



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Unbundled: European Collecting of Andean Mummies 1850-1930

Ordoñez Alvarez, M.P.

Citation

Ordoñez Alvarez, M. P. (2019, June 11). *Unbundled: European Collecting of Andean Mummies 1850-1930*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/74403>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/74403>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/74403>

Author: Ordoñez Alvarez M.P.

Title: Unbundled: European Collecting of Andean Mummies 1850-1930

Issue Date: 2019-06-11

CHAPTER 5

Reinventing the Pre-Columbian Past

The previous chapter looked at the museums and mummy collections that make up this research as individual entities. By looking at their singular histories, as well as dissecting the information available from accession books, each of the collections brought forward their uniqueness, showcasing the iconic or special objects they contain. These unique objects were made so by their material qualities, as well as by their stories. The descriptions of the mummies, of the materials associated with these human remains, and of the chain of custody – from collector to final storage – become, in that sense, the way collection biographies are revealed. The nature of the information available for each museum and each collection is certainly different. According to how much research has been conducted with the collection, there are detailed accounts of collectors and objects – as is the case with the Berlin, Paris, and London collections – or very little information to build up a story – as is the case in Portugal or Leiden. One of the challenges of this research was to look at these unique collections, and both unify and compare the wealth of information they provide. This task is a challenge, as has been stated in previous chapters, precisely because each collection seems to respond to unique collecting histories, tied to national histories, and more so, to specific traditions of collecting.

Although the individuality of each museum and the formation process of each collection is indeed a world of its own, the global historic and geographic scopes of the collections aren't. This statement pinpoints that, though collections are formed by unique individuals, with private personal motivations, and under particular circumstances, the "what?" "who?" "from where?", and "why?" of the collections can all be seen as parallel instances of museum-building. These stories are in themselves connected to each other by ideas on culture and collecting, ideas that are flowing between borders and that ultimately shape connected histories. The goal is, then, not only to find specific connections but also to untangle the relevance of such connections for the construction of collections of Andean mummies in European national museums.

The concept of heterotopias, mentioned in chapter 2 is again useful here. This double nature of the remains, as part of a continuum within the museums they inhabit, and as individual cases. These collections become a reflection of the collectors, the systems that once surrounded them, and the storage or exhibit rooms they occupy today.

In a sense, this chapter presents a double exercise. First to look at the data presented in chapter 4 as comparative scenarios, taking the information within each museum context and visualizing the links that exist between them, as well as what separates them. Second, to look at mummy collections as a whole, and not divided by individual museums.

With the first exercise, the individual collections can be contextualized on a European scale, emphasizing what collections represent the majority of the sample, how they match or not with their counterparts and answering questions on where, when, and why these museums collected Andean mummies. While with the second exercise, the phenomenon of Andean mummy collecting can be better explored. Questions on who and what

was collected are answered by looking at the objects themselves; if we remove the museums, is what is left a look at the sphere of mummy collecting in the nineteenth century? That is the question that the second part of this chapter will attempt to answer.

5.1 The European Context of Mummy Collections

One of the first tasks this research was concerned with was creating an inventory of the known collections of Andean mummies held in European national museums. Once the seventeen collections were located and visited, a short numeric analysis showed an interesting distribution of these collections.


As can be seen in the graph below, of the total of 224 mummies personally inspected and included in this research, the largest collections were found in the Berlin Ethnographic Museum (SMB), the British Museum (BM) and the Quai Branly (QBR). The first has sixty-nine mummies, accounting for 30% of the total collection, and is by far the largest collection found in Europe. The other two collections, in the number of mummified individuals, at the BM and the QBR, represent 9% each, with twenty-two mummies per museum.

It is surprising in that Spain, which held control over the Andean region until the early 1820s, does not have a similarly large collection in a single museum. The same phenomenon was identified in the case of Caribbean archaeological collections (Françoze & Strecker, 2017). Though the combined collections of the Museo de America (MDA) and the Museo Reverte Coma of the Universidad Complutense (MRC)⁵⁰ together account for close to 11% with twenty-seven mummies, it is unclear why the collection was separated in the 1980s, leaving five of the mummies from the Expedición del Pacífico at the MDA, while transferring the other fifteen to the MRC. In contrast, Germany, England, France, Belgium, and Austria seem to have acquired large collections quickly, perhaps taking advantage of the political independence of the Andean nations at the time.

Especially for the Americas and the Andes, the processes of independence from Spanish colonization implied that the permissions needed to carry out scientific expeditions had to be arranged directly with the destination countries, and not the crown.⁵¹ Not only was the bureaucratic process simplified, but the options for travel had also increased (Mora, 2008). Trading routes used for freight and passenger transport were now available for the English, French, German and Spanish alike. The growing commercial power of the United States also opened new routes that connected the previously distant markets in North and South America (McFarlane & Posada-Carbó, 1999).

⁵⁰ Here we exclude the replica mummy held at the Universidad Autonoma de Madrid. It has been taken into account for general statistics in chapter 7 because it highlights connections and exchanges that take part currently between Latin American and European institutions. However, it has been excluded in discussions of authentic human remains, such as the one presented here.

⁵¹ Permission from the crown was hard to obtain and hinged on contacts and favors of royals more so than the interest of the expedition. Alexander von Humboldt, for example, reportedly spent six months trying to get authorization from Carlos IV for his explorations in South America (Wulf, 2015).

Graph 3: Relation Between Number of Mummies and Museum Collections.

As has been stated in previous chapters, the increase of scientific interest in collecting archaeological and ethnographic objects of the Americas implied organized efforts. This can be seen reflected in the most numerous mummy collections included in this research: The Reiss and Stübel collection, and the Arthur Baessler collections in Berlin (SMB), the Wiener collection in Paris (QBR), and the Whympers collection in London (BM). In the German collections, the Baessler and the Reiss and Stübel expeditions were financed at least in part by the government and by the SMB. Though the collections formed by Weiner and Whympers were gathered without institutional backing, they were informed by constant correspondence with other museum and society-backed collectors, in the case of Wiener; and informed by an interest in biological specimen collecting in the case of Whympers.⁵²

During the mid nineteenth century, the publication of manuals that would inform collectors on what to acquire unquestionably had an impact on the remains brought back to Europe. An important document in that line is the manual for collecting and measuring human remains published after the Novara Expedition in Austria under the title *Anthropology: Novara expedition. A system of anthropometrical investigations as a means for the differential diagnosis of human races some general results of the measurements The instruments required. Invented and established by Eduard Schwarz* (Schwarz, 1862). This publication, as well as the printed guides, such as the *Craniological and craniometrics instructions of the Paris Society of Anthropology* (Macdonald, 2010), may have allowed collectors to be informed on the pertinence of what they were acquiring, excavating or receiving as gifts.

Outside of the scientific expeditions, which account for a great number of the remains collected (as is shown later in this chapter), another important reason why En-

⁵² Though the author was unable to find direct reference to Whympers' mummy collection in his writing or by his biographers, he did donate important biological specimen collections to George Albert Boulenger at the British Museum, of which the Ecuadorian amphibian and reptile collection is perhaps the most well known.

gland, France and Germany have the largest collections of Andean mummies has to do with commerce. New economic links are formed right after the independence from Spain. These ties include the establishment of merchant companies in Latin American countries, but also the bureaucratic system that accompany interests in foreign lands: consulates, military and political appointments.

Many private collectors of mummies in the collections visited during this research were either merchants themselves, or had been born into families of merchants. The overlap is not casual, as there is a link between the commercial exchange activities of cultural and non-cultural goods, not only because they are shipped alongside each other, but because the people involved in the business during the nineteenth century are frequently also the collectors. Such an example is Wilhelm Gretzer, whose textile business led him to Lima where he would strike a series of interesting collecting friendships, of which his relationship with Mariano Macedo is perhaps the most fruitful. This relationship is further explored in chapter 7.

Not only the commercial ties but, sometimes also the military involvement these countries had during the wars of independence, and after during the consolidation of national borders, would lead to collecting experiences. The collecting timeframes of many of the mummies indeed point to specific conflict contexts that facilitated, the collecting of mummified remains.

In many cases, museum collections have been formed by a combination of the previously mentioned situations: military involvement, as well as business opportunities. More plainly, collectors acquired similar objects during similar timeframes, and those timeframes can be traced to military and trading activities, turning them into important sources of antiquities.

One such example are the English collections. As has been discussed in detail in a publication on the Pitt Rivers Museum (PRM), the South American collections at the British Museum and Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, all have similar *“strengths in the ceramics and textiles of coastal Peru. Very little of this material comes from well-recorded excavations, with much of it relating to late nineteenth-century naval and trading activities (particularly in relation to Peru, Chile and Argentina, which helps explain the significant collections in Manchester and Glasgow)”* (Sillar in Hicks & Stevenson, 2013). Some of the collections have also been split between institutions, like the Wellcome collection, or have been recipients of donations from the same benefactors.⁵³

The role of auction houses should not be understated. Just as private collectors acquired some of the objects from auctions houses, so did museums. This contributed to having objects that had been collected in the same areas, or most likely looted from similar contexts, and later split into smaller groups for auction. Auction houses become a way

⁵³ In fact, as is stated by Sillar: “some collectors such as Henry Ogg Forbes and Louis Colville Gray Clarke collected material for all three institutions” (Hicks & Stevenson, 2013).

to distribute similar objects as well as a space to compare the collections that they were going to acquire.⁵⁴

5.2 Only Time Will Tell


The dates of collecting of the remains are an important trace to follow in order to understand the process of the formation of said collections. It was stated earlier that England, France, Germany, and Austria seem to have collected their mummies quickly. This happens as well for the collections at the Weltmuseum Wien (WMW), which has 17 mummies or 7% of the total, the Pitt-Rivers Museum (PRM) with its fourteen mummies or 6%, for the thirteen mummies or 5.8% at the Museum of Confluences (MDC), and for the collection of seven mummies or 3.13% of the Royal Museum of Arts and History in Belgium (RMAH). In smaller numbers, the Portuguese collections also represent a single moment of mummy collecting, in the decade from 1880-1889. Both collections amount to less than 2% of the total, with only four individuals.

Spanish collections are formed, in contrast, between 1865 and 1975, so throughout nearly an entire century. A similar case can be seen in the collection of seven individuals or 3.13% at the National Museum of Denmark (NMD), created between 1845-1929; and the Geneva collection (MEG), which represents 4.9% of the total with eleven individuals, made from 1886-2006.

There are two museums whose process of collecting mummies differs significantly from the rest of the collections: the Nápstrek Museum (NPRZ), five individuals, 2.24%; and the Rijksmuseum Volkenkunde (RMV), eight individuals, 3.58%. Both collections are formed much later than any of the previously mentioned, the first between 1967 and 1969, and the second between 1974 and 1976. This information can be seen, first separated by decades in graph 4.

When considering these groupings by decade, the period from 1870 to 1900 is shown as the numerically most significant timeframe for mummy collecting. This period, however, represents at least 30 years – though perhaps it should include the first half of the previous decade as it also registers a higher peak on mummy collecting in comparison with 1830. This is an era of political changes: independence, nation formation, and early border disputes take place in the Andes in the early nineteenth century, up until the 1860s. As is argued later in this chapter, the independence process and the border disputes at the time are very much linked with the collecting opportunities for archaeological artifacts.

⁵⁴ For a documented example, see Sillar and Hicks description of the Pitt-Rivers' South American Collections.

Graph 4: Relation Between Number of Mummies and Decade of Collection for All Collections.

The graph above shows that, while some collecting was happening during the decades between 1830 and 1860, it may not be farfetched to assume that the political turmoil of the time was significant enough that the activity was not flourishing. The beginning of the establishment of nations and the commercial consequences of this process would have had an impact in who and what travelled in and out the region.

After the wars of independence, several economic consequences can be felt throughout the Andean nations. A reduced number of males in the population, which had been decimated by the wars, an increasing disconnect between rural and urban areas that affected the supply of local goods as well as imported goods from their ports of entry to the rest of the nation, and the absence of a unified economic barter system (weights, currency, etc.) are some of the many challenges that the economic systems of the young nations had to overcome well into the nineteenth century (Conde, Stein, & Rybáček-Mlýnková, 1977).


The distribution of the peaks also calls attention to the two highest bars, representing the decades of 1870 and 1900, respectively. In both timeframes, more than eighty mummies were collected, accounting for a significant percentage of total individuals in this research. In order to look in more detail at what is happening in those years, a second graph was created to show, this time by year, how many mummies had been collected. The results can be seen in the graph 5.

What can be glimpsed from the graph above is that, though the general tendency of the late nineteenth century as the most active time in mummy collecting in the Andes continues, there are now four clearer grouping, and not one, that can be further examined.

The first grouping includes dates from 1865 to 1870. Three events may have influenced this timeframe. One is the end of the Civil War in the United States. During the war, trading routes and connections between Europe and the Americas, which had been

open at the beginning of the century, had suffered considerable losses. The end of the war marked the reinstatement of such routes and the reactivation of economic ties, which could have allowed for the antiques trade from the Andes to reactivate as well.

Graph 5: Relation Between Number of Mummies Collected and Year of Collection.



A second event was the War of the Triple Alliance. Taking place between 1864 and 1870, the conflict involved Paraguay, Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil in a bloody border dispute. The war started in late 1864 as a continuation of the border dispute caused between Brazil and Paraguay after Uruguayan independence. Once the conflict escalated and Argentina and Uruguay entered the fray, the conflict became known as the War of the Triple Alliance, in which Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil united forces against Paraguay. The control of the Plata River was also in play, and it had been a sore spot in the relations between Brazil and Argentina since independence (Centeno, 1997).

These disputes, which had been longstanding and complex, led to a perception both in Brazil and Argentina that British involvement in the matter had precipitated the war against Paraguay. Though there is no actual proof of British incitement to war, and there is academic consensus on the matter (Abente, 1987; Leuchars, 2002). What cannot be denied is that there was extensive European military presence in the region at the time, especially British. This presence could have contributed to the formation of private collections and the giving of diplomatic gifts, which, as is explained later in this chapter, accounts for a number of mummies in the museum collections.

Thirdly 1868 was marked by a very strong earthquake in the Arica region. The phenomenon left many mummified remains visible, and they were consequently looted. It has been reported elsewhere that the crew of an English naval vessel, the HMS Malacca, may have participated in such looting activities after assisting the people in need in Arica. The remains recovered and collected by the first officers of the vessel had made their way to the Ashmolean Museum by 1876.

The second grouping also coincides with an important military event in the region, the War of the Pacific. Taking place from 1879 to 1884, the war involved border disputes between Chile on one side, Peru and Bolivia on the other. The war was the result of Chile's border claims to coastal Bolivian territory of the Atacama Desert, which had been precipitated after the Bolivian government, ignoring previous commercial treaties, imposed taxes on Chilean goods using the port of Antofagasta (then under Bolivian control).

Most of the war involved naval campaigns, but battles would be fought in the desert as well as mountainous regions in the Andes. Chile's land campaign proved as effective as its naval one, culminating in the occupation of Lima in January 1881; and though Peruvians kept a sort of guerrilla war going, trying to revert the outcome of the war, a final treaty was signed in 1883 with Peru and in 1884 with Bolivia, with Chile as the victor.

What is more interesting for the purposes of this discussion is that the treaty of 1883 was signed in, and takes its name from, Ancón. This area is most famous for the large necropolis it houses, which had been excavated repeatedly before the conflict. In the graph, the peaks for 1879 to 1880 are quite large, and they reflect a period of collecting directly linked to the occupation and excavations of areas in the Arica region of the Atacama Desert, and in general the dry Pacific coasts of Peru and Chile.

Here the involvement of the British Navy, as well as of other European officers who had been appointed to Chile at the time, has a large impact incidence on the collecting of mummies. A great example of this is the collection formed by William Allison Dyke Acland (1847-1924). Appointed to the ship *Triumph* in 1880, Acland and Admiral Albert H. Markham (1841-1918) were ordered in 1880 to bring their ship from where they had been stationed in Vancouver to Callao to "*protect British interests while the War of the Pacific raged between Chile and Peru*" (http://www.dreadnoughtproject.org/tfs/index.php/William_Alison_Dyke_Acland,_Second_Baronet). Once there, Acland became a naval attaché at Chilean General Headquarters and was present at the battles of Chorrillos and of Miraflores in 1881. His collection of South American remains is organized and well selected, and though he had no formal interest in anthropology, he continued to collect antiquities and ethnographic objects—he even took hundreds of ethnographic photos—in his later military appointments in Australia and the Pacific.⁵⁵

Another important event for the second grouping is the 1878 World's Fair, held in Paris. This is the first instance where newly formed nations have a setting to display their cultures and countries to the world as a whole.⁵⁶ The known world is exhibited and has the chance to both see and be seen. France is particularly notable as a host in this event. The great collections that have been amassed from colonial territories, as well as by collecting heavily in the Americas until that moment were exhibited in pavilions dedicated to An-

⁵⁵ His collections are currently housed at the Pitt Rivers Museum.

⁵⁶ Though some nations had stands in previous World Exhibits like the one held in 1855 in Paris, they did so under different banners. Colombia was Nueva Granada, Argentina the Confederacion Argentina, and Brazil the Império do Brasil (Lopez-Ocon, s. f.).

thropology, Archaeology and Ethnography. The place in itself, the Trocadéro palace, would become a few years later the permanent house for those same objects displayed during the event (Hamy, 1987).

It is worth mentioning that in the anthropology section of these displays, many human remains, mummified or skeletal, went on display as part of a racial comparison exhibit, supported by the likes of Broca, Topinard and Quatrefages, all of them Physical Anthropologists with great interest in comparative anatomy between “races.” This last point is especially relevant given that ten of the mummies in this research belong to his collection, and that the mummies were transferred, after the World Exhibit, to the Guimet museum in Lyon (Berthier-Foglar, 2009). The same can be said about the Bolivian mummy portion of the Quai Branly collection, which is still classified as being donated by the “Commission bolivienne, Exposition Universelle de 1878.”

A third grouping involves the years between 1886 and 1894. Though the numbers of remains collected are a lot less than those of the previous two groupings, they still clearly reflect some changes in the collecting rhythm at the time. There is no uniformity on who or where remains are collected, but there is something important happening at the time, and that is the 1892-1893 World Columbian Exhibition in Chicago. As has been described above, World Exhibits become spaces for the showcasing of collections that would later be donated or left behind under the custody of the host nations. The stimulus to anthropological research that the Paris exhibits of 1878 and 1889 had propelled could be felt again in Chicago. This was not the only world stage for anthropological research at the time. Spain had also organized a lesser-known exhibit under the title of *Exposición Histórico-Americana*, held in Madrid. Some of the archaeological and ethnographical materials that would be shown in Chicago had been originally assembled for this international exposition. Many Latin American nations contributed with materials to this exhibit, including Mexico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Uruguay, Argentina and Cuba (Watters & Zamora, 2005). It is interesting to note that, as Watters and Zamora point out, “*European nations contributing prehistoric and historic artifacts from the Americas, held by their museums or private collectors, included Spain, Portugal, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, with Great Britain and France being conspicuously absent*” (Watters & Zamora, 2005:5).

For both the Madrid 1892 Exhibit and the Chicago 1893 World’s Fair, assemblages of archaeological and anthropological objects were collected, transported and displayed. This movement of collections may have resulted in the spikes visible on the graph above. The peak corresponding with the 1904-1908 period is directly linked with the collecting activities of Arthur Baessler. Though the remains were collected during his travels in Peru in 1896, they were only accessioned into the collection in 1906. They did so as part of a greater collection of Andean and Polynesian objects, and were as such introduced with a later date.

Finally, there are small peaks after the 1970s that should be addressed. A first consideration is the introduction of the UNESCO legislation that has been mentioned in chapter 2. This legislation may have encouraged auction houses, private collectors and antiquities sellers to fend off their collections of mummified remains in the following years (as could be the case for the Leiden museum mummy collection, sold in 1974 and made up of a variety of mummies adjusted as to look as part of one single context (Ordoñez Alvarez, 2014). Other peaks indicate not dates of collection and accession, but rather dates of “rediscovery” of collections in storage rooms, such as the Whymper collection found in storage in 1997 at the BM, or the mummies re-acquired in 2003 at the MEG.

5.3 Where Mummies are Found

In the last few pages, it has been shown that the collecting times across museums can already point to important information regarding global trends in collecting, as well as to the cultural concerns of European museums during the nineteenth century: political reflection, national identity, public displays of “the other” parts of the world. Furthermore, the relation between these dates of collecting and important political events in the Andes also help to show that there are different levels of interaction that lead to the collecting of mummies. The impact of wars with foreign involvement in the Andes seems to have implied a very relevant opportunity for the collecting of such remains, either personally or as gifts after service. This information also leads to finding commonalities in regards to the “what” and “by whom” of collecting which are explored in more detail later in this chapter.

Similar areas are collected because of similar arising opportunities, and war is one of them. Research expeditions are another very relevant opportunity for collecting similar remains. Following the excavations of Reiss and Stübel, other German and French scientists were eager to discover the tombs at Ancón. Many years later, in 1965-1967, young museums like the Naprstek in the Czech Republic looked for mummies in the same regions where other well-known expeditions like those of Bastian, Baessler and Uhle had discovered interesting materials.

The spread of what is collected is another important dataset that needs to be considered. Though the timeframes of collecting point to historically significant moments and motivations, the spread of where these remains are collected can certainly help reinforce or reject those temporary links. Not only do they convey areas of interaction for collecting, but the locations of collecting point to trade routes of objects and ideas; they speak of limitations of movement as well and, more importantly, they also show a first indication of the cultural representations that are been sought for the Andes, aided by the interactions with local scientists, and reinforced by the continuous visits to the same places that had been already proven to provide a high yield of objects.

In that sense, it is useful to organize the data presented in the previous chapter in terms of provenience. What archival data, accession book entries, and documents alike register

regarding the origin of the mummies in museum collections can differ from one museum catalog entry to the other. The most commonly used descriptors are a country of origin, an archaeological site or dig, or the name of the nearest town or region known at the time of collecting.


There are many challenges with the interpretation of the locations and point of origin that have been recorded in the available documents, as has been described in chapter 2. Because of the unclear descriptions in the documents, and the time that has passed since the objects were collected, sometimes it is easy to misconstrue the name of a town for that of a later formed county, or renamed region. It is also very easy to find several regions with similar names, and therefore one must take into account the routes traveled by the collector, the cultural descriptor of the object, or assign it to a larger area. For example, in the case of several “Santa Rosa” locations given as a point of origin, the larger region of Lima is used.

In order to avoid mischaracterization of the documentation, the author initially focused exclusively on countries of origin and not on specific regions within those countries. The summary of that information, as found in the documentary information available at each museum, is presented in the graph below.

As can be seen, more than half of the mummies of all the collections are described as coming from Peru. The second largest provenience is Chile but far behind Peru. In third place we find Argentina, followed closely by Bolivia, and at the very last place Colombia.

The prevalence of Peruvian objects in museum collections from the Andes is not a surprise. Since the 17th century, the fascination with the Inca culture had been a constant feature in Europe (Gänger, 2013). It is no wonder then that the objects a museum would be more eager to possess would be those from Peru, land of the Inca Empire. As archaeology developed as a scientific practice, the importance of mummification, textile production, and ceramic decorations of other earlier Andean cultures became increasingly sought after, but not before highlighting Peru and its Pacific coast as a region of intense archaeological and anthropological interest.

Graph 6: Ascribed Countries of Origin for the Mummies in the Collections Part of this Research. Only those countries, or country regions mentioned directly, have been taken into account.



There are two other points to be made regarding the distribution of provenances in the graph above. The first is that the number of remains without an ascribed provenience are far higher than those of Argentina, Bolivia, and Colombia combined. This is not entirely surprising, given the amount of donations from private collectors who had acquired the mummies without first-hand knowledge of their origin. A second important reason may be the prevalence of collecting of looted objects. In those cases, the remains can be purposefully sold or gifted without stating a provenance either because it is unknown, or because it is in the best interest of the collector that it remains unknown.

The second is that, through the nineteenth century, the redrawing of borders between Peru, Bolivia and Chile may have altered the way mummies were described and introduced to museum collections. There is a marked difference in terms of origin for the remains collected in the regions of Arica, Tacna and Antofagasta before and after the War of the Pacific, and that should be noted.

Sillar has presented very clear examples of those shifts in the information available for the Pitt Rivers collections. After the examination of the collections from the Andes, Sillar makes the following description, which summarized the problems quite clearly: *“The PRM holds c.3,345 artifacts that are recorded as having been collected from mortuary contexts at two locations in the western coastal area of Peru: Ancón, Peru, and Arica, Chile. In the 1870s Arica was part of Peru, but Chile gained control of the area during the ‘War of the Pacific’, and has the area has remained part of Chile since the Treaty of Ancón in 1883. Since the Treaty is later than the date at which many of these objects were collected, objects from this Arica are often recorded in the Museum documentation as from Peru. This territorial change, the similarity of the two place-names, and the complex processes through which the collection has formed have combined to create considerable confusion in the documentation of these collections. The site names are mixed up on a number of occasions, and the attribution, in the following description, of objects to one site or another must therefore be uncertain at present.”*

(Sillar and Hicks in Hicks & Stevenson, 2013:359).


The Necropolis of Ancón had already been extensively looted since its accidental discovery in 1870s while building a train route to Pasamayo (Chancay District, Peru). After Reiss and Stübel’s visit to the site in 1874-1875, the mummies from Ancon had become famous and were sought after by opportunistic collectors, such as military men during the War of the Pacific.⁵⁷ The same can be said for those found in Arica, hence confusion in their descriptions is not uncommon. On table 20, the locations where mummies were collected in Peru and Chile, before and after the conflict, are described:

⁵⁷As was described earlier in the case of William Allyson Dyke Acland, and also in the case of Hutchinson, which are further elaborated later in this chapter.

What can be seen is that for Chile, the region won after the dispute during the War of the Pacific is also the most quoted provenience for Chilean mummies.⁵⁸ In the case of Peru, the areas of collecting are far broader, reaching to Moyabamba in the northeast, and Chimbote on the coast.

Looking at the data on a map paints an even clearer picture. It demonstrates first the general areas in their modern distribution, and secondly the areas where the War of the Pacific took place:

Map 1: Places mentioned in documental information as provenience for mummies in Peru and Chile. Green has been used for those in Peru, blue for Chile. The map signals the position of the places according to modern territorial borders.



Not only did the border lines get redrawn, but the country of origin of the remains had to be shifted accordingly. It is also interesting to see how modern separations in science lead to different perspectives and understandings of mummification practices across the borders. This is something that will be discussed in chapter 7. Stephanie Gänger has argued that these border changes had a profound effect on archaeological sciences in Chile. She contends that:

⁵⁸ Specific numbers for each provenience are further detailed on chapters 6 and 7.

Table 20: List of locations mentioned in documental sources. The two columns on the right indicate the countries the locations belonged to before and after the War of the Pacific.

Place	Before War of the Pacific	After War of the Pacific
Ancon	Peru	Peru
Antofagasta	Bolivia	Chile
Arequipa	Peru	Peru
Arica	Peru	Chile
Atacama	Bolivia	Chile
Ayacucho	Peru	Peru
Azapa	Peru	Chile
Barranca	Peru	Peru
Cerro Colorado	Peru	Peru
Chancay	Peru	Peru
Chavin	Peru	Peru
Chimbote	Peru	Peru
Chincha Alta	Peru	Peru
Chiu Chiu	Bolivia	Chile
Chosica	Peru	Peru
Chuquitanta	Peru	Peru
Collique	Peru	Peru
Concon	Chile	Chile
Cuzco	Peru	Peru
Encalada	Peru	Peru
Ica	Peru	Peru
Infantas	Peru	Peru
Iquique	Peru	Chile
Lurin	Peru	Peru
Magdalena	Peru	Peru
Moyabamba	Peru	Peru
Nazca	Peru	Peru
Ocucaje	Peru	Peru
Pachacamac	Peru	Peru
Parinacota	Peru	Chile
Sta Rosa	Peru	Peru
Tarapaca	Peru	Chile

“both the incorporation of archaeological remains and the appropriation of Peruvian archaeology helped insert Chile into international scientific debates, and that this effect was, if not intended, at least conducive to the priorities of the emerging nation-state”
(Gänger, 2009:691).

This acceptance of archaeology as a pillar on which to rely on for the creation of a national identity is not uniquely Latin American (Carter, Vilches, & Santoro, 2017).


In a similar way, the effects of the World Wars of the twentieth century were also relevant in regards to the information and association of objects that were lost because of the changes in storage movements and ceasing of collecting under German, Russian or allied control.

Conflicts and wars during the nineteenth century had a definitive impact on the collections held today in European museums. twentieth century wars also played a role in the confusion of contexts, remains and associated artifacts. Construction projects for different institutions were halted during the First World War, such as that of the National Ethnology Museum in Berlin (today SMB). In that case, all the collections and exhibits had to be put into storage in different locations at the start of the war, and later moved again to their permanent locations. This scenario was repeated to worse results with the start of the Second World War. Collections are once again moved to far off locations and were separated around Berlin and outside of the city. The Allies confiscated these collections once the War came to an end, and some of them were never recovered. Much documentation was lost, and though around fifty-five thousand objects were brought back together after the reunification of Berlin, there are still some unaccounted items. The collections of the ethnology museum, for example, were only reunited in 1990 when modernization of the museum complex where they were held was possible (Nicholas, 1994).

Continuing with the examination of the location indicators in these collections, a less used category is that of cultural affiliation. Similar issues to the ones highlighted for location can be identified for the descriptions in this category. The definitions of cultural borders have changed according to new developments in archaeology, so what was originally described as a particular culture in one region may have changed in regards to current cultural descriptions.

From the review of the data, it is evident that of the 237 individuals, only thirty-two have a culture descriptor associated with them. In contrast, 193 mummies do not have information on that regard in the databases. When comparing the number of mummies identified with a location – 161 entries – it is evident that this descriptor is by far the least common.

Map 2: Area directly influenced by border changes after the War of the Pacific. Red highlights the areas, today part of Chile, which were once territories of Peru and Bolivia. It is noticeable that during this conflict, Bolivia lost its coastal access.



**Red highlights the areas, today part of Chile, which were once territories of Peru and Bolivia. It is noticeable that during this conflict, Bolivia lost its coastal access.*

One of the reasons may be that there were very few organized archaeological studies for the Andean past at the time of collecting, and therefore, it was even less readily available for collectors who were not actively involved/engaged with the intellectual circles of the moment. Outside of Uhle's systematic work in Pachacamac and his recognition of what would be called "chronological horizons," there are very few published and discussed chronologies of Peru or the Andean coast in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Ramón Joffré, 2005). Table 21 shows the cultures mentioned in the documents for the mummies in this research.

Of those shown in the table above, five are actually not an archaeological or cultural classification but rather a association. Sites such as Ancón and Pachacamac were used as cultural markers at the time, perhaps because the identification of the cultures that occupied the sites would not happen until several decades later.

Table 21: Cultures ascribed to mummies in the documentation. Only 32/225 have a cultural tag. Of the descriptors used 5/13 are references to a geographical location rather than to an archaeological culture recognized today.

Culture in Documents	Recognized archaeologically today
Ancon	no
Arica	no
Atacameña	no
Chinchorro	yes
Chancay	yes
Inca	yes
Chimu	yes
Chiu-chiu	no
Ichma	yes
Pachacamac	no
Paracas	yes
Tihuanaco	yes
Wari	yes

**Only 32/225 have a cultural tag. Of the descriptors used 5/13 are references to a location rather than to an archaeological culture recognized today*

It is interesting to note as well that, from the cultural descriptions used for the thirty-two individuals, eighteen are ascribed to Inca or Chancay/Inca. This second description includes a temporal perception of transition between the Chancay and Inca traditions, but this comes from a later archaeological understanding of the materials. In fact, this notion was beginning to take form by the date of collection of the materials, which is noted as 1906.

In this first discussion the why, where and when of the collecting of mummies in the Andes has been explored. This exercise has permitted to show how the scope of collecting of Andean mummies was being reflected on each museum that was researched for this thesis. By comparing them, it is possible to illustrate how the numbers regarding where and when mummies were collected pointed to political, economic and cultural moments that either helped or hindered collecting transactions .

The second level of discussion concerns the objects themselves. The available information regarding what was collected is limited if only the documentary information is taken into account. Very little information regarding the state of remains, other than bundled or unbundled, partial or complete, is available in the documentation. Sometimes, remains would arrive to a collection bundled and complete, only to be manipulated, unbundled and separated later.

Unbundling of remains became an important and integral part of mummy collecting in the late-nineteenth century up to the mid twentieth century. After collecting the

remains, if the mummy was included within a funerary bundle, there was a museum and public interest in unveiling its contents. Unbundling ceremonies were held in European and American institutions alike, and the reasons for the unbundling varied from scientific interest to attracting audiences to a museum exhibit. Mummies would be completely or partially unbundled, with the removal of wrappings in sections of the body or entirely, and more often than not, the textiles separated from the remains would be stored in different areas of the collection (Wolfe & Singerman, 2012).

In Peru, Julio Cesar Tello started the unbundling tradition for some of the mummies he excavated, and the mantle would be picked up by his student Rebecca Carrion Cachot, who photographed and filmed the process of unbundling for further recording in the 1950s.

Image 5: Rebeca Carrión Cachot in One of the Open Public Mummy Unbundlings. Lima 1951. Taken from an educational video at the Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Antropología e Historia del Perú, Pueblo Libre, Lima.



Similarly, Dr. Jimenez Borja would continue to unbundle mummies from Puruchuco and other late discovery sites in Peru well into the twentieth century. Using diplomatic ties, and with the backing of the Peruvian government, Dr. Jimenez Borja would travel the world in the 1980s unbundling mummies to the delight of his audiences⁵⁹.

The initial period of physical anthropology is marked not by the collection of complete or mummified remains, but rather of skeletal parts of the individual, mainly the skull and mandible. This emphasis on collecting is detrimental and contrary to the preservation of mummified remains, both at their time of collection and at the time of their integration into museums. This trend has had a significant impact on North American collections, where anthropologists such as Ales Hrdlická would systematically collect exclusively de-

⁵⁹Though the work and shows put on by Dr. Jimenez Borja are outside of the dates that concern this research, it is interesting to note how a tradition of unbundling was so popular and sanctioned by the Peruvian government, even by the late twentieth century. Further reading on the subject can be found in the article by Villacorta (Villacorta Ostolaza, 2009).

fleshed or skeletonized remains within the Smithsonian Institution. For him, mummies were of little interest since they could not be measured and probed according to the delicate methods of physical anthropology (Hrdlička, 1930).

In Europe, a mixture of skeletal and mummified remains continued to be of interest because of the overlap between ethnography, anthropology and archaeology in museums of the time. Such an example is the Trocadéro, where remains are stored and exhibited according to these themes, but are equally relevant to each of them.

Another important consideration to make when addressing questions of what is collected is transportation. Mummified remains are not like ceramics, textiles or even skeletal human remains in that they can suffer great changes if not kept in appropriate conditions. Further decomposition of the remains is unlikely, but the tissue may attract fungi, termites or other insect and rodent activity. All transport between the Americas and Europe was conducted across the sea. Ships would take between 1-4 months to arrive at their port of destination, but between the place of collection and the port, as well as from the port to the museum, the remains also needed to be transported safely.

Sometimes, measures for safekeeping and preventing further decomposition of the remains would be taken. The application of resins or coatings like those used for biological specimens has been cited as one of those measures in the literature (Carminati, Bergerok, & Gill-Frerking, 2014). Other times however, it was better to dispose of the remains mid-travel, as is told in the following anecdote told by the naval doctor Liautaud in 1843, when transporting mummies back to Europe (Riviale 1996: 236):

“Several of my colleagues have tried to send some of these Peruvian mummies to France many times, but despite the most careful precautions, they were never able to escape from the humidity of the atmosphere inside the ship, this enters the soft tissues quickly and turns them into a kind of liquid mass, decomposing, without form. Nobody I know has been successful so far, and my efforts have not been more successful. My specimens could not withstand the excessive humidity in the lower decks of the Danaide. The health of the crew entrusted to my care forced me to abandon almost all the anatomical specimens, keeping only the skulls and those only after having cleaned them thoroughly.”⁶⁰

Another description of the transport issues can be found in the writings of Thomas Hutchinsonson. When referring to an urn he had excavated in Peru during his service as a diplomat in the second half of the century and later tried to ship back to the Pitt Rivers, Hutchinsonson says:

“In another place, and at a depth of about four feet from where the hard digging begun, where a foot or eighteen inches of soft sand had to be shoveled off, the diggers came to three diminutive crocks or urns that were broken by the spade before we perceived they

60 In French originally, translation by the author of this dissertation.

contained bones and cloth. This made us more cautious with a large urn, which after nearly half an hour's delicate manipulation was exhumed, and found to contain the body of a full-grown man or woman disarticulated, the skull being placed uppermost, and part of the ashes in the urn being as of burned cloth. The urn was not more than two feet high, although with mouth large enough to admit a skull. In sending it home to Dr. Barnard Davis I unfortunately packed it with sawdust in a large case together with other pottery; and coming as it did by one of the Pacific steamers to Liverpool, it was smashed into pieces before reaching its destination"
(Hutchinson, 1873:2).

Because of this complicated process and the need to keep the remains as intact as possible, many mummies are introduced into museums without further demographic characterizations, other than emphasizing if the remains are adult or young. When available, many of the demographic descriptions of the remains – woman, female, child – are erroneous⁶¹ and in some cases have complicated their identification in storage rooms. The following description of six out of the fourteen Andean mummies in the Pitt Rivers collection, summarized by Sillar, offers a good glimpse of the differences in information in terms of demographic characterizations that are available in the documentary sources:

"Apart from the grave goods, the mummified human remains recorded as from Arica comprise three mummified heads from Arica (1887.1.61, 1887.33.23), one of which is listed as from the collection of Canon William Greenwell (1887.33.23). Recorded as from Ancón are two mummified human bodies – of a child (Mummy III, 1886.2.19) and a new-born baby (Mummy IV, 1886.2.18) – as well as the head of Mummy I (1886.33.22) and a specimen of mummified human hair and skin (1884.2.71). Mummy IV is described as a new-born child, and said to be child of Mummy II which was unwrapped in Peru"
(Sillar and Hicks in Hicks and Stevenson 2013: 361).

Partially mummified remains are seldom described in demographic terms, while full-body mummies, if associated with juveniles or babies, would almost always be classified as female. This subject is further addressed in chapters 6 and 7, but it is important to mention here precisely because of this lack of information from documents. The concerns when collecting mummies were by then not necessarily anthropological (physical anthropology), but rather ethnographical (related to mortuary rituals, etc.).

⁶¹As is presented in chapter 6, many assumptions regarding the sex of the remains are done not on the basis of osteological examination but rather of gendered activities such as textile work or fishing which are related to the remains in some way. In the case of age determination, big bundles are always thought to contain adult remains, while in reality many large sized bundles contain a child with a lot of associated wrappings or objects, which make it seem heavier and larger.

5.4 The Actors of Collecting

As important as the descriptions made of where and when mummies were found in the Andes are, the collectors, donors and sellers of these remains offer a different insight into the collections in this research. The information available in documents and archives comes precisely from what those sellers and collectors have deemed appropriate to convey to the museum. In that sense, the direct interlocutors for the mummies are their collectors. Therefore, the relevance of understanding who collected the remains in museum collections has to do with the veracity and validity of the information provided.

While reviewing the data presented in chapter 4, it became evident that there were at least three very well defined groups of collectors, which provided not necessarily different types of information on the mummies, but rather more or less nuanced recordings of said information. A general way to describe these actors is calling them nineteenth-century travelers. Though the collectors of mummies are indeed travelers from Europe to the Americas, lumping them all together under the same category takes away the complexity of their travels.

For this dissertation, a traveler is someone who makes long journeys often, or who moves around from place to place instead of living in one place for a long time. However, this definition is not applicable to many of the donors of mummies, who had permanent positions abroad rather than traveling occupations. Similarly, a particular definition of traveler applied to the nineteenth century is that of a person or people that are known for their travels or explorations (Gerassi-Navarro, 2017). Yet, there are many collectors and donors registered in the archives that are little-known or could not be traced.

In that respect, nineteenth century travelers are, a very heterogeneous group. What this research shows is that, within that diversity, three smaller descriptors for collectors are well suited. Those are scientific/ethnographical collectors, diplomat/military collectors, and private collectors. Each one of these divisions holds in its midst a range of collectors with varying degrees of enthusiasm towards the collected, in this case mummies. What needs to be understood is that the occupation of the collector provided him⁶² with particular opportunities to collect, be they while passing through a site, sailing near earthquake revealed necropolis, or heading out on exploration expeditions designed mainly for the entertainment of diplomats (Hutchinson, 1873).

An illustrative example is that of Thomas Hutchinson, who served as consul, medical practitioner and merchant during his career for the British Government. From 1858 to 1857 he became a member of several intellectual associations such as the Royal Geographical Society, the Ethnological Society, the Royal Society of Literature and the Anthro-

⁶²The sphere of collecting, as of traveling in the nineteenth century, is almost exclusively dominated by men. Though women were indeed present in these travels, their role was more often than not that of companionship for their husbands, and over time they have been made invisible in the documentary record. For further discussion on this topic as well as stories of women travelers in the Americas, see Gerassi-Navarro (2017), Hahner (1998).

pological Society. He was appointed in 1861 to Buenos Aires as a consul, where he was also an agent for Lloyds. He was similarly engaged in Uruguay from 1864 to 1865 and would later be reassigned (after a short transfer back to England) to the consulate in Callao in 1871. His daily activities centered on controlling the shipments of English products from Peru, but he took advantage of his position to dedicate time to explore the nearby necropolis and to collect remains from those sites. Some accounts of these activities were published in his book *Two Years in Peru, with Exploration of its Antiquities* (1873).

One of the most interesting descriptions regarding how he viewed his collecting activities can be found in the previously mentioned publication, where he refers to a donation to the Pitt Rivers as follows:

"I am almost afraid that the number of skulls which-originally intended for the museum of your Institute-I have been able to remit from Peru during the last and previous year, may lead you to expect a more perfect report upon them than it is in my power to give. In fact, I feel myself obliged to premise by the plea, although it is a purely personal one, that my visits to ancient Peruvian burial grounds were almost invariably made when I had to be absent from my post for the benefit of my health in seeking change of air"
(Hutchinson 1873: 64–5).

Similarly, Hutchinson would dedicate time to describe his first impressions of the area of Arica by recalling having heard that, as a consequence of the 1868 earthquake "not far from the city of a number of bodies, which were in the squatting position that I have- already described. They were covered, as usual, with cloth" (Hutchinson 1873: 64–5). Some of his explorations were conducted in conjunction with another English appointee, Mr. Bracy R. Wilson, the vice-consul in Callao, who he mentions as having gifted to him some archaeological cuttlefish eyes from Arica, which he later donated to the Pitt Rivers Museum.

Taking into account the areas from which collectors are coming allows for a better understanding of the narratives they are conveying to the museum when donating the mummies. For example, the scientists who were sent to the Americas specifically to collect on behalf of the museum may be more interested in retaining the quality of the remains they are bringing back. The diplomats who received gifts would be more likely to elaborate on their relationship to the gift-giver, or the reason for and importance of such a gift, than describing in detail the gift itself. These narratives then become the information the museums have available to enter in their books at the moment of accession, and this is very rarely questioned.⁶³

⁶³ As is described later on the case of the Charles Wiener collection, which is one of the few collections commented on or criticized a few years after it was delivered to a museum. See Gänger (2014:126) (2014b), Rivale (2015).


Evidently, given the state of archaeological research for the Andes during the nineteenth century, much of the conveyed information needs to be revisited today with fresh eyes, and that will be done in the next chapter. However, the information as retold by the collectors at the moment of making their donations is still very valuable, as it points to sites and circumstances that could not otherwise be known.

The veracity of their claims and the authenticity of the information provided along with the mummies should still be taken with healthy skepticism, more so in the case of private sellers or sponsored scientific collectors, as their bending of the truth may have served their economic intentions – and we are not privy to those through documentary evidence. The filters that need to be applied to that information and the reasons why have been explored in chapter 3, so they are not repeated here. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that the information given, even when inaccurate, serves to understand to some degree the circumstances and possible motivations that led to the collecting of these mummified remains.

Against this background, the review of the data available on collectors shows an interesting distribution of the three groups mentioned above. As can be seen in the graph below, the majority of mummies in European museums were collected by scientific or ethnographic expeditions during the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries.

This is in agreement with what has been stated earlier in this chapter: the sponsorship of research expeditions both for naturalist and ethnographic purposes was a great concern of museums in the three biggest collecting countries of this research’s scope: Germany, France, and England. The top three countries are followed closely by Spain, through the *Expedición del Pacífico*, which also gathered a significant number of mummies. The available funds to collect and the incentives to do so for travelers who came from a scientific background was definitely an important factor.

Graph 7: Percentile Distribution of Collectors According to Type: Scientific, Diplomatic, Private and Unknown Categories.



An interesting result from the data examination is the high percentage of mummies that were donated by diplomats or military personnel. Though the importance of military expeditions for collecting has been mentioned elsewhere (Riviale 260 y Bleichmar; Wolfe y Singerman; Maoney 2012: 190; Ganger 2014), it is interesting to note the overlap between military personnel and diplomatic appointees during the nineteenth century in the Andes.

As has been stated previously, the process of independence meant that new links had to be strengthened between America and Europe. The creation of consulates was one of the ways these links were maintained. Appointees to those public offices were often prominent military members, retired or on active duty in the area. The functions of a consular appointee varied according to the need of the consulate at a particular time, from commerce and immigration support, to military advice.

Commonly recognized functions of the consulate were those of protection of commerce and sailing; assistance to mariners and residents of their nation in a foreign land; some notarial duties such as passport issuance, document legalization, issuance of certificates of citizenship, and documents of inheritance or succession; overseeing the fulfillment of commerce and sailing treaties; and the communication of the social, political and economic state of the country where they resided (Nieto Camacho, 2006). The appointment of military background consuls would serve all these purposes, especially if a territorial dispute was in process, such as those cited earlier in this chapter during the War of the Triple Alliance and the War of the Pacific.

Diplomatic and government jobs in a foreign land offered –and still do– a variety of benefits. In regards to the control and oversight of maritime travel and commerce, for example, one of those benefits is the possibility to send larger shipments of objects without the concerns of space or money. That possibility may have implied that collectors with diplomatic ties need not worry about their shipments back to Europe the same way researchers or regular travelers would have. Another benefit is the opportunity to examine other collections passing through to Europe, and making contact with the senders or those accompanying the collections. The links formed between countrymen in foreign lands, especially if those involve celebrated figures of scientific notoriety, are not to be discounted. Examples of such relationships have been reported, for example, during the research expeditions of Reiss and Stübel, as well as those of Edward Seler and Adolf Bastian.

The prospect of moving in local intellectual circles, which in nineteenth century America were more often than not connected to high-status individuals in politics, is also an added benefit of diplomatic life. As is exemplified by private expeditions for collecting organized for the likes of Robert Bunch and William Turner in Colombia (Arroyo, 1990), moving in local circles concerned with the collecting of national pasts allowed European diplomats to simultaneously collect those same objects.

When it comes to private collecting, the scene is quite different. In comparison, private collectors and independent travelers would have had more limited access to the

opportunities of organized collecting than both scientific explorers and diplomatic or military appointees. In fact, the private sphere of collecting in the Andes is mostly known in relation to the local trading of antiquities or as part of auction houses and antiquities shops in Europe.

In the first instance, this information is made available through the relationships between merchants with the antiquarian societies or local collectors (as is the case with Wilhelm Gretzer), or because the selling of objects had been noted as an activity to supplement income, especially in sites such as Ancón, Pachacamac and Lima, (Diemel & Dohrmann, 1999). What is known about who private collectors were or how they came to collect Andean antiquities is, in that sense, gathered only through the reflection of the objects they sold or donated.

Through the documentary sources, many private donors are recorded with initials or incomplete names. Some of them, even when mentioned fully, have proven to be very hard to locate in documents at the museums or associated institutions, and a dedicated search for each one of them would be outside of the scope of this research.⁶⁴

With the amount of pre-Columbian material available at the end of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth century, the private collecting of Andean mummies and human remains needs to be seen as a deliberate choice. In that sense, the author proposes that the private mummy collector must have had an interest in human remains in general (anthropological inclinations), and a desire to understand mortuary practices (ethnology interest). The transport limitations, which, as mentioned earlier, are quite disheartening in terms of preservation, coupled with the unusual possibility of exhibiting a mummy in a private setting, would also point to a definite inclination towards the subjects mentioned above.

Enthusiasm for the macabre should not be discounted. Freak shows and theatrical staging of mummy viewing was not an uncommon practice during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Examples such as these can be found for Egyptian mummies (Sullivan, 2015:17; Wolfe & Singerman, 2012), and with Latin American peoples (Earle, 2007; Miles, 1974; Tromp, 2007). There is no particular example of exhibiting Andean mummies, outside of the unbundling parties organized by individual museums—like in the case of the Pitt Rivers mentioned in Chapter 4— or government linked individuals, such as the aforementioned Dr. Jimenez Borja.

The private seller, on the other hand, would just have had to have an accurate estimation of the market openness for these types of remains. Though museums in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century may have been interested in buying these remains in order to complete their collections, the advent of restrictions on importing


⁶⁴This downside to the availability of data on private collectors was noted in chapter 3. For more details on the methods used to research private collectors and the limitations of those methods, refer to said chapter.

heritage from the Americas, introduced by the mid twentieth century, certainly must have had an impact on the retail price of mummies, as well as the concerns with keeping such objects as part of an antiquarian's inventory.

It is not a surprise then that some sellers of antiquities are present in more than one collection. Such is the case with Louis (Luis) Sokolowski, who made sales to both Vienna and Berlin, selling four individuals to the first and one to the second.

As has been shown from the analysis of the dates and places of the collecting of the Andean mummies in this research, there are particular sites and moments when these remains are most often collected. There is also a direct link between those two circumstances and the countries or museums involved in the practice of collecting, not only mummies but also antiquities in general. It follows then that there is a correspondence between the type of collector most prominent in a collection, and the data already presented above.


Image 11: Letters sent with a parcel of mummies to the Weltmuseum in Vienna by Private Collector L. Sokolowski.



A quick statistical analysis of the proportion of each type of collector group per museum varies very little: countries with more money available to fund scientific collections have larger contributions to their museums from those sources (here Germany is the most representative). The same can be said of countries with political or economic interests in the Andes in terms of donations or gifts to military and diplomatic personnel

(here England is the most representative). As is seen in the comparative graphs below, collections at the British Museum are collected primarily by both scientific and diplomatic endeavors at 38%. At the Quai Branly, the majority of collections come from the scientific pursuits of Charles Wiener, in particular, and other ethnologists, which add up to 59% of the total collections. The divide between scientific and non-scientific collecting is purely present at the Berlin museum collection where an impressive 76% of mummies collected come from state-sponsored ventures like those of Gretzer, Baessler and Uhle.

Graph 8: Distribution in percentiles of the type of collector in three museums: British Museum, Quai Branly and Ethnology Museum Berlin.



As made evident from the graphs above, collectors are also directly linked to the temporal and geographic circumstances detailed earlier in this chapter.

5.5 Routes Traveled

How these collectors moved and finally donated the remains they had collected is also a point of interest. In that regard, one of the important concerns of this research is to try and detangle, from the places where mummies were collected to their ports of arrival, if there were particular routes, areas or transports that these mummies were taken through on their way to Europe. In that sense, the possibility of mapping the journeys of these Andean remains from their origin sites to Europe can be explored. Mummies themselves, as

well as antiquities, were not traveling or moving in particular circles or specialized vessels from America to Europe. Rather they, as all other freight, would follow the same routes as other imports.

Antiquities from the Americas traveled between high traffic ports for people and goods. In the Pacific coast, those ports included Guayaquil in Ecuador, Callao (Lima) in Peru, Arica in Peru and later in Chile, Valparaiso in Chile, Buenos Aires in Argentina, and to a lesser degree Montevideo in Uruguay. Much has been written about the importance of each port in the history of commerce between South America, North America, Europe and Asia (Conde et al., 1977). The geographic proximity of some of these ports to areas of known extensive exploitation of antiquities, both through organized scientific activities or looting, is something to note.

In the case of Callao, the entire modern Lima district is surrounded by and includes many notable *Huacas* and necropolis. Almost all of them were looted and excavated in the dates on which this research concentrates, namely during 1830 to 1890. Ancón and Pachacamac are important examples. A similar case is that of the port of Arica. Famous and extremely active because of its closeness to sources of guano mining, Arica started to be looted early on, and it is linked to mummy finds, some of them found inside the guano (Hutchinson, 1873).

The ports in the Pacific connect both to Panama and Buenos Aires in order to access the Atlantic. For these case studies, both routes are of importance. Panama became a gateway to the East Coast of North America, which even in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is already a required stopover for European scientists (as an example see Humboldt's travels in North America).

The port of Buenos Aires was used for inland commerce. Antiquities travel through land, even today, from Peru, through Bolivia and Chile, to the Argentinian port (Coggins, 1969). During the nineteenth century, many travelers would use the same route to traverse the Andes, and would ship out of Buenos Aires back to Europe (Farro & Tomo, 2008). In that regard, though no mummy collecting sites are found in Argentina, the country and its port become a pathway for the trading of Andean mummies, to the point where they have been noted as a point of origin (see the RMV collection in chapter 4 for an example).⁶⁵

The transport of the antiquities within Europe is not the subject of this research, but it is useful to mention that, at least for those collections coming from diplomatic and scientific expeditions, there are no instances in the documents in which issues with said transport have been reported. The mummies arrived at the museums in original cases, sometimes still surrounded by local newspapers or other materials used to soften the box-

⁶⁵The Rio de la Plata and Buenos Aires were extensively used in the colonial period for the commerce between the Andes and Africa/Europe. Portuguese slave traders used this route, for instance, but the transportation of silver also went this way (Borucki, 2011).

es in which they traveled, and which allow us today a little glimpse of a particular historical moment.

Image 12: Original packaging of a mummy sent from Chile to the Weltmuseum in Vienna



*Notice the paper in Spanish as well as the reeds in cardboard used for packaging.

5.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter has looked at historical data in an attempt to find connections between museum collections as well as with the mummies in those collections. The historical narratives and circumstances visible through those connections show that there is perhaps an unconscious connection between the experiences of all these collectors, and in consequence between the collections made for each museum. Connecting with the idea of a heterotopias facilitates the possibility of understanding this double nature of the mummy collections. These connections are unconscious as they are formed from temporal coincidences more than from a deliberate intent to connect and collect similarly, but they are nevertheless conducive to the same results.

In the following chapters, the task is to counterpose these narratives to the current, or rather modern, understanding of Andean archaeology. The identification, classification, and understanding of funerary traditions in the region have changed dramatically since the nineteenth century. Much as the techniques to identify and describe mummified human remains have changed, so have the biographies of the mummies stored in museums. However, in the case of the national European museums that are part of this research, the information available about these remains has not always kept up with the

times.

On the subsequent pages, the aim is to reanalyze the mummies in these museum collections in light of contemporary archaeology. This is done in order to see how historical and modern perceptions of the same object have changed, or have not. In doing so, the chapter also looks at the histories of these mummies within the collections, their roles, uses, and ultimately the story of their storage.

