



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Nubia and Nubians: The 'Museumization' of a Culture**

Simone, M.C. de

### **Citation**

Simone, M. C. de. (2014, February 12). *Nubia and Nubians: The 'Museumization' of a Culture*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/23598>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/23598>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/23598> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

**Author:** De Simone, Maria Costanza

**Title:** Nubia and Nubians : the 'museumization' of a culture

**Issue Date:** 2014-02-12

## CHAPTER 4

### Nubia in Museums : Dynamics of Circulation of the Objects and Research Methodology

#### *Dynamics of Dispersion of Nubian Collections*

Before presenting the comparative analysis of museum policies of to display or ‘not display’ Nubian collections and the ‘virtual tour’ of Nubia in museums on which I have based this analysis, I think it would be a good idea to make an outline of the main dynamics of dispersion of Nubian artifacts in the world. More detailed information on this topic will be presented in Chapters 6 and 7, in the sections assigned for each museum. The story of how an object arrives in a museum is part of the history of the object itself. Curators are increasingly aware of the importance of this secondary meaning and how these meanings add to our understanding of the evolution of interest in such collections and Nubian culture itself through the dynamics of its display.

In the Egyptian part of the Nile Valley, the looting of monuments had already begun at the dawn of the Pharaonic period. The story of trials and sentences for robbery in the Pharaonic era is recounted in a number of papyri.<sup>211</sup> The conviction that magnificent treasures were hidden in the temples and that tombs were rich in burial furniture seems to have been transmitted orally from generation to generation in Egypt. An Arabic book of magic, of which numerous examples are known, entitled *Book of Precious Gems Buried and Mystery Concerning the Indications of Caches of Artifacts and Treasures*, provides a clear list of places where treasures could be found. It even supplies magical rituals to perform to take possession of them. The searchers for hidden treasures did not hesitate to destroy walls and sledge stelae that they believed were hiding access to the cache.<sup>212</sup>

A more ‘official’ method was used by Persian kings and later by Roman and Byzantine emperors, who claimed possession of obelisks, sphinxes and statues in their Egyptian provinces intending to use them to embellish their capitals, Persepolis, Rome and Constantinople, or even their private villas, such as those of Diocletian and Adrianus.

In the fourth century, Christianity became the official religion of Egypt and with the arrival of Islam the orthodox religious atmosphere increased. Between the first and fourteenth centuries, religious orthodoxy led to the persecution of all that belonged to the pagan past. This often resulted in a *damnatio memoriae* which caused the destruction of many ancient monuments. The Nile Valley became difficult to reach and only those travelers whose destination was the holy cities of the Middle East, would stop for a few days in Cairo. In AD 391 the Emperor Theodosius I ordered the closure of all pagan temples in the Empire.

For centuries the area remained isolated, but the seventeenth century marked the resumption of long trips that preceded the rediscovery of Egypt by Napoleon Bonaparte’s expedition. The great exodus of works of art and artifacts abroad, in particular to Europe, began in

---

<sup>211</sup> An important document that helps to understand the importance of burial and the afterlife in Ancient Egypt as well as the practice of crime and punishment in Egypt under the 20th Dynasty, is represented by the Amherst Papyrus, also known as the Leopold II and Amherst Papyrus. This document is part of the original court records dealing with the tomb robberies under Ramses IX. It contains the confessions of eight men who had broken into the tomb of Sobekemsaf I and a description of the reconstruction of the crime. It throws light on the practices followed in ancient Egyptian courts: eliciting confessions by beating with a double rod, smiting their feet and hands, reconstructing the crime on site and the imprisonment of suspects in the gatehouse of a temple (Peet, 1977:45).

<sup>212</sup> Copies of this text were still in circulation in the early twentieth century. A curator of the Egyptian Museum in Cairo in 1900 stated that ‘This book has ruined monuments more than war and centuries’ (Vercoutter, 1992).

the early nineteenth century and involved several areas. The Nile Valley was one of the principal ones. If Napoleon's expedition to Egypt was a failure from the military point of view, it was successful from the point of view of expanding academic knowledge. Part of the expeditionary force consisted of two special committees of experts assigned to measure and sketch the main monuments of the country. This work was completed on Napoleon's orders between 1808 and 1822. With the famous Franco-Tuscan joint expedition to Egypt and Nubia (1828-1829) directed by Jean François Champollion for the Government of Charles X and for the Grand Duke of Tuscany by Ippolito Rosellini, archeology in Egypt, in the modern sense of the word, began. For fifteen months the expedition explored Egypt and Nubia up to the Second Cataract. Their publication *Travels in Egypt and Nubia* is considered to be the first scientific publication in archeology.<sup>213</sup>

The Napoleon expedition and the publication of *La Description de l'Égypte* greatly excited the imagination of the Western elite who, eager to get a closer view of this exotic world, began to travel along the banks of the Nile.<sup>214</sup> One feature of these trips was the acquisition by Europeans of large collections of objects to display to friends and relatives and sometimes to a wider public. It seems that mummies were the favorite trophy.<sup>215</sup> The popularity of these finds resulted in a flourishing trade in antiquities, significantly sustained by representatives of the major foreign powers in Alexandria and Cairo. The famous consuls/pseudo-archeologists of the early nineteenth century combined their diplomatic duties with their passion for archeology. Assisted by local agents recruited from among those who came to seek their fortune in the Nile Valley, they made the fortune of museums in their motherland. Having been fascinated by Egyptian art during their terms of office in Egypt, these consuls assembled large collections of antiquities which were then shipped back to the great European cities.<sup>216</sup>

It was between the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries that travel and collections became strongly linked. The western colonization of the 'Orient' was, in fact, characterized by specific forms of knowledge that was expressed in surveys, explorations, mapping and statistical reports compiled by colonial officials and civil servants.<sup>217</sup>

Although their enthusiasm cannot be doubted, it is important to remember that those who operated in the field of archeology and ethnology were not specialists, but men of the exact sciences, such as physicians or engineers. They were pioneers of the Enlightenment, of rationalism and scientific thinking. Travels, collections and museology gradually emerged as metaphors for colonial domination. The target of western colonial power was to define the nature of the past and establish priorities in the creation of a monumental record of a civilization.<sup>218</sup> Such a record of civilization, it was thought, would enhance knowledge and serve as a basis and foundation for solidifying power. On the relationship between power and knowledge, Foucault has written :

Power produces knowledge [...] power and knowledge directly imply one another; there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute [...] power relations.<sup>219</sup>

---

<sup>213</sup> Rosellini, 1932-1840.

<sup>214</sup> For a short overview of the first travelers to Nubia cf. Leclant 1991:405- 415.

<sup>215</sup> Cf. Chapter 4.

<sup>216</sup> Tiradritti, 1999:12-22.

<sup>217</sup> Said, 1979.

<sup>218</sup> Vittorini, 2004: 21-34.

<sup>219</sup> Gordon, 1980: 27.

Through a justification which seems to me both racist and paternalistic, the colonialists wanted to show the superiority of the western world over the colonized one. Their purpose was to document and preserve a once illustrious heritage, but locals lacked the ability to understand and consequently the skill to manage it.<sup>220</sup>

While in Europe international exhibitions, world fairs, and museums – as self-conscious representations of the Empire – offered the general public the opportunity to learn and visualize the vast imperial expanse and to experience a ‘tangible sense of having traveled East,’ in many parts of the colonial empires and royal societies were quickly established to provide what we would nowadays call research facilities for travelers, European residents and gentlemen of all nations.<sup>221</sup>

Another important characteristic of this time was the creation of societies of literary and scientific men and women. Their primary scope was to discuss the research findings of their members and to present, often as a gift, some of the artifacts they had discovered to some members of the society. Very soon these societies were being replicated in places in the empires as virtual trans-colonial communities of Western intellectuals and their scope extended to embrace the discussions of a variety of topics. The Laws and Regulations of the Egyptian Society of Cairo summarize its objectives as follows:

[...] to form a rendezvous for travelers, with the view of associating literary and scientific men, who may from time to time visit Egypt; to collect and record information relative to Egypt, and to those parts of Africa and Asia which are connected with, or tributaries to this country to facilitate research enabling travelers to avail themselves of such information as it may be in the power of the society to obtain, and by offering them the advance of a library of reference containing the most valuable works on the East.<sup>222</sup>

Foreign operations in Egypt were supported by the local authorities. Muhammad Ali (1769-1849), who had been appointed Viceroy of Egypt by the Ottoman sultan in Constantinople, had plans to modernize Egypt and was convinced of the need for outside assistance. He recognized the potential of the magnificent archeological heritage for attracting the attention and winning the sympathy of foreigners. He took the dramatic step of issuing *firman*s (a Persian word meaning ‘order, permit’), allowing them to have no difficulty in obtaining licenses to dig. Since these operations were still not governed by any law, the situation led to an active trade in antiquities and significant works of art left Egypt. Among the booty were complete parts of ancient buildings containing inscriptions and decorations. Nobody escaped this fever, even respectable specialists like Champollion, who, in a sense, is regarded as the father of Egyptology. He deplored this situation, but he did not hesitate to exploit it.

The situation became so acute that at a certain point if remedial measures had not been taken, it is not beyond the bounds of belief to claim that practically nothing would have remained in Egypt at all. Finally, the decision by Muhammad Ali to demolish the Pyramids of Giza and use the blocks for industrial purposes prompted French consul, Jean François Mimaut, to persuade the viceroy to issue a decree in 1835 to assure the protection of antiquities and to ban exports:

---

<sup>220</sup> Said, 1979: 233.

<sup>221</sup> Vittorini, 2004: 21-34.

<sup>222</sup> Vittorini, 2004: 21-34.

Foreigners are destroying ancient edifices, excreting stones and other worked objects and exporting them to foreign countries. If this continues, it is clear that soon no more ancient monuments will remain in Egypt [...] It is also known that the Europeans have buildings dedicated to the care of antiquities; painted and inscribed stones, and other such objects are carefully conserved there and shown to the inhabitants of the country as well as to travelers who want to see [...] Having considered these facts, the Government judged it appropriate to forbid the export abroad of antiquities found in the ancient edifices of Egypt and to designate in the capital a place to serve as a depot [...] It has decided to display them for travelers who visit the country, to forbid the destruction of ancient edifices in Upper Egypt, and to spend the greatest possible care on their safekeeping.<sup>223</sup>

Among the western travelers to the Nile Valley in the nineteenth century, few ventured beyond the First Cataract where Nubia begins. Those who did discovered some of the magnificent temples built along the banks of the Nubian Nile Valley. The famous temple of Abu Simbel was discovered in 1813 by the Swiss explorer Johann Burckhardt.<sup>224</sup>

Impressed by his descriptions, the Italian Giovanni Belzoni went to Abu Simbel in 1815. During his tour he stopped at Philae where he took possession of a small obelisk in the name of the British consul in Egypt, Mr Salt. In his work *Travels in Egypt and Nubia*, he wrote that he took away from Abu Simbel 'two lion's head hawks', small seated statues and fragments of copper doors. Despite this, he declares that he was disappointed to have taken away so little from a temple that had remained inviolate for so long.<sup>225</sup>

Upper Nubia or 'Aethiopia', as it was called by the Greeks and Romans, still remained a mystery to the 'time travelers'. It was Burckhardt, who decided in 1813 to disguise himself as an Arab and challenge the mysteries of the 'land of the unknown'. His work, published posthumously in 1819, excited the greed of the viceroy of Egypt, Muhammad Ali, who decided to expand his empire and get his hands on the vast riches of the land. His army of 4,000 men, commanded by his son Ismail Pasha, left in 1820 to conquer the Upper Nile. The imposition of taxes and the trade in slaves and other goods locally available characterized this period of the Egyptian government in Sudan.<sup>226</sup>

Simultaneously, as had happened with Napoleon's intervention in Egypt, this military occupation also marked the birth of the history of its archeology. Napoleon's army had deliberately included a team of academics to study the country, in the army of Muhammad Ali there were officers eager to be the first to discover and document the legendary cities of Napata and Meroe. One of these was the Italian physician Giuseppe Ferlini.<sup>227</sup> Between 1829 and 1835, Ferlini practiced in the Egyptian-Turkish army. During his tenure he obtained permission to conduct archeological excavations at Bragawya, the ancient Meroe, where he dismantled several pyramids in search of treasures. Fortunately (otherwise he would have dismantled all) he immediately found what he was searching for: a fabulous gold hoard in a hidden chamber near the top of one of the largest pyramids. This magnificent treasure, that had belonged to Queen Amanishaketo and was formed of assemblage collection of jewelry almost 16 pounds in weight, is unparalleled. Hiding the find from the workers who was assisting him, he was able to spirit it away. After various

---

<sup>223</sup> Decree of Muhammad Ali, 15 August 1835, quoted in Reid, 2002: 21.

<sup>224</sup> Burkhardt, 1819.

<sup>225</sup> Belzoni, 2007.

<sup>226</sup> Moorehead, 1984:139-208.

<sup>227</sup> Ferlini, 1838.

vicissitudes,<sup>228</sup> he sold it in halves to the kings of Bavaria. Only in 1992, with the fall of the Berlin Wall, would Ferlini's treasure be reunited in an exhibition at the Egyptian Museum, Berlin.<sup>229</sup>

Although the Ferlini treasure indubitably represents one of the main attraction of the German museums, it was the German Karl R. Lepsius who between 1842 and 1845, with the great expedition in Egypt and Nubia organized by the king of Prussia, give the birth not only to the scientific research on the topic in Germany and also in the Sudan.

These are just some examples, certainly the most popular, of how matters were run at the time. This mechanism, although controversial, led to the formation of many museums in the world, particularly in Europe.

The beginning of the twentieth century marks the beginning of scientific research in Nubia, but the exodus of antiquities did not stop. The systematic archeological research conducted in Lower Nubia for the construction of two dams at Aswan produced a large amount of material between 1900 and 1981. Following what is commonly referred as law fifty-fifty split of excavated objects between the missions and the country, a large amount of this material was allowed to go to foreign museums. As compensation or 'reward' for the work accomplished, Egypt sent entire Nubian temples abroad defined by Saroite Okasha, Ministry of Culture in Egypt during the Salvage Campaign, as 'new ambassadors extraordinary' (Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, USA).

The same policy was applied to the numerous excavations undertaken in Upper Nubia. The Boston Museum of Fine Arts was especially prominent in undertaking excavations in prominent locations in the first decades of the twentieth century, bringing to this American museum 'a collection of Nubian royal treasures unique in this hemisphere'.<sup>230</sup> British excavations, as will be gone into in more detail later, were among the most important sources of the circulation of antiquities around the world. Some of these archeologists like John Garstang and the British Society EES (Egypt Exploration Society, initially called Fund), were giving collections in exchange for annual subscriptions that supported their excavations. The upshot of this practice is described below by the archeologist Margaret Serpico in her discussion of Egyptian and Sudanese collections in Britain, but they can extrapolated to other collections worldwide:

Significantly, many of the ancient Egyptian and Sudanese collections in the UK hold objects from known excavations, but again the size and scope of this material is largely unknown. For just under 100 years, beginning in the latter part of the 19th century, it was a common practice for museums to donate funds to an organization undertaking an archeological excavation and, in return, they would receive a portion of the finds. For the most part, the involvement of a museum in the system was dependent on the interests of a few individuals connected with the museum and the ability of the museum to raise funds in a given year, rather than through a formal, consistent policy by a museum to fund excavations annually. While some sites were excavated for only one season (typically 3-6 months long), often more than one site was excavated during that season and excavations at larger sites often continued for a number of seasons. As a result, objects in the collections can originate from one site or several different sites even if the museum subscribed for only one year. A museum also might have objects from only one year of an excavation that in

---

<sup>228</sup> More details on this argument are narrated in the part of this work related to the museums where Ferlini's artifacts are today kept (Berlin, Munich, the originals; Bologna a few originals and some copies. In Turin only copies arrived but they were regarded as original on account of the particularity of their provenance).

<sup>229</sup> Priese, 1993.

<sup>230</sup> Kendall, 1996.

fact continued for several years. Moreover, objects from a single context, such as a burial or a building, were often split between several museums. It is also the case that many excavated objects were given to private individuals who had contributed to excavations and many such objects entered collections through subsequent donations by the individuals, often without transferring of any excavation documentation. The result of this is that, untraced and without specialist documentation, a significant proportion of these objects and hence these collections are at a high risk of obsolescence in the academic community. The general public loses in this as well, as much of the contribution an object can make towards engaging interest comes from understanding its history and context, information which is easily lost and subsequently impossible to recover.<sup>231</sup>

Another dynamic of circulation of objects was the policy of exchange adopted by many museums.

The Norwegian archeologist Henriette Hafsaas says that there is limited discussion among archeologists about whether cultural heritage should rank as an essential element of universal human rights.<sup>232</sup> I think that this limitation is attributable to the still conservative mentality of archeologists who are still very attached to the scientific value of cultural heritage, very often leading them to neglect its social value. I personally experienced this when I established the Documentation Center on Nubia at the Nubia Museum in Aswan.<sup>233</sup>

Today the laws governing the export and looting of archeological materials are strict, particularly in Egypt. The law fifty-fifty split has been abrogated in Egypt that has adopted rigid policies and even forbids the export of materials outside the country for study or analysis. It is very also active in its policy of the repatriation of materials, at least of those taken away illegally.<sup>234</sup>

In the Sudan, although there is a law prohibiting the export of antiquities,<sup>235</sup> the authorities are more flexible in their cooperation with missions working in the country. The foreign museums and universities conducting the rescue fieldwork in the Fourth Cataract region (Merowe Dam Campaign) had permission to take a share of the artifacts uncovered during the excavations to their institutions. The missions working in the Sudan regularly receive 10 per cent of the excavated artifacts, whereas those participating in the Merowe Dam campaign received up to 50 per cent of the 'museum-quality' goods (unique objects excepted) and almost all the potsherds and human skeletons.<sup>236</sup> So far the Manasir living in the area, who are extremely opposed the archeologists' activities, have not objected specifically to the transfer of the archeologically retrieved artifacts out of the country. However, opponents of the current regime have seen this export of the past as a strategy to promote a country with an atrocious reputation abroad.<sup>237</sup>

---

<sup>231</sup> In 2006, Margaret Serpico carried out an audit of the Egyptian and Sudanese collections kept in Britain (Serpico, 2006: 6-7).

<sup>232</sup> Hafsaas, 2011: 65-66; Silverman and Ruggles, 2007.

<sup>233</sup> Cf. Nubia Museum Sub-Paragraph.

<sup>234</sup> An International Conference on *Recovery of Stolen Artifacts* attended by thirty countries was organized by Egypt in 2010. It was repeated, again with the support of Egypt, in Peru in 2011 during which was presented a list of unique artifacts, prepared in Cairo, and named the 'Wish List' of those artifacts which different countries in the world wish to retrieve. Recently, after the events of January and February 2011, with the support of ICOM (The International Council of Museums), Egypt, has produced *The Emergency Red List of Egyptian Cultural Objects at Risk* to fight against the illicit traffic of archeological artifacts. The purpose of the list is to improve both legal instruments and practical tools for disseminating information and to raise public awareness.

<sup>235</sup> Ordinance for the Protection of Antiquities, 1999, National Corporation for Antiquity and Museums of Sudan, in Kush XVIII, 1998-2002.

<sup>236</sup> Hafsaas, 2011: 64-65; Lawler, 2006: 40.

<sup>237</sup> Hafsaas, 2011.



The constructions of dams, an activity which has gone on for almost one hundred years, made Nubia protagonist in the realm of salvage archeology. This position is certainly regretted by local communities and is the source of mixed feelings of sorrow and scientific intrigue by scholars. In such a context, the ‘salvage of cultural assets’ is seen unilaterally instead of recognizing the complex nature with which they (cultural assets) and the process involved interact and remain interdependent and inter-dynamic. The disjuncture between archeology and anthropology, clearly apparent in this interpretation, runs contrary to the ideal relationship between the two fields as a non-linear continuity from the past in to the present. To leave communities in a historical vacuum or to save monuments with a lack of historical context is not a victory. Depriving local communities of these fragments of historical continuity I believe goes too far. Thurstan Shaw has summarized this position clearly when he wrote:

If in many developing countries the concept of colonialism, is now making day, in the realm of cultural property, it is still strong. The territories have been handed back to the inhabitants, but many of their treasures have not. These countries want their own cultural property to contribute to their own process of growing to national maturity. It is entirely reasonable and natural that emergent nations should feel passionately about these things, and need them to establish their own identity, their own roots, and write their own history.<sup>238</sup>

#### *Research Methodology and Logical Presentation of the Collections*

The comparative analysis of museum policies of to display or ‘not display’ of Nubian collections worldwide, the subject of the next chapter, is based on the data obtained from an ‘analytical tour’ of Nubian collections kept both inside and outside Nubia and presented in Chapters 6 and 7. Here I introduce the methodology and the set of criteria I have used to locate, analyze and present the collections.

The material collected in Chapters 6 and 7 is the result of personal involvement in museum works, direct surveys, readings, and above all cooperation with many museum curators. My original intention to base the analysis of these collections on the inclusion of all scattered Nubian objects proved to be too ambitious. Visiting the location of so many objects dispersed around the world would be a difficult, if not unattainable task and therefore can not be considered to have been finalized, even though I have been able to include an impressive part of the legacy. The information collected depends on the state of each museum inventory. If, on account of the great ambiguity which sometimes characterizes the classification of Nubian objects, some of my information is limited or vague, I must apologize, with the caveat that this is ongoing research which hopefully will provide a solid basis for a more refined and clarified classification and interpretation over time.

The ‘tour’ helps to shed light on how Nubia has been understood, ‘created’ and silenced. As explained in the introduction to this research, the collections are examined in the light of their display or ‘not display’ policies; the history of their formation; identification of those instances when Nubia is presented as the subject of an independent academic discipline or, conversely, as an appendage to something else, or just simply a random choice. The tour broadens the understanding of whether these collections have a role in defining/creating a ‘Nubian’ heritage and the link of this process with the Nubians of today.

---

<sup>238</sup> Shaw, 1986: 46-48. Cf. also De Simone, 2008, 225-230.

The presentation of the collections in Chapters 6 and 7 does not follow any fixed structure (better suited to a technical work of cataloguing) but is rather discursive. Each collection has its own story which I briefly outline, emphasizing the different elements of which it is composed. The analysis is based on several elements surrounding these collections as presented in the body of the text. Since I have found the collections in different categories of museums, it is clear that the analysis has taken into account the different mandate that each of these categories of museums has adopted and on the basis of this I have made my comments. There is no standard method to valorize a collection, especially if the contexts in which it occurs are different. Instead the standard must be the message that the collection sends. This has to be clear, although sometimes too complicated to be explained in simple terms. The analysis has also taken into account the typology and number of objects available in each museum. On these factors very much depends the putting on display, the mode and the duration of the exhibition.

Since museum exhibitions are not fixed but can change over time I have reported, as far as this was possible, the exact dates or approximate periods in which these collections were formed and displayed, also remarking on the changes that have occurred in the display over the years. Through personal visits or contacts with curators, I have monitored the data included in the research up June 2013.

Technical details of the collections themselves appear in footnotes. In this way the research serves both those more interested in the display policy of the objects and those archeologists and others who are more interested in their historical and artistic aspects.<sup>239</sup>

As the research is based on various interviews with curators, I have had to report such interviews in the form of quotations. Reporting the knowledge, perceptions, motivations and personal involvement of the curators helps to elucidate their role in the various aspects of the lives of the collections under their care and also helps with a better understanding of my comments. Since today Internet is a powerful tool for the promotion of knowledge, in the context of museums I have sometimes, when available, reported these on-line presentations.

Turning to the quantification of the numbers of objects held in each collection, many curators did not give precise figures since the collection has not yet been accessioned and recorded. In these cases, they have provided a range of objects rather than specific number.

For large collections, the huge number of objects made it only possible to gather general information. These are obviously the most well-known to the public, since they are displayed (at least partially) and located in important contexts. As such, it was possible to analyze the display.

When examining small/middle size collections, I have been able, in some cases, to obtain a complete list of objects, with all data, even though sometimes there are inaccuracies, especially in terms of allocation of material to one phase or the other of the Nubian history or in the location of sites. To avoid publishing other people's work,<sup>240</sup> I have just given a summary of these lists. These collections are sometimes displayed, making an abbreviated analysis of them possible. Sometimes I have picked out individual items on which I have also reported in a note the item description for easier tracing. I considered it best to include these small collections in the main text since, rather than being purely and simply lists of objects gathered from here and there, they contribute much to the overall discussion of this research on the perception of Nubia and Nubians. Moreover, these small venues often provided interesting stories and more awareness on the idea of Nubia than more

---

<sup>239</sup> I wish to clarify that this is not a work of technical classification of the collections but could be a very good basis and inspirational tool for it.

<sup>240</sup> The compilation of a list is not as simple as it might appear. Behind it there is often a long and complex work of identification and classification.

important ones elsewhere. As a result I found 122 locations with Nubian artifacts scattered across five continents<sup>241</sup>

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| Africa   | 22 |
| Americas | 20 |
| Asia     | 1  |
| Europe   | 77 |
| Oceania  | 2  |

At the beginning of each section in Chapters 6 and 7, to guide the reader better, I have given more detailed information about the logical presentation of these collections. The tour begins with the homeland of the objects (Egypt and the Sudan). From this vantage point, it becomes possible to see how this heritage is perceived and presented by modern Egyptians and Sudanese. Moving on to the continent where the first Nubian collections (mixed with Egyptian ones) were formed, I discuss European museums. The ‘New World’ of the North American continent soon followed suit as new home for Nubian collections. The United States gave birth to the scientific idea of Nubia and witnessed the creation of the first Nubian Galleries. Trans-Oceanic collections in Canada and Australia benefited indirectly from the main phenomena of adventure, colonialism and scientific research that so impressed the societies of Europe and America. The last collections to be presented are those in Ghana, India and Argentina, where the appearance of Nubian collections might not have been easily expected, but where, in fact, various groups of objects from Nubia did arrive following the active participation of these countries in the Salvage Campaign of the sixties.

‘Nubian artifacts’, as defined in this research, are objects that originated in the land stretching from the First to the Sixth Cataracts of the Nile, with local characters different from those of the neighboring areas<sup>242</sup> and those of foreign inspiration or importation (Egyptian, Greco-Roman, Christian, Islamic). These last two assumed to be a local Nubian dimension. I have also included in the research those locations where I found collections from the neighboring deserts which research is increasingly tending to consider part of the ‘Nubian milieu’.

---

<sup>241</sup> Cf. Annex II.

<sup>242</sup> Cf. Chapter 1: Prehistoric, A Group, C Group, Kerma, Pan Grave, 25th Dynasty - also called Napatan and Kushite - Meroitic, X Group, Ethnographic.