UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Ethnographies of Imperial Extraction: Creating and Cataloguing American Antiquity from Classical Archeology in the Nineteenth Century

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9960s4cf

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 48(3)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Lovely, Kendall

Publication Date
2025-12-07

DOI
10.17953/A3.25013

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

10.17953/A3.25013

Ethnographies of Imperial Extraction: Creating and Cataloging American Antiquity from Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth Century

Kendall Lovely

> It is not my intention in the present paper—which is simply what it purports to be, a *catalogue*—to attempt any discussion of the habits, customs, or domestic life of the Indian tribes from whom the articles were obtained; nor to enter upon a general comparison of the pottery and other objects with articles of a like character of other nations or tribes. Occasionally, attention may be called to striking resemblances between certain articles and those of other countries, where such comparison will aid in illustrating form or character.
>
> —James Stevenson, excerpted from his 1879 catalog for the Bureau of Ethnology

The section of Colonel James Stevenson's 1879 catalog introducing "articles of clay" provides important evidence of some of the national and international dimensions of archaeological networks of exchange during this period. Colonel Stevenson was largely concerned with analyzing this pottery in terms of natural history. In rendering vessels into specimens, Stevenson spends the first few pages typologizing and quantifying Zuni water vases in terms of their proportions. Following his service in the Union Army following the Civil War, James Stevenson conducted geological survey work on behalf of the US government, which led to ethnographic work for the Bureau of Ethnology (renamed the Bureau of American Ethnology in 1897). His wife, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, accompanied him and prepared his reports, including writing catalogs for him. She continued their work for the bureau following his death in 1888.[1] In this way, while the catalogs are attributed to Colonel Stevenson, authorship was shared through her labor.[2] Administratively, such expeditions and the catalogs that they

produced categorized peoples on behalf of colonial governments. The ethnographic museum catalog is a colonial archive and site of data collection, or "constitution of material-culture as data" as museum studies scholar Hannah Turner has approached it, as well as a discursive space for classifying, standardizing, naming, and excluding.[3] My study considers ways in which these four processes occurred through references to ancient civilizations in reifying the construction of "classical" Western (or "white") traditions as supporting archaeological nationalisms. Archaeological nationalisms, broadly speaking, involve adoptions of ancient pasts to bolster the formation of nation-state foundational myths, including justifications for imperial or colonial expropriations.[4] National archaeologies furthered imperial conceptions of time and history, which is why my study also lends to countering these conceptions through decolonial approaches to time and space through addressing epistemic erasure through ethnographic cataloging. Unpacking the centrality of nationalism in the pursuit of collecting should serve as a basis in reconsidering the ethics of material extraction from source.

References to antiquity preoccupied material artifact documentation in early anthropology. I pay attention to this preoccupation specifically through late nineteenth-century salvage anthropology discursive conceptions, which describe Native American traditions that "imitated" Mediterranean antiquity. This framing of Indigenous materials as imitative worked toward Indigenous dispossession in undermining Indigenous relationships with their own ancient pasts. Stevenson also emphasizes *proximity* to advanced civilization in collecting at Zuni and elsewhere in New Mexico.[5] In both delineating and connecting Native Americans and "Old World" antiquity, anthropologists construed these materials within a hierarchical comparative model. As the Smithsonian asserts new ethics policies, it is important that we consider the late nineteenth century as an era of massive material extraction, when its major collections were built.[6]

This article focuses on the American Southwest as a site of major resource extraction on behalf of increasing the collection of the United States National Museum's holdings during this formative period of the late nineteenth century. Since this region served as a significant site of extraction in terms of numbers of materials collected, however, it affords a starting point for continued approaches to revisiting other ethnographic cataloging archives. Although I employ "material culture" as a more neutral term, I advocate for scrutinizing all terminologies wherein the specific museum materials *become* mere objects through cataloging processes. This study centers the movement of the Stevenson collection, introduced to the US National Museum (now the Smithsonian) at first as a set of scientific specimens. For instance, the scientific designation applied to these collections was unstable through its extended use as a cross-cultural currency between institutions and governments, wherein the items served as objects of trade between museum collections.[7] I build from extant work that traces the exchange of these materials into national and international institutions. Anthropologists Catherine Nichols and Nancy Parezo have described the impact of such catalogs' research value in cross-museum exchanges under Smithsonian curator Otis T. Mason. Through research and publication, systematization of a collection was set and ready for exchange on the grounds of a museum having a surplus of examples.[8]

It is this rendering of materials into mere examples to fill gaps in systematized sets that I seek to call into question as problematic.

Overall, the historiography is invested in defining this history of anthropology as a *science*.[9] Anthropology of this period was ill-defined in terms of distinctions of ethnological and archaeological fields, but the role of individuals' interests largely amounts to the desire to scientifically cast the American past as applicable within their contemporary problems of categorization of peoples. In the introduction to their museum studies reader on source communities, museum anthropologists Allison K. Brown and Laura Peers point to the unidirectional relationships that underscore scientific objectification as process. These nonreciprocal relationships involve collectors drawing from source communities within colonized regions into museums as institutions residing within empire.[10] Imperial power thus relies on having a consolidated and centralized authority on information, premised on mining not just materials but Indigenous knowledge itself for its collections. In focusing on this narrow case study, which I also embed into more expansive, interconnected disciplinary contexts, I consider how the language around imitation and cultural reproduction served a critical function in the construction of a nationalist American antiquity based in Indigenous dispossession in the Southwest. [11]

Recognizing the ongoing legacy of this imperial desire is essential to understanding the dispossession of the American Southwest through its material culture. It also relates to some of the later discussions of what this institutionalization meant in terms of the production of aesthetic and commercial values that would follow anthropological salvage. These catalogs eventually assisted in commodifying the material production of those people on behalf of private collectors.[12] Developments in commercial valorization of Indigenous material culture were, in some ways, codependent with the scientific value placed upon material culture, yet do not fully account for what it meant to turn this dispossession into a "science," which was first central to cataloging as colonial record-keeping. In taking on late nineteenth-century cataloging as a primary source rather than examining the extant collections directly, this study reflects on document-keeping that may bear only traces of materials that are now entirely misplaced. I recognize this also underscores the many challenges to implementing large-scale efforts for better stewardship and reclamation, but this issue still underscores the necessity of facing down the broad extent of museum collections for reparative work.

In reapproaching catalogs as records of this knowledge dispossession, I utilize the concept of pyroepistemology, as archaeologist Paulette Steeves theorizes, which acknowledges colonization and cleanses the academic landscape of discussions that misinform worldviews and fuel racism, clearing the way for new approaches.[13] While various disciplines, including museum anthropology and archaeology, unpack the colonial histories of their disciplines, this interdisciplinary discussion deserves more than a nod to decolonial critique, instead advancing an epistemic cleansing that allows new growth from these archives. As museums revisit their extensive holdings, such epistemological cleansing means reconsidering each collection as containing intrinsic worth to source communities beyond factoring into large groups of data, as initially collected.

In 1879, the Stevensons served as agents of a mass-displacement of material culture from the Southwest, and the legacy of that displacement still reflects in many collections today. The introduction to the 1879 catalog boasts an assemblage of "two thousand eight hundred and fifty eight specimens."[14] Much attention relies on the restitution of "major" artifacts, but the banalized status of these multitudinous "duplicates," "specimens," or "copies" remains largely unquestioned in terms of their mass-displacements into collections, which should have broader consideration in terms of the ethics and definition of looting while large institutions like the Smithsonian seek to reevaluate their collections. Some of this reevaluation, after all, has more urgency in light of revisions to the care and display criteria of collections in the new NAGPRA guidelines developed during Deb Haaland's tenure at the Department of the Interior.[15] In a more minute scope, these displacements occurred as a part of international scientific knowledge exchange, wherein materials were rendered into terms of "resemblance," "imitation," and "reproduction." This restrictive language transcends cataloging and continues to dispossess Indigenous peoples of their pasts with regard to their proximity or contact with other civilizations, ancient and modern. The limitations of resemblance and imitation persist in severing Indigenous relations from precolonial deep time through an imposed standard of imperial cultural production as primary arbiters of knowledge.

Unsettling Settler Science

Catalogs read as early guides for those engaged in collecting for scientific survey research while they reproduced certain forms of language across newly forming disciplines, and in the case of the Stevenson catalogs, American schools of archaeology and ethnology were both emerging though not yet distinct from each other as separated anthropology fields. I analyze the 1879 catalog's introductory material to provide a synchronic rather than a diachronic view of its collectors' uses of language of imitation in their expedition work. In the above-quoted "articles of clay" section, as James Stevenson moves into his analysis of "specific details" concerning shapes on the clay, his discussion continues to label forms based in his sense of imitation.[16] Moving away from the reductionist implications of "resemblance" and "imitation" of cultural forms as documented in early collecting catalogs necessitates viewing early documentation efforts as settler-scientific appropriations of materials in Indigenous worlds. Viewing these catalogs in the contexts of military, land, and labor exploitation involved in the documenting of Indigenous ethnographic and archaeological materials underscores how such discursive appropriations of materials eliminates deeper meanings and knowledges within processes of classification.

As quoted in the outset of this article, Stevenson's approach to documenting articles of clay, largely from New Mexico Pueblo peoples, raised the possibility of noting "striking resemblances" to other countries' materials. While the term "taxonomy" is not used, it is implied where he suggests that resemblance helps in characterizing these clay articles. He approaches his typologization over the next few pages, detailing which clays and minerals the potters used in the vessels' manufacture, as well as

noting some of the local flora and fauna depicted on their decorations. "Articles of clay" sections were most extensive in terms of numbers of items, but Stevenson also categorizes objects as "articles of stone," "vegetal substances" (which included basketry, food, medicines, among other types of items), and "animal substances" (which included horn, bone, skin, and woven fabrics). In Stevenson's particular focus on material, the catalog takes after the systemization of a zoological, botanical, or geological observer.

More descriptive work on culture was undertaken later by his wife, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, and others such as Frank Hamilton Cushing, but the catalog still strove to capture a broad range of life activities in its scope. Matilda Coxe Stevenson herself would take up photography as a major contribution to her documentation of Indigenous peoples, which invites its own discussion of the role of photographic imaging beyond the more text-based cataloging that proceeded it in the Stevensons's collecting.[17] While the Stevenson catalog does bring in documentation of Indigenous language terms for plants and animals, this also incorporates a collecting scope that took terms on their own with little further meaning. The organization around plants, animals, and minerals in the catalog draws immediate associations with zoology, botany, and geological surveying in asserting a seemingly neutral gaze of scientific inquiry.

Yet this descriptive approach (inasmuch as its practitioners meant it to resemble the scientific specimen collecting of flora and fauna in an expedition setting) also served as a collection of data to further imperial knowledge and resource extraction.[18] As a reminder of the colonial setting of the work, the combined 1879 catalog comprising the Stevenson collections opened with a "Letter of Transmittal" by the Bureau of Ethnology director, Major John W. Powell, who confers thanks to Generals Sherman, Hatch, and Buell in aiding their expedition work. These acknowledgements underscore the presence of the nearby Fort Wingate (in the case of Zuni) and the overall army presence in New Mexico and Arizona at the time. The address toward the army presence serves as a reminder that the conditions of collecting were carried out within a colonial territory and specifically serving in the management of Indigenous lands.[19] The opening letter from John Wesley Powell, himself both geological surveyor and former army member, indicated the presence of Frank Hamilton Cushing as part of the expedition where this ethnographic and archaeological material collecting took place. Cushing would later continue after Powell in the pursuit of documenting as much Indigenous life as possible, and would be succeeded in turn by J. Walter Fewkes on behalf of the Bureau of (American) Ethnology. Although a sort of rival to Cushing, Matilda Coxe Stevenson and others worked in conjunction to amass large amounts of material for the Smithsonian's natural history collections.[20] Thus, this documentation was not mere neutral description out of its context alone.

In the 1879 Stevenson catalog, even general description was not neutral where comparison and concern with documenting exemplary decorative forms was a priority for anthropological collectors. Regarding decoration, Stevenson writes that, while he can generalize in describing forms of pottery, the ornamentation patterns of these vessels vary so that no two pieces are exactly the same.[21] Nonetheless, he does make some general assumptions in his observations about these patterns. The four classes of pottery he lists here include "red or uncolored pottery," "brown ware," "black ware,"

and "cream white pottery decorated in colors." Where on the previous page Stevenson remarks twice on the lack of "foreign matter" in clay specimens that he studied, he raises a concern that he often repeats observing the vessels themselves: "The influence of contact with the European races is here very apparent, as, for example, in the true pitcher and other common utensils and an apparent attempt at glazing," writes Stevenson in characterizing the brown ware class of pottery.[22] This is a contrast with his earlier statement that all North American aboriginal pottery is unglazed as a rule—thus confining any adaptations with glazing techniques to mere imitation through European or Euro-American contact.[23] In contrast, a different framework might view not foreign influence but Indigenous knowledge gained through active systems of cultural knowledge reproduction.

Issues around ethics and reproduction are not new for cultural workers dealing with some of the legacies of early anthropology's sweep of cultural material during the salvage era. In a 2011 article, museum anthropologist Gwyneira Isaac examined debates in representational theory and reproductions of knowledges pertaining to Zuni material culture, where Isaac's fieldwork involved examining issues that arose in displaying materials at Zuni's museum, A:shiwi A:wan, between 1995 and 2005.[24] Isaac centered her inquiry with the historical case of Frank Cushing's time at Zuni in order to note the limitations for cross-cultural understandings of the reproduction of knowledge. Euro-American frames for understanding "copy" and "original" are particularly inadequate, as Isaac highlighted.

In a Zuni worldview that regarded the value of knowledge as existing within the acts of repetition, Cushing's ability to produce Zuni cultural objects through his own display of insider knowledge imposes knowledge value on the Ahayu:da that he created, though not being Zuni himself made these Ahayu:da seem like mere replicas to the Pitt-Rivers Museum staff who had them in their collections. From the Euro-American perspective on copying, this ostensible inauthenticity spurred intense debate when the Zuni sought to repatriate these materials. Further, Isaac presented this case within a broader ethical issue wherein the embodiment of knowledges and ability of anthropologists to reproduce those knowledges should also be a factor for consideration in further collaborative work with communities. Isaac elaborated:

> These ideas facilitate a revisiting of my conclusions—not only the need to recognize shared histories and at times meanings but also to acknowledge how knowledge reproduction itself is best understood through exploration of its dialogic nature.[25]

Where Isaac posited the necessity of recognizing histories and meanings to arrange material culture as shared through the exchanges produced by colonial interaction, she also, following some of the trends of decolonizing approaches, emphasized acknowledging the role of knowledge reproduction. Isaac's scholarship lies in the restitution of Zuni items in collections, many of which are implicated in the Stevenson collections. There are many other tribal affiliations indexed in the Stevenson catalogs as well (the 1879 catalog lists Wolip, Laguna, Acoma, Cochiti, Santa Domingo, "Tesuke," Santa Clara, San Juan, Jemez, Jicarilla Apaches, Old Pecos, Cañon de Chelly, Pictograph Rocks, and "other localities"), which necessitates further effort in reconnecting materials

to community knowledge production and reproduction. Such work is underway in addressing legacy anthropology collections, but there remains considerable work in redressing catalogs as archival guiding documentation that erased particular meanings through its attempt to standardize its descriptive discourse.

The Stevenson catalog references imitation in terms of displacement between present cultures and their nearby ruins, but also suggests imitation between American and classical and ancient Mediterranean antiquity.[26] This suggested "imitative quality" demarcates an invented line between a universalized ancient heritage that dispossesses Indigenous people's sovereign relationships to their own ancient materials. The act itself of rendering these objects into possessions for imperial repositories creates conditions of dispossession. Such dispossession works in favor of an unequally shared antiquity that American settlers can claim as their own.[27]

Many of these articles of clay were contemporary creations, but Stevenson and other ethnographers treated any recent version of older forms as authorized revivals of a pure precontact form. Although concerned with later discursive developments regarding Native American art in the early twentieth century, significant to my study is museum anthropologist Lea McChesney's critique of authoritative discourses, such as ethnographic cataloging. Through textual media produced on Indigenous art, both people and objects become symbols of "pure" culture, removed from both their subjectivity while rendering cultural forms as timeless or enduring forms of authentic representation. [28] Stevenson wrote in similar terms of imitation and reproduction that can be found in cataloging elsewhere in the Southwest, such as his contemporary Alexander Stephen's notes from Hopi.[29] Conceptions of "imitation" and "copying" pervade catalogs such as these. I scrutinize the frequency of these terms as evidence of (re)production as central to the shifting value of Indigenous materials.[30] This shifting value is reflected in an unstable systematization through which material embodiments of knowledge becomes displaced and reduced into objects of cultural exchange on behalf of settler and imperial institutions.

Perfect Reproductions

In this comparative context, the role of institutional collection-building can be viewed in a larger framework of collecting as imperial extraction internationally, with those collections supporting the construction of archaeological nationalisms of this period. Significant to nationalism, which relies on legitimizing the idea of the nation state, were ideas about race that linked to national origins. In the Stevenson catalogue, concern with reproductions of material culture is embedded in lists of shapes and descriptive terms. Yet the surrounding contexts of this cataloguing reflect on ways in which these early catalogs reproduce nineteenth-century constructs of white supremacy.

Indigenous reassertions of meaning are key to resisting the naturalization of such frameworks. Language based on imitation resounds in the descriptions of pottery found in Stevenson's catalog. Catalogs such as Stevenson's contain expressions of Native American designs as merely reminiscent of symbols observed by anthropologists elsewhere. Such cultural comparison undermines or obscures specific Indigenous

meanings and relationships. Archaeological dispossession across imperial regimes of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, inasmuch as it reinforced constructs of both "classical" and "Western" associations, informed cataloging practices involving Indigenous cultural material. This may at first seem difficult to notice in the Stevenson catalogs, but this section aims to trace these discursive constructions across contexts, focusing on a few discourses pertaining to shapes and forms ascribed to materials. Through this collecting history, cataloging can be understood as reproducing language based in racialized colonial appropriations of Indigenous cultural production. However, refusing these discursive constructions is necessary for resisting the perpetuation of epistemic appropriation and erasure.

In describing shapes found on Southwest Indigenous pottery, Stevenson states, "Here, we also find the meander or Greek fret correctly drawn, the vine, and several other designs rarely or never found in the other group." Noteworthy in this description is the standard placed on a design, defined through its resemblance to ancient *Greek* pottery, by which it is a "correct" rendering.[31] In other similar examples, after listing one "Paint Cup" as "With a simple Meander band," the next entry reads, "The artist has evidently attempted to figure on this true meander (Greek fret), but has failed."[32] Not only is the terminology encased in a reference to a recognizable classical association but the item in question is deemed less perfect in terms of its replicator's ability to carry out its form. If not a match or perfect reproduction, Stevenson has also noted resemblances that are mere attempts to match what he considers iconography. In this same section, Stevenson lists several "grotesque" animal forms—referring to the art designation that came from ancient Roman depictions of the monstrous, but later revived as a Renaissance art. However, as argued by art historian Frances S. Connelly, the grotesque became as much a construction to serve as a contrasting set of not classical but "primitive" forms as a derivation of an ancient Mediterranean-inspired aesthetic brought into the Western art canon.[33] Stevenson was not alone in borrowing terminology from Mediterranean archaeology in approaching this pottery, but this catalog shows a multitude of examples and relies heavily on the language of reproduction and imitation in approaching the Native American materials.

The use of the "Greek fret/key/meander" carries semiotic baggage that can be similarly problematic through use of other terms from "Old World" civilizations in comparing Native American figuration traditions.[34] I would point to the labelling of Navajo whirling log symbols as "swastikas." To this day, this Indigenous symbol's contested associations provide a case study in which direct responses from contemporary culture-bearers argue against mislabeling. Referring to North American Native American symbols as "swastikas" has nineteenth century anthropological roots. Whirling log or wind symbol iconography has a particularly fraught history through twentieth-century entanglements, wherein its early trading post popularity was curtailed with rising Nazism in Germany and the arrival of World War II. Navajo artists today, such as the Diné weaver Melissa Cody, have sought to reclaim whirling logs from their association as a symbol of fascism, anti-Semitism, and genocide—and rejecting "swastika" as a reference point.[35] This direct contemporary artist intervention underscores one way in which pyroepistomology can work toward Indigenous reclamation, in addition

to reevaluating legacy collections for wider-ranging returns of both materials and knowledges. The linguistic imposition that has tied an Indigenous North American form of iconography to a twentieth-century regime of genocide and white supremacist ideologies stems from an earlier dispossessive comparative framework, reflected across nineteenth-century American archaeological cataloging categorizations. The "swastika" term should be disassociated from Southwest Native American art as a form of epistemic cleansing. Other terms transferred from Mediterranean archaeology, such as the meander, are less inflammatory in their entanglements with Western civilization constructs, but I still regard these impositions as entangled.

In the same decade that the Stevensons were extracting material, ancient and contemporary, from Native Americans in New Mexico and Arizona, archaeologist Heinrich Schliemann was seeking out the site of Homeric Troy in Turkey. In his 1871 excavations, he rediscovered the spindle-whorl symbol, much in the way anthropologists were purporting to "rediscover" ancestral Indigenous iconography among nearby sites intentionally left undisturbed by Southwest Native Americans.[36] Neither set of iconography was truly lost to all humanity, but in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, these rediscoveries amounted to Europeans and European Americans claiming and ascribing their own values upon them as such. In the case of swastikas, Schliemann connected the spindle-whorl-shaped symbol in his excavations to Bronze Age Greece, Vedic Indian civilization, and an ancient German tribe, which informed the birth of a dangerous nationalism based on a mythologized pure Indo-European or Aryan race.[37] While I do not have the space to unpack the complexity of current receptions and reclamations of swastikas in Central and South Asian contexts, I can at least assert that Native American usages of this iconography should be carefully extracted from the narrative of European rediscovery, including through linguistic imposition.[38] Association with Indo-European roots also erases the longer presence of this sign in the Western Hemisphere by suggesting it belongs singularly to an Old World or Indo-European lineage via the combined appropriation and imposition of the Sanskrit term.

Its more recent histories in the American Southwest may be more complicated, but this shape appears in Mississippian mound sites excavated in the Eastern United States and cataloging of those archaeological sites would bear as a cross-reference with Stevenson in his Southwest ethnographic cataloguing. Thomas Wilson, a USNM curator in prehistoric anthropology, published an extensive study of swastikas in 1896, drawing in part from sources excavated by both Professor Cyrus Thomas, an acquaintance of James Stevenson, in Indian burial mounds and the Stevensons' ethnographic collections. In that study, Wilson entertains at length the possibility of Buddhist influence, not as definitive but at least possible, given the presence of the symbol. [39] This illustrates some of the extents to which early archaeology was invested in finding these Old World influences and connections, however unlikely, rather than reading ancestral Native American sites as having intrinsic Indigenous meanings.[40]

Other developments in American archaeology, in Latin America and the eastern mound sites, were also influential in the scholarly networks of James Stevenson, seen when the 1879 catalog references Professor Cyrus Thomas. Thomas had previously worked with Stevenson for the US Geological Survey, but had done his own

archaeological work at Maya sites and later Native American burial mounds. Although Thomas set out to investigate the mounds as part of a "vanishing race theory," he instead concluded in his study that Cherokees "probably" were the mound-builders, rather than an unrelated vanished people. However, he conceded to this connection between ancestral and living people while employing extensive use of comparative models, whereby he refers to Central and Mesoamerica as having more advanced civilizations, but Europeans even more so.[41] With this comparison, Thomas wavers from the suggestion that any artist from Maya or other Central American civilization had created similar designs at the eastern mound sites. However, Thomas had apparently suggested similarities between cultures to Stevenson. Stevenson writes:

> Now, it is possible that this figure has been used with the same meaning from time immemorial, but I find, as pointed out to me by Prof. Cyrus Thomas, that almost exactly the same figure is on a vessel pictured on Plate VII of the manuscript *Troano*, where a religious ceremony of some kind is evidently represented. The same figure is also found in Landa's character for the Maya day *cib*, a word signifying copal, a gum or resin formerly used in religious ceremonies as incense. I find also on Plate XXXV of the same manuscript the figures of bowls or pots with legs similar to those of the Zuñi.[42]

Even while claiming that there is not an intention to use resemblances as evidence of relations between these different groups of people, the effect is still premised in the mode of comparative civilizational models. The effect of distancing present-day people from deeper pasts of their own still occurs. Similarly, through this descriptive method, Stevenson sets up the Zuni ceramics that he exemplified alongside Maya examples from the documentation of sixteenth-century Spanish friar Diego de Landa and Thomas' *Troiano Manuscript* plates, setting these materials outside of their temporal and cultural contexts to illustrate similarities and differences in technological forms. [43]

The Stevenson catalog becomes especially explicit about this where it references plates from the Cyprus collection of General Luigi Palma di Cesnola, a European immigrant from Genoese nobility who served in the Union Army before becoming involved in artifact collecting following the Civil War. Cesnola served as US consul in Cyprus, where he collected thousands of archaeological objects, many of which became the foundational antiquities collection at the Metropolitan Museum in New York. Cesnola then served as director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. [44] Stevenson opened up this comparison to the Cesnola collection, asserting the following:

> Anyone familiar with General Cesnola's collection from Cyprus cannot fail to be reminded of it when he examines this collection of Indian pottery; especially the colors used and the general character of the specimens; but an inspection of the two collections is necessary in order to have this general resemblance brought to mind, as it does not appear so distinctly on a comparison of the published figures only.[45]

Overall, Stevenson brought this into an argument, that it is "unsafe, in studying ancient specimens, to draw hasty conclusions from slight differences" due to the variations seen even among related and contemporaneous tribes.[46] This may seem a contradiction from his previous contemporary study, but I see this more as a rhetorical move to compare his work and his attention to detail to the fieldwork of others, including that evident in the foundational collection-building for the Met. In this way, Stevenson likens his own knowledge-production to the cataloging efforts of both Thomas and Cesnola. This extensive referencing of Cesnola, then, reproduces a value system wherein materials serve as specialized types in terms of showing remarkable characteristics of industry.

The comparison between the Cypriot ceramics and the Pueblo Indian ceramics reveals parallels between those extracting archaeological materials from the Mediterranean and Native American lands, while also pointing to an interrelated system of valorization of these materials. For Cesnola, Cyprus was an area ripe for extraction, while goods from classical Greece and Rome already felt like a previously emptied culture cache. Art historian Ann-Marie Knoblauch, in an article about the 1870s public reception of the Cesnola collection, characterizes the founders of the Met as less interested in knowing about the art they collected—rather, they were "men who aimed to elevate American culture to the standards of Old Europe."[47] Knoblauch also notes that, despite this aspiration, many of the antiquities from "archaeologically rich" countries were becoming less available through stricter laws on exporting them—yet Cesnola's dual consulate position for both America and Russia allowed him to dig at his discretion, then skirt those restrictions.[48] Although not antiquities from Greece, Egypt, or Assyria, Cyprus' artifacts presented as an alternative key stage in the emergence of classical art, situated between those civilizations. However, public reception of this art, at least according to newspaper reviews, found the collection to be overwhelming and unsightly. Knoblauch adds that the problem of duplicates was an obstacle for the Met in building a universal collection comparable to the Louvre or the British Museum.[49]

The Stevenson collection eventually moved beyond the US National Museum, where it intersected with the building of collections at other major museums. Evidence shows that trades of items regularly occurred across domestic museums (for instance, some of the Stevenson's collections are in the Cincinnati Art Museum) as well as with international institutions (there are also Stevenson-attributed items at the British Museum).[50] Nancy Parezo notes that trade of "duplicate" items between the US National Museum and European institutions was common in this period.[51] These duplicate items tended to be smaller pieces such as arrowheads or spearpoints, as Parezo describes. I point as well to these numerous situations where pieces of assemblages, such as whole vessels, also served as trade items similar to the smaller duplicates. These large-item institutional exchanges figured into the transformation from scientific specimen toward a form of cultural currency between not just institutions but nations, as museums served as national representatives. Knoblauch (2019) misses the conversation from Parezo (1987) and Nichols and Parezo (2017) about duplicates and collection-building internationally, but it is worth pointing out that at the same time, the USNM was engaged in these exchanges. This meant amassing large collections,

however full of duplicates, which they could then use to fill in others' collection gaps while mutually seeking out materials to fill gaps in their own collections.

Conversely, Cesnola and the Met's early trustees were seeing themselves as more straightforward competitors to European museums in terms of amassing *European* fine art, toward which the European museums already had much more ground. This is in contrast to USNM's curator Otis Mason, who had the flexibility to turn his attention to the steady supply of material coming from the Bureau of Ethnology's domestic territories—*i.e.*, American Indian country.[52] Classical Greek- and Roman-associated materials were already well represented, or thoroughly looted depending on the perspective, into European museum's appropriations, which presented a difficulty to a collector such as Cesnola on behalf of the Met. Cypriot materials were not representative of the *classical* antiquity that European institutions aspired to in terms of taste, but *proximity* to classical civilization. This proximity could be argued, from Cesnola's contemporary standpoint, in both the evolutionary and relative locational sense. Where proximity through a catalog's assertion made for a weaker case in terms of public display, instead the Cypriot materials' *novelty* from better-recognized classical forms made for an argument that these collections should be important for an American institution to possess in terms of attaining antiquities.

The parallel collecting focuses of the fine art–focused Metropolitan Museum in New York and the National Museum in Washington DC reflected the at times intersecting interests in the late nineteenth century in both of these institutions trying to elevate American culture to European standards, and their growing interest in appropriating and reconfiguring Indigenous art and artifacts into distinctly American materials. The Stevenson collections primarily served, at the time of their collection and cataloging, as specimens for a national institution's collection, but the knowledge obtained was deemed most valuable as a measure of this extraction. The Cesnola collection aimed toward connoisseurship, but the large scope also lent itself to having an academic or scientific value, as seen through Stevenson's citations. Blurred lines formed between collectors' interest in materials as cultural production. Into the early twentieth century, materials became appreciated as "industrial" arts as well as "decorative" arts, amid mass extraction from their source communities. Some of the developments that brought collections such as Cesnola's into the holdings of the Met exemplifies these shifts out of earlier specimen collecting. The interests of a private collector or curator placed emphasis on public consumption in the reception of this archaeological collection.

Considering this case study within a set of turns that involved at least semiprivate pursuits as well as public tastes can obscure the fact that Cesnola's collecting involved a simultaneous creation of a catalog as field documentation for scholarly knowledge production.[53] This obfuscation also occurred as the contemporary efforts of Otis T. Mason at the USNM intended to display its collections, including those accrued by the Stevensons, in its halls and in major expos.[54] Yet at the same time, the Stevensons's collecting served as part of a mission to accrue scientific data points on behalf of the settler government. These two missions, between showcasing for public display choice

cultural pieces and amassing largely unseen vast assemblages ascribed to the catalogs, were not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Conclusion

Understanding the relationship between salvage ethnography and the international cultural exchange of archaeological specimens points to the continued relevance of how institutions still view and handle these materials today. This article is not to assume that a static approach to collecting has occurred in the past century and a half, but to reinforce the move toward a more holistic question of the nature of collections as they originally formed. I approach this history by examining a discursively linked network of people who were invested in both ethnological and archaeological pursuits. This network and their knowledge production exists within a colonial effort to imagine American pasts. Yet these colonial imaginaries serve in staking imperial and national knowledge production within resource, land, and labor claims both on the North American continent and beyond. The 1879 Stevenson collection catalog is one example of an archival record from settler-colonial state ethnographic expeditions that constructed imaginary lines in demarcating ancient heritage. On one side, these constructions appropriate heritage for American nationalist narratives in which settlers can claim to discover history from "vanishing" races. However, this dispossession also universalizes Indigenous cultural production toward global exchange, facilitating inheritance among imperial powers that sought to build encyclopedic knowledge systems. In these ways, heritage functions to dispossess Indigenous people's sovereignty through rendering cultural material into property. What needs cleansing from these archival records is not merely the presence of other ancient civilizations imposed on Indigenous pasts but the specific frames that focus on comparison and measurement between civilizations. In challenging the assumptions of basic documentation of the past, new growth can continue to occur in taking care of the numerous pieces that comprise large institutional collections. Where art historian Mikinaak Migwans has asserted the importance of care and relationality in place of the bureaucratic treatment of museum objects, reconsidering these foundations in the their archives can guide further ethical approaches.[55]

Notes

1. See Darlis A. Miller, *Matilda Coxe Stevenson: Pioneering Anthropologist* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007). For a more detailed biographical account on Matilda Coxe Stevenson's life and work, see Curtis Hinsley, *The Smithsonian and the American Indian: Making a Moral Anthropology in Victorian America* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981 [reprinted 1994]). Hinsley also discusses her presence in the field during this time, but mainly regards the Stevensons as rivals to Frank H. Cushing in his work.

2. While the works of Matilda Coxe Stevenson were formative for anthropology in the 1890s and early 1900s, I look even earlier to her and her husband's work to catalog extracted materials in

their first New Mexico exhibition. This 1879 catalog was published by Colonel James Stevenson as a summary of his work for the Bureau of Ethnology, but I attribute shared authorship due to his wife's acknowledged part in preparing his notes and her longer-lasting role in continuing his work from his notes. The temptation might then be to read this catalog through the lens of Matilda Coxe Stevenson's larger body of publications, making this document part of her legacy as pioneering woman anthropologist. For a narrative of the Stevensons in their respective biographical works, see Miller, *Matilda Coxe Stevenson* and Nancy J. Parezo, "Matilda Coxe Stevenson: Pioneer Ethnologist," in *Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest*, ed. Parezo (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1993). However, in lieu of this historiographic focus on specific anthropologists' contributions, my aim for now is to explore the importance of cataloguing as a feature of ethnographic notation that provides insights on the organizing process of materials as data points, or a rawer view of the Stevenson's early approach.

3. Hannah Turner, *Cataloguing Culture: Legacies of Colonialism in Museum Documentation* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2020), 4.

4. For a few examples and discussions of archeological nationalism, see *Contested Antiquity: Archaeological Heritage and Social Conflict in Modern Greece and Cyprus*, ed. Esther Solomon (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2021); Raphael Greenberg, and Yannis Hamilakis, *Archaeology, Nation, and Race: Confronting the Past, Decolonizing the Future in Greece and Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022); Margarita Díaz-Andreu García, *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology: Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

5. Stevenson, for instance, writes, "The Zuñians and Shinumos, although situated farther from civilized people and less influenced by their usages than any of the other Indians mentioned, surpass all the other tribes in the manufacture of all kinds of earthenware" (1879, 329). In this case, their distance from "civilized people" makes their art more distinct and exemplary of skills in earthenware.

6. Lonnie G. Bunch III, "Why the Smithsonian Adopted a New Policy on Ethical Collecting," *Smithsonian Magazine* (June 2022), https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/smithsonian-adopted-new-policy-ethical-collecting-180980047/ (accessed July 11, 2022). I brought this announcement to the forefront of my argument when I first submitted an abstract of this article to this journal in 2022. While not as recent, I still consider this ethical collecting policy as an issue publicly raised by this major institution in recent years. However, I also hope that the contexts of violence highlighted in this paper may also raise some further scrutiny about what the policy considers theft or duress out of the past 150 years of collecting.

7. Throughout this paper, I use terms such as "object," "artifact," "item," "article," and "material" to describe the types of designations that rendered cultural materials into objects and not material forms of culture. In order to capture the breadth of these collections, I need to rely on these general terms for lack of space to properly address, for instance, what these "articles of clay" comprise in more culturally sensitive terms. This points to the overarching problem of what these catalogs initially renders invisible: more specific and intimate ways of knowing specific vessels and other "items" and "articles."

8. Catherine A. Nichols and Nancy J. Parezo, "Social and Material Connections: Otis T. Mason's European Grand Tour and Collections Exchanges," *History and Anthropology* 28, no. 1 (2017): 58–83, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02757206.2016.1195737.

9. For a small sampling of this historiography not otherwise referenced in this article, see Don D. Fowler, *A Laboratory for Anthropology: Science and Romanticism in the American Southwest, 1846–1930* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000); Curtis M. Hinsley, *Savages and Scientists: the Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846–1910* (Washington, D.C: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981); James E. Snead, *Ruins and Rivals: The Making of Southwest Archaeology* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001); James E. Snead, *Relic Hunters: Archaeology and the Public in Nineteenth-Century America* (First Edition) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

10. Laura L. Peers and Alison K. Brown, *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader* (London: Routledge, 2003), 1. Their discussion premises this one-way ethnographic collecting as the paradigm from which recent work increasingly shifts toward more reciprocal relationships. In no way does this paper disregard that ongoing work in the twenty years since they published this volume has continued, but my discussion adds to the necessity of continuing to question how these foundations perpetuate imperial extraction, necessitating scrutiny for continuing relationship repair.

11. Bruce G. Trigger, "Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist," *Man* 19, no. 3 (1984): 355–70, https://doi.org/10.2307/2802176. I point to Trigger as a starting point, as it serves as an early influential discussion of nationalist archaeology in addition to colonialist and imperialist. While Trigger faulted the United States for engaging in the latter two forms of archaeology, I would add that, from the vantage of historical archaeology, the early American archaeology also maintained threads of nationalist motives in supplying national origins relative to its state as a still-growing colonial state. While the categories of nationalist, colonial, and imperial archaeologies are at once generic and perhaps limited in other senses, I would argue that they are useful starting places toward understanding the more nuanced circumstances of the gathering of materials for archeological and anthropological endeavors. This is also linked to a history of anthropology more broadly, as those such as the Stevensons were conducting ethnographic studies and not simply excavating and surveying ruins.

12. Developments in the commodification of Indigenous art, particularly in the US Southwest, have been extensively covered elsewhere. In the approximately fifty years that would follow, the transition from specimen to artwork involved an extensive trade in Indigenous materials as tourist curios into eventual efforts by the 1930s to better authenticate forms of Indigenous art, which would be reliant on authoritative sources such as museum-produced catalogs. For the effort to legislate Indigenous art, see Jennifer McLerran, *A New Deal for Indigenous Art: Indian Arts and Federal Policy, 1933–1943* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2009). For some of the early twentieth-century transitional period, see Elizabeth Hutchinson, *The Indian Craze: Primitivism, Modernism, and Transculturation in American Art, 1890–1915* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009).

13. Paulette F. C. Steeves, *The Indigenous Paleolithic of the Western Hemisphere* (Lincoln: Nebraska, 2021).

14. James Stevenson, "Illustrated Catalog of the Collections Obtained from the Indians of New Mexico and Arizona in 1879," in *The Second Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian (1880–1881)*, http://rla.unc.edu/Archives/BAE-pubs.html#AR-48, (accessed May 20, 2022).

15. Mary Hudetz, "New Federal Rules Aim to Speed Repatriations of Indigenous Remains and Burial Items," *Pro Publica* (December 8, 2023), https://www.propublica.org/article/interior-department-revamps-repatriation-rules-native-remains-nagpra. This coverage is part of a larger effort for journalistic accountability on the state of repatriation and museum collections in the United States by Hudetz.

16. Stevenson, "Illustrated Catalog," 320.

17. For a more nuanced discussion, see Isaac Gwyneira, "Reobservation and the Recognition of Change: The Photographs of Matilda Coxe Stevenson (1879–1915)," *Journal of the Southwest* 47 (2005): 411–55.

18. For a parallel consideration to this point (specific to botanical specimen collecting), see Banu Subramaniam, *Botany of Empire: Plant Worlds and the Scientific Legacies of Colonialism* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2024).

19. This entanglement between military control and the mapping of Indigenous lands in the region and resource surveying has a deeper history as well. Maps produced by Lieutenant Simpson in a military survey supplied knowledge of ruins surrounding Navajo lands to Lewis Henry Morgan. While not directly influential to the archaeology of the region, Lewis H. Morgan mentored to a

degree Adolph Bandelier in Southwest anthropological study on behalf of the Archeological Institute of America, another key organization in the development of the American study of anthropology. See Berenika Byszewski, "Colonizing Chaco Canyon: Mapping Antiquity in the US Southwest," in *History of Cartography*, ed. Elri Liebenberg and Imre Josef Demhardt (Berlin: Springer, 2012), 145–53.

20. Hinsley, *The Smithsonian and the American Indian*; Snead, *Ruins and Rivals*.

21. Stevenson, "Illustrated Catalog," 320, 326.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid, 325.

24. Isaac Gwyneira, "Whose Idea Was This? Museums, Replicas, and the Reproduction of Knowledge," *Current Anthropology* 52, no. 2 (2011): 211–33. Notably, I bring to this discussion reflections by museum anthropologists working post-NAGPRA's passing. Chip Colwell is another museum practitioner who has detailed extensively his repatriation work specific to Zuni materials and dealing with questions of reproduction and copies, which has unique baggage in the case of creation by a non-Zuni knowledge initiate, Frank H. Cushing. See also Chip Colwell, *Plundered Skulls and Stolen Spirits* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017). Where Colwell was concerned with the question of ownership of material culture and the past, and where he relayed repatriation as a restoration of control to indigenous peoples, Isaac's observations point to further complications in the question of ownership.

25. Gwyneira, "Whose Idea Was This?" 231

26. I use "classical" here, as classical antiquity denotes forms of Greco-Roman antiquity most iconic with ancient Mediterranean antiquity, associated with constructs of ancient civilization which itself requires unpacking in relation to nationalist and imperialist antiquity. Not all ancient material from the Mediterranean regions is classical *per se*, as I will discuss later on, with Cyprus serving as one exception. As this paper will suggest (though this is not my main goal in my discussion here), the construction of "classical" antiquity relates to the regimes of colonial and imperial impositions of antiquity here, where "classical" serves as a marker of civilization in terms of imagining ancient pasts through which certain nations or peoples view themselves having inheritance claims toward the dispossession of others.

27. I draw here from the logics of the white possessive, which links white supremacy and property rights through the settler colonial nation state, as examined in Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).

28. Lea McChesney, "(Art)writing: A New Cultural Frame for Native American Art," in *No Deal! Indigenous Arts and the Politics of Possession*, ed. Tressa Berman (Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 2012). McChesney terms this discourse "artwriting." Her discussion focuses on pure cultural forms as embodied through published textual media that authoritatively gives discursive value to cultural materials as commodified in the marketplace for Native American art. The media that McChesney examines is not limited to cataloguing, but also considers related media such as guides and books that museums and similar heritage institutions produce. See also a previous take on these concepts in McChesney, "Pure Objects, Pure Persons: Artwriting and the Cultural Frame of Traditional Native American Art," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 31, no. 3 (2007).

29. McChesney's "(Art)writing" also introduced me to the prevalence of this language of imitation and reproduction language, including through a note the references to Classical Greco-Roman models in Alexander Stephen's notes from Hopi. As a contemporary to Stevenson, this points to the influence of these models elsewhere in the documentation of Native American materials in the Southwest.

30. My use of *(re)production* and including parentheses draws in part from Mishuana Goeman. In her work on "(re)mapping," she evokes Vizenor's "survivance" and posits that "(re)mapping" is a way

for Indigenous women to use both traditional and new tribal stories toward continuity. I imagine the production of material objects as functioning the same way—not mere *reproduction* in the technical sense but as an embodied way of producing and "remapping" that relationship to production in adaptive ways that reasserts Indigenous presence through active negotiation with colonial disciplining discourses. See Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Indigenous Women Mapping Our Nations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).

31. I also can point to similar references in the catalog produced by Alexander Stephen on behalf of Fewkes for the Keams Canyon collection, where, among references to Hopi pottery with Greek pottery types such as *askos*, he refers to designs as the "Greek maiander . . . perfectly reproduced." See *A Reference Manual for Historic Hopi Ceramics: The Thomas V. Keam Collection*, ed. Lea S. McChesney and Barbara W. McCue (Cambridge: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1982). This manual reproduces much of the cataloguing by Stephen, but with additional annotation such as where material is unaccounted for—that is, based on researching the Harvard collection a century later.

32. Stevenson, "Illustrated Catalog," 364.

33. Frances S. Connelly, *The Sleep of Reason: Primitivism in Modern European Art and Aesthetics, 1725–1907* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995).

34. The use of the term "Old World" in itself is problematic, but I use it with a degree of irony for the sake of my overall criticism of this hierarchy presented between hemispheric civilizations, wherein the Eastern is the established center and the Western hemisphere is newer, discovered. The irony also serves as part of this article's aim to destabilize the assumptions of discovery and ensuing impositions of "Old World" examples as anthropologists worked through their limited knowledges to ascribing meanings upon their "new" (to them) findings.

35. Staff members, "Melissa Cody's Whirling Logs: Don't You Dare Call Them Swastikas," *Indian Country Today*, August 7, 2013, https://ictnews.org/archive/melissa-codys-whirling-logs-dont-you-dare-call-them-swastikas (accessed October 15, 2022).

36. Lorraine Boissoneault, "The Man Who Brought the Swastika to Germany, and How the Nazis Stole It," *Smithsonian Magazine* (2017), https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/man-who-brought-swastika-germany-and-how-nazis-stole-it-180962812/.

37. Ibid.

38. While not as well versed in the many discussions across Central and South Asian ethnic groups, I found some insights on the complex and ambiguous adoptions in popular culture of those regions discussed in a piece by Niels Hegewisch and Julian Dierkes, "Fascist Symbolism in Mongolia," in *Mongolia Focus* (University of British Columbia Blogs, January 20, 2020), https://blogs.ubc.ca/mongolia/2020/hu-nazi-symbols-nationalism-context/.

39. Thomas Wilson, *The Swastika, the Earliest Known Symbol, and Its Migrations, with Observations on the Migration of Certain Industries in Prehistoric Times* (detached from the *Annual Report of the US National Museum*, 1894) (Washington, DC: US Government Publishing Office, 1896).

40. For further discussion on this topic, see Patricia Cleary, *Mound City: The Place of the Indigenous Past and Present in St. Louis* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2024).

41. Cyrus Thomas, "Burial Mounds of the Northern Sections of the United States," *Fifth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology, 1883–1884* (1888).

42. Stevenson, "Illustrated Catalog," 333.

43. With de Landa referenced here via Thomas' suggestion to Stevenson.

44. For recent scholarship on Cesnola and his collection, see Ann-Marie Knoblauch, "The Mainstream Media and the 'Shocking Bad Art' from Cyprus: 1870s New York Reacts to the Cesnola Collections," *Near Eastern Archaeology* 82, no. 2 (2019): 67–74; and Rachel N. Klein, *Art Wars: The*

Politics of Taste in Nineteenth-Century New York (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020).

45. Stevenson, "Illustrated Catalog," 333–34, where he also continued with reference to specific plates, writing, "The figures on Plate XLIV of his 'Cyprus' bear quite a striking resemblance to those on some specimens of Cochiti ware. The quadruple cup, Fig. 25, page 406, is almost exactly like the Zuñi quadruple cups, and was probably used for the same purpose. The same type of multiple cups is also shown in Plate IX of the same work. The two tea-pot-like vessels represented on Plate VIII, as well as the two bird-shaped pieces on the same 333 plate, are much like the similar vessels of Cochiti pottery, several of which are figured in this catalog." Stevenson references Luigi Palma di Cesnola, *Cyprus* (London: Bradbury, Agnew & Co., 1877).

46. Stevenson, "Illustrated Catalog," 333–34.

47. Knoblauch, "The Mainstream Media and the 'Shocking Bad Art' from Cyprus," 67.

48. Ibid.

49. Ibid, 71.

50. See digitized collections for examples of these. British Museum, Matilda Coxe Stevenson collections database search, https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/search?keyword=matilda&keyword=coxe&keyword=stevenson (accessed January 11, 2023) and Cincinnati Art Museum, https://www.cincinnatiartmuseum.org/art/explore-the-collection?id=11295285 (accessed January 27, 2023).

51. Nancy J. Parezo, "The Formation of Ethnographic Collections: The Smithsonian Institution in the American Southwest," *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 10 (1987): 1–47.

52. Hinsley, *The Smithsonian and the American Indian.*

53. John L. Myres, *Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1914).

54. Darlis Miller, in *Matilda Coxe Stevenson: Pioneering Anthropologist*, also discusses how Mason worked with her on exhibitions outside of her fieldwork and made for a proponent of her participation in Washington's then male-dominated anthropological societies.

55. Mikinaak Migwans, "Betraying the Object: Relational Anxieties and Bureaucratic Care in Indigenous Collections Research," in *The Routledge Companion to Indigenous Art Histories in the United States and Canada*, ed. Heather Igloliorte and Carla Taunton (New York: Routledge, 2022), 126–36.