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, 1959. The impressive and indeed outstanding report of Professor Silver is reproduced entirely in "Je Cherche un Homme..." pp. 30-34.

In "A Report on a Group of Limestone Carvings Owned by M. A. Mansoor and Sons," Dr. Fred H. Stross and Mr. William J. Eisenlord, p. 16, wrote:

"Perhaps the most incontrovertible evidence, however, was contributed by Professor Silver. The method used for the purpose is based on recent discoveries, and was ingeniously developed for the case under study. The principle is simply that objects

exposed to the action of desert weathering conditions suffer the surface change known as patination not only physically, but also chemically.

"In 1958, Engel and Sharp showed that in natural desert patina, the so-called 'desert varnish,' manganese oxides are invariably enriched more than most other elements. This enrichment process is a very slow one whose precise rate or mechanism is not known, but geologists consider this a reliable indicator of ancient weathered surfaces. Silver took several samples from the surfaces of two objects, as well as from the interior of the same objects. When comparing the compositions of the samples taken from the interior with those taken from the surface by spectroscopic analysis, he found in both cases that the surface samples showed a significant enrichment in manganese, and even more distinctly in barium and copper, all elements mentioned by Engel and Sharp as being among those showing greatest enrichment in the varnish.

"In summarizing the superficial effects of the two processes, weathering and patination, which in some ways work against each other, Kirk has stated that it would be difficult to conceive of forging either of them as observed, but impossible to imagine them being achieved together. Even more remote is the possibility of artificially achieving the more far-reaching effects described in the preceding paragraphs, especially since it would have had to be done before the 1920's or nearly thirty-five years before the discovery of the selective enrichment of certain elements in 'desert varnish.'"

Dr. Jack De Ment, De Ment Laboratories, Portland, Oregon, 1959. We quote from his report:

"At the outset, from a study of the Young Report, it is clear that Mr. Young:

- a) did not fully understand the tool with which he was working, i.e., the ultraviolet lamp;
- b) and compounded upon this lack of understanding did not properly and correctly interpret such results as he may have obtained...

"In view of the foregoing remarks, and in the carefully considered opinion of the present investigator, the report of Mr. W. J. Young, dated 14 April, 1949, wherein Mr. Young's so-called 'purple fluorescence' is alleged to 'clearly indicate that the pieces in question are of fairly modern origin,' is:

- a) Weak, subjective, and without meaning as set in its present form;
- b) Fraught with erroneous conclusions based upon inadequate experience and understanding with and of ultraviolet light and fluorescence compounded with a complete inability to interpret the results of visual fluorescence analysis;
- c) Indicative of lack of objectivity and lack of carefulness an otherwise competent scientist would rely upon;
- d) To be completely disregarded in any serious appraisal of a body of evidence relating to the authenticity, or lack of same, of the Mansoor sculpturings."

We also would like to quote from Dr. De Ment's report, p. 19, the "SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS." He wrote:

"In view of (a) what is felt to be a thorough study and collation of the gist of ten reports and letter-reports relating to the Mansoor Collection of Egyptian Sculpturings, and (b) the results obtained by the present investigator, the following conclusions are drawn by this writer about the three Mansoor objects identified in Section I hereof:

- (1) The report of W. J. Young of the Boston Museum, including a purported fluorescence analysis, lacks factual and objective bases, for the reasons given in Section III (discussing the Young Report), and should be eliminated in any serious appraisal of a body of evidence regarding the authenticity, or lack of same, of the Mansoor objects.
- (2) Fluorescence analysis made in this laboratory of the three Mansoor objects confirms the statement made under (1) supra.
- (3) Fluorescence analysis made in this laboratory of the three Mansoor objects shows that these objects have had a history of chemomechanical and/or biochemomechanical alteration consistent with authenticity and substantial age.
- (4) Visible, ultraviolet, and infrared photographic investigations made in this laboratory on the three Mansoor objects show features consistent with authenticity and substantial age.
- (5) Spectrochemical analysis as well as microscopic studies, together with a close scrutiny of known facts regarding the nature of patina, are all consistent with authenticity and substantial age.
- (6) It is therefore the considered opinion of the present writer that the three Mansoor sculptures he has examined are genuine and correctly represented as defined by the limits of the investigational techniques (a) employed and reported upon herein and (b) employed and reported upon in the previous reports substantiating authenticity."

Dr. Paul L. Kirk, professor of Microchemistry, University of California, Berkeley; Technical Investigations. Berkeley, 1959.

We quote the beginning of Dr. Kirk's report:

"Brief examination was made of several small sculptured articles supplied by Mr. E. Mansoor from his collection. One of these, a head 4_ inches in length, sculptured from a brownish-pink limestone, was examined more extensively."

Commenting on the previous reports obtained, Dr. Kirk wrote:

"The sole report in which the authenticity of these sculptures is brought into question is that of W. J. Young. His report is chiefly impressive for its lack of reasoned conclusions, and the distinct impression that he is expressing only a personal opinion that he does not believe the sculptures to be genuine; hence, any observation he makes is so interpreted. His conclusions from examination with ultraviolet light cannot be given unqualified acceptance by anyone experienced in the technique.

"The additional reports give support to the authenticity of the objects as being of ancient origin, and excellent experimental work and logical conclusions are present to a degree in most of them. It can be accepted that the material is genuine limestone, containing many Foraminifera, and various mineral inclusions other than calcium

carbonate. Dendrites of manganic oxide are apparent, more commonly in fissures than on the surface in the specimen examined."

For "Summary" of his report, Dr. Kirk wrote:

"Comparison of the possibilities of genuine antiquity as the cause of the condition of the surface of the object examined with those of counterfeiting of this condition indicates very strongly that the object is in its present condition as a result of long weathering.

"The erosion of the surface, along with its patina, could not have been duplicated so precisely by rapid methods without leaving tell-tale failures and errors that could be located and interpreted.

"Not only the surface itself, but the markings on it, the erosion around raised manganic oxide particles, and other detailed features, are all in accord with the genuine antiquity of the object examined."

Dr. Francis J. Turner, Professor of Geology, University of California, Berkeley, Member of the National Academy of Sciences, 1960. We quote from the San Francisco Sunday Examiner and Chronicle of February 9, 1969: "Prof. Francis J. Turner of the University of California has been awarded the Lyell Medal of the Geology Society of London, one of the highest honors in his scientific field. The medal is given annually in the name of Sir Charles Lyell, one of the founders of modern geology and is rarely awarded to an American... The medal will be presented to Dr. Turner on April 23 in London at the annual meeting of the society, the oldest body of its kind in the world. Dr. Turner, a specialist on petrology, and the author and co-author of many books and scientific papers, was awarded the medal on the basis of his overall work in his field. He has received many other academic honors, including the Sterling Fellowship from Yale University, two Guggenheim Fellowships, the Hector Medal of the Royal Society of New Zealand, and a Fullbright Fellowship. His major work, co-authored with UC geophysicist John Verhoogen, 'Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology,' is a standard text for advanced students in geological research and has been translated into several languages..."

We quote all what Professor Turner wrote:

"After a rather cursory examination of the three sculptured heads submitted by you, and a careful perusal of the complete file of reports and correspondence on the Amarna limestone heads, I am glad to offer the following comments.

- (1) I do not know of any scientific test by which the relative age (even "ancient" versus "modern") of a sculptured stone surface can be determined with certainty. Any statement regarding the modern or ancient age of the sculptured surfaces which you submitted to me can only be a matter of opinion. Such an opinion, it is true, may be relatively sound if it is consistent with convincing evidence scientifically established by adequate techniques; or, in the absence of such evidence, it may be dismissed as scientifically worthless speculation.
- (2) Since you have already obtained a number of reports from well-known experts in various appropriate fields who have examined the sculptures by a wide variety of techniques, it would serve no good purpose for me or any other petrographer to go over the same ground again. The authenticity of the heads must be judged on the basis of reports now available, taking into

account also the opinion (not yet received) of my colleague, Professor C. O. Hutton, Stanford University, who enjoys the highest reputation in the field of microchemical mineralogy.

- (3) Certain of the reports submitted by you, notably those by R. R. Compton (1958), R. E. Arnal (1959), P. L. Kirk (1959), and L. T. Silver (1959), are models of clarity and scientific reasoning. The methods used are clearly stated, the evidence so obtained is set out in detail, and conclusions are stated without ambiguity. These consultants are scientists highly skilled in applying special techniques in investigating minerals and stones.
- (4) The report of W. J. Young (4-14-49) by contrast carries no conviction. The evidence cited by him gives no indication of the relative age of the sculptured stone surfaces. His comments are couched in language that in places is meaningless to a scientists (e.g., the last lines in his comments on specimens 233 and 124). The report and appended "remarks and conclusions" cannot be taken seriously as a solution to your problem.
- (5) In the American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. 61, pp. 248-249, 1957, there appears a published article by W. J. Young, reporting on the nature of the marble from which was carved a statue of Trajan in the Fogg Museum. This report deals with aspects of the petrography, texture and chemistry of marble in which I claim some degree of expert knowledge. In my opinion, the techniques employed by Mr. Young, in this case, were unsuited to the problem and could not be expected to contribute to its solution. Other techniques, adequate to solve the problem, he ignored. The conclusions reached by him regarding the Fogg Trajan were, in my opinion, completely without foundation. From this limited experience, I am inclined to view Mr. Young's pronouncements on mineralogical and petrographic problems with some skepticism.
- (6) The evidence collectively supplied in the reports submitted to me, is consistent with the opinion of the majority of your consultants, that the heads are authentic ancient sculptures. I see no reason against accepting them as authentic."

Dr. C. Osborne Hutton, Professor of Mineralogy, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1960. In reviewing the aforementioned reports, Professor Hutton wrote:

"All of the reports, except that due to Mr. W. J. Young, present evidence along many lines that lead to only one conclusion, namely, that the objects studied are genuine antiquities. Furthermore, the data set out in the sole report that casts doubt upon the authenticity of the objects (W. J. Young) are, in my opinion, imprecisely expressed, and scientifically unsound in a number of respects. In this connection at least two points should be clearly understood:

- (1) Mr. Young expresses the opinion that because the objects studied by him fluoresce in ultraviolet light, under the conditions imposed by him, they are, necessarily, of recent manufacture. I believe that the data and statements set out by De Ment Laboratories and by Mr. R. E. Arnal effectively destroy Mr. Young's position in this direction.

- (2) If I have interpreted his phraseology correctly, Mr. Young states that the form of the dendrites in the sculptures points to absence of antiquity. Mr. Compton, and Mr. Silver in particular, point out that there has been growth or creep of manganese oxides and/or hydroxides at the surface, and that erosion has caused the manganese oxide/hydroxide efflorescences to exhibit some relief above the limestone surface. These findings, by the latter two investigators, definitely support the belief that the surfaces are of considerable age, and contradict Mr. Young's position on this matter.

"Furthermore, the characteristics of the erosion surfaces, together with the relief and polish exhibited by foraminifera and other organic remains, the lack of evidence of artificial polish on some broken, but not very recent, surfaces, the gradation of thin surface patina into less altered limestone, and several other situations, clearly support the conclusion of great age. Furthermore, there is no need to go into the question of the nature of the stone used because this has been shown quite definitely to be natural limestone devoid of any "paste" or artificial filling.

"There is one line of evidence, however, that is, in my opinion, of very special significance; this concerns the data obtained by Mr. Silver on the relative amounts of several critical trace elements in the surface stone, and in the interior of the objects tested. Mr. Silver has found definite evidence of relative enrichment of the outer surfaces in manganese, barium, and copper, whether the color is grey or yellow, and this critical evidence, more than anything else, weighs most heavily in favor of the antiquity of the objects studied. In fact, this is the only plausible explanation that may be offered to account for the selective enrichment of the surface layers in these elements.

"After a careful consideration of the data set out in all of the reports submitted for review, I am of the opinion that the weight of evidence is most definitely in favor of the genuine antiquity of the sculptures studied by the investigators, and I am unable to find any significant or critical data that would support Mr. W. J. Young's conclusions in any way whatsoever."

Dr. Fred H. Stross, Research Associate, Archaeological Research Facility, Department of Anthropology, University of California at Berkeley. Participating Guest, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, UC Berkeley, which is world-famous for its advanced and pioneering research in nuclear physics and chemistry, including neutron activation analysis for archaeological objectives. Dr. Stross has organized symposia and has lectured internationally on the application of the physical sciences to archaeology and authentication of art objects. He is also Consultant to the Lowie Museum of Anthropology as well as The University Art Museum at the University of California, Berkeley.

The unflinching, positive and absolute conviction of Dr. Stross, re the Mansoor Amarna Collection, cannot be told in a few paragraphs or chapters. Perhaps a volume is required to give a true account of his magnificent work on these sculptures. Indeed, since 1949 and to date, this eminent scientist has been seriously interested in the Collection studying in detail every single object as well as the reports pertaining to the Collection. Besides his outstanding and unequivocal first article on the sculptures, "Authentication of Antique Stone Objects by Physical and Chemical Methods," which appeared in "Analytical Chemistry," March 1960, and besides his private publication in association with W. J. Eisenlord titled "A Report on a Group of Limestone Carvings Owned by M. A. Mansoor and Sons," 1965, and which was distributed to many museums, Egyptologists and others, Dr. Stross has given numerous talks and written many articles on the Collection. We quote the conclusion of his first article published in Analytical Chemistry, March 1960: "Thus the expanded armamentarium of the chemist and spectroscopist offers weapons to the collector and student of the ancient arts that in many cases

should convince the most skeptical individual as surely as the advent of radiocarbon dating has done in its field of application."

Professor John W. Gruner, Geology and Mineralogy, University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, wrote on October 11, 1960:

"I read the copies and articles you sent me and agree completely with the opinions of the expert mineralogists you consulted. It would be practically impossible to forge the dendritic manganese wad and other hydroxides that you describe. On this you may quote me. I think you have nothing to fear from this angle of the argument.

"To send me one of your sculptures for examination would put you to additional expense and not change my conclusions."

Dr. Harold J. Plenderleith. Formerly Keeper of the Research Laboratory of the British Museum, then Director, International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (UNESCO), Rome, 1961.

Following is the entire statement given to us by Dr. Plenderleith:

"TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

"I have handled one or two specimens from the Mansoor Collection of limestone figurines from Tell El Amarna that were stated to be typical of the collection, looked at the surfaces with a magnifier, but have made no laboratory examination. I have been shown a number of scientific reports, summaries of these in a review by Professor C. O. Hutton, Stanford University, California, as well as photographs taken in daylight, U.V. and I.R. illumination and after studying these I have read Dr. Stross in *Analytical Chemistry*, March 1960.

"My first impression of the great interest attaching to these specimens remains. That the collection has been considered to be "too good to be true" by some is understandable for the specimens submitted to me showed "wear" (degradation), but very little actual deterioration after 3,000 years; they were all very clean; there was little damage of such a nature, as to impair their value as art or historic objects, finely chiselled noses, chins, etc. having survived where thick necks had been broken; and a curious freshness of line attracted attention, made by the sculptor's point, which remained rather whitish in the textured and coloured limestone. In regard to the laboratory reports submitted, it may be sufficient to state that I find the published account of Dr. Stross entirely convincing and to my mind it is not essential to carry any laboratory enquiry as to genuineness further, the case having been amply proved.

"Interest lies rather in trying to understand and explain the discrepancies in the reports. Granted that the conclusions in certain instances are incompatible I find on studying the observations upon which deductions have been made that these are not *necessarily incompatible*. Thus, I have a strong impression that the objects seen by me had never been exposed to weathering in the normal sense, i.e., exposed in the open. I regard the degraded surfaces of stone as having arisen from natural burial in sharp sand. A grinding phenomenon then operates through the years as is well-known and can even result, in extreme cases, in the loss of shape of compact bone and sometimes in its entire disappearance! The fine tool lines referred to above as "being whitish" were possibly caked over by a protective layer through the ages and the general clean appearance of

all specimens suggests the washtub, probably with brushing that could easily result in ambiguity in the interpretation of U.V. fluorescences.

"In my considered opinion, it would be as serious a mistake to underestimate the importance of scientific investigation as to consider that a lack of unanimity in the conclusions warrants a decision against the genuineness of the Egyptian antiquities for, as I have analysed the evidence before me, the inescapable conclusion is that there is over-riding agreement as to their genuineness.

"It is because of this conviction that I am taking the exceptional step of making this gratuitous statement in the hope that after 20 years of doubt it may be a factor in restoring confidence."

Signed: Harold J. Plenderleith
Director

Prof. Dr. Reiner RR Protsch, Department of Palaeoanthropology+ Archaeometry (C-14+Amino-acid Laboratories), J. W. Goethe University, Frankfurt/Main, Germany. 1976.

Dr. Protsch examined eighteen pieces of the Mansoor Amarna sculptures and his excellent "Expertise of the Mansoor Collection" has been inserted entirely in "In Defence...pp. 39-46." We quote from his detailed anthropological-morphological examination:

"...The morphological examination concentrated on the following points:

- 1) Physical features of Nefertiti and Akhenaton which might appear in their daughters.
- 2) Comparison of physical features of the Akhenaton and Nefertiti individuals of the Mansoor Collection to other known collections, i.e., Berlin and Kairo.
- 3) Comparison of physical features of the princesses to other known representations of other collections, i.e., Berlin and Kairo.
- 4) How many of the 6 daughters of Akhenaton and Nefertiti are actually represented in the Mansoor Collection.

"The detailed morphological analysis concentrated on 18 pieces of the collection over a five months period. The analysis started with an eight day work on the above named pieces and further detailed work at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) followed by work at the J. W. Goethe University, Frankfurt, BRD in the Department of Palaeoanthropology and Chronology.

"Akhenaton and Nefertiti. Many physical features of the princesses are indeed those of Akhenaton and Nefertiti. The detailed work of the heads, especially anatomical details by the artist, shows his excellent powers of observation of anatomical details of both parents and children. This in my opinion can only be done if the Royal Family was sitting for the artist. A recent production of these heads is only possible if the artist had constantly over many years access to some original sculptures requiring him to be an excellent artist as well as an anatomist. Even for an outstanding present day anatomist and artist it would be hard to produce such morphological details which shows a positive

relationship between parents and daughters. Nearly all important morphological features of the Royal Family known from such collections of the Berlin and Kairo Museums are, with some minor stylistic differences, represented in the Mansoor Collection pieces.

"If the Mansoor Collection was produced in recent times, copying would only be possible if an artist had constant access to an original collection like those of the above museums over a period of many years.

"...In their overall morphology all heads of the princesses of the Mansoor Collection are the same as that head of the Berlin Museum, examined by Gerhardt in 1967 (Berlin 21223). The only possibility of a recent origin of these heads of the Mansoor Collection would be, as pointed out above, the access of an artist in modern times to a collection like the one in Berlin over an extensive time period.

"...I could go into more anatomical details, but the above should suffice, especially when it is obvious that all heads, and especially one, are apart from minor details and differences which are those normally showing up in different individuals morphologically and anthropologically the same as Berlin 21223. They are also very similar to Berlin 21364, Kairo 44869, and Kairo 44870. Some features also remind of Berlin 17951, especially the overall form of the head. Berlin 21223 possibly represents the same princess as the Mansoor Collection 6"x3_" head in pink limestone. Differences between the six princesses, represented in the Mansoor Collection by nine heads, are solely due to expression, with some individual differences of nose, chin, eyes, the occipital, and the size of the neck. All heads are eury-, pseudodolichomorphic. Since they are still fairly young but have already attained at least 95% of their adult brain capacity, it can be expected that with full adult growth the peculiar head-form will become less pronounced.

"The six statuettes of the princesses possibly represent five different individuals. The statuettes size 14_"x6"x3" and 8"x3"x2" are those of the same individual. No comparisons to other statuettes could be made, since the author is unaware of any others for comparison. Body form and proportions are, however, very similar to those of Akhenaton. Facial features, expressions etc., when compared to those heads of the princesses, are quite similar.

"The anatomical knowledge of the artist is astonishing and it is only possible to copy these details from a living individual. A comparison to those pieces of the Berlin and Kairo Museums (Gerhardt 1967) was done by this author on purpose, since those pieces have been in the Museums for long periods of time unavailable to anyone for copying. Apart from minor stylistic differences, differences between the Mansoor Collection and the Berlin and Kairo Collections of princesses do not exist. A person not trained to observe anatomical detail might make the mistake of concentrating on differences in style.

"I can only reach the conclusion that if the Berlin and Kairo pieces are genuine, which could be solely due to different workmanship by different artists, those pieces of the Mansoor Collection are also genuine."

Dr. Rainer Berger, Professor of Anthropology, Geography and Geophysics, University of California (UCLA), Los Angeles, 1976.

We quote the first ten paragraphs of Dr. Berger's "Evaluation" of the "Mansoor Amarna Collection."

"Recently two Amarna sculptures of the Mansoor Collection were analyzed to determine if they are genuine artifacts or not. The objects tested are Fig. 6 and 19 of that collection and representative in general appearance of the other pieces.¹

"Both sculptures or heads tested are made from a fine-grained foraminiferal limestone of not always strictly uniform composition. One of the heads of Akhenaton is made of a more pink variety of limestone whereas the other is composed of a pale yellow-hued off-white limestone (head of princess).

"In either case, the heads are composed throughout of stone as can be ascertained from modern mounting holes bored through the neck portions in the direction of the head in the usual manner. No artificial substitutes such as plaster fills or gesso application could be detected.

"The surfaces of the heads are covered by a very faint patination which becomes more discernible when one compares the appearance of the native stone surface seen in the recently bored mounting holes with the overall coloration of the sculptures. Moreover, etching with very dilute hydrochloric acid not only attests to the limestone composition, but also removes the patination to show the true color of the native rock.

"There arises the question whether very mild patination goes hand in hand with relatively recent age. However, this need not be the case if the Amarna pieces stem from the dry and protected environment from which they have been reported to originate. In fact many genuine sculptures in the Cairo Museum show very little patination even though they are very old. This lack of substantial patination is not necessarily a true indicator of recency, a fact often observed by the writer over many years in many collections world-wide.

"The question to what extent genuine patinations can be artificially produced has been dealt with by other experts in separate reports and need not be discussed here.

"By far the best quantitative tests of surface composition relative to the average of the native rock itself are the analyses of L. Silver. The implications are that a substantially different surface composition as opposed to the interior of the stone speaks in favor of long time periods of exposure to produce this effect. A freshly carved stone surface would not possess these chemical characteristics. Implicit in this result is the question to what extent such a composition can be simulated on a piece of modern sculpture. First of all, the techniques of surface profile analysis are relatively recent. A determined forger would have to know just how much impurities to add to a surface treatment to arrive at the distinctly measurable but minute chemical differences in surface composition. Massive surface intervention would be clearly detectable and stand out even if the naked eye were to see only minute change. Conversely, had the figures been painted in antiquity, as was often the case, the total lack of paint would argue for great age, especially when one considers burial in dry sand.

¹Figures are numbered according to catalog of A. Colonna (1975).

"Over the years a variety of physical and chemical techniques have been developed to date minerals. These include uranium/lead dating, potassium/argon dating, fission track analysis and obsidian hydration dating to name a few. None of these methods can be brought to bear on the time when the Amarna sculptures were carved. However, fluorine diffusion studies now underway may in the future be applicable to dating the Mansoor Amarna Collection and unambiguously provide a clear-cut answer.

"Thus there exists so far no chemical or physical technique which can give an unequivocal answer to the exact age in years when the Amarna sculptures of the Mansoor Collection were carved.

"However, the anthropometric analysis of R. Protsch lends considerable weight to the authenticity of this collection. Since the shape of the skull of the principal figures is well-known from unassailably genuine sculptures, comparison can be made between those pieces and the Mansoor Collection. On the basis of the known genealogy and skull morphology, it can be shown that the sculptures of the Mansoor Collection fit well with known authentic masterpieces which were not found long ago. Consequently, a forger would not have had long to copy the originals. Also, just about all indications suggest that the surfaces of the Mansoor Collection are old and could not have been made in recent decades. Therefore, it is much more probable that the Mansoor pieces are real."

Dr. Pierre Bariand, Laboratoire de MINÉRALOGIE-CRISTALLOGRAPHIE. Curator of the Mineral Collection at the UNIVERSITÉ PIERRE ET MARIE CURIE (SORBONNE), Paris. After examining three Mansoor Amarna objects (nos. 19, 24 and 26), Dr. Bariand wrote in 1980 (cf. In *Defence...*p. 36):

L'examen de l'état de surface des matériaux ayant servi à la réalisation de ces objets montre une patine très ancienne aboutissant à la conclusion que ces objets sont authentiques. L'aspect granulé de la patine respectant d'ailleurs l'état des débris fossiles existant rend peu probable une imitation moderne." Our translation: Examination of the surface of these objects shows a very ancient patina reaching the conclusion that these objects are authentic. Moreover, the granulated appearance of the patina compared to fossils debris is not likely to be a modern imitation.

We should note here that Dr. Philippe Blanc, a colleague of Dr. Bariand at the same Laboratory, stated without ambiguity that the limestone of the Mansoor objects is natural, and, "D'après les travaux de géologie réalisés en Égypte, une localisation probable de ces matériaux serait: Luxor et Quena sur la vallée du Nil." (cf. In *Defence...*p. 38). Translated: From geological work made in Egypt, a probable localization of the material would be: Luxor and Quena in the Nile Valley.

.

On February 2, 1959, Dr. Ben H. Parker, Professor of Mineralogy at the Colorado School of Mines, issued a brief report after reviewing the first four reports on the Mansoor Amarna Collection, and after examining five of the limestone sculptures. We quote some of what he wrote:

"...Without attempting to ascribe any definite degree of antiquity upon the basis of weathering effects, some significance may be attached to the fact that all who have examined pieces from the Mansoor collection with regard to the surface condition of the pieces and whose reports are available have recognized some degree of weathering.

"In résumé, it is my considered opinion that there is no scientific method available which can be relied upon to fix with certainty the age of the objects under consideration. Rather, I believe that their antiquity must be determined by a comparison with the style and execution of other pieces of known antiquity. If such comparisons are in all respects favorable, then, in my judgment, the antiquity of these pieces would not be subject to question because of any "false" nature of the stone used in the sculptures, because of variations in the degree or type of weathering shown on the pieces which I have examined, nor because of any observed physical or petrological condition which would give rise to suggestions of "false" or "forced" weathering."

• • • • •

Serious Errors on MFA Letterhead

In the preceding pages, we have cited over fifteen scientists--all outstandingly qualified in their respective field, who have given a clear, favorable opinion on the Mansoor Amarna Collection. We have also mentioned the negative opinion of Mr. William J. Young, director of the MFA Boston Laboratory, and a facsimile of his "Technical Examination of nine Tel-El-Amarna Objects" has been inserted entirely in "Je Cherche un Homme..." pp.24-29.

We have some letters written by Mr. Young, dated from the late 1940s, and we would like to quote a few sentences from two of them. But before we do this, it is necessary to point out that these letters were written after he had declared on October 27, 1947 that the limestone "appears not to be a natural material" and that "it shows all the indications of being a made stone which could be fabricated in a great many ways." He concluded that letter by saying: "In my opinion, the above two heads are of fairly modern origin. A full report will follow in the near future."

Now, we quote Mr. Young in one of the two letters, which is dated March 3, 1948. He wrote: "Regarding the examination of the pieces [nine Amarnas] left in our care, I am sorry that we have not as yet come to a definite conclusion. We are waiting for further information regarding the stone from the Geology Department at Harvard. I have been promised this information within the next week or ten days." The answer Mr. Young was expecting from Harvard was that the stone is a fabricated one. The information which came from the Geology Department at Harvard was that the stone is indeed a natural foraminiferous limestone--consequently not "a made stone which could be fabricated in a great many ways."

Now, we quote Mr. Young in the other letter dated September 22, 1948. He said: "Thank you for your letter. I had a very successful time in Europe this summer and have just started to pick up the loose ends at the Museum. I'd very much like to make one more spectrographic analysis of some of the deposit on one of the cleavages of the large head. This will complete my examination. As soon as this is done, I will forward a written report to you." As we can see from the preceding statement, Mr. Young had not yet completed his report on September 22, 1948. Yet, at the end of that very same letter, dated September 22, 1948 he added the following: "While abroad this summer, I made it a point of studying various Amarna material, including a fresco of Akhenaten's daughters at the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, and I found no reason to alter the technical evidence unfortunately indicating they are of fairly modern origin."

The preceding paragraph makes us understand that Mr. Young had definitely a preconceived opinion: He had declared on October 27, 1947 that the sculptures were not ancient and, regardless of that "one more spectrographic analysis" he wanted to make on the large head, the sculptures will have to be so in his report. Never mind whether his examination was complete or not. Never mind that one more spectrographic analysis.

It is interesting to note that it took over six months--from September 22, 1948 to April 14, 1949 (date of the written report) for Mr. Young "to make one more spectrographic analysis of some of the deposit on the cleavages of the large head."

It is also interesting to note that while he was abroad during that summer of 1948, Mr. Young "made it a point of studying various Amarna material, including a fresco of Akhenaten's daughters." First of all, to our understanding, he neither examined scientifically the Amarna material he is talking about, nor even handled it. Second, since the fresco of Akhenaten's daughters is a painting, no scientist should ever compare the surface of an ancient painting with that of any sculptured stone, whether ancient or not. No serious scientist should even think of it.

TAKING THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

As we have seen much earlier (cf. A Splendid Galaxy of Expert opinion pp. 10-23), all scientists who have commented on the Young report did not praise it in any way; on the contrary, they all criticized it. Isn't this strange? Isn't it fair then to consider it of no scientific value whatsoever? Although we appealed several times to the MFA Boston for its re-evaluation, they totally ignored us and, to our knowledge, they also ignored others who approached them on the same subject.

It goes without saying that Mr. William J. Young answered neither our many requests nor others'. We feel he may have liked to reexamine the sculptures when we offered to return them back to the MFA or to him, but possibly the Museum's authorities prevented him from doing so or to answer such requests. Consider this: What would people think of the MFA Boston if it were known that their technical report given, or rather sold to us was a gross error or a blunder? Also, wouldn't museums, collectors and dealers who had obtained a technical report from the MFA for their artifacts doubt its veracity? And wouldn't people--particularly Bostonians--doubt the authenticity of some of the magnificent artifacts in their "proud" MFA? Furthermore, would benefactors and donors continue to donate to the Museum? In short, wouldn't this be a very difficult political situation?

THE CHALLENGE OF GREATNESS

The MFA--A Proud World Resource

The above is the title of a most attractive booklet the MFA Boston published in 1967 obviously to raise funds. We would like to quote some of what this "Proud World Resource" claimed and stated:

"The Boston Museum of Fine Arts is a citadel of the spirit of man."

"The Museum of Fine Arts is one of the great museums of the world."

"Boston takes rightful pride in its reputation as a leading center of culture in our country. Without the Museum of Fine Arts, could Boston enjoy that renown?"

"The Museum's Predicament No matter how rich its past, an institution which cannot fulfill its obligations is poor. Today, the Museum can no longer keep pace with the demands of our time, much less exert its leadership. Funds are needed for space, programs, acquisitions, salaries, and operations."

After reading "The Challenge of Greatness," we have to admit that, as much as this booklet is attractive, the sales pitch to raise money is even more. But please, let us proceed with another extremely important quote:

"THE RESEARCH LABORATORY: Art and science must co-exist in today's museum. Science can derive essential scholarly data from mute objects and conserve or restore priceless works. The art of the forger is so sophisticated that only the most rigorous application of science can prove him false. The Museum's Research Laboratory, the first in America and third oldest in the world, not only serves every department in the Museum, but examines, identifies, repairs, and conserves art treasures from all over the world. This vital work is continually hampered by the Laboratory's improvised attic space. Funds are needed for the most advanced scientific instruments, as well as appropriate space."

Yes, we do agree that "art and science must co-exist in today's museum." Yes, we most definitely agree that "science can derive essential scholarly data from mute objects and conserve or restore priceless

works." And we certainly agree that "*the art of the forger is so sophisticated that **only** the most rigorous application of science can prove him false.*" We are not the only ones to agree on these three vital points: To our understanding, all museums and scholars, and in particular scientists, as well as collectors, antique and art dealers do. But then, what about the many unassailably scientific reports and opinions we obtained on our Amarna objects and which we sent to the MFA Boston? Could the authorities of the "Proud World Resource" say that the Mansoor sculptures were not subjected to "the most rigorous application of science?" Could they? And isn't it "the most rigorous application of science" that proved that the MFA Boston's Technical Examination of nine Tel-El-Amarna Objects is "false"? Could any person of integrity from the Boston "citadel of the spirit of man" state in all honesty, or rather in the real "spirit of man," that the most rigorous application of science was used in the report sold to us? Could that person of integrity say that, by keeping silent in re the Mansoor Collection, the MFA Boston is fulfilling its obligations?

Crossing a Threshold: Scientific Illiteracy?

By now, it should be clear in the reader's mind that the MFA Boston sold us a fallacious technical report that has sullied the Mansoor Amarna Collection and caused the Mansoors tremendous pain and damage for over forty years. Indeed, it almost destroyed their life!

It must also be clear that false rumors emanating from that Museum started spreading since the late 1940s. Are we fair to deduct then that, by keeping silent and by refusing a re-evaluation of their Technical Examination, the MFA Boston has been most unfair to the Mansoors and to their Amarna Collection? Whatever happened to fair play? We are facing here a flagrant defiance of justice by "one of the great museums of the world." Isn't it clear to everyone that because the MFA Boston is so great, so powerful and so important, and we are so small, so powerless and so insignificant, that the authorities of this great institution, all people supposedly of integrity, will go to any length and resort to any means to protect their reputation?

To the authorities of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Massachusetts and particularly to the Trustees--the very people, people trust--we say: If you want Boston to take "rightful pride in its reputation as a leading center of culture in our country, if you want donors to continue to contribute to the success and progress of your institution, if you want everyone to believe that your integrity is beyond reproach, i.e. true and not superficial, if you want the respect of your patrons as well as the respect of all, and, in short, if you really want your MFA to be considered "one of the great museums of the world," you should act now: Investigate the matter!

.

From all that preceded, the reader must have formed by now a personal opinion on the scientific evidence given on the Mansoor Amarna Collection. Is there anyone around who would dare to state publicly that the report of Mr. William J. Young should prevail on all the others? Or even on any of them? That person, if indeed existing, should read this:

"First of all, about Mr. Young of the Boston Museum: I agree with Professor Turner that he is not competent in fields that are essential to evaluate antiquities. I volunteered to analyze the Boston Museum's relief, allegedly part of the Ludovici relief in Rome, by isotopic methods. The Italians say the Boston piece is a forgery, but Young did a variety of meaningless tests to demonstrate that it was authentic. Needless to say, Mr. Young refused to send me any material to analyze, adding that he had proven authenticity beyond any reasonable doubt.

"Young's statement on dendrites is pure nonsense (as are many of his other statements). His ideas on UV examination as an indication of age falls in the same category."

The above is extracted from a letter to Mansoor dated June 9, 1987 by a much respected American scientist teaching archaeological sciences in a leading university. We would like to point out that this professor has neither seen nor examined **yet** any of the Mansoor Amarna sculptures, and that letter was written after we sent him the monograph by Stross and Eisenlord, as well as the scientific reports obtained.

• • • • •

"Je Cherche un Homme..." (Diogène)

Weary of appealing to the MFA Boston and to Mr. Young, as well as to the few leading Egyptologists of the time, to reexamine the sculptures particularly that the impressive scientific evidence we had obtained from 1950 to 1970 unequivocally refuted the allegations of Mr. Young, we wrote in 1971 "Je Cherche un Homme..." which was distributed around the world to many Egyptologists and museums with an Egyptian art collection. Our booklet was also mailed to some newspapers and a few collectors and private individuals. Lack of space does not allow us to insert all the publication; however, we will only insert the "Sequel" as we would like to point out later some important facts mentioned in it. But first, let it be clear to the reader that, without being conceited, the writers do claim a certain knowledge about ancient Egyptian art since they have spent years studying it and particularly handling ancient Egyptian artifacts. (Were he living today, M. A. Mansoor would have claimed, in a most humble way, a fifty years expertise on the subject.) Our knowledge and experience in the field of Egyptology is, to be sure, but a fraction of what the senior Mansoor possessed. As compared to most giants in Egyptology, the writers may be, or rather admit to being, dwarves when the history and writing of the ancient Egyptians are concerned. But when it comes to art, nothing can beat the experience in handling and researching ancient Egyptian objects.

Before inserting the "Sequel," please allow us to quote the conclusions of "Je Cherche un Homme..." We said:

"If, so far, the irrefutable evidence of science has vindicated this truly magnificent collection of ancient sculptures, so it is hoped that a new school of thought, represented by true knowledge of Egyptology and an impartial understanding of the facts, will do likewise.

"It is our strongest conviction that the factual evidence will eventually prevail in the face of the unfavorable but unqualified and undocumented opinions.

"It is because of all the reasons cited here that we appeal to all persons of substance and courage, to all leading institutions of arts and sciences in this country and throughout the world, to investigate this problem with fairness, to weigh all the evidence available, to subject, if necessary, any and all of these sculptures to further tests. Only then, will the truth emerge.

"Only then, a great and noble collection of sculptures dating from one of the greatest periods of cultural and artistic achievements of pharaonic Egypt will rightfully belong to the world of art.

"Je Cherche un Homme..."

• • • • •

"Je Cherche un Homme..." (Sequel)

Perhaps no single chapter of the long history of ancient Egypt has been as much discussed and written about as the period of Tel-El-Amarna. Indeed it was a fascinating age.

Most of the scholars of Egyptology, particularly those of this century, have given us their different interpretations of the life and times of Akhenaten, of his religious philosophy, of his sacrosanct belief in Aton, "his only god," of his relation with the many members of the royal family, and of his feelings toward love, peace, his people and mankind. All these writings, of course, are presumably based on the many inscriptions that have been found on temple and tomb walls, on coffins, on the Tel-El-Amarna Tablets, and on carved fragments and shreds of evidence now scattered in the museums of the world. One subject, however, has yet to be further studied, understood and described. It is the art of Tel-El-Amarna.

This must be done by Egyptologists who possess not only a deep knowledge of the period of Tel-El-Amarna, but also a talent to recognize and appreciate the true aesthetic merit of its art productions.

Although many scholars have made appreciable efforts in this direction, and many have understood the motivating forces that caused the changes and innovations that are evident in the art of Amarna, yet one feels that their works have remained incomplete.

The known artistic productions of this period cover a wide range of styles, from conventional and life-like representations, to idealized forms, then to dynamic lines, finally exploding in grossly exaggerated portraits. No such disparity of styles occurred during the Old Kingdom, the Middle Kingdom, the early part of the Eighteenth Dynasty or in later periods of Egyptian art.

Breasted called Akhenaten "the first individual in history." Is it not likely then, that this king who rid himself of the conventions of the past, and who, one must assume, was the inspiring force behind his artists, felt the urge to have himself as well as the members of the royal family represented in different ways of expression, attitudes and moods to coincide with his philosophy? One must therefore conclude that the artists of Akhenaten were allowed far more independence and freedom to create new forms, to stylize features, indeed to instill new blood in the slow-changing art of Egypt than their predecessors or successors.

Because of the complexities and subtleties of the art of Tel-El-Amarna, it is possible that all its phases have been only superficially discussed by most Egyptologists. In this connection, what should one think of the incredibly exaggerated forms of the colossi of Karnak which defy every artistic rule and pattern to this date? Why was Akhenaten represented in this manner? The change was certainly drastic.

A challenge is offered here to present-day Egyptologists to scrutinize the many phases of the art of Tel-El-Amarna. To be sure, the task is difficult; but the effort could be rewarding.

Although this paper far from pretends to be a short study of the art of Tel-El-Amarna, the points discussed above have been mentioned because our purpose here is to explain why certain Egyptologists have failed to recognize the authenticity as well as the great aesthetic merit of the Mansoor sculptures dating from this period.

Since the overwhelming scientific evidence in favor of the genuine antiquity of the Collection, as against the sole negative opinion of Mr. William J. Young of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, has already been presented in other publications (A Report on a Group of Limestone Carvings Owned by M. A. Mansoor and Sons; Analytical Chemistry; The Vortex) and in the reports of several eminent scientists, this aspect of the problem will not be discussed here any further.

The other important factor to consider is the value of the opinion of certain experts. Over the years, experts in many fields have made innumerable mistakes in judging old works of art. Among these, many Egyptologists are known to have made such mistakes. Whereas science describes with positive facts the natural chain of events that cause the alteration of sculptured surface of ancient art objects, Egyptologists, like their counterparts in other fields, can only base their opinion in judging such objects on purely stylistic or aesthetic grounds. In other words, they rely on their own "feeling." There is no need to mention here the numerous and well known cases in which this "feeling" of the experts was proved to be wrong. Because of this human inadequacy, whenever important art objects are considered for purchase by museums today, the scientific evidence will always have the final word over the eye of the expert. This is precisely what happened in 1947 when Dr. Ambrose Lansing was considering the purchase of the Mansoor Amarna sculptures for the Metropolitan Museum. The "scientific" evidence presented in 1949 by Mr. Young prevailed then over Dr. Lansing's expert opinion. It is unfortunate that Dr. Lansing retired shortly thereafter. He died long before the appearance of the many scientific reports that authenticated the Collection.

A short time later, Mr. John D. Cooney proclaimed his negative opinion to many directors of museums, to curators of Egyptology and to collectors in the United States. Although he has often repeated it for many years, he cannot refute the scientific evidence, nor can he come up with any substantial evidence of his own to justify his claim. One must therefore conclude that since he could not express his "feeling" in tangible terms, he must have relied on the "scientific opinion" of Mr. William J. Young. In deference to Mr. Cooney's opinion, a few other Egyptologists in the United States refused to commit themselves to an opinion.

In Europe, Professor Hans Wolfgang Müller of Munich also gave a negative opinion. Unlike Mr. Cooney who offered no arguments at all, Professor Müller wrote a short report titled "Expert Opinion" on two sculptures sent to him for study. All the statements of this report are inaccurate. In one statement he assumes a knowledge of geology; in others he indicates a lack of knowledge of the art of Tel-El-Amarna; and in his final statement he indulges in technical assumptions. This report must be seen and seriously examined not just by Egyptologists and scientists, but also by art critics and impartial judges.

In the case of our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures, one can therefore conclude that the error of the above named Egyptologists is due to one or more of the following reasons:

- 1) Prejudice after reading the Young report;
- 2) Lack of experience and training;
- 3) Dependence on obsolete points of view;
- 4) Sole reliance on their own feeling;
- 5) Knowledge restricted to only certain aspects of the study of Egyptology;
- 6) Failure to recognize the subtleties, the aesthetic merit and the style of these sculptures.

It should be noted here that several eminent scholars of Egyptology including Drioton, Boreux, Gabra, Varille, Iskander, as well as other connoisseurs, have agreed that in character, essence and technique, these sculptures fit absolutely within the scope of the many phases of the art of Tel-El-Amarna. Dr. A. Lansing of the Metropolitan Museum had also acquiesced to this point of view.

Other important observations and features are also to be considered in this Collection. The following are examples:

- a) That some of the sculptures were made of an unusual, but by no means unknown, pink limestone. This point was already discussed by Dr. Stross and Mr. Eisenlord in their report, and mentioned in "Je Cherche un Homme..." We feel that this "originality" on the part of the artists of Amarna did puzzle some of the dissident Egyptologists. In response to one of Professor Müller's statements, we must add that practically every conceivable type of material--whether native or imported--available to the ancient Egyptians was, at one time or another of their long history, used by their artists in all sorts of artistic productions. A few, of course, were used much less than others because of their rarity.
- b) That some of the male heads, both in the round and in relief, wear crowns and headdresses that are somewhat different from others of this period. How many Egyptologists know of forgers who have been innovators? One would think that the slightest mistake that these forgers could make would reveal the forgery at once. Furthermore, from other periods of Egyptian history, several fine sculptures have been found wearing crowns and other features not exactly conforming with the conventional style of the period.
- c) That many of these sculptures could have been made to serve as models for student artists. That some were finished sculptures and others were not.
- d) That some or all of the sculptures were probably made with the intention of being painted but were not. Drs. Zaki Iskander and Zahira Mustafa describe in their report one statuette of a princess, made of pink limestone, with traces of pink coloring, invisible to the naked eye. On chemical analysis, the composition of the faint water color on the statuette was found to be identical to other pigments used by the ancient Egyptians.

Finally we must include this important quotation from Dr. Jack De Ment's report ("Radiography" section page 15):

"The small head shows features (a) supra, plus (b) a very strong indication that during its sculpturing the artisan gouged out a small hole at the base of the neck and inserted a limestone 'pin' or peg that has a slightly different density. This cannot be seen with the unaided eye, nor at low magnifications, for the fit of the pin is exceptionally good. The juncture of the pin with the edge of the neck hole, into which it is inserted, is filled in and covered over with patina that is typical of both the rest of the head and neck as well as the surface of the pin.

"Hence, one should be able to conclude with a very good degree of certainty that this operation was done at the time of the making of the small head.

"It would seem that a counterfeiter of Egyptian artifacts of the kind described herein certainly would not take the trouble of first drilling a hole into the neck and then fashioning a neck pin or peg to fit into that hole and, finally, meticulously inserting the peg and making sure of an excellent, concealed fit; this could only have occurred down through a very great period of time, with patina forming over the seam of the fit and concealing same. Moreover, the fact that the density of the limestone peg is slightly different from the rest of the neck and head, as indicated by radiolucency, is favorable evidence reinforcing authenticity. It would appear that the maker of a spurious piece of sculpture would take the easy way out, and would very probably utilize limestone from the confines of one locality or from one large piece of stone having common characteristics."

Thus the stylistic as well as the scientific points in favor of the genuine antiquity of the Collection are rational and innumerable. Those presented by Messrs. Young, Müller and Cooney have been proved time and again to be respectively unscientific, erroneous and undocumented.

In his article published in THE VORTEX, and reproduced in "Je Cherche un Homme...", Dr Fred H. Stross makes this final statement: "The scientific vindication has been accomplished--but is there something missing?"

The fact cannot be emphasized enough that in his letter of authentication, the late Abbé Etienne Drioton, one of the greatest Egyptologists of this century, declared: "But I will add that, from the artistic point of view, these pieces come from a workshop related to, but not identical with, the one that produced the colossi of Karnak. Their stylization, driven in that same spirit is of such plenitude and faultless craftsmanship, that they cannot be, in my opinion, the work of a forger."

In the interest of Egyptology, and for the sake of a collection of sculptures that has been acclaimed by many eminent Egyptologists and connoisseurs as ranking with, if not surpassing in beauty, some of the finest ancient Egyptian artistic productions, we strongly urge the American Museums Association and all its members, as well as all Egyptologists and all departments of ancient Egyptian art in the world museums to consider this problem very seriously, to evaluate all the stylistic and scientific facts relating to it, and to make their opinions known publicly. In doing so, the highest ideals for which these institutions stand,

and the better understanding and appreciation of the sciences and the arts for which these men of learning are constantly striving, will have been only faithfully and justly served.

Je Cherche un Homme

Edmond R. Mansoor
(Printed in 1971)

• • • • •

The reaction we received after mailing "Je Cherche un Homme..." and its "Sequel" was indeed stunning and it encouraged us to pursue the matter further since we found that many of the people who received it were shocked, perhaps revolted. But still, the reaction from the museums and Egyptologists was almost non-existent: Most ignored us.

After reviewing all the events that happened from 1947 to 1971 and reading over and over the appalling material we had--the reports obtained as well as correspondence received--we decided to write "J'Accuse" particularly that few offensive letters written by third parties were forwarded to us. We could not comprehend then why the Egyptologists as well as the museum people concerned and particularly the Association of American Museums (AAM), were not answering our requests and appeals to investigate the matter.

Although we never printed "J'Accuse", we are doing it now as it will give the reader a clear picture of what had happened before 1972 and what was going around at the time. Also, what were our feelings and how we were then revolted by the unfair treatment our Collection and ourselves were receiving from few Egyptologists and museums.

Before inserting "J'Accuse", we ask the reader to kindly remember that it was written in 1972 and at this moment, lack of time does not allow us to edit it. While we may very well be wrong, most people mentioned in it were living in 1972 and we are printing it, as we said before, with all respect to the dead and the living.

"J'Accuse" was indeed written in 1972. We would like to quote the conclusion of a three-page article which appeared in *The Times-Weekend* (San Mateo, California) of Saturday, February 26, 1972, pp. 2A, 3A and 6A. The whole front-cover of that newspaper is a photograph of the fascinating head of Queen Nefertiti: Fig. 9, of Dr. Colonna's 1975 Catalogue and Fig. 14, of 1991 Catalogue. That article was written--as noted above--after the publication of "Je Cherche un Homme..."

We quote *The Times*:

"The next chapter, perhaps the one with the key to the solution and perhaps not, is being written by Edmond Mansoor and his brothers. As a sequel to "Je Cherche..." they are preparing the much more pointed "J'Accuse", likening the nebulous cloud that has defiled the honor of the family and its treasures to the Dreyfus case that inspired Emile Zola's spirited counterattack.

"Whereas the mild-mannered and low key "Je Cherche..." set forth an appeal for taking another look at the evidence, "J'Accuse" will name names and point fingers at those responsible for a conspiracy of silence, Mansoor promises. He quotes Zola:

'I do not despair in the least of final triumph. I repeat with the utmost conviction: The truth is on the march and nothing will stop it.'

• • • • •

"...J'ACCUSE..."

Emile Zola

A Sequel to

"Je Cherche un Homme..."

Diogène

Emile Zola

Was written in 1972 by
the Mansoor brothers
but never published

P.S. "J'Accuse" is the following letter,
which has never been mailed to Mr. Brown.

Mr. James M. Brown, III, President
The American Association of Museums
2306 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

..., 1972

Dear Mr. Brown:

On August 25, 1971 we mailed you a copy of our brochure "Je Cherche un Homme...", and a letter in which we appealed to you as President of the American Association of Museums to help us solve the controversy over the Mansoor Collection of limestone sculptures from Tel-El-Amarna. A brochure and a copy of that letter were also sent to every Member of the Executive Committee and most Members of the Association.

To this day, no reply has been received.

The reason why this appeal was made to the American Association of Museums is because this controversy does not concern the Mansoor family alone. It involves the opinions of leading Egyptologists, eminent scientists, competent art dealers, all museums and institutions who have large departments of Egyptology, and museums and connoisseurs who have been directly or indirectly interested in this Collection. We believe our request was reasonable, honest and justified. We believe it should have been investigated by the AAM in the interest of the history of ancient art, particularly for the benefit of the museums and the art-loving public which these institutions serve.

Today, despite the fact that we have so far received no active or moral support from the Association, we still believe in the fairness of our request for investigation. More than ever we believe that sooner or later an ever-increasing number of museum officials, scientists, Egyptologists and art lovers, will join us in this fight against negligence, ignorance, prejudice, obstruction or irresponsibility in certain museum circles.

If and when an error is made by a scientist or a style expert employed by a museum, such error should be corrected, particularly when a massive body of scientific evidence is given to prove that a mistake was made. This is both justice and common sense. This needs no further explanations.

In the case of our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures, we have shown in "Je Cherche un Homme..." that Mr. William J. Young has applied irrelevant methods of study for his "Technical Examination"; that "the evidence cited by him gives no indication of the relative age of the sculptured stone surfaces" (Turner); that the data set out in his report are "imprecisely expressed and scientifically unsound in a number of respects" (Hutton); that "it is impossible to judge his conclusions critically since he offers little evidence of how he arrived at them" (Compton); that "for many of his assertions he has supplied no satisfactory evidence" (Blackwelder); that he "did not fully understand the tool with which he was working, i.e. the ultra-violet lamp"; "and compounded upon this lack of understanding did not properly and correctly interpret such results as he may have obtained..." (De Ment); that "his report is chiefly impressive for its lack of reasoned conclusions, and the distinct impression that he is expressing only a personal opinion that he does not believe the sculptures to be genuine" (Kirk); etc. In other words, in the opinions of the afore cited scientists, Mr. Young has displayed his incompetence in dealing with our sculptures.

When the overwhelming scientific evidence contributed by eminent scholars, unanimously concluding in favor of the genuine antiquity of the Collection was sent to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, did the director or the trustees investigate this serious problem? No. The scientific evidence was conveniently ignored; no efforts were made to refute it. There is a fair reason to assume that it was thought perhaps improper to admit that the director of the Boston Museum Research Laboratory could have made a mistake. Should the authorities of one of the oldest and noblest art institutions have acted

so unjustly, in utter disregard for the truth, in utter disregard for their sacred duty toward the good name of their institution, in utter disregard for a magnificent Collection of unique masterpieces of ancient art, and in utter disregard for the incalculable harm they have caused us? No.

The authorities of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts have sold us a piece of defective merchandise (the Young Report). When we returned with overwhelming scientific evidence in our hands to prove to them that a mistake had been made, they shut their eyes to the evidence and closed their ears to our repeated pleas for a reexamination of the sculptures. It is well known that any reputable establishment will accept the return of defective goods sold by mistake. And we will say that we never saw a sign in the Boston Museum's Laboratory reading "all sales are final."

It is a known fact and it has been pointed out in "Je Cherche un Homme..." that Dr. John D. Cooney, formerly of the Brooklyn Museum and presently Curator of Ancient Art at the Cleveland Museum of Art, could not and did not voice an opinion on the sculptures for two years, but did, after the appearance of the Young report, appoint himself as the champion of the negative stylistic opinion. A letter was reproduced on page 2 of the brochure, showing Dr. Cooney's reliance on Mr. Young's ability as the "best authority in this country on technical problems connected with works of art." Though he admitted that he has "been approached by many collectors and museums at various times concerning these sculptures" and that he has "always had to give an unfavorable opinion," he was never inclined to cite any stylistic detail to substantiate this negative opinion. Furthermore, there is written evidence proving that Dr. Cooney indulged in spreading insinuating and unfounded rumors to discredit our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures. This is not the function of a serious curator of ancient art. The writing of such incongruous letters on Brooklyn Museum letterheads should not have been permitted by the authorities of this institution. Needless to repeat here that the scientific evidence vindicating the authenticity of the sculptures was ignored by Dr. Cooney and the authorities of the Brooklyn Museum, just as they were in Boston.

In a chain reaction of events, other directors and curators of museums throughout the United States were misled by the opinions of Mr. Young and Dr. Cooney. Furthermore, as will be shown in later paragraphs of this paper, a few misguided Egyptologists joined in the act and began to write belittling and insinuating letters, using often abusive and unscholarly language, attacking our good name and spreading mistrust of our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures and other "wares."

One most significant fact in this controversy must be pointed out here. We cannot emphasize it enough. One has to read the sum total of the documents and letters written by Messrs. Young, Cooney, Bothmer, Derchain, and H. W. Müller to realize that we are dealing here with a rather strange group of one "scientist" and four Egyptologists. A brief review of their works and actions in this case is necessary:

- 1) Mr. Young has written a "scientific" report which is scientifically unsound. He refused to answer letters refuting his "scientific" arguments. Using false assumptions, he has engaged in conversations with other museum officials in order to discourage them from viewing this problem with an open mind.
- 2) Dr. Cooney has been unable to give tangible arguments of any kind to substantiate his negative opinion. He acknowledged only the "scientific" opinion of Mr. Young, but could not or did not want to change his opinion after having read the technical reports and studies of several other better qualified and more competent scientists. He also engaged in the hardly commendable business of propagating ill-founded rumors.
- 3) Dr. Bernard V. Bothmer, Curator of Ancient Art at the Brooklyn Museum, wrote at least one damaging letter (a part of which will be reproduced in the following pages) in which he

makes belittling insinuations about our good name and antiquities, and in which he issued an unqualified statement regarding the value of scientific research of several eminent American and foreign scholars.

- 4) Dr. Philippe Derchain, Professor of Egyptology at the University of Cologne, has written a letter in answer to "Je Cherche un Homme..." A translation² of this letter had to be shown at the end of this paper as a proof of his very limited knowledge of the Tel-El-Amarna period. Our answer to this letter follows its translation. To our mind, not only does Professor Derchain give us ample proof of his total lack of understanding the subtleties and magnificence of the Tel-El-Amarna art, but he defends Dr. Cooney's unsubstantiated opinion and Professor Müller's irrational statements as a fanatic. He arrogantly criticizes Dr. Etienne Drioton, one of the truly greatest scholars of Egyptology of our time; two distinguished Egyptian scholars; and a most respected director of an American museum who, though not an Egyptologist, has a splendid understanding and appreciation of the arts of antiquity. He makes the gross statement that scientific research "proves nothing" except the "type of material and nothing more." Then he generously gratifies us with the advice to simply "take all that and dump it in the ocean and rid the market of antiquities of some of the forgeries that encumber it" (translated from the French).
- 5) Professor Hans Wolfgang Müller, Egyptologist at the University of Munich, has written a one and a third page document which he titled "Expert Opinion." In this authoritarian report, Professor Müller makes irrational observations as to the style and material of the sculptures. He also refuses to recognize the value of any method of technical examination, yet he indulges in unqualified technical assumptions of his own.
- 6) A now deceased Egyptologist wrote a very confused letter which will not be reproduced here in its entirety for the sake of decency. It will be discussed in a later chapter of this paper.

All in all, the documents, letters, opinions and statements given by these five persons about our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures are absurd, nebulous, illogical or unfounded. One remarkable trait that the four Egyptologists of this group have in common is the fact that they have paraphrased one another in their statements regarding the value of scientific evidence. Obviously they belong to the same school of thought, with variations in one direction or another. Whereas the competent scientists who investigated our sculptures have warned that they are not qualified to evaluate them stylistically, this group of four Egyptologists, by contrast, does not accept the sound reasoning nor the relevant methods of technical examinations applied by the scientists. Is this sensible? Is this acceptable? One would be curious to know what the research scientists employed by the museums think about all this.

• • • • •

Since the publication of "Je Cherche un Homme...", we have received a tremendous number of encouraging letters from eminent persons in the fields of arts and sciences, art editors of newspapers, etc., in this country and abroad. Many more are still being received regularly along with requests for a brochure by persons who have only seen it or heard about it. Receipt of the brochure has also been

²The translation will be inserted in a later section, not at the end of "J'Accuse."

acknowledged with thanks by the librarians of several important art, research and educational institutions. A clearer picture of the controversy is coming to light. A northern California newspaper (Press Democrat, Santa Rosa, October 31, 1971) devoted two full pages to this problem. Another one, the San Mateo Times, in its Weekend section of February 26, 1972, gave in three full pages a good account of the problem we are facing. The front cover of that section shows an enlarged photograph of the beautiful head of Nefertiti in our Collection. The innumerable and favorable comments in the letters received cannot all be mentioned here for lack of space. A few of these, however, must be quoted.

Professor Henry Faul, noted scientist who taught in two of Europe's leading universities, Chairman of the Department of Geology at the University of Pennsylvania, wrote to say, in part, that we "have assembled a splendid galaxy of expert opinion"; his letter ends with: "It would be a pleasure to correspond with you further."

Professor Max Guilmot, Egyptologist from Brussels, made several favorable, tangible and logical comments, certainly based on a deep knowledge and appreciation of the art of Tel-El-Amarna, but prefers to see and study the sculptures personally (not just from photographs) before giving a firm opinion.

Mr. Richard Lay, Art Correspondent of the "Daily Mail" in London, who has "the ear of editors of art journals in the British Isles" wrote:

"I have read 'Je Cherche un Homme' and my first reaction is one of shock concerning the ostrich-head-in-the-sand attitude of the many experts who throw doubt on the Tel-El-Amarna sculptures."

Professor Francis J. Turner, Department of Geology, UC Berkeley, Member of the National Academy of Sciences, wrote:

"Many thanks for your brochure 'Je Cherche un Homme'. It is a fascinating story even though it is an unfortunate one for you personally, and I think for the history of Egyptian art.

"I hope one day that you indeed 'find a man'."

Mr. John Junor, Editor of one of England's most respected newspapers, "The SUNDAY EXPRESS," wrote to us from London saying:

"I recall that in 1952 several newspapers here carried reports of the sale in New York of some of your late father's Egyptian treasures.

"I hope that as a result of the impressive technical evidence set out in your brochure there will be an end to the controversy about the genuine antiquity of the remaining sculptures in the Mansoor collection.

"Perhaps you will be good enough to let me know in due course what response 'Je Cherche un Homme' brings from the American Museums Association and from leading Egyptologists."

What are we to answer this gentleman? We will certainly inform him of whatever the Egyptologists have said. But what shall we tell him about the American Association of Museums?

From Poland, Prof. Dr. S. Barbacki, President of the Poznan Society of Friends of Arts and Sciences, sent us a letter on November 15, 1971 in which he says:

"I am very sorry indeed not to have written to you after having received your letter but as I am not an archaeologist myself I had to seek for assistance. I have asked an eminent Polish archaeologist Professor Dr. Kazimierz Majewski for his opinion on the subject in question. He has, however, returned from his scientific trip only recently, so I am answering your letter with such delay.

"Following is Prof. Dr. Majewski's opinion on the ancient limestone sculptures collection controversy:

'I herewith state that the names of Drioton, Boreux, Gabra and Varille mentioned on page 3 (Sequel) of the brochure "Je Cherche un Homme," are well known among the world archaeologists and their opinion in this subject should be regarded as a competent one'."

Dr. George L. Stout, distinguished retired scholar who has been a director of American museums for long years wrote:

"You have worked with painstaking care and industry to produce these reports, comments, and photographs all relating to a group of limestone sculptures from Egypt. Your efforts to explore the problem of their authenticity and your pursuit of data and opinion are most commendable.

"As I had to say by telephone, I am not able to make any addition to material you have collected. I am sorry to be ignorant in this field. That is of small consequence, because you have assembled the professional views of many men all highly qualified to form a responsible opinion. Probably the conditions of a stilted and nervous market require works of art to run a gamut of critical attack.

"...Within a few weeks I hope to telephone and gain the privilege of seeing that part of the collection which is in San Carlos."

Dr. Rexford Stead, Deputy Director for Fine Arts, Los Angeles County Museum, wrote to say:

"Thank you so much for your kindness in sending me a copy of 'Je Cherche un Homme' which I have read with much interest. Certainly you have gone to great lengths in your continuing effort to secure a proper pedigree for your collection. My only regret is that you did not include more opinions by recognized Egyptologists. Perhaps, as a result of the publication, you will receive such comments. I would be most interested to hear about them."

Professor J. L. Benson, Ancient Art and Archaeology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, wrote to say:

"I wish to thank you very much for your thoughtfulness in sending me the material entitled 'Je Cherche un Homme.' Although I am not a professional Egyptologist, I have long had an interest in Egyptian art through teaching. Your presentation is most interesting and thought-provoking; your request that the materials in your collection be subjected to a proper art historical investigation is most reasonable. I regret that I am not qualified to do so, as these materials appear to be very interesting and valuable; I can only hope they will be made available for general use before too many years have passed."

Dr. E. T. Hall, noted scholar from the RESEARCH LABORATORY FOR ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE HISTORY OF ART, Oxford, England wrote:

"I am impressed by my friend Dr. Plenderleith having written the letter reprinted in your booklet. I have great respect for his judgment and I am sure he would be in a better position than myself to say what he thinks...

"When I come to America next, perhaps I could have the opportunity of studying the material myself. From all accounts the sculptures are quite remarkable."

Many other letters have expressed similar feelings and some have offered valuable suggestions. By far the vast majority of these were very sympathetic and most encouraging. A few were written by directors of leading European museums explaining the fact that their rules forbade them to intervene in such matters. This is truly unfortunate, at least in this instance. But all the scientists heard from were emphatic on one point: All agreed with the conclusions of their distinguished colleagues who investigated and authenticated the sculptures, and none could find a word of praise for Mr. Young's work. One leading American Egyptologist sympathized with our "dilemma" adding he understood the facts of the problem but was sorry not to be able to intervene, at least for the time being, because of his institution's regulations.

From comments and remarks such as these, one can clearly see that the public opinion of the world of arts and sciences is reacting favorably to our demands and beginning to see the truth in this matter.

.

Two more letters must be mentioned now. They are a part of the evidence we possess of the campaign of defamation which was started by the small group of Egyptologists several years ago. What we cannot fathom is how certain men, supposedly intelligent, supposedly learned, and occupying prominent positions in art institutions, can debase themselves by writing such nonsense.

The first of these letters was written several years ago by a now deceased Egyptologist to a prospective customer. In the opening paragraphs, the author discusses the senior Mansoor, and then the younger Mansoors, saying that he would not trust dealers, that he did not know if the Mansoors knew their business, and claiming that like most dealers we probably had a large number of forgeries in stock. This without having ever known us, without having ever been to any of our galleries in this country or in Egypt, and without having ever seen any of our antiquities. Then he adds, talking about a Tel-El-Amarna head which our customer had described:

"But I must go on to add that I already have an opinion about the head in question, without ever having seen it. I should consider it almost a miracle if this head were to be proved genuine...

"...Unless the head has a known history before it came into the hands of the dealer, the burden of proof is on the dealer to prove that it is genuine, not merely to state an opinion (a definitely prejudiced opinion) that it is genuine.

"You see therefore the reasons which I have for doubt about the head in question. Am I fair in entertaining such doubts without having seen the object? I can only appeal to my experience as my justification. And this is all that I can do, except to refer you to Dr. Cooney of the Brooklyn Museum, in whose opinion I have absolute confidence."

.

The second letter was written on April 5, 1971 by Dr. Bernard V. Bothmer, Curator of Ancient Art at The Brooklyn Museum, to a prominent person in the world of arts. We quote:

"First of all, I must not comment in writing because the brothers Mansoor threatened my predecessor as well as The Brooklyn Museum with a \$1,000,000 law suit. Since then our legal counsel has advised us never, never to comment on any of the wares the Mansoor brothers have been trying to peddle in this country since 1947.

"I am familiar with the booklet written by Messrs. Stross and Eisenlord. To my mind, it does not hold water, and a prominent chemist friend of mine went over it with the proverbial fine tooth comb and felt that scientifically it is of no value whatsoever."

In this letter, Dr. Bothmer tells also the addressee that "a telephone call could have settled the matter comfortably." He was, of course, referring to our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures. Naturally, when the serious and prospective customer with whom we were working at the time saw this letter, he informed us through a mutual acquaintance that he was no longer interested in the sculptures. Dr. Bothmer did not give a substantial opinion, but it is obvious that he implied that our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures were not genuine.

But what is the true meaning of Dr. Bothmer's letter besides the fact that it is in bad taste? Like Mr. Young, he is trying to create an atmosphere of doubt and ill will about the sculptures. Like Dr. Cooney, he is trying to discredit the authenticity of our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures. Like the deceased Egyptologist, he is trying to attack our good name. Is this the function of a serious Egyptologist? Is this the function of a man who has been entrusted with the ancient art department of a great institution? Whatever happened to ethics and whatever happened to plain common sense and decency?

Concerning the law suit Dr. Bothmer mentions, we have assured, over ten years ago, Messrs. Young and Cooney, as well as the authorities of the Boston and Brooklyn Museums, that none of the members of the Mansoor family intended to sue anyone, anywhere regarding our Tel-El-Amarna sculptures. Since we had no intention to go to court, we will, however, take our grievances to the public opinion of the world of arts and sciences. We shall continue this fight against injustice, obstruction, prejudice or ignorance, relentlessly no matter what all cost.

What is most harmful and damaging to this strange group of Egyptologists is that the unanimous opinion of science, whether in this country or abroad, stands firmly against their uncouth opinions.

• • • • •

We are peddlers of wares indeed! Indeed Dr. Bothmer knows that our "wares" are today in the Museums of Brooklyn, Detroit, The Metropolitan, Ann Arbor, Wadsworth Atheneum, Denver, Royal Ontario, Seattle, San Diego, Los Angeles, The Oriental Institute of Chicago, etc., and in other foreign Museums including The Louvre and Cairo. That to his mind, the booklet written by Messrs. Stross and Eisenlord "does not hold water" is, to our mind, a conclusion that could be uttered only by an individual inexperienced in matters dealing with natural sciences. Is Dr. Bothmer--besides being an Egyptologist--also a geologist, mineralogist, chemist, geochemist, criminologist, etc.? We wonder what would be the reaction of Dr. Stross and the other distinguished scientists mentioned in that booklet and on pages 5 and 6 of "Je Cherche un Homme," when they read Dr. Bothmer's bombastic statement. Then, Dr. Bothmer makes matters worse. He confides that a "prominent chemist" friend of his went over the booklet "with the proverbial fine tooth comb and felt that scientifically it is of no value whatsoever." We have recently written Dr. Bothmer three letters challenging him to produce his "prominent chemist friend." Needless, to say, neither did he answer our letters nor did he produce his "friend." Does this prominent chemist really exist? Or was this statement made only to mislead and discourage the prospective buyer

with whom we were working at the time from considering the sculptures? One question could be asked: Does Dr. Bothmer really believe that he is justified or qualified to make such pronouncements?

A couple of significant incidents happened concerning Dr. Bothmer's letter of April 5, 1971:

- 1) After this letter was given to us, we sent Dr. Bothmer a letter of protest and, surprisingly, the Secretary of the Ancient Art Department of the Brooklyn Museum wrote us saying:

"Your letter dated October 25, 1971 addressed to Mr. Bothmer, has been received by this office.

"In line one of your letter you refer to a letter dated April 5, 1971. There is no copy of any such letter in Mr. Bothmer's file. Therefore your letter to him must be based on a mistake. Please clarify."

To dispel any doubt that such a letter existed, we then sent the Brooklyn Museum a photocopy of the letter dated April 5 to prove that our letter was not "based on a mistake." Needless to say we heard no more from the Brooklyn Museum.

- 2) A few weeks after the above incident happened, we received an intimidating letter from the recipient of Dr. Bothmer's letter of April 5, a prominent person in the world of arts, demanding the letter back and forbidding us to publish any of its contents.

We never answered this letter but called the sender over the telephone to confirm that Dr. Bothmer's letter of April 5, was now our property since he gave it away by his free will and since it was given to us. Furthermore, we confirmed to him what we had written Dr. V. Bothmer previously: That we were going to publish it in due time to show the public how our Tel-El-Amarna Collection is being unjustly discredited in certain museum circles. Needless to say that we heard no more from the recipient of Dr. Bothmer's letter.

.

To those who are not familiar with the name of the antiquary M. A. Mansoor and his sons, let it be said that our firm was established in Cairo in 1904; that we have enjoyed the finest reputation for knowledge of ancient art and for integrity; that we have been deeply involved in the study of Egyptology; and that we have faithfully served countless Egyptologists, museums, kings, heads of states, art collectors and connoisseurs for more than six decades in Egypt, Europe and America.

We are peddlers of wares indeed! Indeed two British authors mention our name and our Tel-El-Amarna Collection in their books. One wrote:

"The most famous jewellery shops pale in comparison when one remembers Mansoor's jewellery and antique shop in the main hall of the hotel, with its scintillating gems, the Fabergé masterpieces, 'objets de vertu' or the exquisite Egyptian gold filigree work. The shop was a favourite of ex-King Farouk, whose possessions when he abdicated were compared to the contents of Versailles in 1793. Probably the most valuable statuettes bought by Farouk from Mansoor were a number of delicate limestone figures wrought about 1376 B.C. during the reign of Pharaoh Akhnaton, and worth a fortune." (Nelson, Nina. *Shepherd's Hotel*. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1960, pp. 5-6).

The second author, a historian, wrote:

"Realised in conversation with unusual young Egyptian Copt how little some of us know about the value of precious stones, or even the order of their worth. Thousands of visitors to Egypt have passed the shop kept meticulously by Mansoor at Shepheard's. His son, Edmond, aged 24, today gave me a splendid lecture on antiques and stones here, amid civilisation's heirlooms. He spoke modestly, and with infectious assurance. There was no hesitancy in his phrases, and an affection for the shining subject that communicated itself to me...

"...Edmond came into the business at 17, when he wanted to learn all about hieroglyphics. So he spent a year at Liverpool University under Professor Aylward Blackman, the Egyptologist.

"Farouk often comes to the shop. Six weeks ago he arrived with two Egyptian friends. Edmond was there alone and he found it not only a privilege but a joy to do business with his sovereign, for 'he really is a collector and lover of antiques.' The best pieces they sold to Farouk, for thousands of pounds, were eleven Tell el Amarnas. These represented the reign of King Akhnaton, three thousand years ago. They were small sculptures of King Akhnaton and his wife, in limestone, still in a superb state of preservation and came from Tell el Amarna. The collection, 105 pieces, was found by an Arab who sold it to his father. In this his father sank his fortune. 'He could not buy the collection at one time, so over 18 years, he secured two or three pieces every few months.'

"Lord Moyne was a regular customer, and came to the Shepheard's museum two or three days before he died." (Bilainkin, George. Cairo to Riyadh Diary. London: Williams and Norgate Ltd., 1950, pp. 152-153).

As can be seen from the preceding paragraph, this British historian called one of our galleries in Cairo, a "museum." And Professor John A. Wilson of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago wrote to us when we first came to the U.S., saying: "Of course I remember my visit to your shop last year. It was a very interesting and rewarding experience."

The Mansoor brothers and sisters are ten. Two are housewives; one sister is a prominent member of the Salesian Order (Rome) since 1955; two are assistant vice-presidents and managers of two great California financial institutions; one is a teacher of art and history, and is the chairman of the social studies department in a California educational institution; four are antiquarians and jewelers³. The Mansoor family stands firmly as one against the absurdities or the defamatory accusations of some of the Egyptologists mentioned in this paper.

• • • • •

We have been unjustly and senselessly accused of being dishonest and peddlers of wares, and yet we find in our records literally scores of letters addressed to us by directors and curators of American museums thanking us for the fine acquisitions obtained from our firm; for donations and gifts of ancient works of art; for contributions to exhibits of ancient art in museums; and for lectures and talks on ancient history and art. We also have letters and the necessary evidence to attest to the fact that we were the first--some twenty years ago--to approach the leading American museums, the Egyptian Ambassador in Washington, D.C., and the Egyptian Minister of Public Instruction, Dr. Taha Hussein, in a matter in which antiquarians do not usually indulge, and which resulted in the exhibition of a part

³Now (1993) they are nine--one housewife died, two brothers became vice-presidents of their banks over fifteen years ago, and two brothers retired from business.

of the Treasures of Tut-Ankh-Amon in several museums of the United States. These, and other efforts on our part can only prove our genuine and sincere desire to serve the museums as well as the art loving public.

In return, what have we received from the American museums when we appealed only for justice and understanding? We have asked the Boston and the Brooklyn Museums for a re-examination of our sculptures of Tel-El-Amarna in the light of overwhelming scientific evidence contributed by numerous internationally renowned scholars in fields whose endeavors have developed the highest technical knowledge available in this age. Surely the opinions of such giants of science as Professor Leon T. Silver, Dr. Harold Plenderleith, Professor Francis J. Turner, Professor Paul L. Kirk, Professor C. Osborne Hutton, Dr. Jack De Ment, Dr. Zaki Iskander, Professor Eliot Blackwelder, and many more, must be favored over the sole and unscientific "Technical Examination" of Mr. William J. Young of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. Surely the opinions of eminent scholars of Egyptology like Drioton, Gabra, Boreux and Varille must be favored over the word-of-mouth or irrational statements of Messrs. Cooney, Bothmer, H. W. Müller and Derchain.

If we were to judge the Abbé Drioton on the merits of his innumerable and scholarly works, publications, number of years spent in Egypt, and the highest positions which he occupied in Egypt and France, as against the combined efforts and writings of Messrs. Cooney, Bothmer, Müller, and Derchain, who would have the greater understanding of the Egyptian mind? Who would have the greater knowledge of Egyptian history? Who would have the greater understanding and appreciation of Egyptian art? Who would be the greater style expert of Egyptian art? (For a reference on the late Dr. E. Drioton's life and work, see International Who's Who, 1960.)

Though he was one of the greatest scholars of Egyptology of our time, Dr. Etienne Drioton was modest. He accepted also the value of qualified scientific investigation. The other four accepted only their own authoritarian opinions, whether documented or not. They want to impose their view on all. They want us to believe that Egyptology is their very private domain. They not only ignored the value of qualified scientific investigation, but most of them criticized it. (See excerpts from letters of these four Egyptologists in this paper and in "Je Cherche un Homme..." See also letter of authentication of Dr. Drioton in "Je Cherche un Homme...")

For the benefit of the named Egyptologists, we will say that Egyptian art has been hieratic in the sense that it produced the Sphinx, the Pyramids, the great temples, the Colossi of Memnon, the mummies and the mummified cats, and so forth. Everyone and not just these four Egyptologists--can tell that all these are a part of the Egyptian cultural heritage. On the other hand, from the earliest dynasties until the end of the Ptolemaic period, there have been artists who felt different emotions, who strayed from conventional representations perhaps because they were impelled to do so under the influence of changing times, moods, ideas or environment, and who produced works of art that were "different," and yet so superbly Egyptian as the kneeling statuette of Pepi I; the bust of Ankh-haf; the "Reserve" heads; the Horse and Rider; the Colossi of Akhenaton; the unfinished statuette of Akhenaton kissing one of his daughters; the bust of Nefertiti; the fragment of a relief showing Nefertiti sitting on Akhenaton's lap; and a multitude of others. Can the four Egyptologists tell us in what way any of our sculptures of Tel-El-Amarna is so different from these outstanding and/or unorthodox representations? Is it so difficult for these "expert Egyptologists" to keep an open mind and study these sculptures simply as "a new form" of the art of Akhenaton? The subject of Akhenaton's "mutiny" is still under study. "Akhenaten - Pharaoh of Egypt: A New Study" by Cyril Aldred of the Royal Scottish Museum, a book published recently, discusses new thoughts about the "heretic" king and his period. Two articles published in 1971 and 1972 in the *National Geographic* and in newspapers throughout the United States, by Mr. Ray Winfield Smith, a research archaeologist associated with the University Museum of Philadelphia, continue the investigation of the lives of Akhenaton and Nefertiti.

The understanding of the art of the period of Akhenaton, whether in Karnak or Tel-El-Amarna, is not yet a closed chapter. It is needless to quote here the endless scholarly observations made by serious Egyptologists of this age and the past to prove this point. And nowhere can we find any statements on Amarna art and style worthy of mention from the works of any of the four named Egyptologists. Surely the true scholars of Egyptology and archaeology, the art historians, and all persons familiar with ancient Egyptian art will know what we mean by this last statement.

Before we end this discussion, let us ask the four named Egyptologists, two of whom are thought to be "expert" stylists (Cooney and H. W. Müller), if they know of any Egyptian forgeries displaying the type of surface found on our sculptures. Can they tell us if they know of a way in which this surface can be exactly duplicated on forgeries? Can Mr. Cooney tell us in what way the sculptures reproduced in "Je Cherche un Homme" "give every indication of a recent origin"? Can he only give us a somewhat more tangible argument? Three of the sculptures shown on the front cover of the brochure, and on page 10, 11 and 21, are exquisitely stylized. Can Professor Hans Wolfgang Müller tell us in what way these three pieces "exaggerate certain stylistic characteristics of the Amarna artistry in such an obtrusive fashion that every connoisseur of Egyptian art must consider them forgeries without hesitation"? Has Professor Müller seen the Colossi of Akhenaton found in Karnak? Has he seen other Tel-El-Amarna material whose style is exaggerated? Should we ask Dr. V. Bothmer if the head of Nefertiti on the back cover of "Je Cherche un Homme" looks like a "ware"? Is this the best that Dr. Bothmer can offer for an opinion? It is indeed difficult to argue with the poor reasoning given by these Egyptologists. As to Professor Derchain, we prefer not to even argue the contents of his letter. Our answer to him should be sufficient.

Will the serious Egyptologists, the world of arts and sciences, the museums and connoisseurs of Egyptian art allow Egyptology to be ruled by fantastic, illogical and irresponsible remarks such as those made by these four named Egyptologists?

Is it reasonable to assume that the American Association of Museums as well as other persons in prominent museum positions have been unwilling to act so far only to save face for the few who made a mistake? And what about the preface of the 1971 *Directory of the American Association of Museums* in which Mr. Kyran M. McGrath, director of the Association, says: "...But Museums exist to serve the public and they will continue to provide these services to the utmost of their ability and their resources." We are at a loss here! Are we to laugh, lament or weep when we read this statement?

Should the responsible persons allow this matter to stagnate and deprive the world of arts of a wealth of magnificent sculptures and historical information which have been preserved for us by the elements for more than thirty centuries?

It is ironic that the Boston and Brooklyn Museums, two of this country's leading institutions, which have important departments of Egyptian art, should have been the ones to have originated this controversy, when they should have been the first to investigate the problem, for the sake of their good names, for the sake of Egyptian art, and for the sake of the art-loving public they serve.

It is ironic that the Metropolitan Museum which also has one of the largest departments of Egyptian art outside of Egypt, and which, through its curator of Egyptology, the late Dr. Ambrose Lansing, was the first institution in this country to have asked our father to send some of the sculptures of Tel-El-Amarna for consideration of purchase, should have dropped the matter and ceased all investigation after the appearance of Mr. Young's report.

It should be pointed out that we returned repeatedly to the Metropolitan Museum for a reexamination of the sculptures after we had obtained the numerous scientific reports authenticating the Collection. Though the scientist of the Metropolitan, the late Dr. Murray Pease, had wished to examine

the sculptures, the late Mr. Rorimer, the director of the Museum at the time, prevented him from doing so on the grounds that Mr. Young of Boston had already examined them and had declared them forgeries. All other scientific evidence was ignored. We have sufficient evidence to conclude that Dr. Pease believed in the authenticity of the sculptures. It is a letter written to Dr. Fred H. Stross after the publication of his report, eliciting much interest and favorable comments regarding the technical work done on the sculptures.

It is ironic that the Denver Art Museum, which has one of the smallest collections of Egyptian art in this country, should have been the first and only, through its director, Dr. Otto Karl Bach, to acquire two important sculptures from our Tel-El-Amarna Collection. It must be pointed out that Dr. Bach who is not an Egyptologist, but who has a profound and magnificent appreciation of ancient Egyptian art, had decided to acquire these sculptures after having seen only the negative report of Mr. Young (1949), and the two favorable reports written in Egypt in 1942 by Mr. A. Lucas, and in 1950 by Drs. Iskander and Mustafa. As it happened, the massive scientific evidence came later to vindicate his good judgment and understanding of the problem.

• • • • •

One of the greatest misfortunes that we have encountered in all these years is that even "experts" have given fateful opinions without having examined or even seen the sculptures themselves.

Another great misfortune is the fact that several of the leading Egyptologists of our time have refused to intervene in this matter, some for reasons of their own, some because of their institutions' regulations, and others perhaps to save face for their colleagues.

Another of the greatest frustrations that we have endured is the unwillingness of the officials of the leading museumsto act in this matter despite the irrefutable evidence. Can anyone deny the fact that most of them have shied away from their sacred responsibilities toward art, the museums and the public they serve?

Need we say here that history repeats itself? Need we remind anyone that similar controversies have occurred in the past (Altamira, Tel-El-Amarna Tablets, the case of Shapira, and others); that originally one renowned expert had misjudgedthese great works of art or historical documents; that other experts had followed suit; that the discoverers or owners of these great artifacts or documents had spent a lifetime in the pursuit of the TRUTH; that most of them died disillusioned, before they could see the day of vindication?

M. A. Mansoor purchased these ancient art masterpieces over a period of twenty years. They were shown to great Egyptologists who studied them thoroughly and authenticated them. Then, a "scientist" in Boston and an "expert" in Brooklyn misjudgedthem. A few other "experts" followed suit. A massive body of scientific evidence then authenticated these sculptures. Under various pretexts other museum officials and experts refused to act. M. A. Mansoor died a few years ago, disillusioned, before he could see the day of vindication.

Today we, the sons and daughters of M. A. Mansoor, have vowed to continue our father's struggle for this just and noble cause. Though we have already impoverished ourselves over this controversy, we shall continue to fight in the strongest possible manner until the awakening of the conscience of those persons and institutions responsible for this controversy, and until a just and honest action is taken by the officials of the world museums and all lovers of ancient art.

We bear no grudges whatsoever against museums. We respect them too much. We respect their fine traditions. We also respect all museum officials and have the highest respect for Egyptologists. But

we do protest most vehemently the untoward and incongruous actions of the authorities of the Boston and Brooklyn Museums, as well as those of Messrs. Young, Cooney, Bothmer and their like.

We ask for neither pity nor charity. It must be clearly understood that we are protesting and sending our appeals only for justice, and for the understanding and appreciation of a unique collection of sculptures which includes some of the very finest works of the Tel-El-Amarna period anywhere. Its magnificent beauty, its unexcelled craftsmanship, and its historical importance place it on a level with the noblest masterpieces of art of ancient times. This is the opinion of some of the greatest scholars of Egyptology of our time. This opinion is approved by the unanimous and massive body of technical evidence contributed by some of the most distinguished scientists of our age.

It is indeed a tragedy that the opinions of the few who made a mistake, and who unfortunately placed a stigma on the Collection and mesmerized others in prominent positions in museums, have so far condemned these sculptures to remain in bank vaults for more than twenty years.

• • • • •

Insofar as the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York has a moral obligation in this controversy, an invitation is hereby extended to the authorities, Egyptologists and scientists of this great art institution to reexamine our sculptures of Tel-El-Amarna. This would be in the interests of Egyptology and fine arts.

An invitation is extended to the authorities, Egyptologists and scientists of the University Museum of Philadelphia to examine these sculptures in the interest of Egyptology and the sciences.

An invitation is extended to the Egyptologists of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts to examine our Collection in the interest of Egyptology.

An invitation is extended to the authorities and scientists of the Los Angeles County Museum to examine our Collection in the interest of fine arts and the sciences.

An invitation is extended to any and all institutions of art and related sciences, to directors of museums, to Egyptologists, and to connoisseurs in this country and abroad, to examine the sculptures and investigate this problem in the interest of Egyptology and the arts and sciences.

The late American President John F. Kennedy had said:

"One of our major goals is to help people understand the complexity of the world in which we live and the variety of the problems we face. Without understanding, there cannot be intelligent action. Ignorance and prejudice--two of democracy's greatest foes--can be dispelled by the free flow of information and ideas" (*Reader's Digest*).

Let there be understanding and let there be intelligent action. Let ignorance and prejudice be dispelled by the free flow of information and ideas.

• • • • •

THIS CONTROVERSY MUST NOT BE ALLOWED TO DEGENERATE INTO A MOCKERY.

• • • • •

WE ACCUSE...

WE ACCUSE...

WE ACCUSE...

WE ACCUSE...

WE ACCUSE...

WE ACCUSE... [For obvious reasons, we prefer not to spell out accusations of some twenty years ago against any institution or any individual--1993.]

WE ACCUSE the misled and the misguided in certain museum circles of obstruction and prejudice. Their indifference toward this problem can only cover up for the mistaken few. Their unwillingness to act in this matter is improper, unjustified and cannot serve the interest of the arts nor the interest of their noble institutions.

What we demand is an INVESTIGATION of the facts. We do not accept--and the world of arts and sciences cannot accept--the enigmatic and unfounded views of a very few.

What we demand is JUSTICE, not only for ourselves, but more for the sake of the arts and the sciences, and for the benefit of the museums. What we demand is that every official in a responsible museum position live up to the fine and noble traditions of his institution.

We demand no more. We shall accept no less.

We shall continue our fight to the bitter end; more than anything else, it is a question of justice, principle and honor. Every honest person knows this. At least we will have preserved our dignity. At least we will have done our duty without shame. Can the persons and institutions responsible for this controversy say the same?

Je Cherche un Homme...

• • • • •

The reason we didn't publish "J'Accuse" is that after we distributed "Je Cherche..." we came across two eminent scholars who showed much interest in the Mansoor Collection and we decided to wait. The two scholars: one is in the field of law, Professor Leonard D. DuBoff, at the time associated with Stanford Law School and now at Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon; the second is Dr. Andreina Leanza Becker-Colonna, Professor Emeritus, Archaeology and Egyptology, San Francisco State University.

We would like to insert an outstanding letter that **Prof. DuBoff** wrote as we find it thought-provoking and we feel it is the epitome of the "Mansoor problem." He wrote:

January 19, 1972

Mr. James H. Brown III, President
The American Association of Museums
2306 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

Dear Mr. Brown:

I recently read two papers, one by Fred H. Stross and W. J. Eisenlord and the other "Je Cherche un Homme..." by Edmond Mansoor. The story they tell, if true--and I have no reason to doubt their veracity--is shocking.

I must begin by pleading ignorance as to their scientific disclosures, for I have no background in Egyptology or related subjects; nevertheless I do possess a certain expertise in the field of law. In an era when the concept of due process is ever expanding, it is astonishing to read of an ex parte hearing held in the manner of the medieval Star Chamber which resulted in a judgment so final that even newly discovered evidence, presented by noted scholars, would not be deemed sufficient grounds for a rehearing.

Sir, I am distressed to find the scientific community lagging so far behind the law in its view of fundamental fairness. If in fact the Tel-El-Amarna sculptures are forgeries, then it would be in the best interests of all concerned to once and for all establish that fact beyond any reasonable doubt. If on the other hand they are authentic, then Egyptology, Art and the Public at large are being deprived of a wealth of knowledge and priceless treasures.

I urge you to take steps to cause those responsible for the cavalier treatment accorded the Mansoor Collection to reevaluate their relentless position. If they are correct in their original estimation, they will put the Ghost to rest once and for all. If they were in error, then they--like Mr. Justice Stewart in his concurring opinion in *Boy's Market Inc. v. Retail Clerks Union* 398 U.S. 235 (1970) at 245--should manfully own up to it. In short, I urge you to afford the Mansoors the due process which is part of our American heritage, for as Mr. Justice Frankfurter so aptly put it: "Wisdom too often never comes, and so one ought not to reject it merely because it comes late" (*Henslee v. Union Planters Bank* 335 U.S. 595 at 600).

(signed: Leonard D. DuBoff)

Even though the scholar who wrote the above stupendous letter did not get a really receptive answer from the American Association of Museums, the Mansoors are forever greatly indebted to him. It goes without saying that the courteous answer of the AAM did not amount to much.

The second scholar we came across, *Dr. Becker-Colonna*, started to study the Collection in 1972, examining and indeed scrutinizing all stylistic details of each object, and reviewing the scientific reports. After three years, she was satisfied the pieces are ancient and she decided to have the Collection exhibited at San Francisco State. The exhibition was held from June 17 to July 11, 1975.

The exhibition at San Francisco State University was indeed a tremendous success, although it was boycotted by many Egyptologists. Let it be known that most viewers showed diverse positive enthusiasm and admiration--many returning to see the Collection again. Regarding the exhibition, we would like to quote Dr. Becker-Colonna from the foreword of her 1975 catalogue. She wrote:

"The sculptures were subjected to petrographic, chemical, microscopic analyses, and other scientific techniques which the laboratories of three continents could offer. If that were not enough, the study of the style, fashion, symbols, postures, details, anatomy, etc. undeniably supply that 'quantum' which only competent connoisseurs of ancient art history, trained by long experience and gifted with a special sensitivity may supply. Ample written documentation, both scientific and stylistic, backs the strongest possible evidence of the authenticity of the El-Amarna sculptures.

"When the Mansoors moved to this country a small part of their El-Amarna Collection was exhibited in a few museums: at the De Young Museum in San Francisco in 1954; in 1955 and in 1961 at the Denver Art Museum; at the San Diego Fine Arts Gallery in 1957; and in the Museum of Portland, Oregon in 1972. However, this is the first time that the Collection is presented to the public in its more complete, varied, and significant aspect.

"It is these unique masterpieces, created more than three thousand years ago in Egypt, which we are so fortunate to behold and enjoy today. It is quite a privilege because few collections outside Egypt supply altogether such a fine view of one of the most elegant, sophisticated, and enigmatic periods of the history of world sculpture."

We would also like to quote the conclusion of that catalogue:

"In concluding this descriptive summary presentation of the Mansoor El-Amarna Collection it is hoped that it has been made clear that, according to the author's belief, all the pieces exhibited are genuine, original, authentic and ancient. This statement is necessary because, for approximately twenty-five years, a cloud has been hanging over these remarkable works of art of one of the greatest periods of ancient Egypt. The cloud unfortunately originated in this country because of an ill interpretation of a 'scientific' report.

"Now I turn to those experts who have, over a period of twenty-five years, studied the Collection and given positive reports. All this important, scientifically interesting and ample documentation is available to anyone who wishes to consult it through publications, reports, letters, etc. After a careful study of the Collection, and according to the technical, stylistic, and aesthetic analysis presented in this catalogue, it is self-evident that the preponderance of data speaks in favor of the authenticity of the Mansoor Collection.

"From the scientific viewpoint, the ample documentation available refutes any doubts about the merits of the antiquity or originality of these works.

"The question now remains: How did the late Mr. Mansoor acquire these El-Amarna sculptures? It is evident that archaeological items whose provenance is unquestionable are those found in excavations, well documented by the archaeologists in charge, and described in their daily records and reports. But how many items found in museums and private collections are from these unquestionable, scientific digging sources? If we should accept as authentic only those

works of art whose provenance is that of documented excavations, our museums would be half empty.

"In the controversy over the Mansoor Collection, after having carefully studied the documentation, the author has found a great deal of superficial, unsubstantial, invalid statements made by people who have briefly looked at only a few pieces, or who have not even examined a single piece of the Collection, or who have issued their definitive and all-sweeping judgements based only on photographs, or who have heard about the Collection from other people...

"A positive, critical declaration, honest and worthy of professional consideration can be given by a critic of art only after having thoroughly examined all the pieces in question. This I have done.

"The Collection is exhibited, the scientific and aesthetic documentation printed. Any scholar with professional knowledge, unbiased approach, and ethical behavior who wishes to come forth with sound arguments well supported scientifically and/or stylistically is welcome.

"Professional and ethical art criticism is not based on gossip nor random talk and it is, therefore, high time that such a beautiful collection of fine Egyptian art comes out of the cloud cast on it by the unexplainable behavior of a handful of historians or so-called stylists who have, so far, neither followed the ethical and scholarly procedures of studying the whole Collection nor offered detailed, sound evidences on which they should have based their statements."

Before we end this chapter on the 1975 exhibition, we would like to quote the eminent Dr. Alfred Frankenstein, who was a lecturer at Stanford University and who, at the time, was one of the leading--if not the leading--West Coast art critic. He wrote a two-page article titled "Akhenaten and His Family" in "This World," *San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle*, Sunday, July 6, 1975, pp. 21 and 23:

"...Akhenaten was responsible for a new style in Egyptian portraiture which is most dramatically expressed in the portraits of the monarch himself. 'The heads are grotesquely distorted,' says Edward L. B. Terrace in his great book, *Treasures of Egyptian Art from the Cairo Museum*. 'The face is long and narrow, the chin and cheekbones angular and elongated, the eyes narrow, overlong and hooded, the lips huge, pendulous and sensual. The thin fold of flesh between nostrils and lips is emphasized by the pouched flesh at the corners of the mouth.' These remarkably innovations have been described by Aldred as having 'been exaggerated to such an extent as to lose their natural significance and take on a new, superhuman symbolism--a stigma.'

"Mme. Becker-Colonna sees the new style for the rendering of the royal countenance a little differently. 'The eyes are almond-shaped slanted,' says she. 'The nose is very thin at the top, becoming wider at the nostrils; the eyebrows are rounded, and the eyelids are heavy and seem to veil the gaze, which looks toward a distant inner thought, to a mysterious, inside world.' And she credits the sculptor or sculptors who made these works with an astonishing gift of 'expressing on the king's emaciated face the tormented spirit of a disillusioned individual suffering from a deep spiritual conflict.'

"Terrace and Becker-Colonna are modern critics capable of understanding this Egyptian modernism of the 14th Century, B.C. There are fashions in the criticism of ancient art just as there are fashions in the criticism of everything, and in an older day Egyptian art was filtered through a screen of classic Greek idealization, whether or not these older critics were aware of that fact. The face of Akhenaten horrified them, and so did the portraits of his daughters, of which there are numerous examples at San Francisco State. They felt there had to be something

wrong with these people, some mental or physiological deficiency to explain their departure from the norm.

"The faces of the daughters have puckered lips, big eyes, prominent ears, and fleshy nose like those of Akhenaten himself, but the most extraordinary thing about them is the enormous, bulbous distortion of the backs of their heads. There is no trace of hair, represented on these curious and rather revolting bulges, but William Mansoor says contemporary paintings show abundant hair done up into the same bulbosity; it is therefore likely that the skulls of the princesses were perfectly normal and that their apparent distortion is merely the high-style coiffure of the day. The one person represented without distortion is Akhenaten's queen, Nefertiti, whose name means 'the beautiful one is come.' The Mansoor sculptures of this lovely lady may not equal the painted one in Berlin, which is probably the most famous single Egyptian bust in existence, but they fully justify Nefertiti's name and, since they are unfinished, they add an insight into the workings of the Egyptian sculptor's studio which the Berlin version does not....

"...Some authorities have challenged their authenticity, but the overwhelming preponderance of expert opinion is in their favor. The Mansoors, who are dealers and have been hurt by the unfavorable opinions, make too much of the verdicts on their side. They and their agents snow you with the views of this, that, and the other friendly expert, and this produces a reaction exactly opposite to the one they seek. I, for one, went to see the collection in a highly skeptical mood, but the works themselves instantly won me over.

"Their provenance is mysterious. One is told an unverifiable tale about a shadowy Greek who lived in the Egyptian desert around the turn of the century and found them. Aten (the king's One God) alone knows where. This kind of thing is regarded as criminal today, but when Karl Meyer, author of *The Plundered Past* and the writer who, more than any other, is responsible for arousing the contemporary conscience against the heedless destruction of ancient sites, was here in San Francisco last week he remarked that he does not believe in retroactive morality; mysterious Greeks materializing ancient pieces out of nowhere were a fixture on the archeological scene for generations, and there is not a collection of ancient art in the world that did not take advantage of their offerings.

"The 44 sculptures at San Francisco State are all, with one exception, remarkably small. They are all displayed in one little room on the third floor of the library, and they have been beautifully installed and superbly lighted. The delicacy and finesse of the techniques whereby they were wrought are incredible. This is perhaps most impressively apparent in the reliefs, but the sculptures in the full round are magnificent too....

"All these pieces look as if they were made yesterday, but experts in petrography agree that they show the proper patinas and the proper evidence of erosion by wind and sand. What pleased me most was that these proofs of antiquity appear on the surfaces at the base of each neck as well as everywhere else. In other words, if any of these heads were knocked off full-standing figures, that insult to their integrity was committed in ancient times. Whatever else the mysterious Greek in the desert may have been, he wasn't a desecrator of ancient sites. And that makes me feel a lot better about the whole thing...."

May we please point out to the reader that Dr. Frankenstein "went to see the collection in a highly skeptical mood, but the works themselves instantly won me over." May we also ask the reader to keep in mind that **"the delicacy and finesse of the techniques whereby they [the 44 sculptures] were wrought are incredible** This is perhaps most impressively apparent in the reliefs, but the sculptures in the full round are magnificent too...."

• • • • •

Deplorable and Detrimental Statements by Few Egyptologists

In the following chapters, we will quote and produce letters by few Egyptologists who stated or commented negatively on the Mansoor Amarna Collection. Before we start, we want to emphasize the fact that the letters we'll talk about were written by true scholars that we respect. These scholars happen to also be true human beings. We have one question: Do human beings err?

- I. **Professor Keith Seele** of the Oriental Institute of Chicago, the University of Chicago, is the "deceased Egyptologist" we were talking about in "J'Accuse," on page 42. We would like to quote all his letter as it shows how a letter written by a scholar on important institution letterhead could be damaging. He wrote:

November 20, 1958

"Dear Mr. Stross:

"Yes I do remember the occasion of our meeting when you visited the Oriental Institute several years ago.

"With regard to the limestone head of an Amarna princess, I fear that I am unable to offer you much encouragement on the question of testing it here at the Oriental Institute for authenticity. This is a type of service which we avoid on policy, though on occasion some of the members of the staff do offer opinions on an unofficial basis.

"A judgment on this head would almost certainly have to be made on the study of style and material alone. Perhaps the most qualified authority to attempt this is Dr. John A. Cooney of the Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, N.Y. though I have no idea whether he would be willing to undertake such a responsibility unless the object were being considered for acquisition by his museum.

"But I must go on to add that I already have an opinion about the head in question, without ever having seen it. I should consider it almost a miracle if this head were to be proved genuine. I have no idea whether it was a part of the Mansoor collection offered for sale in New York several years ago in a catalogue issued by the Park Bernet Galleries (I fear that my spelling of both names is incorrect). However, a very large proportion of those objects were forgeries, and one which I could mention was a copy of an original which is still in its original position in an Egyptian monument.

"There is a considerable number of Amarna forgeries on the market and in the hands of dealers. Some of them are quite famous and well known. There may be others which have appeared in dealers' shops in recent years, and I doubt not that a few are still being manufactured. On the other hand, I am confident that few if any works of this sort have been found at Amarna in recent years or that older finds exist in the hands of dealers. I know, however, that certain dealers claim to have magnificent specimens of Amarna sculpture, which they are reluctant to show unless there is a chance of making a deal for a considerable price. And you are fully aware that a first-class head from Amarna would be worth a small fortune.

"The original member of the Mansoor family who carried on a business of dealing in antiquities undoubtedly stocked a large number of genuine pieces. Unless, however, he

differed from the other dealers known to me, he possessed and was ready to sell objects which had originated much more recently than the pharaonic period. I am confident that there were many of this sort in the sale catalog which I mentioned above.

"I do not know how well the senior Mansoor knew his antiquities. I suspect that the dealer has no means of judging the authenticity of a piece which is unknown to the scholar. The dealer has the advantage of knowing manufacturers of forgeries, and the identity of these is often a mystery to collectors, who, of course, are not to be supposed to know that they are even being manufactured. But if the senior Mansoor did have a keen sense of judging what was genuine and what was not (granting that it really made any difference to him in his business), it does not follow that other members of the family would have the same acumen. Detecting forgeries on the basis of style and technique is a really difficult and tricky business, and many great scholars have been deceived, even though they have devoted their lives to the study of ancient art. An uneducated or untrained dealer will scarcely have superior equipment with which to form a judgment.

"That two technical reports on the Amarna head should have reached opposite conclusions is highly suspicious. One would very much wish to know the source of both reports. I should be inclined to wonder whether this is not merely a device to allay doubt on the part of a prospective purchaser. As to whether the head came from the studio of B'k, rather than from one of the other studios, who would be able to determine such a claim? This is merely another effort to throw dust in one's eyes. Is the location of B'k's studio known? And is it a proven fact that this head was found in that location? Obviously, it is not a proven fact that it was actually found at Amarna; if that were certain no one would care whether it came from one studio or another. Unless the head has a known history before it came into the hands of the dealer, the burden of proof is on the dealer to prove that it is genuine, not merely to state an opinion (a definitely prejudiced opinion) that it is genuine.

"You see therefore the reasons which I have for doubt about the head in question. Am I fair in entertaining such doubts without having seen the object? I can only appeal to my experience as my justification. And this is all that I can do, except to refer you to Dr. Cooney of the Brooklyn Museum, in whose opinion I have absolute confidence.

"I hope that my letter is not too much of a disappointment to you. It is really not a pleasant task to pass judgment on antiquities. I have seen many pieces which I should have enjoyed owning, but the joy would have been greatly enhanced if I could have been persuaded that they were authentic."

(signed: Keith Seele)

With the reader's permission, we would like to perform a partial anatomy of Professor Seele's letter, which was in response to a letter Dr. Fred H. Stross had sent him--asking if the Institute could undertake a technical examination on an Amarna head of a princess he was considering acquiring.

- 1) Professor Seele hasn't seen the head he was asked to examine; yet twice, he gives a negative opinion on it.
- 2) Professor Seele is referring to an auction sale we gave at Parke-Bernet Galleries several years before. We actually gave two: one on October 15 and 16, 1947 and the other on January 30 and 31, 1952. Since two other Egyptologists mention also the auction sale in derogatory terms, it is very important to clear this matter once and for all.

- 2A) There has never been any sculpture from the Mansoor Amarna Collection we're talking about, either displayed or sold at the Parke-Bernet Galleries. Never. In fact, none of the Mansoors, father or sons, has ever included any object from the Collection in any auction gallery in the world. (The writers do remember that they are under oath.)
- 2B) Our records from the first sale catalogue of 1947 show that there were no returns and we had no problem in that sale. We deduct, then, that Professor Seele, as well as the two other Egyptologists we'll mention later, are probably referring to the second sale of 1952. We would like to point out that the sale of October 15 and 16, 1947 took place exactly twelve days before Mr. William J. Young's letter dated October 27, 1947 in which he declared that "we [the MFA Boston] have had to throw the book at the objects as far as examinations are concerned.... In my opinion, the above two heads are of fairly modern origin." We wonder if it is the non-appearance before the sale of the astounding letter of Mr. Young that is the reason for our not having any problem in that first sale.
- 2C) We would like to quote from the Foreword of the second sale catalogue of January 30 and 31, 1952, titled "ANCIENT EGYPTIAN ART--The Magnificent Collection Formed by M. A. Mansoor--Cairo and Heliopolis." The following was printed:

"Between the covers of the present catalogue lies a comprehensive view of five thousand years of Egyptian art, from prehistory to the rude Christianity of the Coptic era. The collection was formed over a period of nearly fifty years by M. A. Mansoor of Cairo and Heliopolis, the oldest existing firm of Egyptian antiquarians... This will therefore constitute the most important public sale of Egyptian art ever to take place in America.

"The outstanding artifacts of this era are, however, the extraordinary collection of foundation-deposits of the reign of Thothmes III, found near Thebes, and comprising sixteen tools and nine faience plaquettes. The tools, which have bronze blades engraved with the King's praenomen, are attached by the original red-tinted leather thongs to the wooden handles, and are in perfect preservation, constituting what is undoubtedly the finest group ever excavated. Side by side with these, as an epitome of the period, must be placed the noble Mansoor papyrus, as yet barely opened, with its wealth of illuminated vignettes of hieratic and domestic ceremonies, and its exquisite hieroglyphic writing. Among the late dynastic objects is the famous XXV Dynasty group depicting King Taharqa worshipping before the Horus Hawk, the only major object combining gold, silver and bronze...."

With great pride, we would like to frame the Foreword's conclusion:

Under no circumstances should the Mansoors offer an each and every article in the catalogue."
--

What do we understand from that Foreword? Obviously that the sale was quite important and included were outstanding rare artifacts. In fact, we'll only mention that the "XXV Dynasty group depicting King Taharqa..." was purchased by the Louvre (cf. Louvre-Paris, NEWSWEEK/GREAT MUSEUMS OF THE WORLD, 1967 p. 25 showing a stunning color illustration of that group). And "the

extraordinary collection of foundation-deposits of the reign of Thothmes III..." was purchased by the Oriental Institute of Chicago! What an irony! All other objects were purchased by museums, collectors and art dealers.

But what else do we understand from the Foreword's conclusion which is more obvious than the fact that the sale was important? Isn't it that Mr. Mansoor was offering "an unconditional guarantee of the genuineness of each and every article in the catalogue"? Pray tell, who on earth ever offered such an "unconditional guarantee" on ancient Egyptian artifacts in any auction sale? Doesn't this, in fact, mean that Mr. Mansoor was convinced of the authenticity of "each and every article in the catalogue"? But M. A. Mansoor, who was a human being, must have made errors in his life. There may have been forgeries unknown to him in that sale and according to our records, four pieces out of 342 lots returned to us. And four out of 342 are clearly not "a very large proportion." But we would like to point out that any person could have returned any object purchased under any pretense since there was the money-back guarantee clause. Maybe someone was told that the object purchased was not genuine, or was too expensive...Another point to remember is that none of the pieces sold at Parke-Bernet in the two sales was ever examined scientifically. None. The reader should also remember that the ugly rumors about our "wares" were already circulating since the end of October 1947. The rumors, the despicable rumors--what better example can we give than the letter of Professor Seele?

- 3) As to the statement that the "original member of the Mansoor family...possessed and was ready to sell objects which had originated much more recently than the pharaonic period," this is sheer nonsense because Professor Seele, as we will state in just a little while, has never been in any of our places of business, either in Egypt or in the U.S.A.
- 4) Since Professor Seele does "not know how well the senior Mansoor knew his antiquities," why is he insinuating that he is "uneducated and untrained"? As for inferring that "the dealer has the advantage of knowing manufacturers of forgeries...", we prefer, out of respect for Professor Seele, not to comment on this posterous remark.
- 5) "That two technical reports on the Amarna head should have reached opposite conclusions is highly suspicious!" Indeed, Dr. Stross had mentioned in his letter to Professor Seele that there were two contradicting technical reports without giving their sources: The MFA Boston report and the one of the Cairo Museum. The two "technical reports" in fact existed. As for "unless the head has a known history before it came in the hands of the dealer, the burden of proof is on the dealer to prove that it is genuine, not merely to state an opinion (a definitely prejudiced opinion) that it is genuine." Just look who's talking about prejudice! And just what is the known history of well over 50% of ancient Egyptian artifacts in museums around the world? Can anyone deny that most came directly or indirectly from dealers?
- 6) Needless to point out to the reader that Professor Seele is referring Dr. Stross twice to consult Dr. Cooney who, perhaps, is "the most qualified authority to attempt" to give a judgment on the head "on the study of style and material alone," and in whose opinion he has "absolute confidence." (We're coming to Dr. Cooney's opinion in the next chapter.)

Indeed, there is much more to refute and elaborate on Professor Seele's letter, but we will spare the reader and ourselves the further aggravation this will cause. With one exception, there's no logic in his letter. The exception is: **Detecting forgeries on the basis of style and technique is a really difficult and tricky business, and many great scholars have been deceived, even though they have devoted their lives to the study of ancient art.**" Thank God, we did not and do not have to say it ourselves!

.

Before we proceed to the next chapter, let it be known that one of the main writers--and he realizes he is under oath--went to visit Professor Seele at the Oriental Institute and he was received very courteously. After normal polite exchanges of news about business and M. A. Mansoor, etc., the Mansoor member took out from his briefcase a copy of Seele's letter to Stross, asking him why he wrote that letter. Seele's answer was something like, "You know, we hear things...." When asked if he had ever met M. A. Mansoor or any of his sons, or whether he had ever been in any of our places of business (in Egypt or the United States, New York or California), the answer was "no" and again something like "we hear things from various people." Professor Seele, a scholar, seemed to the writers to be an extremely amiable gentleman, but he was most unconscious of the damage he was causing!

.

II. **Dr. John D. Cooney**, Curator, Department of Ancient Art, The Brooklyn Museum, New York.

In his answer to Dr. Fred H. Stross--who was referred to him as we have seen by Professor Seele and who was asking him to make an examination of the Amarna head of a princess, Dr. Cooney wrote the following on December 9, 1958:

"I have your letter of December 6th requesting my cooperation in making an examination of the Amarna sculptures in the collection of Mr. Mansoor.

"I am perfectly familiar with all the facts you list in your letter and I have seen all the reports you mention. I have seen most of these Amarna sculptures several times, both in Egypt and in this country, and in my opinion these sculptures are not ancient. I have been approached by many collectors and museums at various times concerning these sculptures and I have always had to give an unfavorable opinion. In a few cases I have had the sculptures here for examination and without exception it has been our conclusion that the sculptures give every indication of a recent origin.

"I see no point in going over the same ground again as I would approach the problem from a prejudiced point of view as you will readily understand. I must add that I have a very high opinion of the ability and integrity of Mr. William J. Young who is in my opinion the best authority in this country on technical problems connected with works of art. Since I have this opinion I am sure you will understand me when I say that I think it very unwise to ignore his advice. I hope I have made my position in this matter entirely clear."

Fact: Dr. Cooney has "seen most of these Amarna sculptures several times, both in Egypt and in this country." Fact: "In a few cases," he has had the sculptures at the Brooklyn Museum for examination. Fact: He was convinced that Mr. William J. Young was "the best authority in this country on technical problems connected with works of art." Fact: He relied too much on Mr. Young's opinion. Finally, a most significant fact: Dr. Cooney stated that it is "very unwise to ignore his advice." Very unwise!

Since Dr. Cooney has seen the sculptures several times in Egypt and in the U.S.A. in the 1940s, and has had them for examination at the Brooklyn Museum a few times, don't we understand that he was not at all sure for a long, long time whether they were ancient or not? It is only about April 14, 1949, the date of the ill-fated report of Mr. Young--that his pernicious opinion became known publicly and was spread right and left. Let us clarify this point: We are inserting a facsimile of a "RECEIPT FOR OBJECTS DEPOSITED" with the Brooklyn Museum dated March 17, 1949. Dr. Cooney was about to again examine the sculptures. After a few weeks, we were called to take back the pieces as he had finished his examination and was simply not interested to acquire any of the sculptures for the Brooklyn Museum. About that time, or to be more correct, on April 14, 1949, the negative report of Mr. Young was issued. A facsimile of Young's report is inserted in "Je Cherche un Homme..." pp. 24-29 and the date of April 14, 1949 is clearly shown. What an extraordinary "coincidence"! Were Dr. Cooney and Mr. Young in constant touch during that time?

(Please see Exhibit #1, dated March 17, 1949, Brooklyn Museum.)

At the bottom of page 2 of "Je Cherche un Homme..." we mentioned a letter and we wrote only the following:

"In another communication, when told that Dr. Etienne Drioton considered the sculptures not only ancient, but also outstanding works of art, Mr. Cooney replied:

"I gather you are impressed by the authentication of the Abbé Drioton. He is indeed a distinguished philologist but his opinion on objects is completely worthless."

Later, we'll get back to the remark about the Abbé Drioton, but let it be said at this time that he was one of the greatest Egyptologist of this century and no one can contest this point. In fact, in "WHO WAS WHO IN EGYPTOLOGY," the Egypt Exploration Society, London 1972 p. 88, Dr. Drioton is listed as "French Egyptologist." But for the time being, we are inserting a facsimile of the letter mentioned in page 2 of "Je Cherche un Homme..." so the reader realizes the magnitude of the negative rumors that circulated and are still circulating on the Mansoor Collection. Let it be known quickly that we did not insert that whole letter in "Je Cherche un Homme..." as we did not feel at the time like embarrassing the Brooklyn Museum or any of its officials since "Je Cherche..." was an appeal and that letter contained absurd and inaccurate remarks as we shall now see.

(Please see Exhibit #2)

In reading this letter dated January 28, 1959, one would notice three important points referring to "Dr. Etienne Drioton," "Parke-Bernet Galleries," and "the few acknowledged authorities in the field of Egyptian art." As we said a little while ago, we'll get back later to the remark about Dr. Drioton. We'll now proceed with the second unfounded and untrue remark about Parke-Bernet's "experiences with portions of this collection."

What we reserved from the preceding section concerning Professor Seele and the Parke-Bernet Galleries to be written in this one, is the fact that there were three Amarna objects--positively not from the Mansoor Amarna Collection in limestone we're writing about--in both sales at Parke-Bernet of 1947 and 1952. The writers, having in mind they are under oath, would like to state again that none of the sculptures from the Mansoor Amarna Collection we're writing about and that Dr. Cooney mentions at the beginning of his letter was ever included in

the sales at Parke-Bernet Galleries. None. This is also confirmed by the third Egyptologist we'll mention later, a European, who obviously has the sales catalogues and checked that point.

As a matter of fact, two of the Amarna objects in the sale were heads of Akhenaten in quartzite. The third piece, a relief in limestone of no great importance and not really of any significant beauty, was of a different texture, positively and absolutely not from the same quarry, collection or source, i.e., not purchased from Tawadros Ghoubrial, the dealer who sold the Amarna Collection to M. A. Mansoor. (We still have the two catalogues of the sales at Parke-Bernet and for references, they could also be found in museum libraries with important ancient Egyptian departments.) Furthermore, was it conceivable that Mr. Mansoor would include in the sales any Amarna object of his Collection knowing only too well that Dr. Cooney and Mr. Young had declared the objects of a recent origin? Wouldn't this jeopardize or spoil the sales?

Thus, the "experiences with portions of this collection" by Parke-Bernet is not only totally illogical and unfounded, but indeed not true.

Should we think in depth about the "experiences" of Parke-Bernet, we'll come up with a few questions: Just how did Dr. Cooney know about those "experiences"? Parke-Bernet Galleries was indeed a world-famous, respectable and prestigious firm, and would have never considered selling an object unless they were totally satisfied it was genuine. Consequently, was it conceivable that Parke-Bernet would accept to sell a collection including "portions" of forgeries? Besides, would they broadcast that "portions" of a collection they sold were forgeries? So, someone must have known about the incidents of the objects returned. Could it have been someone from the MFA Boston or the Brooklyn Museum?

We would like to add that only one Amarna object (out of three Amarnas) was returned to us. It is a quartzite head sold for a substantial amount of money in the sale of 1952. We're wondering if someone told the buyer that the amount paid was excessive. Although this is farfetched, did someone, to really discredit the Mansoor Amarna Collection, ask a collector to buy that head and then return it? Or did someone tell the purchaser to return it on grounds it came from the Mansoor Amarna Collection which was declared not ancient by Dr. Cooney and Mr. Young? We just don't know! The "money-back guarantee" clause was clearly stipulated in the sale catalogue and one should never assume that the four pieces returned to us were forgeries or even dubious.

We now refer to the third point of that letter dated January 29, 1959 regarding the "few acknowledged authorities..." They are listed on page 3 of "Je Cherche un Homme..." and also in a letter Dr. Cooney sent Dr. Stross on February 10, 1959 in which he concludes saying:

"I think it is unlikely that any of these individuals would be willing to undertake a technical examination for you, but I think it is very probable that if you were to supply photographs of the objects a firm opinion would be forthcoming. The names I have given you are recognized throughout our field as representing the best on opinions of Egyptian art."

We do not contest the fact that the names of the five Egyptologists Dr. Cooney gave are recognized as "representing [some of] the best on opinions of Egyptian art." Indeed, we consider these Egyptologists scholars. None though, to our knowledge, has issued a written negative opinion on the Mansoor Collection and we are going to discuss Professor Müller's opinion in a later chapter. For now, the four other Egyptologists given by Dr. Cooney are:

- 1) **Dr. William C. Hayes**, Curator, Egyptian Department, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, examined the sculptures in New York **several times**, but, as far as we know, he never formulated an opinion--possibly because it was "very unwise" to ignore Mr. Young's advice. After all, one should respect the opinion of the "best authority in this country on technical problems connected with works of art." And to be sure, one should also respect the opinion of the "most qualified authority" on Egyptian art, who happens to also be a colleague: Dr. John D. Cooney!
- 2) **Mr. Cyril Aldred**, to our knowledge, never saw or examined the Collection. We quote Ms. Sylvia Hochfield from an article in *Art News*, Summer 1978 p. 51. She wrote:

"Cyril Aldred, recently retired keeper of the Egyptian collection of the Royal Scottish Museum in Edinburgh and the world's leading authority on Amarna art...declined to discuss the authenticity of the Mansoor objects, but he said: "You can quote me as follows. If they are genuine, I am not prepared to accept that they are great works of ancient Egyptian art."

That Dr. Aldred is "not prepared to accept that they [the objects] are great works of ancient Egyptian art" is a matter of personal opinion on the artistic and aesthetic evaluation of the Collection. Clearly, it should not reflect on its authenticity. He possibly made that statement as he hasn't seen the Collection but photographs only. As a true scholar, Dr. Aldred could not state for sure, from photographs only, whether the Mansoor Collection is ancient or not. Furthermore, does not the mere fact he said "**if** they are genuine" imply that, chances are, the objects are genuine?

- 3) **Dr. William Stevenson Smith**, Curator, Egyptian Department, MFA Boston, stated to the U.S. Customs in the Port of Boston in 1947, after objects from the Collection arrived there, that they were ancient. Although this statement was contested by an unnamed Egyptologist interviewed by Ms. Hochfield for her article in *ARTnews* about the Mansoor Collection, we truly believe that his honest opinion at first, which was stated to the U. S. Customs--a federal concern to which no false statement should ever be given, was that the objects are indeed ancient. Should the words of Ms. Hochfield's unnamed Egyptologist be true, then we will assume that Dr. Smith reversed his opinion after the appearance of Mr. Young's report in 1949. After all, and it is quite possible, Dr. Smith could have never contradicted the "scientific" opinion stated by a colleague, Mr. William J. Young, particularly when this colleague is attached to the same great institution! Never.
- 4) **Mr. Jacques Vandier**, Curator of the Egyptian Department at the Louvre, was shown in 1956 two Amarna sculptures from the Mansoor Collection, but declined to examine them as negative rumors were circulating on the sculptures. He knew about Dr. Cooney's opinion and didn't feel like contradicting him. After all, wasn't Dr. Cooney considered then the "most qualified authority" on Egyptian art in the U.S.A.?

As for Dr. Cooney's assumption that if Dr. Stross were to supply photographs to the Egyptologists he named, a firm opinion would be forthcoming, how is it that he, being the "most qualified authority" on Egyptian art, could not tell after seeing the sculptures once? Or even twice? How is it that he had to see them several times, both in Egypt and in this country and that, in a few cases, he had to have them at his museum for examination? Are we fair, then, to

conclude that it is a fallacy to believe that experts can tell from photographs if an artifact is genuine or not!

It should be well noted that Dr. Cooney has never given any stylistic reason on the sculptures. Never. It should also be remembered that his negative opinion came right after Mr. Young's.

All in all, should we take into consideration only the correspondence we have from the MFA Boston and the Brooklyn Museum regarding the Mansoor Collection, one wonders if there were honest mistakes made. But then, should we consider the false statements, the illogical reasoning, the rumors, the "eloquent" silence of museums or people concerned, etc., one also wonders if there was anything "fishy" or "cooking" among those people or institutions. Their one-sided deadly verdict should never be tolerated and positively not perpetuated by educational institutions, scholars and particularly Egyptologists with noted integrity. "In an era when the concept of due process is ever expanding, it is astonishing to read of an ex parte hearing held in the manner of the medieval Star Chamber which resulted in a judgment so final that even newly discovered evidence, presented by noted scholars, would not be deemed sufficient grounds for a rehearing" (Prof. DuBoff).

.

III. ***Dr. Bernard V. Bothmer***, Curator of Ancient Art, The Brooklyn Museum, New York.

Sometime in March of 1971, we were about to sell through a friend of ours some of the Amarna sculptures to a San Francisco collector. We gave our friend photographs of the objects as well as the publication of Stross and Eisenlord to give to the collector--who in turn showed them to Dr. Thomas Carr Howe, Director Emeritus, California Palace of the Legion of Honor. Dr. Howe requested then the help of Dr. Bothmer to give him information on the Mansoor Amarna Collection. Even though we mentioned some passages of Dr. Bothmer's answer in "J'Accuse...", p. 42, we are inserting its facsimile for a fair evaluation.

(Please see Exhibit #3, letter of April 5, 1971.)

Although we were threatened with "legal action" if we were to publish that letter as we shall see in a little while, we are publishing it since it concerns the Amarna Collection and the Mansoor brothers. Furthermore, the letter in question is a statement by a scholar, Dr. Bothmer, on a scientific matter and we see no reason why it should not be made public.

We do not deny that we threatened the Brooklyn Museum as well as Dr. Bothmer's predecessor, Dr. John D. Cooney, with the possibility of a \$1 million lawsuit. As we stated in the included sworn statement at the beginning of this publication, and also in other sworn statements sent to the two Museums concerned--Boston and Brooklyn--as well as to two of their officials, our real intention was never a lawsuit. We just wanted to shake them so that they would retract their unfounded opinions and to particularly prevent further false and detrimental statements and rumors emanating from the two museums. A fact: The Mansoor brothers have never sued anyone.

As for Dr. Bothmer's reference on the "booklet written by Messrs. Stross and Eisenlord," we feel Dr. Bothmer had not read it or did not understand its scientific disclosures. We refer the reader to the statement by Dr. Harold J. Plenderleith on page 18, in which he says: "In regard to the laboratory reports submitted it may be sufficient to state that I find the published account of Dr. Stross entirely convincing...." Moreover, the article by Dr. Stross published in *Analytical*

Chemistry (1960) has indeed "received many congratulatory responses, from heads of research laboratories of important museums as well as from other parties, but not a single comment attacking any of the scientific evidence presented in the article" (Stross).

Concerning Dr. Bothmer's "prominent chemist" friend of his, if this friend really exists, we feel he did not understand much--if anything at all--of what he read in the booklet. Were he really prominent as Dr. Bothmer claims, he should have written to contradict Professors Silver (Caltech), Blackwelder, Compton and Hutton (Stanford), Kirk and Turner (Berkeley), Arnal (San Jose), etc.

For the record, let it be stated that we could have sued the Brooklyn Museum as well as Dr. Bothmer since:

- a) The letter in question is not only a "comment," but definitely a "derogatory comment" on the Mansoor sculptures;
- b) the letter in question caused a lost sale for us;
- c) the statement concerning the booklet by Stross and Eisenlord is untrue and it is definitely an attempt to destroy the Collection;
- d) the reference to the Mansoor brothers that they have been trying to "peddle" their "wares" in this country since 1947 is an insult by itself as well as an attempt to tarnish their reputation.

Furthermore, one should never forget that we could have also sued Professor Seele and the Oriental Institute of Chicago; also Dr. Cooney and the Brooklyn Museum for their earlier false statements; and what can we say about Mr. Young and the MFA Boston who are the original cause of our problems and terrible headaches! Couldn't we have sued them if we really wanted to? Did someone forget that Dr. Cooney stated that it is "*very unwise to ignore Mr. Young's advice*"?

It goes without saying that we ourselves, and not our attorneys, wrote to the Brooklyn Museum as well as to Dr. Bothmer protesting the letter dated April 5, 1971 and we are inserting a facsimile of the answer dated October 28, 1971 signed by the Secretary of Ancient Art of the museum. We would like to point out that Dr. Bothmer's letter reached us within two weeks of its date of April 5, 1971, but we preferred to hold it for a few months and not to mention it until "*Je Cherche un Homme...*" was published and mailed.

(Please see Exhibit #4, letter dated October 28, 1971.)

After we received the letter of the Secretary of Ancient Art, we sent to the Brooklyn Museum a photocopy of Dr. Bothmer's letter dated April 5, 1971. To date, we never heard from anyone from the Brooklyn Museum.

Some six weeks after receiving that letter, of the Secretary of Ancient Art, we received from Dr. Thomas Carr Howe, recipient of Dr. Bothmer's letter, a strongly worded letter dated December 18, 1971, and we are also inserting its facsimile.

(Please see Exhibit #5, letter dated December 18, 1971.)

To our understanding, Dr. Bothmer's letter is not personal since it concerns the Mansoor brothers and their sculptures, and it became public as it was read by at least two other people besides its recipient and the Mansoors.

Needless to say again that we did not either return the letter or its copies to Dr. Howe nor cared about his threat.

Sadly, we quote Dr. Howe from a letter written still on his letterhead, dated March 31, 1971, and addressed to the gentleman interested in the Amarna sculptures. He wrote:

"I enclose herewith copies of my letters to Dunham and Bothmer (and a copy of the one I have received from my old friend George Stout) re the Mansoor 'problem.'

"I'll let you know what, if any, 'blood' I draw from these inquiries."

Needless to say that this letter, mentioning "blood," dated March 31, 1971, is disgraceful to say the least. But, all in all, the episode of Dr. Bothmer's letter and its aftermath is cause for little faith in the integrity and veracity of some museums.

• • • • •

REFUSAL BY STANFORD UNIVERSITY MUSEUM

(Please see Exhibits #6 and #7, letters dated March 13, 1962 and April 17, 1962.)

The two reproduced facsimiles of letters dated March 13 and April 17, 1962 from Stanford Art Gallery and Museum speak for themselves. That the two eastern museums--Boston and Brooklyn--clearly indicate they discredited the Mansoor Collection should be of no doubt to anyone. Mr. John D. LaPlante, Stanford Museum Acting Director, told us after sending the April 17 letter that he did in fact contact the two museums and both advised strongly against an exhibition of our Collection.

Some three years earlier, while on a visit to Stanford University, Dr. Bernard V. Bothmer was having lunch one day with Mr. LaPlante and, at the insistence of the latter, accepted reluctantly to visit one of the Mansoor brothers in a retail store he had in Palo Alto as Mr. LaPlante wanted him to see some of the Amarna sculptures and particularly the almost life-size bust of Akhenaten. When they went to the bank where Mansoor kept some sculptures of the Collection, they were shown the large bust in the vault area and Dr. Bothmer barely looked at it in silence. He was extremely polite, thanked Mansoor for the trouble and neither wished to see any of the other sculptures nor volunteered an opinion. Mansoor did not press him since it was clear that Dr. Bothmer was not at ease at that meeting. It seemed to Mansoor that he wanted to see neither any member of that family nor any of their antiquities.

Stanford University, Department of Art

The 1975 Exhibition of the Mansoor Amarna Collection at San Francisco State University was sponsored by the Department of Classical Archaeology of the University and by the Marie Stauffer Sigall Foundation, whose founder and president is Mrs. Mitzi S. Briggs. Mrs. Briggs purchased for herself the outstanding head of Akhenaten illustrated on the front cover of the 1975 exhibition catalog.

Mrs. Briggs sent an invitation to the preview of the exhibition to Professor Lorenz Eitner, chairman of the Department of Art, Stanford University. On June 20, 1975, Professor Eitner wrote to her the following:

"Many thanks for your invitation to attend the opening of the Exhibition of the Mansoor Collection at San Francisco State. Unfortunately, I was in New York all last week and could not get back in time to be present. I enjoyed looking through the interesting catalogue; I hope very much to be able to see the exhibition soon."

(signed: Lorenz Eitner)

On June 23, 1975, Professor William A. Clebsch, chairman of the Department of Religious Studies at Stanford University, wrote to Mrs. Briggs saying:

"After our last telephone conversation, I talked with Lorenz Eitner again, and can reassure you that his mind is not closed with respect to the objects in the Mansoor Collection. He has studied a number of reports verifying the antiquity of the materials from which these objects were made, and I believe he is persuaded that the materials are ancient. He would like to see any reports you may have concerning the antiquity of the carvings. After that, I hope the three of us can have lunch together. I am certainly no expert in this area, but my interest continues in that I told you our Department would, if the Department of Art is persuaded of the authenticity of the pieces in the collection, wish to cosponsor some exhibit of them at Stanford. Meanwhile, I hope to see the collection while it is on exhibit at San Francisco State University."

(signed: William A. Clebsch)

Two important points the reader must have noticed from the above letter: 1) that Professor Clebsch believed that Dr. Eitner "is persuaded that the materials are ancient"; 2) that if the materials are confirmed ancient by the Department of Art, he wished "to cosponsor" some exhibit of the Amarna Collection at Stanford.

On June 27, 1975, Mrs. Briggs wrote the following to Dr. Eitner:

"Enclosed please find a booklet report by Dr. Fred Stross and Dr. Eisenlord together with complete copies of the actual reports mentioned in Dr. Stross' booklet report.

"I would suggest, in order to orient yourself more easily, that you read first the Dr. Stross booklet and then go into greater detail on the reports themselves. (Dr. Compton is Stanford's Dr. Compton.)

"Dr. Iskander is now in the process of reexamining the individual pieces composing the collection after their absence from Egypt of 25 years. He is as totally convinced of their authenticity today as he was 25 years ago in Egypt when he saw them last. In addition he has made several new discoveries testifying to their authenticity as a result of the past quarter of a century of increased experience in his position of high authority in the field of detecting forgeries in Egypt. (See in enclosed bibliography on Dr. Iskander.) Dr. Iskander is the one that took the Tutankhamen exhibition to London and Russia.

"Dear friend, I truly hope that you will take the time to carefully study the reports as I have. This collection does not deserve the treatment it has received from museums in this country..."

(signed: Mitzi Briggs)

In his answer to Mrs. Briggs dated July 1, 1975 Dr. Eitner said:

"Many thanks for your letter of 27th June, with the catalogue of the Mansoor collection and related materials, all of which I studied with great interest. The pieces of the Mansoor collection were previously known to me through catalogues and brochures, sent to me over the years.

"Though I am far from being an expert, I have long been interested in the art of ancient Egypt, and have occasionally taught courses in this field. I have also paid some attention to the pertinent literature, and have used every opportunity to see as much of Egyptian art as possible, most recently at the splendid exhibition, Akhenaten and Nefertiti, which I was able to study closely in the Brooklyn Museum in 1973 and at its later showing in Detroit.

"To my eye, the sculptures in the Mansoor collection appear to be imitations, rather than authentic works. I find that my own reaction to them closely resembles that of Dr. Hans W. Müller, as expressed in Paragraph 1 of his statement. As you are probably aware, most of the pieces in the collection closely resemble famous and unquestionably authentic works, in such collections as the Berlin, Brussels, and Kansas Museums, as well as the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, but there is a vast difference in quality between them and those originals. A case in point are the two reliefs of Smenkhkare and his Wife (fig. 30 and 31) which repeat the composition of a famous relief in the Aegyptische Museum in Berlin (see the plate and comments in the catalogue of the Brooklyn exhibition, no. 120). Another instance is furnished by the reliefs of figs. 24-27 of the Mansoor catalogue which are clearly modelled after a well-

known piece in the Royal Museum of Brussels (cf. Brooklyn catalogue no. 9). The relief of the two Princesses finally, which is illustrated on the back cover of the Mansoor catalogue, appears to me to be a rather clumsy translation into stone of the celebrated fresco fragment in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford.

"As I have said before, I do not pretend to be an expert in these matters, but as an art historian generally interested in Egyptian art, I find myself reacting irresistibly to what appears to me the qualitative inferiority and the stylistic anachronism of the sculptures in the manner of Tell-el-Amarna that comprise the Mansoor collection. It is significant, I think, that when the exhibition of Akhenaten and Nefertiti was being organized for the Brooklyn and Detroit museums, by excellent scholars who drew on all available collections in West and East Germany, France, Britain, Belgium, Switzerland, and the United States, they made no use of the Mansoor material--though this was certainly not unknown to them.

"I am impressed by Mr. Mansoor's efforts to obtain expert opinions on the authenticity of the objects in his collection, but am doubtful of the usefulness of the geological, chemical, and physical evidence he has collected. The really conclusive opinions will have to be obtained, I think, from first-rate Egyptologists, such as Bernard V. Bothmer or Cyril Aldred, world-renowned scholars who have a reliable grasp of the art of Tell-el-Amarna. Have their opinions been sought?

"Dear Mitzi, I admire the work of your foundation and find the idea of a general conference on the culture, religion, and art of the court of Akhenaten fascinating, but I fear that it would be inadvisable to base such an enterprise on material of a highly problematical nature, such as the Mansoor sculptures. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to participate in a venture in which you take such a personal and sincere interest, but on this occasion I must be mindful of my responsibility toward the Museum, the University, and the scholarly community. I cannot, in good conscience, go against my personal opinion that the sculptures we are asked to exhibit are of uncertain authenticity.

"I wish that I could respond more positively to your suggestion."

(signed: Lorenz Eitner)

Answering Professor Eitner's letter dated July 1, 1975, Mrs. Briggs wrote the following on July 11, 1975:

"Thank you for your letter of July 1st. I was disappointed and sorry not to see you at Stanford on the day that Dr. Zaki Iskander lectured there. Knowing that you were concerned with the authenticity of the Mansoor collection, I knew it would be of great benefit to you to discuss this matter with this most eminent man, who holds both a PhD in chemistry and an M.A. in Egyptology. Have you been to San Francisco State yet to see the collection?

"When Dr. Iskander was here I had many days in which to discuss with him not only the Mansoor collection, but his experience of nearly forty years in Egyptology, his tours with the Tutankhamen collection into London and into Russia, his project with Dr. Alvarez on the Pyramids, the continuation in his task of moving and restoring the temples that are presently in danger of being flooded. He is as convinced now as he was twenty-five years ago in Egypt when he first examined the collection of sculptures that each piece is authentic. His entire lecture at San Francisco State was on the criteria for the authentication of ancient works of art, using the sculptures of the Mansoor collection as examples, showing how the individual pieces met these criteria totally. I sincerely hope Dr. Robichek gave you the copy of the tape of this

lecture that I left for you, and I sincerely hope that you have taken the time to listen to it and to see the collection itself.

"I am profoundly sorry that you have taken the position indicated in your letter. I find it almost inconceivable that you also close your ears to the voice of science. Dr. Iskander, who has spent a lifetime in this field, who has been made responsible for the collection of Tutankhamen, for the authentication of pieces offered to the Cairo Museum, for the moving of an entire temple and the conservation of subsequent temples, who has been involved in numerous digs, has declared that the same spirit is found in the Mansoor sculptures as in the Tell-el-Amarna sculptures in the Cairo Museum. The slides that he showed at Stanford that day were ample proof of that...

"I am deeply sorry that certain United States museums lag so far behind Egypt in their war between the stylists and the scientists. When I asked Dr. Iskander if this problem existed in Egypt, he said no, that the museums depended completely on 'us scientists' when they were deciding as to whether a piece was authentic or a forgery; that they accepted the verdict of science completely.

"You ask why the Mansoor collection has never been included in major exhibitions. The answer is very simple; the politics within the museum world--the fear of small curators to stand opposed to curators of major museums whom they need to keep as allies.

"The matter is far from closed, and will never be closed until justice is done to this collection. Twenty-five years of refusal to reexamine the pieces by Boston and New York can only lead me to believe that they doubt their own position and are afraid to reexamine these sculptures. Scientists of the calibre of Dr. Silver at Cal Tech who examined the moon rocks for NASA, Dr. Alfred Lucas, Dr. Iskander, Dr. Plenderleith, Dr. Drioton, Dr. Sami Gabra, to mention but a few, simply cannot all have been wrong in their verdict of authenticity.

"When you first came to Stanford you asked me for a favor, saying that your museum needed a room, and my Foundation gave you that room. I now ask you for a favor.

"Can you ask your friend Dr. Von Bothmer to use his influence with the Metropolitan Museum in New York to admit one or more sculptures from this collection into their lab for a scientific examination?

"And if they refuse, why do they refuse?

"Please assure your friend and colleague that we mean no harm to anyone, nor are we a threat to anyone in the way of lawsuits. We only wish justice for this collection, for the cloud to once and for all be removed from this collection, so that it may move in peace and freely through the museum world, bringing great joy to those who visit it, and confirming the role of science in the field of Egyptology; introducing a new generation to this philosopher-pharaoh who was given the grace to believe in one God even before the time of Moses.

"We are pleased that you do recognize the sincerity of Mr. Mansoor in his twenty-five years effort to obtain expert opinions on the authenticity of the objects of the Tel-el-Amarna. However, I do not understand your comment that you are 'doubtful of the usefulness of the geological, chemical, and physical evidence he has collected.'

"The usefulness is such: according to science it is completely impossible for man to duplicate the existing patina that overlies the surfaces of each of the sculptures. Patina can be

reproduced, but when it is reproduced it can always be removed by chemical agents; it does not adhere in a crystalline structure as does the patina on the Mansoor sculptures. Scientific evidence conclusively confirms the necessity of the passage of many centuries for a patina of this type which can even be found overlaying the intersecting lines produced by ancient methods of polishing. Furthermore, only the passage of time can change animal excretions into a resinous state such as is found on the Mansoor sculptures. The dendrites apparent on many of the sculptures give further evidence of the great passage of time as the trace elements are carried to the surface of the stone which can only happen as the stone loses moisture over hundreds of years. Prolonged weathering of the stone by fine sand erosion is evidenced by the fact that the fossils imbedded in the limestone matrix protrude over the surface which is completely in accordance with logic as the fossils are harder than the limestone and would be more resistant to erosion. And again, the patina covers the fossils as well as the limestone.

"It becomes quite obvious that there is no controversy left around the authenticity of the collection from the eyes of science. Most certainly, scholars, Egyptologists, and art critics have every right to their opinions concerning the greatness or mediocrity of any work of art. And I respect those opinions, as well as the right for each individual to voice his opinion. For while you call the quality of the Mansoor collection inferior and anachronistic, the eminent art critic and author Alfred Frankenstein writes: 'The delicacy and finesse of these forty-four pieces and the techniques whereby they are wrought are incredible', and Dr. Zaki Iskander, formerly Chief Chemist of the Research Laboratory of the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, then Director General for Technical Affairs, Department of Antiquities, Egypt states: 'They are overwhelming in their beauty... and contain such spirit'.

"Am I misinterpreting or are you saying in your letter that this vast array of scientific expertise should be discounted and disregarded in this matter? Are you saying that the authenticity of said collection should depend solely upon the divided and subjective personal opinions of stylists throughout the Western world? You see, Egypt established their authenticity many years ago, and it was only after they had been authenticated by authorities in Egypt that King Farouk purchased ten pieces of this collection for his own personal collection.

"This reply to your letter is very long, and I apologize for the length of it. But there is much at stake here; the credibility of a collection that can remain in the United States if this war between science and stylist can be resolved, and the credibility of a family who has devoted twenty-five years of their lives in attempting to show that these pieces are genuine. They were told that only science could put an end to this controversy, which led them to examination of pieces by eminent scientists and resulted in the existing scientific reports. But when a letter comes such as yours saying that you doubt the usefulness of these reports, I am taken back in time to the days when man said the earth was flat."

(signed: Mitzi Briggs)

In his answer dated July 23, 1975 to the above letter, Dr. Eitner said:

"On returning from a trip to the East, I found your letter of 11 July waiting for me here. Many thanks for your patient effort to explain your interest and your conviction in the matter of the Mansoor collection. I sympathize with your views and respect your stand. And I do not, in any way, regard myself as a specialist, far less an infallible authority, in the matter of the art of Tel el Amarna. But I think that I can say, without presumption, that I am an art historian of some experience and that I am not entirely unqualified to form judgments of authenticity in this particular area of the history of art.

"The scientific authorities who have given positive opinions on the Mansoor sculptures appear to be chemists, geologists, and mineralogists. I have no doubt whatever of their professional competence, nor would I challenge their identification of the stones, or their dating of the patina and of the organic matter adhering to some of the sculptures. But these are asserted to be works of art from a particular period of history. As such--not in their physical or chemical character--they come within the province of art-historical analysis. Whatever their geological age, it appears to me that their quality and style clearly point to a much more recent origin than is being claimed for them. Several of the pieces, in fact, repeat--with the errors and accidents typical of copies--famous works in British, German, and French museums.

"I am convinced that it is this fact, rather than narrow-mindedness, blindness, or conspiratorial obstinacy, that has caused all the major museums to bypass Mr. Mansoor's collection. Great efforts are being made and large sums spent by competent museum men on the acquisition of authentic works of art. The art of Tel el Amarna is currently being very highly prized and is the object of very intensive study. Why should museums deprive themselves of a magnificent body of authentic work? What interest could possibly motivate them in their consistent refusal to accept Mr. Mansoor's collection? If they believed Mr. Mansoor's pieces to be genuine, simple self-interest would cause museums to exhibit, publish, and, if possible, to acquire them. Their failure to do this speaks eloquently against the collection. Individual errors are not uncommon, but it is difficult to conceive of the entire (highly competitive) profession being wrong in an instance such as this, not merely at one time but over a period of decades. The absence of prominent Egyptologists and art historians from the list of positive experts is conspicuous, and so is the failure of the recent, very comprehensive exhibitions of the art of Tel el Amarna to include a single one of Mr. Mansoor's pieces.

"Dear Mitzi, these are the reasons why I believe that an exhibition of the Mansoor collection at Stanford would be inappropriate. If I were able to believe in the authenticity of these sculptures, I should be only too happy to show them here, and it would give me particular pleasure to be able to oblige you, whom we regard fondly as a friend and benefactor. But, under the circumstances, unhappily, I cannot."

(signed: Lorenz Eitner)

We now quote a few paragraphs from the last reply of Mrs. Briggs dated August 1, 1975. She said:

"In answer to your question of why would museums deprive themselves of this collection if they believed the pieces were genuine, I can only relate to you one instance which shall henceforth serve as my example.

"About four months ago I flew to Denver for the express purpose of asking the new Director of the Denver Museum if we could book the tour of the collection into his museum after it leaves Brigham Young in Provo, Utah, this being relatively close. He finally informed me that he could not because his friend (from the East Coast) had told him these were modern forgeries and he was not about to take a chance by putting anything controversial into his museum.

"My friend who lives in Texas and is Chairman of the Board for one of the major museums was also told that he could not have the collection enter there until the controversy was resolved. The Los Angeles County Museum has also said that until the cloud is lifted from the collection, he [the Director] is afraid to bring this up to his board of trustees. So, until and unless

Mr. Young or Dr. Von Bothmer come to our rescue, it appears to me that many doors will remain closed.

"I am deeply sorry that your remark concerning 'the absence of prominent Egyptologists and art historians from the list of positive expertises is conspicuous' was made in your letter. I know full well the high esteem that Egypt holds for their great men such as Dr. Iskander, Lucas, and Drioton in this field and your sincere dismissal of their work makes me feel somewhat ashamed after Dr. Iskander was kind enough to lecture at Stanford out of the goodness of his heart. For you see he asked me to tell Dr. Robichek that he could not accept the honorarium; that he was more than happy to include Stanford in his lectures throughout California, and he even joked about none of our universities being able to afford his usual fee for lecturing. He was merely doing this as an act of good will, for he sincerely believed that America is becoming interested in Egypt and the art of ancient Egypt. I may also point out that the newspaper press on his lecture to be given at Stanford was an insult; they did not even give him the dignity of his correct titles. To top that off, only a few people attended the lecture, and your absence I am afraid hurt him although I am sure it was unintentional.

"But that is all behind us now. We have a way to go now and we shall proceed until the time comes when Mr. Young is given the grace by God to come forth and rectify what he has created."

As one can see, the above correspondence between Mrs. Mitzi Briggs and Professor Eitner is interesting but indeed shocking. Although Mrs. Briggs answered in a splendid manner what Professor Eitner claims, we feel, with all due respect to Professor Lorenz Eitner, that he is totally wrong in his assertions which definitely require some explanations, clarification and comments from our side.

To begin with, to our knowledge, Professor Eitner has not seen the Mansoor Amarna exhibition and has only seen photographs of the sculptures. The fact that Professor Eitner has "long been interested in the art of ancient Egypt" and has "occasionally taught courses in this field" does not necessarily make him an expert on the art of ancient Egypt, and this is by his own admission since he stated that he is "far from being an expert." Consequently, this does not make him an expert to recognize the genuine from the forgery. Similarly, one should not be impressed by the fact that he "was able to study closely" in the Brooklyn Museum and in Detroit the splendid exhibition of Akhenaten and Nefertiti. Hundreds of people and possibly thousands including professors of art, ancient art, archaeology, history, history of art, Egyptology, as well as collectors and art dealers, etc., must have also studied "closely" that exhibition and here again, this hardly makes them experts to recognize the real from the fake.

In answer to Dr. Eitner's question of "what interest could possibly motivate them [the museums] in their consistent refusal to accept Mr. Mansoor's collection," the answer is simple: museums and particularly curators prefer to not contradict their colleagues--but may cover up for their errors or blunders. As for what "has caused all the major museums to bypass Mr. Mansoor's collection," Dr. Eitner said that it is not "narrow-mindedness, blindness, or conspiratorial obstinacy" that is the reason; is he right?

Even though he seemed at one time "persuaded" that the materials are ancient, the opinion of Dr. Eitner regarding the Collection was negative and he was desperately trying to change Mrs. Briggs' mind to no avail. In his letter of July 1, 1975, he finds that his "own reaction to them closely resembles that of Dr. Hans W. Müller, as expressed in Paragraph 1 of his statement." Our next chapter will be devoted to Professor Müller's opinion and, in just a little while, we will discuss his claim that "most of the pieces in the collection closely resemble famous and unquestionably authentic works...." For now, a few words should be said about his bizarre notion concerning the scientific evidence.

Just what did Dr. Eitner mean when he says that he is not challenging the "scientific authorities" as to their "identification of the stones, or their dating of the patina and of the organic matter adhering to some of the sculptures"? Don't we understand that he is not contesting the irrefutable evidence enumerated by the "scientific authorities"? But then, when he adds that "whatever their geological age, it appears to me that their quality and style clearly point to a much more recent origin than is being claimed for them," does this mean if their "geological age" is over 3,000 years, they are still of "a much more recent origin"? Does this make any sense?

.

The Alleged Copies of the Mansoor Collection

Dr. Eitner has given in his correspondence three examples of pieces in the Mansoor Collection that "closely resemble famous and unquestionably authentic works...": 1) The two reliefs of Smenkhkare and his Wife (figs. 30 and 31); 2) the four bas-reliefs of Akhenaten (figs. 24-27); and finally 3), the relief of the Two Princesses. There are actually two reliefs of the Two Princesses and both are illustrated in the 1975 Mansoor catalog: one on its back cover and the second on p. 40--each illustrated in one whole page 8" x 11". Since Dr. Eitner mentions correctly that there are two reliefs of Smenkhkare and his Wife and mentions only one relief of the Two Princesses, one cannot help feeling that he is not a good observer or that he did not study "closely" either the Collection or the catalog--particularly that the two reliefs of the Two Princesses are not quite similar. We will discuss all the Mansoor reliefs as well as the Berlin's and the Ashmolean's shortly, as well as the one of Brussels.

Before we clarify the three examples mentioned above, let it be said--and this is too elementary--that numerous ancient Egyptian works of art are copies of each other. To dispel any doubt from any mind that this is an established, accepted and incontestable fact, we will quote the world-renowned Dr. Cyril Aldred in just a moment, but now we want to quote a sentence from a letter Professor Max Guilmet, Egyptologist, sent us from Brussels on 12/9/71. He said:

"Toutefois, comme vous le savez, les égyptiens travaillaient d'après des 'cahiers de modèles', qui pourraient donner naissance à des monuments fort semblables." *Translated: "However, as you know it, [ancient] Egyptians worked from 'model text-books' that could create monuments looking alike."*

Furthermore, should one refer to the splendid catalog of the Brooklyn Exhibition of 1973, *Akhenaten and Nefertiti*, Cyril Aldred, Viking Press, one will not fail to find too many examples of pieces similar or "copied" from others. Suffice to give a few quotes by Aldred in that catalog:

- a) Title Page: Fig. 1. "Painted limestone bust of Nefertiti. This celebrated portrait is usually accepted as the studio model prepared by the master sculptor from which lesser craftsmen would fashion their likenesses of the Queen...Ägyptisches Museum, Berlin."
- b) P. 90, "The statuette appears to be a replica on a miniature scale of one of the statues of near life size in the Great Temple of the Aten."
- c) P. 120: Fig. 38. "The features of Nefertiti are less exaggerated than those of her husband, her eye better placed and less slanting, her mouth smaller and her jaw shorter.... Certain peculiarities, such as the defined angle of the king's jaw and the mechanical drill hole in his ear lobe, suggest that the pupil was here copying work of an earlier period."

- d) Page 127: Fig. 49. **"Royal Family at Worship. The same design appears on a relief in the tomb of Panehsy at Tell el Amarna** (Davies 1905a, pl. VII)."
- e) And in his excellent "Commentary" of No. 100 on page 173, "Unfinished Head of Nefertiti," Aldred wrote: "The sculptor has apparently copied the painted master portrait of Nefertiti (Fig. 1), but has made the mouth of the queen appreciably larger--a fault that might have been corrected by further cutting. The head is in too rudimentary a state to decide whether it is the product of an apprentice working under the supervision of a master sculptor who would supply the finishing touches, or the incompleting work of an experienced craftsman."

We now proceed with the three examples Dr. Eitner has cited:

I. The Two Reliefs of Smenkhkare and His Wife

A comparison between the famous relief of the Ägyptisches Museum Berlin, Smenkhkare and Meritaten, and the two reliefs in the Mansoor collection representing the same scene has been outstandingly made by Professor Becker-Colonna in "In Defence...", pp. 12-13. Before we quote Colonna in her study of the three reliefs, let it be known that, to our understanding, Professor Hans W. Müller--according to the German article of a certain D. Klemm and which is inserted in "In Defence...", p. 51, believes that the Berlin relief represents "probably Tutankhamun and Ankhsenamun." This is contrary to the belief of Aldred (cf. p. 188, the 1973 Brooklyn Museum catalog), Becker-Colonna (cf. the 1975 S.F. State University catalog), Desroches-Noblecourt (cf. *The Acanthus History of Sculpture-Ancient Egypt*, New York Graphic Society, 1960, Plate 21), and Michalowski (cf. *Art of Ancient Egypt*, Harry N. Abrams, N.Y., 1968, p. 251, No. 104). We are making this observation as Colonna is quoting D. Klemm, who stated that the relief in question "probably represents Tutankhamun and Ankhsenamun."

Dr. Colonna wrote on pp. 12-13 of "In Defence..." the following:

"As the model for two reliefs of the Mansoor-Amarna Collection there serves a small limestone relief, possibly once part of a house-altar, which today is located in the Berlin Museum and shows the royal couple, probably Tutankhamun and Ankhsenamun. At first glance model and imitation resemble each other almost identically. A closer look then reveals some discrepancies in the iconographic details...' [She was, of course, quoting D. Klemm in this paragraph.]

"Although I have great respect and consideration for Prof. Müller, I don't agree with him in this assertion. In fact at first glance the three reliefs (the two of the Mansoor Collection and the one from Berlin) do not seem to me identical at all, except for their theme, because:

- a) The Berlin relief is a 'sunken' relief, while the two others are bas-reliefs;
- b) the Berlin relief is painted, the other two are not.

"Continuing with the comparison between the three reliefs I would like to point out that the two of the Mansoor Collection are quite different from each other; thus one should compare each of them separately. Let us take just one for examination, the no. 30, page 42, of my Catalogue.

"When one looks closely at the King's figure in the Berlin relief, one notices the anatomical mistake of his left leg, the one hidden behind the right one. The left leg is bent and from the knee down it continues in an unnatural line so that the left foot, if the upper part of the leg is naturally prolonged, would have 'elephantine' proportions and would not fit with the

lower part of the leg. The left foot is curved around the right heel making the standing position of the king very precarious and his balance impossible. Such gross mistakes in an ancient Egyptian work of art are quite puzzling and (almost) never met with.

"In the Queen's figure one may notice that her right hand has its fingers in the wrong position showing the little one touching the thumb and before the others.

"Her figure is badly assembled and very disconnected, her left leg thinner than the right one, and while the latter is shown in profile, the left one is not. The curve of the left thigh is exaggerated in respect to that of the right one, her right foot much longer than the left one.

"When one compares the figures of the Berlin relief with those of the Mansoor relief (no. 30), it is very evident that no mistakes of that kind are to be found in the latter. On the contrary, one finds a good balance of the whole composition, a perfectly natural stance of the two figures, a soft, smooth modelling of their limbs, an elegant harmony pervading the whole composition.

"The royal couple stands perfectly at ease, the two figures interlocked by the curved lines of their shoulders, arms and legs; while looking at each other, their expression links them spiritually. This feeling is not at all apparent in the Berlin relief where the King seems to fall backward and looks with surprise (?) at the Queen awkwardly standing before him.

"If the 'supposed' forger of the Mansoor reliefs got his inspiration from that of Berlin as Prof. Müller asserts, he has certainly improved on it a great deal and the Berlin work seems to be of an inferior quality than its 'supposed' copies.

"Prof. Müller continues in criticizing the details of the royal couple's attire. I would remark about this, that the differences in the sashes and in the sandals may well be the result of a change in fashion during the ca. 20 years of the Amarna period, or of an interpretation of the artist's taste, or of his feeling about the balance of the whole composition, but cannot be considered as a sufficient proof of forgery. Since the earliest dynasties, there are innumerable examples in ancient Egyptian statuary where artists, and sometimes the same ones, have changed details of the royal, or private sitter's, attire.

"On the other hand, and particularly about the shape of the sandals strongly blamed by Prof. Müller, I think that it is not logical that a forger would be so careless as to fail in a small detail such as the shape of sandals, while he could very easily have documented himself about them.

"Turning to the Berlin relief one finds that some of the Queen's garment details look rather curious:

"The 'Uraeus' on her head is highly disproportioned and sticks out above in a most ungraceful way; her 'Usekh' collar stands out from her shoulders like a 19th Century lace-collarette; the streamers at the nape of her neck are sketchy and summarily indicated by a brownish touch of brush, and not treated like the ones of the King. And one could go on...

"About the provenance of the Berlin piece, while in the Berlin Museum Catalogue it is stated 'said to be from Tell el Amarna' (House R 45), 1899, in other publications⁴ it is said to

⁴C. Aldred, *New Kingdom Art of Egypt*, 1951. p.81

have been bought 'at Gizah, 1900 perhaps from Memphis.' By whom? Its provenance, therefore, is as uncertain as for many other works of ancient Egyptian art, as we have indicated before.

"I will not continue with the discussion of Prof. Müller's report as it appears in the German article in question because there is not much said in it to disprove the authenticity of the 4 Mansoor pieces and moreover, as I pointed out before, I strongly question the validity of criticism on art works when they have been judged only from their photographs."

Should we consider some of the mistakes or anomalies Dr. Colonna pointed out in the Berlin relief studied above, to wit: "If the King's left leg is naturally prolonged, the left foot would have 'elephantine' proportions; the standing position of the King very precarious and his balance impossible; the Queen's 'Usekh' collar stands out from her shoulders like a 19th Century lace-collarette;" etc., one would certainly conclude, as Dr. Colonna wrote, that "the Berlin work seems to be of an inferior quality than its 'supposed' copies."

Thus, with a certain degree of probability, or rather of certainty, it is only fair to conclude that the two Mansoor reliefs do not "repeat the composition of a famous relief in the Ägyptisches Museum in Berlin." But what would one say if we further point out three contradicting observations the Mansoors noticed recently on the three reliefs:

- 1) That in the two Mansoor reliefs there is one fold of flesh or incision in the abdomen of Meritaten - wife of Smenkhkare, whereas there are two in the Berlin relief. One wonders if it was that difficult for a clever "forger" to add a second incision on his reliefs?
- 2) In the two Mansoor reliefs, Meritaten is wearing sandals, whereas she is shown bare-footed in the Berlin relief. One wonders just why would a "forger" impose on himself some extra delicate work?
- 3) In the two Mansoor reliefs, Meritaten is dressed with what seems to be a transparent tulle skirt or slip, whereas in the Berlin relief, this extra garment seems not to exist. One wonders just why a "forger" would create and not imitate? And, again, just why would he impose on himself more extra delicate work?

II. The Four Reliefs of Akhenaten

Figs. 24-27 of the 1975 Mansoor catalogue are illustrated in that catalogue of 1991 pp. 53-56. Should we compare them to the Brussels relief Dr. Eitner mentions (cf. Brooklyn catalogue fig. 9), we will notice that the five pieces are different from one another and all are strikingly beautiful - each one in its own way. Three of the Mansoor reliefs show clearly incisions or folds of flesh on the necks while the fourth piece, fig. 24, does not. The relief of Brussels shows no incision or fold of flesh on the neck. Other stylistic features of the four Mansoor reliefs as to the lips, nose, chin and slanting eye fit indeed very well within the scope of the art of Tell-el-Amarna.

Special attention should be given, though, to the Brussels relief. In his description of the condition of that relief, Dr. Aldred noted: "Sporadic dendritic markings." Doesn't "dendritic markings," in effect, mean that it is a significant sign of ancient age? If it were not, Aldred would have never mentioned it. What should one say of the numerous "dendritic markings" on many of the Mansoor pieces as evidenced in the scientific reports obtained? In reference to these markings, we would like to quote Stross and Eisenlord in "A report on a Group of Limestone Carvings Owned by M.A. Mansoor and Sons." They wrote on page 18:

"Dendrites. Crystals may grow in many different forms, depending on the conditions of concentration, flow, temperature and other factors prevailing. Many organic and inorganic substances grow in ornamental, more or less regular, tree-like forms, and for this reason, they are called dendrites. Well-known examples are ammonium chloride crystals and snowflakes. Similarly, tree or plant-shaped crystals are frequently formed in capillary passages, between, or in, rock and stone, by the influence of groundwaters in their passage, residence, and evaporation. As these waters leach the mineral salts present, characteristically manganese and iron, their concentration may increase by partial evaporation beyond saturation, and the salts, usually after having been converted to the oxides, may redeposit in the manner indicated. Archaeologists for a long time have considered the presence of firm dendritic deposits a sign of great antiquity, since it has not so far been possible to produce similar firm and tightly adhering dendrites synthetically. It is relatively easy to produce soft dendrites of many kinds, and recently electrolytic methods have made this technique available for the purpose, but the hard, tightly attached dendrites characteristic of stone objects long buried in the proximity of capillary passages, as provided by sand, have been quite generally recognized as indicative of old age. The antiquity of a sculptor's cut can thus be deduced from the presence of the characteristic dendrites, if they are located on the surface cut. Absence of dendrites, on the other hand, does not furnish evidence for or against antiquity, and shows only that no ground waters had been in contact with the stone under the proper conditions for the necessary length of time. No one so far has seriously suggested that a forger could transfer dendrites intact from an old surface to a new surface, and attach them securely without leaving evidence either of this process or of the adhesive used to secure them on the new surface.

"The presence of dendrites on some objects of the Mansoor collection was discussed by Young and Iskander (see above). In addition, Kirk, Lucas and Compton have elaborated on these discussions. All of these (with the exception of Young's, as discussed previously) considered the presence of dendrites on some pieces as further strong links in the chain of evidence supporting the authenticity of the pieces. On the other hand, none of the well-known forgeries, especially of those purporting to simulate the El Amarna sculptures, has, as far as it is known, displayed any dendrites that could in any way pass for the genuine crystals."

III. The Reliefs of the Two Princesses

As we stated earlier, there are two reliefs of the Two Princesses and if Dr. Eitner would have taken the trouble to see the relief he is talking about and not only its photograph on the 1975 catalogue's back cover, he never would have pronounced such an awkward remark that it is "a rather clumsy translation into stone of the celebrated fresco fragment in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford." Clearly, anyone who appreciates Egyptian, and in particular Amarna art, would not hesitate to admire the stunning beauty of the relief on the catalogue's back cover as it is perhaps the most attractive relief in the Mansoor Collection. In fact, it is one of the most beautiful reliefs produced in ancient Egypt and particularly from the Amarna period.

We would like to quote from Dr. Colonna's 1986 catalogue the description of the two Mansoor reliefs of the Two Princesses (cf. pp. 47-51), and we point out that Fig. 28 of the 1975 catalogue corresponds to Fig. 39 of the one of 1991 and the back cover of 1975 corresponds to Fig. 40, still in the 1991 catalogue. She wrote:

"Two more bas-reliefs must be mentioned in the Mansoor-Amarna Collection. They are those, (similar in the subject matter, but quite different in their execution, as well as in the personages represented in them), of two seated Princesses. They recall the famous fragment of a wall painting from Akhetaten, now at Oxford at the Ashmolean Museum. Even though they

may derive in their subject-matter from the painting, no comparison is possible as the Mansoor's are bas-reliefs while the other is a wall painting and different in material and technique.

"Bas-relief no. 39 represents the two Princesses on a square slab of white limestone, seated next to each other, their figures interlocked by the position of their arms and the faces fronting each other. They have the usual shaven, elongated skulls, rather large, the typical Amarna profile, (already previously dealt with when describing the Princesses' figurines and heads). The Princesses are sitting on two cushions in a perfect 'at ease' relaxed posture, and seem to carry on a conversation. The right figure holds her right arm and hand before her sister's face as if to emphasize her argument. The figure to the left is embracing her sister with her right arm in an affectionate gesture. The anatomy of the two young bodies is well rendered in the modelling of the arms, legs, toes and fingers. Two deep incisions mark their upper abdomen and one is at the pubic area. Both of them wear very heavy, ornated earrings with pendants and a triple beaded necklace.

"The bas-relief is damaged on its right side and the left hand of the Princess is missing. Its surface is pitted by water exposure.

"Bas-relief no. 40 shows the same subject as the one above described. However, there are differences in the composition as well as in the technical handling of it. The stone slab is roughly and unevenly cut on the top and on its left side.

"The two Princesses are sitting on two cushions, but while the right one is level, the left one shows the depression due to the heaviness of the body resting on it. They seem to be engaged in an affectionate conversation as it is indicated by the chuck under the chin of one of the sisters. Their bodies are those of very young girls, firm and supple, their small breasts slightly shaped with their pointed nipples; both are barefooted but their toes well detailed, their navels marked by a tiny triangular indentation; their waists are slim, their limbs roundish, flexious, sharply outlined against the background by flowing sure, contour lines. The skulls are the usual ovoid, shaven ones, but that of the right figurine is larger and more bulbous in shape; their profiles also differ somehow hinting at a different person in its features. The girl to the right seems to be of a more mature age than the one to the left who seems to be listening very attentively to her older sister's affectionate suggestions. Both Princesses wear a very richly ornated necklace of five rows of beads and large earrings with their pendants not quite finished but suggested by two vertical parallel incised lines.

"The whole composition shows a high degree of good workmanship and is extremely charming in the tender expression of the two sisters."

Without further discussing Dr. Eitner's letters, let it be said that, were he really interested in Egyptian art and particularly Amarna art since he is "an art historian of some experience" and that he is "not entirely unqualified to form judgments of authenticity in this particular area of the history of art," he should have, at least we think, examined the objects instead of looking at photographs and also attended on Stanford grounds the lecture of Dr. Iskander -- who is also an Egyptologist beside being a scientist. Maybe he would have learned then that the scientific evidence obtained on the Mansoor sculptures attest to the fact that they are indeed ancient. At times, we simply wonder if Dr. Eitner was influenced by an Egyptologist friend of his...?

.

In the summer of 1989, on the initiative of a world-renowned European Egyptologist, a leading professor of Egyptology in a European educational institution was asked to study stylistically and

artistically the Mansoor Amarna Collection. (At this time, we prefer not to divulge the names of the two above-mentioned Egyptologists). For his study, the professor of Egyptology was shown all the pieces of the Collection we have at the present time and which are illustrated in the 1986 Mansoor catalogue except: 1) fig. 26 which was sold to a private collector in 1987; 2) fig. 1, the almost life-size bust of Akhenaten; 3) all the pieces illustrated in the catalogue belonging to private collectors. This was done during almost three days in a Paris bank where the pieces were kept at the time. During his viewing of the Collection, he took some 400 photos of the pieces in color as well as in black and white, and it was obvious to us that he was enthused and admired at length some of the sculptures as to their extreme and exceptional beauty. We noticed this from the way he was pointing out some of their outstanding features to the world-renowned Egyptologist who was also present at the bank with us. It goes without saying that we gave the professor of Egyptology all pertinent material concerning the Mansoor Amarna Collection, viz: all scientific reports including Young's; Stross and Eisenlord Report; 1975 and 1986 Colonna's catalogues; "In Defence...", Nolli and Colonna, 1986; "Je Cherche un Homme..." 1971.

On July 15, 1990 that professor of Egyptology wrote to us a letter enclosing a temporary report on the Collection and we understand from it that he is not sure whether the objects are genuine or not, and that it will take him a long time to study them. The overall impression we have from his temporary report is that he is, perhaps confused, but to be sure, puzzled. Let us consider some of what he wrote to us which we translated from the French language:

"...Despite the features, sometimes 'ridiculous,' of certain heads of the Collection - between Egyptologists we often discuss, with a smile, the 'Mansoor style' of Egyptian art - the pieces are in general of very good quality which shows not only great skill, but especially an unexpected competence in all details of the Amarna style...

"Considering the overall uniformity of the Collection, the anomalies are unexplainable, unless we are facing some unexpected audacity as in the Colossi of Karnak. Even the bas-reliefs, which at first sight seemed to Dr....(the world-renowned European Egyptologist) as well as to myself, absolutely horrible, hideous or 'stupidly copied,' turned out to be very finely executed.

"It seems to me difficult, almost impossible, to separate certain pieces from the Collection and determine the genuine from the forgery. Either all or none of the pieces are authentic...

"...One should, therefore, find out - and this is the study I will make whenever time permits - how a sculptor who lived between 1920 and 1940 could have been so familiar with certain Amarna sculptures. If one cannot find an answer to this question, this could be in favor of your collection or at least part of it.

"I had talked to you about a friend who specializes in examining ancient sculptures and who could perform a microscopic study of the surface of the sculptures (all the opinions of the geologists in the file have no weight at all) to disclose any traces of tools, etc...

"The scientific analyses do not prove much..."

Since, according to that leading Egyptologist, "the scientific analyses do not prove much," what is then the use of further subjecting two or three pieces of the Collection for a "microscopic study" as he suggests? Do the Mansoors have to keep spending time, effort and money on scientific evidence all their life? As for his suggestion for a "microscopic study," doesn't it prove that some consideration by Egyptologists should be given to scientific evidence?

In February of 1991 we sent to Dr. Stross a copy of the letter/temporary report we just discussed above and begged him to write a letter to the world-renowned European Egyptologist and comment on that temporary report - particularly that it contained remarks on the scientific aspect as well as on the reports obtained on the Mansoor Collection. We quote what Dr. Stross wrote on March 3, 1991:

"Dear...,

"Some of the brothers Mansoor have made me aware of a report by professor... on a study of a number of the Amarna carvings in their possession, and they asked me for my comments on his report. They have also intimated that they might be of interest to you - since, I believe, it was at your much valued initiative that this study came about. I am now taking the liberty to transmit to you these comments in the hope you will not mind taking the time to peruse them.

At this time I should like to express my personal appreciation for the interest you have taken in the scientific studies involving the Mansoor pieces.

"The report contains some highly astute observations, such as that the artist (or artists) must have been thoroughly familiar with the features and style of the models in ancient Amarna, by contrast with other features he considers absurdly simple blunders. But of that later. First our response to his discussion of the Parke-Bernet auction in 1952, even though this matter is not really relevant, since, as he correctly remarks, there was no connection between the pieces sold there and the Amarna pieces, which are the subjects of the present discussion. As he correctly notes, the sellers of the pieces were obviously convinced of the authenticity of the very heterogeneous collection offered for sale at that auction. This, of course, is not incompatible with the possibility that one or the other of those pieces might indeed have been of modern manufacture. There is no evidence or reason to believe that there was 'un grand nombre de pièces fausses,' but it is not impossible that there could have been a very small number of dubious pieces among 342 items. This would still represent a high standard compared to auctions of this kind, even those backed by the best experts in the field. The offer of the money-back guarantee (which was taken up in four cases) testifies to the integrity of the seller, which in any case is not in question. Nor can one compare the expectation of authenticity of a large, thoroughly heterogeneous collection of antique objects, none of which have undergone scientific scrutiny, with that of a relatively small group of highly homogeneous character, which has been thoroughly studied by acknowledged scientific authorities, some of which are members of the National Academy of Sciences and also worldwide renown.

"The remarks regarding the scientific analytical studies are to be taken more seriously. These studies are dismissed in two sentences, indicating that they have not been read or at least not understood to any degree. 'Les analyses scientifiques... ne prouvent pas grand chose: oui c'est du calcaire égyptien -oui ce sont bien des oeuvres dont les caractères anthropologiques sont semblables à ceux des autres objets amarniens connus.' The fact that the material is indeed Egyptian limestone is not part of the evidence offered for the authenticity of the objects, and has only been brought up in some of the reports in order to refute the bizarre notion of a Mr. Young that the material was 'a made stone' (concrete? plastic? soap?). The other statement, that the objects resembled other known amarnian objects, is obvious, and certainly was not offered as part of the scientific evidence. It would certainly have no bearing on authentication in any case. The fact that 'les affirmations de la patine et des dendrites ne semblent pas avoir convaincu tout le monde,' on the other hand, is obviously true. After all, the whole world is not convinced that the Earth is (nearly) round. But this does not change the fact that the evidence, in one case as in the other, is strongly on the side of science. And it should be very convincing to any intelligent, open-minded individual who takes the trouble to read the reports.

"We wish to point out at this time again, that Professor... makes some excellent stylistic observations, which seem to have escaped some of the other critics of the collection. He finds

it difficult to explain the 'compétence inattendue dans tous les détails du style amarnien...' and the workmanship of some of the bas-reliefs, which, at first glance are 'affreux...se sont révélés d'une finesse et d'une sûreté d'exécution insolites.' This reaction to some of the now well-known "caricaturing" styles of the Amarna period is familiar to many of us on viewing them for the first time, perhaps in the Cairo Museum. His comment is also to the point, that the audacity of a modern forger in nearly always producing doubly pierced earlobes, is inexplicable, in view of his (the 'forgers') demonstrated acquaintance with details of style and fashion. The implication, that this is a stylistic error, however, is mistaken. The ears of Tuyu, grandmother of Akhnaten, were doubly pierced, as can be verified by inspecting her mummy in the Cairo Museum. Aldred, in his book *Jewels of the Pharaohs* (Praeger, 1971, p.143) describes the 'most popular ear-ring during the Eighteenth Dynasty... evidently worn by women, a pair in each ear-lobe...' and mentions, as one of his examples, the mummy of Tuyu. Another example of double piercing of the earlobes is found clearly indicated on the quartzite head of Nefertiti in the Staatliche Museum, Berlin, which presumably is known to most serious Egyptologists.

"In view of these acute observations it is somewhat surprising to read as one of the principal arguments against the authenticity one listed under b) on p. 4, line 4, 'les fautes criantes, comme par exemple le pschent totalement circulaire et symétrique...' This type of crown was not unknown in the New Kingdom, see, for example, in a colossus of Ramses II, shown e.g. in Michalowski's *Art of Ancient Egypt* (Harry N. Abrams, NY. p. 409). It is all the more astonishing to read, in the next sentence, under c), the argument that shoulders are raised, à propos '[des] <copies> d'oeuvres ultra-célèbres...' Forgeries because precedents don't exist or because they are too well-known? One can hardly have it both ways.

"Another point to be made in this connection, is that, again, under c), the famous bas-relief of Smenkhkara and his queen in the Egyptian Museum in Berlin, displays what surely would have been called 'blunders' had they been exhibited by any of the Mansoor pieces: the strangely inconsistent left leg and the exaggerated necks, particularly of the queen are cases in point. It might be noted that the Mansoor 'copy' (which incidentally is quite different from the Berlin piece) does not show these anomalies. With regard to the other example, the mural fragment of the 'two princesses' at the Ashmolean, beautiful as it is, displays startling features, too: the highly elongated necks of both figures, and the spaghetti-like left lower arm of the squatting princess (forerunners of Expressionism?). The corresponding reliefs of the Mansoor group show more realistic, truly engaging proportions. Several comments suggest themselves: these are the only reliefs of this scene known to exist - the 'forger' exercised his imagination by 'correcting' the anatomical shortcomings, supplying missing features and details, such as showing the fingers of the seated princess resting on the shoulders of the crouching figure, which are in a broken area of the Ashmolean piece. At the same time these pieces are suspect because they are (exact?) copies of the well-known pieces. Here, too, you can hardly have it both ways.

"It is hardly worth mentioning that the 'expertise scientifique négative de Young de Boston' has been discredited so thoroughly in a substantial number of the reports that to call it a scientific report itself is a *contradictio in adjecto*. The items discussed in Young's report actually were refuted in an article published in 1960 (Stross, *Analytical Chemistry*, 32:17A). This article has received many congratulatory responses, from heads of research laboratories of important museums as well as from other parties, but not a single comment attacking any of the scientific evidence presented in the article. Young made no comment, nor did he answer a letter inviting him to comment on the new evidence presented in the article.

"Incidentally, the Mansoor family tell me that at no time have they offered to donate any of the Amarna pieces to the Cairo Museum. They are planning to send you, if they have not already done so, a copy of the report and letter by professor..."

Very sincerely yours,

(signed: Fred Stross)

• • • • •

An "Expert Opinion"

It gives us pleasure to insert here the written "Expert Opinion" of Prof. Dr. Hans Wolfgang Müller, Munich just as much as it gave us pleasure to insert the "Technical Examination..." of Mr. William J. Young in "Je Cherche un Homme." Why? Because anyone who understands Amarna art and/or the scientific evidence obtained on the Mansoor sculptures will be convinced after reading it that this scholar in Egyptology is totally wrong to issue such an erroneous opinion. Following is its translation and we will gladly forward it in the original German language to any Egyptologist requesting it. Professor Müller wrote:

February 15, 1960

"EXPERT OPINION"

"Subject: Relief slab with head turned to the left, height about 16.3 cm, width about 13.3 cm, and a small head with dilated cranium, height 9.6 cm, both made of reddish lime sandstone (?), from the property of the Mansoor family, Palo Alto, California.

"The objects described above were submitted to me by Dr. Voss, Munich-Graefelfing, for examination. I had previously received a written communication from Mr. Edmond Mansoor, dated July 24, 1959, in which he offered me these pieces for purchase by the National Collection of Egyptian objects in Munich, and included very detailed "Technical Examination of 9 Tell el Amarna Objects" of 1959 together with photographs. I have not answered this letter, because all objects, from the photographs, gave me the impression of modern imitations, in spite of the technical examinations which conclude them to be antique.

"Dr. Voss has now submitted to me a series of additional photographs of objects in the style of Amarna owned by the Mansoor family, and has requested me to write my opinion on paper, which opinion can now be based also on the two originals mentioned above. In this connection, I refuse to go into the technical opinions of the De Ment Laboratories and of others, and into their methods, which in my opinion have led to the wrong result regarding the conclusion of authenticity.

"I. It is decisive for me that the forms of all objects submitted to me as coming from the ownership of the Mansoor family, whether in the original or in photographic reproductions, exaggerate certain stylistic characteristics of the Amarna artistry in such an obtrusive fashion, that every connoisseur of Egyptian Art must consider them as forgeries without hesitation. With regard to the forms I refer to a group of Amarna forgeries from the collection of A. Stoclet in Brussels, which still in 1930 could be published as "antique" Amarna objects by Prof. Dr. H. Frankfort (in: Maandblad voor Beeldende Kunsten, VII Jaargang Nr. 3, March 1930 on page 78 ff., fig. 13-15, 16, 17, 18-19, 20-22), but today must be rejected by every connoisseur of Egyptian art as forgeries. I may recognize a certain stylistic relationship of both small heads of princesses of the collection Stoclet (Fig. 17 and 20-22) with the photographs of the Mansoor pieces submitted to me by Dr. Voss; they might in fact, be the work of the same forger.

"II. The material of both objects submitted to me in the original (relief head and small head of princess) is a reddish lime-sandstone, which is supposed to have derived from Egypt, according to the expert opinions, but which is not known to me as coming from Egypt; this type of stone has during the entire pharaonic history of the

valley of the Nile been used neither in its architecture, nor in its art production of reliefs, statues or of small objects.

"It is superfluous to go into further details beyond the forms and the material, which details would only confirm the modern origin of these pieces: e.g. the microscopic picture of the worked surfaces, and the touching up of the borders of the fractures of these pieces. I have examined the two pieces that were left with me again and again in the course of long weeks, and can pronounce them modern imitations with absolute certainty on the basis of my studies and comparisons."

(signed: Prof. Dr. Hans Wolfgang Müller)
Munich.

To begin with, no one can give an opinion on any ancient object from photographs only. Before receiving the two objects for study, and after receiving only photographs of some Mansoor Amarnas, Professor Müller had the impression they were "modern imitations." Furthermore, he refused to consider the technical examinations of recognized scientists as "their methods," according to him, "have lead them to the wrong result regarding the conclusion of authenticity." We do not understand how someone can condemn or contradict the methods of so many eminent scientists, all highly qualified and respected in their own fields, unless he is himself a noted scientist. It seems to us that Professor Müller has not understood or possibly has not read the scientific reports sent to him.

As for stating that it is decisive for him that the forms of *all* objects submitted to him whether "in the original or in photographic reproductions, exaggerate certain stylistic characteristics of the Amarna artistry in *such an obtrusive fashion*, that every connoisseur of Egyptian art *must* consider them as forgeries without hesitation," this is sheer nonsense to say the least. We challenge anyone, and particularly those who rallied behind Professor Müller - like Professors Derchain or Eitner - to point out *any* exaggerated stylistic characteristics in *any* of the Mansoor Amarna sculptures that could have *such an obtrusive fashion*. One should only refer to the numerous Amarna photographs in the Brooklyn Museum catalogue of 1973 to notice clearly that the exaggeration in stylistic characteristics found in any of the Mansoor pieces has never come close to that of many found in other known Amarnas.

Furthermore, to refute the illogical statement "that every connoisseur of Egyptian art must consider them forgeries without hesitation," we will just name only three illustrious connoisseurs of Egyptian art who stated just the opposite. They are: Dr. Etienne Drioton, Professor Pierre du Bourguet, and Madame Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt. Absolutely and positively, no one can contest the fact that these three scholars are indeed connoisseurs of Egyptian art. Suffice to remind the reader that the first two, Drioton and du Bourguet, are the authors of "LES PHARAONS A LA CONQUETE DE L'ART," Desclée De Brouwer, 1965 which is "une histoire complète de l'art égyptien." What to say when one also reads on the cover of that book: "Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française!"

As for Dr. Desroches-Noblecourt, we would like to quote His Excellency Dr. Sarwat Okasha in his Preface of her outstanding book "Tutankhamen," New York Graphic Society, 1963. He wrote:

"I had the satisfaction, as Minister of Culture and National Guidance of the United Arab Republic [Egypt], of being able to second this exceptional work. I am very pleased that I could do so, for a study of Tutankhamen's treasure could not have been confided to a scholar more highly qualified in the world of art and archaeology than Madame Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt. She is an Egyptologist of the first rank: her writings, her masterly work at the Louvre Museum and School, her practical work in the field carried out on sites explored on behalf of France in Upper Egypt, the performance of her official duties as a special consultant

of UNESCO to my government - all single her out as a worthy heir of the great traditions of Egyptology and of her illustrious predecessors.

"I gave her what assistance I could, not only as a tribute to her abilities and to her determination to continue the work of Mariette Pasha, but also in appreciation of her sincere and cordial feelings of friendship towards Egypt at all periods of its history."

Dr. Okasha's statement that "a study of Tutankhamen's treasure could not have been confided to **a scholar more highly qualified in the world of art and archaeology than Madame Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt**," who is "**an Egyptologist of the first rank**," clearly indicates that *Madame Desroches-Noblecourt is one of the foremost Egyptologists of our time* and particularly "*in the world of art and archaeology*." And what can we say when we consider that he gave her "what assistance he could, not only as a tribute to her abilities and to her determination to continue the work of Mariette Pasha," who was a "French Egyptologist and founder of the Egyptian Antiquities Service; probably the most titanic figure in the whole story of Egyptology..." (cf. "Who Was Who in Egyptology," 1972 p. 194). Just what can we deduct from all this when we take into consideration that Dr. Okasha associated Dr. Desroches-Noblecourt to Mariette Pasha, "probably the most titanic figure in the whole story of Egyptology."

It should be noted that Madame Desroches-Noblecourt had seen years ago - and on various occasions - some of the Mansoor Amarna sculptures but never pronounced herself at the time whether they are genuine or not as she was an employee of the French Government and was not permitted to give an official evaluation. At times, through the years, when any of the Mansoors was in Paris, she was kind enough to see him to view the two or three small Amarnas he was carrying with him. Indeed she believes the Collection should be further studied.

Some time in 1979, the Mansoors offered to the Louvre Museum a statuette in pink limestone of an Amarna Princess as a donation to honor the memory of the Abbé Drioton. After studying and examining the piece for two years, Dr. Desroches-Noblecourt accepted it for the Louvre. We quote from a letter dated August 17, 1981 she sent to the representative of our affairs in Paris:

"J'ai pris cette décision en mon âme et conscience et je sais qu'en ce qui concerne l'objet que j'ai fait entrer au Louvre, mon admirable maître, le Chanoine Drioton aurait agi comme moi. Et je suis heureuse, une fois de plus, d'avoir fait quelque chose pour sa mémoire." Translated: "I have taken this decision in my soul and conscience knowing that my admirable teacher, the Canon Drioton would have acted as I did. And I am happy, once more, to have done something to commemorate his memory."

We also would like to quote Monsignor Gianfranco Nolli, Former Director of Oriental Antiquities of the Vatican Museum and Professor of Ancient Egyptian Religion, University of the Lateran in Rome. Speaking of the Mansoor's donation to the Louvre and of course of Madame Desroches-Noblecourt, he wrote in "In Defence..." (cf. Point 10, p.28) the following:

"This object was accepted as authentic (after the due investigation by the Laboratory of Mineralogy and Crystallography of the Université P. et M. Curie of France). The object in question, a Princess figurine, was accepted not by a door-keeper of the Louvre Museum, but by Dr. Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt, universally known as a competent scholar of Ancient Egyptian Art. In fact, she published in 1962 a book "L'Art Egyptien" and in 1960 she wrote a monography "L'extraordinaire aventure Amarnienne" (Edition des Deux Mondes, Paris) which makes one believe that Dr. Desroches-Noblecourt has the necessary competence in this field and precisely in regard to the period to which the Mansoor-Amarna Collection belongs. How could it be that Dr. Desroches-Noblecourt did not notice that the Amarna piece was a "fake" after having studied it for a length of time?"

In October of 1986, Madame Desroches-Noblecourt honored us by attending the IInd Exhibition of the Mansoor Amarna Collection held at San Francisco State University. She spent one week in San Francisco in which she was able to study and handle the Mansoor sculptures. We also had the honor of the presence of Professor du Bourguet and Monsignor Nollino who came over to the same city for the same purpose. Needless to say, these three most eminent scholars admired at length the sculptures remarking and pointing out to each other the various exquisite and indeed realistic details...

We now quote some "Excerpts from interviews conducted by Dimitra Pozirekides" of Channel 13, KCOP Television of Los Angeles on October 15 and 17, 1986 at the St. Francis Hotel and San Francisco State University:

"Dr. Desroches-Noblecourt: 'This collection [Mansoor's] is very important because it is of the Amarna period...this is a very difficult period to understand, we only know of two workshops, but there are many others that are unknown to us... the workshop from which comes the Mansoor collection was certainly that of a very realistic and skilled artist... this collection cannot be compared to any other collection... I don't think we have now in America or in Europe so large a collection of objects coming from one workshop.'"

While the IInd Exhibition of the Mansoor Amarna Collection at San Francisco State University was in progress and the three illustrious European visitors were still in San Francisco, Dr. Andreina Leanza Becker-Colonna gave a dinner reception in their honor at her club, The Metropolitan. Also present were Dr. Fred H. Stross, Dr. Richard L. Trapp, Associate Dean of the School of Humanities, Chairman of the Classics Department, San Francisco State University; and Professor Marian Bernstein, Classics. Some members of the Mansoor family and other people were also present at that reception.

While we cannot quote word-for-word what Dr. Desroches-Noblecourt said in a speech she made on that evening, the writers - to the best of their memories - submit its condensation in a few lines: "I came in San Francisco somewhat skeptical about the Mansoor Amarna sculptures and I now do believe they are really ancient. They should be further studied. Moreover, I have heard quite a few things about the members of the Mansoor family and I find that they are normal people and that what I had heard is not true."

From way deep in our heart, a sincere THANK YOU to Madame Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt from all the Mansoors who acknowledge their debt with eternal gratitude - not only because of the statements she made concerning the Mansoor Collection (or the Mansoors), but mostly because, with the heavy work-load she carries on her shoulders, she created time to come all the way from Europe to view the Collection in San Francisco. The Mansoors also feel an everlasting posthumous gratitude to Professor Pierre du Bourguet, S.J. and to Monsignor Gianfranco Nollino... We're hoping and praying that other Egyptologists with integrity and a higher conscience will do likewise - i.e. come to California to view the Collection.

.

One of the most frustrating matters we have endured in the last forty some years is the way certain Egyptologists have paraphrased each other concerning the value of the scientific evidence obtained on the Mansoor sculptures. Whereas the Egyptologists who have supported the Collection declare their belief in the scientific reports issued, those who are condemning it show a total disregard, disbelief, or disdain in the positive findings of the eminent authors of the reports. Let us compare some of the written statements on the subject from both sides:

- 1) **Professor Müller** refused "to go into the technical opinions of the De Ment Laboratories and of others..." and this is stated clearly in his "Expert Opinion."
- 2) **Dr. Cooney** wrote the following in a letter sent to us on June 16, 1954: "When you were here, you requested me to reconsider my unfavorable opinion of your collection of Amarna sculptures and left with me a copy of the report by Mr. Lucas and Dr. Iskander. I have read the report carefully but find nothing in it to induce me to change my opinion. I realize how important the question is to you and I regret that my opinion continues to be unfavorable." What's more, his disbelief in the positive scientific reports is distinctly shown in his letter to Dr. Stross (cf. p. 62) dated December 9, 1958 when he wrote: "I am perfectly familiar with all the facts you list in your letter and I have seen all the reports you mention... I have always had to give an unfavorable opinion."
- 3) **Dr. Bernard V. Bothmer** wrote in his letter of April 5, 1971 (cf. its facsimile p. 66): "I am familiar with the booklet written by Messrs. Stross and Eisenlord. To my mind, it does not hold water..." Is there any doubt in the reader's mind that this scholar is totally discounting all the positive scientific reports concerning the Mansoor Collection?
 - 1A) **Dr. Drioton** wrote to us in French on January 3, 1959 (cf. his letter p. 39 in "Je Cherche un Homme)" - and we quote from its translation (by Dr. Robert E. Arnal, San Jose State University): "The report of Mr. Lucas who was the most eminent specialist in matter of Egyptology and also the one of Professor Robert R. Compton of Stanford University (in contradistinction to the report of Mr. W. J. Young of the Boston Museum), are positive about this subject." Although it is out of place in this section, and since we have not done it so far in its English translation, we would like to quote now the conclusion of the letter as it reflects Dr. Drioton's artistic and stylistic opinion. He wrote: "I may add that, concerning the artistic point of view, these sculptures come from a workshop related to, but not identical with, the one in which the colossuses of Karnak were executed. Their stylistic pattern, advanced in the same fashion as the Karnak sculptures, is of such a full faultless execution that it cannot be, in my opinion, the work of a forger." The first part of the letter is ample proof that Dr. Drioton believed in the scientific evidence...
 - 2A) **Dr. Desroches-Noblecourt** showed her utmost admiration for Dr. Stross after he talked on October 16, 1986 in San Francisco State University on "Some Features of the Technical Examination of Ancient Artifacts." On that day, Dr. Stross showed also slides of the Mansoor Amarna sculptures to prove his point - describing clearly the irrefutable scientific evidence attesting their ancient age.

Moreover, on July 2nd, 1990 Madame Desroches-Noblecourt wrote to us in French saying: "...Mais je vous l'ai dit - et je le répète, on ne condamne pas si facilement un ensemble aussi étonnant - déroutant même - sans l'avoir mûrement étudié, sans le partipris qu'inspire son premier abord, et sans tenir compte des nombreuses analyses positives dont il paraît être sorti vainqueur, à 99%, et négligeant l'apparition de dendrites marquant certaines pièces et qui ne peuvent se former qu'au prise de millénaires." Our translation: "...But I had said it to you, and I repeat it, one does not condemn that easily such an astonishing - even misleading- group without studying it seriously, without being prejudiced on viewing it for the first time, and without taking into consideration the numerous positive analyses proving its authenticity with a 99% certainty, and neglecting the evidence of dendritic markings on some of the objects that cannot be formed except through thousands of years." Isn't this enough proof that Dr. Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt read the scientific reports and takes **into consideration** scientific evidence?

- 3A) **Professor Pierre du Bourguet**, S.J. Conservateur en chef honoraire au département des Antiquités Egyptiennes du Musée du Louvre, Professeur honoraire d'Égyptologie de l'Institut Catholique de Paris. On August 21, 1986 Professor du Bourguet wrote to us in French saying: "Vous ne pouvez pas douter de mon intime conviction de l'authenticité Amarnienne des pièces de votre collection, même si elles peuvent être de valeur artistique inégale mais dont le style est à mes yeux typiquement Amarnien de l'époque, excluant l'oeuvre d'un faussaire. Cet avis, je ne m'en étonne pas, est entièrement corroboré par l'ensemble impressionnant des analyses chimiques et géologiques dont vous m'avez montré le détail." Translated: "There can be no doubt whatsoever about my deep conviction that the objects in your collection are authentic Amarna sculptures, even though they may be of different artistic value, the style seems to me to be typical from the Amarna period and cannot be the work of a forger. I am not in the least surprised to see my findings totally validated by the impressive body of chemical and geological tests you submitted to me."

After what we just quoted above from three eminent scholars, is there any doubt in the reader's mind that true scholars should consider any "**impressive**" scientific evidence submitted to them?

Flagrant Absurdity

Referring to a group of Amarna forgeries from the collection of A. Stoclet in Brussels, Professor Müller wrote: "I may recognize a certain stylistic relationship of both small heads of princesses of the collection Stoclet (Fig. 17 and 20-22) with the photographs of the Mansoor pieces submitted to me by Dr. Voss; they might, in fact, be the work of the same forger." We got the article by Dr. H. Frankfort not too long ago - which includes figs. 17 and 20-22, and we can state emphatically that any similarity or stylistic relationship of both small heads of princesses of the collection Stoclet (Fig. 17 and 20-22) is positively and absolutely non-existent. In our most humble opinion and with all due respect to Professor Müller, what he recognizes as "a certain stylistic relationship..." is purely in his imagination. Even if compared, from photographs (?), any art connoisseur and particularly of Amarna art, will instantly know that there can be no comparison whatsoever between the style of the Stoclet and that of the Mansoor pieces.

Reddish Lime-Sandstone (?)

The fact that Professor Müller states that the Mansoor sculptures are made of "reddish lime-sandstone" which is not known to him as coming from Egypt makes us believe that he is neither a good observer nor experienced in geological matters. First of all, the Mansoor sculptures are carved out of limestone, white or whitish and pink or pinkish. Second, Stross and Eisenlord in their "Report..." (1965) p. 21, quoted Dr. Zaki Iskander who wrote: "...Pink limestone of different shades occurs plentifully in Egypt, particularly in the western desert on the Adu-Dush road and on the Assiut-Kharga road and also between Ismailia and Suez, and WAS USED occasionally (A. Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, 3rd edition, 1948, p. 472). An example of its use in the XVIIIth Dynasty is the head of Amen-em-Heb, the overseer of estates of King Thotmes III, Cairo Museum, Ground floor, Room No. 12, Case C, Special No. 11529."

Furthermore, should we refer to the statement by Dr. Phillipe Blanc, Université P. et M. Curie (Sorbonne), inserted in "In Defence..." p. 38, the reader will then remember its translation which is included in this publication p. 23, in which he concluded that: "From geological work made in Egypt, a probable localisation would be: Luxor and Quena, in the Valley of the Nile."

It goes without saying that if Professor Müller would have consulted on the stone any of the many eminent German scientists from any university in Germany, he would have been told for sure that the pink limestone of the Mansoor sculptures comes indeed from Egypt - and he most probably would

have also been told that their surface (patination) is definitely ancient - considering the dendritic markings, etc... But, being a reputed scholar in Egyptology who - like very few other Egyptologists - does not believe in scientific evidence, it was, perhaps, beyond his dignity to seek the knowledge of a scientist in this matter. Didn't he, after all, and this by his own admission, "refuse to go into the technical opinions" of scientists, "and into their methods," which in his opinion are leading "to the wrong result regarding the conclusion of authenticity"?

.

Through the years, some leading scholars specializing in ancient art and style - whether it be Egyptian, Greek, Roman or other, have made mistakes and, quite often, have contradicted each other. How can we forget the words of Professor Keith Seele when he wrote to Dr. Stross saying (cf. p. 58): "Detecting forgeries on the basis of style and technique is a really difficult and tricky business, and many great scholars have been deceived even though they have devoted their lives to the study of ancient art."

Writing to the President of a leading West Coast Educational Institution, the Director of an Eastern Museum housing important ancient Egyptian artifacts wrote on February 28, 1973 the following: "After 25 years as the director of the Museum I have no confidence really in experts who authenticate objects on the basis of style. I find they very often disagree. We have had objects here which have been debated for twenty years. So what does one do about ones Mansoor Collection? I know from our Egyptian Department that the collection is well known and debatable."

.

After we wrote and mailed around "Je Cherche un Homme," we received a letter written in English from a European (the name will remain confidential), dated 4 November 1971 and we read in it the following:

"Thank you for your letter of 26 October with the two publications... I can not come out into the open, the way you have done... Please treat that information as confidential... At the moment, it is a well-known fact, that the Amarna-head, Dr. Munro of the Kestner Museum of Hanover acquired, is condemned by most of the other Egyptologists. Munro bought the head, after Prof. Müller in Munich said that it was a genuine piece! Mr. Munro, having been a student of Wolfgang Müller, of course holds his opinion very high, and bought the piece. Mr. Munro is fighting for his Amarna-Piece, but so far he and Prof. Müller stand alone.

"Again confidentially, I can tell you, that Dr. Bothmer of the Brooklyn, Cyril Aldred of Edinburgh and Prof. de Meulenaere of Brussels have condemned the piece, and I, personally, hold their opinion in much higher esteem, than that of Prof. Wolfgang Müller in Munich! Outside Germany, you will hardly find any Egyptologist who takes Prof. Müller serious anymore... I also have found out, that if a piece is condemned by one or other Egyptologist, nobody touches it anymore, let alone somebody that dares to contradict the Egyptologist that made the condemnation in writing."

We are indeed grateful to the European who wrote the above letter, and we are keeping his name confidential as per his request; but we feel the information he sent us should be known publicly as this shows that great scholars often disagree and, with all due respect, some - perhaps many - do make mistakes.

The two previous letters just mentioned (European and the Director of an Eastern Museum) as well as the outstanding sentence of Professor Seele (Chicago) on the detection of "forgeries on the basis

of style and technique" are ample proof that "many great scholars have been deceived even though they have devoted their lives to the study of ancient art."

• • • • •

Egyptian art is indeed complex and its more than 3000 years evolution makes it practically impossible for any expert to master completely its many phases. In particular, Amarna art is perhaps the most complex in all the story of ancient Egypt. At times, art stylists, historians and art dealers differ greatly on the nature of a given object as far as the period, subject or other factors are concerned.

In a most humble way, we have added to the art stylists and historians "art dealers" since many of these do research artifacts they handle. To give an idea of how complex Egyptian art is, we are going to cite examples as an artifact attributed by some scholars to a certain period or a certain personage could be attributed by others to totally different ones. It goes without saying that certain objects authenticated by some could be labelled spurious by others or vice versa.

We would like to start with an example of a painted limestone head, the "Salt Head," illustrated and mentioned in several publications and we will only cite two of them:

1) In *Art of Ancient Egypt*, Kazimierz Michalowsky, Harry N. Abrams, N.Y., fig. 213 of page 364, that head is illustrated and noted as "Early Dynasty V."

2) Should we now consult *Newsweek*, "Great Museums of the World, LOUVRE/Paris," Simon and Schuster, N.Y. 1967, p. 20, we will read the following concerning the illustrated head:

"HEAD OF A YOUNG MAN (THE SALT HEAD). IV Dynasty (?). The so-called Salt Head - named after its former owner - has been dated to periods as much as 14 centuries apart, a startling difference of opinion which is explicable only in the case of an art like Egypt's, where the artistic language crystallized at dawn of its history and remained uninflected by the passing of the centuries. This head is problematic because of its relative independence of the Egyptian esthetic code. It has a naturalism characteristic of just two phases in Egyptian art - the Old Kingdom, with its nascent realism, and the Amarna phase, with its markedly realistic trend. The Salt Head seems to fit better into the second of the two because of its "life-mask" quality typical of certain works from the Amarna epoch."

Question: Which period "The Salt Head" really belongs to? IV, V Dynasty or Amarna period (XVIII Dynasty)? *A startling difference of circa 1400 years apart.*

We now refer the reader to "Egyptian Sculpture of the Late Period," The Brooklyn Museum, 1960. This catalogue was compiled in an outstanding manner by Dr. Bernard V. Bothmer - a scholar, to our mind, specialized in the Late Period, in collaboration with Professor Herman De Meulenaere and Hans Wolfgang Müller on the occasion of an exhibition held at the Brooklyn Museum. Sculptures in the round and some reliefs of the Late Egyptian Period were loaned to the museum from a total of 57 museums, collectors and dealers from around the world. The Foreword of the Catalogue was written by Dr. John D. Cooney, Curator of Ancient Art at the Brooklyn Museum, who concluded the following:

"The dates and attributions listed in the Catalogue are frequently at wide variance with those of the owners or with those found in earlier publications. Praise or censure for these rests with the compiler of the Catalogue, Bernard V. Bothmer." *Frequently at wide variance.* We would like to add that the Catalogue impressed us very much and we do hold that the work of Bernard V. Bothmer in this instance is quite remarkable and deserves the praise and admiration of all.

In the catalogue above-mentioned, we refer to a limestone relief of Akhamenru, High Steward of Shepenwepet II, pp. 6-7, of the end of Dynasty XXV, about 660 B.C. which "is a fine example of the

classicistic tendencies prevailing in private relief work of the XXVth Dynasty." A little further, Bothmer wrote concerning this relief: "Were it not for the inscription, one might wonder if this relief did not come from a tomb of the Middle Kingdom [Dynasties XI - XII, 2052-1786 B.C.] and indeed the difference is so fine that it might well baffle an expert." *Baffle!* And how many years difference between 660 and 2052-1786?

Another example we should mention from the catalogue is on page 168: Man or God, figs. 322-323. Speaking of the limestone torso of the Ptolemaic Period, about 100-50 B.C., Dr. Bothmer wrote: "Chest, rib cage, and loins are competently modeled in the traditional manner; what is unusual is the way in which the abdomen is formed as a separate entity. Although it does not greatly protrude, it is the most prominent part of the torso. For its width, the torso is not very deep - another indication of the distinctive style of the first century B.C. Two additional features seem to support this date. The first is the inclination of the top of the back pillar toward the now-missing head, and the second is the inscription. The text is extraordinarily difficult - so hard to interpret that one prominent Egyptologist, after taking a look at it, declared sculpture and all a forgery." *Prominent Egyptologist!*

Although not relevant to this particular chapter, two other examples should and must be cited now as they are important to our story:

1) Concerning Mentuemhat, Count of Thebes, pp. 14-15, Dr. Bothmer wrote:

"Since the heads of ten of Mentuemhat's statues are preserved, it is disappointing to note how little they resemble each other, for we should like to have a true portrait of Mentuemhat. Though some of the heads show traces of realism, not even his famous bust in the Cairo Museum (C.G. 647; fig. 29) can be acclaimed as truly presenting the features of the great man." *Ten statues of Mentuemhat and none resemble each other!*

2) The second example is a white indurated limestone head of Queen Arsinoe II, Ptolemaic Period, 275-270 B.C. of the Metropolitan Museum, N.Y. Concerning this head, figs. 244-246 p. 125, Bothmer wrote:

"An inscribed statue of Arsinoe II in Rome (Vatican 25), with the head fortunately intact, gives a good idea of the official style of her period. It is of colossal dimensions - the Queen's figure, without base, measuring eight feet in height - and the features are consequently not too detailed, but it permits the conclusion that the head from the Metropolitan Museum of Art is a replica, if not of the Vatican statue itself, at least of a similar one, and that it is undoubtedly an official likeness of Arsinoe II." *A replica!*

We now turn again to the 1973 Catalogue of the Brooklyn Museum "Akhenaten and Nefertiti" by Cyril Aldred. This catalogue deals only with the Amarna Period.

We refer the reader to fig. 125 on page 193. Aldred wrote concerning that relief:

"Only the lower part of the face and part of the shoulder and right arm with hand grasping stalks of grain are here shown in sunk relief, but the complete portrait must have been nearly life size."

We quote now from his Commentary: "This incomplete portrait has been identified by Cooney (see bibliography) as that of a man and by Roeder (see bibliography) definitely as Akhenaten. To this writer, however, the soft features and short firm chin suggest a woman, and the wig, evidently of the short Nubian type, confirms this view, for coiffures of this fashion were virtually a monopoly of royal ladies at Tell el Amarna. The life-size scale of the carving and its high quality reflect the importance of the person represented, who possibly was Nefertiti but more likely Merytaten (No. 120)."

As can be noticed from the above commentary of fig. 125, three *great* scholars differ *greatly* on the relief studied. Does it represent a *man*, or "*definitely*" *Akhenaten*, or "*possibly*" *Nefertiti*, or "*more likely*" *Merytaten*?

Another interesting - possibly intriguing - example we should point out is fig. No. 128, p. 195, a relief of a "Head of a Young Girl, Late Period (?)." We quote from the Commentary: "Gunther Roeder identified the subject as a Nubian raising his hands in adoration, but H. W. Müller has seen in the representation a princess with the delicate face of a young girl, and with him the present writer is in agreement. The features show none of the grim lines given to Nubians in the Amarna Period (No. 37), and the shocks or tufts of hair characteristic of peoples from the southlands are entirely lacking." Here again, scholars disagree: Is the subject a Nubian male (his hands) or an Amarna princess, an Egyptian? *Do Nubians have Egyptian features or characteristics?* Or is it that Amarna art and style baffling or puzzling? Could this relief really be of the *Late Period*? It certainly *could and could not* since a great scholar marked it so.

The reader will bear with us for a last example. It is of relief No. 121 on page 190. We read in the Commentary: "The authenticity of the Brooklyn relief has been doubted by *some who feel* that it does not possess the true 'Amarna vibrancy.' Since Charles Edwin Wilbour purchased the model at Tell el Amarna on December 21, 1881, six years before the discovery of the cuneiform archives had brought notoriety to that site, there is no doubt of the antiquity of the piece."

Since the authenticity of the Brooklyn relief has been doubted by some who feel that it does not possess the true "Amarna vibrancy," and since - according to Aldred - there are "traces of red paint on faces and headdresses," doesn't it make sense that this relief should have been subjected by the Brooklyn to scientific tests to settle the matter?

• • • • •

In "J'Accuse" we wrote (p. 38) that we were going to insert in a later section the translation of Prof. Dr. Philippe Derchain's letter in response to our appeal in "Je Cherche un Homme," and we are inserting it here followed by our answer:

[TRANSLATION]

August 28, 1971

Sir,

I thank you for having sent me your brochure "Je Cherche un Homme" in which you are trying to defend your collection of sculptures supposedly Amarnian. I will tell you right away that I will not be this man, for, after having looked at the photographs of the objects that you have reproduced, I am convinced that Messrs. Cooney and H. W. Müller are right. In the case of the relief of page 14, for example, we have here a copy of the celebrated painting of Oxford, the head on the cover is inspired by one of the celebrated colossi, the one on the back cover from one of the not less known heads in Cairo, etc. All these monuments are published, have frequently been reproduced, so that it is fatal that they should serve to inspire a clever forger.

The quantity of the monuments of your collection which remind one of others, very well known and authentic, these prove, to my way of thinking that yours can be nothing but fakes.

As H. W. Müller says it very correctly, the connoisseur knows as soon as one deals with modern imitations. I am desolate to have to tell you that the persons that you oppose to Prof. Müller, p. 13, can in no way be considered as authorities in the matter. Everybody knows as Mr. Cooney told you and as you have printed it p. 2, that the Chanoine Drioton who was an excellent

philologist was not an archaeologist and that he very often made mistakes in his expertises on authenticity. No one, in addition, would think in trusting the opinion of the two Egyptian scholars that you name afterward. As to Dr. O. K. Bach of Denver, if he has ever studied Egyptology, it is not is this science that he published much. Not knowing him from his Egyptological works which are reduced to very little, I would consider him in margin with Egyptology, and no matter what his talents as Director of the Denver Museum, I would attribute to his judgment but a limited value, and especially would not grant him any weight in regard to the opinions of Cooney, Müller and Vandier.

The petrographic analyses, on the other hand, that you have made, prove nothing. By such means, one can determine the nature of the material and nothing more. An intelligent forger--and yours is, to be sure--naturally chooses his stones with care. Nothing prevents him from recuperating antique blocks on the sites to utilize them. The reports that you publish have little weight in regard to the stylistic arguments. Furthermore, I do not approve at all of the manner in which you suggest that M. Cooney is incapable of recognizing an error. He has made no mistake and I am sure that if he saw your collection for the first time today, his judgment would be the same as in the past. There is then no reason why he should cede to your insistence, which seems to me to be at the limit of dishonesty. The greatest service that you could render to the "world of art," as you seem to desire it from the last paragraph of your brochure, p. 22, is to throw all this in the sea and rid the market of antiquities of some of the forgeries which encumber it.

With my regrets,

Very sincerely yours,

(signed: Prof. Dr. Philippe Derchain)

Answer to Derchain's letter, translated:

September 7, 1971

Sir,

Your letter of August 28 well deserves an answer. You have received our brochure because your name figured on our list of several hundred persons who had to receive it. Naturally, we expected to receive some unfavorable comments, were it only from persons who think in matters of Egyptology like Messrs. Cooney and H. W. Müller (Munich). You are taking their defense: It is too bad.

Good note has been taken of all your regrettable comments, and when the opportune moment will present itself, we should consider it our duty and pleasure to reveal them since you have offered them gratuitously for what they are worth.

It is too late to discuss with you any subject regarding Egyptology or Egyptian art, and I would not know where to start. Having passed a judgment on Egyptian objects after having seen only photographs (even if in the case of this brochure much care was taken to present these sculptures in their true character), you have made an error that no serious Egyptologist should make.

As to your allegations that certain of these sculptures are only copies of authentic representations which exist in museums, the facts and the abundance of ancient statues of such or such king prove by themselves that you are sadly in error. Likewise, your determination in declaring that the great number of objects inclines you to think that they are not authentic, can only be due to your lack

of experience in the study of Egyptian art. I will not even give you any examples; it would be too elementary. Dig a little bit in your memory; but I don't know.

As regards this great and regretted master, Dr. Etienne Drioton, you fall (do) bad in repeating Mr. Cooney's wily remark. Yes, Sir, the Canon Drioton was a giant of Egyptology. Not only was he one of the greatest Egyptologists of this century, but his knowledge and appreciation of Egyptian art were so superior to those of Messrs. Cooney and Müller that a comparison between his knowledge and that of the others would be impossible to measure.

Your remark about the two Egyptian savants is of very bad taste. Do you know them yourself? As to Dr. Bach of Denver, no one said that he was an Egyptologist. But would you believe it, Sir, he understands art and he has good taste.

When you speak of scientific analyses, what do you know of them? According to what you say, we should return to the Middle Ages. Yes, Sir, the sciences show continuous progress, and it is not fitting for one to forcefully oppose the scientific opinions, unless one knows what he is talking about. Unless, of course, you are afraid of the truth. Perhaps you have heard that from time to time science has proved by logic, reason and with certainty that such or such so-called expert has been in error. Why shouldn't Egyptology work jointly with science for the common interest?

Sooner or later, the truth will be known. Sooner or later, the stubborn and the prejudiced will have to keep quiet. In a few words, Sir, in your letter you have said nothing and you have proved nothing. And do you think that with such talk you are serving Egyptology? If you had any good arguments to offer, you should have done it logically and according to the principles of decency.

Your letter is unworthy of an Egyptologist.

However, you are right in one thing: You are certainly not the man we are looking for.

With my regrets.

Sincerely Yours,

Signed: Edmond Mansoor

We would like to add to our answer--particularly for the benefit of Prof. Derchain--that when carved, any antique blocks chosen on the sites will never show an ancient patination of any kind.

Drioton: "*Homme de Grand Savoir*"

Concerning the remark of Derchain that Drioton was an excellent philologist and not an archaeologist, let it be known that many of his colleagues--all recognized scholars--wrote obituaries in archaeological reviews and journals in various countries praising his work as that of "*un des égyptologues les plus complets de sa génération*" (Jacques Vandier). In "*Revue Archéologique*," Paris, 1961, Jean Sainte Fare Garnot wrote: "*Quant à son oeuvre [Drioton's] d'archéologie, elle se recommande par l'abondance et la qualité de la production.*" *Oeuvre d'archéologie*. Besides Vandier and Garnot, the following scholars have to be mentioned: J. Cerny; P. Chantraine; L. Christianini; M. Colinon; F. Daumas; P. du Bourguet; S. Gabra; P. Gilbert; F. Jesi; J. Leclant; C. Maystre; A. Papadopoulo; C. Picard; C. Schaeffer and B. Van de Walle. Possibly other scholars have written about Drioton's Egyptological and archaeological works and we're not aware of them.

Drioton was the Dean of French Egyptologists: He was President-elect of the "French Egyptological Society;" Director General of the "Egyptian Antiquities Service;" Curator Emeritus of the

Louvre Museum and the Museums of France;" Professor of Egyptology at the Catholic Institute of Paris, the Sorbonne, and the *Collège de France*, where he occupied the Chair of Champollion, the highest honor in Egyptology. Furthermore, he was also Professor of Egyptology at the *Institut d'Égyptologie de l'Université Fouad 1^{er}* of Cairo; *Membre très éminent de la F.E.R.E. (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elizabeth)*; Correspondent of the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*; Associate Member of the *Académie de Macon*; Member of the *Institut d'Égypte*; *Docteur Honoris Causa de l'Université de Louvain*; Correspondent of the *Académie des Sciences de Bavière*; Associate Correspondent of the *Académie Royale de Belgique*; Associate Correspondent of the *Académie de Stanislas de Nancy*; *Officier de la Légion d'Honneur*; *Officier de l'Ordre Grand-Ducal de la Couronne de Chêne du Luxembourg*; *Grand Officier du Tadj d'Iran*; *Grand Officier de l'Ordre du Maaref d'Égypte*; Director of the CNRS (*Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*) at the Sorbonne; and finally--and perhaps there's more, Member of the Artistic Council of the Museums of France. Such was the Canon Drioton who was considered by Derchain not to be an archaeologist but only a "distinguished philologist," and that "his opinion on objects"--as claimed by Cooney--"is completely worthless" (Exhibit #2). But we are most thankful to God that Vandier, as stated above, wrote that Drioton was "un des égyptologues les plus complets de sa génération." Also that "quant à son oeuvre d'archéologie, elle se recommande par l'abondance et la qualité de la production (Garnot)."

It should be noted that Ms. Sylvia Hochfield wrote in her article (ARTnews, Summer 1978), that Dr. Cooney was "curator emeritus of Egyptian Art at the Cleveland Museum--which he was, and she only mentions Drioton as a "distinguished French philologist." She only repeated Cooney's opinion of Drioton and that this opinion "is shared by other Egyptologist art historians." This is a shame! This is absurd and preposterous! Is there a COVER UP from the part of the few Egyptologists who "shared" Cooney's opinion? Do these Egyptologists also believe that Parke-Bernet had "experiences with portions of the Mansoor Amarna Collection?" Do these Egyptologists also share Cooney's opinion that Mr. William J. Young is "the best authority in this country on technical problems connected with works of art?"

Drioton was *un homme de grand savoir* in all phases of Egyptology. When he passed away, the obituaries about him (by scholars mentioned above like Vandier, Garnot and others) consisted of more than 34,000 words and were published in newspapers, magazines and journals such as: *Le Monde*, *La Croix*, *Bulletin de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, *Revue d'Égyptologie*, *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale*, *Études*, *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg*, *Nouvelles de l'Institut Catholique de Paris*, *Journal de Genève*, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, *Chronique d'Égypte*, *La Revue du Caire*, *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie*, *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde (ZAS)*, *Archiv für Orientforschung (AFO)*, and *Enciclopedia Pomba of Turin*.

Furthermore, in the "Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Le Caire, 56; 1957, Mlle. Josephine Jacquot wrote the "Bibliographie de l'Oeuvre Scientifique de M. Etienne Drioton" consisting of 287 books and articles among them: a) 37 on "Archéologie;" b) 38 on "Histoire de l'Égyptologie et de Fouilles;" and c) 33 on "Philologie et Editions de Textes." Isn't it fair then to conclude that Drioton was a distinguished archaeologist, as well as a distinguished Egyptologist and a distinguished philologist?

Thus, the letter of Prof. Derchain is not worth much--if anything at all. It is definitely a disgrace to him and to anyone sharing any of his valueless assertions or opinions. It is neither written in an ethical nor a scholarly manner. We feel that by writing it, Prof. Derchain was attempting to discourage us from further discussing the Mansoor Amarna Collection. If this were his aim, and it very much looks like it, he has failed pitifully.

Before we close this chapter, we would like to inform the reader that we read in the "Chronique d'Égypte, No. 73, 1962 (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elizabeth, Brussels), a transcript by Pierre

Gilbert about Drioton's "*innombrables et brillants travaux*" and the kindness of his heart. In this instance, we quote Gilbert: "*Ces efforts du directeur des Antiquités n'ont pu être étrangers aux épreuves de santé qui, après son retour d'Égypte, l'assaillirent ces dernières années. Se sachant menacé, il déferait de quitter la France pour une conférence ou une visite espérée de ses amis, mais quand l'Université de Liège fit appel à lui pour assister à la thèse de Philippe Derchain, il n'hésita pas à donner à l'école égyptologique belge le grand témoignage de sa présence.*" We understand from this last sentence that Drioton was greatly instrumental in Derchain's obtaining his Ph.D.!

When we first came to the U.S.A., i.e. in the late forties and early fifties, we were quite active with several museums around the country and we would like to quote ourselves from the first paragraph on page 46 of this story. We wrote:

"...We find in our records literally scores of letters addressed to us by directors and curators of American museums thanking us for the fine acquisitions obtained from our firm; for donations and gifts of ancient works of art; for contributions to exhibits of ancient art in museums; and for lectures and talks on ancient history and art. We also have letters and the necessary evidence to attest to the fact that we were the first, some twenty years ago [in 1950], to approach the leading American museums, the Egyptian Ambassador in Washington, D.C. and the Egyptian Minister of Public Instruction, Dr. Taha Hussein, in a matter in which antiquarians do not usually indulge, and which resulted in the exhibition of a part of the treasures of Tut-Ankh-Amon in several museums of the United States."

At this time, we would like to talk about some of our activities with the Denver Art Museum since it is the only American museum that, besides purchasing from the Mansoors through the years many other ancient Egyptian artifacts from various periods of Pharaonic Egypt, purchased in 1955 two sculptures from the Mansoor Amarna Collection: A head of Nefertiti and one of a Princess.

After we loaned to the Denver Art Museum many ancient Egyptian objects, Dr. Otto Karl Bach, its Director, wrote to us on January 17, 1950 the letter inserted in this section.

(Please see letter dated January 17, 1950 -- Exhibit #8)

And on January 31, 1950 Dr. Bach wrote to us the following:

"The list of gifts from M. A. Mansoor and Sons to the Denver Art Museum is overwhelming. It will enable us to set up a permanent installation of Egyptian art which will be of great value in stimulating appreciation of Egyptian art..."

"Your loans to the Portrait Exhibition are extremely handsome set off against a large circular sweep of dusty pink velour curtain. This is the first section of the exhibition and one of the most impressive. I have taken the liberty of writing a letter of thanks to your father."

On March 24, 1950 Dr. Bach wrote a letter to Dr. Taha Hussein, Minister of Public Education of Egypt, and we are inserting its facsimile in this section.

(Please see letter dated March 24, 1950 -- Exhibit #9)

On May 9, 1950 Dr. Bach sent us a letter in which he said:

"I have written a letter to the Egyptian Ambassador as you have suggested and I hope that your plans will come through."

We are inserting in this section another facsimile of a letter by Dr. Bach dated August 11, 1954 and we ask the reader to kindly read it at this time.

(Please see letter dated August 11, 1954 -- Exhibit #10)

As can be noticed from the letter of August 11, 1954, Dr. Bach acknowledged with thanks the donation of the "fine gift" of the papyrus scroll to his museum by the Mansoors, and this papyrus was illustrated in at least two of The Denver Art Museum catalogues (1965 and 1971, p.3). It is in red and black ink and measures over five feet. Other items in both catalogues are also noted as gifts from M. A. Mansoor Sons and they are clearly marked so in the catalogues. If we have mentioned that we have donated relics to museums, it is definitely not to show off that we are generous, but rather to establish the fact that we have--in a most humble way--contributed to the progress of some educational institutions.

In 1955, The Denver Art Museum purchased the two Amarna heads we mentioned previously and the reader will remember that at the time, there were only three technical reports available on the sculptures: The one of Young (Boston, 1949) and the others of Lucas (Cairo, 1942), and Iskander and Mustafa (Cairo, 1950). The two sculptures were on display at The Denver Art Museum for some twenty years until Dr. Bach retired [1975?]. It is sad to mention that the new director took down the two heads from display and the name of the Mansoors was blotted out of new catalogues and obliterated from the museum. This leaves no doubt in our mind that some museum people in the East Coast influenced the new director...(cf. letter by Mrs. Mitzi Briggs, p. 73).

On June 19, 1984 we wrote a letter to the new Director of The Denver Art Museum and we quote from this letter:

"Also, since you no longer believe in the authenticity of these 2 sculptures, we would very much like to buy them back from your Museum, and are willing to pay the Museum three times the amount it had paid for them some 30 years ago. I am sure your Museum would be better off getting some money, rather than keep the 2 sculptures hidden for no educational and constructive purpose. Please be kind enough to submit my request to your Museum's Board of Trustees, and let me know of your acceptance as soon as possible."

From the above paragraph, one can easily deduct that the Mansoors are more than convinced of the authenticity of their Amarnas, otherwise they would have never made such an offer.

A facsimile of the answer dated July 11, 1984 is inserted in this section, and, on reading it again and again, we, the Mansoors, are inclined to believe that The Denver Art Museum still believes that the two Amarna sculptures they own are authentic, otherwise they would have never turned down the offer to get their money back advantageously on "controversial" artifacts.

(Please see letter dated July 11, 1984 -- Exhibit #11)

It goes without mentioning that Dr. Otto Bach has shown real American "guts" by defying the giant eastern museum directors and Egyptologists in buying and displaying the two Amarna heads in his Museum from 1955 until he retired some twenty years later.

.

In the Fall 1991 issue of "K.M.T., A MODERN JOURNAL OF ANCIENT EGYPT," Dr. William H. Peck, Senior Curator at the Detroit Institute of Arts, described beautifully in the section "Curator's Choice" on page 21, the unique and attractive "Statue of the Priest Sebekemhet." It is illustrated on pp. 20 and 21. This statue had also been published outstandingly in the "Journal of

Egyptian Archaeology," Vol. 62 (1976), 41-44, by Dr. William Kelly Simpson when he was Curator at the MFA Boston. But at no time, do either of these two noted Egyptologists mention that the Sebekemhet was purchased from the Mansoors.

(Please see Exhibit #12. Also see Exhibit #13 to further know more of our activities with museums during the first years when we arrived in the U.S.A.)

In that same issue of K.M.T., Fall 1991, Dr. Peck wrote the following (page 16): "In 1950 the next important Egyptian object was added, the first example of Old Kingdom sculpture in the form of a limestone seated man with much of its color preserved." This limestone statue of a seated Fifth Dynasty official is illustrated on page 15. And this "important Egyptian object" was also purchased from the Mansoors.

Another "important Egyptian object" at the Detroit Institute of Arts from the M. A. Mansoor Collection of "Egyptian treasures"--as said by the Editor of "The Sunday Express" of London (cf. p. 40), is a limestone Sunk-Relief of "Ramses II offering incense to the gods." This relief is also illustrated in K.M.T., p. 17 and on p. 35 of Parke-Bernet Catalogue of the auction sale of 1952.

Our last example of our activities--and we do have many--is a letter by Dr. William M. Milliken, Director of the Cleveland Museum of Art, addressed to H. E. Kamel Bey Abdul Rahim, Egyptian Ambassador in Washington, D.C. We quote from his letter dated May 10, 1950:

"Mr. Mansoor has been good enough to tell me of his conversation with you and with my friend and colleague, David Finley, at the National Gallery. I am writing at once to tell you of the enthusiasm of the Cleveland Museum of Art for the possibility of having an exhibition of Egyptian art under the auspices of the Egyptian Government. We would be honored to have such a distinguished exhibit here...

"We have had considerable experience in recent years with exhibitions of international character. Certainly the focal point of interest would be objects belonging to the treasure from the tomb of Tut-ankh-Amen. This would have publicity value of the very highest and would draw immense numbers."

Just like in the letter dated March 24, 1950 by Dr. Bach (Denver Art Museum) and which we reproduced a little earlier, the above quote of Dr. Milliken is good proof that the Mansoors were greatly involved in bringing some of the treasures of Tut Ankh Amen in a touring exhibit in the U.S.A.

.

DR. D. WILDUNG JOINS THE NON-BELIEVERS

In 1986, Prof. Becker-Colonna inserted in page 18 of "In Defence of the Mansoor-Amarna Collection" a facsimile of a letter dated 14-5-85 she had received from Prof. Dr. Dietrich Wildung (Congress of Egyptology, Munich). She also inserted in the same booklet a facsimile of her answer dated September 28, 1985. We understand that Prof. Colonna wanted to present during the Fourth International Congress of Egyptology held in Munich from August 26 to September 1, 1985, a Report on "A Group of Portraits of the Amarna Princesses" in the Mansoor Collection. Needless to say that Wildung saw himself "forced to reject" Colonna's report claiming, and we quote him:

"As it is well known to you, today in the Egyptian art milieu exists an overall understanding that the Mansoor objects are not antique. During an exhibit in Munich, Hamburg and Brussels we publicized this position and it looks upon us as our duty to prevent anything which would give the Mansoor pieces a Pseudo-legitimation.

"The gifts of the Mansoor family to the Vatican Museum and to the Louvre were done by the Bank of America as advertisement during the offer for sale of further pieces and I fear that a presentation of the Mansoor pieces during the 4th International Conference of Egyptology would also be used as advertisement for the authenticity and importance of these pieces."

Now, we quote a few paragraphs of Colonna's answer (cf. "In Defence..." pp. 20-23). She wrote:

"Dear Colleague:

"This is in response to your letter of May 14, 1985 which accompanied the article "Falsche Pharaonen" published in your magazine "Zeitung zur Sonderausstellung" of July 21-October 31, 1985...

"In the same Paragraph 2, you say 'During an exhibit in München, Hamburg and Brussels we publicized this position and it looks upon us as our duty to prevent anything which would give the Mansoor pieces a pseudo-legitimation.'

"May I ask, Dr. Wildung, which pieces of the Mansoor-Amarna Collection did you produce in the above mentioned exhibits where you and your Colleagues, not well identified, took upon yourselves the duty to prevent anything which would give the Mansoor-Amarna Collection a pseudo-legitimation? As far as I know, none. In fact you are not and you were not at this time in possession of any part of the Mansoor-Amarna Collection.

"As you did not have any Mansoor artifacts to exhibit and appraise, you, as is evident from your above mentioned magazine, showed only photographs of them, four of them, as a matter of fact.

"Now, I assume that the "Egyptian art milieu" you talk about is composed of the same people who were at the exhibits of München, Hamburg and Brussels and who were so eager and determined to publicize their position. But on what evidence did these "experts" base their infallible verdict on the Mansoor-Amarna Collection, and, judging from only a few pieces, condemned the Collection in its entirety? And this verdict was passed judging only a few pieces and these from photographs? Since when do responsible and objective art experts judge works of art not from the originals but from photos of them?

"An 'overall understanding' is a very vague statement which has no value whatsoever. Any judgement in our field must be undersigned by the expert who expresses his criticism otherwise it carries no weight and amounts to mere gossip...

"You know very well, Dr. Wildung, that the praxis followed by any appraiser of good standing is first to examine the original art work for an amount of time that may be of few days, months, even years, depending on the importance of the case, and then express his criticism supported by sound, valid arguments. This is the customary practice, and this is what all the scholars of Egyptology who (on the contrary) have expressed a favorable judgement on the Mansoor-Amarna Collection have done. I will mention only the two most recent ones, Monsignor G. Nolli of the Vatican Museum and Mme. Desroches-Noblecourt of the Louvre Museum. Both of these world-known Egyptologists have studied some Mansoor-Amarna pieces for more than two years, had them scientifically analyzed and examined, and only after a careful study, they have expressed their favorable conviction about the authenticity of these artifacts and accepted them for their respective Museums. This is the proper standard procedure...

"For those who have been denying the genuineness of the Mansoor-Amarna Collection (and for some unknown, inexplicable reasons) it has been a game of 'hide and seek.' This proceeding is not the one followed by honest and learned scholars, responsible for what they state and who are conscious that they are dealing, in the case of the Mansoor-Amarna Collection, with one of the most extraordinary 'trouvailles' of our time. The Mansoor-Amarna Collection is too important for its historical and artistic value in the field of Egyptology to be dismissed that easily and irresponsibly with few superficial, vague statements uttered by people, some of whom have not even seen the Collection at all...!

"In Paragraph 3 you say 'The Gifts of the Mansoor objects to the Vatican Museum and to the Louvre Museum were made by the Bank of America as advertisement during the offer for sale of further pieces...' This statement is totally untrue as the Bank of America had nothing to do with the gifts which the Mansoor Family offered to the two Museums directly and with no intermediaries. This statement is based on misinformation and therefore this part of Paragraph 3 is inaccurate and misleading...

"I believe that the position you are taking against the Mansoor-Amarna Collection is due to the tendentious misrepresentation of facts of which you may be unaware. Now I refer you, Dr. Wildung to pages 39-41 of my publication on the Mansoor-Amarna Collection (1975) where I extended the invitation to any Egyptologist to come to California, to study the Collection and discuss it with me and whoever is a well known authority in the field of Egyptology, either a historian or a scientist. At this time I invite you, Dr. Wildung, whom I know as a scholar, objective and honest in his professional dealings, to come at your convenience and to study the Collection.

"Anyone can make mistakes, your exhibit of the "Falsche Pharaonen" definitely proves it, but it is also true that mistakes can be corrected. It only takes the courage of one own's opinion to retract what has been wrongly affirmed or misrepresented and make it right.

"I have faith that among the 'real' scholars and Egyptologists there are still some who, aware of the great injustice perpetrated against the Mansoor-Amarna Collection will accept my invitation and follow in the steps of two of the best known Egyptologists of today, Mme. Desroches-Noblecourt and Mons. Nolli and of all the others before them."

We really cannot repeat or comment on Colonna's stupendous answer refuting Wildung's allegations. The whole letter should be read and assessed, and we invite Egyptologists to write to us fast to get a copy of "In Defence..." as there won't be any left in a short time.

Concerning Wildung's allegation that the "gifts of the Mansoor Family to the Vatican Museum and to the Louvre were done by the Bank of America as advertisement during the offer for sale 'of the sculptures'," Colonna was absolutely right--like in all her other statements and rebuttals--in stating that "Bank of America had nothing to do with the gifts which the Mansoor Family offered to the two Museums directly and with no intermediaries." Let it be known once and for all that:

Bank of America had nothing to do with the gift to the two Museums: and that

- a) The sale of Amarna objects through Bank of America happened during the first three months of 1978;
- b) The gift to the Vatican Museum was done in the month of May 1979;
- c) The one to the Louvre in November of 1981.

This means that in 1978, no one knew--and positively not Bank of America, the Mansoors, or Dr. Wildung--that there were going to be gifts donated to either the Vatican Museum or to the Louvre at any time or in the following year or years. (cf. "In Defence..." pp. 18, 33, 34, and 35.)

Concerning the article "Falsche Pharaonen" which is inserted and translated in "In Defence..." pp. 48-54, it contains--as Dr. Colonna said it rightly in her booklet, "misleading information, devious innuendoes and inaccurate statements..." as well as a "morass of contradictions and half-truths expounded in it."

Besides Colonna's, a Report by Mgr. Gianfranco Nolli (Vatican Museum) is also inserted in the booklet and we quote its introduction:

"In reading the article 'Falsche Pharaonen' and in particular the part concerning the Mansoor-Amarna Collection, one has the impression of an attempt by its author to justify someone who likes to remain in the shade. However, this justification is not based on evidence supported by proofs or documents. It develops through uncertainties and incongruities on one side, while on the other it attempts to back up its conclusions by simple statements on the non-authenticity of the examined artifact. What should have been the conclusion drawn from clear and definite premises becomes the thesis to be demonstrated, the principle from which to start but also the assertion to which one arrives without having first produced weighty motives and conclusive evidence."

Thus, from all accounts--whether artistic or scientific evaluation--and considering common sense just as well, the article "Falsche Pharaonen" is weak to say the least. Maybe if the author, a certain D. Klemm, would have contacted Dr. Colonna or Dr. Stross, or even the Mansoors, the article would have contained true and not distorted facts. To be sure, it would have also contained some common sense. A one-side story is definitely a bad and wrong story, and no one can contest this.

.

EDMOND R. MANSOOR
3288 Sawtooth Court
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

An Open Letter to:

Prof. Dr. Dietrich Wildung
Ägyptisches Museum SMPK
Schlostrasse 70
D-1000 Berlin 19 (Charlottenburg)
Germany

Dear Dr. Wildung:

I am referring to a letter dated December 5, 1990 which you sent to Dr. Richard L. Trapp, Chairman of the Department of Classics and Classical Archaeology at San Francisco State University.

(Please see Letter dated December 5, 1990 -- Exhibit #14)

In that letter, you claim that the Rome 1990 Exhibition of the Mansoor Amarna Collection "is once more an attempt to prove the authenticity of the pieces not by scientific reasoning..." Kindly let me know what do you mean by "scientific reasoning"? Just what do you call the reasoning of all the eminent American, Egyptian and European scientists who examined scientifically the Collection in question? Do you mean that the noted scientists who examined the Collection have not used "scientific reasoning"? If so, I quote for your information what Prof. Francis J. Turner wrote (cf. p. 15):

"Certain of the reports submitted by you--notably those by R. R. Compton (1958), R. E. Arnal (1959), P. L. Kirk (1959), and L. T. Silver (1959)--are models of clarity and **scientific reasoning**. The methods used are clearly stated, the evidence so obtained is set out in detail, and conclusions are stated without ambiguity. These consultants are scientists highly skilled in applying special techniques in investigating minerals and stones." This, Dr. Wildung, was written on February 23, 1960, i.e., 30 years before your letter.

So, according to Prof. Turner, a giant in his "scientific field," geology, the scientific reports obtained on the Mansoor Collection are "models of clarity and scientific reasoning." The "authenticity of the pieces" has been well established through "models of clarity and **scientific reasoning**."

You also state that "the Trustees of the British Museum and the former Director of the Ägyptisches Museum Berlin had good reasons to refuse such a donation." (As if such an act determines the non-authenticity of the Collection. If so, what about the acceptance of donations to the Louvre, the Vatican Museum and to San Francisco State University?)

Concerning the donation to the British Museum, "the Trustees were bothered by the publicity that surrounded the Collection and had been 'frightened off' by the adverse opinions and the controversy in general." This, Dr. Wildung, is the reason why they declined the donation.

As for a donation to the Egyptian Museum in Berlin, this is news to me. Maybe this is another ugly rumor being spread to discredit the Mansoor Collection like the one concerning Bank of America supposedly advertising the donations to the Vatican and to the Louvre "during the offer for sale of further pieces."

You wrote in your letter that you "wonder which new arguments were found to defend the assumption these pieces were genuine ancient Egyptian works of art." There is no assumption here.

There is scientific reasoning at its best by highly qualified scientists. There are no new arguments either, and what has been stated long before your letter of December 5, 1990 by eminent scholars--Egyptologists as well as scientists--is ample proof that the Mansoor Amarna objects are genuine ancient Egyptian works of art.

As for the conclusion of your letter, you wrote that you "deeply regret that through this exhibition [Rome] the public gets a wrong idea of what Egyptian Art is like." Quite the contrary, through exhibitions of the Mansoor Amarna Collection, the public gets an excellent idea not only of what Egyptian art is like, but, also and mostly, of what Amarna Art is really like. And I deeply regret and deplore the fact that through prejudice, rumors, letters, unfair and unfounded statements, the public may get a wrong idea of the Mansoor Collection.

Now, I would like to refer to your letter of 14-5-85 addressed to Dr. Colonna and which is reproduced on page 18 of "In Defence..." You said in it that "today in the Egyptian art milieu exists an overall understanding that the Mansoor objects are not antique." It seems to me that you are trying to impose or rather to dictate your view on all, particularly when you stated that you "publicized this position in Munich, Hamburg and Brussels." It should be evident that the Collection is genuine and this should indeed be "very convincing to any intelligent, open-minded individual who takes the trouble to read the reports." What to say if a fair and open-minded individual considers also the opinion of Drioton, Desroches-Noblecourt, Boreux, Varille, Iskander, Nolli, Colonna and other scholars? You would be unfair if, after you read the scientific reports and consider the opinion of the Egyptologists I just mentioned, you still maintain that the Collection is not genuine without having studied and examined it.

Dr. Wildung, it was so unfair from your part to see yourself "forced to reject" Dr. Colonna's report on "A Group of Portraits of the Amarna Princesses" during the 4th International Egyptian Conference. As to look upon yourself as if it is your "duty to prevent anything which would give the Mansoor pieces a Pseudo-legitimation," were you not actually afraid that Dr. Colonna would gain at her side some or many of the Egyptologists attending the conference? Actually, by oppressing or suppressing and rejecting Dr. Colonna's report, you have deprived the Egyptologists attending that Egyptian Conference of a wealth of information concerning "one of the most extraordinary 'trouvailles' of our time." Instead, you are still hammering at the Collection, doing your utmost to destroy it for no apparent or valid reason. Is it fair to condemn anyone or anything without seeing, without considering the evidence, and before hearing the defense? "In an era when the concept of due process is ever expanding, it is astonishing to read of an ex parte hearing held in the manner of the medieval Star Chamber which resulted in a judgment so final that even newly discovered evidence, presented by noted scholars, would not be deemed sufficient grounds for a rehearing." (Prof. Leonard D. DuBoff)

Sir, I do protest most vehemently the unauthorized permission of including photographs of objects from the Mansoor Amarna Collection in the exhibit of fakes. This irresponsible act from the exhibit organizers is not only unfair and revolting, since it is not at all substantiated, but it is most unscholarly and degrading the profession of Egyptologists as well as degrading the "scholars" who have permitted it.

It goes without saying that many scholars, art critics and connoisseurs believe in the authenticity of the Mansoor Amarna objects and some of these sculptures have been acclaimed as ranking with, if not surpassing in beauty or workmanship, some of the finest ancient Egyptian artistic productions. You have read Dr. Colonna in her analogy of the "Stroll in the Garden," Mansoor's vs Berlin's (cf. "In Defence..." pp. 11-13). You will read Dr. Stross (cf. p. 86) remarking on inconsistencies in that same Berlin relief (of Smenkhkare and his Wife?) as well as pointing out "startling features" in the beautiful mural fragment of the "two princesses" at the Ashmolean. You will also read what Dr. Alfred Frankenstein wrote in 1975 concerning the Mansoor Amarna Collection (cf. p. 56). He said:

"The delicacy and finesse of the techniques whereby they were wrought are incredible. This is perhaps most impressively apparent in the reliefs, but the sculptures in the full round are magnificent too."

One more quote extracted from "L'Osservatore Romano" (Feb. 1980) may convince you that there are stunning pieces in the Mansoor Collection. The article was written after the donations to the Vatican Museum. I quote:

"One is a medallion, of calcareous stone, representing the head of Amenophis IV Akhenaton (XVIII dynasty, XIV century B.C.): a work of exquisite workmanship, which in addition to its intrinsic worth, takes on exceptional value owing to its rarity. In fact, it is probably a model which, in the workshop of a sculptor of the capital Akhetaton (today Tell el Amarna), was to serve as a model and sample for the exercises of apprentices in drawing and in bas-relief. The exceptionally delicate quality of the work, and the expressiveness of Akhenaton's face, confirm that it is the work of a great artist. The other item is even more remarkable. It is, in fact, a head (a little broken, but otherwise very well preserved) of Akhenaton's wife, the no less famous Nefertiti. Everyone will remember the splendid bust of this queen which is in Berlin: but this representation excels that famous masterpiece, not for the colours (they are completely lacking here), but because of the intensity of the expression and the interiority of sentiments conveyed by this head bare of all ornaments, but pulsating with exceptional vitality."

I know that Dr. Colonna mailed you "In Defence..." after the exhibit of 1986. Did you read on page 46 the conclusion of the report by the German scholar Prof. Dr. Reiner R. R. Protsch of the J. W. Goethe University, Frankfurt/Main? He wrote:

"I can only reach the conclusion that if the Berlin and Kairo pieces are genuine, which could be solely due to different workmanship by different artists, those pieces of the Mansoor Collection are also genuine."

Dr. Wildung, rumors, illogical and unfounded statements I heard from few Egyptologists have been growing steadily and contained in my mind for well over forty years. Your letter of December 5, 1990 is "*la goutte d'eau qui a fait déborder le vase*" (The straw that broke the camel's back). It compelled me to write with my brothers "The Truth is on the March" to be published soon. Should you have any comments, I'll be more than happy to insert them in the publication, particularly since this letter will be included in it. But I doubt very much you'll answer since three VIPs wrote to you concerning your last comments and they never received your answer.

May I know, Dr. Wildung, on what grounds you condemn the Mansoor Collection, and this, from a "very great distance?" You have "only seen photographs." You have neither studied nor examined the Collection. Is this the way true scholars in Egyptology adopt to determine whether objects are ancient or not?

Yours truly,

Edmond R. Mansoor

EDMOND R. MANSOOR
3288 Sawtooth Ct.
Thousand, Oaks, CA 91362

An Open Letter to:

Professor E. L. Ertman
School of Art
University of Akron
60 Fir Hill
Akron, Ohio 44325-2401

Dear Professor Ertman:

Re: Your remarks in *KMT*, Summer 1992, page 4.

I want to thank you very much for pointing out that in the reliefs of "Smenkhkare and Meritaten" of the Mansoor Collection, "it can be seen that Smenkhkare wears sandals which rise vertically from the heel," and that this "very interesting type of sandal...may well have been quite comfortable." And then you added:

"The problem is, however, that there are no parallels to this type of sandal-shape with a heel support in other representations from ancient Egypt, where footgear was depicted as flat, nor from any known surviving Egyptian sandals found in excavations."

I do not know if there is, in other representations from ancient Egypt, any identical type of sandal with a heel support, and it seems to me you are right, since I found no such sandal in the books I have. I'd like to raise a few questions if you permit me, and I certainly would be most appreciative and grateful to you if you kindly enlighten me on the following:

- 1) Did Smenkhkare own only one pair of sandals, and, if more, were they all similar? Could they have been different?
- 2) Have all "representations" from the period of Amarna, or other periods, been illustrated, excavated or discovered? And in the negative, can we rightly assume or be sure that new discoveries will or will not show that the same identical "flat" sandals, with no vertical rise from the heel, were worn by all Egyptians during a span of some three thousand years?
- 3) Was there a change in fashion during the entire Pharaonic Period?
- 4) Why would a "forger" imagine unusual sandals and take the trouble to carve some that seem "quite comfortable?" Wouldn't it have been easier for a clever, intelligent and skilled "forger" to copy or imitate and not invent or create?
- 5) In the "lovely illustrated catalog" of 1991--and I want to thank you very much for finding it attractive--please refer to relief No. 35 on page 63. You will notice that Akhenaten is wearing "flat" sandals similar to most shown in other ancient representations. Just why would a "forger" show two different sandals in the Mansoor reliefs especially one that is unknown to ancient Egypt?
- 6) Please refer to the book by Etienne Drioton and Pierre Du Bourguet, "Les Pharaons à la Conquête de l'Art," Desclée De Brouwer, 1965. Two illustrations on pages 286 and 342 depict unusual and possibly unparalleled sandals, each with a different ankle-strap. The first one shows a sandal with a strap rising from the sole on one side of the foot near the

heel, then going behind and above the heel, obviously ending on the other side of the foot, also near the heel. A strap on top of the foot attaches the two sides. As for the second illustration, one can see clearly a very wide strap rising from the side of the foot very close to the heel. The two different sandals "may well have been quite comfortable" and seem to me to have "no parallels." Can unique details of this nature be construed as signs of forgery?

- 7) Since you have noticed the unusual sandals worn by Smenkhkare in our two reliefs, did you notice that Meritaten, in our reliefs, is wearing the usual sandals worn by the ancient Egyptians with no "heel support"? And that in the Berlin relief, the Queen is not wearing any sandals? Isn't this strange? Here again, just why would a "forger" imagine, invent or create some detail not existing in the original? Furthermore, could it be possible that the Berlin relief is an ancient copy of the Mansoor's and made by an inexperienced student, since a few mistakes are apparent in it?
- 8) Although not relevant to our interesting argument, and since I am referring to the Berlin relief, did you notice that the King's left leg "from the knee down it continues in an unnatural line so that the left foot, if the upper part of the leg is naturally prolonged, would have 'elephantine' proportions and would not fit with the lower part of the leg?" (cf. Nolli, Gianfranco and Becker-Colonna, Andreina Leanza. *In Defence of the Mansoor Collection*, Rome, 1986.)

Professor Ertman, I do not really find the sandals in the Mansoor reliefs to be a "mistaken detail." Your letter to the KMT Editor is certainly thought-provoking and written in a scholarly manner. However, it adds to the confusion and complexity of the matter, since it has been read by a few thousand people. Most respectfully, I am so sorry to disagree with you about the sandals being a "mistaken detail." Your analogy "of a portrait of George Washington" may indeed be true, but it would not apply to any Amarna art, as we do not have all the answers. Please allow me to venture one of my own that may lead to what the Mansoors would like archaeologists, art historians and stylists, and of course Egyptologists to consider.

Should a man drop dead while dining in a restaurant and a doctor declares that the unfortunate man had a heart-attack or failure; if later an autopsy is performed by a coroner who declares that the man had swallowed a certain poison that was mixed with his drink, who are we supposed to believe: The feeling or opinion of a general practitioner, or the scientific facts discovered by the coroner?

Since so many ancient Egyptian representations have unique details with no known parallels, one cannot or should not look at Smenkhkare's sandals with a skeptical eye. Actually, in my humble estimation, that detail reinforces our conviction that the Collection is ancient. "Art and science must co-exist in today's museum," stated the MFA Boston in one of their brochures. This means to us that the two are essential and indispensable to each other. This is why scientific evaluation cannot and should not be ignored by scholars when they evaluate the Mansoor Amarna Collection. I am praying for this.

Thank you again for your remarks, and please, do consider that this letter is written in a very humble way since my knowledge in Egyptology is quite limited.

With all respect,

Sincerely,

mond R. Mansoor

"ARTnews"

Summer 1978

**"THE
MANSOOR
COLLECTION"**

**"An
Insoluble
Controversy?"**

"A multimillion-dollar sales offering of objects described as antiquities from the age of Akhenaten and Nefertiti has reopened a 30-year-old dispute."

The above is the title and heading of an article which appeared in "ARTnews" (Summer 1978), pp. 50-57. It was written by Ms. Sylvia Hochfield, at the time Associate Editor of the magazine. We quote the introduction of the article:

"In the first three months of 1978, a number of museum officials all over the world received identical letters in the mail. Typed on the stationery of the Bank of America and signed by J. P. Fitzgerald, an assistant vice president in the bank's trust department in Century City (Los Angeles), its purpose was to offer for sale, 'for an undisclosed principal,' three pieces of ancient Egyptian sculpture of the Amarna Period, the age of Akhenaten and Nefertiti. The pieces, the letter continued, were 'formerly part of the M. A. Mansoor Collection.' They were being offered to the highest bidders, subject to certain minimum bids, and buyers would receive 'assurances from the principal as to the authenticity of the pieces as antiquities from the El-Amarna Period.'

"The minimum acceptable bids were breathtaking. For a seven-inch-high relief with a profile of Akhenaten, the price was \$450,000. For a five-inch-high head of the king, the minimum price was \$1 million. And for a head of a princess, 4 1/2 inches high, the minimum price was \$3.5 million."

The article is quite long and consists of eight pages and the arguments offered by the few unnamed Egyptologists Ms. Hochfield contacted are simply not valid. Let it also be known that the author has edited at least one book for the Brooklyn Museum (ART FROM THE AGE OF AKHENATEN by Richard A. Fazzini, The Brooklyn Museum Press, 1973), and "ARTnews has edited at least two other books dealing with ancient Egypt. Consequently, we are inclined to believe--and we sense it--that Ms. Hochfield is more on the side of few Egyptologists and the Brooklyn Museum than that of the Mansoors'.

Concerning this article, two letters were forwarded to us by the Bank of America and we are reproducing them in this section.

(Please see letters by Messrs. Bishara and Ragusa, Exhibits 15 and 16, dated October 10, 1978 and November 16, 1978).

From the two reproduced letters of Messrs. Bishara and Ragusa, it is quite evident that their authors are not agreeable with what was said, or what was written by Ms. Hochfield. Lack of space and time do not allow us to comment on her article or rather on the allegations made to her by the few Egyptologists she did not name. For sure, we will have no problem whatsoever refuting them all and we may do this in the near future after we would have distributed our story and received comments on it. However, we would like to quote and discuss now one paragraph from the article. She wrote:

"Another Egyptologist said: 'The expressions on the Mansoor pieces are so often completely 20th-century ones. So many of the faces of Akhenaten in the collection seem to be leering at you. I've seen quite a few of the Mansoor pieces, and all of them are copies of known objects. Not one is an original composition. Forgers aren't original. They copy--but they make a lot of mistakes. The proportions of these pieces are all wrong; the set of the crowns on the heads is wrong.'"

There are seven points to consider in the previous paragraph:

1) "20th-century ones;" 2) "Akhenaten...leering at you;" 3) "seen quite a few;" 4) "all...copies;" 5) "not one is an original composition;" 6) "Forgers aren't original. They copy--but they make a lot of mistakes;" 7) "The proportions...wrong; the set of the crowns on the heads is wrong."

1) "20th-century ones." By now, we know only too well that this is not true since it is not the opinions of Drioton, Desroches-Noblecourt, Nolli, Colonna and other eminent Egyptologists. And who has forgotten or hasn't read what Prof. Pierre du Bourguet stated? On page 55 of "In Defence...." his deep conviction is clearly printed. He wrote:

"There can be no doubt whatsoever about my deep conviction that the objects in your collection are authentic Amarna sculptures, even though they may be of different artistic value, the style seems to me to be typical from the Amarna period and cannot be the work of a forger."

Also let us not forget for a moment that it took Dr. Cooney about two years to decide that the Mansoor objects "give every indication of a recent origin," and this, after he had "seen most of these Amarna sculptures several times, both in Egypt and in this country," and after he had them, "in a few cases," at the Brooklyn Museum for examination. Clearly then, there's nothing "20th Century" in the Mansoor sculptures and the style is "typical from the Amarna period and cannot be the work of a forger."

2) "Akhenaten...leering at you." This is easy to say but impossible to prove as it is not true either. Let the Egyptologist who said that remark point out to us, from the 1991 color catalogue of the Collection, which is the sculpture in which Akhenaten seems to be leering at us? Now, we'll tell this Egyptologist that if he (?) wants to really see an Amarna figure "leering" at him, or looking askance, we suggest he takes a look at the "Stroll in the Garden" of Berlin (cf. Michalowski, Fig. 104, p. 250).

3) "Seen quite a few." How many? Two, three, four...? This is not the opinion of all the Egyptologists who studied at length and have seen thirty, forty or more pieces of the Collection.

4) "All...copies." We've seen that ancient Egyptians copied the same subject or theme...(Ex: p. 127, Fig. 49 in Aldred's Brooklyn Catalog: **"Royal Family at Worship. The same design appears on a relief in the tomb of Panehsy at Tell el Amarna** (Davies 1905a, pl. VII)."

5) "not one is an original composition." Are all Ancient Egyptian works of art "original compositions?" (Ex: Murals showing an "Offering Ritual" or representing "Offerings to the Dead").

6) "Forgers aren't original. They copy--but they make a lot of mistakes." Are all ancient Egyptian works of art perfect with no mistakes? What about the "Stroll in the Garden" of Berlin? Aren't there any mistakes in that piece? And did the Egyptologist who stated the remark about "mistakes" read Aldred's "Akhenaten and Nefertiti" re the Brooklyn Exhibition of 1973? If he hasn't, he definitely should. On the other hand, he may have not noticed the eminent Aldred's "Commentary" of No. 100 on page 173. We quote again Dr. Aldred:

"...The sculptor has apparently copied the painted portrait of Nefertiti (fig. 1), but has made the mouth of the queen appreciably larger--a fault that might have been corrected by further cutting."

7) "The proportions...wrong; the set of the crowns on the heads is wrong." First, we'll eliminate the allegation that "the set of the crowns on the heads is wrong" by asking the reader to refer to Dr. Stross's letter on page 86 when he stated and gave an example that: "This type of crown was not unknown in the New Kingdom..." Furthermore, an "intelligent forger" could have easily chopped off the set of crowns since it is noticeable that it is different from what is known of Akhenaten's. Or, he could have easily "copied" a real crown of Akhenaten.

As for the proportions being wrong, we have read only three prominent scholars who have discussed the canon of human forms outstandingly. They are: 1) Iversen, Erik. "Legacy of Egypt," Edited by J. R. Harris, Oxford Clarendon Press, Second Edition 1971, pp. 55-82; 2) Michalowski, Kazimierz. "Art of Ancient Egypt," Harry N. Abrams, N.Y. pp. 169-191; 3) Robins, Gay. "JARCE." Volume XXVIII 1991, pp. 41-54. From what we have read and from the extensive bibliography given by the three scholars, we know that others have also dealt with the subject. However, to our knowledge and from the limited books we have referred to, Iversen mentions the "Amarna age" and we quote from his writing about "The Canonical Tradition":

"...Nothing demonstrates with greater clarity the inner stability and balance of Egyptian culture than the fact that for more than two millennia Egyptian artists were able to find complete harmonious expression within a single tradition, without once changing its principles and ideas--with the sole exception of the Amarna age, which cannot be considered here."

Furthermore, on page 264 of Michalowski's "Art of Ancient Egypt," there's a beautiful painted relief (fig. 115) and its description is the following:

"THEBES. TOMB OF HOREMHEB
King Horemheb Before the Goddess Hathor.
The oversized heads denote a continuation of the
Amarna style. Painted relief (detail). Dynasty XVIII."

Thus, the Amarna age includes "oversized" or disproportionate parts of the human form. Indeed, we do not know for sure until now, why Akhenaten was so grotesquely represented in the Colossi of Karnak? And from what we've discussed about the "proportions," they simply "cannot be considered" in "the Amarna age."

• • • • •

Scientific Illiteracy Observed: A Report by IFAR

Anyone who is not familiar with the matter of the Mansoor Collection will indeed be surprised to learn only now that there has been another negative report issued on a sculpture of the Collection. So far, we mentioned the one of Mr. William J. Young (BMFA) and now, we'll discuss a little the only other negative report ever issued on any sculpture of the Collection. It was issued on July 31, 1974 by IFAR, the International Foundation for Art Research, after their examination of a small pink limestone head of Akhenaten.

Before we speak about some IFAR activities and their report, we would like to tell the reader that, after we wrote "Je Cherche un Homme" in 1971, we needed some funds for three of the Mansoor brothers to travel extensively in the USA and Europe. To raise money fast, we made a conditional sale on a small head of Akhenaten in pink limestone giving the buyers, a couple of very dear friends of ours, a chance to return the sculpture within five years for a full refund and with no questions asked. This conditional deal was accepted by our friends even though they did not collect ancient Egyptian art. We considered the money received a gracious loan and we regarded this a gesture of help and true friendship. It goes without saying that our friends, the buyers of the head, were indeed aware of the controversy surrounding the Collection since we gave them a copy of "Je Cherche un Homme" and since they were trying to help us vindicate the Collection. Then, IFAR came to their attention and they sent the Akhenaten head to that foundation for examination.

In the March-April 1975 issue of *Art in America*, on pp. 25 and 27, there's an article by Mr. Lee Rosenbaum, a free-lance writer and editor of the *Art Letter*. We quote from the article titled "IFAR: Art Attributions for Art History's Sake."

"Many concerned art historians, curators and conservators, have found a valuable ally in a little-known nonprofit foundation, the International Foundation for Art Research. IFAR (at 654 Madison Ave., New York City) provides technical and stylistic analyses of problematic works, mostly in the ancient and old-master fields.

"...Of the approximately 50 works of art examined since the foundation began work in 1970, only two have checked out positively--a painting by Fragonard and one by Hubert Robert. While startling, this figure is not a reliable gauge of the general problem, since IFAR usually accepts only those works about which there is already considerable controversy.

"...But IFAR has two important advantages over the private consultant: it saves owners the trouble of finding reliable experts, and its experts speak freely because reports are issued anonymously. The foundation assumes responsibility for handling any litigation--an all-too-frequent occupational hazard of art experts. IFAR's detailed written evaluations of art works include the results of technical analysis, generally performed at the conservation center of New York University's Institute of Fine Arts. Such analysis, which may include use of x-rays, ultraviolet or infrared light, thermoluminescence and chemical testing, is particularly useful for unmasking 'ancient' sculpture of recent manufacture, as in this IFAR report:

"The several experts consulted by the Foundation are agreed on the basis of stylistic and technical analysis that this sculptured head is not of ancient origin and not of the Tel Amarna period of Akhenaton...

"Many edges around the eyes, lips and hairline are exceptionally sharp in detail for an object of the purported age of this sculpture. This sharp modeling is too clearly defined to be of ancient origin...

"When observed under long-wave ultraviolet light, the surface fluoresces an even dark purple, except in areas of scratches which fluoresce a rather yellowish tone. When compared to an authenticated *shawabti* [small tomb sculpture] of Akhenaton in red sandstone, the fluorescence was quite different--i.e., the *shawabti* appeared more yellowish and scratches fluoresced a deep purple (just the reverse of the head in question)."

Before commenting on the above paragraphs extracted from Rosenbaum's informative article praising IFAR and their work, let it be known that Dr. Bernard V. Bothmer, at the time Curator at the Brooklyn Museum, was also a Member of the Advisory Council of IFAR and the only Egyptologist in that Advisory Council. For sure, the reader will also remember that Mr. William J. Young was a Conservator at the MFA Boston. Speaking of "curator" and "conservator," we fully agree with Mr. Lee Rosenbaum that "many concerned art historians, curators and conservators have found a valuable ally..." in IFAR.

We have talked plenty of the "stylistic analysis" of the Mansoor objects compared to other Amarnas in museums, and there is not one single negative argument or comment offered on the Mansoor pieces that was not reasonably refuted. As for the "technical analysis," the scientific reports enumerated previously speak for themselves.

Concerning the "several experts," "reliable" according to Lee Rosenbaum who were "consulted" and who have "observed under long-wave ultraviolet light..." we believe this is pure nonsense as no serious or "reliable expert" should ever compare under UV light an object in pink limestone with another in red sandstone. It is obvious that the two objects compared to each other are not of the same deposit, not of the same material and not of the same color, and were not found in the same place and not under the same conditions. And they were not either handled in the same manner. From all these points, one can fairly deduct that they will fluoresce quite differently and not in the same colors.

In their privately published booklet "A Report on a Group of Limestone Carvings Owned by M. A. Mansoor and Sons," Stross and Eisenlord wrote on page 4 the following:

"The value of ultraviolet examination of limestone has never been demonstrated in any publication, as far as we can ascertain.

"This can be appreciated when one considers that simple washing with some soaps or detergents, or handling the objects with greasy or otherwise contaminated hands will entirely alter the character of the fluorescence. The natural body oils on the hands are such a source of contamination. Since it is well known that amateur diggers almost invariably wash their discoveries in order to free them from dirt and other loose surface blemishes, and also that the objects have been freely handled by the finders, dealers, and owners, all manners of strange and non-germane fluorescence might be expected, even if there existed a good standard for 'antique' fluorescence. Needless to point out that there is no such thing. Plenderleith, an unexcelled authority in the field, specifically warns against hasty conclusion even in relatively simple cases, and against the temptation to extrapolate our slight information concerning some materials onto materials of other kinds and character."

In concluding this section on the fluorescence method, we wonder if the "reliable experts" who spoke so "freely because reports are issued anonymously," fully understood the tool with which they were working, i.e. the ultraviolet lamp? We also wonder if they were not trying to please their "ally?"

We have to come back now to Ms. Hochfield's article in ARTnews mentioned previously since she is referring in it to IFAR's report. We quote from page 56:

"In 1973, a sculpture from the Mansoor collection was tested when it was submitted by its owner to the International Foundation for Art Research, a New York-based non-profit art authentication

service. The unnamed investigator who carried out the technical examination surprisingly brought the argument round full circle: 27 years after Young's original and much-scorned report, the foundation's expert seemed to vindicate his conclusions. The sculpture, a head of Akhenaten, was made, he said, of 'Artificial Stone--or a man made product rather than a natural limestone. Composition most probably crushed limestone with some bright red pigment to give it a pale pink tone and held together with organic adhesive.'

"Had the muses been paying attention, they might have stepped in here and ended the battle on this supreme note of irony. But they were apparently not listening, and the owner sent the sculpture to yet another examiner, a prominent geologist. This investigator disagreed violently with the foundation's expert. The material of the head, he said, was most certainly natural limestone; he couldn't imagine how the appearance of natural limestone could have been duplicated in a man-made material except by 'beings from another planet technologically much more highly advanced than *Homo sapiens*'."

As an uncontested rebuttal of what IFAR's unnamed investigators or "reliable experts" wrote concerning the nature of the stone in the Mansoor objects, we're leaving the pen to noted named scientists and the reader will decide whether the stone is natural limestone or not.

1) On page 18 of their booklet, Stross and Eisenlord wrote concerning "**Organic deposits**. In addition to the inorganic deposits, small dark deposits are found on some of the Mansoor objects, which were analyzed by Iskander and found to be nitrogenous organic substance, 'probably animal excretions.'" So, contrary to what IFAR's consultant wrote, the "organic" material were found **on** some of the Mansoor objects and not **in** the stone.

2) Lucas (Egyptian Museum, Cairo). "The material is a fairly soft limestone..."

3) Iskander and Mustafa (Egyptian Museum, Cairo). In their "Analysis" section, under (c):

"Since some people thought that these objects were made of artificial stone, the silicate test was applied. Thus some of the sample was mixed with ammonium chloride and crushed together; no ammonia was evolved showing the absence of artificial silicates i.e., the material of the samples is ordinary limestone. This is more supported by the fact that there are no air bubbles at all in any part of the body of these pieces. Had these pieces been made of any artificial paste, they should have contained many air bubbles.

"All the above analysis together with the macro and microscopical examinations show definitely that the material of the objects is the ordinary natural, somewhat, siliceous limestone and not artificially made in any way."

4) Compton (Stanford University). "The pieces are entirely of natural stone, with no fillings or paste of any kind."

5) Arnal (San Jose State University). "The sculptures are made entirely of natural rock which contains no artificial filling."

6) Silver (California Institute of Technology). "All of the material in the sculptured pieces is natural stone. There are small quantities of surface deposits which appear secondary and perhaps artificial, but these are not related in any apparent way to an attempt to falsify the surface. There is no evidence of a false paste medium applied to the specimens as has been implied by at least one previous examiner."

And we can go on with more examples on the limestone but let it be said that none of the other prominent scientists who stated that the Collection is ancient had the slightest doubt on the nature of the limestone that it is unmistakably natural. Even Mr. William J. Young of Boston, after first declaring

that the pink limestone "appears not to be a natural material" and that "it shows all the indications of being a made stone which could be fabricated in a great many ways," reversed himself in his official report, after Prof. E. S. Larsen of Harvard confirmed that the stone is natural, by writing (cf. *Je Cherche un Homme*, p. 28): "The limestone...natural."

It should be noted that Ms. Hochfield did not give in her article the name of the investigator who "disagreed violently with the foundation's expert." He is Prof. Richard L. Hay, a giant in the field of Geology, UC Berkeley, who, after an extensive examination of the pink limestone head of Akhenaten which was erroneously declared by IFAR "a man made product rather than a natural limestone," stated emphatically his opinion that: "Unquestionably this is a natural limestone."

As for the artistic evaluation of the Akhenaten head by IFAR, who is the Egyptologist who, in 1974, could have ever contradicted Dr. Cooney when he was curator emeritus of Egyptian art at the Cleveland Art Museum? Or Dr. Hans Wolfgang Müller who was also so prominent among the Egyptologists of the time?

The fact that IFAR will not release the names of experts who examined the Amarna head (or any other artifact) is, to our opinion totally wrong. How can people tell if these experts are competent enough to examine certain specific objects? Since in the Mansoor case, their experts could not even identify the stone as being a natural limestone, we can reasonably deduct that their knowledge in geology leaves much to be desired. Perhaps and most probably, those experts have a general knowledge in the examination of various art objects, but are only specialized in one specific line like bronzes, ceramics, ivories, paintings or others. But they are certainly not "reliable experts" in geological matters and we are not going to repeat again and again the reasons or the names of all the eminent scientists who agree that the Mansoor sculptures are carved out of natural limestone.

Similarly, the mere fact that IFAR does not want the Mansoors (or the public) to know all the contents of their "technical report" is also totally wrong. Scientific facts on the Mansoor Collection or any other artifact--whether good or bad--should be made available to all for the sake and the advancement of arts and sciences. A technical report on artifacts is not a military secret, and the mere fact that IFAR does not want us to know all the contents of the report issued on the Amarna head of King Akhenaten seems to us they are afraid it may be greatly criticized by better qualified and specialized experts.

From what we have read in ARTnews and Art in America, IFAR's report seems to us to be distinctly weak to say the least.

.

Some Common Sense to Ponder

For a complete evaluation of a collection of artworks like the Mansoor's, which, to our knowledge as we said before, has been subjected to more technical examinations than any other we know of, there are three vital points to consider:

- * The scientific evaluation;
- ** the artistic/stylistic evaluation; and
- *** the common sense evaluation.

* We said earlier that the positive scientific reports obtained speak for themselves. As Dr. Harold Plenderleith stated, it would be a serious mistake "to underestimate the importance of scientific investigation..."

** From the artistic/stylistic point of view, the Egyptologists who stated the objects to be genuine are all giants in Egyptology. As for those who have been declaring them forgeries during the last thirty or forty years--and few of these are also giants in that field--most have done so (perhaps being prejudiced) from photographs only, and ...from hearsay and rumors. And the reader will remember that the first one, Dr. Cooney, relied heavily on the "scientific" opinion of Mr. Young of Boston...

*** Should we use common sense, we'll come up with a variety of positive points that should be "very convincing to any intelligent, open-minded individual" who will consider them. Please allow us to mention some:

1) M. A. Mansoor was a reputable antiquary and had the title of: "By Royal Appointment to H. M. King Farouk." Through the years, M. A. Mansoor sold ten Amarnas to King Farouk. Is it conceivable he would sell doubtful or fake objects to his King? Our father, then, must have been and was absolutely and positively certain that his Amarna Collection is authentic. Furthermore, can any museum state that they ever contacted the Mansoors to inform them that they believe that an object they purchased from them is fake? Or did any museum ever return to us any object on grounds it is a fake? And what about the Denver Art Museum stating (cf. Exhibit 11): "We have no desire to dispose of the pieces [Amarnas] we own!"

2) For over forty years, the Mansoors have been fighting uphill a small fraternity (mostly American and German Egyptologists) that is extremely difficult--if not impossible to contradict or penetrate. If the Mansoors were not so convinced of the genuineness of the Collection or if they only had the slightest iota of doubt on it, they would have never been shedding their blood on it for almost half a century. For sure, we are not referring only to money when we say "blood." Rather, we are thinking of the eternal hardships we encountered and still encounter to totally vindicate our Collection. Indeed, the controversy over the Collection, created by an inexperienced museum expert in Boston over 40 years ago has shattered, not to say devastated and destroyed, more than forty of the best years of the life of all the members of the Mansoor family!

3) The American, Egyptian and European collectors who purchased objects from the Mansoor Amarna Collection are all educated people besides being art lovers and connoisseurs. All those who purchased from it after 1949 knew and read the negative report of the MFA Boston. They also knew about the positive report of the Egyptian Museum experts and, in addition, they were aware of the unfounded negative opinion of certain Egyptologists. Does it make any sense that they would buy objects from the Mansoor Collection for a sizable fortune unless they were convinced of their authenticity? For the record, a head of a princess from the Collection was sold to an American collector, a surgeon, after the Exhibit of the Mansoor Amarna Collection in 1986 at San Francisco State University. Also for the record, that same collector was given a copy of "In Defence..." which includes (pp. 17-18) an extremely damaging opinion on the Collection by Dr. Dietrich Wildung. For the reader's

information, that collector and his wife were so revolted by the whole matter that, to defend it, they have written the story (not published yet) of the Collection.

4) Three sculptures from the Mansoor Amarna Collection were offered for sale through Bank of America in 1978, and we quoted the introduction of an article which appeared in ARTnews (Summer 1978). If Bank of America was involved in selling sculptures from the Mansoor Collection, it must have weighed all the evidence available and made sure they were indeed ancient. After all, Bank of America is not just any bank: It is Bank of America!

5) The sculptures in the Mansoor Amarna Collection are carved out of natural limestone of different colors, pink prevailing. Just why would a forger select a colored stone not used during the Amarna period by other artists and not too common in other periods?

6) Concerning "anomalies" in the Mansoor sculptures that puzzle or baffle many Egyptologists, let us refer to the letter by Dr. Fred H. Stross to a leading European Egyptologist which is included pp. 85-87. Furthermore, generally speaking, a forger very seldom invents or creates; he copies or imitates.

7) On March 17, 1960 Dr. Murray Pease, Conservator in the Conservation Department of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, N.Y. wrote the following to Dr. Stross:

"We have been fascinated by your article in Analytical Chemistry for March, and I wish to extend my hearty compliments on an extremely able presentation... These pieces have certainly received the full treatment." Dr. Pease showed interest to examine the Collection...

For the record, Dr. James Rorimer, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art at the time, refused afterwards to let Dr. Pease examine the Amarna sculptures on the grounds that Mr. William J. Young, the BMFA expert, had already done so and stated they are "of fairly modern origin." Is it because Young misinterpreted Rorimer on ultraviolet light? Or is it because the Met doesn't want to contradict the BMFA?

8) In December 1981, the Mansoors offered to donate a sculpture from the Collection to the Los Angeles County Museum of Art but it was flatly rejected by the director out of solidarity of American museums. Let us review other facts:

On January 21, 1982 Dr. Pieter Meyers, Senior Research Chemist at the Conservation Center of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, wrote to Dr. Stross saying:

"I was very interested to hear about the recent developments of the Mansoor sculptures. I have always been interested in these problematic objects, particularly because of the impressive scientific evidence favoring authenticity. Do you have any material on these objects published after 'Je Cherche un Homme!'"

"I believe that a scholarly lecture on the subject would be of considerable interest in Los Angeles. Would you be interested in presenting such a lecture? I will inquire about the possibility of including this topic in the lecture program of the J. Paul Getty Museum, as our program does not have a suitable format."

In a letter dated June 9, 1982 Dr. Stross wrote to Dr. Meyers the following:

"A few months ago you mentioned a possible interest in my giving a talk on the scientific studies made on the Amarna sculptures owned by the Mansoor family. I believe I informed you that I was about to go on a lecture tour relating to my archaeometric activities, for the American Chemical Society. I have returned from that trip, but plan to leave again around the middle of July, and to return around the end of August. My fall schedule is still flexible, but I should like to start developing it, since I am

thinking of firming up some information on obsidian deposits in the Mesoamerican area in the not too distant future. Could you give me an idea if, and approximately when, you or your colleagues might want to schedule my talk?"

Nothing developed after this correspondence. It is quite possible that Dr. Earl Powell, III, Director of the L.A. County Museum of Art at the time, did not allow Dr. Pieter Meyers to pursue further the matter.

On December 20, 1984 the late Dr. Armand Hammer wrote to Dr. Powell, III, the following (on stationery of Occidental Petroleum Corporation):

"I was recently introduced to Mr. Michel Mansoor who possesses a collection of Egyptian antiquities. He and his brothers inherited this collection from their parents who assembled it in Egypt in the early 1920s.

"Apparently there is some controversy about the authenticity of the collection, which has continued in this country since 1949. At that time, I understand that a Mr. William Young, then of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, examined the collection and determined that it was not authentic. Since that time, the Mansoors have had numerous scientific tests conducted which indicate that the pieces are authentic.

"Recently, the Pope accepted two pieces into the Vatican Museum collection. The Louvre has accepted one piece from the collection and it is displayed.

"I would appreciate very much your arranging for your laboratory to conduct tests on these pieces to determine on your own their authenticity. I understand that a Dr. Pieter Meyers, your Senior Research Chemist, is familiar with the collection. Perhaps he or another appropriate member of your staff could conduct tests on the objects."

On December 31, 1984, Dr. Powell answered the following to Dr. Hammer:

"Thank you for your letter of December 20th requesting the laboratory at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art to conduct tests on pieces of the Mansoor collection of Egyptian antiquities.

"I discussed this with Pieter Meyers and have concluded that it will not be possible for Pieter or our staff to participate in yet another analysis of the material. Pieter and our research facility are engaged in major studies of our own collection and the backlog in the museum alone would not permit our staff to conduct an analysis of outside works of art at this time."

What can we think after we see that Dr. Powell did not consider the request of Dr. Armand Hammer to let Dr. Meyers examine the Mansoor sculptures? Was he afraid that Dr. Meyers would find the objects ancient, thus contradicting the Boston Museum's report?

Speaking of Dr. Powell, he assumed, not too long ago, his new post of Director of the National Gallery of Art at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. And speaking of the Smithsonian, we should mention a significant letter dated August 25, 1959 by the most eminent Dr. Rutherford J. Gettens, Curator of the Research Laboratory, and addressed to Dr. Stross. We quote Dr. Gettens:

"Recently on my return from Europe, I found on my desk a series of reports related to 'Examination of Sculptures in the Collection of Mr. Mansoor..."

"I have read the several reports and find them most interesting..."

"...Furthermore, on reading the reports it would seem that just about the last word has been said on the subject anyway. I should think you would be well content with the expert opinion expressed by Dr. Kirk, Mr. Arnal, and others. I don't think there is much point in getting another opinion, even though it is from a person connected with a prominent institution."

9) Why did the Denver Art Museum refuse to sell us back in 1984 two Amarna sculptures they had purchased some thirty years earlier particularly that we offered them three times the price paid for them?

10) Isn't it strange that not one single scientist who read the report of Mr. Young had any word of praise for it? And that some of these eminent scientists criticized it in strong terms and, to our knowledge, Mr. Young never answered any of them.

11) Can a professor of art, let's say for instance in painting, tell if a painting attributed to Rembrandt is genuine or not? Will his feeling prevail over scientific evaluation?

12) "Art and science must co-exist in today's museum" stated the MFA Boston. The two are indispensable and essential to each other. And, added the Boston Museum: "The art of the forger is so sophisticated that only the most rigorous application of science can prove him false." Since these statements are not only true, but are also pure common sense, we cannot and should not accept the illogical thinking of a few Egyptologists who want to place themselves above science. This is only common sense.

.

A Scientific Report *par Excellence*

We have inserted in *Je Cherche un Homme* the negative report of Mr. William J. Young as well as the positive one of Prof. Leon T. Silver in their entirety. Although the report of the most eminent Silver is so outstanding and so convincing as to the authenticity of the Mansoor sculptures, we feel that the reader, and particularly all Egyptologists, museum conservators and scientists, should also read the report of the two Egyptian scientists Drs. Zaki Iskander and Zahira Mustafa since it seemed to Prof. Robert C. Compton, the Stanford University scholar (cf. p. 10), that their report is "well founded petrologically.

It covers many items that only someone with knowledge of Egyptology could present...." Furthermore, besides being an eminent scientist respected by all, Dr. Iskander was also an Egyptologist. His *Brief History of Pharaonic Egypt*, Ghareeb Printing House, Cairo, 1975, was dedicated:

"TO THE MEMORY
of
ALFRED LUCAS

"who devoted all his efforts to Scientific Archaeological Research and Conservation of Egyptian Monuments and Works of Art and specially those of Tut-'nkh-Amun."

Some of Iskander's other works: *The Cheops Boats*, part I, Antiquities Department of Egypt, Cairo, 1960; *Brief History of Ancient Egypt*, jointly with Alexander Badawi, 5th edition, Cairo, 1965; *The Discovery of Neferwptah*, jointly with Nagib Farag, Antiquities Department of Egypt, Cairo, 1971.

The Report:

Examination of Sculpture Pieces of El Amarna Type

INTRODUCTION

Mr. M. A. Mansoor has a collection of sculpture pieces of El-Amarna type including some heads, plaques and statuettes. There were some arguments about their genuineness amongst the archaeologists. Mr. Etienne Drioton, Director General of the Antiquities Department, had asked the late Mr. A. Lucas to examine some of these sculpture pieces from the scientific point of view. Mr. A. Lucas examined 27 objects of them in 1942 and gave the following brief report:

Lucas' Report

I examined the twenty-seven objects brought to the museum by Mr. Mansoor. These were mostly heads, but included a large bust, several statuettes and a plaque.

The material is a fairly soft limestone, often pink but sometimes white and sometimes pink with white patches. I analysed several small fragments and found it to be normal limestone containing a small proportion of silica and colored, when red, by means of oxide of iron.

The director of the Geological Survey informs me that pink limestone is plentiful in Egypt particularly in the western desert on the Edfu-Dush road and on the Asiat-Kharga road. It occurs also near Fayid between Ismailia and Suez. Specimens of pink limestone from all these localities in the Geological Museum are much more siliceous and much harder than that of the objects in question.

One noticeable feature of the heads is the irregular break at the neck, sometimes high up, which detracts from the symmetry of the sculpture and gives the objects an unfinished appearance. This break always has rounded edges and is never sharp, and in my opinion, is a genuine old break and not a modern fracture rubbed down to simulate an old break. This break need not be due to natural weathering after the object was carved, but might be accounted for by supposing that the objects were all made in the same school or workshop and that they were all trial pieces made by pupils or apprentices, who were given irregular blocks of stones to carve and that what looks like an irregular fracture was one of the edges of the block which was left in its original condition.

Many of the objects have small streaks or specks of black material, which consist of oxide of manganese. When these markings are in the form of dendrites (tree-like form), the surface is undoubtedly old since such markings are only formed naturally and always on the surface.

One of the statuettes is broken across the legs, but, although the two pieces undoubtedly belong to one another, the edges at the break are worn and the pieces do not join well. The broken edges have been weathered, and probably anciently, but the rest of the statuette does not show any signs of weathering. The explanation of this is not clear.

Another statuette is broken into several pieces, but all the breaks are sharp and the pieces fit well together, showing that the breaks are recent.

I understand that the objects were not acquired by Mr. Mansoor at once, but gradually over a period of many years on account of the difficulty of finding money to pay for them, and that he states that they were all found together in one lot and that he has known of them for some twenty years. If this is so, then in my opinion it is strongly in favour of their genuineness, since a modern forger would probably make only one or two at a time and would wait until these were sold before making others.

Several heads in the Cairo Museum of this period are of hard quartzite, and it has been suggested that, because a modern forger would have great difficulty in carving quartzite therefore the use of soft limestone points to modern work. A limestone head of this period of El-Amarna is described and illustrated by Schäfer (H. Schäfer, *Kunstwerke aus der Zeit des Amenophis IV*, in *Zeits. für A. Sprache*, vol. 51, 1914. 73).

The fact that the objects are of an unusual stone (pink limestone) not known previously from this period, in my opinion, also points for their genuineness, since the stone, although the exact locality where it occurs is not known, is probably Egyptian.

The fact that the objects are not stained or soiled might be accounted for by supposing that they were found, not in a grave, or buried in the earth, but in a room at El-Amarna, which has gradually sanded up.

In my opinion, the balance of evidence is in favour of the objects being genuine.

Lucas

This report, however, did not put an end to the arguments concerning their genuineness, and another detailed report seemed necessary. Mr. E. Drioton has kindly asked us to examine the objects again and write a detailed report so as to settle this question.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PIECES EXAMINED:

We have examined 66 objects comprising the following:

- a) two statuettes representing King Akhenaton (standing):
Mansoor's registerNos. 124; 23 cms. high
242; 14 cms. high (incomplete)
- b) three busts representing the king:
Mansoor's registerNos. 125; 23 cms. high
235; 14 cms. high (incomplete)
328; 53 cms. high
- c) twelve heads representing the king:
Mansoor's registerNos. 123; 34 cms. high
126; 77 cms. high
128; 15 cms. high
153; 17 cms. high
157; 16 cms. high
182; 11 cms. high
232; 21 cms. high
244; 20 cms. high
255; 13 cms. high
320; 11 cms. high (incomplete)
325; 20 cms. high
326; 12 cms. high
- d) four heads representing Queen Nefertiti:
Mansoor's registerNos. 129; 23 cms. high
130; 16 cms. high
131; 15 cms. high
233; 17 cms. high
- e) seven statuettes representing standing princesses:
Mansoor's registerNos. 132; 57 cms. high
133; 37 cms. high
134; 37 cms. high (incomplete)
135; 20 cms. high
136; 25 cms. high
249; 40 cms. high
254; 27 cms. high
- f) one bust representing a princess:
Mansoor's registerNo. 140; 12 cms. high
- g) fourteen heads of princesses:

- Mansoor's registerNos. 137; 13 cms. high
138; 14 cms. high
139; 11 cms. high
141; 11 cms. high
142; 10 cms. high
152; 10 cms. high
154; 19 cms. high
155; 16 cms. high
156; 17 cms. high
236; 15 cms. high
243; 10 cms. high
245; 10 cms. high
248; 10 cms. high
250; 10 cms. high
- h) two stelae representing, in high relief, the king standing and Queen Nefertiti presenting flowers to him:
Mansoor's registerNos. 253; 32 x 21 cms.
322; 33 x 22 cms.
- i) two fragments representing, in high relief, the king; one sitting on a chair:
Mansoor's registerNo. 148; 19 x 8.5 cms.
the other, probably sitting on a missing chair:
Mansoor's registerNo. 327; 12 x 18 cms.
- j) four stelae representing two princesses:
Mansoor's registerNos. 143; 19 x 23 cms. (low relief)
251; 18 x 13 cms. (high relief, incomplete)
252; 23 x 23 cms. (" ")
321; 20 x 23 cms. (" ")
- k) one plaque, in high relief, representing a bust of the king:
Mansoor's registerNo. 234; 21 x 16 cms.
- l) nine plaques representing heads of princesses:
Mansoor's registerNos. 144; 18 x 11 cms. (high relief)
145; 15 x 14 cms. (" ")
151; 17 x 13 cms. (" ")
231; 16 x 13 cms. (" ")
246; 16 x 12 cms. (" ")
247; 15 x 11 cms. (" ")
257; 14 x 13 cms. (" ")
183; 17 x 11 cms. (low ")
319; 13 x 13 cms. (low ")

- m) four plaques representing incomplete heads.
Mansoor's registerNos. 146; 14 x 11 cms. (low relief)
147; 15 x 14 cms. (" ")
149; 12 x 7 cms. (high relief)
256; 13 x 10 cms. (high ")
- n) a small piece including a part of the neck and the chest:
without number.

All the objects are of limestone of different colours ranging from yellowish white to light pink. This limestone, however, contains in several cases some white patches as in Nos. 123, 126, 142, 144, 156, 320 and 328. The hardness of the stone agrees with that of the ordinary limestones though variable to some extent.

ANALYSIS:

- (a) A sample taken from one of the broken pieces was analysed and the following results were obtained:

	%
Moisture.....	0.26
Silica.....	8.82
Ferric oxide.....	1.78
Aluminium oxide.....	1.12
Calcium phosphate.....	0.87
Titanium oxide.....	traces
Manganese oxides.....	traces
Calcium carbonate.....	81.82
Magnesium carbonate.....	4.77
Calcium sulphate.....	0.48
Sodium chloride.....	<u>0.76</u>
Total:.....	100.68

(b) Some powder was scraped out from some of the white patches of Nos. 126, 156 and 328. These powders were analysed qualitatively and found to be of siliceous limestone, but the percentage of iron oxide in them appears to be very small. These white patches are not recently added for restoration but must have been originally found in the limestone itself since they have almost the same composition of the stone itself though of different colour due to a less percentage of ferric oxide. This is more favoured by the fact that dendrites were also formed on the surface of these patches, in the same way as on the rest of the surface of the stone.

(c) Since some people thought that these objects were made of artificial stone, the silicate test was applied. Thus some of the sample was mixed with ammonium chloride and crushed together. No ammonia was evolved showing the absence of artificial silicates, i.e., the material of the samples is ordinary limestone. This is more supported by the fact that there are no air bubbles at all in any part of the body of these pieces. Had these pieces been made of any artificial paste, they should have contained many air bubbles.

All the above analyses together with the macro and microscopical examinations show definitely that the material of the objects is the ordinary natural, somewhat, siliceous limestone and not artificially made in any way.

SURFACE EXAMINATION.

The surface examination includes the following:

- I) Surface colour or patina
- II) Surface polish
- III) Breaks

I. SURFACE COLOURS OR PATINA:

In general it was noticed that the surface of all the objects examined is clearly different in colour and, somewhat deeper than the inside of the stone. This is clearly visible in Nos. 149 and 152 which contain some new small breaks showing the original colour of the stone. Thus, while the interior of the stone is pinkish white in No. 149 and pink in No. 152, the surface of these two objects is almost wholly reddish brown with different shades. It was found that the same is true for all the other pieces when they were intentionally scratched to see the original colour of the stone.

The surface colours were examined for the purpose of knowing if these colours are surface additions or naturally formed. It was found that there are no surface paints intentionally applied to the surface except in statuette No. 136 on which slight remains of red paint can be seen all over the surface and are specially more visible on the two arms and the shoulders. This red paint is composed of ferric oxide (red ochre) which agrees with the red water colours used by the Ancient Egyptians. The rest of the surface of the statuette, however, seems to have lost its red paint since a long time as it contains the naturally formed patina on most of the bare parts.

All the other statuettes contain the naturally formed patina.

Composition of the patina:

The patina is not, however, uniform in colour or composition. It varies from yellowish white, orange red, reddish brown, dark brown to black. On analysis it was shown that the yellowish white patina is composed mostly of calcium carbonate with a small percentage of ferric oxide; the red patina of the different shades is mostly composed of ferric oxide; the black patina is mostly composed of manganese dioxide. Manganese dioxide was tested for in the pieces including the neck and the chest of the statue (without number), by treating the black part with sulphurous acid solution, some nitric acid added, solution boiled, potassium periodate added and the solution left for three hours; when the pink colour of permanganic acid was produced.

Resistance of the patina to solvents:

It was tried to remove the surface colour by means of water, alcohol, acetone or pyridine but it was shown to be resistant to all these solvents, favouring their formation naturally. Had the surface colour been a water-colour, it would have been removed with water specially if rubbed with a wetted piece of cotton or a stiff brush. Had it been fixed to the surface with a resinous solution, celluloid or drying oil, it could have been removed by alcohol, acetone or pyridine respectively.

Besides being resistant to the solvents, this surface colour is so adherent that, although of different colour it appears as a part of the stone itself. Moreover it is bright and almost crystalline. All these characters prove that it had been slowly and naturally deposited in situ when the objects were exposed to the atmosphere for a very long time.

Orientation of the patina:

This above conclusion is more supported by the orientation of the patina on the different parts of the surface of the objects. Thus the red brown patina is sometimes deposited in irregular aggregations in such a way that it cannot be imitated artificially, e.g., a patch on the left side of the head No. 154 (see

photo). The black patina is also found in most cases e.g., Nos. 124, 133, 134, 139, 142, 154, 155, 248, etc., in the forms of dendrites which are tree-like markings that cannot be artificially imitated, thus favouring the genuineness of these objects.

Chemical explanation of the patina formation:

It is apparent from the analysis of the limestone that it contains a few percentage of iron and manganese salts besides the great percentage of calcium carbonate. The iron and manganese salts are here in the form of carbonates, silicates or both. If moisture coupled with carbon dioxide passes into the inside of the stone object, the insoluble iron, manganese or calcium carbonate will be converted partly to their soluble bicarbonates. Since the stone is porous, the bicarbonates solutions which are formed inside the stone tend to come to the surface as efflorescence salts. By the action of atmospheric heat, these solutions dry and the bicarbonates decompose gradually giving the carbonates. The deposited carbonates in their turn decompose into the ferric oxide and manganese dioxide in case of iron and manganese respectively and remain as carbonate in case of calcium. This process being repeated for hundreds or thousands of years, a distinct layer of these efflorescence compounds is formed on the surface of the stone. The different admixtures or sole presence of the calcium carbonate, ferric oxide and manganese dioxide give the different colours and shades of the patina.

Different deepness of the colour of the patina:

It seems that not all the objects had been in the same position in the workshop or in the different places in which they were found. This is shown by the fact that some parts of the surface of the same objects have different shades of patina. The parts which were more exposed to the atmospheric conditions have a thicker and deeper patina than those which were in contact with the sand or which were only exposed for some time and then sanded up. A good example showing this contrast is the stela No. 321 in which the surface containing the low relief has almost no patina while the back has a thick layer of crystalline red brown patina. This means that this upper surface of the stela was buried in the sand while its back was exposed to the atmosphere for a very long period.

A general feature which can be observed on the surface of all the objects is that the patina is always deeper on the higher or protruding parts of the sculpture such as the nose, the eyebrows, the lips, the chin, etc., while in the grooves as in the low relief and hollow eyebrows, etc., the colour of the patina is always lighter. This is again greatly in favour of the natural formation of the patina and hence the genuineness of the objects. If this surface colour was artificially painted and not a naturally formed patina, the grooves would have much deeper colour owing to the accumulation of the paint in their hollows while the crests would have had a lighter colour.

Patina in cracks:

Another general feature is that the patina is also found in the cracks and even inside them whenever these cracks are wide, and can be examined by the lens. Thus in Nos. 129 and 137, there are cracks in which red brown patina and even some dendrites can be easily seen. This shows that these cracks were either originally in the piece of the stone before shaping it or anciently formed so that there was enough time for the deposition of the patina inside them. This is again in favour of their genuineness.

Artificial formation of the patina:

Now, a question may be raised. Is it possible to cause the deposition of a naturally formed patina within a few years in some artificial way? Actually, it is possible to cause a patina to be formed on the surface of a limestone object by burying it in a wet salty soil impregnated specially with some soluble iron salts, then exposing it to the atmosphere for a few weeks and repeating this process for several times. The patina in this case, however, is not very crystalline and not so adherent to the stone as the patina

which is formed slowly during hundreds or thousands of years. Moreover, this quick efflorescence of the salts causes the surface of the object to disintegrate and the patina cracks out so easily within a period not exceeding two years in any way. The objects under consideration have been shown to the Egyptian Museum since more than ten years and until now there is not the slightest change in the appearance and durability of their patina. This is actually a great evidence of their genuineness.

Organic excretions:

Some dark brown resinous looking spots or streaks were observed on the surface of many of these objects, e.g., Nos. 134, 144, 147, 154, 157, 232, 254, 326, etc. These, on analysis, proved to be of nitrogenous organic matter, probably animal excretions. Animal excretions, when old, acquire a resinous appearance and become difficultly affected by organic solvents. Since the excretions mentioned are not easily affected by the different solvents, are resinous looking, impregnating, and extremely adherent to the stone, they must have been excreted on these objects since a very long time thus supporting the genuineness of these objects.

II. SURFACE POLISH

Microscopical examination of the surface shows two characteristic features concerning the surface polish:

- (a) Irregular lines of polish.
- (b) Surface pitting.

Irregular lines of polish:

The Ancient Egyptians used to polish the surface of their sculpture objects by rubbing them with stones such as dolerite balls held in the hand accompanied by an abrasive powder such as fine sand. This process is represented in many tombs such as in a Fifth Dynasty tomb at Saqqara⁵ and in an Eighteenth Dynasty tomb at Thebes⁶. The grooves and the hollows are also polished by rubbing them with a metal edge together with an abrasive powder⁷. Such an implement is shown in an Eighteenth Dynasty tomb.⁶ Such methods of polish give rise to irregular lines on most of the polished surfaces. Such lines are easily detected on Ancient Egyptian objects. Since the lines of polish on the sculpture pieces under consideration are irregular and similar in all respects to those found on the Ancient Egyptian polished surfaces in the Egyptian Museum and elsewhere, we can safely say that the surface polish of these objects favours greatly their genuineness.

Had these objects been recently made, their surfaces would have been polished by one of the two ways:

- 1) By modern means i.e., by use of files, emery paper, etc., such methods would cause the surface to have regular and mostly parallel lines of polish. Such regular lines are altogether absent from any part of the surface of the objects under consideration.
- 2) By the ancient methods of polishing described above. This method would actually give similar lines of polish as those expected if the objects were genuine. The presence of the almost crystalline and adherent naturally formed patina on the lines of polish indicates, however, that the polishing of the surface is ancient.

Surface pitting:

The long contact of the Ancient Egyptian soft stone objects with sand always causes their surfaces to suffer some sort of pitting. This is what is expected since sand is much harder than the stone. This surface pitting is actually a common feature in all the objects under consideration. The extent of pitting, however, varies greatly according to the hardness of the piece. Although they are all of limestone, yet their hardness varies to some extent. Accordingly some pieces have the surface considerably pitted as in Nos. 234, 252, 325, others are not so much pitted as in most of the other pieces.

Pitting, however, is sometimes almost absent in one of the sides of some pieces. This is actually explained by the fact that such surfaces were originally exposed to the atmosphere for a long time until the naturally formed patina deposited thickly on them. Such a layer of crystalline patina is always harder

⁵G. Steindorf, *Das Grab des ti*, pl. 134.

⁶P. E. Newberry, *The Life of Rekhmara*, pl. XX.

⁷A. Lucas, *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*, 3rd Ed., 1948, page 85.

than the stone itself. When such surfaces were later buried in the sand they resisted greatly the pitting effect of sand in such a way that they either remained practically unaffected or slightly pitted.

III. BREAKS

Most of the objects have one or more breaks. Practically all of these breaks have blunt edges and a naturally formed patina, characteristics which are in favour of being ancient. These breaks, however, can be classified into the following:

(1) Irregular blunt breaks which do not contain any signs of polish: These breaks are found in most of these objects. They are most probably the edges of the original blocks which are left in their original condition after carving and polishing the piece. A full detailed description of this kind of breaks is found in Mr. Lucas' report mentioned before.

(2) Irregular blunt breaks containing some signs of ancient polish: Such breaks are only found in a few pieces, e.g., No. 245, in which one break at the neck contains some irregular lines of polish. These irregular lines are, however, covered with the naturally formed red brown patina showing that there was an ancient trial for polishing it. This break seems also to have been the unfinished edge of the original block used for making the head, but the sculpture student might have found that this edge was so irregular that he was obliged to round it slightly. Thus he polished it in the ordinary way so as to conform better with the whole shape of the head.

(3) Irregular breaks which took place after being left in the tomb or the workshop: Such breaks caused the object to be composed of two or more separate pieces, e.g.:

statuette No. 249, broken into two pieces,
head No. 140, broken into two pieces,
head No. 152, broken into two pieces,
statuette No. 242, broken into two pieces,
plaque No. 145, broken into two pieces,
plaque No. 151, broken into two pieces,
plaque No. 234, broken into three pieces.

The broken pieces of the same object though belonging to each other, their edges at the breaks are worn in such a way that they do not fit well at the edge. Accordingly when stuck together the place of the break can be easily noticed. Mr. A. Lucas, in his report, referred to one of these broken objects mentioning that "the broken edges had been weathered and probably anciently, but the rest of the statuette does not show any signs of weathering. The explanation of this is not clear." Actually, this may be explained by the following:

a) The edges of the breaks after breakage directly are always sharp, thin and easily breakable, and, by time, these sharp edges lose their sharpness and become blunt.

b) The surface of the rest of the objects is always polished and therefore more resistant to the weathering factors than the unpolished sharp edges.

These breaks which have blunt edges were examined thoroughly and no signs of any kind of polish were found. If they were made intentionally blunt by any artificial recent means, lines of polish would have been apparent on their edges. The presence of old patina with its different shades on the surfaces of these breaks indicate also that the breakage took place since a very long time. All these features support considerably the genuineness of the objects.

(4) Regular smooth breaks: This kind of break is only found in Statuette No. 136 which is composed of four separate pieces i.e., it contains three breaks. One of these breaks is across the thighs and is a recent break since its surface is rough and contains no patina at all. The other two

breaks are smooth and ancient. One of them is longitudinal towards the right side and the other is across the neck. Though the surfaces of these two breaks are very smooth, yet their pieces fit well together. The edges of the breaks, however, are blunt and their surfaces contain a naturally formed orange yellow patina. The only possible explanations for these smooth ancient breaks are:

a - This statuette was broken anciently and then an excellent trial for its restoration was done.

b - The statuette was broken intentionally and then one of the sculpture students was asked to restore it. This might have been done as an exercise or examination in methods of restoration.

c - The statuette was made of three separate pieces, each of them shaped in such a way that they all fit together to form the complete statuette. This might have also been given to the students as an exercise in sculpture.

The fact that the big piece contains a crack which extends to the side piece favours, however, that the body of the statuette was obtained from one block which was later broken either accidentally or intentionally, then a trial for its restoration was done. As to the head, there are no apparent signs to indicate whether it belonged to the same piece or was made of a separate block which was later fitted to the other pieces to complete the statuette. At any rate, in order to conceal the breaks, they painted the whole statuette with a red paint, of which traces still remain, so as the whole statuette appears to be of a uniform colour. All these explanations taken together are in favour of the fact that the smooth breakages are ancient and in favour of the genuineness of the statuette.

From all the above arguments and explanations, we find that all the points favour the genuineness of all the objects under consideration.

(signed) Zaki Iskander

&

Zahira Mustafa

28-11-1950

Summary and Conclusions, Plus

In the last forty-some years, we have witnessed the deadly blows and verdict against the Mansoor Amarna Collection by a few scholars, mostly given from photographs only, or after barely looking at a few pieces, with the exception of:

1) Dr. John D. Cooney, who had seen "most of these Amarna sculptures several times" and, "in a few cases," examined them at the Brooklyn Museum, but never gave any reason whatsoever to substantiate his negative opinion. And no one can, or should, ever forget his claim that scholars could give a "firm opinion" from looking at photographs when it took him two years to reach his **after** examining the sculptures a few times.

2) Dr. H. W. Müller, who first wrote that "all objects from the photographs, gave me the impression of modern imitations." Moreover, we have inserted his "Expert Opinion" on page 88 and given proofs that his assertions are totally wrong.

Needless to mention again the only two negative technical reports ever issued on sculptures of the Collection: One from the BMFA and the other from IFAR. Clearly, to our mind, these reports will remain in infamy for the two institutions as long as they are not retracted. Furthermore, we believe they are degrading the distinguished scholars associated with those institutions.

On the positive artistic/stylistic side, we have quoted illustrious scholars who expressed, each in his/her own way, why the Mansoor Amarna objects "are genuine, original, authentic and ancient," and that "this collection is very important because it is from the Amarna Period" and that it "is a very difficult period to understand;" in addition, it should be "further studied." We also remember that "the delicacy and finesse of the techniques whereby they were wrought are incredible," and that "*au point de vue de l'art, ces pièces sortent d'un atelier apparenté, mais non identique, à celui qui a exécuté les colosses de Karnak. Leur stylisation poussée dans le même esprit est d'une plénitude d'exécution sans défaillances qui ne peut pas, à mon avis, être l'oeuvre d'un faussaire.*"

As for the positive scientific facts obtained on the Mansoor Amarnas, they speak eloquently for themselves, concluding that the objects are **unquestionably genuine**.

But then, just why the actual standing of the Collection? The reasons? Clearly, in the beginning, in 1949, the unfortunate Collection had been arbitrarily judged and condemned to protect the reputation of two great American museums, as well as of two "experts:" One of these being "the best authority in this country on technical problems connected with works of art," and the other, being "perhaps the most qualified authority" on Egyptian art. After 1949, neither of the two "experts" nor their institutions--the BMFA and Brooklyn--considered at any time to reexamine the sculptures. Their decision was irreversible!

From 1949, date of the BMFA report, to 1959, rumors--false and devoid of any truth--were at their height, and many Egyptologists and museum officials in the USA would neither contradict Dr. Cooney nor Mr. Young, nor the Brooklyn or Boston museums. During that decade, the Mansoors appealed, implored and begged the two institutions, as well as Dr. Cooney and Mr. Young, to reexamine the sculptures, but it was to no avail. It is only in 1959 that letters from our attorney went to a couple of museums and to two of their officials. We were hoping that they would retract their unfounded negative opinion. We mostly and particularly wanted to put an end to the ugly rumors that were being spread as they were affecting our Collection as well as our reputation. Can anyone blame us for contacting our attorney after ten long and painful years of peaceful and ardent pleas? And as stated before, there was never a lawsuit since it was not really in our mind.

From 1959 on, the Mansoors became "troublemakers." These were some of the rumors. The name of "Mansoor" became synonymous with "lawsuit" and, *ipso facto*, the word "lawsuit" became the refrain of certain museum officials and a few Egyptologists.

Until not too long ago, quite a few people have stated their opinion that the Collection is not ancient. Did we ever bring a lawsuit against anyone? Or any institution? How about Dr. Wildung and his shocking letters condemning our Collection? And then, there are a couple of people whose opinions, published in *KMT*, are really damaging to our Amarnas. Did we, or are we, going to sue them merely because they think very loudly that our sculptures are "forgeries?" Positively not. Quite the contrary, we do thank them for their astounding remarks since, when reasonably and factually refuted, they do reinforce our conviction that the Collection is ancient, while proving to others that it is being unjustly ridiculed, mocked and vilified, attacked and condemned with no foundation, and mostly from photographs only. One should not forget either that our rebuttal, using common sense also, will bring many, perhaps too many, doubters on our side.

Re: The Article on the Mansoor Collection in *KMT*

Before we quote some of what we read in *KMT*, we would like the reader to know that its editor, Mr. Dennis C. Forbes, wrote quite an interesting and informative article on the Collection in the Winter 1991-1992 edition, pp. 10,11,34. He gave a general idea of the controversy on the Mansoor sculptures, and we quote him:

"So, all this reported--after careful and lengthy examination (on two different occasions) of the forty Mansoor Collection artworks displayed at San Francisco State--what was your editor's personal reaction? Let me say, first of all, that--without any expertise whatsoever in geology, mineralogy, etc.--I found the individual pieces, subject matter aside, to be highly attractive examples of stone carving in the round and relief, with especially appealing 'patinas' and apparent 'weatherings.' Since I have absolutely no clue as to how such surface details could be faked, I had to limit my 'gut' response to these pieces, individually and collectively, to art-historical and iconographic considerations alone. Giving the forty Mansoor artworks the benefit of the doubt that they very well may have been sculpted in antiquity, and without addressing the particulars of their unsettling distortions of the early Amarna 'caricaturing' style, I have the following troubling questions (among others), nonetheless:"...

Forbes posed then four "troubling questions" and, for lack of space, we'll only quote the last one as well as the conclusion of his article. He wrote:

"4. And why are eight of the ten bas-relief plaques in the Collection carved in *raised* relief, when I can locate only *one* other published case of this sculptural style in the many, many surviving East Karnak and El Amarna-and-environs examples (the small Amenhotep III-Tiye votive stela from the house of Pinhasy now in the British Museum)? Virtually all known relief-work from the Amarna period is *sunk*, owing to the relatively rapid execution permitted by that stone-carving method. Why, therefore, would a totally atypical and more difficult and time-consuming technique have been employed in mere workshop 'studies' or student model-pieces, as seen in the Mansoor examples?

"Rather than to continue dismissing the Mansoor El Amarna Collection out of hand and 'off the record' on unspecified stylistic grounds, I would challenge knowledgeable, well-credentialed Egyptologist art-historians to debate *on the record* why these particular sculptures are either bona fide unique antiquities or else merely audacious antique curiosities. Perhaps I will be able to generate such a debate for *Amarna Letters 2!*"

Writing to Forbes (*KMT*, Spring 1992, p.2), Mr. I. Selzek of Manchester, U.K. said:

"I think you were far too kind in your reaction to the Mansoor sculptures. I had never heard of them until now, but even your smallish black-and-white photos convey the impression that there is something very, very wrong with these 'controversial' pieces. In fact, *everything* is wrong on purely stylistic grounds. Amarna art at even its most extreme doesn't approach the comic quality of the Mansoor sculptures. Any one of them looks disturbingly like the blatantly fake 'antiquities' for sale in shops and booths of the *suq* at Luxor and elsewhere in Egypt.

"The pictured relief piece of the two standing royals (all-too-similar to the so-called Smenkhkare/Meritaten sunk-relief in Berlin) is totally suspect, for example, in not following the canon of proportions of human figures, as worked out for the Amarna period by Dr. Gay Robins."

Our Comments and Opinions. Mr. Selzek is perhaps a pundit in Egyptology, but we firmly believe that **no one** is learned enough to be able to tell from photographs only (and particularly "smallish") whether an Egyptian sculpture (especially from the Amarna period) is ancient or not. It is "blatantly" obvious to us that *everything* he wrote is very, very wrong in his "comic" estimation of the Mansoor sculptures especially when we remember that Aldred said "if they are genuine," and that it took some two years for Cooney to state his opinion and this, after he had seen, studied and **examined** them a **few** times, and right after William J. Young had issued his fateful technical report. What to say when one remembers that Drioton saw, studied and examined most of the sculptures during 15 years, Becker-Colonna did the same on 40 pieces for 3 years at first, then for another 15, and Noblecourt saw, "in the flesh," few of them through the years, but studied and examined 40 during one week in San Francisco in 1986? Question: Is Mr. Selzek better qualified to give an opinion on Amarna art than Aldred or the other most eminent scholars we just mentioned?

As for the "canon of proportions," we discussed this on page 119 and the reader will remember that it does not apply to the "Amarna age" according to Iversen. For Mr. Selzek's benefit, we would like to quote K. Michalowski in his *Art of Ancient Egypt*, p. 222, on what happened during the "Amarna episode." He wrote: "Artists...created another canon reflecting the kind of mannerism into which Amarna art had fallen."

We also would like to quote once more, still for the benefit of Mr. Selzek, Cyril Aldred in his *Akhenaten and Nefertiti* (Brooklyn Museum/Viking Press) from page 62: "Nefertiti's figure is often elongated, as are those of women in crowd scenes in Amarna tombs and on the Karnak *talatat*, and her head can sometimes be small in relation to her body." And on page 76: "The infant...becomes a person in his own right with the disproportionately large head of a child (Nos. 35, 130)." And should Mr. Selzek open to page 53, he will read two words he should never forget: "The *extraordinary distortions* in which Akhenaten chose to have himself represented...."

Thus, it is a distinct and established fact that during the Amarna age, artists "**created another canon**" and many, indeed, too many figures are disproportionate and *extraordinarily distorted*, but they are definitely not of "comic quality." We wonder if Mr. Selzek worked out the canon of proportions in the Berlin relief of the so-called Smenkhkare/Meritaten?

As for Mr. Selzek's preposterous remark that any one of the sculptures "looks disturbingly like the blatantly fake 'antiquities' for sale in shops and booths of the *suq* at Luxor and elsewhere in Egypt," this is clearly absurd and pure nonsense. Does Mr. Selzek want people to believe that he became experienced in detecting forgeries by merely looking at photographs or by going through the *suq* at Luxor and elsewhere in Egypt? This raises another question in our mind: Did Lucas or Iskander, who spent so much more time in Egypt than Mr. Selzek, ever visit any *suq* in the Land of the Nile, as neither one ever noticed that any one of the sculptures "looks disturbingly like the blatantly fake 'antiquities' for sale in shops and booths" of those bazaars? Furthermore, is Mr. Selzek "more qualified" than Lucas and Iskander to judge the ancient from the fake since, from barely looking at 15 "smallish black-and-

white photos" of the Mansoor sculptures, he was able to give a very definite opinion, whereas Lucas had to scientifically examine 27 pieces, and Iskander 66 pieces of the Collection before stating theirs?

Moreover, for Mr. Selzek's information, if he would have read carefully Mr. Forbes' article in *KMT*, he would have noticed that M.A. Mansoor was a "highly reputable Cairo antiquities dealer," and that "his popular antiquities and fine-jewelry shop [was] at the old Shepheard's Hotel in Cairo, where his customers included numerous international royalty and heads of state of the day," plus collectors and museums from around the world. Why is it that his shop in the prestigious world-famous old Shepheard's was called a "museum" by the British historian who visited it? Why is it that the editor of a leading English newspaper wrote to us from London in 1971 saying: "I recall that in 1952 several newspapers here carried reports of the sale in New York of some of your late father's Egyptian treasures?" Was it then conceivable that a "highly reputable Cairo antiquities dealer" supplying international royalty and museums with his "Egyptian treasures," would tarnish or ruin his impeccable reputation by offering for sale "blatantly fake 'antiquities'" like those sold in Egyptian bazaars?

• • • • •

The second negative letter to the editor of *KMT* was written by Dr. A.M. Dodson of London, England. His comments appeared in the Summer 1992 edition of the publication and we quote most of what he wrote:

"Leaving aside the subjective assessment that the pieces *look* totally wrong, the key point must be that pretty well all of the objects shown in your feature are quite obviously copied from well-known museum objects. Most glaringly, the left-hand-most piece on pp. 10-11 is clearly copied from Berlin 15000 (the so-called 'Smenkhkare and Meritaten' relief), and the second from the right is taken directly from the famous Ashmolean painted pavement: The poses and jewelry are *absolutely* identical; and, regarding the latter piece, it is clipped exactly like most of the published photographs [of the painting]!

"The same is true of most of the three-dimensional items: I particularly 'like' the bottom-left-hand bust. The extremely odd front-band of the blue crown is due to its uncomprehending creator copying from a photograph of a composite statuette of Akhenaten with a badly fitted separate headdress.

"...Since I have not seen the Mansoor Collection 'in the flesh,' and only some of the pieces in photographs, I would not wish to be dogmatic; but, as things stand, I have not the slightest doubt that all the [Mansoor] items I have seen illustrated over the years are fakes."

Our Comments and Opinions. The Berlin relief and the Ashmolean painting as compared to the corresponding Mansoor reliefs have been discussed previously. And contrary to what Dr. Dodson wrote concerning the princesses, "the poses and jewelry" in the Mansoor relief are **not** "*absolutely* identical" to those in the Ashmolean's. It is very clear that the lower arm of any princess in the Mansoor reliefs is **not** "spaghetti-like" as in one of the princesses at the Ashmolean's. Regarding the jewelry, it should be compared "in the flesh" as details do not show well in a photograph 3" x 3" as illustrated in *KMT*. It is obvious to us that Dr. Dodson has seen neither the 1975 nor the 1991 catalogues of the Collection. Otherwise he would have noticed different details in the larger photographs illustrated in those two catalogues. Furthermore, the princesses in the Mansoor reliefs are wearing no bracelets whereas they are, in the Ashmolean painting. Consequently, "the poses and jewelry" are **not** "*absolutely* identical" and, with all due respect to Dr. Dodson, he is totally wrong in his assertions.

It would seem that a skilled and clever "forger" would certainly not miss details like the excessively twisted lower arm of one of the princesses and/or their bracelets that are so conspicuous in the painting. It would also seem that a skilled and clever "forger" could not have failed to adorn his so-beautiful and so-graceful young princesses with bracelets that would have been the easiest thing to carve-- or rather to "copy!"

We now come to Dr. Dodson's inaccurate remark that "the extremely odd front-band of the blue crown is due to its uncomprehending creator copying from a photograph of a composite statuette of Akhenaten with a badly fitted separate headdress." We feel that Dr. Dodson is hinting at the "Amarna-head Dr. Munro of the Kestner Museum of Hanover acquired" in the sixties (cf.p. 95), which apparently has a "badly fitted separate headdress" and which is--or at least was--considered by some Egyptologists to be a forgery. However, in the Mansoor's greatly reduced bust illustrated in *KMT* (1 3/4" x 2 3/4"), the photograph is taken from an angle which does not give a true aspect of the sculpture. Furthermore, it couldn't have been "copied" from the Hanover head since all sculptures of the Mansoor Collection appeared officially from the twenties to the forties, and the Kestner head in the sixties. But let's proceed so we can remind Dr. Dodson that Egyptians did make mistakes in their artworks, and we are positively not referring to the head he is mentioning and which is illustrated in *KMT*, since there is no fault in it.

The Mansoor head of Akhenaten should be seen "in the flesh" or at least from a larger photograph if this unorthodox manner is chosen, and for comparison only with a similar photograph of an authentic Akhenaten and definitely not for positive authentication. For such a comparison we'll take as an example Fig. 9, p. 32 of Colonna's 1991 catalogue, which is the same bust illustrated in *KMT* but a much larger photograph (5 1/2" x 10") and which is taken from the front, and Fig. 42, p. 65--a limestone statue of Akhenaten at the Egyptian Museum, Cairo JE 43580, in Aldred's Brooklyn catalogue, *Akhenaten and Nefertiti*.

Fig. 42, taken from the front, shows Akhenaten wearing the blue crown slightly bent to the left side and this is clearly shown in the photograph. But this is not all: The artist made another fault in placing off-center, still to the left, a cavity--almost square--in the crown where the Uraeus was going to be inserted. Indeed this is quite obvious in Aldred's catalogue. By contrast, in the three Mansoor heads of Akhenaten wearing the blue crown (Figs. 6, 9, 12 of Colonna's 1991 catalogue), that cavity is somewhat oval and not square, and truly well-centered in the crown which stands straight and not bent in any way. Just because the crown in Fig. 42 (Cairo JE 43580) is bent and not straight, would it be right to say that the fault is due to "its uncomprehending creator copying from a photograph of a composite statuette of Akhenaten with a badly fitted separate headdress"?

In concluding our discussion on Dr. Dodson's remarks, and with all due respect to this scholar, we, the Mansoors, "have not the slightest doubt that all what he wrote concerning "some" of the items in the Mansoor Collection he has not seen "in the flesh," but only in photographs, is totally wrong. Although we deplore such totally inaccurate statements by certain scholars, we are thankful to God that we were able to refute them all reasonably through incontestable facts. And we do thank Dr. Dodson again, as well as Mr. Selzek for their comments as they made us discover a few more points in favor of the genuineness of the Collection.

.

Still concerning Mr. Forbes' article in *KMT*, we would like to quote three letters addressed to him which are not negative. The first one was written by G.F. de Freitas, M.D., of Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin, and published in the Spring 1992 issue. Dr. de Freitas wrote:

"I saw the Mansoor-Amarna Collection in San Francisco [November 1991] and was surprised by the 'head in the sand' approach of Egyptologists who have virtually ignored this remarkable collection for forty years. Your article should elicit some interesting reactions and, as you suggest, *Amarna Letters* 2 would be an ideal forum for a rational debate."

For the reader's information, Dr. de Freitas saw the Collection three times, and not only once when it was exhibited in San Francisco in 1991; but also in 1986 when exhibited still at San Francisco State University, and in 1990 when exhibited in Rome. We know for a fact that he is totally convinced of its authenticity.

• • • • •

The second letter was written by Mr. G. Klatt of Santa Rosa, California, and we quote him from the Summer 1992 issue of *KMT*.

"I saw the Mansoor Family Collection while it was displayed at San Francisco State University [1991] and found it to be very interesting and orthodox in appearance. The article in *KMT* was informative, but seemingly quite negative. It prompts the following responses:

"1) Why is the opinion of two authorities in 1947 so highly regarded [by Egyptologists], when exhaustive tests and studies made by other authorities give favorable reports on the authentication of the objects?

"2) Why are the sculptures being questioned because of the original source and purchase?

"3) The [raised-] relief plaques seem to have at least one accepted precedent, so why is this a negative?

"As there are already expert supporters [of the Collection] in the Egyptology field, what further documentation can be required to support the Mansoor family's claims?"

• • • • •

Finally, the third letter was written by our younger brother, Mr. Edgard Mansoor, who, in brief, speaks of a growth on the right earlobe of a princess (Fig. 22, p. 45, 1991 catalogue), and states that a "similar feature is also found on a number of other ancient Egyptian art objects "in major world museums, among them the Louvre, the Metropolitan, the Egyptian Museum (Cairo) and others. Edgard goes on, adding:

"Needless to say, this feature is found on countless other antique limestone sculptures in museums around the world, not only on Egyptian art, but also on sculptures from other countries. I should mention that this distinctive feature is very meaningful, not only to scientists, but also to the few scientifically-minded Egyptologists. Perhaps some day all Egyptologists will understand its meaning.

When they do, they will also understand the scientific reports and letter-reports of professors Silver, Compton, Iskander, Arnal, Kirk, Turner, Plenderleith, Stross, Gettens, Protsch, Bariand and so many others.

"[Egyptologists] Drioton, Noblecourt, Colonna, Nolli, du Bourget and Gabra understood these scientific reports, and I don't see why others can't. But there is hope that they will, if they only sit down and read them carefully with an open mind."

We have no comments on the last three letters of Dr. de Freitas, Mr. Klatt and Mr. Edgard Mansoor other than sending the three of them a BIG THANK YOU!

• • • • •

"Art and science must co-exist" stated "one of the great museums of the world." Both must go hand in hand, and each is essential and indispensable to the other, so we state. American museums would be cheating the public if they maintain a research laboratory for their own fame, gain, or prestige only, since, according to the AAM Directory (1971), these institutions "exist to serve the public...." But after the BMFA sold us by error (?) what we have rightly termed "a piece of defective merchandise," just why have other great world museums like the Metropolitan and the L.A. County Museum of Art refused to

examine the Mansoor Amarna Collection? Should these two museums have accepted, wouldn't it have been for the benefit of all museums, for arts and sciences, and for the public they serve? The Boston MFA has created a monster of a controversy, throwing it with disdain in our lap, and washing their hands of the consequences.. But generally speaking, controversies are settled one way or another--mostly through irrefutable scientific evidence. And who has forgotten or hasn't heard of the controversy over the famous Metropolitan bronze horse? Let us quote Mr. David Shirey in the New York Times of Sunday, December 24, 1974:

"The Metropolitan Museum's famous bronze horse, which the museum's vice director for operations, Joseph Noble, dramatically designated as a 20th-century 'fraud' and 'forgery' in 1967, has been declared an 'irrefutably genuine work of antiquity' by four Metropolitan experts and will soon be put back on exhibition. Once known as 'one of the finest bronzes of classical Greece,' the sculpture was taken off display in 1961 for routine study purposes.

"Mr. Noble, a specialist in ancient ceramics, maintains that 'the appearance of the piece leads one to believe that it is a 20th-century forgery.' But in the wake of new technical evidence uncovered during the last five years through detailed scientific examination, he concedes that it 'may be a late Hellenistic or Roman period eclectic piece.'

"...What are the conclusions? The scientists and conservators assert that the horse is ancient because of technical evidence, but can't give it a precise date. Mr. Yalouris in Athens, Mr. Bearzi in Florence, Carl Bluemel, a historian of ancient art in Berlin and Cornelius Vermeule, acting director of the Boston Museum, believe that it is a classical fifth-century work. 'It is a magnificent creation,' says Mr. Vermeule. 'We should use stylistic differences at times to prove the independent creative spirit of the artist rather than as criteria against its authenticity.'"

How very true the preceding statement of Mr. Vermeule is! But why couldn't it be applied to the Mansoor Amarna Collection since "scientists and conservators assert" that the sculptures are "ancient because of technical evidence"? Because years ago, Egyptologists had the last word on authenticating Egyptian artifacts and no one dared to contradict the sacrosanct opinion of Egyptologists like Cooney or H.W. Müller. Furthermore, the opinion of the MFA Boston on artifacts was not to be ever contradicted. "The [Boston] Museum's Research Laboratory, the first in America and third oldest in the world, not only serves every department in the Museum, but examines, identifies, repairs and conserves art treasures from all over the world." Consequently, the head of this world famous Research Laboratory could not have made such an elementary error in not recognizing a natural limestone from "a made stone which could be fabricated in a great many ways." Moreover, his report could not have been "weak, subjective,...and fraught with erroneous conclusions based upon inadequate experience and understanding with and of ultra-violet light and fluorescence...."

.

On Sunday, June 7, 1987, the Los Angeles Times published an extremely interesting article by Robert A. Jones, a Times staff writer, titled "Fake Artwork: High Stakes for the Getty." In it, Mr. Jones says that two "major sculptures" of the J. Paul Getty Museum "are suspected of being fakes." One of the two is a "marble head of Achilles attributed to the Greek Sculptor Skopas...one of the greatest sculptors of the 4th century B.C." The other sculpture is a "fragment of a grave monument from the 6th century B.C." While we cannot and are not qualified to comment on Greek sculptures, we would like to quote a few paragraphs from the article concerning the marble head:

"Criticism of the Head of Achilles first came from Europe in the form of a long piece in a German scholarly journal, *Antique Welt*. Archaeology professor German Hafner of the University of Mainz maintained that the Getty sculpture most likely was a copy of a genuine head on display at the

National Museum in Athens. Hafner referred to the Getty piece, contemptuously, as probably the 'work of a student' of the Beaux Arts school in the 19th century.

"Hafner's argument focused on one feature of the Getty head: the shape of the visor that runs across the figure's forehead...

"On a spring day recently at the University of California, Berkeley, Andrew Stewart pulled the Hafner article from his file, tossed it on a table, and looked at it with some distaste. 'Hafner has never seen the head; he's only seen photographs,' Stewart said. 'He condemned this piece from a very great distance.'

"Stewart, a professor of art history, believes wholeheartedly in the Getty's head and wrote the book that is sold in the museum's bookstore. Hafner is wrong, Stewart said, because his assumption about the Athens head is wrong. Just returned from a trip to Greece where he re-inspected the Athens head, Stewart said it never had the peaked visor that Hafner claims. 'The damage to the head would not have cut off the entire peak; you should be able to see the beginning of a curve,' Stewart said. 'And you can't see it because it's not there.'"

We quote now the conclusion of the article:

"Dietrich von Bothmer, for many years the curator of ancient art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, said there is another reason museums are reluctant to dispose of such questions quickly.

"'Once an object has been declared a fake, it is besmirched forever,' von Bothmer said. 'So curators tend to defend their pieces. Anybody is capable of accepting a forgery as the real thing; it does not mean you are certifiably insane. But no scholar should ever call a real work of art a forgery. That is a crime.'"

How very true the words of Dr. Dietrich von Bothmer are! We, ourselves, also hold that it is definitely a crime on the part of a scholar to ever call a real work of art a forgery especially when it is stated in an authoritarian or powerful manner and with no foundation. One thing some "scholars" should keep in mind is that the skilled artists who carved objects in antiquity were human beings and may have made errors during their life. Not all their works are masterpieces--particularly at the beginning of their career, and not all their works are identical. (We are not talking about the Getty's sculptures; we are generalizing.)

A couple of very interesting paragraphs in Jones' article must also be quoted:

"There is some consolation for the Getty; this spring, forgeries have been popping up with regularity at other museums across the country. The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York announced recently that its Egyptian bronze cat, one of the most popular pieces of sculpture at the museum, is probably a modern fake. The cat, acquired in 1958, drew such attention that the museum put it on a special poster sold in the bookstore. The cat has now been taken off display.

"Last month, the Dallas Museum of Art and the St. Louis Art Museum disclosed that several of their major pre-Columbian sculptures are forgeries. All the faked pieces appear to have come from the same group of statuary imported from Mexico in the 1950s, a discovery that has led other museums to begin investigating their holdings from the group."

Concerning the Egyptian bronze cat, where were the Egyptologists, archaeologists and art historians from around the world who saw and admired, from photographs and/or "in the flesh," the bronze cat for over a quarter of a century? It is quite obvious that this cat met all the artistic/stylistic requirements for being declared and purchased, in 1958, as ancient, otherwise the eminent Egyptologists

of the Metropolitan would have never approved its acquisition. Now [1987] that it has been "taken off display," the cat will be subjected to "the most rigorous application of science" which is the "**only**" way to give the final word. And this "**only**" was stated by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (cf. p. 26).

The same goes also for several of the "major pre-Columbian sculptures" at the Dallas Museum of Art and the St. Louis Art Museum that are forgeries. Where were the archaeologists, art historians, etc....?

But there's hope for the J. Paul Getty and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. As Mr. Jones said it correctly in his article, "in the past, major artworks have occasionally lingered in a kind of half-life for many years while experts argued over their authenticity. Some have even been declared real, then fake, then real again." The Metropolitan's famous bronze horse is an excellent example.

.

On May 14, 1992, Ms. Suzanne Muchnic, a Times staff writer, wrote in the Los Angeles Times that the Greek kouros of the J. Paul Getty Museum is being shipped to Athens, Greece, where it will be displayed, examined and studied. She wrote: "Eighty art historians, archaeologists and scientists from 13 countries will convene on May 26-27 at the Nicholas P. Goulandris Museum of Cycladic Art to consider the lingering question of whether the kouros is the honest work of a late 6th-century B.C. Greek sculptor or an extraordinary forgery."

Still in that same most interesting article, Muchnic quotes curator Marion True of the Getty Museum who said: "This sculpture has bedeviled us for six years. It has been tried in the press. There have been irresponsible condemnations of it with no supporting evidence. We think it's time to discuss the current state of research and provide a forum for debate." And Muchnic adds: "Nineteen scholars representing a wide range of opinion are scheduled to give brief talks on stylistic, technical and scientific issues of the kouros. True believers, doubters and fence-sitters will face each other in discussions with the audience of experts. The idea is to confront questions and lay all known facts on the table so that judgments can be based on a complete reading of currently available information."

On reading the preceding article, we wonder why photographs of the Getty's kouros were not sent to Greece in lieu of the "6-foot, 8-inch-tall marble sculpture," to determine its authenticity? Doesn't this, in fact, mean that "eighty art historians, archaeologists and scientists" would be incapable of telling from photographs whether the kouros is ancient or not?

Now that we've read the *L.A. Times* article, **we're praying for an open forum** similar to the one accorded the Getty's kouros, in which Egyptologists, archaeologists, scientists and art historians would meet, study and examine the Mansoor Amarna sculptures "in the flesh." We do not mind the presence of scholars from any American or foreign institutions but, before such an event, we suggest that all sculptures we possess at this time be examined and subjected to any and all of the latest known scientific tests by a panel of conservators and scientists from leading educational institutions, including the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the L.A. County Museum of Art, the Center for Archaeological Sciences at the University of Georgia, the J. Paul Getty Museum, the British Museum, the Egyptian Museum (Cairo), and from any other institutions which would have qualified scientists to undertake such work. Tests should be made in the laboratory of either the J. Paul Getty or the L.A. County Museum of Art since both are not only well equipped, but particularly in the charge of eminent scientists and close to the bank where the Mansoor sculptures are kept in safety. It goes without saying that--with the exception of officials from the MFA Boston in 1947-49 and the Egyptian Museum in 1950--no scientist from the above listed institutions has ever examined any of the Mansoor Amarna sculptures.

.

It is about time that scholars cease issuing statements or opinions on Egyptian artworks from photographs only. Furthermore, the personal feeling or opinion of any person, no matter how great a scholar he/she may be, should never prevail irrevocably over real scientific evidence, as real scientific evidence is based on real scientific facts. Consequently, it is definitely time that all scholars, not only Egyptologists, but also archaeologists and art historians, consider real scientific evidence whenever they study artifacts.

In the case of the Mansoor Amarna Collection, we know for a fact that the positive scientific evidence obtained is indeed very real. We also know for a fact that some most eminent Egyptologists have approved its authenticity. On the other hand, we will add that the dissident Egyptologists who condemned the sculptures distorted the truth and said nothing but illogical or untrue statements, at times absurd or even bizarre.

We cannot forget that one European Egyptologist wrote a confusing letter to Bank of America in 1978 (when the bank sent letters to "a number of museum officials all over the world" cf. p. 117) saying that our Amarna sculptures look as if they were designed by a computer! (Was the computer invented in the 1920s, '30s, or '40s?) And when that Egyptologist received an answer asking him to clarify, he became as "silent as the Sphinx."

We cannot forget either that in March of 1974, a most prominent American Egyptologist told a scholar once, over the phone, that the Mansoor Amarna sculptures were smuggled out of Egypt into the USA. (We do have a document by Egyptian authorities attesting that "the Egyptian Museum during the period from 1947-1950 in compliance with the Antiquities Law that was in effect at that time, exported a collection to Mr. William Mansoor, New York City, U.S.A. Among this collection, there were..."). Common sense should be used here: The mere fact that this Egyptologist said that our Amarna sculptures were smuggled, doesn't this imply that he considers them to be ancient? (Who on earth would smuggle fake artworks?)

.

The reader will remember that we quoted on page 41 Professor J.L. Benson, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, when he wrote to us saying that "these materials appear to be very interesting and valuable." We are reproducing in this section another letter (Exhibit #17) that he sent us on June 19, 1975. As one can notice from his letters, Benson, a professor of ancient art and archaeology, seems to us to be "indeed" anxious to see the Mansoor Amarnas "some day."

We also find that another letter by John P. Fogarty, Professor of Archaeology and Ancient History, at Lenoir Rhyne College in Hickory, North Carolina, should be brought to the attention of the reader. Here is what he wrote to us on September 30, 1975 (after spending the summer teaching at Stanford University). He said:

"We remember with much pleasure our brief but deeply meaningful association with you this summer. In truth, though, that association will seem bitter rather than sweet if we cannot hope to renew it in years to come.

"I would be most pleased to express myself regarding the apparent antiquity and the obvious perfection of your el Amarna pieces. I want to thank you again for the privilege of handling and examining the works. After years of examining photographs and displays of Egyptian art, it was particularly satisfying to encounter pieces which--I'm tempted to say--epitomize the dynamic and stylistic achievements of the artists during akh-en-Aton's reign.

"As one educated to the practice of scientific archaeology, I realize that in this age public acceptance of antiquities is--or should be--predicated on scientific evidence in so far as this can be brought to bear in any instance. In regard to such, it is evident that your pieces meet the tests extraordinarily well considering the fact that such tests as are available could hardly disprove the authenticity of pieces for certain even if the tests were negative. When they are consistently positive, one can ask no more.

"On the other hand, as one whose deep interest in akh-en-Aton and his period has given him a sense of identity with the period (or whose sense of identity has led to deep interest--I'm not sure), I found the pieces meeting my expectations in every way.

"As to any persons with whom you would like me to share my opinion, please send me their addresses and I will be happy to write to them."

We would like to point out that Professor Fogarty made a special trip to Rome in 1990 to view and admire again the Mansoor Amarna Collection when it was exhibited there in November of that year. Do we have to mention that his firm opinion remains as it was in 1975?

If we have mentioned letters by the two scholars, Benson and Fogarty, it is merely to show that not all archaeologists and art historians have a negative opinion on the Collection. Quite the contrary, many find them very interesting and, as just quoted, one who has handled and examined "the works" in San Francisco and in Rome stated: "I would be most pleased to express myself regarding the **apparent antiquity and the obvious perfection of your el Amarna pieces.**"

.

Let us suppose for a moment that the Mansoor Amarna sculptures are forgeries. This means that in the 1920s, there was an extremely clever forger who was an outstandingly skilled artist to be able to carve superbly so many unique Amarna artworks that even "fooled" a leading American art critic, inducing him to state publicly that "the delicacy and finesse of the techniques whereby they were wrought are incredible." And this is not all: This forger must have also been an archaeologist, an Egyptologist, an art historian, an anatomist, and above all, an accomplished scientist way ahead of his time, as none of the most eminent scientists who examined the sculptures ever found any detail in the patina of any sculpture that could cast a shred of doubt on the Collection. The scientific knowledge of that forger must have been so superior and so advanced since the "ancient patina" he "produced" over the sculptures "fooled" even the most eminent Professor Leon T. Silver (CALTECH and NASA), who stated:

"Although the presence of manganese oxide in desert varnish has long been known, the enrichment in the trace elements barium and copper were first reported in 1958, long after the first appearance of the Mansoor Collection. Their presence in a false patina would indeed be highly fortuitous."

Indeed if such a "forger" existed in the 1920s, he should have surfaced for gain, fame and admiration, and would have been better off displaying to the world an amalgamation of unique and unequalled skills instead of remaining in the dark for oblivion.

.

It seems to us that some Egyptologists prefer to condemn ancient artifacts that are unusual instead of simply saying that they can't tell for sure or that they don't know. Once in the late forties, Dr. Cooney showed us a few Amarna style objects in stone in the Brooklyn Museum, which were not on display but in a drawer, that he considered forgeries; he added that they were purchased as ancient from

a European dealer. Were these objects given a technical examination and by whom? And who decided to buy them? And in *ARTnews*, Summer 1978, Ms. Hochfield wrote:

"Even the Berlin Museum, which had magnificent genuine Amarna objects, bought a group of sculptures after World War I that are today considered forgeries."

First of all, the group of sculptures--not one or two pieces, but a group--that the Berlin Museum acquired after World War I was not purchased after looking at photographs only. These sculptures were duly examined and studied by at least one eminent Egyptologist, perhaps by two, three, four or more, and we do not believe they were subjected to any scientific examination as it was practically non-existent at the time. Moreover, to our understanding, German Egyptologists do not believe in scientific examination on Egyptian artworks. Questions: 1) How many years did it take from 1918 until today [1978] to recognize that those sculptures are forgeries? 2) How many Egyptologists, archaeologists and art historians viewed and admired the sculptures while on display at the Berlin Museum, or from photographs? 3) For God's sake, where were all these scholars during so many years?

.

From all that it went through, to many people and particularly to us, it is obvious that the Mansoor Amarna Collection has been irresponsibly and unjustly besmirched, ridiculed and vilified for no apparent or justified reason. The treatment it received so far from certain museums and "scholars" is most unfair, indeed so terribly unfair that it causes revolt in our mind to think of it. The few Egyptologists, those responsible for the controversy, never cared about real scientific evidence, refusing adamantly to consider it. They did not care either about the positive opinion of some of their most prominent colleagues. Their false and misleading statements, occasionally inserted in some publications or whispered behind the scenes, have tragically injured our Amarna sculptures. Through unconsciousness, distortion of the truth, prejudice or incompetence, perhaps also through maliciousness to cover up for colleagues, those few have commented in a most unscholarly manner on certain or on all the sculptures of the Collection causing the stigma to last for so many years. May God forgive them!

.

Years ago, Emile Zola, a French journalist and novelist with a noble heart and unsurpassed conscience, put his life on the line by defending an unfortunate human being, Captain Alfred Dreyfus, whose big "crime" was his religion: Dreyfus was a victim of anti-Semitism, cover-up and miscarriage of justice. In the beginning, almost all France and particularly the military were against Zola because he was trying to clear Dreyfus from any wrong-doing. But Zola didn't care as his conscience was revolted that an innocent man had been unjustly condemned, publicly dishonored and sentenced to life in jail on an island in French Guiana fit for devils and monsters: Devil's Island! France had committed a crime by condemning an innocent man and "*ce crime soulèvera la conscience humaine*," Zola wrote. In fact, as known, that abominable crime made headlines around the world at the turn of the century with appalling consequences. Zola had raised the consciousness of people around the world!

There is a great deal of similarity between the tragedy of Captain Dreyfus and that of the Mansoor Amarna Collection. A grave injustice has been committed against both. Dreyfus was cleared after Zola intervened, reinstated in the French Army with a promotion to Colonel, and decorated with the "*Légion d'Honneur*." Similarly, *Inchaallah*, the Collection will be totally cleared after the truth is known widely and all people concerned act according to their conscience.

.

We, the Mansoors, kindly and respectfully request from the American Association of Museums and from leading institutions, from scholars and particularly from Egyptologists, archaeologists and art

historians with a higher conscience, an investigation and a fair re-evaluation of our Amarna Collection in light of all that we've written so far. We're requesting the investigation neither for compensation nor for the purpose of either embarrassing or punishing any individual or institution for whatever harm, pain or damage our Collection or ourselves have sustained for over forty years. As we said before, we are "sending our appeals only for justice, and for the understanding and appreciation of a unique collection of sculptures which includes some of the very finest works of the Tel-El-Amarna period anywhere. Its magnificent beauty, its unexcelled craftsmanship, and its historical importance place it on a level with the noblest masterpieces of art of ancient times. This is the opinion of some of the greatest scholars of Egyptology of our time. This opinion is approved by the unanimous and massive body of technical evidence contributed by some of the most distinguished scientists of our age."

• • • • •

Even though there is more to be said about this matter, we're refraining from doing it now, and may not do it ever--depending on the outcome of our story. We only would like to add to Egyptologists, and to museum officials:

You and your conscience.

For the Mansoor Family,

Edmond R. Mansoor