

‘Pas encore classiques’.

The Making of American Antiquities over the Long Nineteenth Century

Miruna Achim* and Stefanie Gänger**

In 1850, the Louvre opened a new exhibit space, the ‘Hall of American Antiquities’ (*Salle des Antiquités Américaines*), or ‘American Museum’ (*Musée Américain*), with over 800 preconquest antiquities from Andean South and Mesoamerica¹: basalt statues, jade masks, clay figurines and musical instruments from ancient Mexico and zoomorphic pottery, colorful spun clothing, and filigree metalwork from Peru, alongside a few artefacts from Chile, the environs of Tiahuanaco in Bolivia. By 1851, a small collection of Haitian artefacts was added.² No images of the display have come down to us, but a catalogue published by the hall’s curator, Adrien Prévost de Longpérier (1816-1882), indicate that he organized them by geographical provenance, use – weapons, adornments, ceramic vessels –, and material, as well as, with some Mexican antiquities, by their subject matter: zoomorphic, anthropomorphic or mythological figurines.

In many ways, the exhibit was a vanguard gesture. It was innovative in grouping Mexican and Peruvian antiquities together under the label of ‘American antiquities’ – though others, most notably Alexander von Humboldt (1769–1859), had done so in writing.³ It was also unprecedented in granting ‘American antiquities’, collectively, ‘a room of their own’ in a major European museum, that is, a symbolic and figurative space – a privilege hitherto only accorded ancient Egypt, Greco-Roman antiquity, and

* Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Cuajimalpa, Mexico City

** Universität Heidelberg, Germany

¹ Mesoamerica as concept

² Adrien de Longpérier, *Notice des Monuments Exposés dans la Salle des Antiquités Américaines (Mexique et Pérou), au Musée du Louvre* (Vinchon: Imprimeur des Musées Nationaux, 1850). Longpérier published two versions of the catalogue; a second edition came out in 1852 with a supplement that accounted for donations in the intervening years. See also Carole Duclot, "Les Prémices de L'archéologie Mexicaine en France: un Musée Américain au Louvre en 1850," *Bulletin Monumental* 151, no. 1 (1993).

³ Alexander von Humboldt's *Vues des Cordillères*, which first came out in 1810, brought together representations of plates of plates of South and Mesoamerican sites, codices and sculptures. Alexander von Humboldt, *Vues des Cordillères, et Monumens des Peuples Indigènes de L'amérique* (Paris: F. Schoell, 1810).

the 'biblical lands' in Asia minor.⁴ In other respects, however, the hall was quite conventional, mainly so, in Longpérier's ambivalence and hesitancy about American antiquities' relation to classicism.⁵ Although he frequently compared Mexican to Egyptian antiquities and Peruvian to Greco-Roman antiquities – an ornamented Peruvian vase 'offered such analogy with those discovered in Etruria' that even a *connoisseur* would be deceived⁶ –, to Longpérier, 'the antiquities of America', were unlike 'the monuments of Egypt', 'not yet classical (*pas encore classiques*)'.⁷ Longpérier's remark echoed, in some measure, misgivings familiar at the time about American antiquities' aesthetic merits, given their 'bizarre' combinations, failure to adhere to a naturalistic ideal and to advance in the 'pursuit of beauty, which alone leads to progress' (*la recherche du beau*), which associated their style with that of 'the populations of the extreme Orient'.⁸

A close reading of the passage in question suggests, however, that to Longpérier the antiquities of America' were 'not yet classical' (*elles ne sont pas encore classiques*)⁹ not solely on account of their aesthetics but also elusive from an epistemic point of view. 'One utterly lack[ed] guidance (*manque absolument de guide*) to [help] classify them,' to understand 'their meaning, usage and date,'¹⁰ wrote Longpérier, and he attributed what he perceived to be the general incomprehensibility of American antiquities to of their being less well represented in the principal collections, therefore, less studied, as a consequence of their being of less cultural relevance to 'us' – than, for instance, antiquities associated with 'our biblical history' (*notre*

⁴ Annie Caubet, "Adrein de Longpérier et le Musée des Antiquités Américaines au Louvre," in *Artistes, collections et Musées. Un Homage à Antoine Schnapper* ed. Véronique Powell (Paris: PU Paris-Sorbonne, 2015). [page number] The hall was the first pre-Columbian exhibit ever opened in Paris. Elizabeth A. Williams, "Art and Artifact at the Trocadéro. *Ars Americana* and the Primitivist Revolution," in *Objects and Others. Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, ed. George W. Stocking (Madison/ London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 149.

⁵ "Art and Artifact at the Trocadéro."; Henrik Karge, "El Arte americano Antiguo y el Canon de la Antigüedad Clásica. El "Nuevo Continente" en la Historiografía del Arte de la Primera Mitad del siglo XIX," in *Herencias Indígenas, Tradiciones Europeas y la Mirada Europea. Actas del Coloquio de la Asociación Carl Justi y del Instituto Cervantes Bremen, del 6 al 9 de Abril de 2000*, ed. Helga von Kügelgen (Frankfurt: Vervuert-Iberoamericana, 2002), 328.

⁶ Longpérier also stated that the *teocalli* of Tcholula was 'three meters higher' than the pyramid of Gizeh. Longpérier, *Notice des Monuments*, N° 107, 32-33 and N° 738, 95.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 6.

histoire sacrée). Indeed, to Longpérier and his contemporaries, it would seem that ‘classical’ denoted not only the naturalistic and well-proportioned object but also that which was visible in discourse, that which commanded interest and possessed value, iconic status, and relevance to collective identity.¹¹ Given these connotations, Longpérier’s puzzling choice of words – ‘not yet classical’ – acquires another meaning: to Longpérier ‘classical’ was not, or at least not solely, an intrinsic quality, but one that could be acquired, through undertakings such as the opening of his ‘American Museum’. The antiquities of America were just emerging from obscurity, being brought to the attention of the erudite, and the public; to him, they were not yet, but had already begun the route, to becoming ‘classical’.

This essay traces the long process through which the artefacts associated with American pre-conquest societies became objects of study, collection and display. It argues that the aesthetic appeal, epistemic value, commercial worth, and political – or national – relevance attributed to pre-conquest artefacts in the recent past were in no way self-evident in Longpérier’s time, let alone prior to it. Rather, we contend that these attributes were shaped in the course of a long process, that stretched from the mid 1700s, when pre-conquest artefacts were first broadly accorded epistemic value for antiquarian scholarship, to the early 1900s, when state indigenism in both Mexico and Peru consolidated their interest and meaning – a ‘long’ nineteenth century by the end of which, we argue, the pieces’ reconfiguration into what Longpérier would have called ‘classical’ antiquities was complete. Our narrative goes against the grain of the more traditional, national Spanish American historiographies that have tended to regard antiquities as the timeless and ontologically stable objects of the nation-states they came to embody over the late 1800s and early 1900s and that, as a result, have rarely asked questions about the antiquities’ ‘coming into being’ through different material, conceptual, and political arrangements.¹²

¹¹ "Classique," in *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle: français, historique, géographique, mythologique, bibliographique*, ed. Pierre Larousse (Paris: Administration du grand Dictionnaire universel, 1866-1877), 400.

¹² See, for instance, Rogger Ravines, *Los Museos del Perú. Breve historia y Guía* (Lima: Dirección General de Museos, Instituto Nacional de Cultura, 1989); Enrique Florescano,

Indeed, this essay contributes to an on-going reworking of the historiography of Spanish American antiquities collecting, antiquarianism and archaeology that is increasingly concerned with the reconfiguration of its objects.¹³

We adopt a comparative focus on the material cultures associated with the **Inka and Mexica empires** – the complex South and Mesoamerican societies that immediately preceded the Spanish conquest – in ways that allow us to uncover both differences and commonalities – a shared history of Spanish American antiquarianism in its 'long' nineteenth century – unidentifiable as such in national historiographies that do not look beyond their own borders. **Briefly speaking... both become independent in the 1820s... both create national museums then ... crossed by different political and social and economic realities... Mexico until the mid nineteenth century, civil war, meaning regional differences and conflicts between a centralist and a regionalist or federalist... foreign intervention and then strong Porfirian state Peru... different trajectory, guano industry... by late century, museums were stabilized..**

In bringing together historiographies from a variety of national contexts – the Mexican and Peruvian ones especially – we identify a variety of collective practices, from legal frameworks to elite sociability to market forces, involved in the making of American antiquities. **Goes beyond the scope of the national states and strictly national histories.** The essay is divided into five sections corresponding to factors – situated, roughly, in different chronological moments – that centrally contributed to this process: first, an Iberian enlightened antiquarian tradition that put preconquest artefacts into discourse as epistemic and political objects starting in the

Memoria Mexicana, 2 ed. (México City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999); **include Diez Andreu?**

¹³ Natalia Majluf, "Los Fabricantes de Emblemas. Los Símbolos Nacionales en la Transición Republicana. Perú, 1820-1825," in *Visión y Símbolos. Del Virreinato Criollo a la República peruana* (Lima: Banco de Crédito, 2006); Alessandra Russo, "Cortés's Objects and the Idea of New Spain: Inventories as Spatial Narratives," *Journal of the History of Collections* 23, no. 2 (2011); John Beasley-Murray, "Vilcashuamán: Telling Stories in Ruins," in *Ruins of Modernity*, ed. Julia Hell and Andreas Schönle (Durham / London: Duke University Press, 2010); **Haydée López Hernández, En busca del alma nacional**, Luis Vázquez León, *El Leviatán Arqueológico: Antropología de una tradición científica en México* (Mexico City: CIESAS, 2003 [1996]). **[no podemos pretender que no existen estudios que hacen eso Or course, but then we should include our own books in here as well.]**

mid-1700s – the empire and practices from before; second, the collections, public and private, formed by creole elites, foreign travelers and museum directors, that, starting in the early-1800s, brought them into wider circulation and competition, making them objects of financial and commercial speculation and into commodities. This is important because it means that whoever had more power (diplomatic, economic) got to keep them.

third, the ‘paper technologies’ – inventories, lists, engravings, lithographs and photographs – of the mid-1800s, that further extended their popularity and recognition and shaped the ways they were organized, classified and interpreted;

fourth, the processes of national and international institutionalization and disciplinary formation of the late-1800s that entrenched their relevance as objects of science;

and last, the state indigenism of the early 1900s that irrevocably consolidated their political meanings and interest as objects of politics and patrimony across much of Spanish America.

Genealogies: Antiquarianism and Empire

Preconquest antiquities had been subject to collecting practices from the early 1500s – think, for instance, of the hundreds of ‘treasures’ Hernán Cortés (1485-1547) sent to Prince Charles (1500-1558) and his mother Queen Juana (1479-1555) from 1519)–[...]

At the time of the conquerors’ first arrival on the American continent, artifacts made, and used, in pre-conquest America, possessed a variety of meanings and uses. To some, they continued to be imbued with religious meaning, to serve as means of communication, or emblems of divine authority.¹⁴ Others saw them as evidence of Indian idolatry and heathen ‘error’,¹⁵ while to again others, they were testaments to the reality of the conquerors’ presence and venture among New World societies, and, eventually, their defeat. In the string of disputations that ensued over the 1500s and 1600s, pre-conquest material culture also became proof of the

Comentado [aR1]: As I suggest below, it is more than a matter of travelers. I think these objects are shaped by very asymmetric power relations, which involve all sorts of foreign agents, from diplomats (especially) to investors, merchants... and yes, travelers.

Comentado [aR2]: What is the point we are making here

¹⁴ [...]

¹⁵ [...]

level of the 'Indians' intellect, their 'humanity' and 'evidence of their rationality and ability to be converted' ... to these societies' richness, their 'subtle *ingenia*'.¹⁶ It was the 'magnificence' of cities like Tenochtitlán, Cuzco or Quito, the intricacy of Andean road networks, and the sophistication of Inka or Chimu material culture – their delicate, colorful spun clothing, their formal, stylized, carefully wrought ceramics, their filigree metalwork – which functioned, alongside other, environmental considerations, as evidence of the – Aristotelian – civility of those people.¹⁷ Here include the comparisons with the classical world For the Indian elites, on the other hand, prequest artefacts – pictorial documents in the Viceroyalty of New Spain, or insignia of Incan power in Peru – continued to fulfil an important social function under colonial rule: to produce accounts of the elites 'continued relevance within the monarchical order', to corroborate privileges, and to protect lands and legacies, and to demand legal guarantees of these protections from the crown.¹⁸ Creole historiographical projects – by scholars by Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora in the seventeenth century or Francisco Xavier Clavijero in the eighteenth -- incorporated the histories produced by these legal indigenous traditions

It was only from the mid 1700s on that the material culture associated with the pre-Columbian past gradually come to be reinterpreted as 'antiquities', things whose value lay, no longer primarily in the notion of divinity, might, or wealth, but in the distant, ancient past they represented, embodied, and revealed. pre-conquest antiquities began to be studied with new questions and methods, reflecting new directions

¹⁶ Alessandra Russo, "An Artistic Humanity. New Positions on Art and Freedom in the Context of Iberian Expansion, 1500-1600," *Res. Anthropology and Aesthetics* 65-66 (2014-2015): 355. Russo, "Cortés's Objects and the Idea of New Spain: Inventories as Spatial Narratives."; Isabel Yaya, "Wonders of America: The Curiosity Cabinet as a Site of Representation and Knowledge," *ibid.* 20 (2008): 174. Albrecht Dürer spoke famously of the 'wonderful things (Wunderdinge)' that speak to the 'subtle ingenia (*den subtilen ingenia*) of people in foreign lands'. Friedrich Leitschuh, ed. *Albrecht Dürer's Tagebuch der Reise in die Niederlande* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1884), 58.

¹⁷ Surekha Davies, *Renaissance Ethnography and the Invention of the Human. New Worlds, Maps and Monsters*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); John G. A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 4. Barbarians, Savages and Empires (Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 161.

¹⁸ See, for instance, Peter B. Villella, *Indigenous Elites and Creole Identity in Colonial Mexico, 1500-1800* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 9-10; Gabriela Ramos Cárdenas, "Los Símbolos de Poder Inca Durante el Virreinato," in *Los Incas, Reyes del Perú*, ed. Natalia Majluf, et al. (Lima: Artes y tesoros del Perú, 2005).

Comentado [aR3]: Maybe I should eliminate this because it takes it into another direction? I don't know. See comment below, as well

in antiquarianism in the Atlantic world, and more specifically, in the Spanish Empire. There was, on the one hand, increasing engagement with the physical vestiges themselves, reflected in the increasing drive to own, collect, and circulate them.¹⁹ Taken to be the vestiges of a remote past, left behind by peoples long extinct, antiquities were scrutinized as material evidence for writing a universal history of mankind, one of the more ambitious historiographic projects of the Enlightenment. What was America's place in this history and what did its material productions have to show about Europe's own beginnings and unfolding? These were some of the more important questions that were being asked by scholars of the past in different places on both sides of the Atlantic; their answers varied broadly.

The Spanish crown took a special interest in these questions, partly to counter accusations that Spain ignored the ruins it sat on.²⁰ Spurred by discoveries of the buried cities at Pompey and Herculaneum in the Spanish viceroyalty of Naples, -- but also, different studies around the empire... different kinds of work at different ruins and places. The same monarch, Charles III, who reigned in Naples from 1734 before he became king of Spain and its overseas dominions in 1759, personally commissioned several of the excavations to be conducted in the Viceroyalties of New Spain and Peru and in the Captaincy General of Guatemala -- Palenque, or the *Tantalluc Huaca* -- parallel to those of Roman sites in Rome, Pompeii, and Herculaneum.²¹ By the last decades, more and more studies, both sponsored by the crown and locally promoted. The late 1700s also saw the publication of antiquarian treatises of Creole polymaths, such as José Hipólito Unanue y Pavón (1755-1833) in Lima and José Antonio de Alzate (1737-1799) in Mexico City.²² By the late 1700s, American presses were publishing contentious

¹⁹ For the "material turn" in antiquarianism, see Schnapp, *La conquête du passé*

²⁰ Susan Deans-Smith, on this quote... on antiquities studied as part of a much broader program of studying celtic, Iberian, Islamic, roman

²¹ Margarita Díaz-Andreu, *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology. Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). 56; José Alcina Franch, *Arqueólogos o anticuarios. Historia antigua de la arqueología en la América Española* (Barcelona: Ediciones de Serbal, 1995). 16.

²² Alcina Franch, *Arqueólogos o anticuarios*, 56.

debates about the meaning of antiquities²³ and descriptions of ancient sites such as Xochicalco, El Tajín, and Papantla, in Mexico, and Tiahuanacu, Chachapoyas, or Pachacamac in Peru.²⁴ They would culminate, by the turn of the century, the royal antiquarian expeditions in New Spain in charge of Dupaix, three years to research the most important sites there..

Conventions for antiquarian research in the Americas were being forged by the second half of the eighteenth century, in the context of a wider program of scientific expeditions, which sought to inventory, study, and collect the natural and man-made riches of the colonies. In 1777, Spaniard Antonio de Ulloa, a scientist who had held various imperial military and civil posts, drew a set of guidelines for collecting information about the natural and man-made riches of New Spain, which included instructions for the exploration of antiquities. These guidelines -- distributed through the viceregal bureaucracies and published in the local presses-- were directed to members of scientific expeditions, but also, more broadly, to anyone who had an interest in collecting and studying antiquities.²⁵ Ulloa's instructions identified what vestiges were worthy of study: "the ruins of buildings of gentility," such as walls, sepulchers, ditches, burials, houses, and huts; bowls and vessels of all sorts; agricultural tools, made of stone, copper, animal bones, and other materials; weapons, such as bows, arrows, darts, and spears; and "idols" of different materials.²⁶ Later guidelines expanded on Ulloa's. In 1785, Josef de Estachería, the president of the Real Audiencia of Guatemala, presented an expedition to Palenque with instructions for assessing the stage of civilization reached by this ancient city. The expeditioners were to make a note of the layout of the site, inspecting for statues, decorations,

Comentado [aR4]: I need to find out where in Spanish empire he was stationed

Comentado [aR5]:

S: Yes, there are Bourbon expeditions in Peru, with similar instructions. Jorge Juan, Antonio de Ulloa, Louis Feuillé and Charles-Marie de la Condamine all refer to Andean antiquities at some point, though Ulloa's impact is less pronounced than in Mexico.

M: Can we include references to Jorge Juan and la Condamine in here? The point for me is to see how guidelines and instructions create objects and was of seeing these objects. For instance, what are they looking for when they look at ruins and antiquities in the andes?

²³ Juan Pimentel, "Stars & Stones. Astronomy and Archaeology in the Works of the Mexican Polymath Antonio León y Gama, 1735-1802," *Itinerario* XXXIII, no. 1 (2009).

²⁴ For Peru, see José Hipólito Unanue, "Idea General de los Monumentos del Antiguo Perú, e Introducción a su estudio," *El Mercurio Peruano* 1 (1791): 204-5. [M: Add references for Mexican examples]

²⁵ María Eugenia Constantino and Juan Pimentel, "Cómo inventariar el (Nuevo) Mundo. Las instrucciones como Instrumentos para observar y coleccionar objetos naturales," in *Piedra, papel y tijera: Instrumentos en las Ciencias en México*, ed. Laura Cházaro, Miruna Achim, and Nuria Valverde (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 2018).."

²⁶ Ulloa, "Cuestionario," 180-81.

coats of arms, and for spaces designed as treasuries, burial grounds, palaces, and oratories. And they were to look for minted coins, mines, navigable roads, and harbors, to gauge the nature and density of commerce, industry, and manufacture.²⁷

Instructions function as epistemological tools for would-be antiquarians: by presenting a classification of objects, they direct observers' eyes to specific things or classes of things and shape the kinds of questions to be asked of them, they make objects visible and ineligible. Instructions like Ulloa's and Estachera's reflect the absence of local categories for studying and writing about preconquest past, or at least unfamiliarity with what explorers would find in the field.²⁸ The categories put forward for the study of preconquest antiquities express an understanding of civilization as closely modeled on Enlightenment perceptions of what distinguished the ancient cultures of the Old World as civilized: civil architecture, a particular sense of proportion and style, religion and burial of the dead, navigation, coin-based commerce, mining, and industry. In other words, past objects and sites, primarily those of the Inca, or the ruins of Yucatan, Chiapas and Central Mexico, were increasingly conceived as 'physical evidence' to substantiate, or probe, the understanding derived from the writings of 'classical' authors, or, in the Americas, the intelligence available in early-colonial chronicles that made reference to the pre-Columbian past. But also classical... [comparison with classical antiquities, opening them to broader questions about beauty, progress, and geographical determinism in the arts;²⁹

Comparisons between preconquest pasts and the classical past of the Old World anchored new ambitions and interventions – by both Iberian and Creole intellectuals -- in the notorious eighteenth-century 'dispute over the New World' between European and American intellectuals, responses to European diatribes against tropical America by

²⁷ Navarrete, *Palenque*, 1784, 17-23.

²⁸ In time, as information started travelling from the field to the centers of accumulation and processing, guidelines would begin to be modified to reflect the findings Constantino and Pimentel, "Cómo inventariar," 87.

²⁹ [Deans-Smith, "Print culture."]

Comentado [aR6]: I need to shorten or eliminate this because it is repetitive

adducing, among other things, the grandeur of the palaces, cities and fortresses of pre-Columbian Meso- and Andean South America.³⁰

Owning a deep past was a way to counter prejudices, but, more significantly, to carve a space for the Creole intellectuals – many of whom would be crucial in building up the new independent republics after the collapse of the Empire. Antiquities associated with societies indigenous to South and Mesoamerica first came to embody and entail mythical autochthony and political legitimacy.³¹ An engagement with the distant Inka and Aztec past, first ‘became a crucial, if ambivalent motif in creole discourse’, when Mexican, Peruvian, Argentine, Colombian or Chilean creole patriots appropriated it for the imagined collectivities they were beginning to envision in the late eighteenth century.³²

That collectivity, however, had little room for indigenous descendants. creole rhetorical and symbolic representations of pre-Columbian societies as ‘ancestors’ did not entail a more conspicuous role for the men and women supposedly descended from these societies, the ‘Indians,’ ‘this majority absent from the formation of a creole state founded with independence,’ as Natalia Majluf put it.³³

Antiquarianism as “proof” of rupture between the present and the past. Indeed, antiquarianism brought about new temporality and dissociation.. deepening the divide between that past and the living reality of the indigenous world... which translated into ambivalent relationship between descendants and ancestors...meaning, also that it brought about issues of heritage and ownership

Comentado [aR7]: I like all the ideas in this section between *** but I think it gets a little bit repetitive.

The way I understand it:

1. Creoles use the ancient past to intervene in debates about the New World
2. They also use it to carve a space for themselves in new collectivities which will shape years post-independence
3. Those collectivities, as creoles imagine them, have little use for contemporary Indians. As a result, contemporary Indians “miserable” are dissociated from their ancestors and their antiquities. The past is pushed farther into the past – comparisons with classical age in Europe makes this more possible – and antiquities are dissociated from contemporary Indians. (Here maybe we should cite Johannes Fabian)
4. This solves a existential dilemma or gives a space to Creoles. – although I am not sure how much we should say about creoles here, because we are forgetting a little about antiquities. More importantly, for our purposes, antiquities, dissociated from Indians on whose lands and in whose care they are – will be reimagined as patrimony of new nations. Even though it takes a long time for them to become truly objects of the nation. They get involved and entangled in competitions and exchanges we outline in the next section.

³⁰ Jorge Cañizares Esguerra, *How to Write the History of the New World: Histories, Epistemologies, and Identities in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 235; David Brading, *The First America. The Spanish Monarchy, Creole Patriots, and the Liberal State 1492-1867* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 448.

³¹ Natalia Majluf, "De la Rebelión al Museo: Genealogías y Retratos de los Incas, 1781-1900," in *Los Incas, Reyes del Perú*, ed. Natalia Majluf, et al. (Lima: Banco de Crédito, 2005), 257-66.

³² Ibid., 257; Brading, *The First America*.

³³ "Los Fabricantes de Emblemas," 232-9.

[In Peru, it was also the demise of the Indian elites of Incan descent in the wake of the Tupac Amaru Rebellion that allowed for the dissociation of these antiquities both from Indian society and the present.³⁴ But what happens in Mexico... nothing so sudden?]

Indeed, the relationship between the antiquities and the descendants of societies 'indigenous' to South and Mesoamerica was to remain an ambivalent one.

While references to a long-bygone, 'classicist' antiquity fashioned an American identity for creoles, they circumvented, at the same time, the living reality of the indigenous world. Indeed, as various historians have argued, Latin American creoles wrought a rupture between pre-Columbian glories and living Indians' 'miserable,' abject present in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century writings.³⁵ They declared contemporary 'Indians' either to 'have lost their connection to that [pre-Columbian] past'³⁶ or, in the manner of nineteenth-century evolutionism, to belong to it by virtue of their failure to evolve from it along the line of progress towards modernity, as 'relics' of the past in the present. They did so, quite possibly, out of an anxiety with the continuity between living and pre-Columbian Indians, out of their acute awareness that their own American-ness was disputed and forfeited legitimacy by the presence of those other, 'original natives'. It was thus that antiquities, in some measure, resolved the central dilemma at the heart of creole identity: the necessity of appearing both European, and thus capable of self-rule in the face of Europe's imperial powers, and of identifying, at the same time, with indigenous America, as the justification for freedom and autonomy from Spain. As a matter of fact, the power, and 'representativeness' of antiquities presumably resulted precisely from the fact that they resolved

³⁴ Stefanie Gänger, *Relics of the Past. The Collecting and Study of Pre-Columbian Antiquities in Peru and Chile, 1837-1911* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 29-45; Majluf, "De la Rebelión al Museo."

³⁵ Mark Thurner, "Peruvian Genealogies of History and Nation," in *After Spanish Rule. Postcolonial Predicaments of the Americas*, ed. Mark Thurner and Andrés Guerrero (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003); Cecilia Méndez G., "Incas Sí, Indios No: Notes on Peruvian Creole Nationalism and Its Contemporary Crisis," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 28.1 (1996): pp.

³⁶ Earle, *The Return of the Native*, 20.

the creole dilemma by virtue of their – in the eyes of its elites – conciliatory and placatory capacity.

By turn of the century, ... accumulated information in archives and around the empire... for different kinds of uses and interests and different methods... but there were fledling students and collections and newspapers... Humboldt (1769-1859) five year journey... as receiver and beneficent of amny of the studies...he took back few antiquities – by contrast his collection of minerals and plants was massive... . But he did publish a book, *his Vues des cordillères*, which brings together antiquities of the Americas -- Mexico more so than Peru, first time, predecessor, paper collection of sorts, before Longperier– where he summarized some of the more important tendencies in American antiquarianism. Humboldt presents 69 views of manmade objects and ruins side-by-side natural monuments, to underscore the fact that stark, massive style was shaped both by cultural factors – theocracies and slave-owning societies, which put little value on individual freedom – and by natural factors, such as topography, climate, altitude, by being always up against ‘a perennially savage and agitated nature.’³⁷ Indeed, their appearance resonated with that of nature: “volcanoes with their craters surrounded by eternal snow [...], the contours of mountains, valleys with their furrowed flanks, and imposing waterfalls.”³⁸ (images) Although he found American antiquities to be lacking in aesthetic value, Humboldt did not deem them to be “unworthy of attention.”³⁹ Like the artefacts produced by the Egyptians, the Etruscans, or the Tibetans, they were particularly valuable as objects of a universal science, for, he wrote, “they offer to our eyes a picture of the uniform and progressive march of the human spirit.”⁴⁰ They were, in other words, epistemic things, evidence of the universal history of mankind and of the place of the Americas in the universal histories of

³⁷ Ibid., 3.

³⁸ Ibid., 4.

³⁹ Ibid., 2.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

progress and mankind. Not very different from others ... after all, a lot was based on what others had written before—even though not everyone would have agreed with his assessments of beauty. But, *Vues des cordillères* --first published in French and quickly translated into English and German -- would become an important reference on preconquest antiquities well into the mid nineteenth century, just as Humboldt himself went on to become an adviser on acquisitions at museums such as the Louvre. The book contributed to putting American antiquities into discourse and wider circulation and to making them available for comparisons to other cultures, increasingly desirable to collectors and scholars who, following Humboldt's steps, began traveling West after Spanish America reached independence.

Collecting, Travel, and the Market in Antiquities

Following independence from colonial rule, national museums were founded across Spanish America: in Buenos Aires (1812/1823), Santiago de Chile (1813/1838), Bogotá (1823), Mexico (1825), Lima (1826), and later on in Montevideo (1837) and La Paz (1838).⁴¹ Many of these museums – which started off, materially and conceptually, as eighteenth-century cabinets of curiosities, retained both an encyclopedic scope and ambitions towards universality. But, as Irina Podgorny has suggested, universal museums were universal in very specific and situated ways, and their collections reflected local interests and were limited by what was available.⁴² A patriotic and chorographic logic – the aspiration to represent all that sprang from the nation's soil – gradually came to guide these institutions. But what made up the nation was only everyone's guess. It would take a full century for antiquities to come to be more explicitly associated with the nation. In the

Comentado [aR8]: I am not so sure of the title of this section... I would not isolate travelers here, because many of the people collecting were not so much travelers as they were consuls, merchants, landed elites... I think what makes antiquities exciting is how all these different professions shape collections and the way antiquities are exchanged and circulated

⁴¹ Maria Margaret Lopes and Irina Podgorny, "The Shaping of Latin American Museums of Natural History, 1850-1990," *Osiris* 15 (2000): 110. On the early history of Mexico's museum, see Miruna Achim, *From Idols to Antiquity: Forging the National Museum of Mexico* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2017). On Santiago de Chile's 'Cabinet of Natural History', see Daniela Serra Anguita, "Del Paisaje a la Vitrina. La Práctica naturalista en Chile y la formación del Gabinete de Historia Natural de Santiago. 1800-1843" (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Instituto de Historia, 2018), 154. On the first Peruvian national museum, see Stefanie Gänger, "Of Butterflies, Chinese Shoes and Antiquities: A History of Peru's National Museum, 1826-1881," *Jahrbuch für Geschichte Lateinamerikas* 51 (2014).

⁴² Podgorny, universal museums

meantime, the museum in Lima put out a circular, in 1826, asking collectors to donate natural rarities in their possession for the national museum; specifically, it called for ‘crystallized minerals, marbles and rocks’, shells, ‘quadrupeds’, plants, and ‘textiles and treasures (preciosidades) from the *huacas*.’⁴³ A similar circular went out in Mexico the same year, with the result that the early national collection soon displayed silver ores next to mummies and portraits of US presidents next to antiquities. Indeed, the museum’s first curator did not think twice about exchanging antiquities for a collection of stuffed birds from Senegal in 1828.⁴⁴ Antiquities, then, side by side other things... and shaped by these kinds of exchanges and juxtapositions

National museums were but some – and not necessarily the most relevant – nodes in a much wider, and growing, network that put antiquities into broader circulation. The collecting scenes and circles dating back to the monarchy did not disappear completely – the social and intellectual spaces, as well as many of the actors were still around – but it did become a lot more diverse and competitive. Not so much a centralized endeavor, but one of many actors, as well as different uses and logics for collecting. This complex scene was collecting involved a great number of actors, from foreign travelers and businessmen to the local elites, and more widely, new collections and cabinets of American antiquities in other parts of the world, most decidedly, the US and Western Europe. Early centers were Louvre, British Museum, and American Philosophical Society; by the late century, as we shall see, other museums, notably the Peabody, Berlin, Field, Smithsonian. We need a lot more dense case studies to reconstruct how the interactions between these different actors, and of the ways in which antiquities emerged at the

⁴³ These terms are the ones that were used in the circular dispatched on April 8, 1826, by Peru’s Ministry of Government and Foreign Affairs to the country’s ‘prefects, intendants, municipalities and parish priests’, asking for donations of ‘the natural rarities in their possession’ for the national museum. The circular asked specifically for ‘crystallized minerals, marbles and rocks’, shells, ‘quadrupeds’, plants, and ‘textiles and treasures (preciosidades) from the *huacas*’. José Serra, “Circular,” in (Archivo del Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Antropología e Historia, 1826). Could you just provide the reference in the footnote? I really like the info and I included it above. I think it gives the paper color

⁴⁴ Achim, “The Art of the Deal, 1828: How isidro Icaza Traded pre-Columbian Antiquities to Henri Baradère for Mounted Birds and Built a National Museum in Mexico in the Process.” *West* 86th 18.2 (2011): 214-231.

center of these interactions, shaped by new forces, such as the market, together with new scholarly, political, and scientific interests.

Both Mexico and Peru antiquities were collected by ...

an urban bourgeoisie of doctors, landowners, engineers, clergymen and military officials of creole and, in the Andes, Incan descent. Many of them were already collectors during pre-independence although there were also foreign immigrants who had become part of the social fabric of Spanish American societies everywhere. Indeed, already by the 1820s and 1830s cities like Cuzco, Campeche, or Antioquia, were home to lively private antiquities collections – many of them, doubling as museums and sociable spaces for antiquarian debate – frequented by creole fellow collectors and travelers, merchants or diplomats alike.

The magnificent private collections of metal art, sculptured and painted clay pots, feather dresses, turquoise masks, *quipus* and woven tunics gathered together by men and women like the Count of Peñasco (xxxx-xxxx), Carl Adolph Uhde (1792–1856), and Lucas Vischer (1780–1840) in Mexico City, Plancarte (xxxx-xxxx) in Michoacán, Leandro (d. 1849) and José María Camacho (d. 1854) in Campeche, Sologuren in Oaxaca (xxxx-xxxx), In Peru... guano boom produced rich aristocracy

Nicolás Acosta (1844 – 1893) in Bolivia, Ana María Centeno de Romainville (1817–1874) in Peru's southern highlands, Vicente Restrepo Maya (1837–1899) in Colombia, the Peruvian physician, José Mariano Macedo (1823–1894) and the Hannover-born textile merchant Christian Theodor Wilhelm Gretzer (1847–1926) in Lima are but the most renowned of the many assembled in Andean South and in Mexico over the course of the nineteenth century.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Stefanie Gänger, "The Many Natures of Antiquities: Ana María Centeno and Her Cabinet of Curiosities, Peru, ca. 1830-1874," in *Nature and Antiquities: The Making of Archaeology in the Americas*, ed. Philip Kohl, Irina Podgorny, and Stefanie Gänger, *Amerind Studies in Anthropology* (Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 2014). On Vicente Restrepo, see Clara Isabel Botero, *El Redescubrimiento del pasado Prehispánico de Colombia* (Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia, 2006), 87. On Leandro and José María Camacho, see Adam T. Sellen, "Fraternal Curiosity: The Camacho Museum, Campeche, Mexico," in *Nature and Antiquities. The Making of Archaeology in the Americas*, pp [M: fill in on Plancarte, Sologuren etc.] On José Mariano Macedo, see Stefanie Gänger, "Conversaciones sobre el pasado. José Mariano Macedo y la arqueología peruana, 1876 – 1894," *Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos* (2014), <http://nuevomundo.revues.org/67124>. On the Gretzer collection, Corinna Raddatz, *Ein Hannoveraner in Lima. Der Sammler*

What was very different, however, was the increasing presence in these same urban centers, of a transient group of foreigners, who traveled to Spanish America, in the wake of independence from Spain, to investigate its nature and peoples. Like Humboldt, many were attracted by the possibility of knowing a continent that was little known to Europeans outside of Spain; also like Humboldt, they were at the same time interested in the immense potential riches of the continent, so their scientific pursuits can hardly be separated from more mundane pursuits in commerce, mining, and diverse industries. As travellers, investors, commercial agents and diplomats from Europe and the US took West or South, information about the newly independent countries began travelling in the opposite direction. As did collections of natural history and antiquities. Although many foreigners did not arrive in Spanish America with specifically antiquarian interests in mind, once there, their pursuit of antiquities posed fierce competition to the fledgling national collections, while, at the same time, they also helped shape the discussion, circulation, and value of antiquities. An important early case is William Bullock, one of the first travelers to independent Mexico, whose book, *Six months' residence in Mexico* (1822) became an immediate guide for future investors and collectors. In parallel with his book, Bullock also organized an important exhibition of Mexico's natural and man-made riches, with a special section on ancient Mexico, which included both replicas and originals. As a result, one of the earliest shows on Mexican antiquities took place in Bullock's Egyptian Hall, in Piccadilly Square, causing a great sensation among visitors, some of whom would go on to Mexico with the mind bent on collecting similar kinds of objects. While the show a sensation in London, it is not farfetched to suggest that it had importance resonances in Mexico, serving as model and incentive for the foundation of Mexico's own National Museum two years later. Bullock's show was also at the center of

Praecolumbischer Altertümer Christian Theodor Wilhelm Gretzer (1847- 1926). Ausstellungskatalog (Hannover: Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum, 1985).

one of the earliest diplomatic negotiations to repatriate antiquities, which Bullock returned in exchange for mining permits.⁴⁶

Faced with an incipient trade in antiquities both the Peruvian and the Mexican governments enacted legislation – in 1822 and 1827, respectively – that prohibited unauthorized exports of antiquities, together with that of precious metal and minerals.⁴⁷ Though these laws responded in some measure to gestures such as Bullock's – 'depriving us of the benefit of what is ours'⁴⁸ –, and were also under the influence of colonial laws governing exportation of mineral riches, they were presumably also inspired by early property laws and legal restrictions on exports of antiquities, passed from as early as 1624, in the Papal States in Rome and later also in the Bourbon Kingdom of Naples.⁴⁹ They are also part of a wider international awareness and care for antiquities, which saw similar antiexport legislation in Egypt in 1835 and in newly independent Greece in 1834.⁵⁰ But, as we shall see, such laws, while they called attention to antiquities as valuable – or at least as valuable because they enjoyed legal protection –, they had the effect of making them more valuable and more coveted, but did little to deter international trafficking with antiquities. Indeed, Bullock even made reference to this very legislation as he was seeking to auction his collection in London at a higher price, claiming that his might be just the last collection of antiquities to leave Mexico. The effect was not immediate, and antiquities would not bring in a high price until a lot later.⁵¹ Still, antiquities were become increasingly objects of speculation and foreigners continued to

⁴⁶ In the Mexican case, collecting preconquest antiquities began even before foreigners set foot on the Mexican mainland; in the 1820s, with the port of Veracruz occupied by Spanish troops, travelers to Mexico had to first lay anchor in the Isla de Sacrificios, where they spent their time combing the beaches for "idols," many of which would end up in the British Museum. [M: shorten + include reference]

⁴⁷ Achim, *From Idols to Antiquity: Forging the National Museum of Mexico*. [page number or alternative citation] See also Earle, *The Return of the Native*, 138.

⁴⁸ Torre-Tagle and E.B. Monteagudo, "2 de Abril de 1822. Los Monumentos que Quedan de la Antigüedad de Perú..." in *Colección de Leyes, Decretos y Ordenes. Publicadas en el Perú desde el año de 1821 hasta 31 de Diciembre de 1859*, ed. Juan Oviedo (Lima: Felipe Bailly, 1822).

⁴⁹ On these early restrictions on exports and property laws, see Margaret M. Miles, "Greek and Roman Art and the Debate About Cultural Property," in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Art and Architecture*, ed. Clemente Marconi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 502.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 506.

⁵¹ López Luján on Latour Allard... his collection does not sell

collect them and to devise increasingly sophisticated ways of taking them out. There was, of course, the more mundane bribing of a customs official, although exportation of antiquities would include the famed claim of consular privilege – Poinsett in the case of the collection for the American Philosophical Society, Uhde's for Handschusheim and then Ethnological Museum in Berlin –mixing up pages of manuscripts (Aubin), and double-layered suitcases⁵². Indeed, throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there was little success at deterring the export of antiquities, with probably some of the most notorious contraband stories being the draining of the Sacred Cenote at Chichen Itza, by US consul Edward Thompson, on behalf of Peabody at Harvard⁵³; and the treasures of the Macchu Picchu, on behalf of Yale University. As diplomats, merchants, consuls, private collectors exported their collections, increasingly, there was more visibility and, increasingly, interest and value.

Little reconstruction of these scenes... complex nodes... and the way they interacted with each other and with larger national structures vivid intellectual sphere that surrounded these private collections and that would be fundamental to the conception, understanding, and visibility of 'antiquities' for decades to come. Still, when studied collectively, the ways these collections were built, displayed, and used provide a valuable window into the changing meanings and uses of antiquities in the nineteenth century.

One of the uses was, after all, personal prestige, would redound to the owner's advantage, because they had become recognized as an affirmation of taste, or a testimony to one's education.... They were ways of socializing, by foreigners and by locals around certain objects... this is interesting because there are testimonies of new objects being discovered and people trying to see them. At the same time, this played into much wider political structures and uses... . Until well into the 1870s, Mexico was debating itself between federalism and centralism, with the result that antiquities collections were a

⁵² Achim von Waldeck

⁵³ Guillermo Palacios on Thompson

form of resistance... being given or taken, granted or withheld. In fact, Yucatan, which was pretending independence... these were forms of defining local identities. Centeno and regional elites in Peru. as well as to display the greatness of their *patria chica* – Cuzco.

Historiography has traditionally derided the role of these ‘amateurs’, but it was precisely collectors’ professional and personal lives as military engineers, landowners or society ladies that allowed them to generate much of the basis for Americanist collecting in the 19th ce.: on the basis of excavations and acquisitions from indigenous communities, but also family heirlooms (with Indian elite families) and trade and barter with fellow collectors.

perhaps add here: Recent studies have contributed nuance to our understanding of the relationship between the nation and antiquities [...], and argued that the nation was a recurrent but by no means an all-prevailing motif. Especially over the long nineteenth century, at a time when the central governments of many Spanish American countries were either unable or not invoked to provide a setting and funds for antiquarian, archaeological and art historical scholarship – when the finest collections were private rather than public, and when antiquaries, *salonnières* or travellers financed their journeys and publications with private fortunes – the nation-state was all too often eclipsed by rather personal purposes and intellectual partialities. This is not to say that the logic of patriotism, and later nationalism, was not relevant in according ‘antiquities’ visibility, that ‘antiquities’ were not representations of the nation-state, for there can be no doubt that they were. It is to say, however, that the nation-state was but one of many collectivities, and concepts, that furthered ‘antiquities’ visibility, and coherence as a category, over the long nineteenth century.]

It was at the confluence of a variety of elements – patriotism, the travelers’ fascination with a continent unknown to them, or creole elite sociability, to name but a few – that pre-conquest antiquities were put into wider circulation, becoming more visible, and more coveted, in the early 1800s. Antiquities were not only ‘boundary objects’ between a host of characters – diplomats, artists or collectors; it was also their incipient ‘commodification’

at their hands which rendered them more broadly available, more desirable, and elevated them to a new degree of recognition, and popularity.

Paper Collections

By the time the American Hall opened up at the Louvre, many antiquities had been traded between collectors and museums, had been exchanged from place to place. Many, however, could not be traded as easily, as John Lloyd Stephens found out when he offered to buy the ruins of Copán and move them stone by stone to New York. Many pre-conquest antiquities – unwieldy, heavy and too fragile to be transported easily across mountain ranges and oceans – became known to scholars and collectors through visual representations on paper rather than first-hand:⁵⁴ through drawings, engravings, lithographs, photographs, and paper molds... reflecting on the availability of new technologies which could be reproduced on an increasingly massive scale, and, as such, could reach wider audiences. Some of these “paper technologies”⁵⁵ come from other fields, such as botany... Images came to acquire relevance in antiquarian publications more broadly from the late 1700s, in the wake of a ‘visual turn’ in antiquarianism.⁵⁶ Visual turn in botany, earlier, correspond to conventions of standardization and increasing abstraction, to show most relevant details. In other words, images would function as immutable mobiles, to transport and translate images into a well-recognized and universal language, to mediate between local and global taxonomies. Such was not the case in antiquarianism because although, this is something that was still in the making in antiquarianism because it was harder to classify, as catalogues such as Longperier’s makes clear. It was, in fact, paper collections, that is drawings, folios, etc., which would, in time, create a visual record and archive, which, in turn, would in time help classify, organize and order the multiple

⁵⁴ [Portable antiquities, Irina Podgorny]

⁵⁵ Define meaning. For bibliography on paper technologies see Andrew Mendelsohn, Hess Volker, Stefan Wille-Müller, Isabelle Charmentier, Miruna Achim

⁵⁶ Joanne Pillsbury, "Finding the Ancient in the Andes: Archaeology and Geology, 1850-1890," in *Nature and Antiquities. The Making of Archaeology in the Americas*, ed. Philip L. Kohl, Irina Podgorny, and Stefanie Gänger (Tucson: Arizona University Press, 2014), 51.

manifestations of antiquities, and shaping the ways in which they were used and perceived.

The grand-scale folios of Alexander von Humboldt's 1810 *Vues des Cordillères* were some of the earliest visual representations of pre-conquest antiquities from Peru and Mexico, but they would soon be followed by others. In 1827, the curator of Mexico's National Museum, Isidro Icaza (1783–1834) put out a collection of lithographs – the *Colección de antigüedades que existen en el Museo Nacional* –, illustrated by Jean Frederick Waldeck, in an attempt to increase the visibility of the museum's holdings.⁵⁷ In 1834, Henri Baradère (1792–1839) published images from Captain Guillermo Dupaix's (1746–1818) antiquarian expeditions to Palenque,⁵⁸ while Lord Kingsborough's (1795–1837) nine-volume *Antiquities of Mexico* disseminated descriptions and illustrations of Mexican pre-conquest artefacts and codices.⁵⁹ Overall, these images show an important departure from the original expedition drawings – which tend to show isolated objects, as one would find in a herbarium --, catering as they did, to European romantic tastes for the sublime and the picturesque, Peruvians soon followed suit. Over the 1840s, the Peruvian naturalist Mariano Eduardo de Rivero (1798–1857) crafted the lithographic atlas 'Peruvian Antiquities (*Antigüedades Peruanas*)', which he eventually published in 1851 in collaboration with Johann Jacob von Tschudi (1818–1889); an English translation followed in 1857.⁶⁰ These lithographs' influence was limited on account of their cost, but they did reach an avid, public and scholarly readership – men like Longpérier, for instance, who, in

⁵⁷ Achim, *From Idols to Antiquity: Forging the National Museum of Mexico*. [M: Page number]

⁵⁸ [M.]

⁵⁹ Lord Kingsborough, *Antiquities of Mexico*: (London: Robert Havell and Colnaghi, Son, and Co, 1831).

⁶⁰ Rivero intended an earlier, 1841 edition, of Peruvian Antiquities (*Antigüedades Peruanas*) focusing on pre-Columbian sites in the country's north – as the first of a two-volume publication. Mariano Eduardo de Rivero y Ustariz, *Antigüedades Peruanas. Parte Primera* (Lima: Imprenta de José Masias, 1841). Rivero authored a second version of Peruvian Antiquities, comprising north and south, together with the Swiss scholar Johann Jacob von Tschudi. It was published in Spanish in 1851 and in 1857 in English translation. Mariano Eduardo de Rivero y Ustariz and Johann Jacob von Tschudi, *Antigüedades Peruanas* (Viena: Imprenta Imperial de la Corte y del Estado, 1851). According to the preface to the English version, Rivero sent the manuscript to Tschudi, who added 'thereto observations on the Peruvian crania, Quichuan language, religion, &c. [...]' *Peruvian Antiquities*, trans. Francis L. Hawks, 2 ed. (New York: Putnam, 1857), XIII.

several of the entries corresponding to the Mexican objects, directed his readership to the fourth volume of Lord Edward Kingsborough's *Mexican Antiquities*.⁶¹

From the mid-1800s, photographs came to supplement drawings, engravings and lithographs in the representation of American antiquities. Archaeology and the art of photography matured simultaneously in the nineteenth century and often converged in contemporaries' minds and efforts.⁶² Photographs of Egyptian, Greek and Roman antiquities circulated from the earliest days of photography, and some of the first well-known photographs of Mesoamerican ruins date back to the 1857 sojourn of Claude-Joseph Le Désiré Charnay.⁶³ The North American diplomat Ephraim George Squier is said to have made the first attempt to use the camera to record the pre-Columbian material culture of Peru in 1864 and 1865.⁶⁴ Squier owned, upon his return from Peru, a personal collection that contained fifty photographs of 'ancient Peruvian pottery' and two-hundred photographs of ruins. While some of the photographs in Squier's collection are signed 'E.G.S. Phot.', attesting to Squier's authorship, a few are from sets which, according to Keith McElroy, were available from local commercial studios at the time of Squier's visit to Lima.⁶⁵ By the late 1800s, photographs of preconquest 'antiquities' appeared in popular atlases, exhibition catalogues, and travel reports – the photographs of ancient sites and antiquities that illustrated Thomas Hutchinson's well-known 1873 travel report 'Two Years in Peru with

⁶¹ See, for instance, Longpérier, , N° 19, 18; N° 49, 21; N°55, 22, N°58, 23; N°61, 24.

⁶² For the association between archaeology and photography in Europe, see Annetta Alexandridis and Wolf-Dieter Heilmeyer, *Archäologie der Photographie. Bilder aus der Photothek der Antikensammlung Berlin* (Mainz Philipp von Zabern, 2004). See also Bohrer Annetta Alexandridis and Wolf-Dieter Heilmeyer (2004), *Archäologie der Photographie. Bilder aus der Photothek der Antikensammlung Berlin* (Mainz Philipp von Zabern): 19-20.

⁶³ Christine Barthe, *Le Yucatan Est Ailleurs: Expéditions Photographiques (1857-1886) de Désiré Charnay* (Paris: Musée du Quai Branly / Actes Sud, 2007); Andrew Szegedy-Maszak, "Introduction," in *Antiquity & Photography. Early Views of Ancient Mediterranean Sites*, ed. Claire L. Lyons, et al. (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2006).

⁶⁴ Keith McElroy, "The History of Photography in Peru in the Nineteenth Century. 1839 - 1876" (Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977), 167.

⁶⁵ "Ephraim George Squier: Photography and the Illustration of Peruvian Antiquities," *History of Photography* 10, no. 2 (1986): 104.

Exploration of its Antiquities',⁶⁶ for instance, – and were valuable tools for both archaeological reasoning and representation. Indeed, photographs would become increasingly routine for documenting and registering objects and as camera equipment became less and less unwieldy, photography became essential protocol for all excavation or exploration.... A case in point are Seler photographs, but also photographs of collections (Genin, Boban, Sologuren, etc)

Photographs were imperfect renderings of the originals, as the Peruvian antiquary Macedo put it – the photographs of 'the mysterious *kipus* of the Incas', he suggested, his correspondent ought to examine with a magnifying glass to appreciate the colors and distance of the knots⁶⁷ – but they allowed museum directors, collectors and scientists from the Americas and Europe to enter in conversations about the meaning, age, or interest of the same antiquity, when neither they nor the objects were in the same place.⁶⁸

Photographs came to supplement, but not to replace drawings and lithographs, for various reasons. Wilhelm Reiß (1838–1908) and Alphons Stübel (1835–1904), for instance, though they employed photomechanical techniques in their 1875 excavations of the Ancón cemetery, chose color lithographs over black-and-white photography for their 1880- atlas 'Das Todtenfeld von Ancón in Peru (*The Necropolis of Ancón in Peru*) to be able to register, and preserve, the vibrancy of the colors in Ancón textiles.⁶⁹ In their explorations to the ruins of Metlatoyuca, in 1866, in turn, the explorers took a camera, but they also took along a draftsman, José María Velasco, because photographs introduced shadows that were very difficult to tell from reliefs. The draftsman would make up for these possible confusions. In other cases, photography was used in combination with an equally new paper

⁶⁶ Thomas J. Hutchinson (1873), *Two Years in Peru, with Exploration of its Antiquities*, 2 vols. (London: Sampson Low, Marston Low & Searle): xi. See also Benavente, Majluf and Wuffarden, 'Cronología'.

⁶⁷ José Mariano Macedo (1882), 'Carta a Adolf Bastian, Paris, 7 de Enero', *Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Ethnologisches Museum. Sammlung Macedo Pars I B. Litt. J.*

⁶⁸ Stefanie Gänger, "Picturing Antiquities. Photographs of Pre-Columbian Artefacts from the Collection of José Mariano Macedo (1823–1894)," in *Exploring the Archive. Historical Photography from Latin America. The Collection of the Ethnologisches Museum Berlin*, ed. Manuela Fischer and Michael Kraus (Vienna / Cologne / Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2015).

⁶⁹ Pillsbury, "Finding the Ancient in the Andes: Archaeology and Geology, 1850-1890," 54.

technology: paper molds or lottinoplasties (also called facsimilars), invented by Lottin de Narval in the mid nineteenth century. They consisted in placing various layers of wet paper on top of a relief and in waiting for it to dry, then sealing it with flaxseed oil. Such molds had the advantage of being light. On his second visit to Yucatan and Palenque, in 1882, Desiré Charnay also took molds of various surfaces and then took photographs of these molds. The advantage over taking photographs of the ruins themselves was obvious: Charnay could, after all, control exposure and shadows in the controlled environment of his laboratory. Many molds were displayed in museums, making up, as it were for the masterpieces missing and allowing for closer and more detailed study. By the late nineteenth century, molds became a very important tool for the study of Mayan hieroglyphs.⁷⁰

Over the course of the nineteenth century, paper technologies contributed to create large archives of replicas of antiquities, extending their visibility and recognition. These replicas were being increasingly collected and archived at museums and academies, and as such, served to make the objects themselves easier to visualize from afar. Paper technologies were not passive supports for representation; on the contrary, the ways in which they made things available and the circuits through which they were exchanged and traded – these latter, not necessarily the same circuits of the antiquities themselves -- , were also heuristic devices for the study and interpretation of the antiquities themselves. Visual representations could be regrouped, reshuffled, placed side by side – in a way antiquities could not -- to promote comparisons between artifacts. To Humboldt, for instance, the availability of drawings made it possible for him to compare American with Egyptian antiquities, as in the first plate in his *Vues des Cordillères*, for instance, that of the statue of a kneeling woman, which Humboldt compared with images of Isis from the calendar at Dendera – images he saw in Vivant Denon's book on Egypt, on the wake of the Napoleonic campaigns in Northern Africa.⁷¹ They allowed, thus for easier exchange and translations between local and global taxonomies, between local categories and the developing broader

⁷⁰ [...] [M: Add reference] Sweeney; Charnay

⁷¹ [...]

categories of archaeological sciences. They shaped the formation of canons – just as earlier, in the eighteenth century, molds and casts had contributed to shaping the development of canons of masterpieces of Greek and Roman statuary⁷²-- creating fads for different kinds of objects at different moments. Indeed, to a large extent, they were responsible for popularity of a kind of blackware ceramic from central Mexico, purchased extensively by museums, and eventually, they were responsible for revealing the same ceramic to be a fake. By the late nineteenth century, paper technologies gave an important boost to the collection of Mayan artefacts; no respectable museum would lack Mayan objects or at least casts of them. For instance, the National Museum in Mexico, the Smithsonian and the Louvre, all owned casts of a famous Palenque relief, the so-called Cross Relief; ironically, parts of the relief were to be found in various places, and it was the photographs of these casts – replicas of replicas – that eventually determined the Mexican government to unify the three panels in the National Museum. And they played an increasingly important role in sales. Visual representations also played an important part in promoting and rendering visible antiquities, sometimes – intentionally or not – preparing the ground for the sale of collections abroad. The fourth volume of Lord Edward Kingsborough's *Mexican Antiquities*, for instance, consisted of drawings of the Latour Allard collection, which, Longpérier insisted, 'contributed to the reputation of M. Latour Allard's antiquities, which are known in all savant Europe'⁷³ and in the end would prove crucial to the purchase of the collection by the Louvre (which had refused to buy it two decades earlier).⁷⁴

At any rate, American 'antiquities' popularity, and recognition, was further extended through the parallel circulation of drawings, engravings, lithographs and, from the 1840s, photographs of them. As suggested in this

⁷² Charlotte Schreier, Competition, Exchange, Comparison. Nineteenth-Century Cast Museums in Transnational Perspective, *The Museum is Open. Towards a Transnational History of Museums, 1750-1940*, edited by Andrea Meyer and Bénédicte Savoy (Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2014): 31-44.

⁷³ Longpérier, 7.

⁷⁴ The antiquities were exported by Latour-Allard out of Mexico in 1826 and afterwards went on a twenty-year pilgrimage between England and France. [M.: complete reference] López Luján et al. recorded the complicated routes of these objects over twenty years.

section, paper technologies were not exactly immutable mobiles – they betray tastes, a need to appeal to different kinds of viewers, engrained prejudices – so, the question of how a representation transformed the object how the object was known or classified, used or sold, was becoming more and more relevant. As a result, it was necessary to establish strict protocols for representation – and hence, study --of antiquities. By the late century, antiquarianism would develop as a scientific discipline, with departments at museums and universities and with increasingly specialized academies.

Institutionalization and the Formation of Disciplines

Not just that institutions study things... things become forms of developing a niche within these institutions

For instance, area Maya in US... to give identity to certain groups

The late 1800s saw a series of processes of national and international institutionalization and disciplinary formation – especially, the consolidation of the disciplines of archaeology and ethnography – that entrenched the academic significance and public visibility of antiquities.

The 1851 opening of the ‘American Museum (*Musée Américain*)’ in the Louvre marked the beginning of a period in which American antiquities came to be exhibited ever more prominently in public museums – especially newly-founded anthropology museums – across Europe and the Americas. The foundation of the *Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard* in 1866, of the *Musée d’ethnographie du Trocadéro* in 1878 – a foundational moment in French anthropology –, or of the *Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde* in Berlin in 1873 were significant moments in the gradual process that extended the antiquities’ popularity and recognition.⁷⁵ Across Spanish America, too, museums were reorganized or re-founded – in Mexico after 1885, in Peru in 1905, or in Chile in 1912 – in ways that reflected an increasing disciplinary specialization and public interest in antiquities. Competition between these and other large collections museums – both within the same countries and internationally – for the acquisition of select antiquities or entire, private collections of them drove up the prices and value of South and Mesoamerican antiquities over the last decades of the nineteenth century.⁷⁶ Indeed, the market in South and Mesoamerican

Comentado [aR9]: S: this section is our weak link... I have not done anything to it because we should sit down and think where we should be taking it

⁷⁵ On the history and relevance of the Trocadéro Museum, see Nélia Dias, *Le Musée D’ethnographie du Trocadéro (1878-1908)* (Paris: Editions du CNRS, 1991). On the history of the *Königliches Museum für Völkerkunde* in Berlin – Berlin’s Ethnological Museum –, founded in 1873, but inaugurated in 1886, and other German ethnological museums, see Glenn H. Penny, *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

⁷⁶ On competition and its effect on the prices of antiquities, see *Objects of Culture*, 10; 69-70. See also Gänger, *Relics of the Past. The Collecting and Study of Pre-Columbian Antiquities in Peru and Chile, 1837-1911*, 146-55.

antiquities expanded significantly in response to institutionalization process over the late 1800s, with the trade in antiques – authentic and, increasingly, fraudulent ones, too – professionalizing rapidly.⁷⁷

Decide fraud from authentic is important because it is a way of giving authority...

Also inspections

Antiquities also made their appearance in /brought about the emergence of a series of other forums... The late 1800s also saw the emergence of a host of learned societies across the Americas that were either devoted the study of South and Mesoamerican antiquities or, more often, that welcomed contributions to it: Santiago's American Archaeological Society (*Sociedad Arqueológica* [sic] *Americana*, 1878), Lima's Geographical Society (*Sociedad Geográfica de Lima*, 1888/1891), the Mexican Society of Geography and Statistics (*Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y estadística*, 1833), or the Philadelphia *Numismatic and Antiquarian Society* (1857), among many others. Several of these societies published their own proceedings or journals, where by the late 1800s, contributions on antiquities increasingly gained ground. [M: examples] [antiquities were finally objects of study, with disciplined methods and conventions, as new disciplines for their study are consolidated.]

Much of the value, interest and meaning that came to be ascribed to 'antiquities' over the long nineteenth century evolved effectively in a transatlantic dialogue – one that involved scholars from Andean South and Mesoamerica as well as Europe, the United States and, sometimes, other parts of the world. European and North American travellers and creole antiquaries had met and exchanged ideas in Cuzco's, Antioquia's, or

⁷⁷ Pascal Riviale, "Las Colecciones Americanas en Francia en el siglo XIX: objetos de Curiosidad, objetos de estudio," in *Los Americanistas del siglo XIX. La construcción de una comunidad científica internacional*, ed. Leoncio López-Ocón, Jean-Pierre Chaumeil, and Ana Verde Casanova (Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2005), 32-5. On fake antiquities, see Irina Podgorny

Campeche's private collections as early as the 1840s,⁷⁸ and these meetings and exchanges in some measure 'formalized' during the last three decades of the nineteenth, when the scientific community of scholars from both sides of the Atlantic settled into increasingly institutionalized forms of encounter. They corresponded through the networks extended by archaeological societies and public museums all over the Atlantic world or gathered at the Congresses of Americanists, organized on a regular basis from 1875 – held at first exclusively in Europe, and from 1895, alternatingly in the Americas and Europe. Already during the late 1700s and early 1800s, the monumental antiquities of America had derived some of their epistemic interest from their ability to contribute to universal histories of mankind and enlightened models of societal progress.⁷⁹ Again during the late 1800s, the study of American antiquities often gained momentum where they seemed to respond to some of the period's most pressing anthropological questions – about the origins of civilization, racial theories, or diffusionist models. [M: add sth. on how to opt to think that America's ancient civilizations are autochthonous over the late 1800s? mounds in Ohio] Many of these forums also entailed new conventions and legal frameworks [add sth. on Congresses of Americanists + 1911 legislation – do you have material on that, M.?] 'Paper collections' were one of the most important tools that rendered ruins and antiquities 'translatable' and 'portable' in the second half of the nineteenth century and that allowed for the unprecedentedly dense and vibrant Americanist networks of the late-nineteenth century – a community that revolved around the study of America's pre-Columbian material culture.⁸⁰

Comentado [aR10]: I think we have already talked enough about all these precursors to institutionalization and we could leave this out from here...

Comentado [aR11]: We can add congresses here. I am adding legislation in the last section, when I talk about the national relevance of ruins and antiquities

⁷⁸ Sellen, "Fraternal Curiosity: The Camacho Museum, Campeche, Mexico."; Gänger, "The Many Natures of Antiquities: Ana María Centeno and Her Cabinet of Curiosities, Peru, ca. 1830-1874."

⁷⁹ See, for instance, Karge, "El Arte americano Antiguo y el Canon de la Antigüedad Clásica. El 'Nuevo Continente' en la Historiografía del Arte de la Primera Mitad del siglo XIX," 328.

⁸⁰ The expression 'portable antiquities' goes back to Flinders Petrie, who suggested that archaeology's purpose was to produce 'portable antiquities': plans, words, drawings and photographs that would connect the objects to their place of origin. See Irina Podgorny (2008), 'Portable Antiquities: Transportation, Ruins, and Communications in Nineteenth-Century Archaeology', *História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos* 15 (3). On translation, see also Miruna Achim 'Science in Translation: The Commerce of Facts and Artifacts in the Transatlantic Spanish World', *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 8 (2).

[not sure where this should go /whether it should be in here:] In the late 1800s and early 1900s, with the advent of methods associated today with the discipline of archaeology – the observation of material remains as they sequentially occur in stratigraphic deposits, chronological sequencing or stylistic seriation –, American antiquities came to assert their ability to contribute to the understanding, not only of a past, but of a past that distinguished periods and places. Up to the late nineteenth century, the Inka and, as they came to be called, ‘Aztecs’ not only prevailed in narratives about the pre-Columbian period, but encompassed and absorbed the material culture of a series of societies that are today thought to have developed long before or alongside them. Pre-Columbian civilization gradually became a graded, deeper ‘antiquity’ from the late 1800s, and the Inka and *Mexica* reconfigured into merely the last in a series of its manifestations. Meso- and South American antiquities acquired historical depth, just as they occupied a space ‘of their own’ and achieved visual recognition.⁸¹ Over the long nineteenth century, they extended their competences, expanded their territory and their hold on the collective imagination.

⁸¹ Achim and Podgorny 2014; Gänger 2018

Antiquities for the nation

In 1909, Justo Sierra, Mexico's influential minister of public instruction, urged his colleagues at the Ministry of Finance to allocate more funds for the care of antiquities, in anticipation of the celebrations of the Centenario, the 100-year anniversary of Mexico's independence, claiming the following: "For you, who are men of affairs and finance, this thing called archaeology is no more than a trivial and paltry thing, of little importance; but for us it is the only thing that distinguishes Mexico's personality before the scientific world; everything else exists elsewhere and is already being done [studied] by foreigners."⁸² In other words, more than any other object, antiquities identified Mexico as different and unique among the nations of the world. Behind Sierra's request is an ambition to authenticate a certain idea of the Mexican nation as legitimated and determined by and continuous with its ancient past, as materialized by vestiges, especially by those pertaining to central Mexico.⁸³ Among the beneficiaries of Sierra's petition was the completion of the reconstruction of Teotihuacan's massive Pyramid of the Sun, which became an obligatory pilgrimage site for Mexican politicians and foreign dignitaries and for scholars and high-placed personages, in the context of the festivities.⁸⁴

Although it culminated at the turn of the century, this process of identification of modern Mexico with the ancient past had been long in the making, involving, as we have seen, many actors, and many sites. Ironically, antiquities received a particular attention in in the context of the Second Empire, when Emperor Maximilian referred to himself by the title "Huey tlatoani" – that is, the title used by emperors of the Mexican Empire four hundred years before him – and sought to make the antiquities collection at the Museum one of the cornerstones of his empire, both by supporting the collection of antiquities throughout Mexico, the repatriation of specific

⁸² Justo Sierra, letter to Roberto Núñez, vice-secretary of Finance, May 18, 1909, *Obras Completas, XIV. Epistolario y papeles privados* (Mexico City: UNAM, 1984), 189-190.

⁸³ In part, privileging vestiges from central Mexico, associated broadly with the contours of the Mexica Empire has to do with their monumentality, but also with the relative ease of transporting them to the National Museum, reinforced in turn by an increasingly centralized vision of modern Mexico.

⁸⁴ Bueno, *The Pursuit of the Ruins*, p.

Comentado [aR12]: Here I start with what I know of Mexico. Obviously, this can be shortened. I am not sure if we should set up the two cases separately and then draw some larger conclusions from them. In any case, I have left everything you've written, although some of the arguments do not apply to the Mexican case. But we can correct that once we decide how we want to write this section. Main conclusions from this section would be the different ways in which modernity (modern Mexico and modern Peru) seek to draw legitimacy from the ancient prequest past. Other things that strike me as similar to both: -Use of prequest past to build national citizenry, etc. -Participation in world fairs – where they build pavilions inspired by ancient architecture or they show collections -Attempt to make antiquities and archaeology come into absolute control the state (I don't know if it's the case in Peru, but in Mexico everyone needs to apply to the state to carry out any kind of excavation, etc) --Finally, historiography has also naturalized these processes, and as a result it is hard to see how contingent they are and how the construction of antiquity has involved so many other agents. Maybe we can just end the entire paper on this note, suggesting the necessity for more case studies...

objects from the Vienna collections, and by moving the Museum from extremely cramped quarters into one wing of the National (then Imperial) Palace in the symbolic center of the city and the nation. By this gesture, Maximilian sought to bolster his own precarious rule by claiming the ancient past as part of his legitimate foundation and mandate to govern.⁸⁵

Maximilian's was, as we know, a short-lived experiment. It would be under the centralized and unified state finally accomplished by Porfirio Díaz that the archaeological collection finally achieved the visibility worthy of an object of national identification. Various measures ensured this. Beginning in 1887, the visitor entered the Museum through a gallery of monoliths -- mostly from the central Mexican region -- reflective of the advanced civilization reached by the ancients. Farther afield, for the protection of ruins throughout the country, Díaz established an Inspectorate for Ancient Monuments, with the mandate to supervise all excavation and care for ruins. These protections were reinforced with the passage of laws in 1896 and 1897, placing the state in control of the study and exchange of antiquities. Abroad, Mexico's participation in world fairs further stressed the identification with its prehispanic past by displaying antiquities collections and pavilions inspired by monumental prehispanic architecture. Finally, sealing the alliance between the state and state-run archaeology, in 1910, the national Museum of Mexico was divided: the archaeological collection remained in the National Palace, while the natural history collection was practically expelled, to fall gradually prey to moths and oblivion. 1910 also saw the overthrow of Díaz's regime.

But the commitment to antiquities as Mexico's distinct personality trait and as the legitimate foundation of the modern Mexican state persisted and has derived into a world class museum and into a concerted effort to silence and obscure all other meanings and uses of these objects. As pre-Conquest antiquities arrive in the National Museum, they are disciplined and disenchanting. Their ties with the local communities that used them broken,⁸⁶ they are supposed to take their places in the Museum side-by-side

⁸⁵ Achim, *From Idols to Antiquity*, p.

⁸⁶ This break is not always as complete as Museum authorities would expect. In a recent film, Jesse Lerner and Sandra Rozental have documented the rich social life of the Tlaloc monolith

like objects, to form a national collection, that belongs, abstractly, to all Mexicans and is entrusted with the serious task of educating them in the rituals of citizenship. Historiography has followed suit, erasing from the history of Mexican archaeology the kinds of questions and concerns we have been addressing here.

It was, however, a long process: before they became the objects of the Mexican state, they were objects of science, private speculation, market.

Peru... [here I think it might be interested if you show how Mexican situation contrasts with peruvian one]

In particular from the last decades of the nineteenth century, pre-Columbian symbols, alongside other, more generic icons of indigeneity, were to gain a fundamental place in the 'local definition of political legitimacy' in South and Mesoamerica.⁸⁷ It was only over the very last decades of the nineteenth century – under the Second Empire in Mexico (1863–1865) and in the years following the War of the Pacific (1879–1883) in Peru – that the Peruvian and Mexican governments increasingly committed themselves to providing the principal financial and institutional setting for the study of antiquities. Across Spanish America, museums were reorganized or re-founded in ways that reflected not only an increasing disciplinary specialization but also a growing state interest in antiquities: Peru's National Museum of History (*Museo Nacional de Historia*) was (re-) founded in 1905 with an own section devoted to archaeology, ethnology – the study of 'savage tribes' –, while in Mexico [M: fill in: museum and antiquities collecting is financed] [...] Peru and Mexico also regularly exhibited pre-conquest antiquities in their national pavilions and in the archaeological sections of the Universal Expositions, most visibly perhaps at the Paris Universal Exposition of 1889 and the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893⁸⁸. In doing so they

in the midst of the Coatlinchan community before and after the statue was moved to the National Museum of Anthropology in 1964 (*La piedra ausente*, film, Conaculta, 2013.)

⁸⁷ Majluf, "De la Rebelión al Museo," 257.

⁸⁸ Sven Schuster, "The World's Fairs as Spaces of Global Knowledge: Latin American Archaeology and Anthropology in the Age of Exhibitions," *Journal of Global History* 13 (2018):

not only capitalized on the antiquities' growing symbolism and appeal, but also, given these Universal Expositions' many visitors – the latter two alone had 28 million each –, significantly extended it further. The alliance between archaeology and the state certainly hit a peak across Spanish America with early-twentieth century 'indigenism': an artistic, literary and political discourse demanding the revaluation of indigeneity, designed to satisfy the need for 'an identity based on an authentic and organic national culture', that found expression in the creation and popularization of a shared symbolism selectively drawn from the pre-Columbian imagery.⁸⁹ In a process closely associated with the presidency of Porfirio Díaz (1876–80; 1884–1911) in Mexico and the government of Augusto B. Leguía (1908–12; 1919–30) in Peru, nationalism as a political ideology began to systematically sustain and affect the workings of Peruvian and Mexican archaeologies.⁹⁰ It was especially through the alliance between the state and particular archaeologists who came to have great influence – Leopold Bartres (1852–1926), Julio C. Tello (1880–1947) or Manual Gamio (1883–1960) – that politics and ideology came to bear ineluctably upon the study of antiquities. As happened so often in the decades around 1900, where even the most salient form of particularism – like nationalism – developed out of global processes⁹¹ – more restrictive national legislations prohibiting exports of antiquities were enacted partly in response to debates at international forums such as the Congresses of Americanists and partly to another expansion of the market in American antiquities with the vogue for

71. There are numerous studies devoted to the Spanish American participation in the world's fairs. See, for instance, Mauricio Trillo Tenorio, *Artifugio de la Nación Moderna: México en las Exposiciones Universales 1880-1930* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1998). [\[M: more references?\]](#)

⁸⁹ Natalia Majluf, "Nacionalismo e Indigenismo en el Arte americano," in *Pintura, Escultura y Fotografía en Iberoamérica, siglos XIX y XX*, ed. Rodrigo Gutiérrez Viñuales and Ramón Gutiérrez (Madrid: Cátedra, 1997), 249.

⁹⁰ On Peru, see César W. Astuhamán Gonzáles and Richard E. Daggett, "Julio César Tello Rojas: Una biografía," in *Julio C. Tello. Paracas Primera Parte.*, ed. Richard E. Daggett (Lima: Museo de Arqueología y Antropología de San Marcos, 2005). On Mexico, Christina Bueno, *The Pursuit of Ruins: Archaeology, History, and the Making of Modern Mexico* (Albuquerque, N.M.: University of New Mexico, 2016).

⁹¹ See Liah Greenfeld, **Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity** (Harvard University Press, 1992), cited in: Roland Robertson, "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity," in *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson (London: Sage, 1995), 30.

primitivism and surrealist art in the early 1900s.⁹² Peru passed a law in 1911 [Machu Picchu], Mexico [M:....] State indigenism irrevocably consolidated the meaning and interest of antiquities across much of Spanish America as epitomes of autochthony and political legitimacy. Whereas in Mexico, it was in particular Aztec antiquities and Central American monoliths [M:....] that were put to political use, in Peru the Inca were reimagined as Peru's 'national ancestors'. Long into the nineteenth century, 'antiquities' were associated with, but not necessarily limited in their appeal to a specific land or people. Incan antiquities, for instance, long represented a metaphor of civilization all South Americans could partake in. Just as the classical civilizations of the Old World – the Greek and Roman archaeological record – were the past undisputedly acknowledged as at the roots of European nations, regardless of the material remains to be found on their respective territories, the Incan archaeological record was a metaphor, not of race, language, or territory, but of an American civilization – permeable and inclusive enough to encompass Argentineans, Bolivians, Chileans and Peruvians alike.⁹³ It was only in the decades following the War of the Pacific (1879 – 1884), when ethnic nationalism, founded on a common race, history, and language, moved to the fore, displacing discourses about the nation as a unity based on individual rights, the sovereignty of the people and popular freedom,⁹⁴ that South Americans increasingly delineated their nation-states and national ancestries against each other and that the Inca were reimagined as Peru's 'national ancestors' to the exclusion of other states like Chile and Argentina, Bolivia and Ecuador, which gradually retreated from the Inca legacy.⁹⁵ [M.: not sure this should go here – you suggested I expand on it, I know, but I can only do that once we've decided on its definitive possession]

⁹² about 1911 legislation – Irina? Who to cite about primitive art?

⁹³ Díaz-Andreu, *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology* 78-80; Majluf, "De la Rebelión al Museo," 266.

⁹⁴ Díaz-Andreu, *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology*, 20-22, 79-80.

⁹⁵ Mónica Quijada Mauriño, "Los Incas Arios", historia, Lengua y Raza en la construcción Nacional Hispanoamericana del siglo XIX," in *Historia y Universidad: Homenaje a Lorenzo Mario Luna*, ed. Enrique González González (México, D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1996).

[...]

Epilogue 1910/11

[... end on the note of how the antiquities become political, after having travelled through the nineteenth century, where we see so many other uses for these objects... I think it is important that we make the point that these things were not intrinsically national ever, but depended on specific combinations of knowledge-producing technologies, commercial values, aesthetic understandings... they became objects of the nation state later]

[Mexicans receive those meanings to these days, through textbooks, public instruction, etc. But it is important to see this meaning not as something intrinsic, but as a construction, with its own contingencies and many sites and trajectories it took over the nineteenth century. Today, with community museums, new definitions of patrimony, it is important to reflect on how objects are made and how people position themselves around objects.]

[... return to: not yet classical (*pas encore classiques*)]

[A string of historical studies – Rebecca Earle, most recently – have explored how South and Mesoamerican ‘antiquities’ were at the service of the nation-state as a political ideology –... In the course of this paper, I think we have woven in and out of national boundaries, just like the antiquities themselves. We started with the concept of the national museum to show how it was not enough to explore what happened to antiquities in the nineteenth century. In fact, this is what you are saying in this paragraph about how nation was eclipsed. Maybe we can put this earlier, where we are talking about collections and competition, as national museums compete with private collectors over study, interpretation, and uses of antiquities.]